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 log0007.
Part 1/1, total size 851986 bytes:
>From quire@interaccess.com Sat Jul  1 21:23:01 2000
Received: from webmail.interaccess.com (webmail.interaccess.com [207.70.121.245])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id VAA25944 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Jul 2000 21:23:00 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <200007020423.VAA25944@usc.edu>
Date: Sat, 1 Jul 00 23:20:41 -0500
Sender: quire <quire@interaccess.com>
From: quire <quire@interaccess.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Which WebSurvey Software to Buy?
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT
X-Mailer: WebMail (Hydra) SMTP v3.11

I am considering serveal websurvey packages (SPSS, Ronin, etc.) I would appreciate any comments from current users on your experiences and suggestions. (ease of programming, stability, technical support, etc.)

Francis Fullam

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Jul  2 19:25:03 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id TAA10718 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 Jul 2000 19:25:02 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
  by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
According to a study of 2,198 internet users released today by internet customer service provider PeopleSupport, 63% of those who shop online more than once a week are women.

There is an obvious logic to these findings, since, as PeopleSupport CEO Lance Rosenzweig notes: "women have traditionally been responsible for 80% of household purchases. As more purchases take place online, women will continue to take charge in that world as well."

However, women's dominance as web shoppers is occurring faster than expected. In 1995, women made up just 15% of internet users, currently it is about 50%. "Over nine million women have logged onto the internet for the first time in the past year, and 58% of all new internet users are now women," says Rosenzweig. PeopleSupport expects women will outnumber men on the internet by a 3-to-2 margin by the year 2003.

Overall, the study indicates that 19% of internet users are already shopping at least once a week, with 5.1% shopping online several times a week. But the study also shows that almost one out of eight internet users (15.9%) still have never used the internet for shopping. Of the remainder, 22% say that they shop online once a month, and 43% shop online only a few times a year.

The survey reveals considerable information about those consumers whom PeopleSupport labels "Supershoppers," defined in the study as those who shop online several times a week. According to the survey:

* Almost one-third (31%) of these online shoppers are in the 45-54 age group
* 31.9% of them have incomes over $75,000 per year

* 57% are married, and 44% have kids under the age of 18 living at home

* Although 61% have been using the Web for over five years, 20% have been online for less than 3 months

The survey also found that age, inexperience on the internet and lack of customer support were important factors turning users away from shopping online.

For more on the demographic factors of internet shopping, along with a lot of data on e-consumer behavior, see eMarketer's eCommerce: B2C Report.
Dear AAPORNETers:

I am posting this message on behalf of Ms. Can Du of RAND. Ms. Du is an AAPOR member, but has not set up access to this list yet. Please send your reply directly to Ms. Du at candu@rand.org. Thanks.

We are planning a mail survey of college students, graduates, and drop outs (nationwide). We are considering drawing samples from a commercial list of college bound high school seniors (We will use previous 2 (or 3) years' lists to draw the sample). The addresses and/or phone numbers we will have on the respondents were their parents' when the R was in high school. So we will rely on the parents/guardian to forward the survey to the R. I'd appreciate any advise on the following:

1) What is the best source of sample frame for this population and its feasibility of obtaining it?
2) How likely are the parents forwarding children mails (e.g. %) after they leave home (any literature out there)?
3) Any suggestions on pretesting whether parents will (will not) forward children mails?
4) Any suggestions on how to approach the respondents for a higher response rate assuming this sampling methodology is used?

Please respond to me directly. Thanks,

Can Du
RAND
1700 Main Street
P O Box 2138
Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138

Tel: (310) 393-0411 ext 6301
Fax: (310) 451-6957
On Wed, 5 Jul 2000, Can Du (via Wei Yen) wrote:

> 2) How likely are the parents forwarding children mails (e.g. %) after they leave home (any literature out there)?

I would worry less about what percentage of parents might forward the questionnaire to their child and much more about what this design does to your sampling frame, and to the universe of young people it represents.

You begin with a national sample of college students, drop outs and graduates, but the design you propose immediate divides this into three distinct groups:

(1) parents forward/child responds to survey
(2) parents forward/child does not respond to survey
(3) parents do not forward/child cannot respond to survey

In short, your initial sample of college students is destroyed, and you are left with a 100 percent survey of group (1) and 0 percent surveys of groups (2) and (3), and absolutely no useful information on how to get from group (1) back to a representative sample of American college students, drop outs and graduates.

Please tell me what I am overlooking.

-- Jim

******
In addition the the problem that Jim cited I see a couple of other problems:

As far as I know there are no generally available good lists of college bound high school seniors (if you find one please let me know). The best source would probably be the major testing organizations the SAT and ACT but I believe they do not allow their data to be used for external research.

Based on surveys which I have done for individual colleges you probably will get markedly different response rates for those currently in college and those who have dropped out. This is likely to be the case even after you take into account whether parents forward the instrument.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Wei Yen [mailto:weiyen@ucla.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2000 1:40 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Fwd: AAPOR net

Dear AAPORNETers:

I am posting this message on behalf of Ms. Can Du of RAND. Ms. Du is an AAPOR member, but has not set up access to this list yet. Please send your reply directly to Ms. Du at candu@rand.org. Thanks.

Wei Yen

Wei Yen
California Health Interview Survey
UCLA Center for Health Policy Research
10911 Weyburn Ave., Suite 300
Hello,

We are planning a mail survey of college students, graduates, and drop outs (nationwide). We are considering drawing samples from a commercial list of college bound high school seniors (We will use previous 2(or 3) years' lists to draw the sample). The addresses and/or phone numbers we will have on the respondents were their parent's when the R was in high school. So we will rely on the parents/guardian to forward the survey to the R. I'd appreciate any advise on the following:

1) What is the best source of sample frame for this population and its feasibility of obtaining it?
2) How likely are the parents forwarding children mails (e.g. %) after they leave home (any literature out there)?
3) Any suggestions on pretesting whether parents will (will not) forward children mails?
4) Any suggestions on how to approach the respondents for a higher response rate assuming this sampling methodology is used?

Please respond to me directly.

Thanks,

Can Du
RAND
1700 Main Street
P O Box 2138
Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
Tel: (310) 393-0411 ext 6301
Fax: (310) 451-6957

In addition the the problem that Jim cited I see a couple of other problems:
As far as I know there are no generally available good lists of college bound high school seniors (if you find one please let me know). The best source would probably be the major testing organizations the SAT and ACT but I believe they do not allow their data to be used for external research.

Based on surveys which I have done for individual colleges you probably will get markedly different response rates for those currently in college and those who have dropped out. This is likely to be the case even after you take into account whether parents forward the instrument.

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

---

Dear AAPORNETers:

I am posting this message on behalf of Ms. Can Du of RAND. Ms. Du is an AAPOR member, but has not set up access to this list yet. Please send your reply directly to Ms. Du at

---

Wei Yen
weiyen@ucla.edu

---

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

From: Wei Yen [mailto:weiyen@ucla.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2000 1:40 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Fwd: AAPOR net

I am posting this message on behalf of Ms. Can Du of RAND. Ms. Du is an AAPOR member, but has not set up access to this list yet. Please send your reply directly to Ms. Du at
Hello,<n> We are planning a mail survey of college students, graduates, and drop outs nationwide. We are considering drawing samples from a commercial list of college bound high school seniors (We will use previous 2(or 3) years' lists to draw the sample). The addresses and/or phone numbers we will have on the respondents were their parents' when the R was in high school. So we will rely on the parents/guardian to forward the survey to the R. I'd appreciate any advise on the following:

1) What is the best source of sample frame for this population and its feasibility of obtaining it?
2) How likely are the parents forwarding children mails (e.g. %) after they leave home (any literature out there)?
3) Any suggestions on pretesting whether parents will (will not) forward children mails?
4) Any suggestions on how to approach the respondents for a higher response rate assuming this sampling methodology is used?

Please respond to me directly.

Thanks,

Can

RAND
1700 Main Street
P O Box 2138
Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
Tel: (310) 393-0411 ext 6301
Fax: (310) 451-6957
Leo (and AAPORnetters),

The only company (if it still exists) that I have ever heard of that keeps somewhat reliable lists on H.S. students is American Student List Company in Mineola, NY. It has been a while since I have dealt with them personally, so I can only assume they are still in business, but this might be a resource for any who are interested.

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Thu Jul  6 06:40:44 2000
Received: from mail.monmouth.com (mail.monmouth.com [209.191.58.1])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA21882 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jul 2000 06:40:43 -0700
    (PDT)
From: rhickson@monmouth.com
Received: from 205.148.63.217 (www.monmouth.com [209.191.58.2])
    by mail.monmouth.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA10948
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jul 2000 09:40:42 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <200007061340.JAA10948@mail.monmouth.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Are telephone response rates dropping again?
Date: Thu, 6 Jul 2000 09:40:42 EDT
X-Mailer: MI-Webmail - Monmouth Internet

I am looking for any recently published papers that indicate that telephone response rates for household surveys have dropped significantly in very recent years (say, 1998-2000). Papers or reports indicating differences in response rate by state would also be helpful, though not critical.

Any advice aapornetters can give on where to look would be most helpful.

Many thanks,

Rachel Hickson

This message was sent using MI-Webmail.
No matter where you are, never lose touch.
Get your Email using MI-Webmail.
http://www.monmouth.com/

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Thu Jul  6 07:09:23 2000
Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA00581 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jul 2000 07:09:15 -0400 (EDT)
    (PDT)
Received: from default (mxusw5x36.chesco.com [209.195.228.36])
    by carriage.chesco.com (8.10.2/8.9.1) with SMTP id e66E9FU12591
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jul 2000 10:09:15 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <001c01bfe753f9b3aff60$24e4c3d1@default>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
In its 1999 Respondent Cooperation study, CMOR (www.cmor.org) reports that the refusal rate for this RDD household survey -- previously administered in 1995 -- "continues to show a slow but steady upward climb." You have to pay $150 to get the actual numbers unless you are a member of CMOR. Otherwise, don't hold your breath.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
From: rhickson@monmouth.com <rhickson@monmouth.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Thursday, July 06, 2000 9:41 AM
Subject: Are telephone response rates dropping again?

>I am looking for any recently published papers that indicate that
telephone response rates for household surveys have dropped
significantly in very recent years (say, 1998-2000). Papers or reports
indicating differences in response rate by state would also be helpful,
though not critical.

>Any advice aapornetters can give on where to look would be most
helpful.

>Many thanks,

>Rachel
>Hickson

>-------------------------------------------------------------
> This message was sent using MI-Webmail.
> No matter where you are, never lose touch.
> Get your Email using MI-Webmail.
> http://www.monmouth.com/
> 
>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Jul  6 09:19:01 2000
Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.156])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMT
In recent years, marketing research survey analysts have increasingly tended to insist that banner tabulations show "significance tests" between many pairs of banner points. It has been my observation that, with few exceptions, this mostly indicates that the originator of the request does not understand much about statistical significance.

The current issue of PC Magazine contains an excellent example of how statistical significance is all too often misused. For many years, the July issue of that magazine, which is distributed at the PC Expo in New York, has published the results of a "Service and Reliability" survey conducted by mail among a sample selected from the magazine's subscriber list.

In this year's report, certain items display ratings in the form of symbols: a green up-arrow denotes "significantly above average," a gray horizontal bar denotes "average" and a red down-arrow indicates "significantly worse than average." Other items are shown as averages or percents. With one exception, there is no way to match rating symbols and numeric data for any vendor.

Only the column titled "Units needing repair in the past 12 months" shows both a percent and the resulting rating symbol. Reading down, one finds Dell rated "above average" overall, with 25% of units needing repair in the past 12 months, but emachines, with 22%, and Apple, with 24%, are rated "average." At the other end of the scale, "locally built computers," with 34% of units needing repair, displays the scarlet mark indicating "significantly worse than average," while Acer with 39%, AST with 36% and Packard Bell with 35%, are rated as "average."

Since the table provides the number of responses for each vendor, one can easily establish what is happening here: Dell has a base of 2,243 and "locally built" a base of 2,971, whereas for the "average" brands we have 207 for Apple, 129 for emachines, 213 for Acer, 98 for AST and 360 for Packard Bell. Assuming no errors and ignoring methodological issues, one readily sees that those brands rated significantly better or worse than average owe this distinction more to the number of responses they received than to what those responses indicate.

The survey actually shows that emachines and Apple rate better than average,
while Acer, AST and Packard Bell rate worse than average on this particular measurement, even if they did not receive enough responses to determine within an arbitrary (and undisclosed) confidence limit the probability that this reflects the experience of all PC Magazine subscribers.

If I were looking to buy a computer, this result would certainly be "significant," to me, whether or not the survey results for these brands are "statistically significant."

Except for statisticians, few people understand that "significance" indicates only the probability that a survey would show a difference in the sample if there were no such difference in the population. This is not at all the same as the probability that such a difference actually exists in the population, as is too often stated.

Furthermore, statistical significance says nothing about whether such a difference, even if it does exist in the population, means anything in the first place. In other words, even when a survey shows a significant difference and one accepts that such a difference exists in the population, one cannot assume without other information that this results from anything but coincidence.

Yet standard operating procedure today seems to be for analysts to plow through reams of data looking for statistically significant differences so that they can attempt to assign some kind of meaning to them. When faced with a pile of tables littered with significance markers and a deadline to issue a report, it is almost impossible to do otherwise.

Even if you are far more statistically savvy than the editors of PC Magazine, this practice is just as likely to make you miss the true significance of what you are looking at. ______

In the interest of full disclosure, I should note that one of my clients handled the PC Magazine Service and Reliability surveys for Ziff-Davis until two years ago and that, while I never tabulated that project for them, I did help them design the data sets and implement the significance testing as requested by the Ziff-Davis research department. They're nice people (my client, not Ziff-Davis) and they paid their bill on time (ditto). What more can one ask for?

As of this writing, PC Magazine has not yet posted on their web site either this year's survey results nor the promised information about how the study was conducted.

_____

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jul  6 09:21:55 2000
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA16550 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jul 2000 09:21:55 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA14513 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jul 2000 09:21:53 -0700
   (PDT)
Date: Thu, 6 Jul 2000 09:21:53 -0700 (PDT)
Colleagues,

This will be a big story.

Heritage Quest, inc. is going online with the entire US Census, all 12,555 rolls of film. The U.S. Census from 1790 to 1920, fully digitized is going online. You can get more information at a demo during ALA in Chicago, on Saturday, July 8, from 9:30 - Noon in the Hyatt Regency Grand Ballroom E, or stop by the Heritage Quest booth, #3625. It will be available by subscription to libraries when it is up this Fall at GenealogyDatabase.com. This is expected to be the largest data base of any subject on the Internet.

******

From: GenAnnual@aol.com
To: liblicense-l@lists.yale.edu
Subject: Entire US Census, 1790-1920 going online
Date: Wed, 5 Jul 2000 20:48:23 EDT

Colleagues,

This will be a big story.

Heritage Quest, inc. is going online with the entire US Census, all 12,555 rolls of film. The U.S. Census from 1790 to 1920, fully digitized is going online. You can get more information at a demo during ALA in Chicago, on Saturday, July 8, from 9:30 - Noon in the Hyatt Regency Grand Ballroom E, or stop by the Heritage Quest booth, #3625. It will be available by subscription to libraries when it is up this Fall at GenealogyDatabase.com. This is expected to be the largest data base of any subject on the Internet.

Last year our team had the opportunity to conduct over 14,000 telephone interviews with Floridians about their health...
insurance coverage, resulting in the best estimates of the uninsured in our
diverse state, as well as providing a
bunch of other data of interest to those in the health care
field.

At the very end of the survey, we asked an open-ended
question:

"Is there something that I haven't asked you about your
family's health care that you think is important for us
to know?"

This question served several functions. First, it was
a warm-and-fuzzy chance for respondents to get a sense
of satisfaction out of the survey by being able to voice
what was on their mind.

Second, it helped direct future research by directing
us to issues we may have missed in the first year.

Third, we had thought to do some kind of content analysis.

But I confess I am a bit intimidated by the sheer magnitude
of the project. More than 12,000 respondents did take the opportunity to
tell us something about their health care.

Also, I am concerned about misunderstanding on the part
of a casual reader. This is not qualitative data where
12,000 Floridians simply spoke their minds about health care. This was what
12,000 had left to say about health care after answering a 14-minute
telephone survey.

For example, the comments do not include a lot about delays
in seeking health care. This may be due to the fact that our
survey questions devoted a lot of time to delays—we
specifically asked about delays due to cost, and then asked about other
barriers, recording the answers as open-ended. This may have satisfied the
respondents' need to talk about such issues, so they mentioned other things
at the
end.

Anyway, I'd appreciate any advice on where to start, and
any journal or book references on how-to for content
analysis of such responses.

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
UF Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>From rbrapo@wm.edu Thu Jul  6 11:55:27 2000
Received: from email.wm.edu (mars.wm.edu [128.239.10.11])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id LAA29842 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jul 2000 11:55:27 -0700
   (PDT)
OPENING FOR DIRECTOR SURVEY RESEARCH DIVISION CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH
The College of William & Mary

The College of William & Mary seeks to fill the position of Director, Survey Research Division of the Center for Public Policy Research. The Center is the research arm of the College's Thomas Jefferson Program in Public Policy. (See website at: www.wm.edu/tjppp/). The Center's mission is to engage William & Mary in applied public policy research and, in so doing, increase learning and public service opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students. The Director of the Survey Research Division is responsible for overseeing all aspects of survey research, including providing administrative leadership, client development, research planning and design, questionnaire construction and review, project management, budget management, and recruitment and supervision of staff. The Survey Research Division operates a 6-station CATI system for telephone surveys and also conducts mail and web survey projects. Its clients include both internal units of the university (administration, classes, assessment office) as well as external clients. Applicants should hold an advanced degree in a relevant social science discipline, and have experience in survey administration. Experience with CATI, multiple survey methods and statistical analysis of surveys is preferred. Salary is commensurate with experience and qualifications. Position starting date is negotiable.

Application with resume should be sent to:
Professor Ronald B. Rapoport
Chair, Search Committee for Director of Survey Research
The Thomas Jefferson Program in Public Policy (Morton 140)
P.O. Box 8795
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795

In addition, applicants should arrange for three letters of recommendation to be sent to the above address. Review of applications will begin on 1 August 2000 and continue until the position is filled.

The College of William and Mary is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

Ronald Rapoport
OPENING FOR DIRECTOR
SURVEY RESEARCH DIVISION
CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH

The College of William & Mary seeks to fill the position of Director, Survey Research Division of the Center for Public Policy Research. The Center is the research arm of the College’s Thomas Jefferson Program in Public Policy. (See website at: www.wm.edu/tjppp/). The Center’s mission is to engage William & Mary in applied public policy research and, in so doing, increase learning and public service opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students. The Director of the Survey Research Division is responsible for overseeing all aspects of survey research, including providing administrative leadership, client development, research planning and design, questionnaire construction and review, project management, budget management, and recruitment and supervision of staff. The Survey Research Division operates a 6-station CATI system for telephone surveys and also conducts mail and web survey projects. Its clients include both internal units of the university (administration, classes, assessment office) as well as external clients. Applicants should hold an advanced degree in a relevant social science discipline, and have experience in survey administration. Experience with CATI, multiple survey methods and statistical analysis of surveys is preferred. Salary is commensurate with experience and qualifications. Position starting date is negotiable. Application with resume should be sent to:
In addition, applicants should arrange for three letters of recommendation to be sent to the above address. Review of applications will begin on 1 August 2000 and continue until the position is filled.

The College of William and Mary is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.
I'm inclined to agree with you, but I doubt if there is compelling
evidence to support either position.

What say you AAPOR?

Mike & John,
Do either of you know of any literature comparing mail, telephone, and CAPI
(or CASI) techniques? I am particularly interested in studies comparing
adolescents' reports of sensitive behaviors (e.g., drugs, alcohol, sex)
among these modes. I have a grant reviewer who maintains that telephone
surveys are closer to CAPIs than are mail surveys. I find it hard to
believe, but I have no evidence.

Joel W. Grube
Prevention Research Center
2150 Shattuck Ave., Suite 900
Berkeley, CA  94704
Tel: (510) 883-5722
E-Mail:  grube@prev.org

The information contained in this communication is
confidential and is intended only for the use of the
addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co.
If you have received this communication in error,
please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by
e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this
communication and all copies thereof, including
There has been a meta-analysis by S. Weisband & S. Kiesler (1996) University of Arizona. Titled Self-disclosure on computer forms a meta-analysis. Best of all was CASI (most disclosure) but when compared CAPI was better than PAPI (face-to-face).

A second meta-analysis (De Leeuw, 1992) data quality in mail, telephone and face-to-face surveys, compared mail, telephone and face-to-face (PAPI all). Main conclusion corroborated the earlier conclusion of Groves (1989). de leeuw (1992): " most consistent finding is the lack of difference between telephone and face-to-face surveys. The main difference is between mail & self-administered questionnaires on one hand and interview surveys on the other. it is somewhat harder to have people answer in mail surveys (slightly higher item-non response), but when the questions are answered they have a higher data quality (more self-disclosure, more reliable and consistent answers).

Using CASI (computer-assisted forms) will reduce the number of item nonresponse considerably while retaining the more private and open answers (see also Van Hattum & de Leeuw in Journal of official Statistics, 19992: http://www.jos.nu)

Good luck
Edith
At 03:24 PM 7/6/00 -0700, you wrote:
>I'm inclined to agree with you, but I doubt if there is compelling evidence to support either position.
>
>What say you AAPOR?
>
>From: Joel Grube <grube@prev.org>
>To: "Mike Sullivan (E-mail)"
<Sullivan@fsc-research.com>,
>  "John Tarnai (E-mail)" <tarnai@wsu.edu>
>Subject: Survey Mode
Excellent issue to bring up, Jan.

Consulting statisticians often note to clients that with a sufficiently large sample size, virtually any nonzero difference can be deemed "statistically significant" (regardless of how small that difference is). That is because the power of the test (i.e., the probability of rejecting the good ol' null hypothesis) increases with sample size... in other words, as sample size increases, the stat. test becomes more "sensitive" to smaller and smaller differences. So -- fundamentally -- the issue of the *substantive meaning*
of a difference (i.e., how big of a difference is meaningful) is a necessary "precursor" to the interpretation of a "significance" test.

An accompanying, common misuse of significance testing is to simply run significance tests on all possible contrasts of subgroups (e.g., contrasting cells in a table). Statistical tests are designed for (and have as an underlying assumption) making inference about a *single*, specific contrast. So the common practice of noting (with asterisks) all values in a table that are "significant" actually violates the underlying assumptions used to develop the "single inference test" test. If multiple, *simultaneous* inferences like this are to be made, then one needs to account for this by adjusting the test statistics using, say, Bonferroni adjustments (see, for instance, Miller 1981, Simultaneous Statistical Inference, Springer-Verlag... there may be better references out there). (The adjustments make it more difficult to conclude "significance", depending on the number of tests being conducted simultaneously.)

On occasion, we see "unadjusted" presentation of multiple significance tests in POQ articles as well as in many other professional journals... as I said, it is a common misuse of significance testing. Anyway, the issue of "simultaneous statistical inference" should be kept in mind when reviewing such analyses.

Rob Santos
rsantos@ui.urban.org

>-----Original Message-----
>From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
>Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2000 12:18 PM
>To: AAPORNET
>Subject: What does this all signify?
>
>In recent years, marketing research survey analysts have increasingly tended to insist that banner tabulations show "significance tests" between many pairs of banner points. It has been my observation that, with few exceptions, this mostly indicates that the originator of the request does not understand much about statistical significance.
>
The current issue of PC Magazine contains an excellent example of how statistical significance is all too often misused. For many years, the July issue of that magazine, which is distributed at the PC Expo in New York, has published the results of a "Service and Reliability" survey conducted by mail among a sample selected from the magazine's subscriber list.
>
>In this year's report, certain items display ratings in the form of symbols: a green up-arrow denotes "significantly above average," a gray horizontal bar denotes "average" and a red down-arrow indicates "significantly worse than average." Other items are shown as averages or percents. With one exception, there is no way to match rating symbols and numeric data for any vendor.
>
>Only the column titled "Units needing repair in the past 12 months" shows both a percent and the resulting rating symbol. Reading down,
one finds Dell rated "above average" overall, with 25% of units needing repair in the past 12 months, but emachines, with 22%, and Apple, with 24%, are rated "average." At the other end of the scale, "locally built computers," with 34% of units needing repair, displays the scarlet mark indicating "significantly worse than average," while Acer with 39%, AST with 36% and Packard Bell with 35%, are rated as "average."

Since the table provides the number of responses for each vendor, one can easily establish what is happening here: Dell has a base of 2,243 and "locally built" a base of 2,971, whereas for the "average" brands we have 207 for Apple, 129 for emachines, 213 for Acer, 98 for AST and 360 for Packard Bell. Assuming no errors and ignoring methodological issues, one readily sees that those brands rated significantly better or worse than average owe this distinction more to the number of responses they received than to what those responses indicate.

The survey actually shows that emachines and Apple rate better than average, while Acer, AST and Packard Bell rate worse than average on this particular measurement, even if they did not receive enough responses to determine within an arbitrary (and undisclosed) confidence limit the probability that this reflects the experience of all PC Magazine subscribers.

If I were looking to buy a computer, this result would certainly be "significant," to me, whether or not the survey results for these brands are "statistically significant."

Except for statisticians, few people understand that "significance" indicates only the probability that a survey would show a difference in the sample if there were no such difference in the population. This is not at all the same as the probability that such a difference actually exists in the population, as is too often stated.

Furthermore, statistical significance says nothing about whether such a difference, even if it does exist in the population, means anything in the first place. In other words, even when a survey shows a significant difference and one accepts that such a difference exists in the population, one cannot assume without other information that this results from anything but coincidence.

Yet standard operating procedure today seems to be for analysts to plow through reams of data looking for statistically significant differences so that they can attempt to assign some kind of meaning to them. When faced with a pile of tables littered with significance markers and a deadline to issue a report, it is almost impossible to do otherwise.

Even if you are far more statistically savvy than the editors of PC Magazine, this practice is just as likely to make you miss the true significance of what you are looking at. In the interest of full disclosure, I should note that one of my clients handled the PC Magazine Service and Reliability surveys for Ziff-Davis until two years ago and that, while I never tabulated that project for
them, I did help them design the data sets and implement the
significance testing as requested by the Ziff-Davis research
department. They're nice people (my client, not Ziff-Davis) and they
paid their bill on time (ditto). What more can one ask for?

As of this writing, PC Magazine has not yet posted on their web site
either this year's survey results nor the promised information about
how the study was conducted.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

-----

From sullivan@fsc-research.com Fri Jul 7 10:07:55 2000
Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA18163 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Jul 2000 10:07:55 -0700
(PDT)
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
    by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA12102;
    Fri, 7 Jul 2000 10:06:20 -0700
Message-Id: <200007071706.KAA12102@web2.tdl.com>
To: Edith de Leeuw <edith1@xs4all.nl>, "B.D. Strub" <strub8791@hotmail.com>,
    Karol Krotki <KKrotki@intersurvey.com>
Date: Fri, 7 Jul 2000 10:07:16 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Thank you
CC: AAPORNET@usc.edu
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Sometimes I wonder if wading through all the blather on
AAPORNET is worth the trouble. Then there are times like this
when there is absolutely no doubt that it is one of the most
valuable resources available to survey researchers.

Thanks for your kind attention.

The information contained in this communication is
confidential and is intended only for the use of the
addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co.
If you have received this communication in error,
please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by
e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this
communication and all copies thereof, including
attachments.

>From Mike_Battaglia@abtassoc.com Fri Jul 7 12:04:19 2000
Received: from abtassoc.com (abtmail.abtassoc.com [198.105.0.7])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA13024 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Jul 2000 12:04:18 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hadrian.abtassoc.com (hadrian.abtassoc.com [198.105.0.2])
    by abtassoc.com (8.9.1/8.9.1/Cohesive-2.3 (1998-08-10)) with SMTP id
We are interested in digital recording technology used in telephone centers. We would appreciate hearing from anyone who is currently using such technology to learn about types, capabilities, vendors, advantages and disadvantages.

Please send comments to jeffrey_dreyfus@abtassoc.com

Mike Battaglia
Abt Associates

Ruy Teixeira writes in a piece on the folly of Democrats hoping to improve their electoral performance by boosting turnout in the Summer 2000 issue of Dissent: "After the 1996 presidential election, for example, some argued that black male turnout had taken a huge jump, underscoring the possibilities of a mobilization strategy. But these data, based on exit polls, were contradicted by the more reliable Census data showing that the black male turnout actually declined...."

Is it true that the Census data is more accurate than exit poll data? Census figures over-report turnout in general rather dramatically. Aren't exit polls rigorously enough designed not to provoke this kind of skepticism?
REMINDER: COMMENTS ARE NEEDED ON AAPOR'S REVISED STANDARD DEFINITIONS.

For any of you who may have missed the initial notification on the revised Standard Definitions--attached is a copy for your review.

Please send any comments or suggestions directly to me: Janice Ballou, Standards Chair jballou@rci.rutgers.edu.

If you need/prefer a "paper" copy--let me know and I'll forward one.
Comments are due by August 1, 2000. APPOR's goal is to finalize and publish this revision this fall.

Also, to anyone who has been using the Standard Definitions, please send me any information on your experiences.

Thanks for your assistance! Looking forward to your comments!!

Janice Ballou
Standards Chair

--------------9D15F21286843CB838390779
Content-Type: application/msword; name="Standard Definitions, June 7, 2000 Draft.doc"
Doug Henwood just referred to a comment by Ruy Teixeira that exit polls had shown a large jump in black turnout in '96, but that this is not confirmed by the Census data.

This specific case is not really about the Census data vs. the exit poll, it is really about how advocacy analysis leads to bad journalism which leads to "truths" or "myths" which eventually get blamed on the pollster years later.


THE LARGE JUMP IN BLACK TURNOUT IN '96

I presented this analysis at the '97 AAPOR conference as a great example of the misuse of the '96 exit poll. If this continues if might be a good class example of how bad analysis and reporting can have a life of its own.

A February, 1997 article in the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Both Parties Take Stock of Jump in Black Male Turnout" reported a jump of "1.7 million in the number of black men who voted in November over four years before. By making phone calls, we found out that the source of this claim about the jump in turnout among black males was our national exit poll.

This conclusion is based on the 1992 exit poll which shows that black men were 3% of the vote and the 1996 exit poll which show it at 5% of the vote. Both percentages were multiplied by the total vote in each year and then the difference was formed.

This example displays the power of reporting numbers instead of percents and in using rounded numbers incorrectly.

Note that both numbers are rounded. It turns out that each of the numbers are close to .5; '92 was rounded down and '96 was rounded up. Half of this big jump is from rounding. (We urge our users to report rounded percentages so as not to imply more accuracy than is there.)

The rest of this "jump" difference appears to be from sampling error along with the increase in the Black voting age population from '92 to '96.
The numbers in our National poll are based on a sample of 300 precincts. However, for certain demographic items we have access to properly weighted data from all 1500 sample points. We can use those demographics in relationship to the voting age population to display a very different story of turnout.

Adjusting for voting age population, we found at totally different story than what was reported. There was actually a decline in Black turnout from '92 to '96 and it was about the same for both black men and black women.

I sent a letter to the editor when the article appeared but the Journal never printed it.

-----Original Message-----
From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2000 3:24 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: exit polls vs. Census data

Ruy Teixeira writes in a piece on the folly of Democrats hoping to improve their electoral performance by boosting turnout in the Summer 2000 issue of Dissent: "After the 1996 presidential election, for example, some argued that black male turnout had taken a huge jump, underscoring the possibilities of a mobilization strategy. But these data, based on exit polls, were contradicted by the more reliable Census data showing that the black male turnout actually declined...."

Is it true that the Census data is more accurate than exit poll data? Census figures over-report turnout in general rather dramatically. Aren't exit polls rigorously enough designed not to provoke this kind of skepticism?

--
Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
+1-212-741-9852 voice +1-212-807-9152 fax
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>
Vladimir,

I understand the difference between your pre-election poll and the referendum and the consistency of your pre- and post-election surveys. It seems clear that your survey was not measuring the same thing as the referendum. I do not know enough to say the election results were forged. You have not told me enough to rule out methodological problems.

Even if the election result was forged, why do you want to challenge the election result? It appears that both your polls and the vote on the referendum all led to the same outcome. That is, all measures were approved by the voters. What is to be gained by the challenge? Warren Mitofsky

At 03:30 AM 7/11/00 +0300, Vladimir Paniotto wrote:

> Dear colleagues,
> 
> During May conference in Portland we discussed possibility of our surveys
to control elections. I would like to add some information to our discussion and ask your advice.
> 
> April 16, 2000 in Ukraine took place referendum with 4 questions, reflecting the struggle of the President and Parliament (have the president right to dismiss the Parliament, is it necessary to cancel immunity of the deputies, to reduce the number of the deputies and to establish bicameral parliament). The results of the survey (see below), which have been conducted by my institute Kiev International Institute of Sociology - show, that the referendum data, most likely, were forged.
> 
> Shall I try to publish the survey data, if it may results in closing of my institute and other unpredictable consequences?
> 
> RESULTS OF THE SURVEY
> The survey which has been conducted by our institute (=EBIIS) a few weeks=
up=20
to referendum (from March 17 till March 27, 2013 respondents, random=20 sample) has allowed to make the forecast that in referendum will take part=20 about 60 % of voters and that all questions on referendum will be=20 supported by population. The referendum results (see tab. 1) have=20 surprised first of all by very high percent of population, who take part=20 in it, and also that the obscure question about bicameral parliament has=20 supported not 60%, but 80 % voting.

The table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The answers to questions</th>
<th>the forecast</th>
<th>0the=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>referendum</td>
<td>a difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The President right to dismiss Parliament</td>
<td>77=20 85</td>
<td>- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* the=20 Parliament</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cancellation of deputies=20 immunity</td>
<td>87=20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reduction of number of the=20 deputies</td>
<td>97=20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bicameral=20 parliament</td>
<td>63=20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take part in=20 referendum</td>
<td>61=20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a rule, the maximal difference of our forecasts from results of choices=20 did not exceed 3-4 % (see, our report among the materials of a conference=20 WAPOR-AAPOR in Portland), therefore it was difficult to explain difference=20 in 20 % by mistakes of research.

For check of hypotheses the special survey was conducted (the survey was=20 conducted from May 15 till May 26 in all areas of Ukraine and in Crimea,=20 the sample multistage random at each stage, 2101 respondents were=20 interviewed). We asked the respondents to tell, whether they took part in=20 referendum, if yes what was their response on a question about bicameral=20 parliament. In the table 2 the results of comparison of
> research data with=
> =20
> referendum results are given.
> >
> The table 2
> > Forecast=20
> Referendum the survey after referendum
> >
> > % Expressed FOR in the answer
> >
> to 4-th question (about bicameral parliament) 63%  81,7=20
> >
> % 61.3 %
> >
> > % Took part in referendum
> =20
> >
> % 61%  81,2=20
> >
> >
> For some areas of Ukraine the distinction of the referendum results
> and survey results exceeds 30%. It is difficult for me to suggest
> other explanation to these distinctions, than that the referendum
> results in these regions of Ukraine were forged. Can you suggest
> other explanation?
> >
> My best regards
> >
> Vladimir
> >
> ********************************************************************************
> Vladimir Paniotto, Director of KIIS
> (Kiev International Institute of Sociology)
> Milchakova 1/18, kv.11, Kiev-253002, UKRAINE
> Phone (380-44)-463-5868,238-2567,238-2568 (office)
> Phone (380-44)-517-3949 (home)
> Fax (380-44)-263-3458, phone-fax 463-5868
> E-mail: <mailto:paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua
> http://www.kiis.com.ua
> ********************************************************************************
> >
>
>
> Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX=20
--=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=- 6271422==_.ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
<html>
Vladimir,
I understand the difference between your pre-election poll and the referendum and the consistency of your pre- and post-election surveys. It seems clear that your survey was not measuring the same thing as the referendum. I do not know enough to say the election results were forged. You have not told me enough to rule out methodological problems. Even if the election result was forged, why do you want to challenge the election result? It appears that both your polls and the vote on the referendum all led to the same outcome. That is, all measures were approved by the voters. What is to be gained by the challenge?

At 03:30 AM 7/11/00 +0300, Vladimir Paniotto wrote:

Dear colleagues,

During May conference in Portland we discussed possibility of our surveys to control elections. I would like to add some information to our discussion and to ask your advice. April 16, 2000 in Ukraine took place referendum with 4 questions, reflecting the struggle of the President and Parliament (have the president right to dismiss the Parliament, is it necessary to cancel immunity of the deputies, to reduce the number of the deputies and to establish bicameral parliament). The results of the survey (see below), which have been conducted by my institute Kiev International Institute of Sociology - show, that the referendum data, most likely, were forged. Shall I try to publish the survey data, if it may results in closing of my institute and other unpredictable consequences?

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

The survey which has been conducted by our institute (KIEIIS) a few weeks up to referendum (from March 17 till March 27, 2013 respondents, random sample) has allowed to make the forecast that in referendum will take part about 60 % of voters and that all questions on referendum will be supported by population. The referendum results (see tab. 1) have surprised first of all by very high percent of population, who take part in it, and also that the obscure question about bicameral parliament has supported not 60%, but 80 % voting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The President right to dismiss</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Parliament</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellation of deputies immunity</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.Cancellation of deputies immunity
3. Reduction of number of the deputies

97 - 90 = 7

4. Bicameral parliament

63 - 82 = -19

Take part in referendum

61 - 81 = -20

As a rule, the maximal difference of our forecasts from results of choices did not exceed 3-4 % (see, our report among the materials of a conference WAPOR-AAPOR in Portland), therefore it was difficult to explain difference in 20 % by mistakes of research.

For check of hypotheses the special survey was conducted (the survey was conducted from May 15 till May 26 in all areas of Ukraine and in Crimea, the sample multistage random at each stage, 2101 respondents were interviewed). We asked the respondents to tell, whether they took part in referendum, if yes what was their response
on a question about bicameral parliament. In the table 2 the results of comparison of research data with referendum results are given. The table 2<br>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Referendum</th>
<th>the survey after referendum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Expressed FOR in the answer to 4-th question (about bicameral parliament)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>81,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Took part in referendum</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>81,2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For some areas of Ukraine the distinction of the referendum results and survey results exceeds 30%. It is difficult for me to suggest other explanation to these distinctions, than that the referendum results in these regions of Ukraine were forged. Can you suggest other explanation?
Does anyone know where I could get a copy of the long-form census? I looked on the census website, and the form is no longer available.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA

lvoigt@fhcrc.org
We had to go down to the local census bureau office in San Francisco and get one because their distribution was being controlled -- to avoid double counting we were told.

Date sent: Tue, 11 Jul 2000 07:19:50 -0700
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@fhcrc.org>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: copy of long-form 2000 census

Does anyone know where I could get a copy of the long-form census? I looked on the census website, and the form is no longer available.

thanks!

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

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

Ann

I am sending Lynda a copy of the long-form. In order to get it, I had to copy the one sent to my mother-in-law.

Ann
sullivan@fsc-research.com wrote:

> We had to go down to the local census bureau office in San Francisco
> and get one because their distribution was being controlled -- to
> avoid double counting we were told.
> 
> Date sent:              Tue, 11 Jul 2000 07:19:50 -0700
> Send reply to:          aapornet@usc.edu
> From:                   "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@fhcrc.org>
> To:                     ''aapornet@usc.edu'' <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Subject:                RE: copy of long-form 2000 census
> 
> Does anyone know where I could get a copy of the long-form census?  I
> looked on the census website, and the form is no longer available.
>
> thanks!
>
> Lynda Voigt
> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
> Seattle, WA
>
> lvoigt@fhcrc.org
>
> The information contained in this communication is confidential and is
> intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of
> Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in
> error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by
> e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this
> communication and all copies thereof, including
> attachments.

--
Ann Reeder Goraczko, M.S.Ed. phone 305-919-5778 fax 305-919-5242 Field
Director Institute for Public Opinion Research - Florida International
University
goraczko@fiu.edu   http://www.fiu.edu/orgs/ipor/
The results you report are interesting and certainly do indicate that the population you were interviewing is different from the one that was officially counted. Tell us more about your sampling methodology, measurement mode and contact protocols. For example, what was the sampling frame? Did you use in-person, telephone or mail survey techniques? What were the non-contact and non-compliance rates? Sampling bias or non-response bias might explain your findings.

As to the business of publishing your results, I have to counsel that discretion is the better part of valor. Never do anything that you know will get your survey organization shut down if you can avoid it. Who knows, maybe there are even more interesting things for you to report in the future.

Vladimir, I understand the difference between your pre-election poll and the referendum and the consistency of your pre- and post-election surveys. It seems clear that your survey was not measuring the same thing as the referendum. I do not know enough to say the election results were forged. You have not told me enough to rule out methodological problems.

Even if the election result was forged, why do you want to challenge the election result? It appears that both your polls and the vote on the referendum all led to the same outcome. That is, all measures were approved by the voters. What is to be gained by the challenge?

warren mitofsky

At 03:30 AM 7/11/00 +0300, Vladimir Paniotto wrote:

> Dear colleagues,
> 
> During May conference in Portland we discussed possibility of our surveys to control elections. I would like to add some information to our discussion and to ask your advice.
> 
> April 16, 2000 in Ukraine took place referendum with 4 questions, reflecting the struggle of the President and Parliament (have the president right to dismiss the Parliament, is it necessary to cancel
immunity of the deputies, to reduce the number of the deputies and to establish bicameral parliament. The results of the survey (see below), which have been conducted by my institute Kiev International Institute of Sociology - show, that the referendum data, most likely, were forged.

Shall I try to publish the survey data, if it may results in closing of my institute and other unpredictable consequences?

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

The survey which has been conducted by our institute (IIS) a few weeks up to referendum (from March 17 till March 27, 2013 respondents, random sample) has allowed to make the forecast that in referendum will take part about 60 % of voters and that all questions on referendum will be supported by population. The referendum results (see tab. 1) have surprised first of all by very high percent of population, who take part in it, and also that the obscure question about bicameral parliament has supported not 60%, but 80 % voting.

The table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The answers to questions</th>
<th>the forecast</th>
<th>0the referendum</th>
<th>a difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* The President right to dismiss Parliament</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cancellation of deputies immunity</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reduction of number of the deputies</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>- 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bicameral parliament</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>- 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take part in referendum</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>- 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a rule, the maximal difference of our forecasts from results of choices did not exceed 3-4 % (see, our report among the materials of a conference WAPOR-AAPOR in Portland), therefore it was difficult to explain difference in 20 % by mistakes of research.

For check of hypotheses the special survey was conducted (the survey was conducted from May 15 till May 26 in all areas of Ukraine and in Crimea, the sample multistage random at each stage, 2101 respondents were
We interviewed. We asked the respondents to tell, whether they took part in referendum, if yes what was their response on a question about bicameral parliament. In the table 2 the results of comparison of research data with referendum results are given.

The table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Referendum</th>
<th>the survey after referendum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Expressed FOR in the answer</td>
<td>% Expressed FOR in the answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to 4-th question (about bicameral parliament)</td>
<td>63% 81,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Took part in referendum</td>
<td>61% 81,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For some areas of Ukraine the distinction of the referendum results and survey results exceeds 30%. It is difficult for me to suggest other explanation to these distinctions, than that the referendum results in these regions of Ukraine were forged. Can you suggest other explanation?

My best regards

Vladimir

===============================================
Vladimir Paniotto, Director of KIIS
(Kiev International Institute of Sociology)
Milchakova 1/18, kv.11, Kiev-253002, UKRAINE
Phone (380-44)-463-5868,238-2567,238-2568 (office)
Phone (380-44)-517-3949 (home)
Fax (380-44)-263-3458, phone-fax 463-5868
E-mail: <mailto:paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua
http://www.kiis.com.ua

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

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

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by
They are up on the Census Web Site!!!!!

Ann Reeder Goraczko wrote:
>
> I am sending Lynda a copy of the long-form. In order to get it, I had
> to copy the one sent to my mother-in-law.
>
> Ann
>
sullivan@fsc-research.com wrote:
>
> > We had to go down to the local census bureau office in San Francisco
> > and get one because their distribution was being controlled -- to
> > avoid double counting we were told.
> >
> > Date sent: Tue, 11 Jul 2000 07:19:50 -0700
> > Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
> > From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@fhcrc.org>
> > To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > Subject: RE: copy of long-form 2000 census
> >
> > Does anyone know where I could get a copy of the long-form census?
> > I looked on the census website, and the form is no longer available.
> >
> > thanks!
> >
> > Lynda Voigt
> > Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
> > Seattle, WA
> >
Andrew A. Beveridge            Home Office
209 Kissena Hall             50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology      Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597      Fax:    914-337-8210
Phone: 718-997-2837          E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Fax:   718-997-2820          Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

They are up on the Census Web Site!!!!!
Ann sullivan@fsc-research.com wrote:

We had to go down to the local census bureau office in San Francisco and get one because their distribution was being controlled -- to avoid double counting we were told.

Date sent: Tue, 11 Jul 2000 07:19:50 -0700
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@fhcrc.org>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: copy of long-form 2000 census

Does anyone know where I could get a copy of the long-form census?
I looked on the census website, and the form is no longer available.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA

lvoigt@fhcrc.org

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

--
Ann Reeder Goraczko, M.S.Ed. phone 305-919-5778 fax 305-919-5242 Field Director Institute for Public Opinion Research - Florida International University
goraczko@fiu.edu http://www.fiu.edu/orgs/ipor/

Andrew A. Beveridge Home Office
209 Kissena Hall 50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597 Fax: 914-337-8210
Phone: 718-997-2837 E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Fax: 718-997-2820 Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by
Try this.

http://www.census.gov/dmd/www/infoquest.html

-----Original Message-----
From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2000 10:20 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: copy of long-form 2000 census

Does anyone know where I could get a copy of the long-form census? I looked on the census website, and the form is no longer available.

thanks!

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

-----Original Message-----
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2000 11:08:03 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Tuesday, July 11, 2000 11:08:49 AM

Put your fingers on the form.
Thanks

Date sent:        Tue, 11 Jul 2000 13:55:40 -0400
Send reply to:    aapornet@usc.edu
From:             "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@udel.edu>
To:               "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject:          RE: copy of long-form 2000 census

Try this.

http://www.census.gov/dmd/www/infoquest.html

-----Original Message-----
From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2000 10:20 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: copy of long-form 2000 census

Does anyone know where I could get a copy of the long-form census? I looked
on the census website, and the form is no longer available.

thanks!

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

The information contained in this communication is
confidential and is intended only for the use of the
addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co.
If you have received this communication in error,
please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by
e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this
communication and all copies thereof, including
attachments.
I welcome your comments on the data analyses described below.  

-- Jim

http://www.intellectualcapital.com/issues/issue389/item9923.asp

Thursday, July 06, 2000

Different Worlds

by Bill Bishop

Want to know how complicated our politics have become? Consider the relationship between gays and the New Economy.

Gary Gates, a doctoral student at Carnegie Mellon University, used 1990 census data to show that certain cities were more popular than others among people living with unmarried partners of the same sex. (His findings were published in the academic journal, Demography, in May.) Gates used the census information to construct a "gay index" of cities.

And the results are in!

Gates' gay index is based on the concentration of unmarried partners living in metropolitan areas of more than 700,000. The more gay couples per population, the higher the city ranks. There are 50 cities in the gay index. The top 10 are:

(1) San Francisco  
(2) Washington, D.C.  
(3) Austin  
(4) Atlanta  
(5) San Diego  
(6) Los Angeles  
(7) Seattle  
(8) Boston  
(9) Sacramento  
(10) Orlando

The bottom 10 cities in the gay index have the smallest concentration of gay couples:

(41) Detroit
The accounting looked familiar to Richard Florida, a professor of regional economic development at Carnegie Mellon. Gates' ranking looked eerily like the Milken Institute's ranking of cities by concentration of high-tech businesses. So Gates ran the numbers.

The gay index did more than just follow the Milken rankings. Gates and Florida compared other measures that are thought to predict high-tech development: education levels; the number of scientists and engineers; various measures of quality of life.

Gates' gay index beat them all. "You're not going to find a stronger predictor of high technology than the gay index," Gates says. "One is clearly signaling the other."

Why the link?

The match is uncanny. Six of the top 10 cities in the gay index were also in the top 10 of the Milken when it was adjusted to count only the cities over 700,000 (San Francisco, D.C., Atlanta, Los Angeles, Seattle and Boston). Similarly, of the 10 gay-poor towns, four (Greensboro/Winston, Las Vegas, Buffalo and Louisville) were also in the bottom 10 of the Milken.

Is there a connection to gay communities and the new economy? Is there a connection to gay communities and the New Economy?

Florida and Gates do not argue a direct, literal connection between the presence of gay couples and the growth of high-technology firms. Gays are not disproportionately represented in New Economy businesses. It is more complicated than that.

"There is something about cities that gays go to that is also attractive to high-tech firms," Gates says. For instance, gay couples "move to really nice places," Gates says -- places with a high quality of life. They also "go to places where in general there is a more progressive thinking." They seek out towns where there is a "diversity of thought and progressive attitudes, or at least tolerant attitudes."

Those attributes, it turns out, are exactly those sought by young, talented, high-technology workers -- both gay and straight. Florida has been questioning these New Economy workers and has found that diversity -- not rocks to climb or good jobs -- was the No. 1 attribute people wanted in a place to work and a place to live. "If you poison the environment with anti-inclusive rhetoric, these people will turn away," Florida says.

This means that gay men and lesbians are the canaries in the New Economy coal mine. If gay people can survive in a place, then so will high-tech
workers -- the people with the ideas and talents that are now making economies grow.

Beneath the surface

The technology industry has realized the importance of diversity in satisfying the most important ingredient for their economic success, and its leaders are demanding these values be extended to our politics. "These industries don't come to me and say, 'We want you to be conservative on issues of choice or issues of sexual orientation or issues of diversity,'" says Ron Sims, chief executive of Washington state's King County, which includes Seattle. "They are saying to me, 'We want you to be out there talking about being an inclusive society, fully participating in a new global period.'"

But what about regions not benefiting from the New Economy? In those places, the push for diversity is not a priority. Take Seattle, again. Business leaders in Washington state pushed a statewide proposition in 1997 that would ban discrimination based on sexual orientation. It passed in Seattle and King County. It was voted down in the rest of the state.

As diverse and open places surge ahead, others are left behind -- the rural, the uneducated, the blue-collar worker, those in Old Economy industries. Bubba was not invited to the New Economy, and Bubba understands the slight.

These days, political fights split more often down the New Economy/Old Economy divide than between left and right or Republican and Democrat. Gay rights, women's rights, globalization vs. protectionism all split along this economic divide as much as the ideological divide.

"When I look down at what is the political powder keg--I think, this is it," says Richard Florida of the divide between old and new. "It's simmering beneath the surface in California; it's simmering beneath the surface in Seattle. My guess is it's simmering beneath the surface in Texas. And I don't think either political party has sorted this boy out."

------

Bill Bishop is a regular contributor to IntellectualCapital.com and a senior writer at the Austin American-Statesman in Texas.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2000 IntellectualCapital.com, a service mark of VoxCap.com and part of the VoxCap Network.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

*****
The analysis mostly seems plausible, but I have a question on the data.

Does the 1990 census data truly show unmarried "partners" of the same sex or just unmarried people of the same sex? I think the answer is "no," but I am not an expert on census data. If it is "no," then I am not sure the analysis is valid. There may be an alternative explanation of the data.

One cannot make the automatic assumption that unmarried people of the same sex living together are gay. The cities high on the "gay index" are cities with high costs of living and cities that attract young people, regardless of their sexual orientation. Both of these characteristics probably increase the proportion of people living with roommates to share costs. In addition, high tech industries have workforces that are younger and more educated than most other industries. More educated people tend to get married later, and so may be more likely to live with roommates. High tech cities may just have more roommates. I am not saying the thesis is wrong, just that the data may not really prove it.

Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
Creative Research Systems
makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
http://www.surveysystem.com

> 
> 
> I welcome your comments on the data analyses described below.
> -- Jim
> 
> --------------------------------------------------------------------------------
> Copyright 2000 IntellectualCapital.com, a service mark of VoxCap.com and part of the VoxCap Network 
> --------------------------------------------------------------------------------
> http://www.intellectualcapital.com/issues/issue389/item9923.asp
> 
> 
> Thursday, July 06, 2000
> 
> Different Worlds
Want to know how complicated our politics have become? Consider the relationship between gays and the New Economy.

Gary Gates, a doctoral student at Carnegie Mellon University, used 1990 census data to show that certain cities were more popular than others among people living with unmarried partners of the same sex. (His findings were published in the academic journal, Demography, in May.) Gates used the census information to construct a "gay index" of cities.

And the results are in!

Gates' gay index is based on the concentration of unmarried partners living in metropolitan areas of more than 700,000. The more gay couples per population, the higher the city ranks. There are 50 cities in the gay index. The top 10 are:

(1) San Francisco
(2) Washington, D.C.
(3) Austin
(4) Atlanta
(5) San Diego
(6) Los Angeles
(7) Seattle
(8) Boston
(9) Sacramento
(10) Orlando

The bottom 10 cities in the gay index have the smallest concentration of gay couples:

(41) Detroit
(42) Louisville
(43) Cincinnati
(44) Charlotte
(45) St. Louis
(46) Greensboro/Winston-Salem
(47) Cleveland
(48) Las Vegas
(49) Birmingham
(50) Buffalo

The accounting looked familiar to Richard Florida, a professor of regional economic development at Carnegie Mellon. Gates' ranking looked eerily like the Milken Institute's ranking of cities by concentration of high-tech businesses. So Gates ran the numbers.

The gay index did more than just follow the Milken rankings. Gates and Florida compared other measures that are thought to predict high-tech development: education levels; the number of scientists and engineers; various measures of quality of life.

Gates' gay index beat them all. "You're not going to find a stronger predictor of high technology than the gay index," Gates says. "One is
clearly signaling the other.

Why the link?

The match is uncanny. Six of the top 10 cities in the gay index were also in the top 10 of the Milken when it was adjusted to count only the cities over 700,000 (San Francisco, D.C., Atlanta, Los Angeles, Seattle and Boston). Similarly, of the 10 gay-poor towns, four (Greensboro/Winston, Las Vegas, Buffalo and Louisville) were also in the bottom 10 of the Milken.

Is there a connection to gay communities and the new economy? Is there a connection to gay communities and the New Economy?

Florida and Gates do not argue a direct, literal connection between the presence of gay couples and the growth of high-technology firms. Gays are not disproportionately represented in New Economy businesses. It is more complicated than that.

"There is something about cities that gays go to that is also attractive to high-tech firms," Gates says. For instance, gay couples "move to really nice places," Gates says -- places with a high quality of life. They also "go to places where in general there is a more progressive thinking." They seek out towns where there is a "diversity of thought and progressive attitudes, or at least tolerant attitudes."

Those attributes, it turns out, are exactly those sought by young, talented, high-technology workers -- both gay and straight. Florida has been questioning these New Economy workers and has found that diversity -- not rocks to climb or good jobs -- was the No. 1 attribute people wanted in a place to work and a place to live. "If you poison the environment with anti-inclusive rhetoric, these people will turn away," Florida says.

This means that gay men and lesbians are the canaries in the New Economy coal mine. If gay people can survive in a place, then so will high-tech workers -- the people with the ideas and talents that are now making economies grow.

Beneath the surface

The technology industry has realized the importance of diversity in satisfying the most important ingredient for their economic success, and its leaders are demanding these values be extended to our politics. "These industries don't come to me and say, 'We want you to be conservative on issues of choice or issues of sexual orientation or issues of diversity,'" says Ron Sims, chief executive of Washington state's King County, which includes Seattle. "They are saying to me, 'We want you to be out there talking about being an inclusive society, fully participating in a new global period.'"

But what about regions not benefiting from the New Economy? In those places, the push for diversity is not a priority. Take Seattle, again. Business leaders in Washington state pushed a statewide proposition in
1997 that would ban discrimination based on sexual orientation. It passed in Seattle and King County. It was voted down in the rest of the state.

As diverse and open places surge ahead, others are left behind -- the rural, the uneducated, the blue-collar worker, those in Old Economy industries. Bubba was not invited to the New Economy, and Bubba understands the slight.

These days, political fights split more often down the New Economy/Old Economy divide than between left and right or Republican and Democrat. Gay rights, women's rights, globalization vs. protectionism all split along this economic divide as much as the ideological divide.

"When I look down at what is the political powder keg--I think, this is it," says Richard Florida of the divide between old and new. "It's simmering beneath the surface in California; it's simmering beneath the surface in Seattle. My guess is it's simmering beneath the surface in Texas. And I don't think either political party has sorted this boy out."

Bill Bishop is a regular contributor to IntellectualCapital.com and a senior writer at the Austin American-Statesman in Texas.

Copyright 2000 IntellectualCapital.com, a service mark of VoxCap.com and part of the VoxCap Network.

On Tue, 11 Jul 2000, Hank Zucker wrote:
One cannot make the automatic assumption that unmarried people of the same sex living together are gay. The cities high on the "gay index" are cities with high costs of living and cities that attract young people, regardless of their sexual orientation.

Hank,

Does anything about the analysis really depend on whether anyone is gay or not? Suppose we simply stick close to the data and call them all "unmarried people of the same sex living together"--would this really undermine anything about the analysis itself, quite apart from any additional claims people might wish to make about the results (as, for example, in the term "gay index," which at best is only partly justified).

So, that aside, what do we conclude from the analysis? If you headed a high-tech start-up or a new content-creating company, where would you prefer to relocate your firm, based on these data--in the gay index Top 10 cities or in the cities ranked 41-50? And why?

And what about these 50 cities makes them correlate so strongly on the two variables--call them what you will--on which we now know that they correlate so strongly?

-- Jim

P.S. I doubt that anyone in AAPOR needs to be reminded of the ecological fallacies arising when correlations of aggregate units are used to make inferences about proper subsets of those units. For example, the fact that precinct crime rates correlate positively with the percentage of the precinct population that is Belgian does not imply that Belgians are committing more than their share of the crimes--nor that they are not. The national origin of the actual criminals can only be determined by individual level data, but of course.

******
How do you go from unmarried cohabitants of the same sex to "partners" which implies a sexual relationship?

How do you go from an unspecified number of (etc.) to "gay couples?"

These are errors of conceptualization that you would prefer not to see from a doctoral student at CM, or from the journal Demography. Perhaps there are other data that contribute to these conclusions?

There are many artifacts that could account for the differences. The bottom ten all seem to be manufacturing oriented cities (exception: Las Vegas and, to some extent, Charlotte). The top cities are pretty much superheated economically with, yes, lots of New Economy stuff. But lots of media, tourism and -- what did RR call them -- "symbol pushers" or something. Those are things that could/would attract lots of: college students, graduate students, young professionals, relocators/startovers, etc. -- both gay and non-gay. So yes, maybe there's a main effect for unmarried persons of the same sex in the same household. Does that mean there's a main effect for gay vs. non-gay status? I don't think so.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Tuesday, July 11, 2000 6:50 PM
Subject: Data link cultural diversity to individual creativity?

I welcome your comments on the data analyses described below.

-- Jim

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

http://www.intellectualcapital.com/issues/issue389/item9923.asp

Thursday, July 06, 2000

Different Worlds

by Bill Bishop

Want to know how complicated our politics have become? Consider the relationship between gays and the New Economy.

>
Gary Gates, a doctoral student at Carnegie Mellon University, used 1990 census data to show that certain cities were more popular than others among people living with unmarried partners of the same sex. (His findings were published in the academic journal, Demography, in May.) Gates used the census information to construct a "gay index" of cities.

And the results are in!

Gates' gay index is based on the concentration of unmarried partners living in metropolitan areas of more than 700,000. The more gay couples per population, the higher the city ranks. There are 50 cities in the gay index. The top 10 are:

1. San Francisco
2. Washington, D.C.
3. Austin
4. Atlanta
5. San Diego
6. Los Angeles
7. Seattle
8. Boston
9. Sacramento
10. Orlando

The bottom 10 cities in the gay index have the smallest concentration of gay couples:

41. Detroit
42. Louisville
43. Cincinnati
44. Charlotte
45. St. Louis
46. Greensboro/Winston-Salem
47. Cleveland
48. Las Vegas
49. Birmingham
50. Buffalo

The accounting looked familiar to Richard Florida, a professor of regional economic development at Carnegie Mellon. Gates' ranking looked eerily like the Milken Institute's ranking of cities by concentration of high-tech businesses. So Gates ran the numbers.

The gay index did more than just follow the Milken rankings. Gates and Florida compared other measures that are thought to predict high-tech development: education levels; the number of scientists and engineers; various measures of quality of life.

Gates' gay index beat them all. "You're not going to find a stronger predictor of high technology than the gay index," Gates says. "One is clearly signaling the other."

Why the link?

The match is uncanny. Six of the top 10 cities in the gay index were also in the top 10 of the Milken when it was adjusted to count only the
Is there a connection to gay communities and the new economy? Is there a connection to gay communities and the New Economy?

Florida and Gates do not argue a direct, literal connection between the presence of gay couples and the growth of high-technology firms. Gays are not disproportionately represented in New Economy businesses. It is more complicated than that.

"There is something about cities that gays go to that is also attractive to high-tech firms," Gates says. For instance, gay couples move to really nice places," Gates says -- places with a high quality of life. They also "go to places where in general there is a more progressive thinking." They seek out towns where there is a "diversity of thought and progressive attitudes, or at least tolerant attitudes."

Those attributes, it turns out, are exactly those sought by young, talented, high-technology workers -- both gay and straight. Florida has been questioning these New Economy workers and has found that diversity --- not rocks to climb or good jobs --- was the No. 1 attribute people wanted in a place to work and a place to live. "If you poison the environment with anti-inclusive rhetoric, these people will turn away," Florida says.

This means that gay men and lesbians are the canaries in the New Economy coal mine. If gay people can survive in a place, then so will high-tech workers -- the people with the ideas and talents that are now making economies grow.

Beneath the surface

The technology industry has realized the importance of diversity in satisfying the most important ingredient for their economic success, and its leaders are demanding these values be extended to our politics. "These industries don't come to me and say, 'We want you to be conservative on issues of choice or issues of sexual orientation or issues of diversity,'" says Ron Sims, chief executive of Washington state's King County, which includes Seattle. "They are saying to me, 'We want you to be out there talking about being an inclusive society, fully participating in a new global period.'"

But what about regions not benefiting from the New Economy? In those places, the push for diversity is not a priority. Take Seattle, again. Business leaders in Washington state pushed a statewide proposition in 1997 that would ban discrimination based on sexual orientation. It passed in Seattle and King County. It was voted down in the rest of the state.

As diverse and open places surge ahead, others are left behind -- the rural, the uneducated, the blue-collar worker, those in Old Economy industries. Bubba was not invited to the New Economy, and Bubba understands the slight.
These days, political fights split more often down the New Economy/Old Economy divide than between left and right or Republican and Democrat. Gay rights, women's rights, globalization vs. protectionism all split along this economic divide as much as the ideological divide.

"When I look down at what is the political powder keg--I think, this is it," says Richard Florida of the divide between old and new. "It's simmering beneath the surface in California; it's simmering beneath the surface in Seattle. My guess is it's simmering beneath the surface in Texas. And I don't think either political party has sorted this boy out."

Bill Bishop is a regular contributor to IntellectualCapital.com and a senior writer at the Austin American-Statesman in Texas.

---

*From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Tue Jul 11 19:45:21 2000*

Received: from mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (mx1.hcvlny.cv.net [167.206.112.76]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id TAA08416 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jul 2000 19:45:20 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from s1.optonline.net (s1.optonline.net [167.206.112.6]) by mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id WAA15938; Tue, 11 Jul 2000 22:45:14 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (d164-134.ynkrny.optonline.net [24.189.164.134]) by s1.optonline.net (8.9.1/8.9.3) with ESMTP id WAA29020; Tue, 11 Jul 2000 22:45:14 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <396BDC3D.D7E7632C@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Tue, 11 Jul 2000 22:47:25 -0400

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

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (WinNT; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Data link cultural diversity to individual creativity?

References: <001901bfeba5$f621ba80$0ae4c3d1@default>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

"James P. Murphy" wrote:
How do you go from unmarried cohabitants of the same sex to "partners" which implies a sexual relationship?

I have yet to read this article in demography. But everyone should know that there are two relationship questions on the 1990 Census form that were put in as a proxy for the old census POSSLQ (Persons of Opposite Sex Sharing Living Quarters). One category for relation to householder is "Roommate, Roomer, Boarder" the other is "Partner." The hope was that the partner question would pick-up the unmarried partner. The frequency is very low, but higher, even in areas that are well known as having such people (e.g. Greenwich Village). To apply this by metro area, or whatever, does not seem that unreasonable, though the point about college students is well taken.

How do you go from an unspecified number of (etc.) to "gay couples?"

These are errors of conceptualization that you would prefer not to see from a doctoral student at CM, or from the journal Demography. Perhaps there are other data that contribute to these conclusions?

There are many artifacts that could account for the differences. The bottom ten all seem to be manufacturing oriented cities (exception: Las Vegas and, to some extent, Charlotte). The top cities are pretty much superheated economically with, yes, lots of New Economy stuff. But lots of media, tourism and -- what did RR call them -- "symbol pushers" or something. Those are things that could/would attract lots of: college students, graduate students, young professionals, relocators/startovers, etc. -- both gay and non-gay. So yes, maybe there's a main effect for unmarried persons of the same sex in the same household. Does that mean there's a main effect for gay vs. non-gay status? I don't think so.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Tuesday, July 11, 2000 6:50 PM
Subject: Data link cultural diversity to individual creativity?

I welcome your comments on the data analyses described below.

-- Jim

http://www.intellectualcapital.com/issues/issue389/item9923.asp
Want to know how complicated our politics have become? Consider the relationship between gays and the New Economy.

Gary Gates, a doctoral student at Carnegie Mellon University, used 1990 census data to show that certain cities were more popular than others among people living with unmarried partners of the same sex. (His findings were published in the academic journal, Demography, in May.) Gates used the census information to construct a "gay index" of cities.

And the results are in!

Gates' gay index is based on the concentration of unmarried partners living in metropolitan areas of more than 700,000. The more gay couples per population, the higher the city ranks. There are 50 cities in the gay index. The top 10 are:

1. San Francisco
2. Washington, D.C.
3. Austin
4. Atlanta
5. San Diego
6. Los Angeles
7. Seattle
8. Boston
9. Sacramento
10. Orlando

The bottom 10 cities in the gay index have the smallest concentration of gay couples:

41. Detroit
42. Louisville
43. Cincinnati
44. Charlotte
45. St. Louis
46. Greensboro/Winston-Salem
47. Cleveland
48. Las Vegas
49. Birmingham
50. Buffalo

The accounting looked familiar to Richard Florida, a professor of regional economic development at Carnegie Mellon. Gates' ranking looked eerily like the Milken Institute's ranking of cities by concentration of high-tech businesses. So Gates ran the numbers.

The gay index did more than just follow the Milken rankings. Gates and Florida compared other measures that are thought to predict high-tech development: education levels; the number of scientists and engineers;
various measures of quality of life.

Gates' gay index beat them all. "You're not going to find a stronger predictor of high technology than the gay index," Gates says. "One is clearly signaling the other."

Why the link?

The match is uncanny. Six of the top 10 cities in the gay index were also in the top 10 of the Milken when it was adjusted to count only the cities over 700,000 (San Francisco, D.C., Atlanta, Los Angeles, Seattle and Boston). Similarly, of the 10 gay-poor towns, four (Greensboro/Winston, Las Vegas, Buffalo and Louisville) were also in the bottom 10 of the Milken.

Is there a connection to gay communities and the new economy? Is there a connection to gay communities and the New Economy?

Florida and Gates do not argue a direct, literal connection between the presence of gay couples and the growth of high-technology firms. Gays are not disproportionately represented in New Economy businesses. It is more complicated than that.

"There is something about cities that gays go to that is also attractive to high-tech firms," Gates says. For instance, gay couples "move to really nice places," Gates says -- places with a high quality of life. They also "go to places where in general there is a more progressive thinking." They seek out towns where there is a diversity of thought and progressive attitudes, or at least tolerant attitudes.

Those attributes, it turns out, are exactly those sought by young, talented, high-technology workers -- both gay and straight. Florida has been questioning these New Economy workers and has found that diversity --- not rocks to climb or good jobs -- was the No. 1 attribute people wanted in a place to work and a place to live. "If you poison the environment with anti-inclusive rhetoric, these people will turn away," Florida says.

This means that gay men and lesbians are the canaries in the New Economy coal mine. If gay people can survive in a place, then so will high-tech workers -- the people with the ideas and talents that are now making economies grow.

Beneath the surface

The technology industry has realized the importance of diversity in satisfying the most important ingredient for their economic success, and its leaders are demanding these values be extended to our politics. "These industries don't come to me and say, 'We want you to be conservative on issues of choice or issues of sexual orientation or issues of diversity,'" says Ron Sims, chief executive of Washington state's King County, which includes Seattle. "They are saying to me, 'We want you to be out there talking about being an
inclusive society, fully participating in a new global period.'"

But what about regions not benefiting from the New Economy? In those places, the push for diversity is not a priority. Take Seattle, again. Business leaders in Washington state pushed a statewide proposition in 1997 that would ban discrimination based on sexual orientation. It passed in Seattle and King County. It was voted down in the rest of the state.

As diverse and open places surge ahead, others are left behind -- the rural, the uneducated, the blue-collar worker, those in Old Economy industries. Bubba was not invited to the New Economy, and Bubba understands the slight.

These days, political fights split more often down the New Economy/Old Economy divide than between left and right or Republican and Democrat. Gay rights, women's rights, globalization vs. protectionism all split along this economic divide as much as the ideological divide.

"When I look down at what is the political powder keg--I think, this is it," says Richard Florida of the divide between old and new. "It's simmering beneath the surface in California; it's simmering beneath the surface in Seattle. My guess is it's simmering beneath the surface in Texas. And I don't think either political party has sorted this boy out."

Bill Bishop is a regular contributor to IntellectualCapital.com and a senior writer at the Austin American-Statesman in Texas.
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ORTHOPAEDIC SURGEONS

JOB OPENING

POSITION TITLE: MANAGER, SURVEY RESEARCH
DEPARTMENT: Research and Scientific Affairs
REPORTS TO: Department Director
SUPERVISES: Research Associates and Independent Contractors

GENERAL SUMMARY: Manages all aspects of survey research for the Academy and provides survey consultation services to Specialty Societies. Manages, coordinates and reviews the technical and data quality aspects of research studies undertaken by the Academy. Interfaces with external organizations to develop improved and enhanced data collection systems for musculoskeletal conditions.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Oversees all Academy survey research on areas such as orthopaedic practice and workforce, marketing of Academy products and addressing special data and informational needs as identified by Academy management or Board of Directors. Includes responsibility for all aspects of the survey research process including developing questionnaires, selecting appropriate vendors, mailing questionnaires, coordinating data entry, developing programs to tabulate data and perform statistical analyses, interpreting data and writing final reports.

Coordinates activities among departments for periodic updating of the Academy's membership database including questionnaire design of the Orthopaedic Physician Census and supplemental forms. Oversees data entry and statistical data analysis. Interprets results and prepares reports, publications, and articles for Academy and external journals and periodicals.

Manages the Academy's functional outcomes questionnaire data collection projects and oversees the development and production of new products initiated from these projects. Consults with and provides survey research services to the Specialty Society Services department. Serves as technical and data quality staff liaison to Academy committees and task forces, as needed. Seeks opportunities to provide input to external organizations conducting related survey research.

Establishes direction for the Survey Research Unit and identifies areas for
future growth. Performs all other job related duties as required or assigned. TRAVEL: Approximately 10 days per year.

QUALIFICATIONS: Required: Masters degree in a discipline requiring significant experience and training utilizing research design methodologies for the social sciences, especially survey research design; 5+ years of experience in survey research design and development, administration, data entry and analysis, interpretation of results, and report writing; 3+ years of supervisory experience; extensive experience in the use of computer technology (hardware and software) needed to perform data collection and analysis for surveys and moderate to complex research projects; demonstrated expertise and experience in the use of SPSS (preferably version 10.0) and the Microsoft Office Suite of programs; excellent analytic and writing skills; excellent oral communication and interpersonal skills. Desired: previous work and/or academic experience in health or public policy arenas; association experience; knowledge and experience in database design.

Send resume and salary requirements to Marita Powell, Director of Human Resources at AAOS, 6300 N. River Rd., Rosemont, IL 60018 or call 847-384-4266 or fax to 847-823-1288.

>From mark@bisconti.com Wed Jul 12 15:30:42 2000
Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id PAA05893 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jul 2000 15:30:40 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mark (adsl-138-88-46-229.bellatlantic.net [138.88.46.229]) by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2650.21)
  id 3BGV4HGT; Wed, 12 Jul 2000 18:30:38 -0400
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Gays as Canaries for New Economy Coal Mine
Date: Wed, 12 Jul 2000 18:29:33 -0400
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBIEDICJAA.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 V5.00.2919.6700

During the 1990 census, the "partner" category was publicized within the D.C. gay press as a way for gay/lesbian couples to be counted (long form only?).

Are people living in areas with a vocal opposition to a "homosexual lifestyle" (areas with strong religious right) less likely to check the "partner" slot, for fear of being identified? I would expect a higher percentage of gays/lesbians living in "unfriendly" areas to be closeted, and less likely to have formed strong geographically identified communities (gay-friendly neighborhoods, as in SF, NY, and DC) that could be targeted. (The fact that NYC isn't in "top 10" seems curious—maybe it's 11th, but
Metro regions are composed of many very different areas, political jurisdictions, so that presents complications. The suburbs that surround D.C. (in VA and MD) have about 130 (?) separate towns, some of which host the high tech component of the regional economy. Some are very liberal and diverse, others not. D.C. proper, which scores high on diversity, has little of the high tech economy (D.C. is eyeing it with envy and talks of developing a NOMA-north of Mass. Ave.-high tech district; articles have appeared showing some in that well-paid workforce coming to D.C., staying in hotels on weekends for urban cultural life). I think the main reasons high tech companies located where they did: very aggressive local economic developers/plans, economic incentives, low cost land for tech parks, available and educated workforce, affordable housing and good schools. D.C. proper has not been able to offer the same incentives to the companies thus far-D.C.'s "diversity" comes with poverty, inner city issues, and high taxes that the high tech companies aren't attracted to.... D.C. has a very tolerant and liberal community, formed of many minority groups (elsewhere, that is... here they're majority!), with a strong gay and lesbian component (2 of 13 Council members are openly gay-one Republican, one Democrat). D.C. passed a domestic partnership law (straight and gay) in early '90s (Congress won't allow implementation). I believe there are one or two suburban jurisdictions with such a law, but not many-that says something about gay/lesbian political power in those areas. Looking at the bottom of the "50" list... Greensboro and Winston-Salem are lumped together... two different Bible Belt cities about 30 miles apart that are growing into one another, in a region that is mainly suburban and rural, with very little urban core. I can't imagine an openly gay or lesbian running for office in that region without that factor becoming THE issue, but Greensboro has a substantial gay and lesbian population (as does Charlotte). I guess even making the top 50 is something... there must be a lot of places with lower ranks? I can imagine high tech business doing well in these areas-a good labor pool with strong work ethic and lower cost of living, salaries (than top urban areas, etc.) (I think Raleigh, Research Triangle area is attractive to high tech). Might be telling to look at key gay/lesbian-associated company employment policies, existence of company gay/lesbian associations, as well as laws in areas where these companies are located and pay taxes.

Although Bishop writes "Florida and Gates do not argue a direct, literal connection," he also quotes Gates as saying "You're not going to find a stronger predictor of high technology than the gay index. One is clearly signaling the other." I doubt gays and lesbians are the canaries for the New Economy coal mine (what a concept, though!?!), but it probably doesn't hurt high tech companies to have an urban "playground" nearby! (What about government and gays?!) Cheers, Mark Richards

>From candu@rand.org Wed Jul 12 16:27:39 2000
Received: from mail02-lax.pilot.net (mail-lax-2.pilot.net [205.139.40.16])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id QAA11207 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jul 2000 16:27:39 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mail01-rand.pilot.net (unknown-23-138.pilot.net [204.48.23.138]) by mail02-lax.pilot.net with ESMTP id QAA15748 for
  <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jul 2000 16:27:37 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mail.rand.org (localhost [127.0.0.1]) by
  mail01-rand.pilot.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id QAA21401 for
I'd like to know if you have any recommendations on a user-friendly web survey design software and its cost to purchase it.

Please send response directly to me.

Thanks.

Can Du
RAND
1700 Main Street
P O Box 2138
Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
Tel: (310) 393-0411 ext 6301
Fax: (310) 451-6957
Jim,

----- Original Message -----
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
Cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2000 9:24 PM
Subject: Re: Data link cultural diversity to individual creativity?

> Hank,

> Does anything about the analysis really depend on whether anyone is
gay or not? Suppose we simply stick close to the data and call them
all "unmarried people of the same sex living together"--would this
really undermine anything about the analysis itself, quite apart from
any additional claims people might wish to make about the results (as,
for example, in the term "gay index," which at best is only partly
justified).

Of course the term "gay index" very much depends on whether the "unmarried
people of the same sex living together" are gay or not. The Bishop piece
do not make clear what data was used, though James Murphy said there was a
specific "partner" category in the census. Gates could have used that. Not
knowing for sure makes it harder to analyse Bishop's analysis.

> So, that aside, what do we conclude from the analysis? If you headed
a high-tech start-up or a new content-creating company, where would
you prefer to relocate your firm, based on these data--in the gay
index Top 10 cities or in the cities ranked 41-50? And why?

Well, just looking at the list, I would pick the top 10 over the 41-50, but
not because of the "gay index," because of the Milken rankings. Why not use
the latter directly? High tech business thrive better when they are near
other high tech businesses. Such concentrations have better talent pools,
more support businesses and synergy in numbers.

> And what about these 50 cities makes them correlate so strongly on the
two variables--call them what you will--on which we now know that they
correlate so strongly?

Perhaps some of the things Gates suggests - Cultural vibrancy? Tolerance
of/appreciation for new ideas? Tolerance/celebration of diversity?

In the Bishop piece, these were just ideas tossed out without any supporting
data, but they seem plausible. The point of the Bishop piece seems
political - be tolerant and you will prosper in the new economy. Well,
tolerance is a good thing in any case...

> -- Jim

> P.S. I doubt that anyone in AAPOR needs to be reminded of the
ecological fallacies arising when correlations of aggregate units are
used to make inferences about proper subsets of those units. For
example, the fact that precinct crime rates correlate positively with
the percentage of the precinct population that is Belgian does not
imply that Belgians are committing more than their share of the
crimes--nor that they are not. The national origin of the actual
criminals can only be determined by individual level data, but of
course.

At least the Bishop piece does not claim "a direct, literal connection
between the presence of gay couples and the growth of high-technology
firms." While we in AAPOR know that correlation does not apply causality,
too many other people do not.

Hank

> On Tue, 11 Jul 2000, Hank Zucker wrote:
> 
> > One cannot make the automatic assumption that unmarried people of
> > the
> > same
> > > sex living together are gay. The cities high on the "gay index" are
cities
> > > with high costs of living and cities that attract young people,
regardless
> > > of their sexual orientation.
> > 
> > 
> > *****
> > 
> >From paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua Thu Jul 13 00:37:31 2000
Received: from sivka.carrier.kiev.ua (root@sivka.carrier.kiev.ua
[193.193.193.101])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id AAA17780 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Jul 2000 00:37:25 -0700
  (PDT)
Received: from planka.carrier.kiev.ua (root@users.lucky.net
[193.193.193.106])
  by sivka.carrier.kiev.ua (8/Kilkenny_is_better) with ESMTP id
  KOG14109;
  Thu, 13 Jul 2000 10:37:05 +0300 (EEST)
  (envelope-from paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua)
Received: from default (ln1-173.users.lucky.net [193.193.195.173])
  by planka.carrier.kiev.ua (8) with SMTP id KOE02455;
  Thu, 13 Jul 2000 10:36:50 +0300 (EEST)
  (envelope-from paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua)
Message-ID: <000601bfec5d$3df8ea60$adc3c1c1@default>
From: "Vladimir Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>
To: "AAPOR Network" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: <Tamara.Gruzbarg@chase.com>
Subject: Problems with forecast of referendum results
Date: Thu, 13 Jul 2000 00:43:14 +0300
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
  boundary="----_NextPart_000_0003_01BFECE6.63462260"
X-Priority: 3
Dear colleagues,

During May conference in Portland we discussed possibility of our surveys to control elections. I would like to add some information to our discussion and to ask your advice.

April 16, 2000 in Ukraine took place referendum with 4 questions, reflecting the struggle of the President and Parliament (have the president right to dismiss the Parliament, is it necessary to cancel immunity of the deputies, to reduce the number of the deputies and to establish bicameral parliament). The results of the survey (see below), which have been conducted by my institute - Kiev International Institute of Sociology - show, that the referendum data, most likely, were forged. Shall I try to publish the survey data, if it may results in problems for my institute and other unpredictable consequences?

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

The survey which has been conducted by our institute (KIIS) a few weeks up to referendum (from March 17 till March 27, 2013 respondents, random sample) has allowed to make the forecast that in referendum will take part about 60 % of voters and that all questions on referendum will be supported by population. The referendum results (see tab. 1) have surprised first of all by very high percent of population, who take part in it, and also that the obscure question about bicameral parliament has supported not=20 60%, but 80 % voting. The table 1.

The answers to questions the forecast the = referendum a difference

1. The President right to dismiss the Parliament 77 = 85 8
2. Cancellation of deputies immunity 88 = 89 1
3. Reduction of number of the deputies 97 = 90 7
4. Bicameral parliament 63 = 82 19
Take part in referendum 61 = 81 20

=20
As a rule, the maximal difference of our forecasts from results of choices did not exceed 3-4 % (see, our report among the materials of a conference WAPOR-AAPOR in Portland), therefore it was difficult to explain difference in 20 % by mistakes of research.

For check of hypotheses the special survey was conducted (the survey was conducted from May 15 till May 26 in all areas of Ukraine and in Crimea, the sample multistage random at each stage, 2101 respondents were interviewed). We asked the respondents to tell, whether they took part in referendum, if yes - what was their response on a question about bicameral parliament. In the table 2 the results of comparison of research data with referendum results are given.

The table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Referendum</th>
<th>the survey after referendum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Expressed FOR in the answer</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>81.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to 4-th question (about bicameral parliament)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Took part in referendum</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>81.2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For some areas of Ukraine the distinction of the referendum results and survey results exceeds 30%. It is difficult for me to suggest other explanation to these distinctions, than that the referendum results in these regions of Ukraine were forged. Can you suggest other explanation?

My best regards

Vladimir
Dear colleagues,

During May conference in Portland we discussed possibility of our surveys to control elections. I would like to add some information to our discussion and to ask your advice.

April 16, 2000 in Ukraine took place referendum with 4 questions, reflecting the struggle of the President and Parliament (have the president right to dismiss the Parliament, is it necessary to cancel immunity of the deputies, to reduce the number of the deputies and to establish bicameral parliament). The results of the survey (see below), which have been conducted by my institute - Kiev International Institute of Sociology - show, that the = referendum data, most likely, were forged.

Shall I try to publish the survey data, if it may result in problems for my institute and other unpredictable consequences?

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

The survey which has been conducted by our institute (KIIS) a few weeks up to referendum (from March 17 till March 27, 2013 respondents, random sample) has allowed to make the forecast that in referendum will take part about 60% of voters and that all questions on referendum will be supported by population. The referendum results (see tab. 1) have surprised first of all by very high percent of population, who take part in it, and also that the obscure question about bicameral parliament has supported not 60% but 80% voting.

The table 1. The answers to questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The forecast</th>
<th>the referendum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The President right to dismiss the Parliament</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The President immunities of Parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reduction of the deputies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment of bicameral parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a rule, the maximal difference of our forecasts from results of choices did not exceed 3-4 % (see, our report among the materials of a conference=20 WAPOR=AAPOR in Portland), therefore it was difficult to explain difference in 20=20 % by mistakes of research. 

For check of hypotheses the special survey was conducted (the survey was conducted from May 15 till May 26 in all areas of Ukraine and in Crimea, the sample multistage random at each stage, 2101 respondents were interviewed). We asked the respondents to tell, whether they took part in referendum, if = yes=20 – what was their response on a question about bicameral parliament. In the table 2 the results of comparison of research data with referendum results are given.
Forecast

Referendum
the survey after referendum <P>% Expressed FOR in the answer</P> <P>to 4-th question (about bicameral parliament) %

63% %

81,7 =

61.3 %</P>

% Took part in referendum &nbsp; &nbsp; &nbsp; &nbsp; &nbsp; &nbsp; &nbsp; 61% % 81,2 =

67.4 %</P>

For some areas of Ukraine the distinction of the referendum results and survey results exceeds 30%. It is difficult for me to suggest other explanation=20 to these distinctions, than that the referendum results in these regions of=20 Ukraine were forged. Can you suggest other explanation?&lt;/P&gt;&lt;B&gt;&lt;/B&gt;&lt;/P&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2&gt;My best regards&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2&gt;Vladimir&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2&gt;&lt;br&gt;My best regards&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2&gt;Vladimir&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2&gt;&lt;br&gt;My best regards&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2&gt;Vladimir&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;

Paniotto, Director of KIIS&lt;BR&gt;(Kiev International Institute of 20 Sociology)&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;Milchakova 1/18, kv.11, Kiev-253002, UKRAINE&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;Phone=20 (380-44)-463-5868,238-2567,238-2568 (office)&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;Phone=20 (380-44)-517-3949&amp;nbsp; (home)&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;Fax (380-44)-263-3458, phone-fax = 463-5868&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;E-mail: &lt;A=20 href=3D"mailto:paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua">paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua</A>&lt;/A&gt;&lt;/BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;=

(A=20 href=3D"http://www.kiis.com.ua">http://www.kiis.com.ua</A>&lt;/A&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2&gt;&lt;br&gt;&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2&gt;&lt;br&gt;&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;&lt;/BODY&gt;&lt;/HTML&gt;

-----=_NextPart_000_0003_01BFEC76.63462260--

>From mohler@zuma-mannheim.de Thu Jul 13 04:14:27 2000
Received: from mail.zuma-mannheim.de (mail.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.12])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id EAA29163 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Jul 2000 04:14:25 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from zuma-mannheim.de (nb-mohler.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.87])
by mail.zuma-mannheim.de (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id NAA25849 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Jul 2000 13:13:55 +0200
Message-ID: <396DA456.74DCC411@zuma-mannheim.de>
Date: Thu, 13 Jul 2000 13:13:27 +0200
Dear Edith,

two issues today:

a. the editors of the cross-cultural book would like to add a section on Meta-Analysis in comparative research. Do you know someone who could write about this topic?

b. Joop asked me a couple of days ago about the possibility of a conference on the international interviewer project. I was in a meeting at this point and perhaps rather short to Joop. Actually I am quite enthusiastic about the idea and would like to encourage Joop to send me a page or so indicating what he intends to do (ZUMA finalises its conference planning for 2001 in August).

warm regards

Peter Mohler

quidquid it est timeo methodicos ut donas ferentes (Homer, Ilias)
Dear Peter,

At 01:13 PM 7/13/00 +0200, you wrote:
a. the editors of the cross-cultural book would like to add a section
on Meta-Analysis in comparative research. Do you know someone who could
write about this topic?

Some questions in reply:
1) Should it be a basic introductory chapter, or a statistical chapter?
2) How many pages available?
3) It depends a bit on the time path. If I remember correctly from Janet's
last communication, the draft chapters should be ready around september. Is
there an adapted new time-path for the new chapter?

>b. Joop asked me a couple of days ago about the possibility of a
conference on the international interviewer project. I was in a meeting
at this point and perhaps rather short to Joop. Actually I am quite
enthusiastic about the idea and would like to encourage Joop to send me
a page or so indicating what he intends to do (ZUMA finalises its
conference planning for 2001 in August).

Sorry about out late reaction. We were rather busy with the preparations
for the CD-ROM-proceedings for Cologne.
Next week we leave for Ann Arbor to teach.
I am not sure we manage to send you something before we leave. But we will
immediately when we return (August 5).

From a rainy Amsterdam,
warm regards, Edith

Edith de Leeuw, Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam tel/fax
+31.20.6223438 e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl
Does anyone have syllabi, or recommendations for sites that post syllabi, for courses on Survey Research Methods and Data Analysis? Thank you for your help.

Anna Greenberg
Asst. Prof. of Public Policy
John F. Kennedy School of Government
As far as I can see, this message is blank. In your defense, it is Friday, so maybe I just can't see it! Just kidding. Let me know if you need anything.

Melissa

>>> <anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu> 07/14 9:18 AM >>>

> From jcf3c@erols.com Fri Jul 14 06:43:13 2000
Received: from hestia.host4u.net (hestia.host4u.net [216.71.64.32])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id GAA20053 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jul 2000 06:43:12 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from erols.com ([209.3.2.162])
  by hestia.host4u.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id IAA24249
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jul 2000 08:42:27 -0500
Message-ID: <396F18BE.6A6CCA87@erols.com>
Date: Fri, 14 Jul 2000 09:42:22 -0400
From: "John C. Fries" <jcf3c@erols.com>
Reply-To: jcf3c@erols.com
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: The To: field......
References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10002221054020.17608-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
  <4.2.0.58.20000229201417.0095af00@pop.xs4all.nl>
  <4.2.0.58.20000714104747.00a49bc0@pop.xs4all.nl>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

OK....I'm going to venture out on this limb here and ask how it is STILL possible that people continue to send personal messages to the ENTIRE AAPORNet list. Are there email programs out there that don't display the To: field in the composition window? I realize all it takes is one click of the delete key and the misdirected message is gone. But as frequently as it happens, it becomes a bit tiresome.

Anyway, I'm truly not lashing out at anyone in particular. I realize that mistakes happen. And of course the odds of MY making this particular mistake are now increased exponentially by this post. So I guess I offer this only as a reminder to everyone (including myself), please....PLEASE....check the address fields before you hit [SEND].
Hey Melissa: It took me a minute to figure out I did that. I get strangely nervous when I write to appornet. You know what I mean? I got the bid and need to talk to the potential clients. I'll get back to you when I know more. Have a great weekend. Best, Anna

mherrmann@mail.icrsurvey.com@usc.edu on 07/14/2000 09:32:49 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

Sent by: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: 
Subject: Re:

As far as I can see, this message is blank. In your defense, it is Friday, so maybe I just can't see it! Just kidding. Let me know if you need anything.

Melissa

>>> <anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu> 07/14 9:18 AM >>>
The Washington Times  
Page A19  
Friday, July 14, 2000  

Arrest that poll  
by Jay Bergman  

This spring the University of Connecticut’s Center for Survey Research and Analysis (CSRA) conducted a poll of 1,341 Connecticut State University professors on the use of preferences based on race, gender and ethnicity. The poll was commissioned by the Connecticut Association of Scholars and co-sponsored by the National Association of Scholars, the American Civil Rights Institute and the Center for Equal Opportunity.  

Its questions were clear: "Do you feel that [name of institution] should or should not grant preference to one applicant over another in faculty employment decisions on the basis of race, sex, or ethnicity?" A second question, phrased the same way, concerned student admissions.  

The results of the poll, which were widely reported in newspapers and on television around the state, revealed overwhelming opposition to these preferences. In faculty hiring, professors in the Connecticut State University system rejected preferences by 61 percent to 18 percent (with the remainder undecided or not responding), University of Connecticut faculty did so by 52 percent to 29 percent, and community college faculty by 75 percent to 15 percent. In student admissions, CSU faculty rejected preferences by 58 percent to 23 percent, University of Connecticut faculty by 47 percent to 35 percent, and community college faculty by 73 percent to 9 percent.  

Even before the poll was completed, several professors at the University of Connecticut, fearful of the results, angrily denounced it, claiming its methodology was flawed - that the questions were misleading and
ambiguous and deliberately designed to advance the conservative agenda of the organizations that commissioned the poll and co-sponsored it. One protesting professor, Kenneth Neubeck of the Sociology Department, said the questions were "loaded." Another, Murphy Sowell of the School of Business Administration, declared that "as a social scientist and a professional, I don't believe this study should be acceptable for academic standards and research."

Yet another, Diana Rios of the Department of Communication Sciences, condemned the poll for "forcing a choice and not allowing for an alternative response." On the day the results were announced, approximately 30 University of Connecticut faculty assembled outside the office of the president of the university, Philip Austin, and demanded that he join them in repudiating the poll. In the press release they issued, they complained that the poll "left many faculty feeling they were duped." Several professors affiliated with the university's Puerto Rican/Latino Cultural Center even demanded that CSRA itself be investigated.

That these professors disliked the results of the poll, rather than the way in which the poll was conducted, is obvious. Can anyone seriously believe they would have been so agitated if the poll had revealed support for preferences? CSRA has done polls for liberal organizations in the past, such as the Media Studies Center and the First Amendment Center. One searches in vain for any protests against those polls by the professors so offended by this most recent one. What these advocates of preferences evidently believe is that faculty opinion on preferences should not be sampled by a duly constituted agency of the university. Their real objective, as their actions reveal, is to silence those who disagree with them.

When the poll results were announced, Mr. Austin issued a statement reaffirming the right of CSRA to conduct polls for whomever it wished. But he also repeated an earlier statement of his that the university's commitment to inclusion and fairness "will not be tailored to fit this or any year's political fashion," thus implying that the faculty at his university who oppose racial preferences are somehow opposed as well to inclusion and fairness - which is really just a small step from saying they are bigots. Indeed, the interim chancellor of the university, Fred Maryanski, effectively nullified the president's statement supporting CSRA by agreeing to the professors' demand and creating a task force to examine how CSRA conducts research for external organizations.

The mere existence of the task force is a threat to academic freedom. Regardless of its ultimate recommendations, it cannot help but exert a chilling effect on what professors and students believe can be freely and openly discussed at the University of Connecticut. What is worse, it sends a message to polling organizations everywhere in America, not just those affiliated with universities, that no matter how sound and unbiased their polling methods may be, they can expect to be investigated, their integrity questioned and their professionalism impugned, if persons displeased with the results of their polls decide to vent their spleens publicly.

Polling is an integral aspect of American politics. It is also helpful in the formulation of public policy. For this reason, everyone who values democracy and free speech in America should hope that the University of Connecticut comes to its senses and disbands this task force immediately. For too long, university administrators have capitulated to the demands of a small minority of faculty so infatuated with their own imagined moral virtue and victimization that they seek a marketplace of ideas in academia in which only their own ideas are presented. It is time that such petulance end. Jay Bergman is professor of history at Central Connecticut State University and president of the Connecticut Association of Scholars.
Killing the messenger is one of the oldest and most effective methods of putting bad news to rest. On the other hand, I think Mr. Bergman should get a grip. People who work in the kitchen can expect things to get a little hot from time to time. If, as he maintains, there is nothing untoward about the CSRA's dealings with its clients, the investigation will reveal it and the issue will die a natural death. Maybe the best approach would be to advocate that the parties who are disputing the results do their own poll and show how an unbiased version would change the outcome.
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>From RobFarbman@aol.com Fri Jul 14 13:47:54 2000
Received: from imo-d04.mx.aol.com (imo-d04.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.36]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id NAA28305 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jul 2000 13:47:54 -0700 (PDT)
From: RobFarbman@aol.com
Received: from RobFarbman@aol.com by imo-d04.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v27.12.) id 5.84.7fc0ac2 (3971) for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jul 2000 16:47:09 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <84.7fc0ac2.26a0d64c@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 14 Jul 2000 16:47:08 EDT
Subject: dial based research info (?)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 117

My company needs to do a dial based survey for a project in the Washington D.C. area sometime between mid-August and early September. We would need access to a facility or the dial equipment for a few nights.

Any referrals or other information would be greatly appreciated.

Rob Farbman
Edison Media Research
908-707-4707

>From KathrynC@socialresearch.com Fri Jul 14 13:55:50 2000
Received: from researchnt.socialresearch.com (node-d8e942ba.powerinter.net [216.233.66.186]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id NAA05047 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jul 2000 13:55:50 -0700 (PDT)
I'm looking for published or unpublished research on the minimum number of call attempts needed to designate an RDD sample telephone number as non-household if no contact has ever been made with that number. I know anecdotally that people use cutoffs of 14 to 18 attempts and I know the cost involved in dialing through all those numbers in the right calling pattern. Has anyone the probability of misassigning a non-HH disposition code after X or Y attempts? Please email me privately and I will send a summary to the whole list. Thanks in advance.

Kathy

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

Dear fellow netters,

Apologies for having a private conversation through your channels.

Late at night I simply used the reply-button.
Well it teaches me to be humble! I was getting in the stage that I thought only rookies make these errors.

Warm regards, Edith

The moral to the following modest little tale: Never underestimate the persuasive power of a simple, obvious and unforgettable visual symbol--especially not when it is posted to the World Wide Web.

Can you imagine what it must feel like, as an elected representative in a democracy, to be publicly accused of violating the sacred act of voting because you "delegated that responsibility to a piece of office supply"?

No, me neither.

-- Jim

*****

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company


July 16, 2000

POLITICS

TALE OF A PAPER CLIP HAUNTS A CANDIDATE

B.Drummond Ayres Jr.

Back in 1980, when he was one of the newer members of the Illinois House, State Representative Timothy V. Johnson, a Republican from the Champaign-Urbana area, rigged a paper
clip so that it held the "Yes" voting button on his desk in the down position. When a picture of the clip hit the newspapers, he first denied installing it but later backtracked, saying such rigs were "accepted practice" in the legislature and enabled members to vote on legislation even when absent from the House chamber, especially at times when votes were called while members were meeting with constituents or working on other pressing matters.

That explanation apparently satisfied voters in Mr. Johnson's district. He still represents it 20 years later.

But now he has his eye on a larger district, the 15th Congressional, which has an open seat this year, and the photo of the paper clip has come back to haunt him.

His Democratic rival, Mike Kelleher, has dredged up the shot and contends it says much about Mr. Johnson's worthiness to serve. He has posted newspaper articles about it on the Web -- timspaperclip.com -- and is running ads about it.

"It shows a pattern of behavior by Tim Johnson to avoid his responsibilities and violate the trust his constituents placed in him," Mr. Kelleher said last week. "Voting is the reason you are elected, and he delegated that responsibility to a piece of office supply. This goes to character."

Mr. Johnson says he is guilty of no wrongdoing and calls the resurrected picture and stories "a silly little red herring" raised by "a desperate candidate who is far behind."

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

******
I had expected to see posted here earlier the news of our loss of Naomi "Donny" Rothwell, a great light source for the survey profession for many years in the sense of both enlightening and lighting up the place.

I append the text of the Washington Post's obit published Saturday:

> Naomi D. 'Donny' Rothwell
> Census Official
> Naomi Doniger "Donny" Rothwell, 82, who spent 31 years at the U.S. Census Bureau doing survey research and retired as chief of what was the human factors research center, died July 12 at Glenn Dale Elderly Care after a stroke.
> She was a recipient of the Commerce Department's Silver and Gold Medal awards.
> She was a New York native and a 1939 agriculture graduate of Cornell University.
> She moved to the Washington area in the early 1940s and was at the State and Army departments but predominantly at the Department of Agriculture, where she had been a study director at the Bureau of Agriculture Economics.
> She was a past fellow of the American Statistical Association and a past president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research's Washington chapter.
> She was the past director of the Woodley House in Washington, a halfway facility for psychiatric patients that her sister Joan M. Doniger founded. The sisters co-wrote "The Psychiatric Halfway House, A Case Study," published in 1966 by Charles C. Thomas.
> After retiring, Mrs. Rothwell did volunteer tutoring in Prince George's County jails.
> She was a former Washington resident and had lived at Glenn Dale Elderly Care since the late 1990s.
> Mrs. Rothwell was the guardian of Teresa Doniger and Kiyo Doniger Tukman, whom she had raised from an early age. She took them into her home 28 years ago.
> Mrs. Rothwell's husband, George James Rothwell, whom she married in
> 1940, died in 1995.
>
> Survivors include two sons, David Rothwell of Garrett Park and Jed
> Rothwell of Atlanta; two daughters, Nan Rothwell of Faber, Va., and
> Kate Rothwell of West Hartford, Conn.; two sisters; and 11
> grandchildren.
>
> From abider@american.edu Sun Jul 16 18:42:56 2000
> Received: from harrier.prod.itd.earthlink.net
> (harrier.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.121.12])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> id SAA06207 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 16 Jul 2000 18:42:55 -0700
> (PDT)
> Received: from american.edu (sdn-ar-004varestP277.dialsprint.net
> [168.191.217.207])
> by harrier.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3-EL_1_3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id
> SAA21509
> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 16 Jul 2000 18:42:54 -0700 (PDT)
> Message-ID: <397264FC.688DCF07@american.edu>
> Date: Sun, 16 Jul 2000 21:44:28 -0400
> From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
> X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
> X-Accept-Language: en
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Subject: HK poll flap
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
>
> This AP story in the NY Times today should be of great interest to us:
> <http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/i/AP-Hong-Kong-Pollster-Row.html>

The following article appeared in yesterday's Atlanta Constitution -- front=
Poll hints at low turnout in fall

Charles W. Holmes - Staff
Saturday, July 15, 2000

Washington --- Voters are more disengaged from the presidential race this year than at any time in recent history, according to an extensive survey of American attitudes toward politics.

Good economic times and a sense that there is little difference between Democrat Al Gore and Republican George W. Bush have lulled voters into "a rather pleasant sleep," pollster Andrew Kohut, director of the nonpartisan Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, said Friday.

The flagging voter interest could be an indication that turnout this fall may sink to a new low, Kohut said. In 1996, only 49 percent of eligible citizens cast ballots, the first time in more than 70 years that less than half of voters went to the polls to elect a president.

The Pew poll found that fewer than half of registered voters --- 46 percent --- said they have thought a lot about the election, a decline from 55 percent in the same period in 1996 and 63 percent in 1992. The drop-off in voter interest and familiarity with the candidates is especially pronounced in young and middle-age adults.

'It seems virtually certain' that turnout will be lower than the 55 percent of voters who went to the polls in 1992, when Bill Clinton defeated incumbent George Bush, the pollster said.

At the same time, Americans say they are more satisfied with their choice of presidential candidates this year, and they are less critical of the way the campaigns are being conducted.

Among Republicans, 73 percent expressed satisfaction with the candidates compared to 49 percent in 1996, when former Sen. Bob Dole won the GOP nomination. Sixty-six percent of Democrats said they were satisfied this year, compared to 56 percent in 1996.

The poll concluded that the race between Bush and Gore remains wide open as the candidates head to the nominating conventions next month.

The survey found that likely voters are evenly split between Gore and Bush --- 47 percent each, with 6 percent undecided. Third-party candidates Ralph Nader and Pat Buchanan will not have much impact on the race, Kohut predicted.

Americans increasingly believe election of the president is not as important as it was a decade or two ago, the poll found. Nearly half of Americans --- 49 percent --- believe things will stay pretty much the same no matter who is elected.
The Pew survey, conducted among 2,174 adults June 14-28 with a margin of plus or minus 2.5 percentage points, complements other recent polls that indicate voters see little differences in the two major candidates.

ON THE WEB: Pew Research Center for the People and the Press:
www.people-press.org

---

The following article appeared in yesterday's Atlanta Constitution -- front page.<br> Dick Halpern<br> <br>
Poll hints at low turnout in fall<br> Charles W. Holmes - Staff<br> <br>Washington --- Voters are more disengaged from the presidential race this year than at any time in recent history, according to an extensive survey of American attitudes toward politics. Good economic times and a sense that there is little difference between Democrat Al Gore and Republican George W. Bush have lulled voters into "a rather pleasant sleep," pollster Andrew Kohut, director of the nonpartisan Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, said Friday. The flagging voter interest could be an indication that turnout this fall may sink to a new low, Kohut said. In 1996, only 49 percent of eligible citizens cast ballots, the first time in more than 70 years that less than half of voters went to the polls to elect a president. The Pew poll found that fewer than half of registered voters --- 46 percent --- said they have thought a lot about the election, a decline from 55 percent in the same period in 1996 and 63 percent in 1992. The drop-off in voter interest and familiarity with the candidates is especially pronounced in young and middle-age adults. 'It seems virtually certain' that turnout will be lower than the 55 percent of voters who went to the polls in 1992, when Bill Clinton defeated incumbent George Bush, the pollster said. At the same time, Americans say they are more satisfied with their choice of presidential candidates this year, and they are less critical of the way the campaigns are being conducted. Among Republicans, 73 percent expressed satisfaction with the candidates compared to 49 percent in 1996, when former Sen. Bob Dole won the GOP nomination. Sixty-six percent of Democrats said they were satisfied this year, compared to 56 percent in
The poll concluded that the race between Bush and Gore remains wide open as the candidates head to the nominating conventions next month. The survey found that likely voters are evenly split between Gore and Bush --- 47 percent each, with 6 percent undecided. Third-party candidates Ralph Nader and Pat Buchanan will not have much impact on the race, Kohut predicted. Americans increasingly believe election of the president is not as important as it was a decade or two ago, the poll found. Nearly half of Americans --- 49 percent --- believe things will stay pretty much the same no matter who is elected. The Pew survey, conducted among 2,174 adults June 14-28 with a margin of error of plus or minus 2.5 percentage points, complements other recent polls that indicate voters see little differences in the two major candidates.

AAPORnet – I would appreciate leads regarding organizations doing surveys among high school students, and omnibuses that include or specialize in youth. Thank you for any ideas.

Nancy Belden, Belden Russonello & Stewart, Washington, DC
202 822 6090
nancybelden@brspoll.com

>From ckreider@mint.net Mon Jul 17 14:13:48 2000
Received: from dolomite.mint.net (dolomite.mint.net [216.227.128.33])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA01295 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Jul 2000 14:13:47 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ckmarg (dialup-b-53.mint.net [216.227.152.73])
   by dolomite.mint.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id RAA27703
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Jul 2000 17:13:43 -0400
From: "Christine Kreider" <ckreider@mint.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: DATA ENTRY SOFTWARE
Date: Mon, 17 Jul 2000 17:15:45 -0700
Message-ID: <LPBBJMECHCAHECCMFKEPCEPLCBAA.ckreider@mint.net>
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
X-SLUIDL: 3F963781-5BF611D4-9BE80010-4B0F537B

Does anyone have any recommendations for data entry software? Most of what I seem to be able to find is either extremely poorly documented, or full of bells and whistles for Internet use -- while all I want is to replace the old SPSS Dos data entry software for use in rapid entry of postal surveys. Thanks for any help!

Chris Kreider

>From rrands@cfmc.com Mon Jul 17 14:22:28 2000
Received: from mail.cfmc.com (main.cfmc.com [206.15.13.129])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA07457 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Jul 2000 14:22:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from rrands-W98 (rands-w95.cfmc.com [206.15.13.172])
   by mail.cfmc.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id OAA21615
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Jul 2000 14:22:26 -0700
Message-Id: <4.1.20000717142005.00c6ede0@pop.cfmc.com>
X-Sender: rrands@pop.cfmc.com
Hi Chris,

CfMC sells a program called MicroPunch that runs on a PC and emulates an old Keypunch machine. Our data entry people use it daily and really like it. We sell it for $500 per copy.

Richard Rands

Does anyone have any recommendations for data entry software? Most of what I seem to be able to find is either extremely poorly documented, or full of bells and whistles for Internet use -- while all I want is to replace the old SPSS Dos data entry software for use in rapid entry of postal surveys. Thanks for any help!

Chris Kreider

It happened to me once. I forwarded an AAPOR message to someone. He then used the reply feature to reply to me, and it went to the whole list. When I received his return message, it looked like it came from him rather than the AAPOR list, so I replied to him, again broadcasting to the whole list. I think it's better to copy an AAPOR message, then paste the message in a new email, rather than using the forward feature. That's how I inadvertently replied to the whole list, but I'm sure there are other ways than people can embarrass themselves with list servers. Linda
To: field in the composition window? I realize all it takes is one click of the delete key and the misdirected message is gone. But as frequently as it happens, it becomes a bit tiresome.

Anyway, I'm truly not lashing out at anyone in particular. I realize that mistakes happen. And of course the odds of MY making this particular mistake are now increased exponentially by this post.
So I guess I offer this only as a reminder to everyone (including myself), please....PLEASE....check the address fields before you hit [SEND].

Have a great weekend!

-- John C. Fries..................................Voice: (804) 358-8981
Senior Project Director..........................FAX: (804) 358-9701
Southeastern Institute of Research.............Richmond, Virginia
Marketing and Opinion Research...............email: JCF@SIRresearch.com

>From KAF@cbsnews.com Tue Jul 18 06:50:10 2000
Received: from cbsnews.com ([170.20.81.50])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id GAA05278 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Jul 2000 06:50:10 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from CBSNY-Message_Server by cbsnews.com
    with Novell GroupWise; Tue, 18 Jul 2000 09:49:38 -0500
Message-Id: <s9742832.016@cbsnews.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Tue, 18 Jul 2000 09:49:05 -0500
From: Kathy Frankovic <KAF@cbsnews.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: On Pummeling Pollsters: An International View
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id GAA05279

In light of AAPORNET discussions of pollster "pummeling" and the recent questions about pre-election polls in Mexico raised in yesterday's NY Times article, I thought I'd post an article published in The Sunday Post, Hong Kong, on July 16. It written by David Bottomley, of Hong Kong, and was posted on wapornet. He agreed to let me pass it on to you.

The dangerous art of accurate polling

*David. I didn't like the headline in this morning's Post. We're in discussions with the Chinese and it didn't help.* The Chief Secretary, David Ford, now Sir David, had called me to his office. It was about the first or second year of the ten years for which I conducted the South China Morning Post's polls, probably 1987.

Still fresh from Australia I found this first contact with British colonialism intriguing. I suggested he should talk to the editor. I was not responsible for headlines based on my surveys. He did seem genuinely upset by the *80% support* for whatever it was that the Post had featured.
This incident came to mind with the last few days' discussion about whether or not the administration tried to influence a Hong Kong pollster. Was the Chief Secretary then ever so nicely giving me a message that he expected me to be prudent with my polls? I don't know.

In 1988 the Administration issued a Green Paper about the future of democracy in Hong Kong. It commissioned a public opinion survey. It was the worst survey I'd ever seen. Hong Kong market researchers condemned it. The European Society of Opinion and Marketing Research (ESOMAR) investigated it and found it sadly wanting.

This time the Chief Secretary invited me to lunch. He seemed genuinely puzzled by the survey criticism. If, indeed, these were messages from the Administration they were too subtle for this Australian.

Politicians and administrators are human. They like polls that support them or their policies; they are not so happy when they don't. Then they may accuse the pollster of personal bias or declare his methods suspect. Defensively, they trot the old cliché: "The only poll that counts is the one on election day!"

Messages to pollsters are not always subtle. Humphrey Taylor, chairman of Louis Harris & Associates, wrote two years ago: "Attempts to manipulate and corrupt the polls are now a serious worldwide phenomenon." He described how a Nixon aide in 1972 attempted to influence the Harris Poll to give Nixon good results. Marta Lagos, former president of the Chilean Association for Public Opinion Research described the pressure on herself following the recent election in Chile as "brutal."

Telephone lines to her office were cut. Senators attacked her in the press and her colleagues warned her she was up against a very powerful man who could harm her.

Why? Because she warned publicly that telephone polls might not yield correct results in a country where only half the homes had telephones. The opposition party in the hope of influencing the result was using only telephone polls, which predicted its victory. It lost.

Today, in an East European country a pollster suspects the government falsified results of a recent poll. He fears that to follow his conscience and publish his results will cause his company to be closed.

Many western countries which have democratic elections nevertheless fear the polls. They restrict publication of results near election times. France does so for two weeks before the final election and Spain for five days.

The effect of such restrictions, which deprive the population of polling information from established and reliable pollsters, is to invite reams of bad information and disinformation.

In France surveys are commissioned by major broking houses and political parties. They may then leak those results to clients or to the public. Information then reaches the public during the period of the ban but not from known and reliable polling companies.
The Government of Canada attempted a three-day ban on publication of results before Federal elections. The ban was defeated because one established pollster put its results on the website of MORI, the major independent market research and polling institute in UK. The Canadian media referred the public to the website.

Subsequently, the Canadian High Court declared the ban was unconstitutional. Bob Worcester, MORI*s Chairman said: *Any country that believes in freedom of information cannot introduce illiberal legislation without it being found unconstitutional*.

There is much to be done in Hong Kong to improve the quality of poll information that reaches the public. The Marketing Research Society and the Statistical Society could set up a council to answer questions about opinion polls. Editors could be encouraged to follow international guidelines for publishing poll results and journalists could be provided with critical questions to put to people who report polls, such as those which appear in the Sunday news releases of political parties.

[David T. Bottomley is managing director of Asia Marketing Research Directions Ltd. He conducted SCMP polls for ten years between 1986 and 1998. He is the HK representative of the World Association for Public Opinion Research.] END

I believe the problem is that when a message comes in, for some software, it lists the original sender, and not AAPORNET, so, if people see a message from someone they correspond with often, they just hit 'reply' and don't check the "to" field, as it is counter-intuitive. That is, if you just told the computer to reply to your friend, you don't tend to check who it's replying to. My version of Eudora (4.2.2 right now) lists the name of the original sender as the message sender, then, when you reply, it lists the original sender first, and then AAPORNET in the 'to' field, so we are also asking people to check the To field thoroughly.
It is like getting a phone call and, after saying 'hello,' and hearing your friend say 'Hi, this is Joe' having to say "Am I really speaking to Joe?"

I would suggest that the problem could be minimized if the messages sent from AAPORN said AAPORN was the sender rather than the originator of the message. Just a thought.

Dan McDonald

At 03:19 PM 7/17/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Are you referring to when you hit [REPLY]? My contention is that if people looked at the To: field BEFORE sending a message, they would see whether or not the message is going to the individual or to AAPORN or BOTH. I use Outlook, Netscape, and Eudora and have found that it only lists eventual recipients in the To: field.>
>Although in re-reading your message I see now that you mean the message may initially appear to be from an individual (since they are listed in the incoming message's To: field) in which case people falsely assume it did not come from the AAPOR list. I see.... This definitely doesn't help things. Thanks for pointing out this source of confusion.>
>John
>
>John
>
>Dan McDonald wrote:
> >
> > On some email programs it actually lists the original sender of the message rather than AAPORNET, so it's actually pretty easy to get confused.
> >
> > Dan McDonald
> >
> > At 09:42 AM 7/14/00 -0400, you wrote:
> >
> > >OK....I'm going to venture out on this limb here and ask how it is STILL possible that people continue to send personal messages to the ENTIRE AAPORNet list. Are there email programs out there that don't display the To: field in the composition window? I realize all it takes is one click of the delete key and the misdirected message is gone. But as frequently as it happens, it becomes a bit tiresome.
> >
> > Anyway, I'm truly not lashing out at anyone in particular. I realize that mistakes happen. And of course the odds of MY making this particular mistake are now increased exponentially by this post. So I guess I offer this only as a reminder to everyone (including myself), please....PLEASE....check the address fields before you hit [SEND].
> >
> > Have a great weekend!
> >
> >
> >
> >John C. Fries..........................Voice: (804)
Daniel G. McDonald  
Professor  
School of Journalism and Communication  
3080 Derby Hall  
154 North Oval Mall  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, OH 43022  
phone: (614) 292-5811  
fax: (614) 292-2055  

> From Michael_Mokrzycki@ap.org Tue Jul 18 07:34:48 2000  
Received: from APRelay2.ap.org (APrelay2.ap.org [165.1.59.100])  
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
id HAA19485 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Jul 2000 07:34:48 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from nyc2.ap.org ([165.1.5.61])  
by APRelay2.ap.org (Lotus Domino Release 5.0.2c (Int1))  
with SMTP id 2000071810234768:21402 ;  
Tue, 18 Jul 2000 10:23:47 -0400  
Received: by nyc2.ap.org(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.5 (863.2 5-20-1999)) id  
85256920.00507567 ; Tue, 18 Jul 2000 10:38:49 -0400  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: THEAP  
From: "Michael Mokrzycki" <Michael_Mokrzycki@ap.org>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-ID: <85256920.00507415.00@nyc2.ap.org>  
Date: Tue, 18 Jul 2000 10:38:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: private msgs to list  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
X-MIMETrack: Itemize by SMTP Server on APRelay2/TheAP(Release 5.0.2c  
(Int1)|2 February  
2000) at 07/18/2000 10:23:47 AM,  
Serialize by Router on APRelay2/TheAP(Release 5.0.2c (Int1)|2 February
My understanding is the listserv software can be configured to make the default "reply to sender only" unless you deliberately choose "reply to all" (or whatever that command may be called) in your email reader. AAPORnet is configured so that the default is "reply to the list" whether you choose "reply" (single) or "reply to all."

It also appears, at least from Lotus Notes, that the only way I can reply privately to a sender is by manually typing in the sender's address. UGH.

If the listserv were configured so that the default action for "reply" (single) is to reply only to the sender and "reply to all" would send it to the list as well as to the sender, the potential downside would be some people might intend to post to the list but inadvertently reply only to the sender. I run a list where this is the default, and yes, I've gotten a few private replies that I subsequently determined were intended for the list -- but I've also found that when the discussion really gets going, users have no problem making sure the full list sees their opinions.

I have raised this issue with the AAPORnet powers that be and was told that Council wanted "reply-to-list" as the default, believing there is greater harm in debate grounding to a halt inadvertently than from private messages going to the list. I have to disagree.

Detailed background on this issue -- including how default "reply to list" violates the principles of least surprise and least damage -- is at http://www.unicom.com/pw/reply-to-harmful.html

Mike Mokrzycki
Associated Press

Dan McDonald <mcdonald.221@osu.edu> on 07/18/2000 01:03:49 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To:   aapornet@usc.edu
cc:    (bcc: Michael Mokrzycki/TheAP)

Subject:  Re: The To: field......

I believe the problem is that when a message comes in, for some software, it lists the original sender, and not AAPORNET, so, if people see a message from someone they correspond with often, they just hit 'reply' and don't check the "to" field, as it is counter-intuitive. That is, if you just told the computer to reply to your friend, you don't tend to check who it's replying to. My version of Eudora (4.2.2 right now) lists the name of the original sender as the message sender, then, when you reply, it lists the
original sender first, and then AAPORNET in the 'to' field, so we are also asking people to check the To field thoroughly.

It is like getting a phone call and, after saying 'hello,' and hearing your friend say 'Hi, this is Joe' having to say "Am I really speaking to Joe?"

I would suggest that the problem could be minimized if the messages sent from AAPORNET said AAPORNET was the sender rather than the originator of the message. Just a thought.

Dan McDonald

At 03:19 PM 7/17/00 -0400, you wrote:

> Are you referring to when you hit [REPLY]? My contention is that if people looked at the To: field BEFORE sending a message, they would see whether or not the message is going to the individual or to AAPORNet or BOTH. I use Outlook, Netscape, and Eudora and have found that it only lists eventual recipients in the To: field.
> Although in re-reading your message I see now that you mean the message may initially appear to be from an individual (since they are listed in the incoming message's To: field) in which case people falsely assume it did not come from the AAPOR list. I see.... This definitely doesn't help things. Thanks for pointing out this source of confusion.
> John
>
> Dan McDonald wrote:
> > On some email programs it actually lists the original sender of the message rather than AAPORNET, so it's actually pretty easy to get confused.
> >
> > Dan McDonald
> >
> > At 09:42 AM 7/14/00 -0400, you wrote:
> >
> > > OK....I'm going to venture out on this limb here and ask how it is STILL possible that people continue to send personal messages to the ENTIRE AAPORNet list. Are there email programs out there that don't display the To: field in the composition window? I realize all it takes is one click of the delete key and the misdirected message is gone. But as frequently as it happens, it becomes a bit tiresome.
> > > Anyway, I'm truly not lashing out at anyone in particular. I realize that mistakes happen. And of course the odds of MY making this particular mistake are now increased exponentially by this post. So I guess I offer this only as a reminder to everyone (including myself), please....PLEASE....check the address fields before you hit [SEND].
> > > Have a great weekend!
John C. Fries..................................Voice: (804) 358-8981
Senior Project Director..........................FAX: (804) 358-9701
Southeastern Institute of Research................Richmond, Virginia
Marketing and Opinion Research............email: JCF@SIRresearch.com

Daniel G. McDonald
Professor
School of Journalism and Communication
3080 Derby Hall
154 North Oval Mall
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43022
phone:  (614) 292-5811
tax:  (614) 292-2055

John C. Fries..................................Voice: (804) 358-8981
Senior Project Director..........................FAX: (804) 358-9701
Southeastern Institute of Research................Richmond, Virginia
Marketing and Opinion Research............email: JCF@SIRresearch.com

Daniel G. McDonald
Professor
School of Journalism and Communication
3080 Derby Hall
154 North Oval Mall
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43022
phone:  (614) 292-5811
tax:  (614) 292-2055
Dear friends,

As you probably know, a most important election took place in Mexico last July the 2nd. After 71 years, the ruling party (PRI) lost the Presidency. There is every sign of what could be described as one of the smoothest transitions ever. Democracy worked. Unfortunately, the polls did not deliver. This was another case where polls failed. The consensus portrayed by the final polls was of a close election with better odds for Labastida, the PRI candidate. All that was wrong. The election ended up as an election with a seven points lead for Fox, the PAN candidate.

Who should be blamed? Respondents, of course. Who else? Next morning some pollsters gave the typical, and I think completely wrong explanation. Polls failed because of the so called Nicaraguan effect: respondents lied to pollsters because after so many years of authoritarian rule they feared repression.

The fact is that the PRI lost its majority since 1995 after one of the most devastating financial crisis in Mexico's history. Since then it lost many state governor races and in the 1997 mid-term election it lost control of the Chamber of deputies, the lower house of our Congress. In all these cases polls could forecast very accurately the outcome and exit polls have always produced good estimates.

I am preparing an article on this as a continuation of a previous one published in IJPOR. I think it can be very useful to include some information on the general accuracy of polls in the world. I am beginning to think that outcomes like this one are more common than what one would expect. First, errors are in general large, but not enough to mislead the public about the expected outcome, USA 1996 and 1980, for instance. Second, there are many cases where they fail on the winner. The important thing is that these things happen independently of the political system or the degree of economic development of the countries involved.

I am sure that a good review of this topic can help us all to do a better work, either as practitioners or as users of poll results.

Does any one know of a good data base where I can review poll results and vote counts of a good number of countries? Can anybody refer to me his or her personal experience in his or her country's more recent election focusing on the last polls (one or two weeks before the election)?

Please answer directly to me and I will give the list the results of this querry.

Thanks

Ulises Beltran
Director
Survey Research Unit
Office of the President of Mexico
Anyone know of any polling on the gender and racial makeup of Ralph Nader's support?

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
+1-212-741-9852 voice  +1-212-807-9152 fax
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>
This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

Does anyone know how many households in the U. S. have an answering machine? Can someone direct me to a source that would have this information?

ORC does a regular kids/teens omnibus called Caravan. Call Judy Loescher at ORC.

At 02:33 PM 7/17/00 -0400, you wrote:

AAPORnet - I would appreciate leads regarding organizations doing
surveys among high school students, and omnibuses that include or specialize in youth. Thank you for any ideas.

Nancy Belden, Belden Russonello & Stewart, Washington, DC
202 822 6090
nancybelden@brspoll.com

Jo Holz
434 Fifth Street
Brooklyn, NY 11215

Phone: (718) 499-3212
Fax: (718) 499-3606

From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Wed Jul 19 07:14:58 2000
Received: from mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (mx1.hcvlny.cv.net [167.206.112.76])
     by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
     id HAA22166 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Jul 2000 07:14:57 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from s1.optonline.net (s1.optonline.net [167.206.112.6])
     by mx1.hcvlny.cv.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA23076;
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (d164-134.ynkrny.optonline.net
     [24.189.164.134])
     by s1.optonline.net (8.9.1/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA24373;
Message-ID: <3975B86D.F608AA00@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Date: Wed, 19 Jul 2000 10:17:17 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (WinNT; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: African American Voter Turnout
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This was emgargoed, but is now released.

African Americans Defy Trend of Plunging Voter Turnout, Census Bureau Reports

African Americans were the only race or ethnic group to defy the trend of declining voter participation in congressional elections, increasing their
presence at the polls from 37 percent in 1994 to 40 percent in 1998, according to a report released today by the Commerce Department's Census Bureau.

Nationwide, overall turnout by the voting-age population was down from 45 percent in 1994 to 42 percent in 1998 -- about 3 million fewer voters in 1998 than in 1994.

"The increase in voter participation by African Americans was most notable in the South, where the rate grew by 4 percentage points to 39 percent," said Avalaura Gaither, co-author of Voting and Registration in the Election of November 1998, P20-523. "About 40 percent of the 9 million African American voters lived in the South."

Turnout by Whites declined from 50 percent to 47 percent from 1994 to 1998, while Asian and Pacific Islander turnout fell from 22 percent to 19 percent and Hispanic turnout remained at 20 percent. (The turnout rates for each of the latter two groups would increase by nearly 13 percentage points if estimated noncitizens were subtracted from the voting-age universe. Data by race in this release exclude people of Hispanic origin, who may be of any race.)

Turnout also declined across all age groups and for men and women. For example, 35 percent of 25- to 44-year-olds cast ballots in 1998, down from 39 percent in 1994.

Other highlights of the report:

Reasons for Not Voting

- Of the 40 million people who said they registered but did not vote in the 1998 election, about one-third reported they were "too busy" or had conflicting work or school schedules. Another 13 percent were not interested or felt their vote would not make a difference.

Voter Turnout

- The West and Midwest states recorded the highest voting rates in 1998, led by Minnesota (66 percent), while the South had the lowest (Virginia was at 31 percent).

- Among voting-age citizens, the lowest voting rates by age were for 18- to 24-year-olds, where a ratio of slightly less than 1 in 5 voted. The age group with the highest voting participation was 55- to 74-year-olds; more than 3 in 5 in this age group cast ballots.

- Women (46 percent) were slightly more likely than men (45 percent) to vote in 1998, continuing a trend that started in 1986.

- About 5 in 10 homeowners said they voted, compared with 3 out of 10 renters. About one-half of those living in families who voted had family incomes of more than $50,000.
In 1998, voting-age citizens who had bachelor's degrees were nearly twice as likely (6 in 10) to have voted as those who had not completed high school (3 in 10).

Voter Registration

- Voter registration between 1994 and 1998 increased for African Americans (from 59 percent to 61 percent) and Hispanics (from 31 percent to 34 percent).
  The rates for Whites (68 percent) and Asians and Pacific Islanders (29 percent) were the same in both elections.

- Of the 198 million people of voting age in 1998, 62 percent said they were registered to vote. This is not significantly different from the percentage registered in the 1994 and 1990 congressional elections.

- More than two-thirds of citizens in the Midwest were registered to vote. North Dakota (91 percent) and Minnesota (83 percent) had the highest registration rates, while many of the states with lower rates were in the West (Nevada had 52 percent).

- The percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds who were registered to vote declined from 42 percent in 1994 to 39 percent in 1998. There was no significant change for people ages 25 to 44 years.

The data were collected in the November 1998 Current Population Survey (CPS) two weeks after the election. As in all surveys, data are subject to sampling variability and other sources of error. The CPS routinely overestimates voter turnout. Possible reasons include understatement of the votes cast; overreporting by survey respondents who want to demonstrate their civic responsibility; misreporting of voting because of refusals or lack of knowledge on the part of proxy respondents; and survey undercoverage.

-x-

Editor's Note: The data can be accessed at http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/voting.html.
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Dan McDonald <mcdonald.221@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: private msgs to list
In-Reply-To: <85256920.00507415.00@nyc2.ap.org>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I think the bigger issue is who the message comes from. Most of the time
the issue is that the message appears to be from someone a person knows,
and they simply reply to the message. If the sender was AAPORNET instead
of an individual, I imagine 90% of the problem would go away. I almost
never see the problem on lists where the list name is listed as the
sender. If you want to reply to an individual who sent a message on a
list, it's easy to compose a special message, and you almost never make the
mistake of replying because you think it's a personal note. It should be
easy to configure the AAPORNET list so that it shows AAPORNET as the sender
rather than the original person.

At 10:38 AM 7/18/00 -0400, you wrote:
> My understanding is the listserv software can be configured to make the
> default
> "reply to sender only" unless you deliberately choose "reply to all" (or
> whatever that command may be called) in your email reader. AAPORnet is
> configured
> so that the default is "reply to the list" whether you choose "reply"
> (single)
> or "reply to all."

Daniel G. McDonald
Professor
School of Journalism and Communication
3080 Derby Hall
154 North Oval Mall
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43022
phone: (614) 292-5811
fax: (614) 292-2055

> From mkshares@mcs.net Wed Jul 19 09:43:00 2000
Received: from Kitten.mcs.net ([192.160.127.90])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id JAA05502 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Jul 2000 09:43:00 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P63-Chi-Dial-2.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.127])
  by Kitten.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA70096
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Jul 2000 11:42:56 -0500 (CDT)
  (envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)
Message-ID: <3975944B.4225FDD@mcs.net>
Date: Wed, 19 Jul 2000 11:43:14 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
The final graph below says: "The CPS routinely overestimates voter turnout. Possible reasons include underestimation of the votes cast; overreporting by survey respondents who want to demonstrate their civic responsibility; misreporting of voting because of refusals or lack of knowledge on the part of proxy respondents; and survey undercoverage."

The Census Voter and Registration survey reports routinely include this disclaimer in their reports, a disclaimer which is based on FEC reports. For 1998, the FEC counted 73,117,000 votes cast based on state reports (I believe) while the Census survey below reports 83,098,000 persons voting. This has been the pattern for many years.


Has anyone ever examined the data to see which groups over-report voting; e.g., gender, age, race?

Has anyone ever examined official state records to find which states over-report.

Years ago, Gallup examined local election board records to confirm the efficacy of their likely voter calculation. Has the Census Bureau ever compared respondents who said they voted with voter history compiled by local election authorities?

Or, are there any issues with the FEC reported voter counts? (Issues with registered voter data are well-known.)

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

> This was embargoed, but is now released.
> 
> Public Information Office
> CB00-114
> 301-457-3030/301-457-3670 (fax)
> 301-457-1037 (TDD)
> e-mail: pio@census.gov
> 
> Avalaura Gaither
> 301-457-2464
> 
> African Americans Defy Trend of Plunging Voter Turnout, Census Bureau Reports
> 
> African Americans were the only race or ethnic group to defy the trend of declining voter participation in congressional elections, increasing their presence at the polls from 37 percent in 1994 to 40 percent in 1998, according to a report released today by the Commerce Department's Census
Nationwide, overall turnout by the voting-age population was down from 45 percent in 1994 to 42 percent in 1998 -- about 3 million fewer voters in 1998 than in 1994.

"The increase in voter participation by African Americans was most notable in the South, where the rate grew by 4 percentage points to 39 percent," said Avalaura Gaither, co-author of Voting and Registration in the Election of November 1998, P20-523. "About 40 percent of the 9 million African American voters lived in the South."

Turnout by Whites declined from 50 percent to 47 percent from 1994 to 1998, while Asian and Pacific Islander turnout fell from 22 percent to 19 percent and Hispanic turnout remained at 20 percent. (The turnout rates for each of the latter two groups would increase by nearly 13 percentage points if estimated noncitizens were subtracted from the voting-age universe. Data by race in this release exclude people of Hispanic origin, who may be of any race.)

Turnout also declined across all age groups and for men and women. For example, 35 percent of 25- to 44-year-olds cast ballots in 1998, down from 39 percent in 1994.

Other highlights of the report:

Reasons for Not Voting

- Of the 40 million people who said they registered but did not vote in the 1998 election, about one-third reported they were "too busy" or had conflicting work or school schedules. Another 13 percent were not interested or felt their vote would not make a difference.

Voter Turnout

- The West and Midwest states recorded the highest voting rates in 1998, led by Minnesota (66 percent), while the South had the lowest (Virginia was at 31 percent).

- Among voting-age citizens, the lowest voting rates by age were for 18- to 24-year-olds, where a ratio of slightly less than 1 in 5 voted. The age group with the highest voting participation was 55- to 74-year-olds; more than 3 in 5 in this age group cast ballots.

- Women (46 percent) were slightly more likely than men (45 percent)
> to vote
> - About 5 in 10 homeowners said they voted, compared with 3 out of 10
> renters.
> - About one-half of those living in families who voted had family
> incomes of
> - more than $50,000.
> - In 1998, voting-age citizens who had bachelor's degrees were nearly
> twice
> as likely (6 in 10) to have voted as those who had not completed
> high
> school (3 in 10).
> Voter Registration
> - Voter registration between 1994 and 1998 increased for African
> Americans
> (from 59 percent to 61 percent) and Hispanics (from 31 percent to 34
> percent).
> The rates for Whites (68 percent) and Asians and Pacific Islanders
> (29 percent) were the same in both elections.
> - Of the 198 million people of voting age in 1998, 62 percent said
> they were
> registered to vote. This is not significantly different from the
> percentage
> registered in the 1994 and 1990 congressional elections.
> - More than two-thirds of citizens in the Midwest were registered to
> vote.
> North Dakota (91 percent) and Minnesota (83 percent) had the highest
> registration rates, while many of the states with lower rates were
> in
> the West (Nevada had 52 percent).
> - The percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds who were registered to vote
> declined
> from 42 percent in 1994 to 39 percent in 1998. There was no
> significant
> change for people ages 25 to 44 years.
> The data were collected in the November 1998 Current Population Survey
> (CPS) two weeks after the election. As in all surveys, data are subject
> to
> sampling variability and other sources of error. The CPS routinely
> overestimates voter turnout. Possible reasons include understatement of
> the votes cast; overreporting by survey respondents who want to
> demonstrate their civic responsibility; misreporting of voting because
> of
> refusals or lack of knowledge on the part of proxy respondents; and
> survey
> undercoverage.
> -X-
Is anyone aware of recent data on confidence in the American justice system, by ethnicity and gender?

Following are abbreviated remarks made by Eleanor Holmes Norton (Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus's Judicial Task Force and D.C.'s non-voting Delegate to the House of Representatives) at a press conference today on the need to process African-American nominees to the Federal Judiciary:

"There is a severe and growing crisis of confidence in the American justice system-from the conduct of police on the streets to the diversity and composition of those selected and elected to make judicial decisions."

"The criminal justice system in particular is burdened with the perception of serious and pervasive unfairness. The documentation has been legion from the state and federal justice systems-racial profiling by the INS and state and city policy; wholesale police brutality; sentencing rules for small-time drug offenses with a disproportionate racial impact so severe that in the federal system, sentencing guidelines have been repudiated by the federal judiciary; and use of the death penalty whose racial consequences have shaken the American public and led to moratoriums and a call for national action."

Norton called attention to the slowest processing of the President's judicial nominees by the Senate in 20 years, stating, "Our [CBC] analysis demonstrated that perhaps the major reason for the slow processing of Clinton judges in recent years was that in 1998, for example, three-quarters of those delayed for a year or more and two-thirds of those pending for six months or more were minorities or women. ...As of last November... The
Senate had confirmed 42% of Clinton's white but less than half as many, or 18%, of his African-American nominees."

"The Citizens for Independent Courts' Task Force on Federal Judicial Selection has issued a non-partisan, blue-ribbon study that found that during the 105th Congress, minorities and women nominees took significantly longer to gain Senate consideration than white male nominees: 60 days longer for non-whites, and 65 days longer for women than men."

"Our [CBC] point remains that the federal judiciary does not fairly include black judges. ...If we are unable to get fairness for African-American nominees in the Congress, it will be up to them [our communities] to do it at the polls."

Full text available from Eleanor Holmes Norton's office (202) 225-8050

The National Center for State Courts, Res. Dir. David Rottman, is working on such data right now. I know because my lab collected it. They also did one last year form the Hearts Foundation. His e-mail is <drottman@ncsc.dni.us>

Brian Vargus Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory

Mark David Richards wrote:

> Is anyone aware of recent data on confidence in the American justice system,  
> by ethnicity and gender?  
> 
> Following are abbreviated remarks made by Eleanor Holmes Norton (Chair of  
> the Congressional Black Caucus's Judicial Task Force and D.C.'s non-voting  
> Delegate to the House of Representatives) at a press conference today on the  
> need to process African-American nominees to the Federal Judiciary:  
> > "There is a severe and growing crisis of confidence in the American justice
system from the conduct of police on the streets to the diversity and composition of those selected and elected to make judicial decisions."

"The criminal justice system in particular is burdened with the perception of serious and pervasive unfairness. The documentation has been legion from the state and federal justice systems-racial profiling by the INS and state and city policy; wholesale police brutality; sentencing rules for small-time drug offenses with a disproportionate racial impact so severe that in the federal system, sentencing guidelines have been repudiated by the federal judiciary; and use of the death penalty whose racial consequences have shaken the American public and led to moratoriums and a call for national action."

Norton called attention to the slowest processing of the President's judicial nominees by the Senate in 20 years, stating, "Our [CBC] analysis demonstrated that perhaps the major reason for the slow processing of Clinton judges in recent years was that in 1998, for example, three-quarters of those delayed for a year or more and two-thirds of those pending for six months or more were minorities or women. ...As of last November... The Senate had confirmed 42% of Clinton's white but less than half as many, or 18%, of his African-American nominees."

"The Citizens for Independent Courts' Task Force on Federal Judicial Selection has issued a non-partisan, blue-ribbon study that found that during the 105th Congress, minorities and women nominees took significantly longer to gain Senate consideration than white male nominees: 60 days longer for non-whites, and 65 days longer for women than men."

"Our [CBC] point remains that the federal judiciary does not fairly include black judges. ...If we are unable to get fairness for African-American nominees in the Congress, it will be up to them [our communities] to do it at the polls."

Full text available from Eleanor Holmes Norton's office (202) 225-8050
Several people wrote me offlist to share the fruits of my Nader polling research. Gallup sent me the breakdown from their most recent poll. Highlights follow (since I'm too lazy to type all of it up):

CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll, July 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gore</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Buchanan</th>
<th>Nader</th>
<th>no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonwhite</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postgrad</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college grad</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some college</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS or less</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total college</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75k+</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50k+</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30-50k</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20-30k</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$20k</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ideology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
+1-212-741-9852 voice +1-212-807-9152 fax
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>
Subject: RE: teen surveys
Date: Wed, 19 Jul 2000 18:53:07 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
       charset="iso-8859-1"

Nancy: Maryellen Colten [Maryellen.colten@umb.edu] and Sue Gore [Susan.gore@umb.edu] at the Center for Survey Research, UMASS Boston, have two ongoing studies involving samples of high school students. One is a 5-wave longitudinal survey of adolescents. I have also surveyed adolescents, but the samples were provided by health plans and Massachusetts Medicaid.

AAPORNET: I hope this doesn't seem too much like a private message. Just being a passive observer to exchanges between researchers requesting info and those who respond has certainly been enlightening for me. I'd hate to see it reduced to just half of the exchange.

Trish

-----Original Message-----
From: Nancy Belden [mailto:nancybelden@brspoll.com]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2000 2:34 PM
To: aapornet
Subject: teen surveys

AAPORNET - I would appreciate leads regarding organizations doing surveys among high school students, and omnibuses that include or specialize in youth. Thank you for any ideas.

Nancy Belden, Belden Russonello & Stewart, Washington, DC
202 822 6090

nancybelden@brspoll.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Nader, etc.
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

It was just pointed out that there was an error in the presidential breakdown table I just sent. Liberals for Nader should be 10%, not
20%. The corrected chart follows.

Doug

----

CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll, July 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gore</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Buchanan</th>
<th>Nader</th>
<th>no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonwhite</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postgrad</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college grad</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some college</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS or less</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total college</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75k+</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50k+</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30-50k</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20-30k</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$20k</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ideology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of those on this discussion list may not know of the 1996-published, 95-page, hardcover or softcover book that I consider an excellent source for tips on how to develop charts. It's "Graphing Statistics & Data: Creating Better Charts," written by several members of Statistics Sweden (which I
believe is like our Census Bureau). The authors are (as listed on the red/white/blue cover): Anders Wallgren, Britt Wallgren, Rolf Persson, Ulf Jorner, and Jan-Aage Haaland.

The book's chapters and numerous illustrations and examples go into the value of charts, specific instructions on how to develop bar/frequency/development over time/relationship/variation/flow/geographical variation-type charts, charts and layout issues, charts in practice discussions, and even contains a two-page checklist on how to evaluate a developed chart for whether or not it meets your needs in depicting data patterns and conveying a message.

The book is sold by Sage Publications in Thousand Oaks, California; their web address is sagepub.com

I'm not related to the authors or even work for Statistics Sweden, I just consider the book a very useful addition to one's professional reference text library.

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

Jeff,

I thought you might find this table interesting.

Nancy

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Doug Henwood [SMTP:dhenwood@panix.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2000 7:07 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Nader, etc.
>
> It was just pointed out that there was an error in the presidential breakdown table I just sent. Liberals for Nader should be 10%, not 20%. The corrected chart follows.
Doug

----

CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll, July 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gore</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Buchanan</th>
<th>Nader</th>
<th>no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonwhite</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postgrad</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college grad</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some college</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS or less</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total college</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75k+</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50k+</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30-50k</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20-30k</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$20k</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From mkshares@mcs.net Thu Jul 20 06:58:29 2000
Received: from Kitten.mcs.net ([192.160.127.90])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA27498 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jul 2000 06:58:28 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P23-Chi-Dial-1.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.23])
    by Kitten.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA81244
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jul 2000 08:58:24 -0500 (CDT)
    (envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)
Message-ID: <3976BF3B.2D2B9082@mcs.net>
Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 08:58:42 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: CPS Turnout
References: <3975B86D.P608AA00@troll.soc.qc.edu> <3975944B.4225FDD@mcs.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

More about the CPS Voter and Registration survey vs. official turnout
In my last message I said: "FEC counted 73,117,000 votes cast based on state reports while the Census survey below reports 83,098,000 persons voting."

But FEC turnout is defined on their web site as: "In this instance turnout refers to the total vote cast for the highest office contested on the ballot in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. In most cases this figure represents total votes cast for either U.S. Senator or Governor."

The reason for this is that many states do not report total ballots cast or the *total number of people* who voted. So the FEC must use total votes cast for highest office when reporting turnout state by state.

But *some states do report* total ballots and Illinois is one of them. In 1998, our State Election Board shows that 3,541,000 total ballots were cast while the FEC shows 3,395,000 "turnout" for Illinois, total votes cast for U.S. Senate (matching both IL State Election Board and Clerk of the House figures).

So in Illinois, 4.3% more voters voted than were reported at the FEC site, or 3,541 divided by 3,395.

Others who have access to 1998 turnout data in states which count total ballots cast could compare their states with turnout as reported by the FEC at:
http://www.fec.gov/pages/reg&to98.htm

In the meantime, assuming Illinois represents the national average, the FEC figure could be revised upward to 76,261,000 (1.043 X 73,117). So the figure closer to actual national turnout should be 76,261,000 - still considerably below the Census's 83,098,000 turnout.

Not to lose sight of the original question - is there any research showing which groups over-report voting in the CPS?

Nick Panagakis wrote:

> The final graph below says: "The CPS routinely overestimates voter turnout. Possible reasons include understatement of the votes cast; overreporting by survey respondents who want to demonstrate their civic responsibility; misreporting of voting because of refusals or lack of knowledge on the part of proxy respondents; and survey undercoverage."

> The Census Voter and Registration survey reports routinely include this disclaimer in their reports, a disclaimer which is based on FEC reports. For 1998, the FEC counted 73,117,000 votes cast based on state reports (I believe) while the Census survey below reports 83,098,000 persons voting. This has been the pattern for many years.


> Has anyone ever examined the data to see which groups over-report voting;
Has anyone ever examined official state records to find which states over-report?

Years ago, Gallup examined local election board records to confirm the efficacy of their likely voter calculation. Has the Census Bureau ever compared respondents who said they voted with voter history compiled by local election authorities?

Or, are there any issues with the FEC reported voter counts? (Issues with registered voter data are well-known.)

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

> This was embargoed, but is now released.

African Americans Defy Trend of Plunging Voter Turnout, Census Bureau Reports

African Americans were the only race or ethnic group to defy the trend of declining voter participation in congressional elections, increasing their presence at the polls from 37 percent in 1994 to 40 percent in 1998, according to a report released today by the Commerce Department's Census Bureau.

Nationwide, overall turnout by the voting-age population was down from 45 percent in 1994 to 42 percent in 1998 -- about 3 million fewer voters in 1998 than in 1994.

"The increase in voter participation by African Americans was most notable in the South, where the rate grew by 4 percentage points to 39 percent," said Avalaura Gaither, co-author of Voting and Registration in the Election of November 1998, P20-523. "About 40 percent of the 9 million African American voters lived in the South."

Turnout by Whites declined from 50 percent to 47 percent from 1994 to 1998, while Asian and Pacific Islander turnout fell from 22 percent to 19 percent and Hispanic turnout remained at 20 percent. (The turnout rates for each of the latter two groups would increase by nearly 13 percentage points if estimated noncitizens were subtracted from the voting-age universe. Data by race in this release exclude people of Hispanic origin,
who may be of any race.

Turnout also declined across all age groups and for men and women. For example, 35 percent of 25- to 44-year-olds cast ballots in 1998, down from 39 percent in 1994.

Other highlights of the report:

Reasons for Not Voting

- Of the 40 million people who said they registered but did not vote in the 1998 election, about one-third reported they were "too busy" or had conflicting work or school schedules. Another 13 percent were not interested or felt their vote would not make a difference.

Voter Turnout

- The West and Midwest states recorded the highest voting rates in 1998, led by Minnesota (66 percent), while the South had the lowest (Virginia was at 31 percent).
- Among voting-age citizens, the lowest voting rates by age were for 18- to 24-year-olds, where a ratio of slightly less than 1 in 5 voted. The age group with the highest voting participation was 55- to 74-year-olds; more than 3 in 5 in this age group cast ballots.
- Women (46 percent) were slightly more likely than men (45 percent) to vote in 1998, continuing a trend that started in 1986.
- About 5 in 10 homeowners said they voted, compared with 3 out of 10 renters. About one-half of those living in families who voted had family incomes of more than $50,000.
- In 1998, voting-age citizens who had bachelor's degrees were nearly twice as likely (6 in 10) to have voted as those who had not completed high school (3 in 10).

Voter Registration

- Voter registration between 1994 and 1998 increased for African Americans (from 59 percent to 61 percent) and Hispanics (from 31 percent to 34 percent).
- The rates for Whites (68 percent) and Asians and Pacific Islanders
(29 percent) were the same in both elections.

- Of the 198 million people of voting age in 1998, 62 percent said they were registered to vote. This is not significantly different from the percentage registered in the 1994 and 1990 congressional elections.

- More than two-thirds of citizens in the Midwest were registered to vote. North Dakota (91 percent) and Minnesota (83 percent) had the highest registration rates, while many of the states with lower rates were in the West (Nevada had 52 percent).

- The percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds who were registered to vote declined from 42 percent in 1994 to 39 percent in 1998. There was no significant change for people ages 25 to 44 years.

The data were collected in the November 1998 Current Population Survey (CPS) two weeks after the election. As in all surveys, data are subject to sampling variability and other sources of error. The CPS routinely overestimates voter turnout. Possible reasons include understatement of the votes cast; overreporting by survey respondents who want to demonstrate their civic responsibility; misreporting of voting because of refusals or lack of knowledge on the part of proxy respondents; and survey undercoverage.

Editor's Note: The data can be accessed at http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/voting.html.
I have had a copy of this text for about two years now, and I find it to be an excellent reference work for presenting data. I fully agree with Dr. Goldsamt on this. Some of you might want to get a copy; it is relatively cheap too. Oh yes I don't own stock in Sage, but I do use a lot of their work in my classes and in my research.

jon ebeling
ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu

MILTGOLD@aol.com wrote:

> Some of those on this discussion list may not know of the 1996-published, 95-page, hardcover or softcover book that I consider an excellent source for tips on how to develop charts. It's "Graphing Statistics & Data: Creating Better Charts," written by several members of Statistics Sweden (which I believe is like our Census Bureau). The authors are (as listed on the red/white/blue cover): Anders Wallgren, Britt Wallgren, Rolf Persson, Ulf Jorner, and Jan-Aage Haaland.
> The book's chapters and numerous illustrations and examples go into the value of charts, specific instructions on how to develop bar/frequency/development over time/relationship/ variation/ flow/geographical variation-type charts, charts and layout issues, charts in practice discussions, and even contains a two-page checklist on how to evaluate a developed chart for whether or not it meets your needs in depicting data patterns and conveying a message.
> The book is sold by Sage Publications in Thousand Oaks, California; their web address is sagepub.com
> I'm not related to the authors or even work for Statistics Sweden, I just consider the book a very useful addition to one's professional reference text
> library.
> Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.
> Research Statistician
> U. S. Dept. of Justice
> miltgold@aol.com

>From eric.zeidman@vnsusa.org Thu Jul 20 12:22:35 2000
This e-mail is probably more suited to recent students of people on this list than to the actual subscribers. I appreciate your passing it on to anyone who is interested.

Voter News Service is looking for several Exit Poll Recruiters for the Fall 2000 election season. These are full-time positions based in New York City lasting from August, 2000 to November, 2000, paying $575 a week.

Ideal first job for recent college graduate. Recruiters build and manage nationwide exit poll operation: locating, screening and hiring interviewers; overseeing training and rehearsal exercises; managing Election Day operations. Good project management experience while learning some of the basics of exit polling and election surveys.

Excellent communication and organizational skills are required. Strong computer skills and an interest in politics is a plus. Please forward resume and cover letter by e-mail to exitpoll@vnsusa.org or via fax 917-344-3022.

Eric Zeidman
Exit Poll Operations
Voter News Service
225 West 34th Street, Suite 310
New York, NY 10122
mailto:Eric.Zeidman@vnsusa.org
Phone: 800.330.8683
The director of our Pastoral Care department is interested in conducting a survey of our acute care inpatient population with regards to their satisfaction with the pastoral care services (religious/spiritual clergy) they received or didn't receive while in the hospital. We are thinking of mailing the survey to the patients no more than one week post discharge. I wondered if anyone has done a survey on this topic before and could offer some references or if anyone has any pearls of wisdom.

Once again, thanks for your consideration.

Elizabeth P. Gulick, MBA
Quality Coordinator
St. Luke's Hospital
801 Ostrom St.
Bethlehem, PA 18015
(610) 954 - 4129
(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)
gulicke@slhn.org

The director of our Pastoral Care department is interested in conducting a survey of our acute care inpatient population with regards to their satisfaction with the pastoral care services (religious/spiritual clergy) they received or didn't receive while in the hospital. We are thinking of mailing the survey to the patients no more than one week post discharge. I wondered if anyone has done a survey on this topic before and could offer some references or if anyone has any pearls of wisdom.

Once again, thanks for your consideration.

Elizabeth P. Gulick, MBA
Quality Coordinator
St. Luke's Hospital
801 Ostrom St.
Bethlehem, PA 18015
(610) 954 - 4129
(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)
gulicke@slhn.org
didn't receive while in the hospital. We are thinking of mailing the survey to the patients no more than one week post discharge. I wondered if anyone has done a survey on this topic before and could offer some references or if anyone has any pearls of wisdom.

Once again, thanks for your consideration.

Elizabeth P. Gulick, MBA
Quality Coordinator
St. Luke's Hospital
801 Ostrum St.
Bethlehem, PA 18015
(610) 954 - 4129
(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)
gulicke@slhn.org

Hi - I'm posting this for a friend of mine, if anyone is interested.

Susan
Hello,
I'm looking for candidates for a new position here in our department. Due to recent new business wins we're expanding the strategic planning function by adding a brand analyst.

The ideal candidate has a minimum of 1 year analyst or project manager experience from an agency or research firm and a solid understanding of a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods. They should possess both a curiosity about consumer trends as well as resourcefulness in researching them. The candidate would serve as the chief contact for subcontracted projects and would be very involved in the development of proposals, guides, summaries, and other deliverables such as consumer interviews for new business projects.

Though in the planning department, this position is not intended as an entry into planning, but rather as an important but stand alone position.

Clients include Mattel (Hot Wheels, Nickelodeon, Disney, etc.), Sunkist, a handful of 'new economy' clients and others. This position spans across all projects and brands and would be working very closely with the planners in our department.

If you know of anyone who might be interested, please have them email me their resume (or fax to number below) as soon as possible. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Thanks so much!
Sean

--
Sean Miller
Account Planning
--
FCB Southern California
11601 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1772
--
Phone: 310-312-7392
Fax: 310-479-1277
Email: semiller@fcb.com <mailto:semiller@fcb.com>

From rshalpern@mindspring.com Thu Jul 20 20:24:28 2000
Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.200.246]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id UAA08855 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jul 2000 20:24:27 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from w5y0s9.mindspring.com (user-381d6h4.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.154.36]) by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id XAA04819 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jul 2000 23:24:24 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20000720231952.00b74760@mail.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Thu, 20 Jul 2000 23:23:00 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: One More Source of Graphing Statistical Data
In-Reply-To: <9a.74a2c98.26a83a59@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="======================_33381080==_.ALT"
Graphing Statistics & Data: Creating Better Charts is available from Sage for $30 or from Amazon for $23.00 (paper)

Dick Halpern

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
rshalpern@mindspring.com
phone/fax 770 434 4121

---

>From hschuman@umich.edu Fri Jul 21 06:53:45 2000
Received: from donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
(smtp@donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.163])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA22100 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jul 2000 06:53:27 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from centipede.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
(smtp@centipede.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.142])
   by donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id JAA24879
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jul 2000 09:49:57 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)
   by centipede.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id JAA22547
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jul 2000 09:52:39 -0400 (EDT)
Some years backAAPOR somehow developed a list of important or useful books on public opinion, survey research, & the like. I'm told it was in a Conference Proceedings. Does anyone know of its precise location?

Howard, If you don't have a copy of the 1995 conference program, I can easily fax you the pages. Alternatively, the AAPOR secretariat may have a copy of that
program
in the AAPOR office.

Dawn V. Nelson
US Census Bureau
dawn.v.nelson@ccmail.census.gov
phone: 301-457-3801
fax: 301-457-2316

Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu> on 07/21/2000 09:52:39 AM
Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>
cc: (bcc: Dawn V Nelson/DSD/HQ/BOC)

Subject: Query on books

Some years back aapor somehow developed a list of important or useful books on public opinion, survey research, & the like. I'm told it was in a Conference Proceedings. Does anyone know of its precise location?
Contact William Heard directly if you are interested.  -- Jim

*******

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Tue, 18 Jul 2000 15:51:56 -0700
From: "Heard, William"<HeardW@MTA.NET>
To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Subject: Intern for Survey

Jim...Can you suggest an intern who is knowledgeable about communications surveys?  I want someone who would be capable of developing, distributing and evaluating an employee survey pertaining to Intranet readership, usage, etc. I look forward to hearing from you.

    Bill Heard...
    Intranet Content Manager
    LA County MTA
    (213) 922-7479
    heardw@mta.net

*******

>From Dawn.V.Nelson@ccmail.census.gov Fri Jul 21 07:18:06 2000
Received: from info.census.gov (info.census.gov [148.129.129.10])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usd) with ESMTP
    id HAA01869 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jul 2000 07:18:06 -0700
(PDT)
From: Dawn.V.Nelson@ccmail.census.gov
Received: from deliver.tco.census.gov (inet-gw.census.gov [148.129.143.2])
    by info.census.gov (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA25972
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jul 2000 10:17:35 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from it008nthqln.tco.census.gov (it008nthqln.tco.census.gov
    [148.129.123.82])
    by deliver.tco.census.gov (8.10.2/8.10.2/v3.7) with SMTP id
e6LEH2M11173
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jul 2000 10:17:35 -0400
Received: by it008nthqln.tco.census.gov(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.5  (863.2
    5-20-1999)) id 85256923.004E22BD ; Fri, 21 Jul 2000 10:13:26 -0400
X-Lotus-FromDomain: BOC
Sender: Dawn.V.Nelson@ccmail.census.gov
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Oops, I need to correct the last email.


>From the outside, the commemorative book looks just like the conference program!

Dawn.V.Nelson@ccmail.census.gov on 07/21/2000 10:04:46 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu
The Fifty "Great Books" in the Field of Public Opinion Research was first presented at the 1995 AAPOR conference (AAPOR's 1st 50th Anniversary Conference). In fact, they are listed in that year's conference program (pages 17-22). There's a great introduction by Al Gollin that describes the committee and how the selection process occurred.

Howard,
If you don't have a copy of the 1995 conference program, I can easily fax you the pages. Alternatively, the AAPOR secretariat may have a copy of that program in the AAPOR office.

Dawn V. Nelson
US Census Bureau
dawn.v.nelson@ccmail.census.gov
phone: 301-457-3801
fax: 301-457-2316

Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu> on 07/21/2000 09:52:39 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>
cc: (bcc: Dawn V Nelson/DSD/HQ/BOC)

Subject: Query on books
Some years back aapor somehow developed a list of important or useful books on public opinion, survey research, & the like. I'm told it was in a Conference Proceedings. Does anyone know of its precise location?

Thanks for answers to my query, the list is in the Fall 1995 POQ. (I had also managed to forget I was on the committee, which happens with age & decrepitude.)
Before this magic moment passes, a note to Council: Why not save Howard and many others the trouble of asking, and Dawn the trouble of helping them, by posting the book list on our Website? The list was intended for researchers and students not necessarily members of AAPOR, even more than it was for our membership. Our Website is one place where it properly belongs.

Note to the Conference Committee for 2001: The book list will be six years old when we next meet—might it not be time to consider more recent additions?

-- Jim

******

On Fri, 21 Jul 2000, Howard Schuman wrote:

> Thanks for answers to my query, the list is in the Fall 1995 POQ. (I had
> also managed to forget I was on the committee, which happens with age &
> decrepitude.)

>From KathrynC@socialresearch.com Fri Jul 21 11:07:08 2000
Received: from researchnt.socialresearch.com (node-d8e942ba.powerinter.net
[216.233.66.186])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
    id LAA11328 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jul 2000 11:07:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by node-d8e942ba.powerinter.net with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2448.0)
  id <NYB4FXVB>; Fri, 21 Jul 2000 11:05:33 -0700
Message-ID:
<FFA752642AD0D3118E4600A0249EACBE08CCDD0node-d8e942ba.powerinter.net>
From: Kathryn Cirksena <KathrynC@socialresearch.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: One More Source of Graphing Statistical Data
Date: Fri, 21 Jul 2000 11:05:33 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"

Or from Borders Online for $14.80 plus shipping.

Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.
Research Services Manager
Communication Sciences Group/
Survey Methods Group
-----Original Message-----
From: dick halpern [mailto:rshalpern@mindspring.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2000 8:23 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: One More Source of Graphing Statistical Data

Graphing Statistics & Data: Creating Better Charts is available from Sage for $30 or from Amazon for $23.00 (paper)

Dick Halpern

*******************************************************************************
Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
rshalpern@mindspring.com
phone/fax 770 434 4121
*******************************************************************************

I guess I should have waited to buy my copy since the prices have dropped so much. Wow!.

jon ebeling
ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu
Kathryn Cirksena wrote:

> Or from Borders Online for $14.80 plus shipping.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: dick halpern [mailto:rshalpern@mindspring.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2000 8:23 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: One More Source of Graphing Statistical Data

Graphing Statistics & Data: Creating Better Charts is available from Sage
for $30 or from Amazon for $23.00 (paper)

Dick Halpern

*******************************************************************************
Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
rshalpern@mindspring.com
phone/fax 770 434 4121
*******************************************************************************
Yes, it's true: www.borders.com offers it as a price of $14.80. I just ordered it, for a total cost of $18.75, which includes shipping. There is, however, a potential wait for delivery of up to 6 weeks.

Alice

On Fri, 21 Jul 2000, jon ebeling wrote:

> I guess I should have waited to buy my copy since the prices have dropped so much. Wow!.
>
> jon ebeling
ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu
>
> Kathryn Cirksena wrote:
> > Or from Borders Online for $14.80 plus shipping.
> >
> > 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
> >
> >
> >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: dick halpern [mailto:rshalpern@mindspring.com]
> > Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2000 8:23 PM
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Re: One More Source of Graphing Statistical Data
> >
> > Graphing Statistics & Data: Creating Better Charts is available from Sage
> > for $30 or from Amazon for $23.00 (paper)
> >
> > Dick Halpern
> >
> >***********************************************
> > Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
> > Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
> > 3837 Courtyard Drive
> > Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
> > rshalpern@mindspring.com
> > phone/fax 770 434 4121
> >***********************************************
I guess the moral of all this is that one should check out as many different suppliers as possible before purchasing! I suppose I shouldn’t be amazed but I am that there is such a wide difference in price between Amazon, Borders and Sage.

This very brief experience also underscores the helpfulness of AAPORNET. We were not only able to identify potential suppliers but also the lowest price. Not bad.

Dick Halpern
as many different suppliers as possible before purchasing! I suppose I shouldn't be amazed but I am that there is such a wide difference in price between Amazon, Borders and Sage.

This very brief experience also underscores the helpfulness of AAPORNET. We were not only able to identify potential suppliers but also the lowest price. Not bad.

Dick Halpern

---

And for those of you who do not yet own Tufte's "The Visual Display of Quantitative Information," the seminal classic in this field and a great coffee table book as well, it is on sale for 50% off ($20.00 plus S/H) at www.fatbrain.com until July 28, where you can find it on their list of "science & engineering bestsellers."

Jan Werner

Alice Robbin wrote:

> Yes, it's true: www.borders.com offers it as a price of $14.80. I just ordered it, for a total cost of $18.75, which includes shipping. There is, however, a potential wait for delivery of up to 6 weeks.
> Alice
> On Fri, 21 Jul 2000, jon ebeling wrote:
I guess I should have waited to buy my copy since the prices have dropped so much. Wow!

jon ebeling
ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu

Kathryn Cirksena wrote:

Or from Borders Online for $14.80 plus shipping.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: dick halpern [mailto:rshalpern@mindspring.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2000 8:23 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: One More Source of Graphing Statistical Data

Dick Halpern

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
rshalpern@mindspring.com
phone/fax 770 434 4121

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

School of Library and Information Science
Indiana University
005A Main Library
1320 East 10th Street
Bloomington, IN 47405-3907
Office: (812) 855-2018 Fax: (812) 855-6166
Email: arobbin@indiana.edu

Received: from smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net (smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net [207.172.4.60])
We are probably bordering on being "off-topic" with this thread, but so long as we are talking about it, I wanted to recommend a website to everyone. For those who haven't found it yet, MySimon.Com is designed to do a lot of the "leg work" when you want to shop for the best on-line price for books, CDs, videos, etc. I generally order from Buy.Com, but use MySimon to get the lowest price since Buy.Com offers a "guaranteed lowest price" deal. I have generally saved between $1 - $4 on each item I purchase. It really is a great resource.

A free and unsolicited recommendation, although kickbacks would be welcome.

At 03:57 PM 7/21/2000 -0400, you wrote:
>I guess the moral of all this is that one should check out as many
>different suppliers as possible before purchasing! I suppose I shouldn't
>be amazed but I am that there is such a wide difference in price between
>Amazon, Borders and Sage.
>
>This very brief experience also underscores the helpfulness of AAPORNET.
>We were not only able to identify potential suppliers but also the lowest
>price. Not bad.
>
>Dick Halpern

----------------------------------------------------------
John C. Fries           jcf3@erols.com
PhD Candidate           Department of Sociology
University of Virginia  Charlottesville, Virginia
----------------------------------------------------------
"In much wisdom is much grief; and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow." -- Ecclesiastes 1:18
Has anyone done any research on what value/values citizens feel the WWII Memorial should honor? Or other aspects of that subject? The WWII Memorial design was approved this week. It is to be built on the axis between the Washington Monument (freedom) and the Lincoln Memorial (unity) on the National Mall. mark

Can anybody help me with a fast literature search? I need to know what, if anything, has been written about the "convention bump," i.e. the boost that a party sometimes gets in the polls as the result of the attention drawn by its national convention. Thanks, P.
>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Mon Jul 24 08:59:14 2000
Received: from fw.gallup.com (fw.gallup.com [63.71.157.115])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA22264 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Jul 2000 08:59:14 -0700
    (PDT)
From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com
Received: from exchng2.gallup.com (exchng2.gallup.com [198.175.140.80])
    by fw.gallup.com (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id LAA28562
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Jul 2000 11:01:27 -0500 (CDT)
Received: by exchng2.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
    id <357MWTZ9>; Mon, 24 Jul 2000 10:58:39 -0500
Message-ID: <D18E70780D62119580006008162F90EEF109@EXCHNG3>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: The convention bump
Date: Mon, 24 Jul 2000 10:58:30 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Phil,

Here is the text of a news story Gallup released on this subject in 1996
through the Los Angeles Times Syndicate:

Best,

Lydia

GALLUP NEWS SERVICE
August 8, 1996 -- For immediate release

AVERAGE CONVENTION "BOUNCE" SINCE 1964 IS FIVE POINTS

PRINCETON, N.J. -- The Republican National Convention coming up next week
may energize the Dole for President campaign, but it is not likely to boost
his ratings in the polls enough to turn the election around. Gallup polls
going back to 1964 show that most presidential candidates enjoy an increase
in the percentage of voters supporting them right after their national
conventions -- but this "bounce" averages only five percentage points.
According to Gallup records, most convention bounces have been moderate in
size, ranging from four to eight percentage points. In a few cases the
bounce was substantially higher, while in a few others the candidates failed
to gain any new support coming off their conventions.

The latest Gallup Poll shows Bob Dole trailing Bill Clinton by
23-points, 58% to 35%. Dole would need to increase his level of support to
42% -- a seven point bounce -- in order to be within single digits of
Clinton. He would need a thirteen-point bounce to pull into first place. Achieving a thirteen-point bounce or better is not impossible, but it has only been recorded once before by the Gallup Poll, and that was under very unusual circumstances.

Clinton's Record Bounce

The highest post-convention bounce in Gallup's records is 16-points, recorded for Bill Clinton in 1992. Support for Clinton grew from 40% just before the Democratic convention, to 56% just after it. This turned Clinton's 8-point deficit against George Bush into a 22-point lead -- yielding a dramatic 30-point swing in the race. The 1992 situation was unusual, however, in that third party challenger Ross Perot dropped out of the race for President during the Democratic convention, creating a political vacuum which Bill Clinton was able to fill.

The next highest bounces in the Gallup records were both recorded for Jimmy Carter. In 1980 Carter entered the Democratic convention with only 29% support from registered voters and left with 39% -- a ten-point bounce. This lifted Carter from second place behind Ronald Reagan, to a tie for first place. Carter had a bounce of nearly the same magnitude in 1976, when he picked up nine points.


Bob Dole would hope not to follow the paths of Walter Mondale in 1984 or George McGovern in 1972. Both of these candidates ran against popular incumbent presidents, entered their conventions trailing substantially, and failed to show any increase in support as a result of their conventions.

Historical Bounce Statistics

The timing of a party's convention -- as either first or second on the calendar -- does not appear to significantly affect a candidate's bounce. The average bounce for the candidates whose conventions came first each election was just over six percentage points, compared to five points for those whose conventions came second. But if one excludes 1992 with Clinton's extraordinarily high bounce figures, that difference disappears. Between 1964 and 1988, the average bounce was about five points for all first conventions and four-and-a-half points for second conventions.

History also suggests that incumbent presidents are just as likely to benefit from a bounce as are challenger candidates. Again excluding 1992, the average convention bounce for incumbent presidential candidates is exactly six points, and for challengers just under six points.

Neither party seems to have an advantage when it comes to convention bounces, with the average being roughly the same for both. Across all eight presidential elections since 1964, the average convention bounce for both Republican and Democratic candidates was about five-and-a-half percentage points. Excluding 1992, the Republicans appear to have done slightly better historically, with an average bounce of five-and-a-half point compared to
the Democrats' four points.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The latest election results are based on telephone interviews with a randomly selected national sample of 1,003 registered voters, 18 years and older, conducted August 5-7, 1996. For results based on samples of this size, one can say with 95 percent confidence that the error attributable to sampling and other random effects could be plus or minus 3 percentage points. In addition to sampling error, question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of public opinion polls.

Table 1.
POST-CONVENTION INCREASES IN SUPPORT.
1992..Clinton......16 points........
1992..Bush...........5 points....
1988..Bush...........6 points....
1988..Dukakis.......7 points.....
1984..Reagan.......4 points.....
1984..Mondale.....1 points.....
1980..Reagan.......8 points.....
1980..Carter......10 points........
1976..Carter.......9 points........
1976..Ford...........4 points....
1972..Nixon........7 points........
1972..McGovren....0 points........
1968..Nixon........5 points........
1968..Humphrey....2 points........
1964..Johnson....0 points........
1964..Goldwater....5 points........

Table 2.
........................Average Bounce.
........................-pts-
Calendar Order
First Conventions........6.4.......
Second Conventions.......4.8.......
Political Party
Republican Conventions.....5.5.......
Democratic Conventions.....5.6.......
Candidate Status
Incumbents' Conventions...5.0.......
Challengers' Conventions....6.5.......

Table 3.
CONVENTION BOUNCE STATISTICS, 1964-1988
(Excludes 1992 Because of Extreme Clinton Bounce)
........................Average Bounce.
........................-pts-
Calendar Order
First Conventions..............4.9........'
Second Conventions..............4.5........'
Political Party
Republican Conventions...........5.5........'
Democratic Conventions...........3.9........'
Candidate Status
Incumbents' Conventions..........6.0........'
Challengers' Conventions........5.9........'

-----Original Message-----
From: Philip Meyer [mailto:pmeyer@email.unc.edu]
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2000 11:54 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: The convention bump

Can anybody help me with a fast literature search? I need to know what, if anything, has been written about the "convention bump," i.e. the boost that a party sometimes gets in the polls as the result of the attention drawn by its national convention. Thanks, P.

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 mkshares@mcs.net Mon Jul 24 09:08:57 2000
Received: from Kitten.mcs.net ([192.160.127.90])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA27980 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Jul 2000 09:08:56 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P39-Chi-Dial-2.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.103])
by Kitten.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA25608
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Jul 2000 11:08:53 -0500 (CDT)
(envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)
Message-ID: <397C23D1.3DB37C2B@mcs.net>
Date: Mon, 24 Jul 2000 11:09:10 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Google Search: convention bump
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="----------56827DB052C6AB836F740332"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.
----------56827DB052C6AB836F740332
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"
   x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Tip: In most browsers you can just hit the return key instead of
``bump'','' Holm said voter... Clinton also maintained a... 

...agreement during the Constitutional <b>Convention</b> of 1787 protecting the... 

...three weeks after the <b>Convention</b>, here was <b>Bump</b>, bringing his old... 

...of the series. At one <b>Convention</b> they <b>bump</b> into a strange bunch of...
Considerable attention to the post-convention bump is given in Thomas Holbrook's Do Elections Matter. I believe it appears in chapter 4.

Mark Joslyn
Kansas University
Political Science

Phil,

The convention bump is given in Thomas Holbrook's Do Elections Matter. I believe it appears in chapter 4.
Hi Phil,

Thomas Holbrook has a relevant chapter in his book "Do Campaigns Matter?" (Sage, 1996).

Patricia

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

Dr. Patricia Moy
Assistant Professor
School of Communications
Adjunct, Political Science
University of Washington
Box 353740
Seattle, WA 98195 U.S.A.

Voice: +1.206.543.9676
Fax: +1.206.543.9285
Email: pmoy@u.washington.edu
That would be "Do Campaigns Matter," I think. Looks good. Many thanks for the tip. Cheers, P.

On Mon, 24 Jul 2000, Mark Joslyn wrote:

> Date: Mon, 24 Jul 2000 12:02:57 -0500
> From: Mark Joslyn <mjoslyn@lark.cc.ukans.edu>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: The convention bump
>
> Phil,
>
> Considerable attention to the post-convention bump is given in Thomas Holbrook's Do Elections Matter. I believe it appears in chapter 4.
>
> Mark Joslyn
> Kansas University
> Political Science
>
>A Washington Post TV critic is aghast at the political incorrectness of
Greetings, AAPORnetters!

The following is a report from the Washington-Baltimore Chapter to its membership regarding initiatives for 2000-2001. By posting this message to AAPORNET we seek to reach as many current and potential chapter members as possible, given that our current chapter membership list contains some but not all email addresses of its cherished members.

Of course, all AAPORnetters are welcomed to review & comment on the contents of this message... Moreover, you are encouraged to join us!

Please contact our Online Administrator, Jennifer Reed, if you wish to become a member of our chapter. Her email address is:

dc-aapor.admin@erols.com

And please send Jennifer your email address if you wish to be added to our chapter EMail list.

onward!

Rob Santos
DC-Baltimore Chapter President

*****  BEGIN REPORT TO THE WASHINGTON-BALTIMORE CHAPTER MEMBERSHIP *****

July 12, 2000

Greetings, fellow Chapter members! Welcome to a new year of exciting Chapter activities!

To begin, I report on the outcome of our June 22 Annual Dinner. The
dinner appears to be successful on two fronts. First, fun was had by all! The food was tasty, and the door prizes (ranging from "edible bubbles" and a "bowl of fresh cherries," to a computer goddess/icon that "protects" against viruses) were appropriately unconventional for the crazy crowd that gathered that evening. (On a sad note, we bid a fond farewell and a "thanks for the memories & wonderful view" to the USA Today building because the organization will soon be moving. And we will need to change the location of our next annual dinner.)

Secondly, and of equal if not more importance, we completed a fair amount of planning work at our meeting! The 2000-2001 Chapter agenda was reviewed. The two initiatives (call for elections, and review of by-laws) were adopted with minor modifications. We decided to form an ad hoc program committee to plan and implement activities for the winter and spring of 2001. And we conducted a brainstorming session to identify needs of our chapter members and ideas for providing service to members and to the greater community. Details follow.

1. Call for Elections

This initiative calls for formal Chapter officer elections to be held in the fall of 2000 for the following offices:

Vice President (President-Elect)
Associate Chapter Secretary (Secretary-Elect)
Associate Treasurer (Treasurer-Elect)
Associate On-Line Administrator (Administrator-Elect)

The elected members would hold two-year offices, the first year as "associate" members, and the second year as the "officer." This is similar to the national AAPOR Council terms of office. Current Chapter officers would remain as interim officers to facilitate the transition process through March 2001.

This initiative was approved with the following amendments:

The Nominating Committee will amend the initiative as necessary to take into account the need for new "associate" officers in March 2001, when the terms of the current interim officers expire.

Tentative Schedule:

July 2000 President establishes Nominating Committee and announces a Call for Election Nominees
August Nominating Committee submits a list of nominees to the Chapter President; the President establishes an Election Committee
September Election ballots are issued to members
October Election Committee tallies ballots and announces results
November Elected officers begin terms as "Associates"
March 2001 Associates take office as "Full" officers

The Nominating Committee would be composed of five Chapter members appointed by the President, including the Past President (chair); one officer in the current Chapter Council; a member of the national AAPOR Council; and two Chapter members.
2. Call for Revision of By-Laws

This initiative was also approved. The AAPOR DC Chapter By-Laws are outdated and require revision in a number of areas, including but not limited to the organizational structure of the Chapter (e.g., officers and associated portfolios), membership categories, dues and services, and even the mission of the Chapter (i.e., Why does it exist? What are the principal objectives?)

An explicit issue to consider in reviewing infrastructure is the utility of establishing a Program Committee that would be responsible for soliciting presentations and developing other activities for the benefit of our membership.

The Chapter President will appoint a By-Law Review Committee, charged with reviewing our current by-laws and developing recommendations for amendment that would subsequently be considered by our Chapter members in one or more referenda. The Committee would be constructed similarly to the Nominating Committee: a former chapter president (or former officer if a past president is not available) would chair; one officer from the present chapter council; one member of the national AAPOR Council; and two members of the chapter.

Tentative Schedule:

July 2000    President appoints By-Laws Committee
November     Committee provides recommendations on by-law revision
January 2001 Referendum on revised by-laws
March        New by-laws take effect

3. Summary of the 2000-2001 Chapter Agenda

This year there are four principal agenda items in our Chapter agenda:

1) A call for formal elections, marked by the formation of a nominating committee, the nomination of candidates, and the implementation of an election by members.

2) The formation of a committee to review our chapter by-laws. The committee's work would culminate in one or more referenda to consider amendments to our current by-laws.

3) The establishment of a committee on member feedback to develop a low cost method to gather member input for use in Chapter service and event planning.

4) Continuation of our monthly seminar series on a diverse range of topics.

4. Brainstorming

We also conducted a brainstorming session at our Annual Dinner to gather members' thoughts, concerns, suggestions, ideas about the Chapter and how it might better serve our members and our community. Jennifer Reed
graciously accepted the job of compiling the notes from that session, and they appear later in this email message.

5. A Call for Greater Participation

The AAPOR Washington-Baltimore Chapter is your chapter. Make it work for you! We invigorate our chapter and develop ourselves professionally whenever we:

* attend a Chapter session or activity
* talk with fellow members about our jobs, our profession, or about Chapter business
* volunteer our help in organizing and/or conducting Chapter activities
* communicate needs, concerns, ideas, suggestions to the Chapter officers
* invite a colleague to join national AAPOR and our local chapter.

The AAPOR Washington-Baltimore Chapter is committed to your professional growth. Help us to help you by participating!

INTERESTED?

If you are interested in participating on any of the proposed committees, would like to provide input to the committees, or would like to participate in the Chapter operations/activity, please contact Rob Santos at 202-261-5291 or email him at rsantos@ui.urban.org. The opportunity for participation at some level is assured.

************* BEGIN BRAINSTORMING REPORT *************

The following is our first cut on answering the questions: What makes our chapter distinctive? What do our members find valuable about belonging to DC-AAPOR? What would make chapter membership even more appealing and valuable?

Over the summer and fall these ideas will be explored and refined as we re-write our chapter by-laws and formulate the officer slates and programs for 2000-2001. Your suggestions and comments are welcomed and invited.

Contact chapter President Rob Santos at rsantos@ui.urban.org or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com. Rob Santos may also be reached by phone at 202-261-5291 or by mail at: Urban Institute, 2100 M Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

CONNECTING

* Provide access to other professionals willing to assist with technical questions.
* Schedule events that enable seeing old friends and making new friends.
* Schedule more events that are primarily social - with wine!
* Screen and broadcast individual members' email messages that could be of general interest to the chapter (career opportunities, resources, other events).
LEARNING/DEVELOPING
* Offer short courses on technical topics similar to those offered at the national level.
* Offer downloadable knowledge summaries of short courses and seminars so members who can't attend can still benefit. Offer printed versions to those not online.
* Program events that share not only technical but personal perspectives of individuals and groups in the chapter, including government, academia, and business.
* Program panels that debate different views of timely issues.
* Publicize job postings as well as professionals who are available for new positions.
* Provide transition counseling and a re-entry service for people leaving government for industry.
* Provide opportunities for business development by commercial members.

ACCESSIBILITY
* Hold events at locations easily reached by a variety of means, including Metro.
* Maximize use of email by obtaining the address of all members willing to receive it.
* Update the chapter directory; include not only contact information but notes on ways individuals are willing to be a resource for other members.
* Provide the chapter directory as a printed booklet and as a downloadable file.
* Build a chapter Web site using the national AAPOR site as a starting point.
* As the "DC/Baltimore" chapter, explore ways to better serve Baltimore.

CONTRIBUTING TO THE PROFESSION
* Explore ways to get young people interested in a career in survey research.
* Make contact with university students and encourage them to do graduate studies in survey research: by speaking to survey classes about real-world opportunities, by holding career-promoting events on campus, by arranging internships.
* Organize a mentoring program that links up survey professionals with upcoming graduate students.

CONTRIBUTING TO THE COMMUNITY
* Create a speakers bureau and publicize it to local civic, education, and business groups.
* Do outreach to the community by creating projects for younger students that use survey research concepts to challenge and educate them.

LISTENING TO THE MEMBERSHIP
* Conduct qualitative research to learn what other members find valuable and distinctive about chapter membership, and what the barriers are to their joining and/or participating.
* Conduct a member survey to identify which benefits are most desirable.
* Provide channels that encourage and respond to member feedback on an ongoing basis.

These ideas were generated in the brainstorming session and in individual discussions at the DC-AAPOR June 22, 2000 annual dinner.
Can anyone direct me to citizen perception surveys concentrating on economic development issues (i.e., annexations, tax incentives, land use, etc...)?

Thank you,

Charissa Brannon
Research Associate
Center for Urban and Public Affairs
Wright State University
We have done many surveys on land use and tax incentives. What are you looking for?

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Charissa Mettler <charissa.mettler@wright.edu>
To: AAPOR <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2000 5:09 PM
Subject: Economic Development CP Surveys

> Can anyone direct me to citizen perception surveys concentrating on economic development issues (i.e., annexations, tax incentives, land use, etc...)?
> Thank you,
> Charissa Brannon
> Research Associate
> Center for Urban and Public Affairs
> Wright State University

> From ratledge@udel.edu Tue Jul 25 14:20:45 2000
Received: from zeke1.udel.edu (exchange.chep.udel.edu [128.175.63.23])
 by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id OAA09751 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jul 2000 14:20:45 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by exchange.chep.udel.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
 id <NMJQK2GP>; Tue, 25 Jul 2000 17:20:31 -0400
Message-ID: <FCDC58EC0F22D4119F0800A0C9E589950282@exchange.chep.udel.edu>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@udel.edu>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Economic Development CP Surveys
Date: Tue, 25 Jul 2000 17:20:30 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

You can get a few ideas from here.

http://www.cadsr.udel.edu/demography/presentations.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: Charissa Mettler [mailto:charissa.mettler@wright.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2000 5:10 PM
To: AAPOR
Subject: Economic Development CP Surveys
Can anyone direct me to citizen perception surveys concentrating on economic development issues (i.e., annexations, tax incentives, land use, etc...)?

Thank you,

Charissa Brannon
Research Associate
Center for Urban and Public Affairs
Wright State University

AAPORNETERS,

I'm looking for information on the e-term in response rate calculations (for example, as used in the AAPOR-4 formula) -- the percentage of phone numbers attempted in a telephone survey where eligibility is undetermined because no contact was made. What is the general range of this proportion in RDD national surveys? Are there any general guidelines or "rules of thumb" for calculating e -- beyond what is described in AAPOR's Standard Definitions? Also, was there a recent posting on this topic that can be accessed?

Sid Groeneman
Manager, Social Capital Benchmark Survey
Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
Sid_Groeneman@harvard.edu
Hi Sid:

So I see you left Market Facts - how are you doing and how are u happy? Congratulations.

Susan

-----Original Message-----
From: Sid Groeneman [SMTP:sidg@his.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2000 10:03 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu; sidg@dellnet.com
Subject: Help w/ e-term in response rate calculations

AAPORNETERS,
I'm looking for information on the e-term in response rate calculations
(for example, as used in the AAPOR-4 formula) -- the percentage of phone numbers attempted in a telephone survey where eligibility is undetermined because no contact was made. What is the general range of this proportion in RDD national surveys? Are there any general guidelines or "rules of thumb" for calculating e -- beyond what is described in AAPOR's Standard Definitions? Also, was there a recent posting on this topic that can be accessed?

Sid Groeneman
Manager, Social Capital Benchmark Survey
Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
Sid_Groeneman@harvard.edu
It is sometimes possible to estimate the number of eligibles in your sample from Census data and your sampling rate. The number will be Poisson distributed, so you have a known confidence interval. You can calculate a range of e values from that.

For short-term surveys with a large non-contact rate, this range of e values will be narrower than the range of 0 to 1 that you would use otherwise. I advocate this method of estimating e for that kind of survey, but I don't think this opinion is widely shared.

>> Sid Groeneman <sidg@his.com> 07/26/00 12:02pm >>
AAPORNETERS,
I'm looking for information on the e-term in response rate calculations (for example, as used in the AAPOR-4 formula) -- the percentage of phone numbers attempted in a telephone survey where eligibility is undetermined because no contact was made. What is the general range of this proportion in RDD national surveys? Are there any general guidelines or "rules of thumb" for calculating e -- beyond what is described in AAPOR's Standard Definitions? Also, was there a recent posting on this topic that can be accessed?

Sid Groeneman
Manager, Social Capital Benchmark Survey
Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
Sid_Groeneman@harvard.edu
The good news? Few registered Republicans are likely to be caught by surprise by the major tv network coverage of their national convention.

-- Jim

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2000 by United Press International
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Wednesday, 26 July 2000 14:11 (ET)

MOST UNAWARE OF UPCOMING OF GOP CONVENTION

CAMBRIDGE, Mass., July 26 (UPI) -- Most Americans are unaware Republicans will hold their national convention next week, according to a new Harvard University poll.

The poll, released Wednesday, also found that most registered Republicans are not aware their party's convention is just days away.

The national poll, conducted by the Shorenstein Center at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government, found that nearly 74 percent of those questioned didn't know when the convention would be held and another 6 percent said it was a month or so away. Only 19 percent said accurately that it would be held within a week or two.

Tami Buhr, a research coordinator for the center, said that while comparable data on awareness of past conventions was lacking, "it's clear that today's public -- in an era of fragmented audiences and declining news consumption and political interest--does not have this information."

The center noted that over-the-air broadcast networks recently announced a sharp cutback in the planned convention coverage. ABC and CBS will carry live coverage all four nights but for a total of only five hours each. NBC will televise the last two nights only, for a total of just two and a half hours.

Professor Thomas Patterson said that both those who intend to watch the convention and those who just happen to tune in will be fewer in number this year.

"Fewer people know enough to tune in," he said, "and fewer will just happen to see it because the networks have cut back on their broadcast hours."

The center said the poll indicated that those most aware of the timing of the convention were registered Republicans, but even among this group only 35 percent said the convention was just a week or two away.

The most poorly informed were young adults. Only 9 percent knew it was one
or two weeks away, and 85 percent did not know or guessed incorrectly that it was more than a month away.

*****

I would say this isn't surprising given how long it's been since there was anything resembling a real race on both sides of the aisle. No one pays attention until after Labor Day anyway.

Also, as someone who pays attention to this sort of thing, unless it's on the 6PM news, no one is going to think about it, and at least around here, it's not been a headline news story at all.
However, if these figures stay the same (which is unlikely) how will it affect the traditional post-convention "bounce?"

Frank Rusciano

Bill Thompson wrote:

> I would say this isn't surprising given how long its been since there was anything resembling a real race on both sides of the aisle. No one pays attention until after Labor Day anyway.
> Also, as someone who pays attention to this sort of thing, unless it's on the 6PM news, no one is going to think about it, and at least around here, it's not been a headline news story at all.

Is anyone aware of where to find phone penetration rates and/or sample vendors (SSI does not RDD in the region) for the following Caribbean territories:
Anguilla
Antigua and Barbuda
Barbados
Bermuda
British Virgin Islands
Cayman Islands
Dominica
Grenada
Montserrat
St. Kitts
St. Vincent
Grenadines

Thanks for any info you can provide. Please email responses directly to me at: bzolling@fhsu.edu

Brett Zollinger, Ph.D.
Director, Center for Survey Research
Docking Institute of Public Affairs
Fort Hays State University
Hays, Kansas 67601
785-628-5881
bzolling@fhsu.edu

Sid,

I've been one of the people working on the revision of these AAPOR guidelines, but am answering here based on my own knowledge and preferences:

The issue of how to deal with noncontacts in phone surveys is always troubling, but some clear distinctions can be made. First not all noncontacts are "equal," from an eligibility standpoint. That is many noncontacts with a human being or with the selected respondent still ample yield information that properly categorize the number as a household and probably an eligible household in many, if not most, phone surveys. An example of this is a number that constantly is a answering machine that is clearly NOT a business number.

The problem is most challenging when numbers *always* end as "ring, no answer." That is, the number never ends as any other outcome/disposition when dialed. The proportion of these that are households will depend on how many times the number has been dialed. At the Northwestern and Ohio State
survey centers I have directed, we've always treated numbers that were
dialed at least 10 times, on different days of the week and times of day,
and always ended as "ring, no answer," as highly unlikely to be residential.
Response rates can then be reported eliminating these from the denominator
and also by including some proportion of these to reflect a "range." When
we use the latter capitulation, I typically add 5%-10% of the "ring, no
answer" numbers dialed at least 10 time into the denominator; (this fraction
comes from what I recall Groves and Kahn, 1979, reported about such numbers
likley to be households). Regardless, we always report the rationale used
in the response rate calculation. As can be seen, surveys that stop
processing a "ring, no answer" with fewer callbacks should use a greater
proportion of these in the denominator; ones that uses even more callbacks
on these numbers would be even more confident that they are not housesholds.

> Date: Wed, 26 Jul 2000 13:02:35 -0400
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
> X-PH: V4.4@orb2
> From: Sid Groeneman <sidg@his.com>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu, sidg@dellnet.com
> Subject: Help w/ e-term in response rate calculations
> X-Accept-Language: en
> X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN
>
> AAPORNETERS,
> I'm looking for information on the e-term in response rate calculations
> (for example, as used in the AAPOR-4 formula) -- the percentage of
> phone numbers attempted in a telephone survey where eligibility is
> undetermined because no contact was made. What is the general range of
> this proportion in RDD national surveys? Are there any general
> guidelines or "rules of thumb" for calculating e -- beyond what is
> described in AAPOR's Standard Definitions? Also, was there a recent
> posting on this topic that can be accessed?
>
> Sid Groeneman
> Manager, Social Capital Benchmark Survey
> Kennedy School of Government
> Harvard University
> Sid_Groeneman@harvard.edu
>
>
> From jballou@rci.rutgers.edu Thu Jul 27 06:12:16 2000
Received: from gehenna5.rutgers.edu (gehenna5.rutgers.edu [165.230.116.160])
 by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
 id GAA22157 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jul 2000 06:12:16 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (qmail 8490 invoked by alias); 27 Jul 2000 13:11:45 -0000
Received: (qmail 8484 invoked from network); 27 Jul 2000 13:11:45 -0000
Received: from fzappa.rutgers.edu (HELO rci.rutgers.edu) (165.230.123.136)
 by gehenna5.rutgers.edu with SMTP; 27 Jul 2000 13:11:45 -0000
Message-ID: <39803346.2810D2D3@rci.rutgers.edu>
With the upcoming political conventions, George magazine provided info to readers on the cast of characters that may be involved in commentary in their August edition. The following was reported about Frank Luntz:

"Frank Luntz
Luntz is the favored pollster of GOP leadership: He's done work for Senate majority leader Trent Lott and former Speaker Newt Gingrich (Luntz was later criticized by an industry group for dishonest work on Gingrich's Contract with America). Luntz may be identified as an independent pollster. Don't buy it. He comes from the right."

For AAPOR members who don't remember--there was an AAPOR Standards Case against Luntz which resulted in his censure.

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT
DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS

STONY BROOK CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK

Rapidly growing academic survey research center seeks an experienced survey researcher to serve as Director of Operations.
DUTIES: Responsible for day-to-day management of the Center under the Director's supervision, manages staff, and coordinates survey projects. Acts as immediate supervisor for two CATI software and project managers, a computer specialist, a personnel manager, and an office assistant. Responsible for project planning, preparation of budgets and time-lines, and project management. Assists Director in meeting with clients, keeping them informed of project status, and responding to their inquiries. Writes and reviews questionnaire drafts, survey reports, and other results, and assists in their preparation as needed.

STONY BROOK CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH (SBCSR): The center opened in March, 2000 and is undergoing rapid expansion. We currently have a 14-station CATI lab running Sawtooth WinCATI. Our goal is to provide quality survey research to clients on and off campus and train graduate and undergraduate students in state-of-the-art survey methods.

POSITION REQUIREMENTS: This is a full-time, renewable, non-tenure track, Research Professional Staff position with benefits. It could start as early as mid-August, 2000. It requires an MA and a minimum of three years experience in telephone surveys. Qualified applicant must have experience in research design, survey design, data analysis, client relations, and procedures used in CATI surveys. Prior supervisory experience and experience in managing survey projects is desirable. A successful applicant should have excellent organizational skills, good writing skills, and be able to train, supervise, hire, and dismiss part-time personnel. An ability to meet deadlines and work well with other staff is essential. The position requires competence in word processing, data analysis, the use of spread sheets, and a familiarity with the internet and email. Knowledge of Stata, SPSS, Excel, Sawtooth WinCATI or Ci3 preferred. Salary is competitive. The State University at Stony Brook is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Applications from women, people of color, disabled individuals, special disabled veterans or Vietnam veterans are especially welcome.

Applications will be accepted until the position is filled. Please send resume or curriculum vitae and a summary of your survey experience to:

Professor Stanley Feldman, Assistant Director
Stony Brook Center for Survey Research
Department of Political Science
SUNY at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4392
PHONE: (631) 632-9761 or (631) 632-1498
FAX: (631) 632-1538

For more about SBCSR, visit our website at www.sunysb.edu/surveys.
We offer rewarding employment opportunities in social science research. Successful candidates will be valued for their experience and appreciated for their ability to make a difference.

RTI is a leading nonprofit survey research organization headquartered in Research Triangle Park, NC, and with offices in Washington, D.C.; Rockville, MD; Chicago, IL; and Atlanta, GA. We currently have career opportunities for Survey Methodologists, Senior Survey Directors, and entry-level and advanced Survey Specialists.

SURVEY METHODOLOGISTS

We currently have career opportunities for Survey Methodologists at all levels within the Survey Research Methods Program (SMRP). Minimum qualifications for the entry-level positions are a Masters degree in survey methodology, sociology, psychology, statistics or other related field; course work in survey methods; and 1+ year of post-degree experience in the design and implementation of surveys. Senior-level positions require 5+ years of post-degree experience in survey methods research. Strong oral and written communications skills are required at all levels.

SMRP is engaged in a variety of research areas that would interest survey methodologists including:
comparisons of data quality by mode of interview; the application of cognitive interview methods for improving questionnaires; the application of usability testing for improving computerized survey applications; studies of the impact of nonresponse on survey estimates; estimation of reliability and validity in the absence of criterion measures; and methods for improving response rates and response quality.

RTI offers competitive salary and excellent benefits. To apply for Survey Methodologist positions, applicants should use the job reference number 30659 and send their resume to:

RACHEL CASPAR
RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE
P.O. BOX 12194
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-2194
(E-MAIL: CASPAR@RTI.ORG; FAX: 919-541-1261)

Senior Survey Director

We currently have career opportunities for Senior Survey Directors in each of our office locations.

Minimum Qualifications: The most successful candidates have 10+ years experience:
working with clients as a project director, principal investigator, or in other senior management or scientific roles
managing contract research
working closely with staff across a wide variety of substantive and technical fields (epidemiologists, survey methodologists, statisticians, health and social policy, survey operations, and computer applications and design)
gaining recognition from peers and clients for technical expertise
authoring articles published in peer-reviewed scientific journals

Responsibilities: Responsibilities of a Senior Survey Director include:

Working with study collaborators to develop, implement, and monitor research designs
Managing day-to-day activities of ongoing research studies
Preparing and presenting research reports to clients
Make positive contributions to marketing and business development activities
Contributing to and directing the preparation, presentation, and follow-up of research proposals

RTI offers competitive salary and excellent benefits. To apply for the Senior Survey Director position, applicants should use job reference number 30666 and send their resume to:

KIRK PATE
RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE
Survey Specialist

We currently have career opportunities for entry-level and mid-level Survey Specialists in each of our office locations.

Minimum Qualifications – The most successful candidates have:

- B.S. or B.A. degree with a background in social science research methods (entry-level and mid-level candidates)
- Strong writing and oral communications, interpersonal, word processing, organizing, and computer spreadsheet skills (entry-level and mid-level)
- Mid-level candidates must have 3+ years of post-graduate experience with survey research, research design, client interaction, management of day-to-day activities of ongoing research tasks and studies, budget development, cost control, report writing, and presentation

Responsibilities: The responsibilities of a survey specialist include:

- Working with study collaborators to develop, implement, and monitor research designs
- Overseeing data collection operations (field or phone)
- Training data collectors
- Implementing quality control procedures;
- Scheduling and delegating of study tasks
- Traveling periodically overnight
- Documenting study procedures
- Contributing to the preparation of research proposals

RTI offers competitive salary and excellent benefits. To apply for the Survey Specialist position, applicants should use job reference number 30730 and send their resume to:

KIRK PATE
RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE
P.O. BOX 12194
Can anyone direct me to literature that shows the added benefit of repeated calls back in a survey? For example, after the third call back (4 attempts) who will I get, and how different are they from those I have already interviewed?

What is the benefit of 20 calls back in terms of improving the representativeness of the survey?

thank you
The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press conducted a study that tested the impact of additional calls (plus other features of a rigorous protocol such as refusal conversions, prenotification letters, and incentives) on response rates and the distribution of responses to survey questions. The results are reported on the Pew Center's web site at

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

A forthcoming article in POQ is based on the study. A slightly older version of the manuscript for that article is available for downloading on my website at
http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter/downloads.html

The paper is entitled "Consequences of Reducing Nonresponse in a National Telephone Survey."

On Thu, 27 Jul 2000, Richard Day wrote:

> Can anyone direct me to literature that shows the added benefit of repeated calls back in a survey? For example, after the third call back (4 attempts)
> who will I get, and how different are they from those I have already interviewed?
> What is the benefit of 20 calls back in terms of improving the representativeness of the survey?
> thank you
>
> ---------------------------
> Scott Keeter
> Dept. of Public and International Affairs
> George Mason University MSN 3F4
> Fairfax, VA 22030-4444
> Voice 703 993 1412
> Department fax 703 993 1399
> Personal fax 703 832 0209
> E-mail skeeter@gmu.edu
> Web site http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter

>From brianr@marketdecisions.com Thu Jul 27 14:57:15 2000
Received: from smtp.gwi.net (smtp.gwi.net [207.5.128.11])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id OAA00367 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jul 2000 14:57:05 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from brian (d-207-5-175-65.gwi.net [207.5.175.65])
    by smtp.gwi.net (8.10.1/8.10.1) with SMTP id e6RLv1L00598
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jul 2000 17:57:01 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <007d01bfb80d$9a1e3f00$b134fea9@brian>
From: "Brian Robertson" <brianr@marketdecisions.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Sampling Error Calculations
Date: Thu, 27 Jul 2000 16:59:46 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="----=_NextPart_000_007A_01BFF7EC.119B5BC0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--------=_NextPart_000_007A_01BFF7EC.119B5BC0
Content-Type: text/plain;
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This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--------=_NextPart_000_007A_01BFF7EC.119B5BC0
Content-Type: text/plain;
A quick question about sampling error.

I was reading a study where the authors quoted the margin of error as plus or minus 2%. The study involved contacting households, but gathering data from the respondent about all household members. A total of just over 1000 households were contacted from which information was obtained on roughly 2300 individuals.

In such cases, is it appropriate to calculate margin of error based on the number of "people" on whom data was gathered (of which most weren't actually interviewed)? It seems a little strange since you've not actually spoken with the person.

Brian Robertson
Director of Research
Market Decisions
brianr@marketdecisions.com
Hello --

Would anyone know of a national data set (or even published numbers) of the opinions of children and youth that can be aggregated at the municipal or county level? I know that there are several out there but none I've seen to date can be aggregated at anything lower than state level. I'm working on a longitudinal study that measures the well-being of children and youth in several selected cities around the country.

I'm looking specifically for a survey (or surveys) that captures how kids feel about school, feeling safe in school and in their neighborhoods, about relationships with adults (parents, teachers, etc.), and after school activities. I already know about the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, which covers a little of what I need, but unfortunately it doesn't isolate most of the cities in my study (which, by the way, are: Baltimore, Detroit, Oakland, Philadelphia, Richmond, Baton Rouge, Birmingham, Boston, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Newark, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and Washington, DC).

Thanks in advance for any help you can provide,
Hello --

Would anyone know of a national data set (or even published numbers) of the opinions of children and youth that can be aggregated at the municipal or county level? I know that there are several out there but none I've seen to date can be aggregated at anything lower than state level. I'm working on a longitudinal study that measures the well-being of children and youth in several selected cities around the country.

I'm looking specifically for a survey (or surveys) that captures how kids feel about school, feeling safe in school and in their neighborhoods, about relationships with adults (parents, teachers, etc.), and after school activities. I already know about the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, which covers a little of what I need, but unfortunately it doesn't isolate most of the cities in my study (which, by the way, are: Baltimore, Detroit, Oakland, Philadelphia, Richmond, Baton Rouge, Birmingham, Boston, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Newark, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and Washington, DC). Thanks in advance for any help you can provide,
Let's Watch TV,
but let's not forward hoaxes

by Dave Chess

The latest (May 2000) variant of the standard "just announced by IBM" virus hoax claims that IBM is warning the universe not to open mail with the subject line "Let's watch TV", because it contains a terrible new virus called "KALI" which, it says, "is a very dangerous virus, much worse than Melissa", and of course "there is NO remedy for it at this time".

IBM has not, of course, made any such announcement. This is just the usual hoax with the supposed deadly subject line and virus name changed. As usual, if this had been a real virus alert it would have included URLs or other contact information, and instructions on how to find more details. See our page on How to spot a virus hoax for more
hints; in general anything that asks you to "forward this
warning to everyone that might access the Internet" is
almost certainly something you should ignore.

[See original hoax message below]

Hi !

If you receive an email titled "Lets watch TV"
- DO NOT OPEN IT.

It will erase everything on your hard drive. This information
was announced yesterday morning from IBM; AOL states that "KALI"
is a very dangerous virus, much worse than "Melissa," and that
there is NO remedy for it at this time.

Some very sick individual has succeeded in using the reformat
function from Norton Utilities causing it to completely erase
all documents on the hard drive. It has been designed to work
with Netscape Navigator and Microsoft Internet Explorer.

It destroys Macintosh and IBM compatible computers. This is a
new, very malicious virus and not many people know about it.

Pass this warning along to EVERYONE in your address book and
please share it with all your online friends ASAP so that this
threat may be stopped.

Forward this warning to everyone that might access the Internet.
Vincent Sim - Director, Sales & Mktg
DID(65)3666-138  PAGER:9406-1106

*******
There are a number of qualitative analysis software packages on the market. Any thoughts on what are the best/most reasonable priced packages for analyzing focus group scripts? Any experience with these products: CDC EZ-Text; Ethnograph v.5.0 or HyperResearch 2.0?

Dr. Lowndes F. (Rick) Stephens
Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communications
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
Phone: (803)-777-2974
Fax: (803)-777-4103
email: stephens-lowndes@sc.edu or 1fstephens@prodigy.net
From: "jk" <jklein@igc.org>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Query on Qualitative Analysis Software
Date: Fri, 28 Jul 2000 00:12:23 -0400
Message-ID: <000801bff84a$8b224fca0$1029f7a5@jkleinigc.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0009_01BFF829.2B135CA0"
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
In-Reply-To: <007f01bff836$919d70c0$7bc49cd1@stephenshome>

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_0009_01BFF829.2B135CA0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Rick: In case you are thinking about using SPSS' Textsmart, be careful. I
have not tried their second version, but 1.0 was a disaster. It was a
rather brilliant program idea with serious graphics, GUI, and slowness and
crashing problems. I don't know about the others.
-- Josh

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
Lowndes F. Stephens
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2000 9:53 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Query on Qualitative Analysis Software

There are a number of qualitative analysis software packages on the
market. Any thoughts on what are the best/most reasonable priced packages
for analyzing focus group scripts? Any experience with these products: CDC
EZ-Text; Ethnograph v.5.0 or HyperResearch 2.0?

Dr. Lowndes F. (Rick) Stephens
Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communications
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
Phone: (803)-777-2974
Fax: (803)-777-4103
email: stephens-lowndes@sc.edu or lfstephens@prodigy.net

------=_NextPart_000_0009_01BFF829.2B135CA0
Content-Type: text/html;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">
<html>
<head>
<meta http-equiv=3d"Content-Type" content=3d"text/html; =
Rick:

In case you are thinking about using SPSS' Textsmart, be careful. I have not tried their second version, but 1.0 was a disaster. It was a rather brilliant program idea with serious graphics, GUI, and slowness and crashing problems. I don't know about the others.

-- Josh

---

Original Message-----

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

On Behalf Of: Lowndes F. Stephens

Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2000 9:53 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Query on Qualitative Analysis Software

There are a number of qualitative analysis software packages on the market. Any thoughts on what are the best/most reasonable priced packages for analyzing focus group scripts? CDC EZ-Text; Ethnograph v.5.0 or HyperResearch 2.0?

Dr. Lowndes F. (Rick) Stephens
Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communications
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
Phone: (803) - 777-2974
Fax: (803) - 777-4103
email: <a>stephens-lowndes@sc.edu</a> or <a>lfstephens@prodigy.net</a>

Dr. Lowndes F. (Rick) Stephens
Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communications
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
Phone: (803) - 777-2974
Fax: (803) - 777-4103
email: <a>stephens-lowndes@sc.edu</a> or <a>lfstephens@prodigy.net</a>

-----=_NextPart_000_0009_01BFF829.2B135CA0--

>From mikeoneil@earthlink.net Thu Jul 27 22:34:53 2000
Received: from harrier.prod.itd.earthlink.net (harrier.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.121.12])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
Opinion Research Internship - Fall 2000

O'Neil Associates Inc. is expanding a highly successful summer internship program it has offered since 1990 to include the opportunity for a full-year or academic semester appointment. The option would be ideal for an undergraduate or graduate student who wishes to take a year off to explore career opportunities and grow professionally.

The internship program. Past interns have been among the most capable and dedicated of students (two have been Rhodes Scholarship finalists). This position is ideal for a highly committed individual with an interest in learning how social science and opinion/marketing research is actually conducted in industry. Interns will gain firsthand knowledge, practical experience and insight into the entire research process, as well as highly marketable research skills. The training acquired in this program will be extraordinarily useful for someone intending to pursue research as a profession after graduation. Past interns have also found the experience highly useful in obtaining high-level employment in allied fields.

The Company. Our firm, established in 1981, is a full service public opinion/ market research firm serving a highly diverse clientele ranging from Fortune 100 companies, to government agencies, and nonprofits. We are small enough to provide real "hands on" experience, and are entrepreneurial, nonbureaucratic and growing. Applications will be accepted from both undergraduate and graduate students interested in the
field of public opinion research. Paid internships are available for a full year appointment, one academic semester, and the summer of 2001. (A shorter, unpaid internship is available for the winter recess.)

Duties. The individual selected for this position will be exposed to all phases of the research process in a professional atmosphere. The intern will participate in study design, field operations, focus group research, a wide array of computer tabulation and data processing assignments, and, for someone with exceptional abilities, writing analytical reports. Most of our previous interns have undertaken analytical writing responsibilities, a tribute to their exceptional abilities.

Computer skills. The ideal candidate will possess a high degree of microcomputer literacy. At a minimum, to function in our work environment, one should be competent with Microsoft Word (or Windows-based word processing programs). Other relevant competencies would include proficiency with SPSS, Access or dBase, PowerPoint or Harvard Graphics, Web page design, PC networks, and BASIC or FORTRAN programming, but training and guidance will be provided to quick learners with a high degree of enthusiasm and dedication. Obviously, the more skill an individual has in this area, the faster he or she will progress and take on a wider array of tasks. A candidate who has a basic familiarity with the logic of social science data processing including such programs as SPSS or one of its many equivalents would be especially well qualified and would be in a position to become involved more quickly in our operations.

Candidate preferences. Candidates who have interest in the field of survey research or an allied field such as marketing, advertising, public relations, or applied social science as a career will be given preference. Computer skills, understanding of social science research methods and strong writing skills are pluses that will expedite progress.

Time commitment. In order to maximize the mutual value of the program, we will give first consideration to those willing to commit to work a full year, an entire semester or an entire summer. Interns working an entire semester or entire summer will be paid $400 per week. (We also offer a shorter, unpaid, internship over the winter recess).

Housing. Housing in the Tempe area in the summer is plentiful and reasonably priced. We are located less than two miles from a large student community (Arizona State University, student population 45,000) with the concomitant massive summer vacancy. We can provide assistance with the logistics of locating housing.

To apply. Interested candidates should e-mail a letter outlining their interests with some specificity along with a resume to oneil@oneilresearch.com or mail the information to: Internship Program, O’Neill Associates Inc., 412 East Southern Avenue, Tempe, Arizona 85282. We also recommend that interested candidates see our web page, www.oneilresearch.com to find out more about our firm and the internship program (including essays from former interns). In light of the approaching fall semester, applications for that term will be accepted on a first-come first served basis and will be acted on promptly.
Previous interns:

2000 Evan Klebe, Harvard
1997, Christopher Sant, Cornell
2000 Sara Huntwork, Stanford
1996, Daniel Leshowitz, Northwestern
1995 Mike Yoshino, Yale
1999, Ana Melgar, Wayne State
1994, Anna Thompson, Cornell
1998, Tamara Johnson, Princeton
1993, Hua Bai, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard
1998, Samantha Nebrich, Stanford
1990, Josh Bazell, Brown

Michael J. O'Neil, Ph.D.------------------------------------ 
www.oneilresearch.com -------------
oneil@oneilresearch.com - business email. Accessed by staff at O'Neil =
Associates=20
during the day (fastest response, but not confidential) and by me at =
night from home.
mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu - personal email. Read at home by me each =
evening.=20
-------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------
Opinion Research Internship - Fall 2000

O’Neil Associates Inc. is expanding a highly successful summer internship program it has offered since 1990 to include the opportunity for a full-year or academic semester appointment. The option would be ideal for an undergraduate or graduate student who wishes to take a year off to explore career opportunities and grow professionally.

Past interns have been among the most capable and dedicated of students (two have been Rhodes Scholarship finalists). This position is ideal for a highly committed individual with an interest in learning how social science and opinion/marketing research is actually conducted in industry. Interns will gain firsthand knowledge, practical experience and insight into the entire research process, as well as highly marketable research skills. The training acquired in this program will be extraordinarily useful for someone intending to pursue research as a profession after graduation. Past interns have also found the experience highly useful in obtaining high-level employment in allied fields.

Our firm, established in 1981, is a full service public opinion/ market research firm serving a highly diverse clientele ranging from Fortune 100 companies, to government agencies, and nonprofits. We are small enough to provide real “hands on” experience, and are entrepreneurial, nonbureaucratic and growing. Applications will be accepted from both undergraduate and graduate students interested in the field of public opinion research. Paid internships are available for undergraduate and graduate students interested in the field of public opinion research.
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in the field of survey research or an allied field such as marketing, advertising, public relations, or applied social science as a career will be given preference. Computer skills, understanding of social science research methods and strong writing skills are pluses that will expedite progress.

Time commitment. In order to maximize the mutual value of the program, we will give first consideration to those willing to commit to work a full year, an entire semester or an entire summer. Interns working an entire semester or entire summer will be paid $400 per week. (We also offer a shorter, unpaid internship over the winter recess).

Housing. Housing in the Tempe area in the summer is plentiful and reasonably priced. We are located less than two miles from a large student community (Arizona State University, student population 45,000) with the concomitant massive summer vacancy.

To apply. Interested candidates should e-mail a letter outlining their interests with some specificity along with a resume to oneil@oneilresearch.com or mail the information to: Internship Program, O'Neil Associates Inc., 412 East Southern Avenue, Tempe, Arizona 85282. We also recommend that interested candidates see our web page, to find out more about our firm and the internship program (including essays from former interns). In light of the approaching fall semester, applications for that term will be accepted on a first-come first served basis and will be acted on promptly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Evan Klebe</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Christopher Sant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous interns:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Sara Huntwork</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Daniel Leshowitz</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>Charles Morrow</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Mike Yoshino</td>
<td>Yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Hua Bai</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Anna Thompson</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Tamara Johnson</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Samantha Nebrich</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Ana Melgar</td>
<td>Wayne State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Samantha Nebrich</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1990, Josh Bazell, Brown

Michael J. O'Neil, Ph.D.------------------------------------
www.oneilresearch.com
-------------
oneil@oneilresearch.com - business email. Accessed by staff at O'Neil Associates during the day (fastest response, but not confidential) and by me at night from home. 

mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu - personal email. Read at home by me each evening.

---------------------------------------------------------------------
--------------------------------------------
I like SPSS. For the SAS aficionados (I wish I were bright enough and had enough money to count myself among them), DBMS Copy has much of the underlying SAS tools built in for a tiny percentage of the price.

Dan Browning
Computer-Assisted Reporting Editor
Star Tribune

>>> "Lowndes F. Stephens" <lfstephen@prodigy.net> 07/27 7:53 PM >>>
There are a number of qualitative analysis software packages on the market. Any thoughts on what are the best/most reasonable priced packages for analyzing focus group scripts? Any experience with these products: CDC E2-Text; Ethnograph v.5.0 or HyperResearch 2.0?

Dr. Lowndes F. (Rick) Stephens
Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communications
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
Phone: (803)-777-2974
Fax: (803)-777-4103
cemail: stephens-lowndes@sc.edu or lfstephens@prodigy.net

>From aubinp@EM.AGR.CA Fri Jul 28 06:25:03 2000
Received: from agrout1.agr.ca (gw.agr.ca [192.197.71.131])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA11876 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jul 2000 06:25:02 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from [192.197.71.135] (agrgate2.agr.ca [192.197.71.135])
   by agrout1.agr.ca (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA10559
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jul 2000 09:25:07 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from agrin1.agr.ca by [192.197.71.135]
   via smtpd (for agrout1.agr.ca [192.197.71.131]) with SMTP; 28 Jul
   2000 13:25:00 UT
Received: from webshield.agr.ca (webshield.agr.ca [142.61.34.108])
   by agrin1.agr.ca (8.9.3/8.8.4) with SMTP
   id JAA16887 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jul 2000 09:24:09 -0400
   (EDT)
Received: FROM EM.AGR.CA BY webshield.agr.ca ; Fri Jul 28 09:21:47 2000
   -0400
Received: from AGCAN-Message_Server by EM.AGR.CA
   with Novell GroupWise; Fri, 28 Jul 2000 09:25:33 -0400
Message-Id: <s981518d.086@EM.AGR.CA>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Fri, 28 Jul 2000 09:24:31 -0400
From: "Pierre Aubin" <aubinp@EM.AGR.CA>
Sender: Postmaster@EM.AGR.CA
Reply-To: aubinp@EM.AGR.CA
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Objet :Re: Query on Qualitative Analysis Software
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Je serai à l'extérieur du bureau jusqu'au lundi 14 aoûtt, date à laquelle je lirai votre message.

Si vous avez besoin d'une réponse immédiate, veuillez s'il vous plaît contacter Marc McCarthy au (613) 759-7392 (Ottawa) ou Claude Perreault au (514) 283-3815 poste 485 (Montréal).

I will be outside of the office until Monday August 14, 2000, at which date I will read your message.

If you need immediate assistance, please contact Marc McCarthy at (613) 759-7392 (Ottawa) or Claude Perreault at (514) 283-3815 ext. 485 (Montreal).

Merci ! / Thanks !
Rick: In case you are thinking about using SPSS' Textsmart, be careful. I have not tried their second version, but 1.0 was a disaster. It was a rather brilliant program idea with serious graphics, GUI, and slowness and crashing problems. I don't know about the others. -- Josh

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2000 9:53 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Query on Qualitative Analysis Software

There are a number of qualitative analysis software packages on the market. Any thoughts on what are the best/most reasonable priced packages for analyzing focus group scripts? Any experience with these products: CDC EZ-Text; Ethnograph v.5.0 or HyperResearch 2.0?

Dr. Lowndes F. (Rick) Stephens
Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communications
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
Phone: (803)-777-2974
Fax: (803)-777-4103
email: stephens-lowndes@sc.edu or lfstephens@prodigy.net

Thanks, Josh, for the feedback. I am trying to acquire a package for our research center for use by some of our colleagues and doctoral students.
Rick: In case you are thinking about using SPSS' Textsmart, be careful. I have not tried their second version, but 1.0 was a disaster. It was a rather brilliant program idea with serious graphics, slowness and crashing problems. I don't know about the others.

--- Josh

Dr. Lowndes F. (Rick)
Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communications
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
Phone: (803) 777-2974
Fax: (803) 777-4103
email: stephens-lowndes@sc.edu or lfstephens@prodigy.net

---=

From mitofsky@mindspring.com Fri Jul 28 12:15:47 2000
Received: from blount.mail.mindspring.net (blount.mail.mindspring.net [207.69.200.226]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id MAA01025 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jul 2000 12:15:45 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from x.mindspring.com (user-2ivf145.dialup.mindspring.com...
July 28, 2000
John Tukey, 85, Statistician Who Coined 2 Crucial Words
By DAVID LEONHARDT

John Wilder Tukey, one of the most influential statisticians of the last 50 years and a wide-ranging thinker credited with inventing the word "software," died on July 26 in New Brunswick, N.J. He was 85.

The cause was a heart attack after a short illness, said Phyllis Anscombe, his sister-in-law.
Tukey developed important theories about how to analyze data and compute series of numbers quickly. He spent decades as both a professor at Princeton University and a researcher at AT&T's Bell Laboratories, and his ideas continue to be a part of both doctoral statistics courses and high school math classes. In 1973, President Richard M. Nixon awarded him the National Medal of Science.

But Tukey frequently ventured outside of the academy as well, working as a consultant to the government and corporations and taking part in social debates.

In the 1950s, he criticized Alfred C. Kinsey's research on sexual behavior. In the 1970s, he was chairman of a research committee that warned that aerosol spray cans damaged the ozone layer. More recently, he recommended that the 1990 Census be adjusted by using statistical formulas in order to count poor urban residents whom he believed it had missed.

"The best thing about being a statistician," Tukey once told a colleague, "is that you get to play in everyone's backyard."
An intense man who liked to argue and was fond of helping other researchers, Tukey was also an amateur linguist who made significant contributions to the language of modern times. In a 1958 article in American Mathematical Monthly, he became the first person to define the programs on which electronic calculators ran, said Fred R. Shapiro, a librarian at Yale Law School who is editing a book on the origin of terms. Three decades before the founding of Microsoft, Tukey saw that "software," as he called it, was gaining prominence. "Today," he wrote at the time, it is "at least as important" as the " 'hardware' of tubes, transistors, wires, tapes and the like."

Twelve years earlier, while working at Bell Laboratories, he had coined the term "bit," an abbreviation of "binary digit" that described the 1's and 0's that are the basis of computer programs.
Both words caught on, to the chagrin of some computer scientists who saw Tuley as an outsider. "Not everyone was happy that he was naming things in their field," said Steven M. Schultz, a spokesman for Princeton.

Tukey had no immediate survivors. His wife of 48 years, Elizabeth Rapp Tukey, an antiques appraiser and preservation activist, died in 1998. Tukey was born in 1915 in New Bedford, a fishing town on the southern coast of Massachusetts, and was the only child of Ralph H. Tukey and Adah Tasker Tukey. His mother was the valedictorian of the class of 1898 at Bates College in Lewiston, Maine, and her closest competition was her eventual husband, who became the salutatorian. Classmates referred to them as the couple most likely to give birth to a genius, said Marc G. Glass, a Bates spokesman.

The elder Tukey became a Latin teacher at New Bedford's high school, but, because of a rule barring spouses from teaching at the school, Tukey worked as a private tutor, Anscombe said. Tukey's main pupil became her son, who attended regular classes only for special subjects like French. "They were afraid that if he went to school, he'd get lazy," said Howard Wainer, a friend and former student of John Tukey's.

In 1936, Tukey graduated from nearby Brown University with a bachelor's degree in chemistry, and in the next three years earned three graduate degrees, one in chemistry at Brown and two in mathematics at Princeton, where he would spend the rest of his career. At the age of 35, he became a full professor, and in 1965 he became the founding chairman of Princeton's statistics department.

Tukey worked for the U.S. government during World War II. Friends said he did not discuss the details of his projects, but Anscombe said he helped design the U-2 spy plane.

In later years, much of his important work came in a field that statisticians call robust analysis, which allows researchers to devise credible conclusions even when the data with which they are working are flawed. In 1970, Tukey published "Exploratory Data Analysis," which gave mathematicians new ways to analyze and present data clearly.

One of those tools, the stem-and-leaf display, continues to be part of many high school curriculums. Using it, students arrange a series of data points in a series of simple rows and columns and can then make judgments about what techniques, like calculating the average or median, would allow them to analyze the information intelligently.

That display was typical of Tukey's belief that mathematicians, professional or amateur, should often start with their data and then look for a theorem, rather than vice versa, said Wainer, who is now the principal research scientist at the Educational Testing Service.

"He legitimized that, because he wasn't doing it because he wasn't good at math," Wainer said. "He was doing it because it was the right thing to do."

Along with another scientist, James Cooley, Tukey also developed the Fast Fourier Transform, an algorithm with wide application to the physical sciences. It helps astronomers, for example, determine the spectrum of light coming from a star more quickly than previously possible.
As his career progressed, he also became a hub for other scientists. He was part of a group of Princeton professors that gathered regularly and included Lyman Spitzer Jr., who inspired the Hubble Space Telescope. Tukey also persuaded a group of the nation's top statisticians to spend a year at Princeton in the early 1970s working together on robust analysis problems, said David C. Hoaglin, a former student of Tukey.

Tukey worked as a consultant to the Educational Testing Service, Xerox Corp. and Merck & Co. From 1960 to 1980, he helped design the polls that the NBC television network used to predict and analyze elections.

His first brush with publicity came in 1950, when the National Research Council appointed him to a committee to evaluate the Kinsey Report, which shocked many Americans by describing the country's sexual habits as far more diverse than had been thought. From their first meeting, when Kinsey told Tukey to stop singing a Gilbert and Sullivan tune aloud while working, the two men clashed, according to "Alfred C. Kinsey," a biography by James H. Jones.

In a series of meetings over two years, Kinsey vigorously defended his work, which Tukey believed was seriously flawed, relying on a sample of people who knew each other. Tukey said a random selection of three people would have been better than a group of 300 chosen by Kinsey.
earlier this afternoon was from the New York Times.

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

>From abider@american.edu Sat Jul 29 11:39:42 2000
Received: from snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.62])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA26465 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jul 2000 11:39:41 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from american.edu (sdn-ar-003varestP194.dialsprint.net [168.191.219.106])
    by snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3-EL_1_3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA29882
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jul 2000 11:39:40 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <39832567.F6543840@american.edu>
Date: Sat, 29 Jul 2000 14:41:43 -0400
From: oshucks <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Arianna's No Poll Pledge
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For those unaware of the newest New Leftie's "No Poll Pledge," here's the link:
<http://www.ariannaonline.com/crusades/ppfa.html>

Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu

>From mkshares@mcs.net Sat Jul 29 14:13:14 2000
Received: from Kitten.mcs.net ([192.160.127.90])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA23502 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jul 2000 14:13:13 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P37-Chi-Dial-2.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.101])
    by Kitten.mcs.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id QAA85128
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Jul 2000 16:13:12 -0500 (CDT)
    (envelope-from mkshares@mcs.net)
Message-ID: <398302A6.15980500@mcs.net>
Date: Sat, 29 Jul 2000 16:13:27 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Illinois Poll
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
For anyone who is interested, here is our current Tribune poll. Charts appear in the print edition.


Peter, do you need anything more from me regarding the public land, sale/swap?

BEGIN:VCARD
VERSION:2.1
N:Day;Richard
FN:Richard Day
ORG:Richard Day Research
TEL;WORK;VOICE:(847)328-2329
ADR;WORK;ENCODING=3DQUOTED-PRINTABLE;;801 Davis Street=3D0D=3D0AThird Floor;Evanston;Il;60201
FOCUS GROUP RAISES CONCERNS ABOUT CHENEY

By PAUL SINGER and SHAUN WATERMAN

PHILADELPHIA, July 30 (UPI) -- A group of undecided voters convened by Republican pollster Frank Luntz said Sunday that the more they learn about Republican vice presidential candidate-to-be Dick Cheney, the less they like him.

The group, an unscientifically chosen focus group assembled here by Luntz to track reactions to the Republican convention throughout the week, also played a game of "political survivor," in which they chose which well-known politicians to eject from national politics. Beginning with 10 top personalities - including presumptive Republican presidential nominee George W. Bush, Al Gore and Jesse Ventura -- the last "survivor" left standing was Hillary Clinton.
The Luntz focus group was sponsored by YROCK.com, a Web site and Internet service run by the National Young Republicans.

The 36 uncommitted voters were split evenly in thirds among registered Democrats, Republicans and independents, and all said they had not firmly settled on whom to vote for this year. Twenty-four members of the group said they voted for President Bill Clinton in 1996, while nine voted for GOP candidate Robert Dole, two voted for Reform Party founder Ross Perot and one voted for Green Party candidate Ralph Nader. Luntz said the heavy Clinton vote makes the group less representative than other focus groups.

Nevertheless, pushed by Luntz to make a choice at the end of the event, 16 said they would vote for presumptive Democratic Party presidential nominee Gore, 19 said they would vote for Bush and one said he planned to vote for Green Party candidate and consumer advocate Nader.

Luntz's staff said the focus group was the first it knows of to test the impact of Cheney's selection on independent voters. Several in the group said they had favorable views of Cheney when he was first named, but as they have heard more about his record, they have come to view him as a detriment to the GOP ticket.

One Republican woman in the group said she had an initially positive view of Cheney, "but I saw him interviewed on the morning talk shows today -- little scary now." A male participant said Cheney "was in his father's Cabinet. ... I think [George W. Bush] should do something on his own."

Of the 36 voters in the group, only one said the selection of Cheney made him more likely to vote for Bush. Four said they were less likely to vote for Bush because of Cheney.

Several people in the group said they are concerned about Cheney's record of consistently voting against gun control. One man said "being against banning plastic handguns -- that's ridiculous. I believe in the Second Amendment [which protects the right to bear arms], but not that much."

Several participants said they dislike Cheney because he was secretary of defense in 1991 when the Pentagon decided to shut down the Philadelphia Navy Yard, which cost the region 10,000 jobs. Luntz pointed out that this local concern could skew the views of the Philadelphia focus group, making it hard to generalize to a broader, national population. But the Navy yard was only one of dozens of military bases that were closed under Cheney's watch through the Base Realignment and Closure process.

"It's not just in Philadelphia, they remember in Fort Worth, Texas, too, and all over the country," said Molly-Beth Malcolm, chair of the Texas State Democratic Party.

Luntz also led the group thorough the survivor game, beginning with 10 photos on a bulletin board: Bush; Gore; Nader; Bill Clinton; Hillary Clinton; Rev. Jesse Jackson; Minnesota Gov. Ventura; U.S. Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass.; Reform Party presidential candidate Pat Buchanan; and Attorney General Janet Reno. After several elimination rounds -- "How many of you would vote to throw ----- out of politics forever?" --- only Hillary Clinton and Gore were left standing. And after a final vote, Gore was gone.

Luntz told UPI afterward that the survivor game is a good gauge of the
Bush campaign spokesman Dan Bartlett said Sunday that Cheney's role in base closures is unlikely to have a broad negative impact on the campaign, in part because the closure decisions were made by a non-partisan expert panel.

"The tenure of Secretary Cheney at the Pentagon had a high water mark when he oversaw the Persian Gulf War. Most people appreciate his leadership," Bartlett said. As far as base closure goes, "that could cut both ways" because the Clinton administration tinkered with the commission process in 1996, changing the decisions of the expert panel in order to favor key political regions, Bartlett alleged.

To the degree people have a negative view of Cheney, it is because the Gore campaign is "focused on negative attack politics" and is attempting "a very improbable bank-shot" to damage Bush by attacking Cheney, Bartlett said.

"The American people are going to vote in November based on who the president is [going to be]." The voters will decide based on "Gov. Bush and his ideas and his agenda," he concluded.
RICK BLOWS PAST HILL

By ROBERT HARDT Jr.

Turning from a political unknown into a front-runner in two months, Long Island Rep. Rick Lazio has pulled ahead of Hillary Rodham Clinton by 7 points in the Senate race, a stunning new Post poll shows.

Lazio's advantage - 49.6 percent to Clinton's 42 percent - is technically slightly within the poll's margin of error of plus or minus 4 percentage points, meaning Lazio could be up by as many as 15 points or as low as a tie with the first lady.

But it shows a significant voter shift to the Suffolk County legislator.

The survey of 605 likely voters, conducted by Zogby International on Thursday and Friday, found Lazio doing better than in any other poll conducted since he entered the campaign on May 20 after Mayor Giuliani suddenly dropped out.

"The race has really become all about her," said pollster John Zogby.

"When Giuliani was running, the vote was a little bit about him, but now that he's gone, it's more or less a statewide vote on Hillary," he said.

Lazio, a Republican, now has commanding leads upstate (56.4 percent to 35.9 percent) and in New York City's suburbs (58.6 percent to 32.9 percent) while Clinton's stronghold remains the heavily Democratic five boroughs (60.6 percent to 30.1 percent).

"She's clearly been spending a lot of time upstate and is doing well in the upstate cities but the anti-Hillary vote is very, very powerful in the rest of the region," Zogby said.

"In addition, we are now seeing Lazio's numbers in the suburbs pick up where Giuliani's left off, which is a real hurdle for Hillary," he said.

Zogby said that Clinton's biggest problem is that a bedrock 38.2 percent of those polled have a "very unfavorable" opinion of her.

"Those are people who really aren't going to change their minds about a candidate," he said.

But 32.2 percent have a "very favorable" opinion of the first lady.

Factoring in people who have "somewhat favorable" and "somewhat unfavorable" opinions, Clinton's favorables lead slightly, 49.6 percent to 47.8 percent.

Lazio's "very unfavorable" rating is just 12.7 percent while his "very favorable" rating is 27.4 percent.

Factoring in the "somewhats," more people have a favorable opinion of the six-term congressman, 56.3 percent, to 29.6 percent unfavorable.
About 13 percent of those polled said they aren't yet familiar enough with Lazio to have an opinion about him – voters who will undoubtedly be targeted by the Clinton campaign.

Factoring in Green Party candidate Al Lewis and Independence Party candidate Jeff Graham, Lazio's lead over Clinton shrinks, 45.9 percent to 41.1 percent.
The Lutz focus group is nothing more than PR for Lutz. His claim for the first "study" of independent voters, and his rank audacity in giving UPI a tally on the vote for president by 25 non-representative Republican young voters, is outrageous! I know it is difficult for AAPOR to respond to this violation of basic opinion polling principles (and, incidently, erroneous use of focus groups), but I would love to hear some ideas. For now, we can thank Jim for bringing this to our attention. Perhaps AAPOR should once again release its condemnation of one of Lutz's previous violations. If ever we needed sanctions, now is the time for it.

Best,

Sid
How about a letter to UPI and major newspapers from AAPOR leadership explaining why FG's are not representative and why Frank should be ignored?

This just goes to show Luntz really is just a "media-whore". He'll do anything to get his mug in the paper.

Since Frank Luntz is again a subject for AAPORNET, I thought I might add a personal touch. I taught with Luntz about 10 years ago in a summer program held at Georgetown for outstanding high school students. He had just returned from England and was a real ball of energy, quite excited about being in the classroom. He related quite well with his students, but not so well with his colleagues, with whom he shared very little. For example, when I found out that he had done some polling in New York, I tried on several occasions to talk with him about it, but I couldn't get any answers from him--he wouldn't even tell me the supplier of his telephone numbers. But my favorite Frank Luntz story had to do with a bet he made with his students. It seems the class was talking about drugs and their availability. Frank said he could score within 15 minutes of leaving the
Georgetown campus and his students took him up on the bet. So Frank cruised
the neighborhood with a carload of students from his class—and he won!
Needless to say, the program administrators were horrified when they found
out about it.

Robert S. Ross
Professor and Chair
Department of Political Science
California State University, Chico

> ---------
> From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Sent: Monday, July 31, 2000 11:55 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: UPI: Lutz Focus Group Raises Concerns About Cheney
>
>
> The Lutz focus group is nothing more than PR for Lutz. His claim for the
> first
> "study" of independent voters, and his rank audacity in giving UPI a
> tally on
> the vote for president by 25 non-representative Republican young voters,
> is
> outrageous! I know it is difficult for AAPOR to respond to this violation
> of
> basic opinion polling principles (and, incidently, erroneous use of focus
> groups), but I would love to hear some ideas. For now, we can thank Jim
> for
> bringing this to our attention. Perhaps AAPOR should once again release
> its
> condemnation of one of Lutz's previous violations. If ever we needed
> sanctions,
> now is the time for it.
>
> Best,
>
> Sid

>From bthompson@directionsrsch.com Mon Jul 31 12:47:42 2000
Received: from proxy.directionsrsch.com (IDENT:root@dri74.directionsrsch.com
[206.112.196.74])
 by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
 id MAA20709 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 12:47:39 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from drione.directionsrsch.com (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.5 (863.2
5-20-1999)) id 8525692D.006C9738 ; Mon, 31 Jul 2000 15:46:06 -0400
X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI
From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <8525692D.006C957F.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
Now we know why his numbers are so far off the mark!