This is the USC listproc archive of aapornet messages for this entire month. It is one big message, just the way the USC archive stored it. You can search within this month with your browser's search function.

Turning this into individual messages that Listserv can index and sort means a lot of reformatting. We will do this as time permits. Meanwhile, the search function works, so we have as much functionality as before. New messages are of course automatically formatted correctly—see August & September 2002.

Some of the early months have been completed. Take a look at them for an idea of how AAPORNET got started. (Thanks, Jim!)

Shap Wolf
shap.wolf@asu.edu

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log0107.
Part 1/1, total size 1776344 bytes:

>From simonetta@artsci.com Mon Jul 2 06:23:16 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f62DNFJ26338 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001
06:23:15 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA02214 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 06:23:15 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
    id <N8RSGSPQ>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 09:09:20 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F316D2790AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Graphics conventions
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2001 09:09:10 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="----=_NextPart_001_01C102F8.34B638B0"

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

------ =_NextPart_001_01C102F8.34B638B0
Content-Type: text/plain;
Along with the Tufte I'd recommend "Graphing data: Techniques for display and analysis" from the Sage Applied Social Research Methods Series.

(Disclaimer - I did some of the graphs so I am biased.)

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

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com [mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2001 1:27 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Graphics conventions

My firm conducts The Iowa Poll for The Des Moines Register and part of our responsibility is to check numbers in stories and graphics. I'm looking for any source you might know that details conventions for presenting graphics.

Like a pie chart starting at 12.00. And, ranking the data (if categorical) with the largest slice starting at 12.00. My company has our own standards, from years of preparing our own graphics and studying others. But, it might be helpful to have a standard style book on this. I've not found one so far that addresses some very basic issues of graphic presentation of data. The USA Today pie charts are notorious for seemingly random arrangements of wedges, and I recall watching with horror Ross Perot's graphics. Ideas, anyone?

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
Along with the Tufte I'd recommend "Graphing data: Techniques for display and analysis" from the Sage Applied Social Research Methods Series.

(Disclaimer - I did some of the graphs so I am biased.)

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

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2001 1:27 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Graphics conventions

My firm conducts The Iowa Poll for The Des Moines Register and part of our responsibility is to check numbers in stories and graphics. I'm looking for any source you might know that details conventions for presenting graphics. I'm trying to have a standard style book on this. I've not found one so far that addresses some very basic issues of graphic presentation of data. The USA Today pie charts are notorious for seemingly random arrangements of wedges, and I recall watching with horror Ross Perot's graphics. Ideas, anyone? JAS<br> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.

----- = NextPart_001_01C102F8.34B638B0--
>From JAnnSelzer@aol.com Mon Jul 2 06:52:43 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f62DghJ27916 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001
  06:52:43 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from imo-r03.mx.aol.com (imo-r03.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.99])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id GAAl0095 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 06:52:42 -0700
(PDT)
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Received: from JAnnSelzer@aol.com
  by imo-r03.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v30.22.) id 5.b8.17d0d9b2 (4242)
  for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 09:52:37 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <b8.17d0d9b2.2871d6a5@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2001 09:52:37 EDT
Subject: Re: Graphics conventions
Any guidance on a Sage website?  JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

From WallworkSS@mso.umt.edu Mon Jul  2 07:50:15 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f62EoEJ01170 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001
    07:50:15 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f62EoEJ01170 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001
    07:50:15 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from message1.umt.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    id N4AD1SYP; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 08:46:17 -0600
Message-ID: <E99C30D42BB0D4119AA000508B602D260160D0C8@message1.umt.edu>
From: "Wallwork, Susan Selig" <WallworkSS@mso.umt.edu>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Graphics conventions
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2001 08:46:16 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="----=_NextPart_001_01C10305.BFA843C0"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ Susan Selig Wallwork
Research and Assessment Officer
Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Analysis, UH217
The University of Montana - Missoula
Missoula MT 59812
(406) 243-5607 (Office/voice mail)
(406) 243-5661 (OPBA receptionist)
E-mail: WallworkSS@mso.umt.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com [mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2001 7:53 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Graphics conventions

Any guidance on a Sage website? JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

Any guidance on a Sage website? JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
Susan Selig Wallwork
Research and Assessment Officer
Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Analysis, UH217
The University of Montana - Missoula
Missoula MT
59812
E-mail: WallworkSS@mso.umt.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2001 7:53 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Graphics conventions

Any guidance on a Sage website? JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com

---NextPart_001_01C10305.BFA843C0--
Hello,
Attached is a job vacancy announcement for a senior position at Temple University's DC office.
Thank you,
Wendy Landers

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at http://explorer.msn.com
New York Times columnist Bob Herbert, writing on the op-ed page of today's Times...

-- Jim

________________________________________________________________________
Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
________________________________________________________________________
http://www.nytimes.com/2001/07/02/opinion/02HERB.html

July 2, 2001

THE MESSAGE IN THE SINKING POLLS

By BOB HERBERT

The past two weeks have not been good ones for George W. Bush.

Even before the news emerged that the indispensable Dick Cheney needed more work done on his heart, a series of public opinion polls was giving the president agita.

An article about the latest New York Times/CBS News Poll was headlined, "Bush Loses Favor Despite Tax Cut and Overseas Trip."

Last Thursday The Wall Street Journal was reporting, "Bush's Approval Rating Slips to 50%, a 5-Year Presidential Low."

The Times said its poll showed that "despite his first overseas trip as president and the passage of his sweeping measure to cut taxes, President Bush's standing as a leader on both domestic and foreign fronts has diminished considerably."

The Journal said, "Five months into his presidency, George W. Bush faces sagging approval ratings and an array of issues tilted toward his Democratic opposition." The Journal added that "paradoxically" the unfriendly poll results could give
Mr. Bush an opportunity "to regain the initiative."

They could. I suppose. Anything could happen. But that would require an exhibition of leadership qualities that so far have not been seen in this president. Rather than rallying the country to a new and compelling vision of the future -- his vision -- Mr. Bush has appeared content to quietly follow the lead of his senior advisers, especially Mr. Cheney.

The president, to put it mildly, does not seem vigorously engaged in the very tough job of being president. And that's hurting him.

"His personality," said Betty Thomas, a 62-year-old Republican who responded to The Times's poll, "doesn't inspire a lot of confidence."

Mr. Bush worked hard and successfully for passage of his tax cuts. But he has shown little leadership and remains out of step with a majority of Americans on many other issues. His ratings in the Times poll on energy, on the environment and on foreign policy were well below 50 percent. And by a wide margin, a majority of respondents said his administration favors the rich over the middle class and the poor.

Mr. Bush has maintained the support of his conservative base. "But," as Robert Teeter, one of the pollsters who conducts the Wall Street Journal/NBC News survey, said, "he doesn't have anywhere near the share of the middle he needs to have a governing coalition."

This is the kind of problem that is much easier for a politician like Bill Clinton to turn around. Whenever Mr. Clinton was in trouble (which, of course, was all the time), he was able to draw on his extraordinary political instincts, his intelligence, his communication skills and his eagerness to work as long and as hard as it took to get the job done.

Those are not Mr. Bush's strong points. Most Americans see Dick Cheney, heart problems and all, as doing most of the administration's heavy lifting. And by not forcefully countering the impression that he is disengaged, Mr. Bush gives
free rein
to those who would characterize him in the worst possible ways.

It's a wonder his approval ratings aren't lower. There are now book-length editions of his misadventures with the English language ("I know how hard it is to put food on your family"), and he is a figure of constant ridicule on late-night television.

The public is probably predisposed to like Mr. Bush. He has that affable, aw-shucks, all-American personality. But he comes across as so detached, so removed from the major issues of the day, so uninterested in them, that he's in danger of coming to be seen as president in name only.

There's a reason why Dick Cheney's health problems get the kind of coverage ordinarily reserved for the president's health.

A major legislative development last week helped to illustrate how the public's view of President Bush is being shaped, and not for the better.

On Friday the Senate passed a popular patients' rights bill that was vehemently opposed by the health insurance industry. Nine Republican senators voted for the bill, but Mr. Bush has threatened to veto it. And that's a problem.

Fairly or unfairly, the man who campaigned for president as a Republican with a heart, a compassionate conservative, appears to be favoring the cold, heartless insurers over ordinary Americans struggling with illness and their finances.

It's exactly the kind of stance that causes poll numbers to sink.

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/07/02/opinion/02HERB.html

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

*****
Here is the detailed reference to the Sage volume.

Tufte is great for deep understanding and creative use of graphics but the Sage volume: Graphing Statistics and Data: Creating Better Charts by Wallren, et. al. (1996) is the best single practical reference on my shelf.

There is a section called "News graphics: How amusing can you be?", and two tight pages on pie charts.

As much as I liked the New York Times charts, I kept remembering how much ordinary readers like pie charts. They have a familiar and intuitive appeal...

John Kochevar

Leo Simonetta wrote:

> Along with the Tufte I'd recommend "Graphing data: Techniques for display and analysis" from the Sage Applied Social Research Methods Series. (Disclaimer - I did some of the graphs so I am biased.)-- Leo
> G. Simonetta Art & Science Group, LLC
> simonetta@artsci.com
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com [mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com]
> Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2001 1:27 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Graphics conventions
>
> My firm conducts The Iowa Poll for The Des Moines Register
and part of our responsibility is to check numbers in stories and graphics. I'm looking for any source you might know that details conventions for presenting graphics. Like a pie chart starting at 12.00. And, ranking the data (if categorical) with the largest slice starting at 12.00. My company has our own standards, from years of preparing our own graphics and studying others. But, it might be helpful to have a standard style book on this. I've not found one so far that addresses some very basic issues of graphic presentation of data. The USA Today pie charts are notorious for seemingly random arrangements of wedges, and I recall watching with horror Ross Perot's graphics. Ideas, anyone?

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

--

Tufte is great for deep understanding and creative use of graphics but the Sage volume: Graphing Statistics and Data: Creating Better Charts by Wallren, et. al. (1996) is the best single practical reference on my shelf. There is a section called "News graphics: How amusing can you be?", and two tight pages on pie charts. As much as I liked the New York Times charts, I kept remembering how much ordinary readers like pie charts. They have a familiar and intuitive appeal... John Kochevar

Leo Simonetta wrote: Along with the Tufte I'd recommend "Graphing data: Techniques for display and analysis"
from the Sage Applied Social Research Methods Series.<br>

(Disclaimer - I did some of the graphs so I am biased.)

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

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com [mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2001 1:27 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Graphics conventions

My firm conducts The Iowa Poll for The Des Moines Register and part of our responsibility is to check numbers in stories and graphics. I'm looking for any source you might know that details conventions for presenting graphics. Like a pie chart starting at 12.00. And, ranking the data (if categorical) with the largest slice starting at 12.00. My company has our own standards, from years of preparing our own graphics and studying others. But, it might be helpful to have a standard style book on this. I've not found one so far.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
This sounds like it would be a great topic for an AAPOR conference short course.

May I suggest that if anyone is interested in teaching such a course, or has ideas for how it might be presented, that they contact the AAPOR education committee (either Allan McCutcheon, Geraldine Mooney, or me).

Lydia Saad

-----Original Message-----
From: John Kochevar [mailto:jkoch@tiac.net]
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2001 11:37 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Graphics Statistics and Data
Here is the detailed reference to the Sage volume.

Tufte is great for deep understanding and creative use of graphics but the Sage volume: Graphing Statistics and Data: Creating Better Charts by Wallren, et. al. (1996) is the best single practical reference on my shelf.

There is a section called "News graphics: How amusing can you be?", and two tight pages on pie charts.

As much as I liked the New York Times charts, I kept remembering how much ordinary readers like pie charts. They have a familiar and intuitive appeal...

John Kochevar

Leo Simonetta wrote:

Along with the Tufte I'd recommend "Graphing data: Techniques for display and analysis" from the Sage Applied Social Research Methods Series. (Disclaimer - I did some of the graphs so I am biased.)--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com [mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com]
<mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2001 1:27 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Graphics conventions

My firm conducts The Iowa Poll for The Des Moines Register and part of our responsibility is to check numbers in stories and graphics. I'm looking for any source you might know that details conventions for presenting graphics. Like a pie chart starting at 12.00. And, ranking the data (if categorical) with the largest slice starting at 12.00. My company has our own standards, from years of preparing our own graphics and studying others. But, it might be helpful to have a standard style book on this. I've not found one so far that addresses some very basic issues of graphic presentation of data. The USA Today pie charts are notorious for seemingly random arrangements of wedges, and I recall watching with horror Ross Perot's graphics. Ideas, anyone?
The book that I was talking about was a different one from the Applied Social Research Methods Series (Vol 36) "Graphing data: Techniques for display and analysis" (1995) by Gary T. Henry.

Some of the problems with pie charts are covered on pages 39-46 of that book.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com
Here is the detailed reference to the Sage volume.

Tufte is great for deep understanding and creative use of graphics but the Sage volume: Graphing Statistics and Data: Creating Better Charts by Wallren, et. al. (1996) is the best single practical reference on my shelf.

There is a section called "News graphics: How amusing can you be?", and two tight pages on pie charts.

As much as I liked the New York Times charts, I kept remembering how much ordinary readers like pie charts. They have a familiar and intuitive appeal...

John Kochevar

Leo Simonetta wrote:

Along with the Tufte I'd recommend "Graphing data: Techniques for display and analysis" from the Sage Applied Social Research Methods Series. (Disclaimer - I did some of the graphs so I am biased.)--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com [mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2001 1:27 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Graphics conventions

My firm conducts The Iowa Poll for The Des Moines Register and part of our responsibility is to check numbers in stories and graphics. I'm looking for any source you might know that details conventions for presenting graphics. Like a pie chart starting at 12.00. And, ranking the data (if categorical) with the largest slice starting at 12.00. My company has our own standards, from years of preparing our own graphics and studying others. But, it might be helpful to have a standard style book on this. I've not found one so far that addresses some very basic issues of graphic presentation of data. The USA Today pie charts are notorious for seemingly random arrangements of wedges, and I recall watching with horror Ross Perot's graphics. Ideas,
anyone?

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

------ = _NextPart_001_01C1030E.B060B9F0
Content-Type: text/html;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
    <META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">
</HEAD> <BODY
    bgColor=#ffffff>
    <DIV><SPAN class=730355615-02072001></SPAN><FONT size=2><FONT
        color=#0000ff><FONT face=Arial>T<SPAN class=730355615-02072001>he book that I
        was talking about was a&nbsp;</SPAN><SPAN
            class=730355615-02072001>diff</SPAN><SPAN
            class=730355615-02072001>er<SPAN class=730355615-02072001>ent from the Applied Social Research
        Methods Series (Vol 36)&nbsp;"</SPAN>Graphing data: Techniques for display
        and analysis"&nbsp;</DIV></FONT></DIV>
    <DIV><FONT size=2><FONT color=#0000ff><FONT face=Arial><SPAN
            class=730355615-02072001>Some of the problems with pie charts
        are covered on pages 39-46 of that book.</SPAN></FONT></FONT></DIV>
    <P>--<BR>Leo G. Simonetta<BR>Art &amp; Science Group,
    LLC<BR>simonetta@artsci.com</P>

<BLOCKQUOTE style="BORDER-LEFT: #0000ff 2px solid; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-RIGHT:
  0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px">
    <DIV align=left class=OutlookMessageHeader dir=ltr><FONT face=Tahoma
        size=2>-----Original Message-----<BR><B>From:</B> John Kochevar [mailto:
        jkoch@tiac.net]<BR><B>Sent:</B> Monday, July 02, 2001 11:37 AM<BR><B>To:</B>
        aapornet@usc.edu<BR><B>Subject:</B> Re: Graphics Statistics and Data<BR>
        Tufte is great for deep understanding and creative use of graphics but
        the Sage volume: Graphing Statistics and Data: Creating Better Charts by
        Wallren, et. al. (1996) is the best single practical reference on my shelf.
    </DIV></BLOCKQUOTE>
There is a section called "News graphics: How amusing can you be?", and two tight pages on pie charts.

As much as I liked the New York Times charts, I kept remembering how much ordinary readers like pie charts. They have a familiar and intuitive appeal...

John Kochevar

Leo Simonetta wrote:

Along with the Tufte I'd recommend "Graphing data: Techniques for display and analysis" from the Sage Series. (Disclaimer - I did some of the graphs so I am biased.)

John Kochevar

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, LLC

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2001 1:27 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu

My firm conducts The Iowa Poll for The Des Moines Register and part of our responsibility is to check numbers in stories and graphics. I'm looking for any source you might know that details conventions for presenting graphics. My firm has its own standards, but it might be helpful to have a standard style book on this. I've not found one so far.

Like a pie chart starting at 12.00. And, ranking the data (if categorical) with the largest slice starting at 12.00. My company has our own standards.

From years of preparing our own graphics and studying others, it might be helpful to have a standard style book on this.
face=arial,helvetica><FONT size=-1>wedges, and I recall watching with horror Ross Perot's graphics.&nbsp; Ideas,</FONT></FONT> <BR><FONT face=arial,helvetica><FONT size=-1>anyone?</FONT></FONT> <BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR><BR>
CHINA'S LEADER URGES ACCEPTANCE OF CAPITALISTS IN COMMUNIST PARTY

By CRAIG S. SMITH

SHANGHAI, July 1 -- China's president and Communist Party general secretary, Jiang Zemin, marked the 80th birthday of the party today by declaring that private business owners and other members of China's increasingly diverse society ought to be allowed to join.

Mr. Jiang's statement, delivered in a two-hour speech from Beijing's Great Hall of the People on Tiananmen Square, throws weight behind one side of an intense debate within the party over its future.

With the country's small private sector growing faster than any other part of the economy, many reformist party members have argued that private businessmen should be allowed into the Communist Party, the 65-million-strong club that wields absolute political power in the country.

It also signals that the trend of relaxing restrictions on the private sector is likely to continue.

With many of the country's state-owned enterprises foundering despite years of efforts to turn them around, China's leaders have recognized the importance of private businesses in absorbing the state sector's excess workers and in improving the economy's global competitiveness as the country prepares to enter the World Trade Organization. Private companies, for example, are now free to list their shares on the country's stock markets, although the pace of such listings is excruciatingly slow.
"This is a path-breaking speech in redefining the role of the party and its relationship to the rest of society," said Dali L. Yang, a political science professor at the University of Chicago. "It will be seen as a fundamental document setting the tone for rebuilding the party."

Eighty years after its founding in Shanghai in July 1921, the world's largest communist party is struggling to remain relevant in a country that has largely abandoned Marxism and is trying instead to create a hybrid socialist-capitalist system more relevant to an age in which its citizens are increasingly connected to the outside world via the Internet and other forms of communication.

During the last year, Mr. Jiang has promoted increased representation of the party in areas of society that have been neglected or have undergone the most change. Even under Mao Zedong, the government protected select "red capitalists" such as Rong Yiren, who later became vice president of the country. But few of those people were allowed to join the party.

But allowing private businessmen into the party could fundamentally alter the organization's character and lead to factionalism, which might someday provide the framework for a multiparty system. At the very least, it would further weaken the party's already shaky ideological underpinning, which most concerns those party members on the other side of the debate.

"We must uphold the purity of the party," Lin Yanzhi, a deputy secretary of Jilin Province and the son of a revolutionary leader, said in The Pursuit of Truth, a small magazine that often serves as a sounding board for traditional Marxists. "The Communist Party cannot absorb capitalists into it. If these people really join the party they will use their strength to first seize power within the party and to change the party's nature."

Until Mr. Jiang's speech, the party's top leadership had not made any public statements on their position in the debate. And in calling for broader criteria in admitting party members, he sought to assuage hard-liners by insisting that
"party members from among the workers, farmers, intellectuals, military personnel and officials, are the most basic components and core force of the party's ranks."

He also called on party members to "resolutely resist the influence of the Western multiparty system."

But hard-line Marxists are now a small minority within the party, and many party members have already gone into the private sector as employees of private companies or as private business owners themselves.

Mr. Jiang went on to say that given the changes in the Chinese economy, "We cannot simplistically use whether people have property and how much property they have as a criterion to determine whether they are politically advanced or backward."

He said that "social strata" have emerged that include entrepreneurs, owners of private enterprises and employees of foreign firms who "make contributions to developing socialism's productive forces and its other endeavors through honest labor and work." These people should be given a chance to join the party, he said.

Mr. Yang of the University of Chicago said, "If the party can accommodate the best and brightest and most economically influential and at the same time curb corruption, another focus of the speech, it will be able to extend its dominance over an extended time."

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/07/02/world/02CHIN.html

****
I failed to mention the most important contact person for this, Tom Guterbock, the Education Committee chair. (My apologies Tom!)

All contact information for the education committee members is in the AAPOR directory, but for convenience, here is Tom's:

Thomas M. Guterbock, AAPOR Education Chair
Center for Survey Research, University of Virginia
Voice: 434-243-5223
tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu <mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
<mailto:TomG@virginia.edu>

-----Original Message-----
From: Saad, Lydia
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2001 11:44 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: Graphics Statistics and Data

This sounds like it would be a great topic for an AAPOR conference short course.

May I suggest that if anyone is interested in teaching such a course, or has ideas for how it might be presented, that they contact the AAPOR education committee (either Allan McCutcheon, Geraldine Mooney, or me).

Lydia Saad

-----Original Message-----
From: John Kochevar [mailto:jkoch@tiac.net]
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2001 11:37 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Graphics Statistics and Data

Here is the detailed reference to the Sage volume.
Tufte is great for deep understanding and creative use of graphics but the Sage volume: Graphing Statistics and Data: Creating Better Charts by Wallren, et. al. (1996) is the best single practical reference on my shelf.

There is a section called "News graphics: How amusing can you be?", and two tight pages on pie charts.

As much as I liked the New York Times charts, I kept remembering how much ordinary readers like pie charts. They have a familiar and intuitive appeal...

John Kochevar

Leo Simonetta wrote:

Along with the Tufte I'd recommend "Graphing data: Techniques for display and analysis" from the Sage Applied Social Research Methods Series. (Disclaimer - I did some of the graphs so I am biased.)
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com [mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com]
<mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2001 1:27 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Graphics conventions

My firm conducts The Iowa Poll for The Des Moines Register and part of our responsibility is to check numbers in stories and graphics. I'm looking for any source you might know that details conventions for presenting graphics. Like a pie chart starting at 12.00. And, ranking the data (if categorical) with the largest slice starting at 12.00. My company has our own standards, from years of preparing our own graphics and studying others. But, it might be helpful to have a standard style book on this. I've not found one so far that addresses some very basic issues of graphic presentation of data. The USA Today pie charts are notorious for seemingly random arrangements of wedges, and I recall watching with horror Ross Perot's graphics. Ideas, anyone?

JAS
But they had not gone twenty yards when they stopped short. An uproar of voices was coming from the farmhouse. They rushed back and looked through the window again. Yes, a violent quarrel was in progress. There were shoutings, bangings on the table, sharp suspicious glances, furious denials. The source of the trouble appeared to be that Napoleon and Mr. Pilkington had each played an ace of spades simultaneously.

Twelve voices were shouting in anger, and they were all alike. No question, now, what had happened to the faces of
the pigs. The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which.

-- George Orwell, 1903-1950
Animal Farm: A Fairy Story (1946)
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CHINA'S LEADER URGES ACCEPTANCE OF CAPITALISTS IN COMMUNIST PARTY

By CRAIG S. SMITH

SHANGHAI, July 1 -- China's president and Communist Party general secretary, Jiang Zemin, marked the 80th birthday of the party today by declaring that private business owners and other members of China's increasingly diverse society ought to be allowed to join.

Mr. Jiang's statement, delivered in a two-hour speech from Beijing's Great Hall of the People on Tiananmen Square, throws weight behind one side of an intense debate within the party over its future.

With the country's small private sector growing faster than any other part of the economy, many reformist party members have argued that private businessmen should be allowed into the Communist Party, the 65-million-strong club that wields absolute political power in the country.

It also signals that the trend of relaxing restrictions on the private sector is likely to continue.

With many of the country's state-owned enterprises foundering despite years of efforts to turn them around, China's leaders have recognized the importance of private businesses in absorbing the state sector's excess workers and in improving the economy's global competitiveness as the country prepares to enter the World Trade Organization. Private companies, for example, are now free to list their
shares on the country's stock markets, although the pace of such listings is excruciatingly slow.

"This is a path-breaking speech in redefining the role of the party and its relationship to the rest of society," said Dali L. Yang, a political science professor at the University of Chicago. "It will be seen as a fundamental document setting the tone for rebuilding the party."

Eighty years after its founding in Shanghai in July 1921, the world's largest communist party is struggling to remain relevant in a country that has largely abandoned Marxism and is trying instead to create a hybrid socialist-capitalist system more relevant to an age in which its citizens are increasingly connected to the outside world via the Internet and other forms of communication.

During the last year, Mr. Jiang has promoted increased representation of the party in areas of society that have been neglected or have undergone the most change. Even under Mao Zedong, the government protected select "red capitalists" such as Rong Yiren, who later became vice president of the country. But few of those people were allowed to join the party.

But allowing private businessmen into the party could fundamentally alter the organization's character and lead to factionalism, which might someday provide the framework for a multiparty system. At the very least, it would further weaken the party's already shaky ideological underpinning, which most concerns those party members on the other side of the debate.

"We must uphold the purity of the party," Lin Yanzhi, a deputy secretary of Jilin Province and the son of a revolutionary leader, said in The Pursuit of Truth, a small magazine that often serves as a sounding board for traditional Marxists. "The Communist Party cannot absorb capitalists into it. If these people really join the party they will use their strength to first seize power within the party and to change the party's nature."

Until Mr. Jiang's speech, the party's top leadership had not made any public statements on their position in the debate. And in calling for
criteria in admitting party members, he sought to assuage hard-liners by insisting that "party members from among the workers, farmers, intellectuals, military personnel and officials, are the most basic components and core force of the party's ranks."

He also called on party members to "resolutely resist the influence of the Western multiparty system."

But hard-line Marxists are now a small minority within the party, and many party members have already gone into the private sector as employees of private companies or as private business owners themselves.

Mr. Jiang went on to say that given the changes in the Chinese economy, "We cannot simplistically use whether people have property and how much property they have as a criterion to determine whether they are politically advanced or backward."

He said that "social strata" have emerged that include entrepreneurs, owners of private enterprises and employees of foreign firms who "make contributions to developing socialism's productive forces and its other endeavors through honest labor and work." These people should be given a chance to join the party, he said.

Mr. Yang of the University of Chicago said, "If the party can accommodate the best and brightest and most economically influential and at the same time curb corruption, another focus of the speech, it will be able to extend its dominance over an extended time."

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/07/02/world/02CHIN.html

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

*****
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Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f62ISUJ00392 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001
11:28:30 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from epimetheus.hosting4u.net ([209.15.2.70])
Two China items follow. Mark Richards

1. Why Trade Won't Bring Democracy To China: New Republic
2. New wave of censorship on Internet Cyber dissident Huang Qi detained for more than one year without trial

-----Original Message-----
From: Worldright@aol.com [mailto:Worldright@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2001 1:54 PM
To: mark@bisconti.com
Subject: Why Trade Won't Bring Democracy To China: New Republic WHY TRADE WON'T BRING DEMOCRACY TO CHINA. Trade Barrier by Lawrence F. Kaplan

On February 25, business professor and writer Li Shaomin left his home in Hong Kong to visit a friend in the mainland city of Shenzhen. His wife and nine-year-old daughter haven't heard from him since. That's because, for four months now, Li has been rotting in a Chinese prison, where he stands accused of spying for Taiwan. Never mind that Li is an American citizen. And never mind that the theme of his writings, published in subversive organs like the U.S.-China Business Council's China Business Review, is optimism about China's investment climate. Li, it turns out, proved too
optimistic for his own good. In addition to rewarding foreign investors, he believed that China's economic growth would create, as he put it in a 1999 article, a "rule-based governance system." But, as Li has since discovered, China's leaders have other plans.

Will American officials ever make the same discovery? Like Li, Washington's most influential commentators, politicians, and China hands claim we can rely on the market to transform China. According to this new orthodoxy, what counts is not China's political choices but rather its economic orientation, particularly its degree of integration into the global economy. The cliche has had a narcotic effect on President Bush, who, nearly every time he's asked about China, suggests that trade will accomplish the broader aims of American policy.

Bush hasn't revived Bill Clinton's recklessly ahistorical claim that the United States can build "peace through trade, investment, and commerce." He has, however, latched onto another of his predecessor's high-minded rationales for selling Big Macs to Beijing--namely, that commerce will act, in Clinton's words, as "a force for change in China, exposing China to our ideas and our ideals." In this telling, capitalism isn't merely a necessary precondition for democracy in China. It's a sufficient one. Or, as Bush puts it, "Trade freely with China, and time is on our side." As Congress prepares to vote for the last time on renewing China's normal trading relations (Beijing's impending entry into the World Trade Organization will put an end to the annual ritual), you'll be hearing the argument a lot: To promote democracy, the United States needn't apply more political pressure to China. All we need to do is more business there.

Alas, the historical record isn't quite so clear. Tolerant cultural traditions, British colonization, a strong civil society, international pressure, American military occupation and political influence--these are just a few of the explanations scholars credit as the source of freedom in various parts of the world. And even when economic conditions do hasten the arrival of democracy, it's not always obvious which ones. After all, if economic factors can be said to account for democracy's
most dramatic advance—the implosion of the Soviet Union and its Communist satellites—surely the most important factor was economic collapse.

And if not every democracy emerged through capitalism, it's also true that not every capitalist economy has produced a democratic government. One hundred years ago in Germany and Japan, 30 years ago in countries such as Argentina and Brazil, and today in places like Singapore and Malaysia, capitalist development has buttressed, rather than undermined, authoritarian regimes. And these models are beginning to look a lot more like contemporary China than the more optimistic cases cited by Beijing's American enthusiasts. In none of these cautionary examples did the free market do the three things businessmen say it always does: weaken the coercive power of the state, create a democratically minded middle class, or expose the populace to liberal ideals from abroad. It isn't doing them in China either.

One of the most important ways capitalism should foster democracy is by diminishing the power of the state. Or, as Milton Friedman put it in Capitalism and Freedom, "[t]he kind of economic organization that provides economic freedom directly, namely, competitive capitalism, also promotes political freedom because it separates economic power from political power and in this way enables the one to offset the other." In his own way, Bush makes the same point about China: "I believe a whiff of freedom in the marketplace will cause there to be more demand for democracy." But the theory isn't working so well in the People's Republic, whose brand of capitalism isn't quite what Adam Smith had in mind.

China's market system derives, instead, from a pathological model of economic development. Reeling from the economic devastation of the Mao era, Deng Xiaoping and his fellow party leaders in the late 1970s set China on a course toward "market socialism." The idea was essentially the same one that guided the New Economic Policy in Soviet Russia 50 years before: a mix of economic liberalization and political repression, which would boost China's economy without weakening the Communist
Party.
And so, while leaving the party in control of China's political life, Deng junked many of the economy's command mechanisms--granting state-owned enterprises more autonomy, opening the country to limited investment, and replacing aging commissars with a semiprofessional bureaucracy. The recipe worked well: China has racked up astronomical growth rates ever since. And democracy seems as far away as ever.

The reason isn't simply that government repression keeps economic freedom from yielding political freedom. It's that China's brand of economic reform contains ingredients that hinder--and were consciously devised to hinder--political reform. The most obvious is that, just as the state retains a monopoly on the levers of coercion, it also remains perched atop the commanding heights of China's economy.

True, China has been gradually divesting itself of state-owned enterprises, and the process should quicken once China enters the World Trade Organization (WTO). But Beijing's leaders have said they will continue to support China's most competitive and critical industries. Taking a cue from authoritarian South Korea during the 1980s, China's leaders have proposed sponsoring industrial conglomerates in crucial sectors of the economy, transformed industrial ministries into "general associations," merged failing state-owned firms with more successful ones, and established organizations to, as Chinese economist Xue Muqiao has put it, "serve as a bridge between the state and the enterprises."

But that's where any similarities with South Korea end. Unlike South Korea, the Philippines, and Taiwan, which evolved from authoritarianism (and did so, significantly, as de facto protectorates of the United States), China even today has no effective system of property rights--a signature trait that distinguishes its Communist regime from traditional authoritarian ones. The absence of a private-property regime in China means that, at the end of the day, the state controls nearly the entire edifice on which China's "free" markets rest. It also means that China's brand of capitalism blurs, rather than clarifies, the distinction between the public and the private realms on which political liberty depends. Nor is that the only requisite for democracy that China's markets lack. As the imprisonment of Li Shaomin and thousands of other political prisoners attests, capitalism
in the
PRC still operates within the confines of an arbitrary legal order and a
party-controlled court system. "China is still a lawless environment," says
University of Pennsylvania sinologist Arthur Waldron. "Whether in terms of
individual
rights or the rights of entrepreneurs, interests are protected not by
institutions
but by special relationships with those in power."

Before he was arrested, Li diagnosed this condition as "relation-based
capitalism."
What he meant was that relations with government officials, not property
rights or
the rule of law, underpin the Chinese market. Because the political
foundations of
China's economy remain the exclusive property of the state, China's
entrepreneurs
operate with a few degrees of separation, but without true autonomy, from the
government. Hence, capital, licenses, and contracts flow to those with
connections to
officials and to their friends and relatives, who, in turn, maintain close
relations
with, and remain beholden to, the regime. Their firms operate, in the words
of
Hong
Kong-based China specialist David Zweig, "[l]ike barnacles on ships, ...
draw[ing]
their sustenance from their parastatal relationships with the ministries from
which
they were spun off."

Helping to keep all these distortions in place are Deng's functionaries, who
now
constitute the world's largest bureaucracy and still control the everyday
levers of
the Chinese economy. Today, they function as the engines and administrators of
a
market increasingly driven by skimming off the top. The foreign-trade sector
offers
particularly easy pickings. In 1995, for instance, the World Bank found that
while
China's nominal tariff rate was 32 percent, only a 6 percent rate was
officially
collected. Presumably, much of the difference went into the pockets of
Chinese
officials. And even though WTO accession will reduce opportunities for rent-
seeking
from inflated trade tariffs, China's bureaucracy will be able to continue
siphoning
funds from distorted interest rates, the foreign exchange markets, and
virtually any
business transaction that requires its involvement—which is to say, nearly
every
business transaction. Nor is the problem merely the corrupting influence
these
bureaucrats wield over China's markets. The larger problem is that, whereas in the United States the private sector wields enormous influence over the political class, in China the reverse is true.

or precisely this reason, Washington's celebrations of the democratic potential of the new Chinese "middle class" may be premature. "Entrepreneurs, once condemned as 'counterrevolutionaries,' are now the instruments of reform.... [T]his middle class will eventually demand broad acceptance of democratic values," House Majority Whip Tom DeLay insisted last year. Reading from the same script, President Bush declares that trade with China will "help an entrepreneurial class and a freedom-loving class grow and burgeon and become viable." Neither DeLay nor Bush, needless to say, invented the theory that middle classes have nothing to lose but their chains.

In the first serious attempt to subject the ties between economic and political liberalization to empirical scrutiny, Seymour Martin Lipset published a study in 1959, Some Social Requisites of Democracy, which found that economic development led to, among other things, higher levels of income equality, education, and, most important, the emergence of a socially moderate middle class--all factors that promote democratization. More recent studies have found that rising incomes also tend to correlate with participation in voluntary organizations and other institutions of "civil society," which further weakens the coercive power of the state.

But middle classes aren't always socially moderate, and they don't always oppose the state. Under certain conditions, late modernizing economies breed middle classes that actively oppose political change. In each of these cases, a strong state, not the market, dictates the terms of economic modernization. And, in each case, an emerging entrepreneurial class too weak to govern on its own allies itself--economically and, more importantly, politically--with a reactionary government and against threats to the established order. In his now-classic study Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, sociologist Barrington Moore famously revealed that, in these "revolutions
from above," capitalist transformations weakened rather than strengthened liberalism. In the case of nineteenth-century Japan, Moore writes that the aim of those in power was to "preserve as much as possible of the advantages the ruling class had enjoyed under the ancien regime, cutting away just enough ... to preserve the state, since they would otherwise lose everything." Japan's rulers could do this only with the aid of a commercial class, which eagerly complied, exchanging its political aspirations for profits. On this point, at least, Marx and Engels had things right. Describing the 1848 revolution in Germany, they traced its failure partly to the fact that, at the end of the day, entrepreneurs threw their support not behind the liberal insurrectionists but behind the state that was the source of their enrichment.

Much the same process is unfolding in China, where economic and political power remain deeply entwined. In fact, China's case is even more worrisome than its historical antecedents. In Germany and Japan, after all, an entrepreneurial class predated the state's modernization efforts, enjoyed property rights, and, as a result, possessed at least some autonomous identity. In China, which killed off its commercial class in the 1950s, the state had to create a new one. Thus China's emerging bourgeoisie consists overwhelmingly of state officials, their friends and business partners, and--to the extent they climbed the economic ladder independently--entrepreneurs who rely on connections with the official bureaucracy for their livelihoods. "It is improbable, to say the least," historian Maurice Meisner writes in The Deng Xiaoping Era: An Inquiry Into the Fate of Chinese Socialism, "that a bourgeoisie whose economic fortunes are so dependent on the political fortunes of the Communist state is likely to mount a serious challenge to the authority of that state ... the members of China's new bourgeoisie emerge more as agents of the state than as potential antagonists."

A steady diet of chauvinistic nationalism hasn't helped. In the aftermath of the Tiananmen Square massacre, party leaders launched a "patriotism" campaign, a sentiment they defined as "loving the state" as well as the Communist Party. As the Shanghai-based scholar and party apologist Xiao Gongqin explains, "[T]he overriding
issue of China's modernization is how, under new historical circumstances, to find new resources of legitimacy so as to achieve social and moral integration in the process of social transition." To Xiao and others like him, the answer is nationalism. And, as anyone who turned on a television during the recent EP-3 episode may have noticed, it's working. Indeed, independent opinion polling conducted by the Public Opinion Research Institute of People's University (in association with Western researchers, who published their findings in 1997), indicate greater public support for China's Communist regime than similar surveys found a decade earlier. And, contrary to what development theory might suggest, the new nationalism appears to have infected the middle class--particularly university students and intellectuals--more acutely than it has China's workers and farmers. "The [closeness of the] relationship between the party and intellectuals is as bad as in the Cultural Revolution," a former official in the party's propaganda arm noted in 1997. Even many of China's exiled dissidents have fallen under its spell.

In addition to being independent of the regime and predisposed toward liberal values, China's commercial class is supposed to be busily erecting an independent civil society. But, just as China's Communist system restricts private property, it prohibits independent churches and labor unions, truly autonomous social organizations, and any other civic institutions that might plausibly compete with the state. Indeed, China's leaders seem to have read Robert Putnam's Bowling Alone and the rest of the civil-society canon--and decided to do exactly the reverse of what the literature recommends. "Peasants will establish peasants' organizations as well, then China will become another Poland," senior party official Yao Yilin reportedly warned during the Tiananmen protests. To make sure this fear never comes true, China's leaders have dealt with any hint of an emerging civil society in one of two ways: repression or co-optation. Some forbidden organizations--such as Falun Gong, the Roman Catholic Church, independent labor unions, and organizations associated with the 1989 democracy movement--find their members routinely imprisoned and tortured. Others, such as the Association of Urban Unemployed, are merely monitored.
and harassed. And as for the officially sanctioned organizations that impress so many Western observers, they mostly constitute a Potemkin facade. "[A]lmost every ostensibly independent organization--institutes, foundations, consultancies--is linked into the party-state network," says Columbia University sinologist Andrew Nathan. Hence, Beijing's Ministry of Civil Affairs monitors even sports clubs and business associations and requires all such groups to register with the government.

The same kind of misreading often characterizes celebrations of rural China's "village committees," whose democratic potential the engagement lobby routinely touts. Business Week discerns in them evidence "of the grassroots democracy beginning to take hold in China." But that's not quite right. China's leaders restrict committee elections to the countryside and, even there, to the most local level. Nor, having been legally sanctioned 14 years ago, do they constitute a recent development. More important, China's leaders don't see the elections the way their American interpreters do. In proposing them, says Jude Howell, co-author of In Search of Civil Society: Market Reform and Social Change in Contemporary China, party elites argued that elected village leaders "would find it easier to implement central government policy and in particular persuade villagers to deliver grain and taxes and abide by family planning policy. Village self-governance would thus foster social stability and order and facilitate the implementation of national policy. By recruiting newly elected popular and entrepreneurial village leaders, the Party could strengthen its roots at the grassroots level and bolster its legitimacy in the eyes of rural residents." Which is exactly what it has done. In races for village committee chairs, the Ministry of Civil Affairs allows only two candidates to stand for office, and until recently many townships nominated only one. Local party secretaries and officials often push their favored choice, and most committee members are also members of the Communist Party, to which they remain accountable. Should a nonparty member be elected, he must accept the guidance of the Communist Party, which, in any case, immediately sets about recruiting him. As for those rare committee members who challenge local party officials, their success may be gleaned from the fate of elected committee members from a village in Shandong province who in 1999 accused a
local party secretary of corruption. All were promptly arrested.

Still, the very fact that China's leaders feel compelled to bolster their legitimacy in the countryside is telling. Last month Beijing took the unusual step of releasing a report, "Studies of Contradictions Within the People Under New Conditions," which detailed a catalogue of "collective protests and group incidents." What the report makes clear is that Beijing's leaders think China's growing pool of overtaxed farmers and unemployed workers, more than its newly moneyed elites, could become a threat to the regime. Fortunately for the authorities, with no political opposition to channel labor unrest into a coherent movement, protests tend to be narrow in purpose and poorly coordinated. And the wheels of repression have already begun to grind, with Beijing launching a "strike hard" campaign to quell any trouble. In any case, what these formerly state-employed workers have been demonstrating for is not less communism, but more--a return to the salad days of central planning.

Which brings us to the final tenet of the engagement lobby: that commerce exposes China to the ideals of its trading partners, particularly those of the United States. As House Majority Leader Dick Armey has put it, "Freedom to trade is the great subversive and liberating force in human history." Or, as Clinton National Security Adviser Sandy Berger burbled in 1997, "The fellow travelers of the new global economy--computers and modems, faxes and photocopiers, increased contacts and binding contracts--carry with them the seeds of change." But the Chinese disagree. To begin with, they don't import much. And economists predict that won't change dramatically once they've joined the WTO, since China's leaders have committed themselves to the kind of export-oriented, mercantilist growth model that South Korea, Japan, and Taiwan pursued in decades past. Last year, for instance, China exported $100 billion in goods and services to the United States and only imported $16 billion worth. Hence, for every six modems it sent to America, Sandy Berger sent back only one.

To be sure, that one modem may carry with it seeds of change. Bush, for instance, says, "If the Internet were to take hold in China, freedom's genie will be out
of the bottle." Alas, through links to Chinese service providers, Beijing tightly controls all access to the Web. And Western investors in China's information networks have eagerly pitched in. One Chinese Internet portal, bankrolled by Intel and Goldman Sachs, greets users with a helpful reminder to avoid "topics which damage the reputation of the state" and warns that it will be "obliged to report you to the Public Security Bureau" if you don't. But Goldman Sachs needn't worry. If anything, China's recent experience lends credence to the pessimistic theories of an earlier era, which held that nations shape the uses of technology rather than the other way around. Thus Beijing blocks access to damaging "topics" and to Western news sources like The New York Times, The Washington Post, and this magazine. It also monitors e-mail exchanges and has arrested Internet users who have tried to elude state restrictions. And, in ways that would make Joseph Goebbels blush, the government uses websites--and, of course, television, newspapers, and radio--to dominate the circuits with its own propaganda. "Much as many people might like to think the Internet is part of a bottom-up explosion of individualism in China, it is not," writes Peter Lovelock, a Hong Kong-based academic who studies the Internet's effect in the PRC. Instead, it provides "an extraordinarily beneficial tool in the administration of China." And that tool was on vivid display during the EP-3 crisis, when China blocked access to Western news sources and censored chat rooms.

American politicians describe foreign direct investment, too, as a potent agent of democratization. But, in this case, they're not even paraphrasing political science literature they haven't read, because the literature makes no such claim. In fact, a 1983 study by the University of North Carolina's Kenneth Bollen found that levels of foreign trade concentration and penetration by multinational corporations have no significant effect on the correlation between economic development and democracy. In China's case, it's easy to understand why. Beijing requires foreign investors in many industries to cooperate in joint ventures with Chinese partners, most of whom enjoy
close ties to the government. These firms remain insulated mainly in three coastal enclaves and in "special economic zones" set apart from the larger Chinese economy. Moreover, they export a majority of their goods—which is to say, they send most of their "seeds of change" abroad. At the same time, their capital largely substitutes for domestic capital (foreign-owned firms generate half of all Chinese exports), providing a much-needed blood transfusion for China's rulers, who use it to accumulate reserves of hard currency, meet social welfare obligations, and otherwise strengthen their rule. Nor is it clear that U.S. companies even want China to change. If anything, growing levels of U.S. investment have created an American interest in maintaining China's status quo. Hence, far from criticizing China's rulers, Western captains of industry routinely parade through Beijing singing the praises of the Communist regime (and often inveighing against its detractors), while they admonish America's leaders to take no action that might upset the exquisite sensibilities of China's politburo. Business first, democracy later.

But ultimately the best measure of whether economic ties to the West have contributed to democratization may be gleaned from China's human rights record. Colin Powell insists, "Trade with China is not only good economic policy; it is good human rights policy." Yet, rather than improve that record, the rapid expansion of China's trade ties to the outside world over the past decade has coincided with a worsening of political repression at home. Beijing launched its latest crackdown on dissent in 1999, and it continues to this day. The government has tortured, "reeducated through labor," and otherwise persecuted thousands of people for crimes no greater than practicing breathing exercises, peacefully championing reforms, and exercising freedom of expression, association, or worship. It has arrested Chinese-American scholars like Li Shaomin on trumped-up charges, closed down newspapers, and intimidated and threatened dissidents. Nor is it true that linking trade and human rights will necessarily prove counterproductive. When Congress approved trade sanctions against Beijing in the aftermath of Tiananmen, China's leaders responded by releasing more than 800 political prisoners, lifting martial law in Beijing, entering
into talks with the United States, and even debating among themselves the proper role of human rights. As soon as American pressure eased, so did China's reciprocal gestures.

Turning a blind eye to Beijing's depredations may make economic sense. But to pretend we can democratize China by means of economics is, finally, a self-serving conceit. Democracy is a political choice, an act of will. Someone, not something, must create it. Often that someone is a single leader--a Mikhail Gorbachev, a King Juan Carlos, or a Vaclav Havel. But such a man won't be found in China's current leadership. Other times, the pressure for democracy comes from a political opposition--the African National Congress in South Africa, Solidarity in Poland, or the marchers in Tiananmen Square. But there are no more marchers in Tiananmen Square.

Pressure for democratization, however, can also come from abroad. And usually it comes from the United States or from nowhere at all. During the 1980s America applied diplomatic and economic pressure to repressive regimes from Poland to South Africa; intervened to prevent military coups in the Philippines, Peru, El Salvador, Honduras, and Bolivia; and loudly enshrined human rights and democracy in official policy. The United States played a pivotal and direct role in democratizing even countries like South Korea and Taiwan, which many China-engagers now tout as evidence that the market alone creates political freedom. Appropriately enough, the decade closed with democracy activists erecting a facsimile of the Statue of Liberty in Tiananmen Square.

The commercialist view of China, by contrast, rests on no historical foundation; it is a libertarian fantasy. "The linkage between development and rights is too loose, the threshold too high, the time frame too long, and the results too uncertain to make economic engagement a substitute for direct policy intervention," writes Columbia's Nathan. Yet make it a substitute is precisely what the United States has done. And, far from creating democracy, this subordination of political principle has created the justified impression of American hypocrisy and, worse, given U.S.
policymakers an excuse to do nothing.

Maybe the claim that we can bring liberty to China by chasing its markets will prove valid in the long run. But exactly how long is the long run? A political scientist at Stanford University says it ends in 2015, when, he predicts, China will be transformed into a democracy. Others say China will democratize before that. Still others say it may take a half-century or more. The answer matters. After all, while capitalist Germany and Japan eventually became democracies, it wasn't capitalism that democratized them, and it certainly wasn't worth the wait. In China's case, too, no one really knows what might happen as we wait for politics to catch up with economics. With the exception, perhaps, of Li Shaomin, who tested the link between economic and political liberalization in China for himself. He's still in jail.

Timothy Cooper
Ambassador-at-large
China Democracy Party
202/244-9479
202/361-0989
worldright@aol.com
///
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CHINA
New wave of censorship on Internet
Cyberdissident Huang Qi detained for more than one year without trial

In a letter addressed today to Chinese prime minister Zhu Rongji, Reporters Sans Frontières (Reporters Without Borders RSF), expressed indignation about the detention without trial of Huang Qi, who is charged with disseminating "subversive information" on the Internet. The organisation asked the prime minister to do
everything possible to ensure the immediate release of Huang Qi. RSF also protested against the new wave of censorship on Internet forums and web sites accused of being critical. "While at least five newspapers have been punished by the authorities because of critical articles, the regime is again attacking the Internet," declared Robert Mićiàmnard, general secretary of RSF. "All of Beijing’s promises to ensure total freedom for foreign journalists during the 2008 Olympics Games are very illusory when a wave of repression like this happens," added Robert Mićiàmnard.

According to information obtained by RSF, the trial of Huang Qi, creator of the 6-4tianwang.com web site, was postponed indefinitely. The cyberdissident charged with "dissemination of subversive information on the Internet" has been detained since 3 June 2000. His trial started last February but was postponed because of his health. He collapsed during the first hearing. According to his lawyer and his wife, Huang Qi was beaten during his interrogation. The trial was due to start again on 27 June, but a spokesman of the Chengdu court (Sichuan province, southwest of the country) announced that the trial was postponed again because of the 80th Anniversary of the Chinese Communist Party. Huang Qi is accused to have published articles denouncing the Tiananmen Square massacre of June 1989 and texts by Chinese dissidents.

On 23 June, the Hong Kong based Information Centre for Human Rights and Democracy announced that authorities had again censored some Internet forums. One run by the Southern Weekend newspaper was closed on 18 June 2001 because it contained a great deal of criticism against the government’s decision to fire two journalists who work for this weekly. Moreover, an online chatroom of the Xici Hutong web site called "Democracy and Human Rights" was closed on 22 June 2001 because web users condemned the repression against critical media. One million people visit this web site daily.

Again according to the Information Centre, the authorities also closed the online magazine Hot Topic, send to an email list of more than 235,000 Chinese web users. This magazine allegedly contains critical articles of the government. Finally,
Chine

Police statistics show that authorities closed at least 8,000 Internet cafes in the
last two months.

CHINE

Nouvelle vague de censure sur Internet

Le cyberdissident Huang Qi détenu depuis un an sans jugement

Dans une lettre adressée au Premier ministre chinois, Zhu Rongji, Reporters sans
frontières (RSF) s'est indignée du maintien en détention sans jugement de
Huang Qi, accusé d'avoir diffusé des "informations subversives" sur Internet. L'organisation a
demandé au Premier ministre d'intervenir auprès des autorités de la province
du Sichuan pour obtenir la libération immédiate de Huang Qi. RSF a, par ailleurs,
protesté contre la vague de censure des forums de discussion et des sites
Internet jugés "critiques". "Alors que plus de cinq journaux viennent d'être
sanctionnés par les autorités pour des articles critiques, le régime s'attaque de nouveau
à l'Internet", a déclaré Robert Ménard, le secrétaire général de RSF. "Toutes les
promesses de Pékin d'assurer une liberté totale aux journalistes étrangers pendant les Jeux olympiques de 2008 semblent bien illusoires quand on assiste à une telle vague de répression", a conclu M. Ménard.

Selon les informations recueillies par RSF, le procès de Huang Qi, créateur du site Internet 6-4tianwang.com, a été reporté sine die. Le cyberdissident, accusé de "diffusion d'informations subversives sur Internet", est détenu depuis le 3 juin 2000. Son procès a commencé en février dernier, mais avait été adjourné en raison de l'état de santé du détenu. Celui-ci s'était évanoui pendant l'audience.

Selon son avocat et sa femme, Huang Qi a été battu pendant les interrogatoires. Le procès devait reprendre le 27 juin, mais un responsable du tribunal de Chengdu (province du Sichuan, sud-ouest du pays) a annoncé qu'il était, de nouveau, reporté sine
die, en raison de la célébration du "80ème anniversaire de la création du Parti communiste chinois". Huang Qi est accusé d'avoir publié sur son site des informations sur le massacre de la place Tiananmen en juin 1989 et des articles de dissidents chinois.

Le 23 juin, le Centre d'information pour les droits de l'homme et la démocratie (basé à Hong Kong) a annoncé que les autorités se sont de nouveau attaquées à certains forums de discussion sur Internet. Ainsi, celui de l'hebdomadaire Le Week-end du sud a été fermé le 18 juin 2001 car il contenait de nombreuses critiques sur la décision du gouvernement de licencier deux journalistes de cette publication. De même, un des forums de discussion du site Internet Xici Hutong, intitulé "Démocratie et droits de l'homme" a été fermé le 22 juin 2001 car de nombreux internautes y condamnaient la répression contre les médias critiques. Ce site serait consulté chaque jour par un million de personnes. Selon le Centre d'information, les autorités auraient également fermé le magazine en ligne "Sujet chaud" qui est distribué à une mailing-liste de plus de deux cent trente cinq mille personnes. Le magazine contiendrait des articles critiques envers le gouvernement. Enfin, des statistiques de la police chinoise font état de la fermeture d'au moins huit mille cafés Internet au cours des deux derniers mois.

Reporters Sans Frontières defends jailed journalists and press freedom throughout the world, that is, the right to inform and be informed, in accordance with Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Reporters Sans Frontières has nine branches (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland), representatives in Bangkok, Tokyo, Washington and Abidjan and more than
Thanks for everyones responses. I will try to address everyone's questions. This is a local survey. The client has pinpointed 2 neighborhoods (approximately 5000 households) to survey. He also stated that there were 400-450 Jewish households in these 2 neighborhoods but doesn't know the age of the occupants (55 or older is eligibility). Methodology has been somewhat tricky because the budget will not
allow us to canvass all households. We ran census data and GIS in hopes to isolate census tracts and block groups with higher proportions of people over the age of 55. We had a little luck but not much. The client suggested we do a reverse lookup and find last names that "sound" Jewish and interview those households (not real comfortable with that for several reasons).

The survey asks questions about housing adequacy, transportation issues, special needs, demographics, etc. The client is concerned that there has been a large migration of Jewish people therefore some services are being cut. He is concerned that Jewish people who have stayed in the neighborhoods are not getting the services they need.

I hope this helps a bit more.

Thanks for your feedback in advance,
Terrie

>From llawton@informative.com Mon Jul  2 14:06:02 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f62L62J11950 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 14:06:02 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from sfrexch.cahoots.com ([63.83.135.211])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA15861 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 14:06:01 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by SFREXCH with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    id <MHQBD36Y>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 12:51:50 -0800
Message-ID: <6FFA5AEBCD9ED311861A00508B0E71FBC12E828SFREXCH>
From: Leora Lawton <llawton@informative.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: US Representative cities
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2001 12:51:49 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="----=_NextPart_001_01C10338.D07B54C0"

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

----=_NextPart_001_01C10338.D07B54C0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Once upon a time I read that there are some cities that are 'known' to be representative of the US market and are therefore often selected by companies
to do trials of their products, and I seem to remember that Providence, RI is one of them. Anyone know anything about this? thanks,

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Research
Informative, Inc.
2000 Sierra Point Parkway, Suite 310
Brisbane, CA  94005
v: 650 534-1080; f: 650 534-1020
m: 650 303-4072
www.informative.com
Charles Lindblom noted in POLITICS AND MARKETS back in 1978 that all polyarchies are market systems, but not all market systems are polyarchies. Hence, a market system is necessary, but not sufficient, for an open society. The only thing I find odd in the New Republic article is that this philosophy is attributed to Clinton alone; actually, many conservative theorists have been stating that opening markets creates open societies since at least the Reagan administration.

Frank Rusciano
Reminds me of the old Jimmie Stewart movie, "Magic Town". I'd be interested to hear if there are such cities and how they are deemed as representative today.

Bill McCready
Knowledge Networks
Chicago

-----Original Message-----
From: Leora Lawton [mailto:llawton@informative.com]
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2001 3:52 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: US Representative cities

Once upon a time I read that there are some cities that are 'known' to be representative of the US market and are therefore often selected by companies to do
trials of their products, and I seem to remember that Providence, RI is one of them.
Anyone know anything about this? thanks,

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Research
Informative, Inc.
2000 Sierra Point Parkway, Suite 310
Brisbane, CA  94005
v: 650 534-1080; f: 650 534-1020
m: 650 303-4072
www.informative.com

----- =_NextPart_001_01C10340.6FF2D4E0
Content-Type: text/html;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN"> <HTML><HEAD>
<META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">
<META content="MSHTML 5.50.4522.1800" name=GENERATOR>

<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>
<DIV><SPAN class=023014421-02072001><FONT face="Microsoft Sans Serif"
    color=#0000ff size=2>Reminds me of the old Jimmie Stewart movie, "Magic
    Town". I'd be interested to hear if there are such cities and how they are deemed as
    representative today.&nbsp;</FONT></SPAN></DIV>

<DIV><SPAN class=023014421-02072001><FONT face="Microsoft Sans Serif"
    color=#0000ff size=2>Bill McCready</FONT></SPAN><BR>

<DIV><SPAN class=023014421-02072001><FONT face=Tahoma><BR><FONT
    size=2><SPAN class=023014421-02072001><STRONG><FONT face="Microsoft Sans
    Serif">-----Original Message-----</FONT></STRONG></SPAN></FONT></DIV></FONT>

<DIV><SPAN class=023014421-02072001><B>From:</B> Leora Lawton
    [mailto:llawton@informative.com]<BR><B>Sent:</B> Monday, July 02, 2001 3:52
    PM<BR><B>To:</B> aapornet@usc.edu<BR><B>Subject:</B> US Representative
    cities<BR><BR></SPAN></DIV>

<DIV><SPAN class=023014421-02072001><FONT face="Arial color="#0000ff size=2">Once
    upon a time I read that there are some cities that are 'known' to
    be representative of the US market and are therefore often selected by
    companies to do trials of their products, and I seem to remember that
    Providence, RI is one of them. &nbsp;Anyone know anything about
    this?&lt;/SPAN&gt;&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;
Leora Lawton, Ph.D.<br>Director of Research<br>Informative, Inc.<br>Brisbane, CA 94005<br>650 534-1080; f: 650 534-1020

From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Mon Jul  2 15:30:25 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f62MUOJ16335 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 15:30:24 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.47]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id PAA18294 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 15:30:20 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from oemcomputer ([12.85.9.211]) by mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net (InterMail vM.4.01.03.16 201-229-121-116-20010115) with SMTP id <20010702222948.NJDD13460.mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net@oemcomputer>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 15:30:48 -0700
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.20010702172905.006e6f40@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>
X-Sender: Jim-Wolf@postoffice.worldnet.att.net
Date: Mon, 02 Jul 2001 17:29:05 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net>
Subject: Re: US Representative cities
In-Reply-To: <6FFA5AEBCD9ED311861A00508B0E71FBC12E82@SFREXCH>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
I'd be very suspicious about a real "Magic Town", but Jimmy Stewart and Jane Wyman starred in a fluffy little comedy of the same name made back in the '40's about a public opinion researcher who hits paydirt when he finds such a town, only to have his dream spoiled (and his heart taken?) by the lovely but righteous publisher of the local newspaper.

Ah...they don't make 'em like that anymore.

At 12:51 PM 7/2/01 -0800, Leora Lawton wrote:
>Once upon a time I read that there are some cities that are 'known' to be representative of the US market and are therefore often selected by companies to do trials of their products, and I seem to remember that Providence, RI is one of them.
Anyone know anything about this? thanks

==-=--=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=
Jim Wolf Jim-Wolf@att.net
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Jul  2 20:31:18 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f633VHJ28822 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001
20:31:17 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id UAA23184 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 20:31:17 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f633VIS16624 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Jul 2001 20:31:18 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2001 20:31:18 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: New Opinion Website: Americans and the World
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0107021952070.22674-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I post this announcement to AAPORNET on behalf of the good people at a new public attitudes and opinion Website, "Americans and the World" (http://www.americans-world.org/).
On a quick visit just completed, I found the site an authoritative and useful contribution to our collective study of public opinion, attitudes and beliefs, including both North American opinion on international issues and the rest
of the world, and also global opinion on these same and other
issues.

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Americans and the World < http://www.americans-world.org >
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

From: Americans and the World <listserv@americans-world.org>
Subject: US Public Opinion on International Issues

The Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) is proud to
announce the launch of its new website, "Americans and the World"
(http://www.americans-world.org/). This website will report on US
public opinion on a broad range of international policy issues,
integrating all publicly available polling data. It will be
continually updated as new data become available, so that you are
assured that you are getting a 'state of the art' analysis.

Today we are releasing our inaugural report on: US Relations with
China.

In our "Digest" section you will find brief summaries followed by
in depth analysis of public attitudes on China with sections on:

General Attitudes Toward China
Nature of the US-China Relationship
Engagement with China
Human Rights and Relations with China
Trade with China
Chinese Nuclear Proliferation
Taiwan
   Defending Taiwan
   Arms Sales to Taiwan
Hong Kong
The Spy Plane Incident

Over the coming weeks and months PIPA will be releasing
additional reports on such subjects as biotechnology, the United
Nations, global population issues, Russia, global warming, Africa,
international trade, and many other topics. Gradually we will
build a comprehensive resource on US public opinion on international
issues.

Our hope and expectation is that this will provide a valuable
resource for policymakers, journalists, researchers, non-governmental
organizations, students, and all individuals who would like to know
more about American public opinion.

PIPA is a joint program of the Center on Policy Attitudes and the
Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, School of
Public Affairs, University of Maryland.
Prior to, say, the 1990 Census, markets like Peoria, Syracuse, Quad Cities, and others were popular for testing new products. The criteria were that the population demographics were close to the U.S. in total, and something referred to as "media isolation" (what it sounds like) for better control of advertising exposure. With
changing demographics since 1990, the growth of cable and other alternative media,
and a reduction in the number of new brands (brands, not products), companies are
doing less of this, I think.
Plus there is more "laboratory" test marketing. IRI and AC Nielsen, which
track consumer purchasing and new products, would be the best sources of
information about what is done today.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Leora Lawton <llawton@informative.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Monday, July 02, 2001 5:07 PM
Subject: US Representative cities

>Once upon a time I read that there are some cities that are 'known' to
>be representative of the US market and are therefore often selected by
>companies to do trials of their products, and I seem to remember that
>Providence, RI is one of them. Anyone know anything about this?
>thanks,
>
>Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
>Director of Research
>Informative, Inc.
>2000 Sierra Point Parkway, Suite 310
>Brisbane, CA 94005
>v: 650 534-1080; f: 650 534-1020
>m: 650 303-4072
>www.informative.com
>
>From lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU Tue Jul  3 06:11:39 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f63DBcJ00842 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001
06:11:38 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (eeyore.cc.uic.edu [128.248.171.51])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GA08201 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001 06:11:40 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (smtp.srl.uic.edu [131.193.93.96])
    by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id IAA15359
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001 08:11:39 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 03 Jul 2001 08:07:49 -0500
Message-Id: <sb417d55.009@SRL.UIC.EDU>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
I got this too and wonder how I ended up on their listserver. Linda

>>> James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu> 07/02/01 10:31pm
>>> 

I post this announcement to AAPORNET on behalf of the good people at a new public attitudes and opinion Website, "Americans and the World" (http://www.americans-world.org/). On a quick visit just completed, I found the site an authoritative and useful contribution to our collective study of public opinion, attitudes and beliefs, including both North American opinion on international issues and the rest of the world, and also global opinion on these same and other issues.

-- Jim

Americans and the World < http://www.americans-world.org

The Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) is proud to announce the launch of its new website, "Americans and the World" (http://www.americans-world.org/). This website will report on US public opinion on a broad range of international policy issues, integrating all publicly available polling data. It will be continually updated as new data become available, so that you are assured that you are getting a 'state of the art' analysis.

Today we are releasing our inaugural report on: US Relations with China.

In our "Digest" section you will find brief summaries followed by in depth analysis of public attitudes on China with sections on:

General Attitudes Toward China
Nature of the US-China Relationship
Engagement with China
Human Rights and Relations with China
Trade with China
Chinese Nuclear Proliferation
Taiwan
    Defending Taiwan
    Arms Sales to Taiwan
Hong Kong
The Spy Plane Incident

Over the coming weeks and months PIPA will be releasing additional reports on such subjects as biotechnology, the United Nations, global population issues, Russia, global warming, Africa, international trade, and many other topics. Gradually we will build a comprehensive resource on US public opinion on international issues.

Our hope and expectation is that this will provide a valuable resource for policymakers, journalists, researchers, non-governmental organizations, students, and all individuals who would like to know more about American public opinion.

PIPA is a joint program of the Center on Policy Attitudes and the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland.

"Americans and the World" is made possible by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Tides Foundation, and the Compton Foundation.

Please Note: PIPA will notify you by e-mail whenever new reports are being released. If you do not wish to receive future notifications please let us know.

If you have friends or co-workers who you think might be interested in receiving notifications regarding new releases, please direct them to the "Americans and the World" website (http://www.americans-world.org/) where they can sign up for our listserv.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Americans and the World < http://www.americans-world.org
>  
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

*****

>From teresa.hottle@wright.edu Tue Jul  3 07:05:06 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f63E55J03072 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001
07:05:06 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mailserv.wright.edu (mailserv.wright.edu [130.108.128.60])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id HAA25498 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001 07:05:07 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON mailserv.wright.edu by mailserv.wright.edu
(PMDF
Thanks for all the good ideas. Unfortunately the client does not want a telephone survey which was my first choice of methodology. We were thinking about contacting the Synagogue to get a listed sample and I like the idea of using the snowball technique. I will probably have to get more information from the client and then make a decision. At least I have more options now.

Thanks,
Terrie
At least with a list from a synagogue, you have a sampling frame with at least some integrity. Otherwise, as I said, you just can't generalize, and that doesn't help the client at all. Best of luck. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
Des Moines  
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com  
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
Thank you Jim for your kind comments on our effort. We are committed to making public opinion on international policy issues available as widely as possible to the public, media and to policymakers. We would like to encourage AAPOR members and other pollsters who share our goal of giving public opinion a greater impact on policy to let us know about findings they may have that are relevant to a discussion of public opinion and international policy issues. We make extensive efforts to include data from many sources utilizing the polling archives available on the web and on CD. No search is ever perfect however, and we welcome any additional information.
To answer Linda's question, we compiled our list from our own database of policymakers, researchers, and media, as well as including public opinion professionals, particularly active members of AAPOR, whom we thought would be interested in the site. It is our first attempt at a list serve, so we apologize for any omissions and any inappropriate or duplicate mailings. If you would like to be included in our future mailings as we expand the site to cover new and interesting topics, there is a page on our site "Americans and the World" website (http://www.americans-world.org/) that allows you to submit your contact information.

Thanks,
Monica Wolford

Linda Owens wrote:

> I got this too and wonder how I ended up on their listserver. Linda
> > James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu> 07/02/01 10:31pm
> >
> > I post this announcement to AAPORNENET on behalf of the good
> > people at a new public attitudes and opinion Website,
> > "Americans and the World"
> > (http://www.americans-world.org/).
> > On a quick visit just completed, I found the site an
> > authoritative and useful contribution to our collective study
> > of public opinion, attitudes and beliefs, including both
> > North American opinion on international issues and the rest
> > of the world, and also global opinion on these same and
> > other
> > issues.
> > -- Jim
> >
> > Americans and the World <http://www.americans-world.org>
> >
> > From: Americans and the World <listserv@americans-world.org>
> > Subject: US Public Opinion on International Issues
> >
> > The Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) is proud to
> > announce the launch of its new website, "Americans and the World"
> > (http://www.americans-world.org/). This website will report on
> > public opinion on a broad range of international policy issues,
> > integrating all publicly available polling data. It will be
> > continually updated as new data become available, so that you
> > are
> > assured that you are getting a 'state of the art' analysis.
Today we are releasing our inaugural report on: US Relations with China.

In our "Digest" section you will find brief summaries followed by in depth analysis of public attitudes on China with sections on:

- General Attitudes Toward China
- Nature of the US-China Relationship
- Engagement with China
- Human Rights and Relations with China
- Trade with China
- Chinese Nuclear Proliferation
- Taiwan
  - Defending Taiwan
  - Arms Sales to Taiwan
- Hong Kong
- The Spy Plane Incident

Over the coming weeks and months PIPA will be releasing additional reports on such subjects as biotechnology, the United Nations, global population issues, Russia, global warming, Africa, international trade, and many other topics. Gradually we will build a comprehensive resource on US public opinion on international issues.

Our hope and expectation is that this will provide a valuable resource for policymakers, journalists, researchers, non-governmental organizations, students, and all individuals who would like to know more about American public opinion.

PIPA is a joint program of the Center on Policy Attitudes and the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland.

"Americans and the World" is made possible by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Tides Foundation, and the Compton Foundation.

Please Note: PIPA will notify you by e-mail whenever new reports are being released. If you do not wish to receive future notifications please let us know.

If you have friends or co-workers who you think might be interested in receiving notifications regarding new releases, please direct them to the "Americans and the World" website (http://www.americans-world.org/) where they can sign up for our listserv.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
A city that is "representative" of the US market for one type of service or product is not necessarily representative for others, so test markets vary depending on what you are trying to test. Other variables include whether trials are for new products, brand extensions or new marketing of existing products. Media considerations can be as important as demographics. Also, markets change over time, so a city that might
have provided a good test market for a product 10 or 20 years ago may no
longer fit the bill.

IRI's Behaviorscan provides test markets in which various marketing variables
can be controlled in what they call a "laboratory" environment characterized by
media isolation (little or no over-the-air broadcast TV reception and a cable
company that can split commercials by households) and high scanner identification (nearly
all supermarket sales can be identified by household).

I believe the current Behaviorscan markets are Pittsfield, MA; Marion, IN; Eau
Claire, WI; Midland, TX; Grand Junction, CO; and Cedar Rapids, IA. Previous
markets included Williamsport, PA; Rome, GA; Salem, OR; and Visalia, CA.

While IRI tracks behavior through a recruited panel and supermarket scanners,
many of the characteristics that qualify a market for Behaviorscan may make it
attractive for other test marketing.

Jan Werner

At 12:51 PM 7/2/01 -0800, Leora Lawton wrote:

> Once upon a time I read that there are some cities that are 'known'
> to be representative of the US market and are therefore often selected
> by companies to do trials of their products, and I seem to remember
> that Providence, RI is one of them. Anyone know anything about this?
> From joespaeth1@home.com Tue Jul 3 10:22:47 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f63HM1J19072 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001
10:22:47 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from femail13.sdcl.sfba.home.com (femail13.sdcl.sfba.home.com
[24.0.95.140])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id KAA23183 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001 10:22:48 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [65.12.163.243] by femail13.sdcl.sfba.home.com
  (InterMail vM.4.01.03.20 201-229-121-120-20010223) with ESMTP
  Tue, 3 Jul 2001 10:22:40 -0700
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express Macintosh Edition - 4.5 (0410)
Date: Tue, 03 Jul 2001 10:24:34 -0700
Subject: Re: Jewish survey
From: "Joe Spaeth" <joespaeth1@home.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-version: 1.0
Terrie:

Starting with the Synagogue list and working out from there sounds like a good idea. I hope "snowball" is shorthand for multiplicity. The difference between a snowball sample and a multiplicity sample is that the probability of selection is known. For your survey, you could ask respondents to nominate their living parents, siblings, and adult children, not living with them. You could then interview them. Because you are dealing with a limited area, you might consider stopping when you get no new nominations. What makes this procedure a multiplicity, and therefore probability, sample is that you can find out the number of nominees by asking original respondents how many of each there are. You can then weight your data accordingly. I don't see how you could make this procedure work with friends, an accurate number of which is probably unknowable. A reference is Sudman, Sirken, and Cowan (1988): Sampling rare and elusive populations; Science, 240 (4855), 991-996.

Good luck.

Joe Spaeth

----------
> From: Teresa Hottle <teresa.hottle@wright.edu>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Jewish survey
> Date: Tue, Jul 3, 2001, 7:01 AM
> 
> Thanks for all the good ideas. Unfortunately the client does not want a telephone survey which was my first choice of methodology. We were thinking about contacting the Synagogue to get a listed sample and I like the idea of using the snowball technique. I will probably have to get more information from the client and then make a decision. At least I have more options now.
> 
> Thanks,
> Terrie
> 
> From lvoigt@fhcrc.org Tue Jul 3 13:18:34 2001
> Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> id f63KIYJ05594 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001
We have found several phone numbers recently where the RDD interviewer is certain she has dialed the number correctly, but the person who answers denies that it is their phone number and will give another phone number when we ask for their phone number. The RDD interviewer calls the number back on another day with the same response. When I call these phone numbers, the response several times has been a recording that it is a voice mail box. The RDD interviewer thinks that at least some of these people may have a second line that they do not know about, and that the second line may be for voice mail or other extra phone services. The respondent denies that they have any additional lines. Has anyone else had this experience, or have a clue what may be going on?? This is a new occurrence for us and started about a year ago.

thanks!

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

>From teresa.hottle@wright.edu Tue Jul  3 13:32:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f63KWv0J07050 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001 13:32:57 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mailserv.wright.edu (mailserv.wright.edu [130.108.128.60])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
Interesting. We do a lot of RDD's and this hasn't happened yet. Have you asked the organization that you purchase your phone numbers from if they have any idea? What percentage of your phone numbers are having this problem? Do you think respondents are telling you this in hopes you don't call back? Some of our respondents have caught on to the game and make up things to tell us. Please let me know what kind of responses you receive from Aapornet. I'm very interested in this new phenom.

Terrie

"Voigt, Lynda" wrote:

> We have found several phone numbers recently where the RDD interviewer
> is certain she has dialed the number correctly, but the person who
> answers denies that it is their phone number and will give another
> phone number when we ask for their phone number. The RDD interviewer
> calls the number back on another day with the same response. When I
> call these phone numbers, the response several times has been a
> recording that it is a voice mail box. The RDD interviewer thinks that
> at least some of these people may have a second line that they do not
> know about, and that the second line may be for voice mail or other
> extra phone services. The respondent denies that they have any
> additional lines. Has anyone else had this experience, or have a clue
> what may be going on?? This is a new occurrence for us and started
> about a year ago.
Sounds like call forwarding, which allows you to have calls to one number automatically routed to another one, either for a limited time period, or until you cancel it.

Call forwarding is provided by some voice mail systems and answering devices, or as a separate service by some phone companies.

When the call is forwarded by an answering device or voice mail system, you may hear dialing or there may be a silent delay, but when the phone company service is used, there may be no indication at all that the call has been rerouted.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

"Voigt, Lynda" wrote:
>
I recall reading about this problem. I believe it was discussed in a back issue of "The Frame" which is published by Survey Sampling, Inc. <http://www.surveysampling.com/ssi_home.html>. Apparently, some phone companies assign secondary phone numbers to certain households in order to forward calls within their system for their own internal purposes. The end user is not aware that this secondary phone number exists. In such instances, you may think you have a single phone number, but you can actually be reached by two phone numbers -- your phone number and a secondary number that the phone company uses on your behalf. When someone dials this secondary number such as through RDD, they will indeed reach you, but you would have no way to know that they dialed this other number. I don't remember why the phone companies adopted this system, but I believe the article explained it. I suggest you contact the telephone companies to learn more about this practice.
The existence of these secondary phone numbers may bias the calculation of sample weights because the probability of respondent selection is based on the respondent's self-report of the number of phone lines serving the household and the number of eligible household members. Since a respondent is unaware of his/her secondary number phone number, s/he unknowingly provides survey researchers with inaccurate information with regard to the number of phone lines. Fortunately, according to the article I read, this practice of assigning secondary numbers is supposed to be rare.

At 7/3/2001 01:18 PM, you wrote:
> We have found several phone numbers recently where the RDD interviewer
> is certain she has dialed the number correctly, but the person who
> answers denies that it is their phone number and will give another
> phone number when we ask for their phone number. The RDD interviewer
> calls the number back on another day with the same response. When I
> call these phone numbers, the response several times has been a
> recording that it is a voice mail box. The RDD interviewer thinks that
> at least some of these people may have a second line that they do not
> know about, and that the second line may be for voice mail or other
> extra phone services. The respondent denies that they have any
> additional lines. Has anyone else had this experience, or have a clue
> what may be going on?? This is a new occurrence for us and started
> about a year ago.
> 
> thanks!
>
> Lynda Voigt
> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
> Seattle, WA
> lvoigt@fhcrc.org

===========================================
Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.
Director
Center for Family and Community Health
School of Public Health
University of California, Berkeley
WWW: http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH
===========================================

> From mitofsky@mindspring.com Tue Jul  3 15:36:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f63MavJ29749 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001
    15:36:57 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from granger.mail.mindspring.net (granger.mail.mindspring.net
    [207.69.200.148])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA11187 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001 15:36:59 -0700
(PDT)
From: mitofsky@mindspring.com
Received: from smui05.slb.mindspring.net (smui05.slb.mindspring.net
    [199.174.114.91])
    by granger.mail.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id SAA15751
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Jul 2001 18:36:58 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by smui05.slb.mindspring.net id SAA0000014377; Tue, 3 Jul 2001
I am missing something. I don't see how this type of sampling is a probability sample. At the very least it would seem to me that some people have a zero chance of selection. Could someone explain further, please.

warren mitofsky

aapornet@usc.edu wrote:

Terrie:
Starting with the Synagogue list and working out from there sounds like a good idea.
I hope "snowball" is shorthand for multiplicity. The difference between a snowball sample and a multiplicity sample is that the probability of selection is known. For your survey, you could ask respondents to nominate their living parents, siblings, and adult children, not living with them. You could then interview them. Because you are dealing with a limited area, you might consider stopping when you get no new nominations. What makes this procedure a multiplicity, and therefore probability, sample is that you can find out the number of nominees by asking original respondents how many of each there are. You can then weight your data accordingly. I don't see how you could make this procedure work with friends, an accurate number of which is probably unknowable. A reference is Sudman, Sirken, and Cowan (1988): Sampling rare and elusive populations; Science, 240 (4855), 991-996.

Good luck.

Joe Spaeth

---------

Thanks for all the good ideas. Unfortunately the client does not want a telephone survey which was my first choice of
methodology. We were thinking about contacting the Synagogue
to get a listed sample and I like the idea of using the
snowball technique. I will probably have to get more
information from the client and then make a decision. At
least I have more options now.

Thanks,
Terrie

A personal experience may be relevant here. I recently discovered that
two phone numbers and lines that I used to have are still in service,
although I don't pay for them. I have reported this to the phone company,
but I still get calls from persons who dial those numbers.

Norval Glenn
I should have added that at one time calls to those numbers were call forwarded to my main phone number. They still are.

Norval Glenn

In a message dated 7/3/01 10:05:40 AM, teresa.hottle@wright.edu writes:

<< We were thinking about contacting the Synagogue
to get a listed sample >>

A synagogue list may not be released to you anyway. Our membership directory, like other synagogues' directories I know, say the directory will not be used for commercial purposes. Nevertheless, it is a frame only of "affiliated Jews," just those choosing to join the synagogue AND have listed/releasable information. Some Jews living in a certain area also do not join the closest synagogue, but rather the one that appeals to them for various reasons the most, which could be further away. For example, since there are several branches of Judaism, one synagogue may not fit all Jews and those might not be members of the one synagogue you're considering.

Milton R. Goldsamt, PhD
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
I suggest you contact Jim Schwartz Research Director at United Jewish Communities in New York. They are in the middle of completing the National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) and the National Survey of Religious Identification (NSRI). They have confronted the full range of issues associated with conducting research among the Jewish population in the US.

Barry

Barry M. Feinberg, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President
Director, New York Office
CRI
One Penn Plaza
New York, New York 10119
212-330-1484
bfeinberg@customresearch.com
bmfein@aol.com
There are actually a number of possible explanations for such events. It might be easier to explain if I knew whether these numbers were from one local area or not, but based on our experience, the most likely sources within the overall telephone network itself are:

1) CALL FORWARDING. The fact that a number is forwarded is usually transparent to the recipient. If the forwarding was purposeful, the called party would probably be aware of the number you had called. Of course the possibility exists, as has been pointed out, that this was just another form of "soft refusal." [Was the phone number verification prior to, or after the interview?]

Erroneous call forwarding is also commonplace. With the increasing frequency of routine call forwarding from business numbers, cell phones, voice messaging systems and voice mail boxes, the likelihood of errors is quite high - these errors can occur from the phone company or individual telephone subscribers who enter the information themselves.

2) LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY. This is sort of a variation on the above, but telephone subscribers can now keep their "old telephone number" when they change providers (service provider portability) or when they move to a new residence outside the traditional geographic boundaries of their telephone exchange (geographic portability). In most cases these forwarded calls are transparent and correctly mapped, but errors do occur. During the initial implementation of service provider portability, it was almost a certainty that dialing either the ported number (i.e., the old number) and the "new" number to which the old was being forwarded, would result in the call connecting to the household (We alerted research companies to this, and the resultant multiple selection probabilities two years ago in a newsletter article.) Our understanding is that this was generally a thing of the past, but the possibility on a local level still exists.

3) LOCAL PHONE COMPANY/LONG DISTANCE CARRIER PROBLEMS. The most interesting thing related in your query was that different results were observed when the interviewers called than was found in the follow-up verification calls. We experience and have documented numerous discrepancies between call results across long distance carrier and also between placing calls on analog vs. digital lines (i.e., regular phone lines versus T1s). Could this be the situation: when the interviewer places the call from the call center it goes via a T1 while the follow-up call is from an office over a regular phone line?

The fact is, that most long distance carrier problems are transparent to the caller. We discovered one carrier who failed to update the Area Code table in one of their regional switches or two years after an Area Code split in Texas. This caused all calls to this Area Code routed through this Midwestern switch to be "non-working." [Needless to say we had a very unhappy client who of course blamed our "sample", when in fact, it was their long distance carrier.] The number of calls to the new area code would typically represent a small proportion of the total sample, even in a
statewide Texas survey. The only reason we were able to find it quickly was because it was a local study conducted by a research company whose long distance calls were all routed through this problem switch.

In some cases long distance carriers will return different messages: all NWs vs. No Answers; No Answers vs. Busy signals, etc. The biggest variations though seem to be between analog an digital calls.

4) RESPONDENT CONFUSION. Is there a possibility that the telephone numbers corresponded to a second or third phone line, a modem line, or a child's phone? In most cases this can be sorted out if you are speaking to the right person in the household, but often people aren't aware that if they have two voice lines there really are two different phone numbers - they may only give out their regular number but if someone reached them by directly dialing the second number its transparent to them.

In conclusion, the explosion over the past few years in the number of long distance carriers and new competitive local exchange carriers has strained the pool of expert technical telephone network talent - only so much to go around. Couple this with the increasing complexity of the communications network itself and the likelihood of routing problems/errors/messaging difficulties becomes almost a certainty. [Talk to research companies about their increasing difficulties in just getting T1s provisioned and set-up to specifications.] That is not to say that this is the cause of your problem, but the variation in call results is certainly suspicious.

This does not discount the fact that consumers themselves are dealing with telecommunications options that are prone to errors. For example, it is very possible that the owner of the number you actually dialed simply entered an incorrect digit and forwarded his line erroneously to the to the household's number you reached. Or, maybe there is a technical problem with the voice mail box system. Nothing would surprise me.

Lynda, if you would like us to look in to this particular problem, please contact me directly to transfer the telephone numbers in question. You can then post the results to AAPORNET.

Thank you,

Dale W. Kulp

Marketing Systems Group/GENESYS Sampling Systems
215-653-7100 (PH)
215-653-7115 (FX)
dkulp@m-s-g.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 4:18 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: question about phone numbers

We have found several phone numbers recently where the RDD interviewer is certain she has dialed the number correctly, but the person who answers denies that it is their phone number and will give another phone number when
we ask for their phone number. The RDD interviewer calls the number back on another day with the same response. When I call these phone numbers, the response several times has been a recording that it is a voice mail box. The RDD interviewer thinks that at least some of these people may have a second line that they do not know about, and that the second line may be for voice mail or other extra phone services. The respondent denies that they have any additional lines. Has anyone else had this experience, or have a clue what may be going on??? This is a new occurrence for us and started about a year ago.

thanks!

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

>From teresa.hottle@wright.edu Thu Jul  5 05:49:30 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f65CnUJ25159 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Jul 2001
05:49:30 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mailserv.wright.edu (mailserv.wright.edu [130.108.128.60])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id FAA29816 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Jul 2001 05:49:31 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON.mailserv.wright.edu by mailserv.wright.edu
   (PMDF V6.0-24 #45557) id <0GG0009013MHY9@mailserv.wright.edu> for
   aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 05 Jul 2001 08:49:29 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from wright.edu (al131037.wright.edu [130.108.131.37])
   by mailserv.wright.edu (PMDF V6.0-24 #45557)
   with ESMTP id <0GG0007BT3MHR7@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
   Thu, 05 Jul 2001 08:49:29 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Thu, 05 Jul 2001 08:48:56 -0400
From: Teresa Hottle <teresa.hottle@wright.edu>
Subject: Re: Jewish survey
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3B446238.4F97F44B@wright.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCMCD  (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <Springmail.105.994199818.0.09300700@www.springmail.com>

Yes, you are right. I had explained earlier that the client has not yet decided whether to go with a random sample survey or something like a marketing/needs assessment.

Terrie

mitofsky@mindspring.com wrote:
> 
> I am missing something. I don't see how this type of sampling is a probability sample. At the very least it would seem to me that some people have a zero
chance of selection. Could someone explain further, please.
> warren mitofsky
>
> aapornet@usc.edu wrote:
> > Terrie:
> > Starting with the Synagogue list and working out from there sounds like a
good idea. I hope "snowball" is shorthand for multiplicity. The
difference
> between a snowball sample and a multiplicity sample is that the probability
> of selection is known. For your survey, you could ask respondents to
> nominate their living parents, siblings, and adult children, not living
> with
> them. You could then interview them. Because you are dealing with a
> limited area, you might consider stopping when you get no new nominations.
> What makes this procedure a multiplicity, and therefore probability, sample
> is that you can find out the number of nominees by asking original
> respondents how many of each there are. You can then weight your data
> accordingly. I don't see how you could make this procedure work with
> friends, an accurate number of which is probably unknowable. A reference is
> Sudman, Sirken, and Cowan (1988): Sampling rare and elusive populations;
> Science, 240 (4855), 991-996.
> 
> Good luck.
>
> Joe Spaeth
>
> ---------
> >From: Teresa Hottle
> >To: aapornet@usc.edu
> >Subject: Jewish survey
> >Date: Tue, Jul 3, 2001, 7:01 AM
> >
> >Thanks for all the good ideas. Unfortunately the client does
> >not want a telephone survey which was my first choice of
> >methodology. We were thinking about contacting the Synagogue
> >to get a listed sample and I like the idea of using the
> >snowball technique. I will probably have to get more
> >information from the client and then make a decision. At
> >least I have more options now.
> >
> >Thanks,
>
> From dhagan@partnersinc.com Thu Jul  5 06:43:37 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
id f65DhaJ28654 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Jul 2001
06:43:36 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from amigo.partnersinc.com ([63.222.44.25])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id GAA14091 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Jul 2001 06:43:36 -0700
(PDT)
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Dale, that was good of you to comment!

You raise another question. What is the implication of all this for interpreting a typical distribution of final dispositions for response rate calculations?

My sense is that we are seeing a dramatic increase in the number of cases that end up as NA's over the last several years. And, we are generally unsuccessful in reducing this category even with dramatic extension of the call rule to 10+ attempts. Do these numbers reflect residences that we are not reaching because of inadequate LD carriers managing an increasingly complex set of customer options? Or, does all this confusion overstate the number of residences we are not getting to in typical RDD study?

-----Original Message-----
From: Dale Kulp &lt;DKulp@M-S-G.com&gt; 
Sent: Wednesday, July 04, 2001 1:30 PM 
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: question about phone numbers

There are actually a number of possible explanations for such events. It might be easier to explain if I knew whether these numbers were from one local area or not, but based on our experience, the most likely sources are:
1) CALL FORWARDING. The fact that a number is forwarded is usually transparent to the recipient. If the forwarding was purposeful, the called party would probably be aware of the number you had called. Of course the possibility exists, as has been pointed out, that this was just another form of "soft refusal." [Was the phone number verification prior to, or after the interview?]

Erroneous call forwarding is also commonplace. With the increasing frequency of routine call forwarding from business numbers, cell phones, voice messaging systems and voice mail boxes, the likelihood of errors is quite high - these errors can occur from the phone company or individual. telephone subscribers who enter the information themselves. 

2) LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY. This is sort of a variation on the above, but telephone subscribers can now keep their "old telephone number" when they change providers (service provider portability) or when they move to a new residence outside the traditional geographic boundaries of their telephone exchange (geographic portability). In most cases these forwarded calls are transparent and correctly mapped, but errors do occur. During the initial implementation of service provider portability, it was almost a certainty that dialing either the ported number (i.e., the old number) and the "new" number to which the old was being forwarded, would result in the call connecting to the household (We alerted research companies to this, and the resultant multiple selection probabilities two years ago in a newsletter.) Our understanding is that this was generally a thing of the past, but the possibility on a local level still exists.

3) LOCAL PHONE COMPANY/LONG DISTANCE CARRIER PROBLEMS. The most interesting thing related in your query was that different results were observed when
The interviewers called than was found in the follow-up verification calls.

We experience and have documented numerous discrepancies between call results across long distance carrier and also between placing calls on analog vs. digital lines (i.e., regular phone lines versus T1s). Could this be the situation: when the interviewer places the call from the call center it goes via a T1 while the follow-up call is from an office over a regular phone line?

The fact is, that most long distance carrier problems are transparent to the caller. We discovered one carrier who failed to update the Area Code table in one of their regional switches or two years after an Area Code split in Texas. This caused all calls to this Area Code to be "non-working." [Needless to say we had a very unhappy client who of course blamed our "sample", when in fact, it was their long distance carrier.] The number of calls to the new area code would typically represent a small proportion of the total sample, even in a statewide Texas survey. The only reason we were able to find it quickly was because it was a local study conducted by a research company whose long distance calls were all routed through this problem switch.

In some cases long distance carriers will return different messages: all NWs vs. No Answers; No Answers vs. Busy signals, etc. The biggest variations seem to be between analog and digital calls.

4) RESPONDENT CONFUSION. Is there a possibility that the telephone numbers corresponded to a second or third phone line, a modem line, or a child's phone? In most cases this can be sorted out if you are speaking to the right person in the household, but often people aren't aware that if they have two phones there really are two different phone numbers - they may only
give out their regular number but if someone reached them by directly

dialing the second number its transparent to them.

In conclusion, the explosion over the past few years in the number of long
distance carriers and new competitive local exchange carriers has strained
the pool of expert technical telephone network talent - only so much to go
around. Couple this with the increasing complexity of the communications
network itself and the likelihood of routing problems/errors/messaging
difficulties becomes almost a certainty. [Talk to research companies about]
their increasing difficulties in just getting T1s provisioned and set-up to
speficiations.] That is not to say that this is the cause of your problem,
but the variation in call results is certainly suspicious.

This does not discount the fact that consumers are dealing with
telecommunications options that are prone to errors. For example, it is

very possible that the owner of the number you actually dialed simply entered an incorrect digit and forwarded his line erroneously to the household's number you reached. Or, maybe there is a technical problem with the voice mail box system. Nothing would surprise me.

Lynda, if you would like us to look in to this particular problem, please
contact me directly to transfer the telephone numbers in question. You can
then post the results to AAPORNET.

Thank you,

Dale W. Kulp

Marketing Systems Group/GENESYS Sampling Systems
215-653-7100 (PH)
215-653-7115 (FX)
-----Original Message-----
From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 4:18 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: question about phone numbers

We have found several phone numbers recently where =
the RDD interviewer is

certain she has dialed the number correctly, but the =
person who answers

denies that it is their phone number and will give =
another phone number when

we ask for their phone number. The RDD =
interviewer calls the number back on

another day with the same response. When I =
call these phone numbers, the

response several times has been a recording that it =
is a voice mail box.
The RDD interviewer thinks that at least some of =
these people may have a

second line that they do not know about, and that =
the second line may be for

voice mail or other extra phone services. The =
respondent denies that they

have any additional lines. Has anyone else had =
this experience, or have a

clue what may be going on???

This is a new =
ocurrence for us and started

about a year ago.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA

lvoigt@fhcrc.org
See the new publication on "PROMOTING HEALTH - Intervention Strategies from Social and Behavioral Research"
Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. 800-624-6242

On Thu, 28 Jun 2001 10:14:04 -0700 "H. Stuart Elway" <hstuart@elwayresearch.com> writes:
Aapornetters,
We are starting a project on "non-medical determinants of health" and I am looking for pertinent opinion research. Variables on the current list include such things as: lifestyle, income, diet, exercise, alcohol, fire arms, excessive attention to polls, etc. It's a wide net at this point.
As always, I would appreciate any references and/or guidance.

H.Stuart Elway
Elway Research, Inc.
206/264-1500
NEW E-MAIL: hstuart@elwayresearch.com
Website: www.elwayresearch.com

"PROMOTING HEALTH - Intervention Strategies from Social and Behavioral Research"
On Thu, 28 Jun 2001 10:14:04 -0700 "H. Stuart Elway" &lt;hstuart@elwayresearch.com&gt; writes:

Aapornetters,

We are starting a project on "non-medical determinants of health" and I am looking for pertinent opinion research. Variables on the current list include such things as: lifestyle, income, diet, exercise, alcohol, fire arms, excessive attention to polls, etc. It's a wide net at this point.

As always, I would appreciate any references and/or guidance.

H. Stuart Elway
Elway Research
206/264-1500
NEW E-MAIL: hstuart@elwayresearch.com
Website: www.elwayresearch.com
You should also look at the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) which is sponsored by the CDC and executed in almost every state monthly. Most of the items mentioned are covered either in the core or are rotated in periodically.

Edward C. Ratledge, Director
Center for Applied Demography & Survey Research
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-1684
ratledge@udel.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Jack Elinson [mailto:jelinson@juno.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2001 7:43 AM
To: hstuart@elwayresearch.com
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Non-medical determinants of health

See the new publication on "PROMOTING HEALTH - Intervention Strategies from Social and Behavioral Research"
Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C.
800-624-6242

On Thu, 28 Jun 2001 10:14:04 -0700 "H. Stuart Elway" <hstuart@elwayresearch.com> writes:

Aapornetters,  
We are starting a project on "non-medical determinants of heath" and I am looking for pertinent opinion research. Variables on the current list include such things as: lifestyle, income, diet, exercise, alcohol, fire arms, excessive attention to polls, etc. It's a wide net at this point.  
As always, I would appreciate any references and/or guidance.

H.Stuart Elway
Elway Research, Inc.
206/264-1500
NEW E-MAIL: hstuart@elwayresearch.com
Website: www.elwayresearch.com
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You should also look at the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) which is sponsored by the CDC and executed in almost every state monthly. Most of the items mentioned are covered either in the core or are rotated in periodically.

Edward C. Ratledge, Director
Center for Applied Demography & Survey Research
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-1684
ratledge@udel.edu

See the new publication on "PROMOTING HEALTH - Intervention Strategies from Social and Behavioral Research"

Aapornetters, We are starting a project on "non-medical determinants of health" and I am looking for pertinent opinion research. Variables on the current list include such things as: lifestyle, income, diet, exercise, alcohol, fire arms, excessive attention to polls, etc. It's a wide net at this point.

H. Stuart Elway
Elway Research, Inc.
206/264-1500
NEW E-MAIL:
AAPORNETters from cross-tabbers to multivariate analysts will appreciate immediately the many possibilities to test empirically the various analogies and arguments in Michael Barone's newest book, "The New Americans: How the Melting Pot Can Work Again," as reviewed below by syndicated columnist Jim Pinkerton on my own Internet list, "The Triumph of Content."

The essence of Barone's argument in "The New Americans," which more specifically compares U.S. minority groups of 2000 with the major immigrant groups of 1900: "Blacks resemble Irish, Latinos resemble Italians, Asians resemble Jews."

Pinkerton's judgment: "That assertion will startle some, but over the course of 279 pages, the author is persuasive."

For us obdurate empiricists of AAPORNET, of course, the question must be: What do the best relevant data tell us? Or, for those of us who can't wait that long to express an opinion: What do we guess that the data *will* tell us, once we get around to marshaling it toward Barone's seemingly superficial analysis?

And your answer is? -- Jim
For more than two centuries, Fourth of July celebrations have offered Americans the chance to reflect upon the American experiment, and how the union might become more perfect. But in recent years, a new source of concern for many has been the combination of increased immigration and increased cultural fragmentation. Now Michael Barone has written a new book in which he argues that we can relax about the former if we can deal with the latter—although the proper response, for those looking ahead another fifty or so Fourths, is a cautious "maybe."

Barone, of course, is the well-known columnist and commentator; the Almanac of American Politics, which he co-authors, is the biennial bible of the election junky. But in The New Americans: How the Melting Pot Can Work Again, Barone argues that the US is not facing an immigration crisis; what we are seeing today is merely the latest chapter in an old saga—the always challenging but never hopeless struggle to assimilate aliens into Americans.

Then Barone makes more daring claims, specifically comparing minority groups of 2000 with immigrant groups of 1900: "Blacks resemble Irish, Latinos resemble Italians, Asians resemble Jews." That assertion will startle some, but over the course of 279 pages, the author is persuasive.

Blacks today, for instance, are almost all refugees from the South, where they were oppressed by a dominant race that disrupted familial patterns and left them mistrustful of the law and its enforcers. Yet the Irish, too, a century-and-a-half ago, were fleeing oppression, in their case, the iron fist of the British. The Irish then, and blacks now, have suffered from high rates of crime, substance abuse, and family breakup. And yet the Irish eventually pulled themselves out of their rut of social dysfunction and joined the productive mainstream. And so too can blacks today, Barone declares.

Whoa. Aren't blacks marked for difference—and discrimination—by their skin color? Barone concedes that point, but he notes that the Irish were also thought of as a distinct—and distinctly hopeless—"race" in the 19th century. As just one piece of evidence in a work fat with footnotes, he cites a 1904 book, Freckles, in which the author could refer to a character's "Irish face," confident that readers would draw their own appropriate mental picture.

As for Latinos now and Italians then, both have hailed from Catholic lands, where the governments have varied from the passively venal to the actively vicious; in response, both groups learned to put their trust only in church, clan, and their own strong backs. And as for Asians and Jews, both come from cultures that prized delayed gratification, learning, and literacy, and both flourished when they arrived in a land of entrepreneurial opportunity.

So far, so good, so similar. But as Barone himself notes, the fly in his argument is the attitude of today's elites. The racists and exclusionists of the past were not nearly as destructive, he maintains, as the condescending affirmative actioneers andquotacrats of the
Perhaps, but there's another issue as well. America is going through the greatest wave of immigration in its history, and that wave has far from crested. More than 10 million people entered the US legally in the decade ending in 1998, according to latest data from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and an unknown number—estimates vary widely—entered illegally.

Meanwhile, the Census Bureau projects that in the next 50 years, the population of the US, currently 285 million, could swell to as much as 553 million. Almost all of that growth will come immigrants, and the children of immigrants. And most newcomers will be from Latin America, which even today has a population of more than half a billion.

In which case, maybe Barone's Latin-Italian analogy will break down, as this new group becomes so huge it no longer melts into the pot—perhaps because it is too big for the pot. In which case, even if the artificial multiculturalism of the politically correct disappears, it could be replaced by a far sturdier biculturalism, as two huge ethnic blocs, one English-speaking and one Spanish-speaking, vie for power.

The New Americans offers answers to past questions of ethnicity, but it does not provide the answer to this future question of immigration overload, which might be the biggest question of all.

###

Triumph-of-Content-l@usc.edu

Jim Pinkerton's column for Thursday

*****
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  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
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Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Sender: margolis@email.uc.edu
Message-Id: <p04320402b76b71fc52ff10@[129.137.72.182]>
Date: Fri, 6 Jul 2001 09:56:19 -0400
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: Mike Margolis <Michael.Margolis@uc.edu>
Subject: RE: Non-medical determinants of health
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
Consider public health measures: condition of water supply, sewage disposal, air quality, food sanitation and general nutrition etc. Historically, these have had far more impact on the overall health and life expectancy of the population than have individual behaviors.

--
Michael Margolis
Department of Political Science
University of Cincinnati
P.O. Box 210375
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375
Tel: 513-556-3310
Fax: 513-556-2314

From JAnnSelzer@aol.com Fri Jul 6 07:10:18 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f66EAHJ14420 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Jul 2001 07:10:17 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from imo-m06.mx.aol.com (imo-m06.mx.aol.com [64.12.136.161])
Thanks to all who directed me to the Sage website. One of the books just arrived and in the simplest possible way, endorsed what I'd been trying to tell the newspaper graphics artists with little success: "Pie charts begin at 12.00 and are read clockwise." How often do we see this very basic rule violated?! Can you tell this is a pet peeve? JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
JAS,

Rules are nothing more than attempts to routinize the behavior of creative individuals who can do the same things by instinct or intuition or magic--call it what you like. We also have rules to keep cars from crashing into each other head-on, and I'm all for this as well, believe me.

That said, many rules are entirely arbitrary, silly and often constraining or even subversive. For example, since the 15th century--and for much of my own life--men were blond while women were blonde. Even as a child I felt stupid obeying such a rule (which I had to do to show that I had learned my "English," even though I am a native speaker, and the son of native speakers). Today I can also begin to understand what such rules say about the status of women in society: Women are linguistically more exotic than are men, or at least they are in English--and this is not entirely a good deal for either men or women.

The rule "pie charts begin at 12.00" seems to me just as arbitrary and silly as blond/e. Is anyone smart enough to read a pie chart going to be too dumb to understand it if it does not happen to "begin" at 12.00? And what could it possibly mean that a necessarily circular chart "begins" somewhere? Is anyone besides me surprised to learn that there exist people who think pie charts have beginnings--or even *ought to* have beginnings? All Western clocks "begin" only where they "end"--at the top--after all, so we can find little comfort in this approach from even our own timepieces.
And the Sage rule is obviously made to be broken. If the several categories in a pie chart had appeared in a chronological order, for example, I might want the earliest one to appear toward the left of the pie, and the most recent to appear toward the right, in keeping with the venerable Western cultural tradition that time flows as we read—from left to right (such an arrangement is easy to describe but often hard to achieve in a pie, I will admit). In short, the communication task at hand will be obvious to most researchers—especially if they trust in their own knowledge of the subject and data collected, and in the common cultural sense they will share with their readers.

I write you, JAS, mainly to say this: If I were as fortunate as you are to work with professional graphic artists, the very last thing I would want to do is to read them some rule from a Sage publication. What I suggest you do is to explain the communication problem—as you yourself see it—to your artists, let them tackle it based on their own graphic training, and insist that they explain and justify their approach to you in great detail. I would also urge you to take notes on what they say, so that you can report back to all of us, and also that you argue with the artists as vigorously as you can, but of course—you are all on the same side, after all, in the struggle to get your research results into the minds of your readers.

Late at night, just before dropping off to sleep, you might actually wish to visit more eternal questions such as this: If such life questions as yours here could really be decided by short and concise rules-declared-conventions, courtesy of Sage Publications, would life really be worth living, after all? Shall we shoot all of our artists, or keep a few around just for the laughs?  

-- Jim

On Fri, 6 Jul 2001 JAnnSelzer@aol.com wrote:

> Thanks to all who directed me to the Sage website. One of the books just arrived and in the simplest possible way, endorsed what I'd been trying to tell the newspaper graphics artists with little success: "Pie charts begin at 12.00 and are read clockwise." How often do we see this very basic rule violated?! Can you tell this is a pet peeve? JAS
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FYI: It appears that biracial couples/partners are still fairly rare. Census (2000) reported that 97.4% of married couples are of the same race, while 1.9% are interracial. 3% of married couples are Hispanic+non-Hispanic. Unmarried partner households (4% of total) are also mostly same race couples (94.6%), but are more likely to be interracial (4.3%) or Hispanic+non-Hispanic (5.8%) than married partners. 2000 America's Families and Living Arrangements: http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p20-537.pdf

>From 1990 Census Interracial Tables: http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/interrace.html : Here is the percent of same race/ethnicity couples:

Total: 97
White: 97
Black: 93
American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut: 26 (71% were married to a white partner)
Asian, Pacific Islander: 70 (29% married to a white partner)

Hispanic Origin: 97%
--Mexican: 69 (partnered with another of Hispanic origin)
--Puerto Rican: 55
--Cuban: 63
Biracial Couples Report Tolerance
Survey Finds Most Are Accepted by Families
By Darryl Fears and Claudia Deane
Washington Post Staff Writers
Thursday, July 5, 2001; Page A01
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Note this interesting study…! Links below.
It appears that biracial couples/partners are still fairly rare. Census (2000) reported that 97.4% of married couples are of the same race, while 1.9% are interracial. Unmarried partner households (4% of total) are also mostly same race couples (94.6%), but are more likely to be interracial (4.3%) or Hispanic+non-Hispanic (5.8%) than married partners. From 1990 Census Interracial Tables: Here is the percent of same race/ethnicity couples:

From 1990 Census Interracial Tables: Here is the percent of same race/ethnicity couples:
Total: 97

White: 97

Black: 93

American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut: 26 (71% were married to a white partner)
Asian, Pacific Islander: 70 (29% married to a white partner)

Hispanic Origin:
--Mexican: 69 (partnered with another of Hispanic origin)
--Puerto Rican: 55
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I guess the "rule" that quadrants in a Cartesian plane be numbered I through IV, starting at the upper right and continuing clockwise might also be discarded as equally arbitrary. In other words . . .

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
I'm 99% in agreement with Jim Beniger's position. However, because he's such a free-form kind of guy, I wonder why he wants to follow the "rule" of reading time from left to right. Why not let the staff artists handle that in the way that makes most sense to them? In other words, why sneer at one arbitrary rule (starting the pie chart at 12:00) while bowing toward another one (starting time on the left)? C'mon, Jim -- loosen up!

Lee Sigelman
Rules are nothing more than attempts to routinize the behavior of creative individuals who can do the same things by instinct or intuition or magic--call it what you like. We also have rules to keep cars from crashing into each other head-on, and I'm all for this as well, believe me.

That said, many rules are entirely arbitrary, silly and often constraining or even subversive. For example, since the 15th century--and for much of my own life--men were blond while women were blonde. Even as a child I felt stupid obeying such a rule (which I had to do to show that I had learned my "English," even though I am a native speaker, and the son of native speakers). Today I can also begin to understand what such rules say about the status of women in society: Women are linguistically more exotic than are men, or at least they are in English--and this is not entirely a good deal for either men or women.

The rule "pie charts begin at 12.00" seems to me just as arbitrary and silly as blond/e. Is anyone smart enough to read a pie chart going to be too dumb to understand it if it does not happen to "begin" at 12.00? And what could it possibly mean that a necessarily circular chart "begins" somewhere? Is anyone besides me surprised to learn that there exist people who think pie charts have beginnings--or even *ought to* have beginnings? All Western clocks "begin" only where they "end"--at the top--after all, so we can find little comfort in this approach from even our own timepieces.

And the Sage rule is obviously made to be broken. If the several
categories in a pie chart had appeared in a chronological order, for example, I might want the earliest one to appear toward the left of the pie, and the most recent to appear toward the right, in keeping with the venerable Western cultural tradition that time flows as we read—from left to right (such an arrangement is easy to describe but often hard to achieve in a pie, I will admit). In short, the communication task at hand will be obvious to most researchers—especially if they trust in their own knowledge of the subject and data collected, and in the common cultural sense they will share with their readers.

I write you, JAS, mainly to say this: If I were as fortunate as you are to work with professional graphic artists, the very last thing I would want to do is to read them some rule from a Sage publication. What I suggest you do is to explain the communication problem—as you yourself see it—to your artists, let them tackle it based on their own graphic training, and insist that they explain and justify their approach to you in great detail. I would also urge you to take notes on what they say, so that you can report back to all of us, and also that you argue with the artists as vigorously as you can, but of course—you are all on the same side, after all, in the struggle to get your research results into the minds of your readers.

Late at night, just before dropping off to sleep, you might actually wish to visit more eternal questions such as this: If such life questions as yours here could really be decided by short and concise rules-declared-conventions, courtesy of Sage Publications, would life really be worth living, after all? Shall we shoot all of our artists, or keep a few around just for the laughs?

-- Jim

On Fri, 6 Jul 2001 JAnnSelzer@aol.com wrote:

Thanks to all who directed me to the Sage website. One of the books just arrived and in the simplest possible way, endorsed what I'd been trying to tell the newspaper graphics artists with little success: "Pie charts begin at 12.00 and are read clockwise." How often do we see this very basic rule violated?! Can you tell this is a pet peeve? JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

From tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu Fri Jul 6 12:12:44 2001
Rules today are made not by society, nor in heaven, but by Bill Gates. And if you stick some numbers into an Excel worksheet and take the default pie chart settings, the wedges start at 12 o'clock and proceed clockwise. Even Thomas Pennfield Jackson could not undo a rule like that.

Tom

PS: Jim--lighten up with the bombast!

Thomas M. Guterbock
Voice: (434) 243-5223
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jul  6 12:59:17 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f66JxGJ21149 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Jul 2001
12:59:16 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id MAA06850 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Jul 2001 12:59:16 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
  by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f66JxGF07967 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Jul 2001 12:59:16 -0700
(PDT)
For some reason, critics have been queuing up over the past several months to attack survey methods as a means to compile bestseller lists for recently-published books. Anyone have any explanations?

-- Jim

The pieces are now in place for the book industry's first integrated sales-reporting system. Bookscan would work like the music business's Soundscan system, with publishers paying a fee for access to the data. The benefits could be immense. So could the costs.

When Soundscan was introduced, two things happened to the pop charts. First, whole genres of music previously ignored were suddenly perceived as wildly commercial. Those records had been selling all along, just not charting. Once listed, though, multiplier effects (record stores often automatically discount or give preferential display to albums on the charts) kicked in and they did even better. If you were an artist or label that benefited, you couldn't help but think Soundscan was great.

But what also happened, and this is certainly subjective, was the charts got worse. That is, just about everything became Britney, Faith, Puffy -- in short, junk. Every so often something interesting got through, but on average, records slipped to the lowest common denominator. The resulting market lock-ins led to mediocrity.

Bookscan could easily do the same thing. For example, the New York Times bestseller list skews toward sales in independent stores (the Times samples a select group of stores for its data), which tend to be more literary in orientation than chain stores. This means that certain literary or regional books can "cheat" their way onto the list. Once on the list, those books can cross over into the chains and sell tons of copies. The Times's list also has all sorts of rules that result in some books being left off.
For example, romance novels, which sell tons of copies, are not included on the fiction bestseller list -- unfair to romance novelists perhaps, but it makes room for the Chuck Palahniuks and Walter Mosleys of the world. Diet and self-help books, which ostensibly are nonfiction, have their own separate list. The rules can be silly -- the Times considers humor books, no matter how fanciful, to be nonfiction -- but they work well when it comes to advancing literature.

It is awfully hard to resist the charm of hard numbers. But the intangible can be exactly what makes a product -- or, in the long-term, an industry -- work. You can pay Tom Clancy $15 million per book, and if you're lucky you'll end up making a few million in profit. But the real winners are the books that cost almost nothing up front and turn into superstars.

Bestsellers aside, smaller books can sell steadily, over time, and if an author's later books become bestsellers, then the catalog becomes much more valuable. A publishing house's prestige, which is often built on small, marketplace-unfriendly books, can have immense value in the long term in attracting future authors, many of whom could turn out to be commercial. And small books can be seen as part of a company's investment in employees -- employees who are often in the business because they love the good stuff, whether or not it sells.

Business history is full of examples of market lock-in and technology advancement resulting in inferior products and services. What's worrisome about Bookscan\ is that the Soundscan experience shows that businesspeople often settle for the least creative interpretation and manipulation of data. It is no coincidence that as database and inventory systems have improved, fewer and fewer books are consuming a larger portion of the sales pie. Someday we may read how Bookscan\ resulted in a bestseller list of 'get thin quick' books and celebrity bios. Or maybe we won't read about it at all, which is the point.

http://www.inside.com/article/ArticlePrint.html

Copyright (C) 2001 Powerful Media, Inc. -- Inside.com
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>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Jul  6 13:50:00 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f66Ko0J27868 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Jul 2001
13:50:00 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtp5ve.mailsrvcs.net (smtp5vepub.gte.net [206.46.170.26])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA14389 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Jul 2001 13:49:58 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (client-151-203-162-240.wma.adsl.bellatlantic.net
   [151.203.162.240])
   by smtp5ve.mailsrvcs.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id UAA24078288
JAnnSelzer@aol.com wrote:

> I guess the "rule" that quadrants in a Cartesian plane be numbered
> through IV, starting at the upper right and continuing clockwise
> might also be discarded as equally arbitrary. In other words . . .
>
Actually, that numbering scheme is completely arbitrary. In mathematics and physics, the normal (positive) direction of rotation is counter-clockwise. We tend to think in clockwise terms, just as we tend to read from left to right, so in our culture, a clockwise progression is usually easier to grasp quickly, but that is not always the case.

The primary reason for starting a pie chart at 12 O'clock is that the vertical axis gives a viewer an instant visual reference point. If you have two sectors of roughly equal size, this makes it easy to see which is larger.

If you have many sectors, it is easiest to follow the relationships if you start with the largest and proceed clockwise by decreasing size, but there is no particular reason to start at 12 O'clock. If the largest sector is much bigger than the others, this relationship may be better conveyed by centering the wedge on the 12 O'clock position rather than starting from there.

If you show three sectors, one of which is smaller or less important than the other two, the relative size of the major elements is best conveyed by showing them to either side of the vertical, with the remainder filling in the bottom.

Graphic representation of data is used to make results immediately visible without having to digest the numbers. Guidelines can help, but rigid rules will inevitably lead to bad graphics. A good graphic artist will know this kind of thing, either explicitly or intuitively, and design graphics that convey information clearly and efficiently.
ABSTRACT

Two recent surveys reported a spike in the percentage of Taiwanese who say they could accept "one country, two systems," the arrangement under which China took possession of Hong Kong from Britain in 1997. While those who favor one country, two systems are still in a minority, the number has almost doubled, to 33 percent, since the last polls in 1999. "People suddenly have doubts about Taiwan's long-term economic and political future," said Chu Yun-han, a professor of political science at National Taiwan University. Taiwan companies are flocking to Shanghai to open factories. Unlike the past, when investors used China's cheap labor to make sneakers and other low-end goods, factories now churn out advanced chips and notebook computers. For many Taiwanese college students, China is replacing the United States as the land of opportunity.

-- Jim


July 8, 2001

TAIWAN'S HARD TIMES REKINDLE 'ONE CHINA' DEBATE

By MARK LANDLER

TAIPEI, Taiwan, July 7 -- For a 78-year-old pensioner with heart trouble, Lee Teng-hui is not easing up. When Mr. Lee, the former president of Taiwan, came home from a visit to the United States this week, he greeted well-wishers by grabbing a megaphone and bellowing, "Let's all have confidence in our Taiwan."
Those seemingly benign sentiments have propelled Mr. Lee into the white-hot center of Taiwanese politics.

Fourteen months after he stepped down, the economy here is sputtering, and the government is paralyzed. China, meanwhile, is growing stronger by the day. Polls indicate that as their fortunes diverge, the idea of unifying Taiwan with its fast-growing neighbor is gaining ground here.

For the man who spent his career trying to fashion a separate identity for Taiwan -- often drawing Beijing's wrath in the process -- this gradual drift toward China is alarming. And it has prompted Mr. Lee to set off on an emotional, some say quixotic, campaign to restore the hope of his people.

"He thinks people are putting China's interests ahead of Taiwan's," said Huang Chu-wen, an adviser of the former president. "We feel that emphasizing Taiwan's indigenous culture should be our No. 1 priority."

Last month, Mr. Lee threw his support behind Chen Shui-bian, the pro-independence opposition leader who succeeded him. That enraged Mr. Lee's comrades in the Nationalist Party, who were swept out of power in that election after a half-century of rule.

And now, Mr. Lee is lending his prestige to efforts to start a new party, one that would ally with Mr. Chen against the Nationalists in legislative elections this December.

Mr. Lee's moves have far-reaching implications, not just for Taiwan's politics but also for Taiwan's relationship with China and the United States. Experts here say it could fuel latent animosities between people of mainland Chinese descent and native Taiwanese who share this island. Mr. Lee and Mr. Chen are both native Taiwanese.

It could also draw a jagged line between those who support or oppose unification with China.

"He is appealing to people who believe in Taiwanese independence," said Wu Nai-jen, the secretary general of Mr. Chen's party. "He is whipping up nationalist feeling, not a rational discussion of the issues."

Political discourse has been uncommonly heated for the last few weeks. Some of Mr. Lee's Nationalist colleagues are howling for his expulsion, while newspapers and talk shows debate his motives.

But critics and defenders of Mr. Lee agree that he has accurately gauged the public mood. The collapse in the global technology industry has devastated Taiwan's economy, pushing growth to its lowest level since the early 1970's and unemployment to a nearly two-decade high. As times become tough, more people believe that maybe Taiwan should cast its lot with China.

Two recent surveys reported a spike in the percentage of Taiwanese who say they could accept "one country, two systems," the arrangement under which China took possession of Hong Kong from Britain in 1997.

While those who favor one country, two systems are still in a minority, the number has almost doubled, to 33 percent, since the last polls in
"People suddenly have doubts about Taiwan's long-term economic and political future," said Chu Yun-han, a professor of political science at National Taiwan University.

In this gloomy atmosphere, China beckons. Taiwan companies are flocking to Shanghai to open factories. Unlike the past, when investors used China's cheap labor to make sneakers and other low-end goods, factories now churn out advanced chips and notebook computers.

For many college students here, China is replacing the United States as the land of opportunity. "All my classmates think they are going to work in China," said Chou Ju-yi, 21, an electrical engineering major at National Taiwan University. "They think they will have no choice, because the economy here is so bad."

Ms. Chou said she opposed unification. But her boyfriend, Hsu Chieh, said he believed that integration was inevitable, and desirable. "China is getting stronger and stronger," said Mr. Hsu, who is 21 and studies botany. "To survive, we will have to integrate our economy into China. And to do that, we have to have political integration."

Such attitudes run deep in Taiwan's business establishment. One of the island's most powerful industrialists, Wang Yung-ching, recently called on President Chen to accept Beijing's demand that Taiwan recognize a single China of which it is a part. Mr. Chen's refusal to do so has angered Beijing.

The Nationalist Party, which under Mr. Lee took a confrontational approach toward Beijing, has changed course and begun to cultivate ties with China's leaders. A former Nationalist prime minister recently visited Beijing while the mayor of Taipei went to Hong Kong.

The chairman of the Nationalists, Lien Chan, denies that his party has tilted toward Beijing. But he makes no apologies for the visits.

"The majority of the people here do not agree with the idea of Taiwan independence," said Mr. Lien, who served as vice president under Mr. Lee. "We have to make this clear to the leaders in Beijing."

It was the Nationalists' shift toward China that precipitated Mr. Lee's break with his party. Mr. Lee had anointed Mr. Lien as the party's presidential candidate in 1999. But experts say the former president secretly preferred Mr. Chen. In the end, Mr. Chen trounced Mr. Lien.

Despite the bad blood, Mr. Lien said he was aghast that Mr. Lee appeared to have switched sides. He speculated that other people were exploiting the former president's name to further their own goals.

Mr. Lee declared recently that he would die as a Nationalist Party member. But he has met with former Nationalist lawmakers who are thinking of running in the new party being formed by Mr. Lee's adviser and protégé, Huang Chu-wen.

Mr. Huang said his goal was to win 35 seats in Taiwan's 220-seat Legislature. If he does, and if Mr. Chen, with Mr. Lee's implied
blessing, can increase his party's seats to more than 75 seats, from 66 now, Mr. Chen's party and its allies would gain a majority. In the past, his government has been stymied because the Nationalists control the assembly.

Political oddsmakers say the chance of both those things' happening is slim. But Mr. Huang said Mr. Lee has a broader agenda. He is trying to stem the tide of pro-China sentiment. If he fails and Taiwan lets its identity erode, he said, the island will be powerless to ward off Beijing.

"The mainland would be quite happy to let this situation continue," Mr. Huang said. "They figure maybe Taiwan will collapse by itself."

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
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>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Jul  7 22:01:05 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f68515J02239 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Jul 2001
22:01:05 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id WAA23426 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Jul 2001 22:01:07 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
  by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f68516f10727 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Jul 2001 22:01:06 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Sat, 7 Jul 2001 22:01:06 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: It's Good to Be the King (Frank Rich NYT)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0107072155290.9544-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

ABSTRACT

The president's polls are down, and Washington, of course, is shocked, shocked. What's gone wrong? One alleged culprit was the supposed liberal slant of the first poll to mark the extent of Mr. Bush's political anemia, the New York Times/CBS News survey finding the president's job approval rating at 53 percent and the country disagreeing with him on nearly every issue, including the use of the
budget surplus for a tax cut. "When I look at The Times's polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats," said John Zogby, a rival pollster championed by conservatives, who then added that the Times/CBS poll was "an inaccurate reading [that] doesn't tell me anything."

Days later, the Zogby/Reuters poll showed Mr. Bush's job approval number at 51 -- two points lower than Times/CBS.

What we have here, big time, is another case of disconnect between the Beltway and the country. In the Clinton years, Washington kept saying that Americans would soon give the president the boot, only to be rebuffed by the president's high job ratings, which were then confirmed by the Democrats' romp in the 1998 election, at the height of the impeachment frenzy. In the Bush years the disconnect has inverted itself: Washington keeps saying that the country is warming to its decent new president, only to be confounded by polls showing what CNN has described as "a slow, steady slide spread out over several months" that is capsizing the G.O.P.'s ratings at an even steeper pace.

-- Jim
screen, which is why he made the blunder of threatening to veto any patients' bill of rights that vexes the H.M.O.'s, which are among his biggest campaign contributors.

The president's polls are down, and Washington, of course, is shocked, shocked. Washington had given Mr. Bush high marks for his amazing feats to date: the largest tax cut in 20 years, mandating school testing, standing up to the Chinese, hobnobbing with the Europeans, wearing a jacket and tie in the Oval Office. What's gone wrong?

One alleged culprit was the supposed liberal slant of the first poll to mark the extent of Mr. Bush's political anemia, the New York Times/ CBS News survey finding the president's job approval rating at 53 percent and the country disagreeing with him on nearly every issue, including the use of the budget surplus for a tax cut. "When I look at The Times's polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats," said John Zogby, a rival pollster championed by conservatives, who then added that the Times/CBS poll was "an inaccurate reading [that] doesn't tell me anything." Days later, the Zogby/Reuters poll showed Mr. Bush's job approval number at 51 -- two points lower than Times/CBS.

What we have here, big time, is another case of disconnect between the Beltway and the country. In the Clinton years, Washington kept saying that Americans would soon give the president the boot, only to be rebuffed by the president's high job ratings, which were then confirmed by the Democrats' romp in the 1998 election, at the height of the impeachment frenzy. In the Bush years the disconnect has inverted itself: Washington keeps saying that the country is warming to its decent new president, only to be confounded by polls showing what CNN has described as "a slow, steady slide spread out over several months" that is capsizing the G.O.P.'s ratings at an even steeper pace.

Liberals tend to attribute Mr. Bush's decline to what they call his right-wing policies. But it's a measure of how malleable this president is that he has backed away from so many conservative principles with little fight. In just over five months, he has abandoned school vouchers and his opposition to price controls for California energy; he has knuckled under to protests led by Al Sharpton in Vieques; he has embraced the "honest, straightforward" Vladimir Putin as a soulmate, which looks even more foolish now than it did three weeks ago, given Mr. Putin's subsequent betrayal of a U.S.-backed U.N. resolution to retool sanctions against Saddam Hussein.

The real ideology that drives Mr. Bush remains less that of the hard right than that of his soft character, which is a product of a biography full of easy landings. A man who has never faced adversity -- who has finessed Andover, Yale, Vietnam and brief careers in business and politics with well-placed connections and sweetheart deals -- is not conversant with reality as most Americans have experienced it. The problem isn't that he's wealthy -- so were F.D.R. and Ronald Reagan, whose hard knocks in life gave them an empathy for their fellow citizens -- but that he's out of touch. He doesn't know how much he doesn't know and is in no rush to find out.

What's been farcical about the Bush presidency so far is how quickly his smug policy assertions, and not just about Mr. Putin, are upended almost instantaneously by events or facts (some of them supplied by his own
administration). "America in the year 2001 faces the most serious energy shortage since the oil embargoes of the 1970's," read the opening of the Bush energy report, which also warned that skyrocketing energy prices were disrupting family finances. But, as David Sanger and Joseph Kahn pointed out in The Times, a chart in the same administration report showed that Americans spend less than 5 percent of their disposable income on energy costs now, a sizable drop from the 8 percent of the early Reagan years. Nor was the shortage itself real: Gas prices have fallen like Mr. Bush's polls, with everyone from Alan Greenspan to Sir John Browne, the head of BP oil, dismissing talk of a crisis.

A similar comeuppance followed Mr. Bush's insistence that the verdict of science wasn't in on global warming -- a stance immediately demolished by a report that the administration itself solicited from the National Academy of Sciences. Last week the president's blind faith in abstinence-only sex education was undermined by the Surgeon General's report, which politely pointed out that only sex education that includes birth control information has any track record of delaying teenage sexual activity.

The administration is studiously ignoring that finding, and presumably it will do the same with the internal Defense Department report uncovered last week by Defense Week. The report reveals that the tests given to Mr. Bush's favorite toy, a national missile defense system, have been overly "rehearsed," rendering them meaningless as indicators as to whether a missile shield could actually accomplish anything beyond busting the budget.

Will Mr. Bush also ignore the National Institutes of Health report on the dazzling medical value of embryonic stem cell research? Our "pro-life" president's position is that adult stem cells can substitute for embryonic stem cells in cures for diseases like diabetes, Parkinson's and Alzheimer's. Once again the science contradicts him. Why is Mr. Bush disregarding it?

On this life-or-death decision, political science takes precedence over biological science. Karl Rove, this president's answer to Dick Morris, is worried about losing Catholic votes and offending the pope on the eve of Mr. Bush's visit to the Vatican. But the political science is wrong too. Polls show that most Catholics, just like most other Americans, support embryonic stem cell research. (And if Mr. Bush is so solicitous of the pope, why isn't he reversing his position on the death penalty as well?) It's hard to imagine that any leader in touch with his constituents would waffle as long as Mr. Bush has on a no-brainer decision like this, putting a months-long hold on research that could save countless lives.

As the fine print of the president's poll numbers reveals, the public isn't blind to any of his actions (or non-actions). Only a quarter of the country answers yes when asked if Mr. Bush "has concentrated on problems that matter most to you." Nearly two-thirds think he lied about an energy crisis to reward big oil. As with the last administration, Americans have sized up the strengths and weaknesses of this one well ahead of the press. They salute Mr. Bush for having higher "moral values" than Bill Clinton, but they don't make the Washington mistake of confusing his personal life with his policies.

The White House, meanwhile, continues to hope that we can be suckered by
pictures. Never mind that Mr. Bush's recent, sudden tour of national parks failed to convince a single American that he was an environmentalist. By Independence Day, his handlers had him back posing with inner-city black kids again, as they always instruct him to do when polls plummet. We'll know panic has really set in if those kids turn up to blow out his birthday candles this weekend in Kennebunport.


Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company


*****

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Jul  8 08:42:36 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f68FgZJ20094 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 8 Jul 2001
  08:42:35 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id IAA21047 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 8 Jul 2001 08:42:35 -0700
  (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
  by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f68Fgba27810 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 8 Jul 2001 08:42:37 -0700
  (PDT)
Date: Sun, 8 Jul 2001 08:42:36 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Is Our Fate Written in the Lengths of Our Fingers? (LATimes)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0107080825210.27374-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

This report by Deborah Blum suggests that we are going to see a lot more survey interviewers lugging around portable photocopiers to capture the shapes of respondents' hands, as in the pioneering Berkeley study:

The Berkeley study is one of those lovely examples of scientific reasoning. How do you get a diverse sampling of finger lengths? Researchers went to street fairs in Berkeley with a portable photocopier and copied 720 fairgoers' hands, while asking them pointed questions about their sex lives. What the Berkeley group found, published in the journal Nature, was that lesbians' finger lengths tend to resemble the more classic male hands. Do male homosexuals have hands in the so-called female pattern? It's not that easy, naturally, and those results have been contradictory.
If all this might seem far-fetched (it may well be), keep in mind that Blum is a Pulitzer Prize-winning science writer and author of the academically well-regarded "Sex on the Brain: the Biological Differences Between Men and Women," an enviable status in her profession which I suspect she writes here with every intention to maintain.

Can any of you tell us all more about the "Berkeley study"?

-- Jim

Sunday, July 8, 2001

Is Our Fate Written in the Lengths of Our Fingers?

By DEBORAH BLUM

MADISON, Wis.--From my childhood, I remember one particularly goofy joke. It started like this: "What's the first sign of insanity? Hair growing on your knuckles." Then, just as the victim checked his or her own knuckles, came the punchline: "What's the second sign? Looking for it." The teller and any lurking observers would crack up, and we'd all troop off to try the joke on our siblings.

When the first reports linking finger length to behavior appeared, I had a sudden flashback to those days of checking for hairy knuckles. Scientists have now measured hundreds of people's hands and linked their finger structure to an extraordinary array of behaviors--musical talent, athletic ability, spatial skills, dyslexia, stuttering, sexual orientation. In March, British researchers added autism to the list.

It sounds like a gotcha joke--but one with potentially troublesome consequences. I can envision the scenarios: couples peering at each other's hands on the first date; parents checking their children's hands for signs of trouble; gloves becoming popular again as those of us with the "wrong" fingers (mine are, of course, "normal") seek to hide them.

Except, of course, that it's hard to keep a joke going in the face of reasonable science. When you really start exploring the connections between finger length and behavior, they turn out to be less hilarious than we joke lovers might hope. What they provide is a window on the ways scientists try to figure out who we are--and the ways that human biology, beautifully complex, gorgeously convoluted, makes that so hard.

All of this is really about the length difference between two fingers, the index finger (second) and the ring finger (fourth, counting from the thumb). Biologists call this the 2D:4D ratio. It appears that in the first trimester of pregnancy, as hormones are pitching in to help build the body, exposure to testosterone can result in a difference in
lengths of these two fingers. Why? Unclear, although biologists have known for a long time that testosterone helps shape some bone growth—high, chiseled cheekbones, for instance. Now it appears that those of us exposed to a little more prenatal androgen tend to have a ring finger that's longer than the index finger.

It means, not surprisingly, that men—the testosterone heavies in our species—usually have longer ring fingers than index fingers. British researcher John Manning, at the University of Liverpool, sees testosterone as a potent force here. He did the recent autism work and is considering the role of hormones in that disorder. He's also done studies suggesting that exceptional athletes and math whizzes may have gotten an early high dose of testosterone. Manning has found, for instance, that some of Britain's best soccer players tend to have extra-long ring fingers compared to the index.

I'm wary of any finding that fully associates the size of a body part with a laundry list of behaviors and abilities. Those mistakes have been made in science before, to our cost, as with the 19th-century belief that because women have slightly smaller skulls than men they are dumber. And, even if there is a statistical correlation between the 2D:4D ratio and male athletes, that still doesn't make testosterone the sole source of athletic prowess. And it doesn't say much about female athletes at all. In women, overall, the finger ratio is different. Index and ring tend to be closer to the same length, the index maybe a little longer.

The exception to that, for women, seems to be regarding sexual orientation, which then begs a couple of questions. Is orientation set before birth? If testosterone shapes fingers prenatally, could it shape sexual behavior as well? When scientists at UC Berkeley decided to look into this last year, they were unsure what they would find.

The Berkeley study is one of those lovely examples of scientific reasoning. How do you get a diverse sampling of finger lengths? Researchers went to street fairs in Berkeley with a portable photocopier and copied 720 fairgoers' hands, while asking them pointed questions about their sex lives. What the Berkeley group found, published in the journal Nature, was that lesbians' finger lengths tend to resemble the more classic male hands. Do male homosexuals have hands in the so-called female pattern? It's not that easy, naturally, and those results have been contradictory.

Psychology professor Marc Breedlove is not sure why the results are clear with women. His speculation, though, is that it's easier for a little extra testosterone to affect females. Males, who tend to have at least seven times as much anyway, are designed to tolerate higher levels of the hormone, whereas females "normally see pretty low levels, so even a modest increase might be registered by the brain." Breedlove doesn't believe that all lesbians are merely whipped up by a little extra hormone floating in the amniotic soup. Some women may become lesbian because of that exposure, he says cautiously, but not all. Hormones may influence, but their power varies from person to person.

Over the last year or so, other scientists have tested that lesbian finger result and confirmed it. The most recent study, presented at the Western Psychological Assn. in May, is by Richard Lippa and Michael Cassens of Cal State Fullerton. Lippa has been pulling together a larger
test group, including college students, attendees at the Long Beach Gay Pride Festival and so on. He expects to have surveyed about 2,000 people when his results are tallied. He consistently sees the lesbian-versus-straight woman difference, although he emphasizes that it is a small statistical difference. When a scientist raises the "statistical difference" flag, it usually means that these studies tell you nothing about the individual. They are group differences: If we compare hundreds of lesbians to hundreds of straight women, there will be more male pattern hands in the lesbian group. But person by person, there will also be many straight women with longer ring fingers, gay women with the usual "female" hand and so on. Lippa also finds ethnic exceptions. Latinos seem to have, overall, the more "masculine" hand pattern, Caucasians more female. He suspects that this may be another kind of group variation, not necessarily hormonal, in the same way that height varies among ethnic populations.

So the more we look at our fingers, the more complicated this gets. The finger-length ratios are fascinating, says Lippa, because "they provide a possible measure, even if it is a very indirect and 'noisy' measure, of prenatal hormone exposure. Human prenatal hormone levels are very difficult to assess in any direct fashion." So that, for him, the 2D:4D ratios become a "messy proxy" for early hormone exposure, and the ethnic variations are part of the noisy background. Consequently, cautions Lippa, "there's simply too much variability" to draw conclusions about a person from his or her fingers. "You need large numbers of participants to see these effects," he says.

Despite such caveats, I suspect that many people will find finger evaluations irresistible. I did. I also speak with the expertise of someone who has mentioned this work to friends, family and fellow science writers—all of whom instantly whipped out a hand for analysis. So far, all have seen the entertainment value. But what about those who might take a more serious view?

We reside in a society still judgmental about sexual orientation. It could be more than risky—downright dangerous—if people become convinced that finger length is a reliable guide to a person's sexual preference. Critics have suggested that the danger makes the science not worth the risk. On that point, I think they are wrong. Yes, this work can be misinterpreted, despite all the scientific instructions and disclaimers. But these studies may also help correct even bigger mistakes and help counter judgmental attitudes about sexual orientation. The research strengthens the evidence that preference can be set before birth and remain beyond our control.

If finger-length studies are, yet, a messy probe into biology of behavior, then we should support research that refines them, that moves us that slight and critical step closer to a genuinely thoughtful exploration of human behavior, sexual and otherwise.

Until then, the rest of us can at least enjoy the fact that the personal finger check holds up pretty well as a gotcha joke. Made you look, right?

---------
Deborah Blum Is a Pulitzer Prize-winning Science Writer and Author of "Sex on the Brain: the Biological Differences Between Men and Women."
I will be out of the office starting 07/07/2001 and will not return until 07/22/2001.

I will respond to your message when I return. For immediate attention please forward the message to Bonnie_Randall@abtassoc.com
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE ~ FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE ~ FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

~MEDIA ADVISORY~

Zoë Baird, President of the Markle Foundation, cordially invites you to a Press Conference where the Markle Foundation in association with Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research will release the results of a comprehensive survey of public attitudes toward the Internet and Internet Policymaking entitled:

Toward a Framework for Accountability

All Members of the Press and Interested Parties are Welcome To Attend.

When: Tuesday, July 10, 2001
Time: 10:00 AM
Where: The National Press Club, The First Amendment Room

[A link to the Press Club briefing will be available at www.markle.org]

Speakers: Zoë Baird and Stan Greenberg

For more information about the Press Conference, please contact: Kristofer Eisenla at 202-822-1700

The Markle Foundation works to realize the potential of emerging communications media and information technology to improve people’s lives and recently unveiled a new program focus and a $100 million commitment to do so. Markle pursues its goals through a range of activities including analysis, research, public information and the development of innovative media products and services. The foundation creates and operates many of its own projects—using not only grants but also investments and strategic alliances with non-profits and businesses.
More information on the Markle Foundation can be found at: www.markle.org.
business numbers) from RDD samples. Traditional automated screening and database business match procedures typically reduce the base of telephone numbers actually dialed and dispositioned by 15% or so. Newer, more effective attended screening procedures remove about 35%. So one must be careful in looking at the increasing proportion of NAs, because this could be perceptual due to decreased bases. For example, if twenty (20) numbers out of an unscreened RDD sample of 100 can be expected to yield No Answers, this suddenly represents over 30% of dialed numbers (i.e., 20/65) after pre-screening removes an expected thirty-five (35) businesses and NWs prior to dialing.

You are also correct in that long-distance carrier problems increase the number of NAs in your final disposition. If one is serious about minimizing NAs, I would offer the following suggestions, knowing that implementing them may be difficult without significant effort or rather sophisticated switch or automated dialing equipment:

LONG DISTANCE CARRIER VARIATION. Call centers typically have a single long-distance carrier or a preferred carrier with a second as back-up for outbound traffic on digital T1s. In addition there are usually a few analog lines. Set up a dialing protocol that specifies that four (4) or five (5) call NA and Busy (same problem as NAs) numbers receive their next attempt(s) on a second carrier (if available) and then lastly on analog lines. [Caution: if you have multiple long distance carriers you must verify whose networks the carriers are actually using, because many "long distance carriers" are just resellers of time on the primary networks.]

NUMBER OF RINGS. Always an issue. Answering machines usually pick-up after the fourth ring, but some not until the fifth or sixth and I have personally encountered "automated attendants" and off-premises answering machines, like those offered by local phone companies, that don't "pick up" until the seventh or eighth ring. Again, a protocol that increases the number of rings for repeated NAs will yield some marginal results. Another caution here: four (4) rings locally is not the same as four (4) rings to a number across the country - rule of thumb is a half ring cycle per time zone, but there are still wide variations.

TIME OF DAY. This was a common practice. A dialing protocol should specify that the second or third attempt on NAs be placed 9-5 local time to identify business numbers that only "ring" at night.

The above will reduce the number of NAs in a final disposition and increase response rates somewhat, but obviously there is a cost involved. And that just begs the question as to where any additional efforts should be placed. It may be more cost effective to put efforts into refusal conversion rather than NA validations. We just need to recognize that some of the call result/disposition categories we always thought were incontrovertible, are actually somewhat variable. In fact, even dialing NWs over different carriers will frequently return different "out of service" messages.

I hope this helps

Dale

Original Message-----
From: Dan Hagan [mailto:dhagan@partnersinc.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2001 9:54 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: question about phone numbers

Dale, that was good of you to comment!

You raise another question. What is the implication of all this for interpreting a typical distribution of final dispositions for response rate calculations?

My sense is that we are seeing a dramatic increase in the number of cases that end up as NA's over the last several years. And, we are generally unsuccessful in reducing this category even with dramatic extension of the call rule to 10+ attempts. Do these numbers reflect residences that we are not reaching because of inadequate LD carriers managing an increasingly complex set of customer options? Or, does all this confusion overstate the number of residences we are not getting to in typical RDD study?

-----Original Message-----
From: Dale Kulp [mailto:DKulp@M-S-G.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 04, 2001 1:30 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: question about phone numbers

There are actually a number of possible explanations for such events. It might be easier to explain if I knew whether these numbers were from one local area or not, but based on our experience, the most likely sources within the overall telephone network itself are:

1) CALL FORWARDING. The fact that a number is forwarded is usually transparent to the recipient. If the forwarding was purposeful, the called party would probably be aware of the number you had called. Of course the possibility exists, as has been pointed out, that this was just another form of "soft refusal." [Was the phone number verification prior to, or after the interview?]

Erroneous call forwarding is also commonplace. With the increasing frequency of routine call forwarding from business numbers, cell phones, voice messaging systems and voice mail boxes, the likelihood of errors is quite high - these errors can occur from the phone company or individual telephone subscribers who enter the information themselves.

2) LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY. This is sort of a variation on the above, but telephone subscribers can now keep their "old telephone number" when they change providers (service provider portability) or when they move to a new residence outside the traditional geographic boundaries of their telephone exchange (geographic portability). In most cases these forwarded calls are transparent and correctly mapped, but errors do occur. During the initial implementation of service provider portability, it was almost a certainty that dialing either the ported number (i.e., the old number) and the "new" number" to which the old was being forwarded, would result in the call connecting to the household (We alerted research companies to this, and the
resultant multiple selection probabilities two years ago in a newsletter article.) Our understanding is that this was generally a thing of the past, but the possibility on a local level still exists.

3) LOCAL PHONE COMPANY/LONG DISTANCE CARRIER PROBLEMS. The most interesting thing related in your query was that different results were observed when the interviewers called than was found in the follow-up verification calls. We experience and have documented numerous discrepancies between call results across long distance carrier and also between placing calls on analog vs. digital lines (i.e., regular phone lines versus T1s). Could this be the situation: when the interviewer places the call from the call center it goes via a T1 while the follow-up call is from an office over a regular phone line?

The fact is, that most long distance carrier problems are transparent to the caller. We discovered one carrier who failed to update the Area Code table in one of their regional switches or two years after an Area Code split in Texas. This caused all calls to this Area Code routed through this Midwestern switch to be "non-working." [Needless to say we had a very unhappy client who of course blamed our "sample", when in fact, it was their long distance carrier.] The number of calls to the new area code would typically represent a small proportion of the total sample, even in a statewide Texas survey. The only reason we were able to find it quickly was because it was a local study conducted by a research company whose long distance calls were all routed through this problem switch.

In some cases long distance carriers will return different messages: all NWs vs. No Answers; No Answers vs. Busy signals, etc. The biggest variations though seem to be between analog an digital calls.

4) RESPONDENT CONFUSION. Is there a possibility that the telephone numbers corresponded to a second or third phone line, a modem line, or a child’s phone? In most cases this can be sorted out if you are speaking to the right person in the household, but often people aren’t aware that if they have two voice lines there really are two different phone numbers - they may only give out their regular number but if someone reached them by directly dialing the second number its transparent to them.

In conclusion, the explosion over the past few years in the number of long distance carriers and new competitive local exchange carriers has strained the pool of expert technical telephone network talent - only so much to go around. Couple this with the increasing complexity of the communications network itself and the likelihood of routing problems/errors/messaging difficulties becomes almost a certainty. [Talk to research companies about their increasing difficulties in just getting T1s provisioned and set-up to specifications.] That is not to say that this is the cause of your problem, but the variation in call results is certainly suspicious.

This does not discount the fact that consumers themselves are dealing with telecommunications options that are prone to errors. For example, it is very possible that the owner of the number you actually dialed simply
entered an incorrect digit and forwarded his line erroneously to the to the household's number you reached. Or, maybe there is a technical problem with the voice mail box system. Nothing would surprise me.

Lynda, if you would like us to look in to this particular problem, please contact me directly to transfer the telephone numbers in question. You can then post the results to AAPORNET.

Thank you,

Dale W. Kulp

Marketing Systems Group/GENESYS Sampling Systems
215-653-7100 (PH)
215-653-7115 (FX)
dkulp@m-s-g.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 4:18 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: question about phone numbers

We have found several phone numbers recently where the RDD interviewer is certain she has dialed the number correctly, but the person who answers denies that it is their phone number and will give another phone number when we ask for their phone number. The RDD interviewer calls the number back on another day with the same response. When I call these phone numbers, the response several times has been a recording that it is a voice mail box. The RDD interviewer thinks that at least some of these people may have a second line that they do not know about, and that the second line may be for voice mail or other extra phone services. The respondent denies that they have any additional lines. Has anyone else had this experience, or have a clue what may be going on?? This is a new occurrence for us and started about a year ago.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
lvoigt@fhcrc.org
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Dan raises some interesting questions. Let me address the No Answer (NA) issue first, because this is an issue that touches on a number of disposition related areas. Based on my experience, the proportions of NAs in typical RDD samples have increased somewhat over the years due to a number of diverse factors: the increasing prevalence of telephones in seasonal units; increases in the number of business lines (not all lines are intercepted by a switchboard or message - for example analog lines used for outbound interviewing); modem lines when the PC is turned off; people using Caller ID to screen "out of area" calls without answering machine intervention, etc. Undoubtedly, some of the increase may also be attributable to poor "supervision" of unassigned lines by new competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) and even some incumbent carriers. However, we need to be careful because a large proportion of this "increase" may be more perception than reality. Over the past few years, sample suppliers have become increasingly adept at identifying and removing non-productive numbers (i.e., non-working and business numbers) from RDD samples. Traditional automated screening and database business match procedures typically reduce the base of telephone numbers actually dialed and dispositioned by 15% or so. Newer, more effective attended screening procedures remove about 35%. So one must be careful in looking at the increasing proportion of NAs, because this could be due to decreased bases. For example, if twenty (20) numbers out of an unscreened RDD sample of 100 can be expected to yield No Answers, this suddenly represents over 30% of dialed numbers (i.e., 20/65) after pre-screening removes an expected
thirty-five (35) businesses and NWs prior to dialing. You are also correct in that long-distance carrier problems increase the number of NAs in your final disposition. If one is serious about minimizing NAs, I would offer the following suggestions, knowing that implementing them may be difficult without significant effort or rather sophisticated switch or automated dialing equipment:

**LONG DISTANCE CARRIER VARIATION.** Call centers typically have a single long-distance carrier or a preferred carrier with a second as back-up for outbound traffic on digital T1s. In addition, there are usually a few analog lines. Set up a dialing protocol that specifies that four (4) or five (5) call NA and Busy (same problem as NAs) numbers receive their next attempt(s) on a second carrier (if available) and then lastly on analog lines. [Caution: if you have multiple long distance carriers you must verify whose networks the carriers are actually using, because many "long distance carriers" are just resellers of time on the primary networks.]

**NUMBER OF RINGS.** Always an issue. Answering machines usually pick-up after the fourth ring, but some not until the fifth or sixth and I have personally encountered "automated attendants" and off-premises answering machines, like those offered by local phone companies, that don't "pick up" until the seventh or eighth ring. Again, a protocol that increases the number of rings for repeated NAs will yield some marginal results. Another caution here: four (4) rings locally is not the same as four (4) rings to a number across the country - rule of thumb is a half ring cycle per time zone, but there are still wide variations.

**TIME OF DAY.** This was a common practice. A dialing protocol should specify that the second or third attempt on NAs be placed 9-5 local time to identify business numbers that only "ring" at night.

The above will
reduce the number of NAs in a final disposition and increase response rates somewhat, but obviously there is a cost involved. And that just begs the question as to where any additional efforts should be placed. It may be more cost effective to put efforts into refusal conversion rather than NA validations.

And that just begs the question as to where any additional efforts should be placed. It may be more cost effective to put efforts into refusal conversion rather than NA validations.
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such events. It might be easier to explain if I knew whether these numbers were from one local area or not, but based on our experience, the most likely sources within the overall telephone network itself are:

1) CALL FORWARDING. The fact that a number is forwarded is usually transparent to the recipient. If the forwarding was purposeful, the called party would probably be aware of the number you had called. Of course the possibility exists, as has been pointed out, that this was just another form of "soft refusal." [Was the phone number verification prior to, or after the interview?]

Erroneous call forwarding is also commonplace. With the increasing frequency of routine call forwarding from business numbers, cell phones, voice messaging systems and voice mail boxes, the likelihood of errors is quite high - these errors can occur from the phone company or individual telephone subscribers who enter the information themselves.

2) LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY. This is sort of a variation on the above, but telephone subscribers can now keep their "old telephone number" when they change providers (service provider portability) or when they move to a new residence outside the traditional geographic boundaries of their telephone exchange (geographic portability). In most cases these forwarded calls are transparent and correctly mapped, but errors do occur. During the initial implementation of service provider portability, it was almost a certainty that dialing either the ported number (i.e., the old number) and the "new" number to which the old was being forwarded, would result in the call connecting to the household (We alerted research companies to this, and the resultant multiple selection probabilities two years ago in a newsletter.) Our understanding is that this was generally a thing of the past, but the possibility on a local level still exists.

3) LOCAL PHONE COMPANY/LONG DISTANCE CARRIER PROBLEMS. The most interesting thing related in your query was that different results were observed when called than was found in the follow-up verification calls. We experience and have documented numerous discrepancies between call results across long distance carrier and also between placing calls on analog vs. digital lines (i.e., regular phone lines versus T1s). Could this...
the situation: when the interviewer places the call from the call center it goes via a T1 while the follow-up call is from an office over a regular phone line?

The fact is, that most long distance carrier problems are transparent to the caller. We discovered one carrier who failed to update the Area Code table in one of their regional switches or two years after an Area Code split in Texas. This caused all calls to this Area Code routed through this Midwestern switch to be "non-working." Needless to say we had a very unhappy client who of course blamed our "sample", when in fact, it was their long distance carrier. The number of calls to the new area code would typically represent a small proportion of the total sample, even in a statewide Texas survey. The only reason we were able to find it quickly was because it was a local study conducted by a research company whose long distance calls were all routed through this problem switch.

In some cases long distance carriers will return different messages: all NWs vs. No Answers; No Answers vs. Busy signals, etc. The biggest variations though seem to be between analog and digital calls.

4) RESPONDENT CONFUSION. Is there a possibility that the telephone numbers corresponded to a second or third phone line, a modem line, or a child's phone? In most cases this can be sorted out if you are speaking to the right person in the household, but often people aren't aware that if they have two voice lines there really are two different phone numbers - they may only give out their regular number but if someone reached them by directly dialing the second number its transparent to them.

In conclusion, the explosion over the past few years in the number of long distance carriers and new competitive local exchange carriers has strained the pool of expert technical telephone network talent - only so much to go around. Couple this with the increasing complexity of the communications and the likelihood of routing problems/errors/messaging difficulties becomes almost a certainty.
their increasing difficulties in just getting T1s provisioned and set-up to specifications.] That is not to say that this is the cause of your problem, but the variation in call results is certainly suspicious. This does not discount the fact that consumers themselves are dealing with telecommunications options that are prone to errors. For example, it is very possible that the owner of the number you actually dialed simply entered an incorrect digit and forwarded his line erroneously to the household's number you reached. Or, maybe there is a technical problem with the voice mail box system. Nothing would surprise me. 

Lynda, if you would like us to look in to this particular problem, please contact me directly to transfer the telephone numbers in question. You can then post the results to AAPORN ET. 

Thank you,

Dale W. Kulp  
Marketing Systems Group/GENESYS Sampling Systems  
215-653-7100 (PH)  
215-653-7115 (FX)  
dkulp@m-s-g.com  

-----Original Message-----  
From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2001 4:18 PM  
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'  
Subject: RE: question about phone numbers

We have found several phone numbers recently where the RDD interviewer is certain she has dialed the number correctly, but the person who answers denies that it is their phone number and will give another phone number when we ask for their phone number. The RDD interviewer calls the number back on another day with the same response. When I call these phone numbers, the response several times has been a recording that it is a voice mail box. The RDD interviewer thinks that at least some of these people may have a second line that they do not know about, and that the second line may be for a voice mail or other extra phone services. The respondent denies that they have any additional lines. Has anyone else had this experience, or have a clue what may be
going on??? This is a new occurrence for us and started about a year ago.

Lynda Voigt
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
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>From jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov Mon Jul  9 13:47:53 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f69K1qJ26790 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Jul 2001
13:47:52 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from info.census.gov (info.census.gov [148.129.129.10])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id NAA22123 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Jul 2001 13:47:51 -0700 (PDT)
From: jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov
Received: from deliver.tco.census.gov (inet-gw.census.gov [148.129.143.2])
  by info.census.gov (8.11.3/8.11.3/1.46) with ESMTP
  id f69K1HS26899 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Jul 2001 16:47:17 -0400 (EDT)
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INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT, EVALUATION, AND
TESTING METHODS (QDET)

CALL FOR ABSTRACTS FOR CONTRIBUTED PAPERS

DEADLINE: Abstracts of no more than 200 WORDS are due SEPTEMBER 1, 2001

Abstracts should be submitted online through the CONFERENCE WEBSITE:
www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet

CONFERENCE DATES: November 14-17, 2002

LOCATION: Radisson Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina

QDET will be the first international conference devoted exclusively to
the methods used for questionnaire development, evaluation, and testing,
and will bring together researchers and survey practitioners working in
this area, to stimulate research papers that contribute to the science of reducing measurement error through questionnaire evaluation, to provide documentation of the current practices, and to stimulate new ideas for future practice.

Both INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTED PAPER PROPOSALS and SPECIAL CONTRIBUTED PAPER SESSION PROPOSALS are encouraged. Special Contributed Sessions are arranged in advance by an organizer and include four speakers and a discussant (proposals should indicate Special Session status and include four abstracts).

Papers are encouraged in a wide range of areas related to questionnaire development, evaluation, and testing methods, including but not limited to:

Cognitive interviewing, behavior coding, interviewer/respondent debriefing, usability testing, split-sample experiments, psychometric analysis, establishment survey testing, question design for special populations, and questionnaire standards and practical issues.

QUESTIONS ABOUT CONTRIBUTED PAPERS: Contact Gordon Willis: willisg@mail.nih.gov

GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE QDET CONFERENCE: Contact Jennifer Rothgeb: Jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov

The QDET conference is sponsored by ASA/SRM, AAPOR, IASS, CASRO, and CMOR.
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SURVEY ABOUT ACCOUNTABILITY ONLINE

By AMY HARMON

If the American public could elect a governing body for the Internet, candidates would include the Pope, William H. Gates, Oprah Winfrey, teachers, ex-hackers and "regular folks," according to the first major study of public attitudes about accountability on the Internet, to be released today by the Markle Foundation, a nonprofit group that focuses on public policy and technology.

The ever-expanding citizenry of the Internet -- 63 percent of American adults now go online, up from 39 percent in 1998, according to the report -- is not likely to have that opportunity anytime soon. But Markle's yearlong inquiry found that Americans would like to have significantly more say into the rules that govern the Internet. Not only that, but they would like a variety of people and institutions to pitch in, and members of focus groups suggested a range of participants in a hypothetical national commission.

"There is a strong desire on the part of the public to have their values respected as the technology developed and some markers laid out as to what those values are," Markle's president, Zoë Baird, said. "People are looking for more democratic decision-making in a medium that has such widespread consequences for our personal and civic lives."

That may mean finding a way to wield public influence in decisions about privacy, the quality of information and consumer protection, power now typically left to business executives and technologists who design software, Ms. Baird said, because in many ways, technology has replaced government as the main regulator of online behavior.

Markle's study, which included telephone and online polling and focus groups of the public and of Internet experts, found enormous enthusiasm for the Internet, with 83 percent of those who use it having a positive view and 79 percent saying it had made their lives easier.

But the zeal was tempered by the view of about half of those surveyed that the Internet is a "source of worry" because of concerns that include pornography, privacy violations and poor connection speeds. Fifty-nine percent of those polled said they did not know who they would turn to if they had a problem.

Many focus-group participants wished for the equivalent of the safety net that exists for credit card fraud, a phone number they can call when their card is stolen or there is a billing error. Seventy percent said users have to question what they read on the Internet, and more than half -- 54 percent -- said they did not believe they had the same rights and protections online as off.

To some extent, the frustrations are a reflection of the impersonal nature of the Internet. It is hard to imagine a single help line for the
myriad problems one can encounter. Among the experts on the focus groups, a common view was that individual rights carried over to the Internet, but that traditional safeguards, like the ability to size up a store by its location and appearance, do not exist.

The desire to make the Internet more closely mirror the world off-line was underscored by the response to the much-debated issue of taxation, where 60 percent said that online purchases should be taxed, despite the efforts of some lawmakers and Web sites to keep the Internet tax free.

Still, the sharp frustrations amid the general embrace of the Internet raise the concern that the medium may not live up to its potential unless the public has a sense of more control over its choices, Ms. Baird said. Although 60 percent of those surveyed said rules for governing the Internet should be mostly developed and enforced by the private sector, 64 percent also said that "government should develop rules to protect people" on the Internet.

Ms. Baird, who has been working with standards-making bodies and world governments to establish forums in which companies, governments, nonprofit groups and public representatives could be heard on questions of Internet policy, said the report reinforced the need to build that constituency before an "online oil spill" alienates the public.

But not everyone agrees that the Internet needs more regulation. Esther Dyson, the former chairman of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, or Icann, the agency that controls the Internet address system, said that users, and not a governing body, could better govern the Internet through which Web sites they visit and what goods they buy.

"I've found people want democracy, but they're often unwilling to do the work, whether it's looking at voting records or taking the most basic measures to protect their own privacy," said Ms. Dyson, who serves on a committee that is trying to increase public representation in Icann. "Frankly sometimes you don't need democracy, you need a market where people understand what's being offered and choose what they want."

Still, both positions could be heard in the response of a young focus-group participant from Syosset, N.Y., when asked who should make the rules that govern the Internet. "We should," the participant said. "The people."
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Survey Shows Support for Internet Rules

By Jonathan Krim
Washington Post Staff Writer

Americans are conflicted about the Internet, enthusiastically embracing it even as they worry about privacy, misinformation and sexual or violent content, according to a study to be released today.

Aimed at stimulating public policy debate as the medium becomes more integral to daily life, the extensive survey of typical users and Internet experts conducted for the New York-based Markle Foundation found Americans concerned about their rights and wrestling with several key issues:

** Although wary of government regulation for the Internet, for example, a majority want some rules to protect their privacy when they are online, and they even see a government role in such areas as Internet service problems and the cost of connections.

** By an overwhelming margin of 70 percent to 23 percent, respondents said they question the truthfulness of most things they read on the Internet.

** By a slim but growing plurality, respondents believe the Internet is disturbingly resistant to accountability, both on the part of individuals for their actions or words online and on the part of private and public institutions that govern its use.
Nearly half of the Internet experts surveyed said that existing institutions are doing a fair or poor job of reflecting the public's interest.

The concerns are not scaring users away, however, and the survey reflects a growing sophistication about the risks of the Internet and a desire for more public involvement in policymaking. Yet a majority of respondents also said they do not know enough to participate in a meaningful way.

"The public appears to be looking for a pluralistic model of Internet governance," according to a copy of the study obtained by The Washington Post. "They see specific strengths, but also drawbacks, to the involvement of the government, the private sector and non-profit organizations."

At one point in the year-plus study, focus groups were asked to provide nominees for a hypothetical national commission on Internet rulemaking, and the array of names offered included Bill Gates of Microsoft, Oprah Winfrey, Interpol and the pope.

The study also shows Americans as viewing the Internet primarily as a giant library rather than a place to shop or use financial services. And in the finding likely to stir the most political controversy, a strong 60 percent believe it is wrong to exempt online commerce from taxation.

Extending the federal moratorium on Internet taxes -- which expires in October -- has broad support on Capitol Hill. But governors are seeking the opportunity to develop a long-term, uniform plan that would enable easy Internet tax collection. Representatives of the bipartisan Congressional Internet Caucus will begin examining the study today.

The more than 2,000 respondents in both random phone surveys and focus groups in several U.S. cities gave pointed answers on their top concerns and suggestions to ease the frustrations of online life.

Topping the list of concerns are pornography and violence, protecting children, and ensuring individual privacy. Among the top suggestions for improvement is a 24-hour, toll-free number providing help with online problems, consumer complaints and privacy issues. Users also favor privacy policies that are "opt-in," meaning that they have to actively direct a site to capture personal information, as opposed to "opt-out," in which such data is collected unless users specifically ask that it not be.

The Markle study is unique among surveys of its kind in its focus on how Internet public policy should develop. And many of the respondents, especially Internet experts, worry that such policymaking won't be proactive.

"Ultimately, most of the experts expect that major changes in rules and institutions for online accountability are unlikely to change until some kind of disaster occurs," the report says. Officials of the Markle Foundation, which studies and provides grants on the social impact of technology, declined to comment until its formal release.
Those who might want to read the actual report, rather than the media rehashes of the executive summary section, can get it in Adobe Acrobat format from the Markle Foundation at:


Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com
Folks,

I have just learned from CNN that the interview on the Markle Survey which I taped with two CNN reporters yesterday--here at my house in Manhattan Beach--is scheduled to be first aired tonight at 7, PDT (which I suppose might make it 10 EDT, although I can't recall now just how CNN manipulates its pre-recorded programming over the time zones).

I do know that you have all heard more than enough from me, and I can tell you in advance that I didn't say anything that you all don't already know, but because my two daughters--Katherine and Ann--did play an active role in the CNN coverage, the many of you who have been kind enough to express interest in them--over the past six years, three months, and five days (but who's counting?)--may wish to take advantage of CNN to see how much they've grown since AAPOR's 50th, which they both still think is the name of their East Coast uncle, and second cousin of The Tooth Fairy.

I apologize for using AAPORNENET for such a personal message--I won't do it again any time soon, I promise. -- Jim

******
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The Washington Post reports today (7/10/01) on a poll about perceptions of racial equality in America that the Post conducted in collaboration with the Kaiser Foundation and Harvard University.

Richard Morin's summary from the Post print edition is reproduced below.

What appears to be a full set of questions and tabulated results for the survey are posted on the Post web site at:
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Misperceptions Cloud Whites' View of Blacks
By Richard Morin
Washington Post Staff Writer
Wednesday, July 11, 2001; Page A01

Whether out of hostility, indifference or simple lack of knowledge, large numbers of white Americans incorrectly believe that blacks are as well off as whites in terms of their jobs, incomes, schooling and health care, according to a national survey by The Washington Post, the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard University.

Depending on the question, the poll found that 40 percent to 60 percent of all whites say that the average black American is faring about as well and perhaps even better than the average white in these areas.

In fact, government statistics show that blacks have narrowed the gap, but continue to lag significantly behind whites in employment, income, education and access to health care.

These misperceptions have consequences, the survey suggests. Among whites, the pervasiveness of incorrect views seems to explain, at least in part, white resistance to even the least intrusive types of
affirmative action. And more broadly, these mistaken beliefs represent formidable obstacles to any government effort to equalize the social and economic standing of the races.

"The results suggest there is the overwhelming sense among most whites that this is 2001 -- we could not possibly be saddled with segregation and discrimination and therefore things can't possibly be as bad as black Americans say they are," said political scientist Keith Reeves of Swarthmore College, an expert on racial attitudes and a consultant on the survey project.

These results also defy conventional wisdom. They indicate that many whites do not broadly view blacks as particularly disadvantaged or beset by problems that demand immediate attention. Instead, these whites believe exactly the opposite -- that African Americans already have achieved economic and social parity. For these broadly misinformed whites, equality between the races is a reality.

"Blacks and whites are pretty much equal in terms of income and other things these days," said Emily Reed, 48, who lives in Russell, N.Y., and was questioned in the poll. "It's good that the bad days are past and blacks have come up. As a whole, you don't hear about [problems] now as you used to. Now if something occurs, like a black guy being mistreated for a job or something, you hear about it."

Others were less upbeat. "I think it's pretty even, but you'd never get blacks to admit it," said Thomas Ripley, 71, a retiree who lives in Belleville, Ill. "It keeps the pressure on government for more programs."

Overall, the survey found that a majority of whites favored federal government action to ensure that all races had access to schools and health care. A larger majority said the government should make sure that blacks and whites were treated the same by police and the courts.

Still, whites with accurate views of black circumstances were more likely (69 percent versus 57 percent) to say the federal government has an obligation to make sure black and white children attend schools of equal quality.

Informed whites also were more likely to say the government had an obligation to ensure that the races were treated equally by the courts and police (79 percent versus 60 percent).

Black Gains in Society

Blacks have a far more negative view of their own circumstances, the poll found. Majorities of those polled said blacks continue to lag behind whites in terms of their educational achievement, income, jobs and health care. (Still, anywhere from a quarter to just over a third of all blacks also thought that African Americans were doing as well as whites in the areas tested.)

This survey is the latest in a series of polls on public policy issues conducted by The Post, the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard University researchers and includes questions on racial attitudes asked in the first Post/Kaiser/Harvard project in 1995.
A total of 1,709 randomly selected adults were interviewed by telephone from March 8 through April 22. The sample included 779 non-Hispanic whites, 315 Hispanics, 323 blacks and 254 Asians. The margin of sampling error for the overall results is plus or minus 3 percentage points. It is plus or minus 4 points for whites, 6 points for blacks, 7 points for Latinos and 9 points for Asians.

Blacks have made dramatic progress in many, if not most, areas of American life. There have never been more blacks in the middle class or a larger share who have graduated from high school, gone to college, or entered professional schools. Virtually everywhere, from law firms to corporate board rooms to college faculties, African Americans are rapidly closing the achievement gap with white America.

But economic and social distance between blacks and whites is far from closed, except in the minds of many white Americans.

Six in 10 whites -- 61 percent -- say the average black has equal or better access to health care than the average white, according to the poll.

In fact, blacks are far more likely to be without health insurance than whites. In 2000, the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey found that blacks were nearly twice as likely as whites to be without health insurance.

The survey found that half of all whites -- 49 percent -- believe that blacks and whites have similar levels of education, a perception that again is out of step with reality.

About one in six blacks -- 17 percent -- have completed college, compared with 28 percent of all whites. And 88 percent of all whites are high school graduates, compared with 79 percent of all blacks 25 years old or older.

"I'm surprised at those numbers; I thought everybody was the same these days," said Jeffrey Thomas, 42, an ironworker who lives in Salem, Ore.

Thomas said his views on African Americans were based largely on the blacks that he knows and those he sees in his community. "I have black friends, and my son's friend is black, and everybody's in the same boat around here in Salem," he said. "Maybe if you went to Portland, things would be different."

Half of all whites -- 50 percent -- say that the average black is about as well off as the average white in terms of the jobs they hold, according to the Post/Kaiser/Harvard survey. Again, the hard data are less positive: A third of all whites hold professional or managerial jobs, compared to slightly more than one-fifth of all blacks, according to census data.

Blacks are about twice as likely as whites -- 23 versus 12 percent -- to hold lower-paying, less prestigious service jobs. Blacks also are more than twice as likely to be unemployed; in May, the jobless rate for blacks stood at 8 percent, compared with 3.8 percent among whites.
"Those figures are probably correct," said Brian Clayton, 35, director of information technology for a law firm in Dayton, Ohio. "But what were they 10 years ago? Twenty years ago? I think we're moving in the right direction. You shouldn't just make a black a manager because he's black. It's going to take more time."

The poll found that a majority of whites -- 57 percent -- recognize that blacks on average earn less than whites. Still, four in 10 whites -- 42 percent -- believed incorrectly that the typical black earned as much or more than the typical white.

In fact, substantial differences persist between black and white earnings. The median household income for whites was $44,366 in 1999, compared with $27,910 for blacks. Fewer than three in 10 whites earn less than $25,000; nearly half of all blacks in 1999 earned less than that. And the poverty rate for African Americans is more than double the white rate.

Blacks were twice as likely to have reported having difficulties recently paying their rent or mortgage and about half as likely as whites to have money invested in stocks, bonds or mutual funds, according to the Post/Kaiser/Harvard poll.

Another way to look at the extent of these misperceptions is to see what proportion of whites holds at least one false belief about black circumstances. When analyzed together, seven in 10 whites hold at least one of these misperceptions, and a majority -- 56 percent -- held two or more. Three in 10 whites -- 31 percent -- believe that the average black fared as well or better than whites in each of the four areas tested.

Perception of Competition

The sources of these misperceptions remain elusive. Swarthmore's Reeves suggests that part of the answer is that black success, in part, may be masking lingering black disadvantage. As the black middle class swells, more whites see blacks who have the same skills, earn the same money, and live in the same kinds of neighborhoods.

Another part of the explanation is that whites may be feeling increased competition from blacks for jobs, promotions and college admission, Reeves said.

The survey found that less well-educated and lower-income whites -- groups most likely to be competing directly with blacks -- were significantly more likely to be misinformed about black circumstances. These pressures could breed resentment among whites, particularly toward any actions that would seem to provide additional and undeserved benefits to blacks.

And part of the answer, Reeves said, is that it simply is convenient for some whites to claim that blacks and whites are equal. Such beliefs eliminate the need for whites to take action on problems that disproportionately face the black community. "There remains an unwillingness to acknowledge reality and an unwillingness to move forward on the difficult question of race," he said.
The survey provides evidence for this view. Misinformed whites were far less likely to view black problems as being serious, or to favor government action to correct persistent social and economic disparities.

"They're treated just like anyone else," said Tom Morford, 54, a steelworker who lives in Export, Pa. "Some may use it as an excuse to get things. For some, complaining is a way of life. But discrimination is not a problem, from what I can see."

These divisions echo loudly in the policy arena, where they help to shape attitudes on an array of high-profile and racially charged issues such as affirmative action.

The survey found that an overwhelming majority of all whites and blacks continue to reject giving outright preferences to blacks and other minorities in employment or admissions to college, views that differed little by how much whites knew about black circumstances.

But "hard" preference programs are vanishing fast from the scene, either ended by judges who ruled these programs constituted reverse discrimination or abandoned by their besieged sponsors. In their place, many corporations and colleges are mounting "outreach" programs that aggressively seek qualified minorities.

But the Post/Kaiser/Harvard survey revealed that even these outreach programs are not popular with whites: only half -- 49 percent -- favor them, while 45 percent are opposed.

John Straley, 30, a firefighter in Rockford, Ill., opposes preference and outreach programs if the result is that blacks receive more consideration than equally qualified whites.

"That boils down to reverse discrimination," Straley said. "I think education and jobs should be open to everybody. If they want to recruit minorities, fine, as long as an equally qualified white isn't replaced. If that's a problem, make the school bigger."

Assistant Director of Polling Claudia Deane contributed to this report.
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Misperceptions Cloud Whites' View of Blacks
By Richard Morin
Washington Post Staff Writer
Wednesday, July 11, 2001; Page A01

Whether out of hostility, indifference or simple lack of knowledge, large numbers of white Americans incorrectly believe that blacks are as well off as whites in terms of their jobs, incomes, schooling and health care, according to a national survey by The Washington Post, the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard University.
Depending on the question, the poll found that 40 percent to 60 percent of all whites say that the average black American is faring about as well and perhaps even better than the average white in these areas.

In fact, government statistics show that blacks have narrowed the gap, but continue to lag significantly behind whites in employment, income, education and access to health care.

These misperceptions have consequences, the survey suggests. Among whites, the pervasiveness of incorrect views seems to explain, at least in part, white resistance to even the least intrusive types of affirmative action. And more broadly, these mistaken beliefs represent formidable obstacles to any government effort to equalize the social and economic standing of the races.

"The results suggest there is the overwhelming sense among most whites that this is 2001 -- we could not possibly be saddled with segregation and discrimination and therefore things can't possibly be as bad as black Americans say they are," said political scientist Keith Reeves of Swarthmore College, an expert on racial attitudes and a consultant on the survey project.

These results also defy conventional wisdom. They indicate that many whites do not broadly view blacks as particularly disadvantaged or beset by problems that demand immediate attention. Instead, these whites believe exactly the opposite -- that African Americans already have achieved economic and social parity. For these broadly misinformed whites, equality between the races is a reality.

"Blacks and whites are pretty much equal in terms of income and other things these days," said Emily Reed, 48, who lives in Russell, N.Y., and was questioned in the poll. "It's good that the bad days are past and blacks have come up. As a whole, you don't hear about [problems] now as you used to. Now if something occurs, like a black guy being mistreated for a job or something, you hear about it."

Others were less upbeat. "I think it's pretty even, but you'd never get blacks to admit it," said Thomas Ripley, 71, a retiree who lives in Belleville, Ill. "It keeps the pressure on government for more programs."

Overall, the survey found that a majority of whites favored federal government action to ensure that all races had access to schools and health care. A larger majority said the government should make sure that blacks and whites were treated the same by police and the courts.

Still, whites with accurate views of black circumstances were more likely (69 percent versus 57 percent) to say the federal government has an obligation to make sure black and white children attend schools of equal quality.

Informed whites also were more likely to say the government had an obligation to ensure that the races were treated equally by the courts and police (79 percent versus 60 percent).

Black Gains in Society
Blacks have a far more negative view of their own circumstances, the poll found. Majorities of those polled said blacks continue to lag behind whites in terms of their educational achievement, income, jobs and health care. (Still, anywhere from a quarter to just over a third of all blacks also thought that African Americans were doing as well as whites in the areas tested.)

This survey is the latest in a series of polls on public policy issues conducted by The Post, the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard University researchers and includes questions on racial attitudes asked in the first Post/Kaiser/Harvard project in 1995.

A total of 1,709 randomly selected adults were interviewed by telephone from March 8 through April 22. The sample included 779 non-Hispanic whites, 315 Hispanics, 323 blacks and 254 Asians. The margin of sampling error for the overall results is plus or minus 3 percentage points. It is plus or minus 4 points for whites, 6 points for blacks, 7 points for Latinos and 9 points for Asians.

Blacks have made dramatic progress in many, if not most, areas of American life. There have never been more blacks in the middle class or a larger share who have graduated from high school, gone to college, or entered professional schools. Virtually everywhere, from law firms to corporate board rooms to college faculties, African Americans are rapidly closing the achievement gap with white America.

But economic and social distance between blacks and whites is far from closed, except in the minds of many white Americans.

Six in 10 whites -- 61 percent -- say the average black has equal or better access to health care than the average white, according to the poll.

In fact, blacks are far more likely to be without health insurance than whites. In 2000, the U.S. Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey found that blacks were nearly twice as likely as whites to be without health insurance.

The survey found that half of all whites -- 49 percent -- believe that blacks and whites have similar levels of education, a perception that again is out of step with reality.

About one in six blacks -- 17 percent -- have completed college, compared with 28 percent of all whites. And 88 percent of all whites are high school graduates, compared with 79 percent of all blacks 25 years old or older.

"I'm surprised at those numbers; I thought everybody was the same these days," said Jeffrey Thomas, 42, an ironworker who lives in Salem, Ore.

Thomas said his views on African Americans were based largely on the blacks that he knows and those he sees in his community. "I have black friends, and my son's friend is black, and everybody's in the same boat around here in Salem," he said. "Maybe if you went to Portland, things would be different."

Half of all whites -- 50 percent -- say that the average black is about
as well off as the average white in terms of the jobs they hold, according to the Post/Kaiser/ Harvard survey. Again, the hard data are less positive: A third of all whites hold professional or managerial jobs, compared to slightly more than one-fifth of all blacks, according to census data.

Blacks are about twice as likely as whites -- 23 versus 12 percent -- to hold lower-paying, less prestigious service jobs. Blacks also are more than twice as likely to be unemployed; in May, the jobless rate for blacks stood at 8 percent, compared with 3.8 percent among whites.

"Those figures are probably correct," said Brian Clayton, 35, director of information technology for a law firm in Dayton, Ohio. "But what were they 10 years ago? Twenty years ago? I think we're moving in the right direction. You shouldn't just make a black a manager because he's black. It's going to take more time."

The poll found that a majority of whites -- 57 percent -- recognize that blacks on average earn less than whites. Still, four in 10 whites -- 42 percent -- believed incorrectly that the typical black earned as much or more than the typical white.

In fact, substantial differences persist between black and white earnings. The median household income for whites was $44,366 in 1999, compared with $27,910 for blacks. Fewer than three in 10 whites earn less than $25,000; nearly half of all blacks in 1999 earned less than that. And the poverty rate for African Americans is more than double the white rate.

Blacks were twice as likely to have reported having difficulties recently paying their rent or mortgage and about half as likely as whites to have money invested in stocks, bonds or mutual funds, according to the Post/Kaiser/Harvard poll.

Another way to look at the extent of these misperceptions is to see what proportion of whites holds at least one false belief about black circumstances. When analyzed together, seven in 10 whites hold at least one of these misperceptions, and a majority -- 56 percent -- held two or more. Three in 10 whites -- 31 percent -- believe that the average black fared as well or better than whites in each of the four areas tested.

Perception of Competition

The sources of these misperceptions remain elusive. Swarthmore's Reeves suggests that part of the answer is that black success, in part, may be masking lingering black disadvantage. As the black middle class swells, more whites see blacks who have the same skills, earn the same money, and live in the same kinds of neighborhoods.

Another part of the explanation is that whites may be feeling increased competition from blacks for jobs, promotions and college admission, Reeves said.

The survey found that less well-educated and lower-income whites -- groups most likely to be competing directly with blacks -- were significantly more likely to be misinformed about black circumstances.
These pressures could breed resentment among whites, particularly toward any actions that would seem to provide additional and undeserved benefits to blacks.

And part of the answer, Reeves said, is that it simply is convenient for some whites to claim that blacks and whites are equal. Such beliefs eliminate the need for whites to take action on problems that disproportionally face the black community. "There remains an unwillingness to acknowledge reality and an unwillingness to move forward on the difficult question of race," he said.

The survey provides evidence for this view. Misinformed whites were far less likely to view black problems as being serious, or to favor government action to correct persistent social and economic disparities.

"They're treated just like anyone else," said Tom Morford, 54, a steelworker who lives in Export, Pa. "Some may use it as an excuse to get things. For some, complaining is a way of life. But discrimination is not a problem, from what I can see."

These divisions echo loudly in the policy arena, where they help to shape attitudes on an array of high-profile and racially charged issues such as affirmative action.

The survey found that an overwhelming majority of all whites and blacks continue to reject giving outright preferences to blacks and other minorities in employment or admissions to college, views that differed little by how much whites knew about black circumstances.

But "hard" preference programs are vanishing fast from the scene, either ended by judges who ruled these programs constituted reverse discrimination or abandoned by their besieged sponsors. In their place, many corporations and colleges are mounting "outreach" programs that aggressively seek qualified minorities.

But the Post/Kaiser/Harvard survey revealed that even these outreach programs are not popular with whites: only half -- 49 percent -- favor them, while 45 percent are opposed.

John Straley, 30, a firefighter in Rockford, Ill., opposes preference and outreach programs if the result is that blacks receive more consideration than equally qualified whites.

"That boils down to reverse discrimination," Straley said. "I think education and jobs should be open to everybody. If they want to recruit minorities, fine, as long as an equally qualified white isn't replaced. If that's a problem, make the school bigger."

Assistant Director of Polling Claudia Deane contributed to this report.
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The Washington Post reports today (7/10/01) on a poll about perceptions of racial equality in America that the Post conducted in collaboration with the Kaiser Foundation and Harvard University.

Richard Morin's summary from the Post print edition is reproduced below.

What appears to be a full set of questions and tabulated results for the survey are posted on the Post web site at:
Whether out of hostility, indifference or simple lack of knowledge, large numbers of white Americans incorrectly believe that blacks are as well off as whites in terms of their jobs, incomes, schooling and health, according to a national survey by The Washington Post, the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard University.

Depending on the question, the poll found that 40 to 60 percent of all whites say that the average black American is faring about as well and perhaps even better than the average white in these areas.

In fact, government statistics show that blacks have narrowed the gap, but continue to lag significantly behind whites in employment, income, education and access to health care.

These misperceptions have consequences, the survey suggests. Among whites, the pervasiveness of incorrect views seems to explain, at least in part, white resistance to even the least intrusive types of affirmative action. And more broadly, these mistaken beliefs represent formidable obstacles to any government effort to equalize the social and
The results suggest there is the overwhelming sense among most whites that this is 2001 -- we could not possibly be saddled with segregation and discrimination and therefore things can't possibly be as bad as.

Black Americans say they are, said political scientist Keith Reeves of Swarthmore College, an expert on racial attitudes and a consultant on the survey project.

These results also defy conventional wisdom. They indicate that many whites do not broadly view blacks as particularly disadvantaged or beset by problems that demand immediate attention. Instead, these whites believe exactly the opposite -- that African Americans already have achieved economic and social parity. For these broadly misinformed whites, equality between the races is a reality.

"Blacks and whites are pretty much equal in terms of income and other things these days," said Emily Reed, 48, who lives in Russell, N.Y., and was questioned in the poll. "It's good that the bad days are past and blacks have come up. As a whole, you don't hear about [problems] now as black guy being mistreated.

Others were less upbeat. "I think it's pretty even, but you'd never get blacks to admit it," said Thomas Ripley, 71, a retiree who lives in Belleville, Ill. It keeps the pressure on government for more.

Overall, the survey found that a majority of whites favored federal government action to ensure that all races had access to schools and
A larger majority said the government should make sure black and whites were treated the same by police and the courts.

Still, whites with accurate views of black circumstances were more likely (69 percent versus 57 percent) to say the federal government has an obligation to make sure black and white children attend schools of equal quality.

Informed whites also were more likely to say the government had an obligation to ensure that the races were treated equally by the courts (79 percent versus 60 percent).

Blacks have a far more negative view of their own circumstances, the poll found. Majorities of those polled said blacks continue to lag behind whites in terms of their educational achievement, income, jobs and health care. (Still, anywhere from a quarter to just over a third of all blacks also thought that African Americans were doing as well as whites in the areas tested.)

This survey is the latest in a series of polls on public policy issues conducted by The Post, the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard University researchers and includes questions on racial attitudes asked in the first Post/Kaiser/Harvard project in 1995. A total of 1,709 randomly selected adults were interviewed by telephone from March 8 through April 22. The sample included 779 non-Hispanic whites, 315 Hispanics, 323 blacks and 254 Asians. The margin of sampling error for the overall results is plus or minus 3 percentage points. It is plus or minus 4 points for =
whites, 6 points for blacks, 7
<br>
points for Latinos and 9 points for Asians.
</p>

Blacks have made dramatic progress in many, if not most, areas of American life. There have never been more blacks in the middle class or a larger share who have graduated from high school, gone to college, entered professional schools; Virtually everywhere, from law firms to corporate board rooms to college faculties, African Americans are rapidly closing the achievement gap with white America.
</p>

But economic and social distance between blacks and whites is far from closed, except in the minds of many white Americans.

Six in 10 whites -- 61 percent -- say the average black has equal or better access to health care than the average white, according to the poll.

In fact, blacks are far more likely to be without health insurance than whites. In 2000, the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey found that blacks were nearly twice as likely as whites to be without health insurance.

The survey found that half of all whites -- 49 percent -- believe that blacks and whites have similar levels of education, a perception that again is out of step with reality.

About one in six blacks -- 17 percent -- have completed college, compared with 28 percent of all whites. And 88 percent of all whites are high school graduates, compared with 79 percent of all blacks 25 years old or older.

&quot;I'm surprised at those numbers; I thought =
everybody was the same these days," said Jeffrey Thomas, 42, an ironworker who lives in Salem, Ore.

Thomas said his views on African Americans were based largely on the blacks that he knows and those he sees in his community. &quot;I have black friends, and my son's friend is black, and everybody's in the same boat around here in Salem,&quot; he said. &quot;Maybe if you went to Portland, things would be different.&quot;

Half of all whites -- 50 percent -- say that the average black is about as well off as the average white in terms of the jobs they hold, according to the Post/Kaiser/Harvard survey. Again, the hard data are less positive: A third of all whites hold professional or managerial jobs, compared to slightly more than one-fifth of all blacks, according to census data.

Blacks are about twice as likely as whites -- 23 versus 12 percent -- to hold lower-paying, less prestigious service jobs. Blacks also are more than twice as likely to be unemployed; in May, the jobless rate for blacks stood at 8 percent, compared with 3.8 percent among whites.

&quot;Those figures are probably correct,&quot; said Brian Clayton, 35, director of information technology for a law firm in Dayton, Ohio. &quot;But what were they 10 years ago? Twenty years ago? I think we're moving in the right direction. You shouldn't just make a black a manager because he's black.&quot;

The poll found that a majority of whites -- 57 percent -- recognize that blacks on average earn less than whites. Still, four in 10 whites -- 42 percent -- believed incorrectly that the typical black earned as much or more than the average white.
more than the typical white.

In fact, substantial differences persist between black and white earnings. The median household income for whites was $44,366 in 1999, compared with $27,910 for blacks. Fewer than three in 10 whites earn less than $25,000; nearly half of all blacks in 1999 earned less than that. And the poverty rate for African Americans is more than double.

Blacks were twice as likely to have reported having difficulties recently paying their rent or mortgage and about half as likely as whites to have money invested in stocks, bonds or mutual funds, according to the Post/Kaiser/Harvard poll.

Another way to look at the extent of these misperceptions is to see what proportion of whites holds at least one false belief about black circumstances. When analyzed together, seven in 10 whites hold at least one of these misperceptions, and a majority -- 56 percent -- held two or more. Three in 10 whites -- 31 percent -- believe that the average black fared as well or better than whites in each of the four areas tested.

Perception of Competition

The sources of these misperceptions remain elusive. Swarthmore's Reeves suggests that part of the answer is that black success, in part, may be masking lingering black disadvantage. As the black middle class swells, more whites see blacks who have the same skills, earn the same money, and live in the same kinds of neighborhoods.

Another part of the explanation is that whites may be feeling increased competition from blacks for jobs, promotions and =
college admission,

Reeves said.

The survey found that less well-educated and lower-income whites -- groups most likely to be competing directly with blacks -- were significantly more likely to be misinformed about black circumstances. These pressures could breed resentment among whites, particularly toward any actions that would seem to provide additional and undeserved benefits to blacks.

And part of the answer, Reeves said, is that it simply is convenient for some whites to claim that blacks and whites are equal. Such beliefs eliminate the need for whites to take action on problems that disproportionately face the black community. There remains an unwillingness to acknowledge reality and an unwillingness to move forward on the difficult question of race, he said.

The survey provides evidence for this view. Misinformed whites were far less likely to view black problems as being serious, or to favor government action to correct persistent social and economic disparities.

"They're treated just like anyone else," said Tom Morford, 54, a steelworker who lives in Export, Pa. Some may use it as an excuse to get things. For some, complaining is a way of life. But discrimination is not a problem, from what I can see.

These divisions echo loudly in the policy arena, where they help to shape attitudes on an array of high-profile and racially charged issues such as affirmative action.

The survey found that an overwhelming majority of all whites and blacks
continue to reject giving outright preferences to blacks and other minorities in employment or admissions to college, views that differed little by how much whites knew about black circumstances.

But "hard" preference programs are vanishing fast from the scene, either ended by judges who ruled these programs constituted reverse discrimination or abandoned by their besieged sponsors. In their place, many corporations and colleges are mounting &quot;outreach&quot; programs that aggressively seek qualified minorities.

But the Post/Kaiser/Harvard survey revealed that even these outreach programs are not popular with whites: only half -- 49 percent -- favor them, while 45 percent are opposed.

John Straley, 30, a firefighter in Rockford, Ill., opposes preference and outreach programs if the result is that blacks receive more consideration than equally qualified whites.

"That boils down to reverse discrimination," Straley said. "I think education and jobs should be open to everybody. If they want to recruit minorities, fine, as long as an equally qualified white isn't replaced.

If that's a problem, make the school bigger."

Assistant Director of Polling Claudia Deane contributed to this report.
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Dear colleagues:

I am looking for empirical data that track two trends in interpersonal relations in the United States: One is the switch from formal address in dealing with strangers to intimate first-naming, particularly in business telephone conversations. The second is the increased use of profanity in casual conversation. I'd appreciate hearing from anyone who has actual evidence to support what are now just personal observations. Also I'd like to hear from anyone doing omnibus surveys who might be willing to tack on a couple of questions dealing with this subject.

Thanks.

Leo Bogart
Dear colleagues:

I am looking for empirical data that track two trends in interpersonal relations in the United States: One is the switch from formal address in dealing with strangers to intimate first-naming, particularly in business telephone conversations. The second is the increased use of profanity in casual conversation. I'd appreciate hearing from anyone who has actual evidence to support what are now just personal observations. Also I'd like to hear from anyone doing omnibus surveys who might be willing to tack on a couple of questions dealing with this subject. Thanks.

Leo Bogart
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If you're in the Washington, D.C. area this summer, come join DC/AAPOR for dinner and a social evening on Thursday, August 2, from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. Once again we're meeting in Rosslyn's USA Today Tower. If you haven't been there, the view of Washington from the 17th Floor is spectacular. Members, nonmembers and prospective members welcome. Here are the details:

SUMMER SOCIAL EVENING
Come join the fun!

What: Dinner and a social evening
   Mix and mingle
   Introduction of the new officers

Date & Time: Thursday, August 2, 2001
   6:30 - 9:00 p.m.

Location: USA Today, 17th Floor
   1000 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA

Parking: Available at 1000 Wilson (@ N. Arlington Ridge Rd.)
   Gate will open if closed.
   Take elevator from garage to "mall."
   Walk to USA Today front desk.

Metro: Ride Blue or Orange Line to Rosslyn.
   Walk to Gannett Tower, 1100 Wilson (@ Lynn St.).
   Take escalator from lower mall up to mall level.
   Follow mallway to USA Today front desk.

RSVP: Mail check for $20.00 per person, payable to DC/AAPOR, so that it arrives by Saturday, July 28. Address it to:
   Karen Goldenberg
   18717 Severn Road
   Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Or RSVP by e-mail or phone by Monday, July 30
   E-mail: dc-aapor.admin@erols.com
   Phone: Call Kathy Herring at 202-691-6371.
   Leave your name and telephone number, and pay at the door.

Hope to see you there!
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One data source that has always interested me because of potential for
to re-analysis is transcripts of focus groups. Although not "casual," focus
groups aren't exactly formal either and I've noticed an increase in swearing
in them over the years, which you should be able to document if you can
sample transcripts going back a while from companies that specialize in this
line of work. If electronic versions of transcripts are available, it
wouldn't be that hard to count the cuss words and divide by the total number
of words in the file for a quick and dirty measure.

Of course, Oval Office tape recordings offer another rich source of
swearing. A measure such as "expletives per hour" from the original tapes
and/or transcripts of Nixon and other presidents, if available, would be a
neat source of data on casual conversations among the powerful.

Woody Carter
Director of Research
Metro Chicago Information Center
360 N. Michigan Ave. Suite 1409
Chicago IL 60601
312 580-2873
FAX 312 580-2879
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Dear colleagues:

I am looking for empirical data that track two trends in interpersonal
relations in the United States: One is the switch from formal address in
dealing with strangers to intimate first-naming, particularly in business
telephone conversations. The second is the increased use of profanity in
casual conversation. I'd appreciate hearing from anyone who has actual
evidence to support what are now just personal observations. Also I'd like to hear from anyone doing omnibus surveys who might be willing to tack on a couple of questions dealing with this subject. Thanks.

Leo Bogart

-----

Woody Carter
Director of Research
Metro Chicago Information Center
360 N. Michigan Ave. Suite 1409
Chicago IL 60601
312 580-2873
FAX 312 580-2879
Dear colleagues:

I am looking for empirical data that track two trends in interpersonal relations in the United States: One is the switch from formal address in dealing with strangers to intimate first-naming, particularly in business telephone conversations. The second is the increased use of profanity in casual conversation. I'd appreciate hearing from anyone who has actual evidence to support what are now just personal observations. Also I'd like to hear from anyone doing omnibus surveys who might be willing to tack on a couple of questions dealing with this subject. Thanks.

Leo Bogart
Abstract: The use of vague or ambiguous terms may induce systematic biases in respondents' interpretation of survey questions, and thus the answers they provide (Fowler, 1992). One such term, "cash," is used across many federal surveys to describe a key component of household wealth. This study compares results from cognitive interviews using a self-administered form with data collected in an omnibus research telephone survey. Both the cognitive interview results and the survey data suggest respondents resisted using the "cash" concept to describe net proceeds from refinancing a home. Instead, they preferred to describe their motivation for refinancing through an open-ended response option labeled "other reason." This research illustrates respondents' reluctance to use the "cash" concept as liberally as it was intended, for example, in circumstances where funds were diverted to other debt, to finance home improvements, or for other large, one-time expenses. Furthermore, results from a large, second-stage investigation reveal a broader, more complex response problem arising form the use of a vague economic term in the survey question along with a partially closed response format.

Sponsored by American Association for Public Opinion Research Washington/Baltimore Chapter

Note: If you prefer not to receive e-mail notices like this, please let us know at dc-aapor.admin@erols.com.
Coming two days after the release of the Markle Foundation survey on governing the Internet, this seems like both a smart and self-serving move by the Senate Democrats. The ambiguous if not poor data collected so far may not be the best guide, however (my own guess is that most who frequent the Internet want little or no governance, apart from that necessary to protect their own personal privacy). Whatever the case, it's an interesting question, its time has come, and it deserves much further study. I hope that those of you in the polling business will lead us ahead on this--the mistakes we make now might well be inherited by our children (if past technologies are any guide).

-- Jim
differences over how to address the issue. Central to it is the question of how much legal authority individuals should have in choosing when information is collected about where they go and what they view on the World Wide Web.

In testimony yesterday, privacy advocates called on Congress to require banks, retailers, service providers and others to obtain "opt-in" permission from customers before collecting any details about them.

"Privacy law makes clear that consent must be meaningful and that this often requires prior express consent," said Marc Rotenberg, executive director of the Electronic Privacy Information Center. "Privacy advocates and experts favor the opt-in approach," he said, because "it follows the common-sense understanding of consent."

But many companies oppose that approach, saying it would be costly to implement and would hinder activity on the Web. They prefer the prevailing approach in which customers who don't want personal information collected for marketing and other purposes "opt out" of such collection and sharing by notifying the company.

Fred Cate, director of the Information Law and Commerce Institute at the Indiana University School of Law, said that businesses are right to oppose giving consumers absolute control over how their information is used. He said many people are not as worried about privacy as advocates contend.

"The problem is that most consumers, in practice, don't want to exercise that control over the information we disclose and generate," he said. "We don't want to take the time to make those decisions, [and] we often lack the knowledge or experience to understand the decisions we are being asked to make."

In setting an aggressive tenor for the hearing, Hollings sided with advocates who want to put more authority in the hands of customers. He mocked as confusing and deceptive some recent federally mandated privacy notices issued by financial services companies to tell customers about their opt-out rights.

"Quite clearly, this is concrete evidence of why opt-out doesn't work," Hollings said. "And if it won't work when they mail you the notice, it certainly won't work on the Internet when the notice is buried behind a link at the bottom of a Web page."

Senators and witnesses also wrestled with questions of whether federal Internet privacy law should preempt possible state laws and prohibit private lawsuits for violations.

Ari Schwartz, associate director at the Center for Democracy and Technology, a nonprofit advocacy group, said he was encouraged by the hearing, noting that senators from both parties asked smart questions. But he's not betting on any major legislation this year.
Jim

Many thanks for sending.

Perhaps I misunderstood your comment but there has actually there has been quite a lot of survey work and analysis done on concern about privacy by us (Harris), Alan Westin, Gallup, Pew, Wirthlin, ORC and undoubtedly others. As you know it is a very tricky subject, easy to get conflicting and sometime misleading responses from the public either online or offline.

David Krane
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Coming two days after the release of the Markle Foundation survey on governing the Internet, this seems like both a smart and self-serving move by the Senate Democrats. The ambiguous if not poor data collected so far may not be the
best guide, however (my own guess is that most who frequent the Internet want little or no governance, apart from that necessary to protect their own personal privacy). Whatever the case, it's an interesting question, its time has come, and it deserves much further study. I hope that those of you in the polling business will lead us ahead on this--the mistakes we make now might well be inherited by our children (if past technologies are any guide).

-- Jim
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Democrats Focus on Internet Privacy
Senate Panel Eyes Bigger U.S. Role

By Jonathan Krim and Robert O'Harrow Jr.
Washington Post Staff Writers

A key Senate committee began a new push for Internet privacy legislation yesterday, holding a packed hearing dominated by concerns about data collection and surveillance on the global computer network.

The Commerce Committee session was a clear indication that Democrats, now in control of the Senate, intend to step up the debate about privacy and take a hard look at how business and government agencies collect and use personal information.

"Clearly we need legislation that requires notice, affirmative consent, reasonable access and reasonable security to protect individuals online," Commerce Committee Chairman Ernest F. Hollings (D-S.C.) said in an opening statement. "Poll after poll indicates that the public wants this level of protection."

Democrats and some Republicans, including Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), chairman until the recent changeover, agreed on the need to expand federal protections on the Internet while trying not to stunt the growth of the new medium. It is by no means certain, however, that there will be enough votes this year to take on an issue that is loaded with business and political land mines.

As was the case in a similar debate last year, there are also sharp differences over how to address the issue. Central to it is the question of how much legal authority individuals should have in choosing when information is collected about where they go and what they view on the World Wide Web.

In testimony yesterday, privacy advocates called on Congress to require banks, retailers, service providers and others to obtain "opt-in" permission from customers before collecting any details about them.
"Privacy law makes clear that consent must be meaningful and that this often requires prior express consent," said Marc Rotenberg, executive director of the Electronic Privacy Information Center. "Privacy advocates and experts favor the opt-in approach," he said, because "it follows the common-sense understanding of consent."

But many companies oppose that approach, saying it would be costly to implement and would hinder activity on the Web. They prefer the prevailing approach in which customers who don't want personal information collected for marketing and other purposes "opt out" of such collection and sharing by notifying the company.

Fred Cate, director of the Information Law and Commerce Institute at the Indiana University School of Law, said that businesses are right to oppose giving consumers absolute control over how their information is used. He said many people are not as worried about privacy as advocates contend.

"The problem is that most consumers, in practice, don't want to exercise that control over the information we disclose and generate," he said. "We don't want to take the time to make those decisions, [and] we often lack the knowledge or experience to understand the decisions we are being asked to make."

In setting an aggressive tenor for the hearing, Hollings sided with advocates who want to put more authority in the hands of customers. He mocked as confusing and deceptive some recent federally mandated privacy notices issued by financial services companies to tell customers about their opt-out rights.

"Quite clearly, this is concrete evidence of why opt-out doesn't work," Hollings said. "And if it won't work when they mail you the notice, it certainly won't work on the Internet when the notice is buried behind a link at the bottom of a Web page."

Senators and witnesses also wrestled with questions of whether federal Internet privacy law should preempt possible state laws and prohibit private lawsuits for violations.

Ari Schwartz, associate director at the Center for Democracy and Technology, a nonprofit advocacy group, said he was encouraged by the hearing, noting that senators from both parties asked smart questions. But he's not betting on any major legislation this year.
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RESEARCH POSITION AVAILABLE
QUANTITATIVE SOCIAL SCIENTIST

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, School of Public Health, seeks behavioral scientist for Staff Officer of Research position for secondary analysis of substance use in large national data sets, with emphasis on smoking and nicotine dependence. Responsibilities include computer programming, data analysis and writing of research papers. Expertise in analysis of survey data, programming (SAS), management of large data sets, strong quantitative skills in multivariate methods and good writing skills essential. Working experience with dyadic samples, log-linear procedures, structural equation modeling, survival analysis, and SUDAAN desirable. Applicants should have an interest in the areas of smoking, substance abuse and family. Ph.D. in sociology, psychology or epidemiology required. Publication record an advantage.

Position available immediately. Send vitae, preprints/reprints and three letters of recommendation to: Denise Kandel, Department of Psychiatry, Columbia University, 1051 Riverside Drive, Unit #20, New York, NY 10032. Fax # (212) 305-1933. Email: dbk2@columbia.edu. Equal Opportunity Employer. We welcome nominations from women and minorities.

RESEARCH POSITION AVAILABLE
ASSISTANT PROJECT DIRECTOR

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, School of Public Health, seeks social scientist for Staff Officer of Research Position as an assistant project director for a multiwave longitudinal study of risk and protective factors for adolescent cigarette smoking/nicotine dependence. Responsibilities include: developing interview schedules for computer-administered household interviews with mothers and adolescents; liaison with fieldwork agency, monitoring of fieldwork/data processing activities; statistical analysis, writing reports and papers. Demonstrated excellence in interview development; organizational, writing/communication, computer programming (SAS) skills required; experience with assessment of child psychiatric disorders, data management/analysis desirable. PhD/MA in developmental psychology, sociology, human development, family studies or related fields.
I'd say that for us, we (element) have always gone far beyond the concerns expressed here by requiring participants in our research to read an agreement fully explaining what market research does, guaranteeing that their names will never be associated with the data collected on them, etc. Any company doing market research on the internet, using the internet as a tool, needs to go far beyond these concerns. I'd say that this is more an issue that affects e-commerce and other sites that, for example, offer free services in exchange for information about visitors. But then, we do work only with a panel that is recontacted for research purposes on a regular frequency.

John Mitchell

element
The leading provider of youth data and insight
55 Washington Street
Suite 8A
Brooklyn, NY 11201
ph: 646-827-8380
fax: 646-827-8381

jmitchell@elementusa.com
www.elementcentral.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Krane, David [mailto:DKrane@harrisinteractive.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2001 2:42 PM
Many thanks for sending.

Perhaps I misunderstood your comment but there has actually there has been quite a lot of survey work and analysis done on concern about privacy by us (Harris), Alan Westin, Gallup, Pew, Wirthlin, ORC and undoubtedly others. As you know it is a very tricky subject, easy to get conflicting and sometime misleading responses from the public either online or offline.

David Krane

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2001 2:19 PM
To: AAPORNENET
Subject: Democrats Focus on Internet Privacy (WashPost)

Coming two days after the release of the Markle Foundation survey on governing the Internet, this seems like both a smart and self-serving move by the Senate Democrats. The ambiguous if not poor data collected so far may not be the best guide, however (my own guess is that most who frequent the Internet want little or no governance, apart from that necessary to protect their own personal privacy). Whatever the case, it's an interesting question, its time has come, and it deserves much further study. I hope that those of you in the polling business will lead us ahead on this--the mistakes we make now might well be inherited by our children (if past technologies are any guide).

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
(C) 2001 The Washington Post Company
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thursday, July 12, 2001; Page E02

Democrats Focus on Internet Privacy
Senate Panel Eyes Bigger U.S. Role

By Jonathan Krim and Robert O'Harrow Jr.
Washington Post Staff Writers

A key Senate committee began a new push for Internet privacy legislation yesterday, holding a packed hearing dominated by concerns about data collection and surveillance on the global computer network.
The Commerce Committee session was a clear indication that Democrats, now in control of the Senate, intend to step up the debate about privacy and take a hard look at how business and government agencies collect and use personal information.

"Clearly we need legislation that requires notice, affirmative consent, reasonable access and reasonable security to protect individuals online," Commerce Committee Chairman Ernest F. Hollings (D-S.C.) said in an opening statement. "Poll after poll indicates that the public wants this level of protection."

Democrats and some Republicans, including Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), chairman until the recent changeover, agreed on the need to expand federal protections on the Internet while trying not to stunt the growth of the new medium. It is by no means certain, however, that there will be enough votes this year to take on an issue that is loaded with business and political land mines.

As was the case in a similar debate last year, there are also sharp differences over how to address the issue. Central to it is the question of how much legal authority individuals should have in choosing when information is collected about where they go and what they view on the World Wide Web.

In testimony yesterday, privacy advocates called on Congress to require banks, retailers, service providers and others to obtain "opt-in" permission from customers before collecting any details about them.

"Privacy law makes clear that consent must be meaningful and that this often requires prior express consent," said Marc Rotenberg, executive director of the Electronic Privacy Information Center. "Privacy advocates and experts favor the opt-in approach," he said, because "it follows the common-sense understanding of consent."

But many companies oppose that approach, saying it would be costly to implement and would hinder activity on the Web. They prefer the prevailing approach in which customers who don't want personal information collected for marketing and other purposes "opt out" of such collection and sharing by notifying the company.

Fred Cate, director of the Information Law and Commerce Institute at the Indiana University School of Law, said that businesses are right to oppose giving consumers absolute control over how their information is used. He said many people are not as worried about privacy as advocates contend.

"The problem is that most consumers, in practice, don't want to exercise that control over the information we disclose and generate," he said. "We don't want to take the time to make those decisions, [and] we often lack the knowledge or experience to understand the decisions we are being asked to make."

In setting an aggressive tenor for the hearing, Hollings sided with advocates who want to put more authority in the hands of customers. He mocked as confusing and deceptive some recent federally mandated privacy notices issued by financial services companies to tell customers about
their opt-out rights.

"Quite clearly, this is concrete evidence of why opt-out doesn't work," Hollings said. "And if it won't work when they mail you the notice, it certainly won't work on the Internet when the notice is buried behind a link at the bottom of a Web page."

Senators and witnesses also wrestled with questions of whether federal Internet privacy law should preempt possible state laws and prohibit private lawsuits for violations.

Ari Schwartz, associate director at the Center for Democracy and Technology, a nonprofit advocacy group, said he was encouraged by the hearing, noting that senators from both parties asked smart questions. But he's not betting on any major legislation this year.


**********************************************
(C) 2001 The Washington Post Company
**********************************************
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>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Jul 13 07:20:23 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6DEKMJ12447 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Jul 2001
07:20:22
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtp5ve.mailsrvcs.net (smtp5vepub.gte.net [206.46.170.26])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA03983 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Jul 2001 07:20:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (client-151-203-163-154.wma.adsl.bellatlantic.net
[151.203.163.154])
    by smtp5ve.mailsrvcs.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id OAA27896851
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Jul 2001 14:19:48 GMT
Message-ID: <3B4F03D5.FB5F7530@jwdp.com>
Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2001 10:21:09 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Internet privacy and survey research
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0107121111560.6016-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The issue of Internet privacy is beginning to command serious attention in regard to marketing and similar abuses, and I believe that the "opt-out vs. opt-in" question, which means little to most people today, will soon become a major item in the public dialog.

I predict that this concern will accelerate as understanding of the
privacy implications of Microsoft's "Smart Tags" and "Hailstorm" technologies spreads beyond a small circle of computer experts now warning of the extraordinary potential for abuse in these and similar technologies.

But there is another aspect of Internet privacy that may be of greater import to most AAPOR members over the next few years, and that is the inability to guarantee respondent confidentiality in online surveys.

It is relatively easy to separate identifying materials from recorded survey instruments for paper surveys, and somewhat harder, but still feasible, to do the same for CATI surveys. But the electronic trail created by Internet transactions makes it impossible to promise anonymity to respondents who fill out a survey online, no matter how diligent the survey takers may be in attempting to provide confidentiality.

Under section II-D of the AAPOR Code of Ethics, this should pose serious concerns to anyone conducting surveys on sensitive topics.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Can anyone point me to an authoritative summary of Federal and state laws pertaining to telephone surveys, with emphasis on differences from laws pertaining to telemarketing? Thanks,
Jim Ellis
Virginia Commonwealth University

>From KFeld@humanvoice.com Fri Jul 13 08:37:49 2001
Dear Jim,

Contact Donna Gillin at the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR). She is the government affairs person for CMOR and is an authority on these issues. I've copied her on this e-mail. Her number and some information on this subject is available at the CMOR site at www.cmor.org.

Hope this helps!

K.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jim Ellis [mailto:jellis@saturn.vcu.edu]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2001 9:24 AM
To: aapornet
Subject: laws regarding phone surveys and telemarketers

Can anyone point me to an authoritative summary of Federal and state laws pertaining to telephone surveys, with emphasis on differences from laws pertaining to telemarketing? Thanks,
Jim Ellis
Virginia Commonwealth University

-----Original Message-----
From: Karl Feld <KFeld@humanvoice.com>
To: "'jellis@saturn.vcu.edu'" <jellis@saturn.vcu.edu>
Cc: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>, "'dgillin@cmor.org.'"
Subject: RE: laws regarding phone surveys and telemarketers
Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2001 09:37:46 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
       charset="iso-8859-1"

Jim,

Contact Donna Gillin at the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR). She is the government affairs person for CMOR and is an authority on these issues. I've copied her on this e-mail. Her number and some information on this subject is available at the CMOR site at www.cmor.org.

Hope this helps!

K.
1995 Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (Telemarketing Sales Rule). 202-382-4357

Calls made for research purposes are specifically exempt from the regulations.

Edward C. Ratledge, Director
Center for Applied Demography & Survey Research
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-1684
ratledge@udel.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Jim Ellis [mailto:jellis@mail1.vcu.edu]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2001 11:24 AM
To: aapornet
Subject: laws regarding phone surveys and telemarketers

Can anyone point me to an authoritative summary of Federal and state laws pertaining to telephone surveys, with emphasis on differences from laws pertaining to telemarketing? Thanks,

Jim Ellis
Virginia Commonwealth University

-----Original Message-----
From: beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jul 13 09:31:05 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTMP
    id f6DGV5J09528 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Jul 2001 09:31:05
    -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
    id JAA01889 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Jul 2001 09:31:05 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTMP
    id f6DGV7816997 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Jul 2001 09:31:07 -0700
(PDT)
Is AAPOR prepared to pay for a court ruling on whether conducting a scientific survey is an effective means to relieve boredom? Oh, and also—whether it's effective or not—is surveying out of boredom (i.e., SOOBing) a free-speech right, or not?

-- Jim

July 13 2001

JUDGE BARS SURVEY OF JURY POOL

COURT: THE WOULD-BE RESEARCHER, A BORED POTENTIAL JUROR, SAYS THE RULING VIOLATES HIS FREE-SPEECH RIGHTS.

STEVE BERRY
TIMES STAFF WRITER

UCLA law professor Gary Blasi isn't the first potential juror to gripe about the inconvenience and time-wasting aspects of jury service.

But Blasi, 56, may be among the first whose pique subjected him to a gag order.

Concerned about the amount of idle time he and other prospective jurors were spending in the jury assembly room, he decided this week to conduct a survey of his fellow court captives to find out what their attitudes were about the process. But Thursday morning, Superior Court Judge Sam Ohta, who is in charge of Traffic Court at the Metropolitan Courthouse just south of downtown Los Angeles, quickly put a stop to it. Saying he feared that Blasi's survey might taint the "quasi-holy" jury process, Ohta issued a formal order preventing him from conducting any systematic interviews or surveys of prospective jurors.

"When Mr. Blasi is conducting this research with other potential jurors, it's possible that in some way it could influence jurors in a certain way," Ohta said.

Although Blasi's experience may amuse court critics, Ohta's decision also
highlights serious questions about the extent to which judges have the power to limit free speech if they believe it jeopardizes their ability to seat impartial juries.

"There is a free speech question involved here," said Stan Goldman, a law professor at Loyola University and a former public defender. "But there has to be a balance of interests here," he said, speaking of the judge's duty to protect the integrity of the jury pool.

That said, Goldman declared, "It's a bit of a stretch to say this questionnaire would affect the integrity of the jury."

The dispute began to unfold Tuesday, when Blasi, after having sat for hours without being called to a courtroom, began asking other jurors how they felt about the idle time they were spending in the waiting room and their feelings about the entire jury process.

Being a researcher and seeing a chance to gather data for a newspaper "op-ed piece" or a journal article, Blasi decided to turn wasted time into something productive.

"As my annoyance increased, I decided I would do a little study," said the professor, who previously worked in legal aid for more than a decade. Instead of just chit-chatting about the issue, Blasi wanted to record the information in a more systematic way. He developed a two-page survey form. Part of the survey simply gathered information about people's jury service, such as how long they had been waiting and how many times they had been summoned to a courtroom. The second set of questions sought their opinions about how they were treated, whether they believed the court system showed sufficient respect for their time and whether they thought court officials could do a better job.

The courts need answers to those questions, Blasi said in an interview. "When do you think is the last time a judge went down to a jury assembly to try to gather this kind of information?" he asked.

After court Wednesday, Blasi notified a jury service administrator by E-mail that he planned to distribute the survey form. On Thursday morning, the administrator told him his plan violated court policy.

Blasi challenged the administrator's decision but withheld the survey until she could discuss the matter with Ohta. Ohta called a brief hearing, and then ordered Blasi to abandon his survey.

"I agree, and the courts agree, with the importance of finding out how jurors feel about jury service and how the court can assist in making it better," Ohta said. "What he was trying to do was a good thing."

Nevertheless, doing it in the jury assembly room was "inappropriate," Ohta said.

"The jury pool is sacred," Ohta said. "They should come here with a clean slate, to serve the court, to do this solemn, quasi-holy duty. So you try to create an environment to foster that attitude."

Superior Court Assistant Presiding Judge Robert Dukes agreed. "The court has the responsibility of protecting privacy rights of jurors," he said.
"They are there against their will. They are not free to just leave if another juror starts asking them questions."

Blasi scoffed at such notions. The questions would not inflame the juror, and any juror who didn't want to answer his questions could simply refuse and walk away.

"The gag order violates my 1st Amendment rights [to freedom of speech]," he said, adding that he is considering filing suit in federal court to challenge the decision.

If he does, he probably will not win, said Goldman, the Loyola Law School professor. Although Goldman says Blasi should have been allowed to do the survey, higher courts usually are reluctant to second-guess a trial judge's discretion in protecting a jury's integrity.

"Once a trial judge makes a decision like this, a higher court will usually go out of its way to find a good reason for letting him do it."

As for Blasi, he finally got summoned for a trial late Thursday. But if he had not, he was going to keep talking to fellow jurors.

"I just wouldn't do it systematically," he said.


---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
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>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jul 13 12:14:54 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6DJEsJ10070 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Jul 2001
12:14:54
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id MAA10672 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Jul 2001 12:14:54 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6DJEtc10569 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Jul 2001 12:14:55 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2001 12:14:55 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Election 2000: An Internet Library
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0107131209230.913-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Election 2000: An Internet Library

http://archive0.alexa.com/collections/e2k.html

Commissioned by the Library of Congress and made possible by Alexa Internet, Compaq Computer, and the Internet Archive, Election 2000 allows users to take a historical look at Internet content. The site contains archived copies of pages from the last presidential election, thus providing a record of what might otherwise be lost in the ephemeral world of the net. Compaq repeatedly archived more than 1,000 election-related sites during the fall and winter of 2000, and users can access those pages here, either through browsing the categorized list of sites or through searching for a specific URL. In either case, results show a list of links to a specific page over time. This site should be a real boon to political researchers who are interested in recovering the online, day-to-day coverage of the election and attendant controversies. Very nifty.
Position:  RESEARCH PSYCHOLOGIST (GS - 0180 - 12 )

Location:  Office of Survey Methods Research
           Bureau of Labor Statistics
           Washington, D.C.

Duties:  Works as a research psychologist in the Office of Survey Methods Research. Conducts cognitive testing and advises on questionnaire wording, order, and content for core and supplemental questions on the American Time Use Survey (ATUS). Analyzes responses and response patterns to identify and solve problems that could lead to non-sampling errors in ATUS. Plans and conducts studies on research topics that will lead to more efficient data collection, more accurate reporting, less respondent burden, better interviewer performance, and improved data-collection technologies.

Qualification Requirements:  Candidates must be a U.S. citizen and possess a Ph.D. in Psychology or relevant area of social science.

Salary:  $53,156 - $69,099

For website application:  http://www.bls.gov/eop/eopjob.htm  (Announcement Number: BLS-091-01)

For Additional Information:  Contact: Teidra Green, Phone (202) 691-6615, TDD (202) 691-7838
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: LA Superior Court Judge Bars Survey of Jury Pool (LATimes)

Hi Guys,

Our judge, Tom Bateman III, who is now a district judge, allowed us to gather data from nearly 1100 jurors in 1998 while they waited in the Assembly Room to finish being qualified. Our items address their attitudes toward jury duty. We have some questions comparable to Blasi's.

One article from this study ("Reluctant Jurors") appeared in Judicature last summer. I have some limited hard copies to snail to folks (their articles are not online) who are interested. There are two other papers off these data, including a poster session that Rob Boatright and I presented in May. We will submit that paper later this summer.

Susan

At 09:31 AM 7/13/2001 -0700, you wrote:

> Is AAPOR prepared to pay for a court ruling on whether conducting a scientific survey is an effective means to relieve boredom? Oh, and also--whether it's effective or not--is surveying out of boredom (i.e., SOOBing) a free-speech right, or not?
> -- Jim

> Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times

> July 13 2001

> JUDGE BARS SURVEY OF JURY POOL
> COURT: THE WOULD-BE RESEARCHER, A BORED POTENTIAL JUROR, SAYS THE RULING VIOLATES HIS FREE-SPEECH RIGHTS.
> STEVE BERRY
> TIMES STAFF WRITER

> UCLA law professor Gary Blasi isn't the first potential juror to gripe about the inconvenience and time-wasting aspects of jury service.
> But Blasi, 56, may be among the first whose pique subjected him to a gag order.
> Concerned about the amount of idle time he and other prospective jurors were spending in the jury assembly room, he decided this week to conduct a survey of his fellow court captives to find out what their attitudes were about the process. But Thursday morning, Superior Court Judge Sam
Ohta, who is in charge of Traffic Court at the Metropolitan Courthouse just south of downtown Los Angeles, quickly put a stop to it. Saying he feared that Blasi's survey might taint the "quasi-holy" jury process, Ohta issued a formal order preventing him from conducting any systematic interviews or surveys of prospective jurors.

"When Mr. Blasi is conducting this research with other potential jurors, it's possible that in some way it could influence jurors in a certain way," Ohta said.

Although Blasi's experience may amuse court critics, Ohta's decision also highlights serious questions about the extent to which judges have the power to limit free speech if they believe it jeopardizes their ability to seat impartial juries.

"There is a free speech question involved here," said Stan Goldman, a law professor at Loyola University and a former public defender. "But there has to be a balance of interests here," he said, speaking of the judge's duty to protect the integrity of the jury pool.

That said, Goldman declared, "It's a bit of a stretch to say this questionnaire would affect the integrity of the jury."

The dispute began to unfold Tuesday, when Blasi, after having sat for hours without being called to a courtroom, began asking other jurors how they felt about the idle time they were spending in the waiting room and their feelings about the entire jury process.

Being a researcher and seeing a chance to gather data for a newspaper "op-ed piece" or a journal article, Blasi decided to turn wasted time into something productive.

"As my annoyance increased, I decided I would do a little study," said the professor, who previously worked in legal aid for more than a decade. Instead of just chit-chatting about the issue, Blasi wanted to record the information in a more systematic way. He developed a two-page survey form. Part of the survey simply gathered information about people's jury service, such as how long they had been waiting and how many times they had been summoned to a courtroom. The second set of questions sought their opinions about how they were treated, whether they believed the court system showed sufficient respect for their time and whether they thought court officials could do a better job.

The courts need answers to those questions, Blasi said in an interview. "When do you think is the last time a judge went down to a jury assembly to try to gather this kind of information?" he asked.

After court Wednesday, Blasi notified a jury service administrator by E-mail that he planned to distribute the survey form. On Thursday morning, the administrator told him his plan violated court policy.

Blasi challenged the administrator's decision but withheld the survey until she could discuss the matter with Ohta. Ohta called a brief hearing, and then ordered Blasi to abandon his survey.

"I agree, and the courts agree, with the importance of finding out how jurors feel about jury service and how the court can assist in making it
“better,” Ohta said. "What he was trying to do was a good thing."

Nevertheless, doing it in the jury assembly room was "inappropriate," Ohta said.

"The jury pool is sacred," Ohta said. "They should come here with a clean slate, to serve the court, to do this solemn, quasi-holy duty. So you try to create an environment to foster that attitude."

Superior Court Assistant Presiding Judge Robert Dukes agreed. "The court has the responsibility of protecting privacy rights of jurors," he said. "They are there against their will. They are not free to just leave if another juror starts asking them questions."

Blasi scoffed at such notions. The questions would not inflame the juror, and any juror who didn't want to answer his questions could simply refuse and walk away.

"The gag order violates my 1st Amendment rights [to freedom of speech]," he said, adding that he is considering filing suit in federal court to challenge the decision.

If he does, he probably will not win, said Goldman, the Loyola Law School professor. Although Goldman says Blasi should have been allowed to do the survey, higher courts usually are reluctant to second-guess a trial judge's discretion in protecting a jury's integrity.

"Once a trial judge makes a decision like this, a higher court will usually go out of its way to find a good reason for letting him do it."

As for Blasi, he finally got summoned for a trial late Thursday. But if he had not, he was going to keep talking to fellow jurors.

"I just wouldn't do it systematically," he said.


---------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times

---------------------------------------------
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Susan Carol Losh, PhD
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
Susan,

I've read my share of jury studies over the years, believe me (a number were conducted within Berkeley's Department of Sociology, when I was a doctoral student in the 70s). I've also been placed on juries where it was clear that I fit some demographic group which defense counsel had identified among the armful of printouts generated by some jury research service (although I can't imagine what demographic that could possibly be). I've even given free survey advice to students who took summer jobs working for jury research outfits--some operating under the guise of offering cheap magazine subscriptions door-to-door (and I like to think that I gave these students every bit of the expert advice that they paid for).

Such experiences account for my interest in posting Steve Berry's report in today's Los Angeles Times (its intrinsic humor aside) to AAPORNENET, because it seemed to me--and does still seem to me--that Superior Court Judge Sam Ohta's ruling might well establish a legal precedent which would seriously hamper studies of potential jurors already called to duty, much like those you yourself describe, Susan,
As even Steve Berry himself expressed this concern:

Although Blasi's experience may amuse court critics, Ohta's decision also highlights serious questions about the extent to which judges have the power to limit free speech if they believe it jeopardizes their ability to seat impartial juries.

Since no AAPORNETters have yet written to address this question, let me put it more precisely: Do you think that the Ohta ruling might deal a devastating blow to surveys of jurors on courthouse property, or not? If I already knew, I wouldn't ask--but, alas, I have no idea.

-- Jim

P.S. Susan: I do hope I have at least earned a snailmailed copy of "Reluctant Jurors"--I might even save it to read next time I serve on jury duty (it could even get me bounced before lunch, if your title is printed prominently enough). -- Jim

******

On Fri, 13 Jul 2001, Susan Losh wrote:

Hi Guys,

Our judge, Tom Bateman III, who is now a district judge, allowed us to gather data from nearly 1100 jurors in 1998 while they waited in the Assembly Room to finish being qualified. Our items address their attitudes toward jury duty. We have some questions comparable to Blasi's.

One article from this study ("Reluctant Jurors") appeared in Judicature last summer. I have some limited hard copies to snail to folks (their articles are not online) who are interested. There are two other papers off these data, including a poster session that Rob Boatright and I presented in May. We will submit that paper later this summer.

Susan

At 09:31 AM 7/13/2001 -0700, you wrote:

> Is AAPOR prepared to pay for a court ruling on whether conducting a scientific survey is an effective means to relieve boredom? Oh, and also--whether it's effective or not--is surveying out of boredom (i.e., SOOBing) a free-speech right, or not? -- Jim

-- Jim

JUDGE BARS SURVEY OF JURY POOL

COURT: THE WOULD-BE RESEARCHER, A BORED POTENTIAL JUROR, SAYS THE RULING VIOLATES HIS FREE-SPEECH RIGHTS.

STEVE BERRY
TIMES STAFF WRITER

UCLA law professor Gary Blasi isn't the first potential juror to gripe about the inconvenience and time-wasting aspects of jury service. But Blasi, 56, may be among the first whose pique subjected him to a gag order.

Concerned about the amount of idle time he and other prospective jurors were spending in the jury assembly room, he decided this week to conduct a survey of his fellow court captives to find out what their attitudes were about the process. But Thursday morning, Superior Court Judge Sam Ohta, who is in charge of Traffic Court at the Metropolitan Courthouse just south of downtown Los Angeles, quickly put a stop to it. Saying he feared that Blasi's survey might taint the "quasi-holy" jury process, Ohta issued a formal order preventing him from conducting any systematic interviews or surveys of prospective jurors.

"When Mr. Blasi is conducting this research with other potential jurors, it's possible that in some way it could influence jurors in a certain way," Ohta said.

Although Blasi's experience may amuse court critics, Ohta's decision also highlights serious questions about the extent to which judges have the power to limit free speech if they believe it jeopardizes their ability to seat impartial juries.

"There is a free speech question involved here," said Stan Goldman, a law professor at Loyola University and a former public defender. "But there has to be a balance of interests here," he said, speaking of the judge's duty to protect the integrity of the jury pool.

That said, Goldman declared, "It's a bit of a stretch to say this questionnaire would affect the integrity of the jury."

The dispute began to unfold Tuesday, when Blasi, after having sat for hours without being called to a courtroom, began asking other jurors how they felt about the idle time they were spending in the waiting room and their feelings about the entire jury process.

Being a researcher and seeing a chance to gather data for a newspaper "op-ed piece" or a journal article, Blasi decided to turn wasted time into something productive.

"As my annoyance increased, I decided I would do a little study," said
the professor, who previously worked in legal aid for more than a decade. Instead of just chit-chatting about the issue, Blasi wanted to record the information in a more systematic way. He developed a two-page survey form. Part of the survey simply gathered information about people's jury service, such as how long they had been waiting and how many times they had been summoned to a courtroom. The second set of questions sought their opinions about how they were treated, whether they believed the court system showed sufficient respect for their time and whether they thought court officials could do a better job.

The courts need answers to those questions, Blasi said in an interview. "When do you think is the last time a judge went down to a jury assembly to try to gather this kind of information?" he asked.

After court Wednesday, Blasi notified a jury service administrator by E-mail that he planned to distribute the survey form. On Thursday morning, the administrator told him his plan violated court policy.

Blasi challenged the administrator's decision but withheld the survey until she could discuss the matter with Ohta. Ohta called a brief hearing, and then ordered Blasi to abandon his survey.

"I agree, and the courts agree, with the importance of finding out how jurors feel about jury service and how the court can assist in making it better," Ohta said. "What he was trying to do was a good thing."

Nevertheless, doing it in the jury assembly room was "inappropriate," Ohta said.

"The jury pool is sacred," Ohta said. "They should come here with a clean slate, to serve the court, to do this solemn, quasi-holy duty. So you try to create an environment to foster that attitude."

Superior Court Assistant Presiding Judge Robert Dukes agreed. "The court has the responsibility of protecting privacy rights of jurors," he said. "They are there against their will. They are not free to just leave if another juror starts asking them questions."

Blasi scoffed at such notions. The questions would not inflame the juror, and any juror who didn't want to answer his questions could simply refuse and walk away.

"The gag order violates my 1st Amendment rights [to freedom of speech]," he said, adding that he is considering filing suit in federal court to challenge the decision.

If he does, he probably will not win, said Goldman, the Loyola Law School professor. Although Goldman says Blasi should have been allowed to do the survey, higher courts usually are reluctant to second-guess a trial judge's discretion in protecting a jury's integrity.

"Once a trial judge makes a decision like this, a higher court will usually go out of its way to find a good reason for letting him do it."

As for Blasi, he finally got summoned for a trial late Thursday. But if he had not, he was going to keep talking to fellow jurors.
"I just wouldn't do it systematically," he said.
WASHINGTON -- President Bush has reversed the slip in his approval rating and is turning his attention to new health care, privacy and education proposals.

After hitting a low of 52% two weeks ago, Bush's approval rating rebounded to 57% in a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll taken this week.

At the same point in Bill Clinton's presidency in 1993, Clinton's approval rating was 45%.

Bush is bouncing back even though half of those polled said he's out of touch with the problems of ordinary Americans, and 67% said big business has too much influence over his policies.

As Bush nears his six-month mark Wednesday -- a benchmark he said should be the first serious measure of his success -- advisers are developing new proposals:

* Education. Bush wants to highlight ways that school systems create incentives for student achievement and also promote character education.

* Health care. Bush wants to explore the development of medical devices, quality-of-care issues and discrimination by insurers based on genetic screening.

* Privacy. Bush wants more protections for Internet users and will pursue broader privacy concerns.

In the poll, most approved of Bush's handling of the economy, foreign affairs, education, taxes, prescription drugs and patient protections. But he got less than 50% approval on energy, the environment, campaign finance and government support for religious institutions.

He did well on personal qualities:

* 70% said they approve of Bush as a person.

* 78% said they respect Bush regardless of their political views.

* 73% accept him as the legitimate president, although half still said he
won the election on a technicality or stole the election.

On relations with Congress, 59% said he has cooperated enough with Democrats, while 46% said they have cooperated enough with him. Asked about Bush's political views, 35% said he's too conservative, 43% said about right, and 14% said too liberal.

Aides say the president believes he needs to interact better with the public. They plan more informal, campaign-style events. In August, he'll interrupt his Texas vacation several times to visit small towns for casual question-and-answer sessions. He will focus on values and personal responsibility -- modest ideas reminiscent of Clinton's pitch for small-scale proposals such as school uniforms and V-chips to allow parents to control the types of TV content their kids see.
Income and Racial Disparities in the Undercount
in the 2000 Presidential Election


This week, the House Committee on Government Reform released the first national study correlating income, race, and vote-counting in the last presidential election. While the report is short, the findings are significant. Examining 40 districts in 20 states, the committee found that voters in high-minority, low-income districts were, on average, three times more likely to have their votes discarded than voters in high-income, low-minority districts. Improved voting technology reduced uncounted votes in high-minority, low-income districts by as much as 85%.

Press Release:


Recently, there have been a number of documents circulated or published that might cause data users to understand or conclude that the statistical adjustment based on the Census 2000 Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation (A.C.E.) would add 6.4 million missed individuals to the results of Census 2000. This conclusion is incorrect.

The Census Bureau does have initial estimates from the Census 2000 A.C.E. that indicate there were 4.3 million persons undercounted by Census 2000 and 1.0 million persons overcounted, for a net measured undercount of 3.3 million persons. These estimates which are still preliminary, and which are being examined this summer in light of the serious concerns identified by the Executive Steering Committee on Adjustment Policy (see the report of the E.S.C.A.P. dated March 1, 2001) are based on a methodology known as Dual System Estimation that the Census Bureau has designed and extensively tested. This methodology is designed to adjust for net coverage errors in the census, and used in that fashion, it is a very robust estimator of net undercounts and overcounts. Further, by using data obtained from the matching operations of the Census 2000 A.C.E. and applying several simplifying assumptions, we can obtain estimates of the erroneous enumerations. These estimates of
erroneous enumerations used in conjunction with the measures of net coverage can be used to estimate gross omissions, but both estimates are highly dependent upon the assumptions made. The Census Bureau's 6.4 million gross omissions (missed persons) estimate and the corresponding 3.1 million erroneous enumerations estimate provide general information about the quality of the census and the quality of the coverage measurement. Unfortunately, the 6.4 million estimate for gross omissions has been misinterpreted as appropriate to adjust Census 2000 calculations. In fact, the estimate for gross omissions will not be used by the Census Bureau in the adjustment calculations for Census 2000.

To summarize, it is the net coverage estimates based on the dual system methodology that are being evaluated for possible use in adjusting the Census 2000 data. To clarify this matter, we are reissuing three tables based on data already available on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site, that document the preliminary net coverage adjustments, estimated by race and ethnicity. Note that these estimates are subject to revision potentially substantial as the Census Bureau continues its work to determine if intercensal population estimates and the population controls for household surveys to be used in the next decade would be improved by statistical adjustment.

Table 1 shows the percent net undercount for major groups calculated in the Census 2000 A.C.E. and the 1990 Post Enumeration Survey (PES). Table 2 provides the distribution of net undercount estimates for the Census 2000 A.C.E. and the 1990 PES. Table 3 shows the distribution of the undercount and the overcount for the Census 2000 A.C.E.


-X-

Editor's Note: News releases issued by the Census Bureau on Census 2000, as well as other activities, can be found on our Internet homepage at <http://www.census.gov>. Click on the News button to view news releases, by date and by subject, or for Census 2000 information.
I have been mulling an observation about the 2000 election for some time.

Background: the black vote has historically been overwhelmingly Democratic for about the last 40 years. Nothing in this election would lead one to have expected a reversal of this historical pattern. Yet, if one were to look at the candidates and the campaign, one would be hard-pressed to find anything in Bush's record on race that would make him less attractive to blacks than most recent Republican Presidential candidates. Indeed, he seemed to make at least some effort to at least court the black vote (e.g., the Republican convention), unlike some recent predecessors who simply wrote it off. Likewise, there was nothing about Gore's record on racial issues that would seem to make him MORE attractive to blacks than most recent Democratic presidential candidates. If anything, at first blush, by looking at the respective records, I think it would not have been unreasonable to have expected some very modest Republican inroads in relation to historical trends. But, the reverse happened; this election, by most reports, produced black proportionate vote and especially turnout MORE Democratic than recent historical norms.
The question is this: why then was the black vote so abnormally pro-Gore?

Note, I am NOT asking for an explanation of the historical tendency of the black vote to skew heavily Democratic. Rather, given this known proclivity, why should the 2000 election have been even more so?

My personal theory (based on no formal examination of data, just general observations of the election) is this: despite Bush's overtures and an adequate record on race, he was seen as a child of privilege, someone who throughout his entire life "got all the breaks". While voters of all races undoubtedly made this observation, my guess is that it was an unusually sensitive one to blacks.

I have never seen any polling on this, or any discussion on Aapornet. Did any question on any of the pre- or post-election surveys address this issue?

Michael O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com
I have been mulling an observation about the 2000 election for some time.
the black vote has historically been overwhelmingly Democratic for about the last 40 years. Nothing in this election would lead one to have expected a reversal of this historical pattern. Yet, if one were to look at the candidates and the campaign, one would be hard-pressed to find anything in Bush’s record on race that would make him less attractive to blacks than most recent Republican Presidential candidates. Indeed, he seemed to make at least some effort to at least court the black vote (e.g., the Republican convention), unlike some recent predecessors who simply wrote it off. Likewise, there was nothing about Gore’s record on racial issues that would seem to make him MORE attractive to blacks than most recent Democratic presidential candidates. If anything, at first blush, by looking at the respective records, I think it would not have been unreasonable to have expected some very modest Republican inroads in relation to historical trends. But, the reverse happened; this election, by most reports, produced black proportionate vote and especially turnout MORE Democratic than recent historical norms.
The question is this: why then was the black vote so abnormally pro-Gore?

My personal theory (based on no formal examination of data, just general observations of the election) is this: despite Bush=92s overtures and an adequate record on race, he was seen as a child of privilege, someone who throughout his entire life =93got all the breaks=94. While voters of all races undoubtedly made this observation, my guess is that it was an unusually sensitive one to blacks.
I have never seen any polling on this, or any discussion on Aapornet. Did any question on any of the pre- or post-election surveys address this issue?
Seems to me that the judge is acting more akin to a bureaucrat protecting himself against something that could be personally embarrassing. I have been called for jury duty several times. Great lip service is always paid to the value of jurors. In practice, however, little or no value is attached to their time. I do understand that many cases are settled only at the last minute. Still, those who administer the jury process have, in effect, to perform a mathematical calculation. They have to calculate the probability of not having enough jurors against the risk of having a room full of uncalled jurors. In making such calculations, the value attached to
a judge's time is virtually infinite while that of a juror is based on what they are paid (in our county, I think this is $12 per day....and they stopped providing parking a couple of years ago, so most of this will go to parking). I know the people who run the system in our county and discussed this once. If any judge EVER cannot get a jury when he needs one, there is hell to pay. So enough jurors have to be called that if NO case settles and every one goes to a jury trial (a very unlikely event), there is still a sufficient jury pool available to go to trial immediately. The inevitable result: a huge jury pool that does not get called. And our county is regarded as having one of the more efficient systems in the country (and did at least implement one reform—a one day, one trial obligation).

Michael O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Susan Losh
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2001 12:36 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: LA Superior Court Judge Bars Survey of Jury Pool (LATimes)

Hi Guys,

Our judge, Tom Bateman III, who is now a district judge, allowed us to gather data from nearly 1100 jurors in 1998 while they waited in the Assembly Room to finish being qualified. Our items address their attitudes toward jury duty. We have some questions comparable to Blasi's.

One article from this study ("Reluctant Jurors") appeared in Judicature last summer. I have some limited hard copies to snail to folks (their articles are not online) who are interested. There are two other papers off these data, including a poster session that Rob Boatright and I presented in May. We will submit that paper later this summer.

Susan

At 09:31 AM 7/13/2001 -0700, you wrote:
>

> Is AAPOR prepared to pay for a court ruling on whether conducting a scientific survey is an effective means to relieve boredom? Oh, and also—whether it's effective or not—is surveying out of boredom (i.e., SOOBing) a free-speech right, or not?

> -- Jim

>---------------------------------------------------------------------------
> Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
>---------------------------------------------------------------------------
>
> July 13 2001
>
> JUDGE BARS SURVEY OF JURY POOL
COURT: THE WOULD-BE RESEARCHER, A BORED POTENTIAL JUROR, SAYS THE RULING VIOLATES HIS FREE-SPEECH RIGHTS.

STEVE BERRY
TIMES STAFF WRITER

UCLA law professor Gary Blasi isn't the first potential juror to gripe about the inconvenience and time-wasting aspects of jury service.

But Blasi, 56, may be among the first whose pique subjected him to a gag order.

Concerned about the amount of idle time he and other prospective jurors were spending in the jury assembly room, he decided this week to conduct a survey of his fellow court captives to find out what their attitudes were about the process. But Thursday morning, Superior Court Judge Sam Ohta, who is in charge of Traffic Court at the Metropolitan Courthouse just south of downtown Los Angeles, quickly put a stop to it. Saying he feared that Blasi's survey might taint the "quasi-holy" jury process, Ohta issued a formal order preventing him from conducting any systematic interviews or surveys of prospective jurors.

"When Mr. Blasi is conducting this research with other potential jurors, it's possible that in some way it could influence jurors in a certain way," Ohta said.

Although Blasi's experience may amuse court critics, Ohta's decision also highlights serious questions about the extent to which judges have the power to limit free speech if they believe it jeopardizes their ability to seat impartial juries.

"There is a free speech question involved here," said Stan Goldman, a law professor at Loyola University and a former public defender. "But there has to be a balance of interests here," he said, speaking of the judge's duty to protect the integrity of the jury pool.

That said, Goldman declared, "It's a bit of a stretch to say this questionnaire would affect the integrity of the jury."

The dispute began to unfold Tuesday, when Blasi, after having sat for hours without being called to a courtroom, began asking other jurors how they felt about the idle time they were spending in the waiting room and their feelings about the entire jury process.

Being a researcher and seeing a chance to gather data for a newspaper "op-ed piece" or a journal article, Blasi decided to turn wasted time into something productive.

"As my annoyance increased, I decided I would do a little study," said the professor, who previously worked in legal aid for more than a decade. Instead of just chit-chatting about the issue, Blasi wanted to record the information in a more systematic way. He developed a two-page survey form. Part of the survey simply gathered information about people's jury service, such as how long they had been waiting and how many times they
had been summoned to a courtroom. The second set of questions sought
their opinions about how they were treated, whether they believed the
court system showed sufficient respect for their time and whether they
thought court officials could do a better job.

The courts need answers to those questions, Blasi said in an interview.
"When do you think is the last time a judge went down to a jury assembly
to try to gather this kind of information?" he asked.

After court Wednesday, Blasi notified a jury service administrator by
E-mail that he planned to distribute the survey form. On Thursday
morning, the administrator told him his plan violated court policy.

Blasi challenged the administrator's decision but withheld the survey
until she could discuss the matter with Ohta. Ohta called a brief
hearing, and then ordered Blasi to abandon his survey.

"I agree, and the courts agree, with the importance of finding out how
jurors feel about jury service and how the court can assist in making it
better," Ohta said. "What he was trying to do was a good thing."

Nevertheless, doing it in the jury assembly room was "inappropriate,"
Ohta said.

"The jury pool is sacred," Ohta said. "They should come here with a clean
slate, to serve the court, to do this solemn, quasi-holy duty. So you try
to create an environment to foster that attitude."

Superior Court Assistant Presiding Judge Robert Dukes agreed. "The court
has the responsibility of protecting privacy rights of jurors," he said.
"They are there against their will. They are not free to just leave if
another juror starts asking them questions."

Blasi scoffed at such notions. The questions would not inflame the juror,
and any juror who didn't want to answer his questions could simply refuse
and walk away.

"The gag order violates my 1st Amendment rights [to freedom of speech],"
he said, adding that he is considering filing suit in federal court to
challenge the decision.

If he does, he probably will not win, said Goldman, the Loyola Law School
professor. Although Goldman says Blasi should have been allowed to do the
survey, higher courts usually are reluctant to second-guess a trial
judge's discretion in protecting a jury's integrity.

"Once a trial judge makes a decision like this, a higher court will
usually go out of its way to find a good reason for letting him do it."

As for Blasi, he finally got summoned for a trial late Thursday. But if
he had not, he was going to keep talking to fellow jurors.

"I just wouldn't do it systematically," he said.
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Can anyone point me to an authoritative summary of Federal and state laws pertaining to telephone surveys, with emphasis on differences from laws pertaining to telemarketing? Thanks,
Jim Ellis
Virginia Commonwealth University
Confidentiality and anonymity are, of course, two fundamentally different things. Regardless, (and presuming that the real issue is holding survey responses confidential), the same techniques used to keep economic transaction information confidential can be used for survey information. To quote Gregory Rawlins in his book Slaves of the Machine, "Today's encryption technology could, if used widely enough, make us the last generation ever to have to fear for our privacy. . . if misued, it oculd make us the last generation with any notion of personal privacy at all." Judging from the flood of privacy policy statements in my mailbox these days I would say that the great privacy debate is already under way and that the direction is clear.

The principle of respondent confidentiality is alive and well, even for Internet research. Let's stay clear of the word "impossible."

Reg Baker
www.ms-interactive.com
The issue of Internet privacy is beginning to command serious attention in regard to marketing and similar abuses, and I believe that the "opt-out vs. opt-in" question, which means little to most people today, will soon become a major item in the public dialog.

I predict that this concern will accelerate as understanding of the privacy implications of Microsoft's "Smart Tags" and "Hailstorm" technologies spreads beyond a small circle of computer experts now warning of the extraordinary potential for abuse in these and similar technologies.

But there is another aspect of Internet privacy that may be of greater import to most AAPOR members over the next few years, and that is the inability to guarantee respondent confidentiality in online surveys.

It is relatively easy to separate identifying materials from recorded survey instruments for paper surveys, and somewhat harder, but still feasible, to do the same for CATI surveys. But the electronic trail created by Internet transactions makes it impossible to promise anonymity to respondents who fill out a survey online, no matter how diligent the survey takers may be in attempting to provide confidentiality.

Under section II-D of the AAPOR Code of Ethics, this should pose serious concerns to anyone conducting surveys on sensitive topics.

Jan Werner
This is the NY Times' portrait of the electorate site.


According to their exit poll data, the GOP candidate got 8% of the black vote in 2000, 12% in 1996, 10% in 1992. After considering some sample error, I don't think that the fall-off in 2000 was all that precipitous.

But I would add this to our comments below.

I think the GOP's outreach to blacks at their convention was perceived as disingenuous. Do you recall how the pundits were say that there were more blacks on stage than in the hall; i.e., among the convention delegates.
I would also add that Gore had another factor in his favor - black support of Bill Clinton.

Nick

Michael O'Neil wrote:

> I have been mulling an observation about the 2000 election for some time.
> Background: the black vote has historically been overwhelmingly Democratic for about the last 40 years. Nothing in this election would lead one to have expected a reversal of this historical pattern. Yet, if one were to look at the candidates and the campaign, one would be hard-pressed to find anything in Bush's record on race that would make him less attractive to blacks than most recent Republican Presidential candidates. Indeed, he seemed to make at least some effort to at least court the black vote (e.g., the Republican convention), unlike some recent predecessors who simply wrote it off. Likewise, there was nothing about Gore's record on racial issues that would seem to make him MORE attractive to blacks than most recent Democratic presidential candidates. If anything, at first blush, by looking at the respective records, I think it would not have been unreasonable to have expected some very modest Republican inroads in relation to historical trends. But, the reverse happened; this election, by most reports, produced black proportionate vote and especially turnout MORE Democratic than recent historical norms.
>
> The question is this: why then was the black vote so abnormally pro-Gore?
> Note, I am NOT asking for an explanation of the historical tendency of the black vote to skew heavily Democratic. Rather, given this known proclivity, why should the 2000 election have been even more so?
> My personal theory (based on no formal examination of data, just general observations of the election) is this: despite Bush's overtures and an adequate record on race, he was seen as a child of privilege, someone who throughout his entire life "got all the breaks". While voters of all races undoubtedly made this observation, my guess is that it was an unusually sensitive one to blacks.
>
> I have never seen any polling on this, or any discussion on Aapornet. Did any question on any of the pre- or post-election surveys address this issue?
>
> Michael O'Neil
>
> www.oneilresearch.com
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This is the NY Times' portrait of the electorate site.

According to their exit poll data, the GOP candidate got 8% of the black vote in 2000, 12% in 1996, 10% in 1992. After considering some sample error, I don't think that the fall-off in 2000 was all that precipitous.

But I would add this to our comments below.

I think the GOP's outreach to blacks at their convention was perceived as disingenuous. Do you recall how the pundits were say that there were more blacks on stage than in the hall; i.e., among the convention delegates.

I would also add that Gore had another factor in his favor - black support of Bill Clinton.

Nick

Michael O'Neil wrote:

"According to their exit poll data, the GOP candidate got 8% of the black vote in 2000, 12% in 1996, 10% in 1992. After considering some sample error, I don't think that the fall-off in 2000 was all that precipitous."
I have been mulling an observation about the 2000 election for some time. Background: the black vote has historically been overwhelmingly Democratic for about the last 40 years. Nothing in this election would lead one to have expected a reversal of this historical pattern. Yet, if one were to look at the candidates and the campaign, one would be hard-pressed to find anything in Bush's record on race that would make him less attractive to blacks than most recent Republican Presidential candidates. Indeed, he seemed to make at least some effort to at least court the black vote (e.g., the Republican convention), unlike some recent predecessors who simply wrote it off. Likewise, there was nothing about Gore's record on racial issues that would seem to make him MORE attractive to blacks than most recent Democratic presidential
candidates. If anything, at first blush, by looking at the respective records, I think it would not have been unreasonable to have expected some very modest Republican inroads in relation to historical trends.

But, the reverse happened; this election, by most reports, produced black proportionate vote and especially turnout MORE Democratic than recent historical norms.

The question is this: why then was the black vote so abnormally pro-Gore?

Note, I am NOT asking for an explanation of the historical tendency of the black vote to skew heavily Democratic.

Rather, given this known proclivity, why should the 2000 election have been even more so?
observations of the election) is this: despite Bush's overtures and an adequate record on race, he was seen as a child of privilege, someone who throughout his entire life "got all the breaks".

While voters of all races undoubtedly made this observation, my guess is that it was an unusually sensitive one to blacks. I have never seen any polling on this, or any discussion on Aapornet. Did any question on any of the pre- or post-election surveys address this issue?

---

Michael O'Neil

www.oneilresearch.com
Yes, interesting how the party of Lincoln, which I think has grown in southern states, has so much trouble convincing African-Americans of its good intentions toward the African-American community. Here are some thoughts from a local D.C., aka "Chocolate City," perspective.

D.C. is the jurisdiction that most supported Gore over Bush and where there is a rich African-American culture that plays a leadership role among African-Americans nationally (for historic perspective, see "The Guide to Black Washington" by Sandra Fitzpatrick and Maria Goodwin):

(1) Clinton/Gore were very good to African-Americans in terms of appointments and addressing issues of concern—and that was rewarded with intense loyalty ("the devil you know is better than the devil you don't know").
(2) Gore had a pretty good Congressional record on African-American issues; so did Lieberman—certainly not hostile.
(3) The Presidential election followed after the discussion of the Census count. There was a big outreach effort in the African-American community, where there was a perception that national Republicans were
less interested in counting minority populations.  
(4) The knowledge that Supreme Court appointments were at stake was important. There is a perception here that Civil Rights gains nationally have been eroding (this in parallel with retraction of D.C. Home Rule gains lost when contemporary "Radical Republicans" won in Congress). Although he distanced himself from Congressional Republicans, Bush took positions that reinforced the perception that he would facilitate their policies. For example, they opposed affirmative action and supported the death penalty.  
(5) Gore put an African-American woman in a high level position in his campaign office to help get out the vote—Donna Brazil was manager of his campaign, she was formerly DC Congressional non-voting Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton's Chief of Staff with good ties to the African-American leadership and grassroots experience.  
(6) Ronald Reagan and George H. Bush were not considered friends of African-Americans or local D.C. (to dramatically understate the feeling among many here). Many view/ed Bush/Cheney as more of the same.  

Like his father (and unlike his grandfather), G.W. Bush stated during the campaign that he opposed Congressional voting rights for majority black D.C.—a statement that got media play here and in the African-American press. Some believe D.C. continues to have no vote in Congress because the District is majority African-American (too black, too liberal, too poor). Historically, D.C. was not allowed to have Home Rule/any self-government at all for 100 years after Reconstruction (1874-1974), and southern Democrats in Congress sustained the policy that cut out the freed black vote. This policy in D.C. preceded (signaled?) and outlived Jim Crow Laws (1883-1964/8). African-Americans in D.C. (led by professors/students at Howard University) established the legal right to protest outside of businesses that would not hire them, and played an important role in bringing national Civil Rights laws—Eleanor Holmes Norton and many local D.C. leaders were actively involved in organizing Freedom Summer, etc.). I think this history is better known in the African-American community than in others. Like the complaint of "staging" at the convention, some in D.C. complain that Bush uses D.C. African-Americans as props (T-ball on the White House lawn anyone?).  

I am not sure what role any of these items played in at least maintaining the Democratic vote among African-Americans, but there is no question that national African-American organizations worked hard to get out the vote and they, the leadership, supported Gore. Although an uphill battle, perhaps when the Republican Party takes policies that are considered supportive of African-Americans within that community they could gain support (local D.C. has elected two Republicans to our 13 member City Council—certainly not ones in the mold of many national Republicans: a white gay man and a white Jewish woman sensitive to local issues). D.C. had also elected white Radical Republicans after the Civil War and before losing Home Rule.  

As the old Wendy's ad said, "Show me the beef!"

Cheers, Mark Richards

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf
I have been mulling an observation about the 2000 election for some time.

Background: the black vote has historically been overwhelmingly Democratic for about the last 40 years. Nothing in this election would lead one to have expected a reversal of this historical pattern. Yet, if one were to look at the candidates and the campaign, one would be hard-pressed to find anything in Bush's record on race that would make him less attractive to blacks than most recent Republican Presidential candidates. Indeed, he seemed to make at least some effort to at least court the black vote (e.g., the Republican convention), unlike some recent predecessors who simply wrote it off. Likewise, there was nothing about Gore's record on racial issues that would seem to make him MORE attractive to blacks than most recent Democratic presidential candidates. If anything, at first blush, by looking at the respective records, I think it would not have been unreasonable to have expected some very modest Republican inroads in relation to historical trends. But, the reverse happened; this election, by most reports, produced black proportionate vote and especially turnout MORE Democratic than recent historical norms.

The question is this: why then was the black vote so abnormally pro-Gore?

Note, I am NOT asking for an explanation of the historical tendency of the black vote to skew heavily Democratic. Rather, given this known proclivity, why should the 2000 election have been even more so?

My personal theory (based on no formal examination of data, just general observations of the election) is this: despite Bush's overtures and an adequate record on race, he was seen as a child of privilege, someone who throughout his entire life "got all the breaks". While voters of all races undoubtedly made this observation, my guess is that it was an unusually sensitive one to blacks.

I have never seen any polling on this, or any discussion on Aapornet. Did any question on any of the pre- or post-election surveys address this issue?
Yes, interesting how the party of Lincoln, which I think has grown in southern states, has so much trouble convincing African-Americans of its good intentions toward the African-American community. Here are some thoughts from a local D.C., aka Chocolate City, perspective. Gore over Bush and where there is a rich African-American culture that plays a leadership role among African-Americans nationally (for historic perspective, see The Guide to Black Washington by Sandra Fitzpatrick and Maria Goodwin).
Clinton/Gore were very good to African-Americans in terms of appointments and addressing issues of concern and that was rewarded with intense loyalty (the devil you know is better than the devil you don't know). Gore had a pretty good Congressional record on African-American issues; so did Lieberman certainly not hostile.

The Presidential
election followed after the discussion of the Census count. There was a big outreach effort in the African-American community, where there was a perception that national Republicans were less interested in counting minority populations.

The knowledge that Supreme Court appointments were at stake was important. There is a perception here that Civil Rights gains nationally have been eroding (this in parallel with retraction of D.C. Home Rule gains lost when contemporary Radical Republicans won in Congress).

Although he distanced himself from Congressional Republicans, Bush took positions that reinforced the perception that he would facilitate their policies. For example, they opposed affirmative action and supported the death penalty.

Gore put an African-American woman in a high level position in his campaign office to help get out the vote—Donna Brazil was manager of his campaign, she was formerly DC Congressional non-voting Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton's Chief of Staff with good =
ties to
the African-American leadership and grassroots =
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Some believe D.C. =
continues to have
no vote in Congress because the District is majority African-American =
(too
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Historically, D.C. was not allowed to have Home Rule/any self-government at all for =
100 years
after Reconstruction (1874-1974), and southern Democrats in Congress =
sustained the
policy that cut out the freed black vote =85 this policy in D.C. =
preceded
(signaled?) and outlived Jim Crow Laws (1883-1964/8).
African-Americans in D.C. (led by professors/students at Howard University) established the legal right to protest outside of businesses that would not hire them, and played an important role in bringing national Civil Rights laws—Eleanor Holmes Norton and many local D.C. leaders were actively involved in organizing Freedom Summer, etc.). I think this history is better known in the African-American community than in others. Like the complaint of "staging" at the convention, some in D.C. complain that Bush uses D.C. African-Americans as props (T-ball on the White House lawn anyone?)

I am not sure what role any of these items played in at least maintaining the Democratic vote among African-Americans, but there is no question that national African-American organizations worked hard to get out the vote and they, the leadership, supported Gore. Although an uphill battle, perhaps when the Republican Party takes policies that are considered supportive of African-Americans within that community they could gain support (local D.C. has elected two Republicans to our 13 member City Council—certainly not ones in the mold of many national Republicans: a white gay man and a white Jewish woman sensitive to local issues). D.C. had also elected white Radical Republicans after the Civil War and before losing Home Rule.
As the old Wendy's ad said, "Show me the beef!"

Cheers, Mark Richards
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On Behalf Of Michael O'Neil
Sent: Saturday, July 14, 2001 11:35 PM
To: Aapornet@Usc.Edu
Subject: Race and the 2000 Election

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]
On Behalf Of Michael O'Neil
Sent: Saturday, July 14, 2001 11:35 PM
To: Aapornet@Usc.Edu
Subject: Race and the 2000 Election
I have been mulling an observation about the 2000 election for some time. Background: the black vote has historically been overwhelmingly Democratic for about the last 40 years. Nothing in this election would lead one to have expected a reversal of this historical pattern. Yet, if one were to look at the candidates and the campaign, one would be hard-pressed to find anything in Bush's record on race that would make him less attractive to blacks than most recent Republican Presidential candidates. Indeed, he seemed to make at least some effort to at least court the black vote (e.g., the Republican convention), unlike some recent predecessors who simply wrote it off. Likewise, there was nothing about Gore's record on racial issues that would seem to make him MORE attractive to blacks than most recent Democratic presidential candidates. If anything, at first blush, by looking at the respective records, I think it would not have been unreasonable to have expected some very modest Republican inroads in relation to historical trends.
happened; this election, by most reports, produced black proportionate vote and = especially turnout MORE Democratic than recent historical norms.

The question is this: why then was the black vote so abnormally pro-Gore?

Note, I am NOT asking for an explanation of the historical tendency of the black vote to skew heavily Democratic. Rather, given this known proclivity, why should the 2000 election have been even more so?
My personal theory (based on no formal examination of data, just general observations of the election) is this: despite Bush's overtures and an adequate record on race, he was seen as a child of privilege, someone who throughout his entire life 'got all the breaks'. While voters of all races undoubtedly made this observation, my guess is that it was an unusually sensitive one to blacks.

I have never seen any polling on this, or any discussion on Aapornet. Did any question on any of the pre- or post-election surveys address this issue?
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Michael O'Neil

www.oneilresearch.com
Fellow Aaporites,

Several points I would add to the consideration of factors for a showing by Bush which a priori would not necessarily have been expected to be worse than 1992 and 1996.

First, while one could easily argue that there was doubt about the reality of Bush's outreach at the convention, it is somewhat hard to conclude that this would make a WORSE impression than if the GOP had presented a lily-white image.

Secondly, the point that Bill Clinton was seen as having an especial affinity with the African-American community (recall the talk of him being in some sense the "first Black President") might mean that Bush's repeated emphasis on the big difference between him and Clinton on style and character, might connote something different to African-Americans (perhaps even an anti-African-American "code") than it would to others.

Third, it has been noted that African-American political, religious, and community groups were especially active in getting "new voters" to turn out and there is some evidence they were successful. One would expect that people responding to their mobilization efforts would be more likely to be sympathetic to the "traditional" viewpoints of the leadership of such groups. Thus, "new" black voters would be even more pro-Democratic than "old" black voters. If so, even if there were slippage among "older groups", this could easily be counteracted by a virtual unanimity of "new" African-American votes.

Finally, while much was made of GWB's relatively positive showing among Blacks and Hispanics (especially the latter) in Texas for his re-election effort, if I recall he made little or no such inroads during his FIRST campaign for Governor. It was only as an incumbent that he cut deeply into traditional Democratic advantage. If that is the case, then the re-election campaign might well be where this supposed "special appeal" of the younger Bush would become more obvious.

Don

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Echoing Nick's point about black support of Clinton: In a Harvard =
University/University of Chicago/Knowledge Networks survey conducted in =
December 2000, 77% of black respondents gave Clinton an "extremely =
favorable" rating, while Bush received an "extremely UNfavorable" rating =
from 55% of black respondents. The same survey found that "92% of blacks =
believe that Bush is to some degree hostile toward their interests."

The findings are discussed in two Polling Report articles by Michael =
Dawson and Larry Bobo: "Election 2000: The Racial Divide" (Dec. 31, =
2000) and "Polls Apart: Blacks and Whites View Bill Clinton" (Jan. 15, = 2001).

I'd be happy to e-mail either or both articles (in pdf format) to anyone interested.

Tom Silver
editor@pollingreport.com

----- Original Message -----=
From: Nick Panagakis=
To: mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu=
Cc: Aapornet@Usc.Edu=
Sent: Sunday, July 15, 2001 12:46 PM
Subject: Re: Race and the 2000 Election

This is the NY Times' portrait of the electorate site.==
race.html==

According to their exit poll data, the GOP candidate got 8% of the =
black vote in 2000, 12% in 1996, 10% in 1992. After considering some =
sample error, I don't think that the fall-off in 2000 was all that =
precipitous.==

But I would add this to our comments below.==

I think the GOP's outreach to blacks at their convention was perceived =
as disingenuous. Do you recall how the pundits were say that there were =
more blacks on stage than in the hall; i.e., among the convention =
delegates.==

I would also add that Gore had another factor in his favor - black =
support of Bill Clinton.==

Nick==

Michael O'Neil wrote:==

I have been mulling an observation about the 2000 election for some =
time.==

Background: the black vote has historically been overwhelmingly =
Democratic for about the last 40 years. Nothing in this election would =
lead one to have expected a reversal of this historical pattern. Yet, =
if one were to look at the candidates and the campaign, one would be hard-pressed to find anything in Bush's record on race that would make him less attractive to blacks than most recent Republican Presidential candidates. Indeed, he seemed to make at least some effort to at least court the black vote (e.g., the Republican convention), unlike some recent predecessors who simply wrote it off. Likewise, there was nothing about Gore's record on racial issues that would seem to make him MORE attractive to blacks than most recent Democratic presidential candidates. If anything, at first blush, by looking at the respective records, I think it would not have been unreasonable to have expected some very modest Republican inroads in relation to historical trends. But, the reverse happened; this election, by most reports, produced black proportionate vote and especially turnout MORE Democratic than recent historical norms.

The question is this: why then was the black vote so abnormally pro-Gore?

Note, I am NOT asking for an explanation of the historical tendency of the black vote to skew heavily Democratic. Rather, given this known proclivity, why should the 2000 election have been even more so?

My personal theory (based on no formal examination of data, just general observations of the election) is this: despite Bush's overtures and an adequate record on race, he was seen as a child of privilege, someone who throughout his entire life "got all the breaks". While voters of all races undoubtedly made this observation, my guess is that it was an unusually sensitive one to blacks.

I have never seen any polling on this, or any discussion on Aapornet. Did any question on any of the pre- or post-election surveys address this issue?

Michael O'Neil

www.oneilresearch.com
Echoing Nick’s point about black support of Clinton: In a Harvard University/University of Chicago/Knowledge Networks survey conducted in December 2000, 77% of black respondents gave Clinton an “extremely favorable” rating, while Bush received an “extremely unfavorable” rating from 55% of black respondents. The same survey found that 92% of blacks believe that Bush is “to some degree hostile toward their interests.”


I’d be happy to e-mail either or both articles (in pdf format) to anyone interested.

Tom Silver
editor@pollingreport.com
According to their exit poll data, the GOP candidate got 8% of the black vote in 2000, 12% in 1996, 10% in 1992. After considering some sample error, I don't think that the fall-off in 2000 was all that precipitous.

But I would add this to our comments below. I think the GOP's outreach to blacks at their convention was perceived as disingenuous. Do you recall how the pundits were say that there were more blacks on stage than in the hall; i.e., among the convention delegates?

I would also add that Gore had another factor in his favor - black support of Bill Clinton.

Nick

Michael O'Neil wrote:

I think the GOP's outreach to blacks at their convention was perceived as disingenuous. Do you recall how the pundits were say that there were more blacks on stage than in the hall; i.e., among the convention delegates.

I would also add that Gore had another factor in his favor - black support of Bill Clinton.

Nick
I have been mulling an observation about the 2000 election for some time. Background: the black vote has been overwhelmingly Democratic for about the last 40 years. Nothing in this election would lead one to have expected a reversal of this historical pattern. Yet, if one were to look at the candidates and the campaign, one would be hard-pressed to find anything in Bush's record on race that would make him less attractive to blacks than most recent Republican Presidential candidates. Indeed, he seemed to...
least some effort to at least court the black vote (e.g., the Republican=
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known proclivity, why should the 2000 election have been even more so?

My personal theory (based on no formal examination of data, just general observations of the election) is:

this: despite Bush's overtures and an adequate record on race, as a child of privilege, someone who throughout his entire life "got all the breaks." While voters of all races undoubtedly made this observation, my guess is that it was unusually sensitive one to blacks.

I have never seen any polling on this, or any discussion on Aapornet. Did any question on any of the pre- or post-election surveys address this issue?

--
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Echoing Tom's point about my point, attached is our Illinois poll for the Tribune taken in late '99 - a few months after the long national nightmare was over.

Although not mentioned in the text because we had gotten so used to seeing this, African-Americans stuck with Clinton throughout the impeachment ordeal as is evident in these findings. I believe ours and other data show that African Americans thought the whole process was purely political.

Nick

Editor wrote:

> > Echoing Nick's point about black support of Clinton: In a Harvard University/University of Chicago/Knowledge Networks survey conducted in December 2000, 77% of black respondents gave Clinton an "extremely favorable" rating, while Bush received an "extremely UNfavorable" rating from 55% of black respondents. The same survey found that "92% of blacks believe that Bush is to some degree hostile toward their interests."
> >
> > I'd be happy to e-mail either or both articles (in pdf format) to anyone interested.
> >
> > Tom Silver
> >
> > editor@pollingreport.com


----- Original Message ----- 
From: Nick Panagakis 
To: mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu 
Cc: Aapornet@Usc.edu 
Sent: Sunday, July 15, 2001 12:46 PM 
Subject: Re: Race and the 2000 Election

This is the NY Times' portrait of the electorate site.


According to their exit poll data, the GOP candidate got 8% of the black vote in 2000, 12% in 1996, 10% in 1992. After considering some sample error, I don't think that the fall-off in 2000 was all that precipitous.
But I would add this to our comments below.

I think the GOP's outreach to blacks at their convention was perceived as disingenuous. Do you recall how the pundits were say that there were more blacks on stage than in the hall; i.e., among the convention delegates.

I would also add that Gore had another factor in his favor - black support of Bill Clinton.

Nick

Michael O'Neil wrote:

I have been mulling an observation about the 2000 election for some time.

Background: the black vote has historically been overwhelmingly Democratic for about the last 40 years. Nothing in this election would lead one to have expected a reversal of this historical pattern. Yet, if one were to look at the candidates and the campaign, one would be hard-pressed to find anything in Bush's record on race that would make him less attractive to blacks than most recent Republican Presidential candidates. Indeed, he seemed to make at least some effort to at least court the black vote (e.g., the Republican convention), unlike some recent predecessors who simply wrote it off. Likewise, there was nothing about Gore's record on racial issues that would seem to make him MORE attractive to blacks than most recent Democratic presidential candidates. If anything, at first blush, by looking at the respective records, I think it would not have been unreasonable to have expected some very modest Republican inroads in relation to historical trends. But, the reverse happened; this election, by most reports, produced black proportionate vote and especially turnout MORE Democratic than recent historical norms.

The question is this: why then was the black vote so abnormally pro-Gore?

Note, I am NOT asking for an explanation of the historical tendency of the black vote to skew heavily Democratic. Rather, given this known proclivity, why should the 2000 election have been even more so?

My personal theory (based on no formal examination of data, just general observations of the election) is this: despite Bush's overtures and an adequate record on race, he was seen as a child of privilege, someone who throughout his entire life "got all the breaks". While voters of all races undoubtedly made this observation, my guess is that it was an unusually sensitive one to blacks.

I have never seen any polling on this, or any discussion
Echoing Tom's point about my point, attached is our Illinois poll for the Tribune taken in late '99 - a few months after the long national nightmare was over.

Although not mentioned in the text because we had gotten so used to seeing this, African-Americans stuck with Clinton throughout the impeachment ordeal as is evident in these findings. I believe ours and other data show that African Americans thought the whole process was purely political.

Nick

Editor wrote:

Echoing Nick's point about black support of Clinton: In a Harvard University/University of Chicago/Knowledge Networks survey conducted in December 2000, 77% of black respondents gave Clinton an "extremely favorable" rating, while Bush received an "extremely unfavorable" rating from 55% of black respondents. The same survey found that "92% of blacks believe that Bush is to some degree hostile toward their interests."
<p class="MsoNormal"><font face="Arial"><font size=-1><a href="mailto:editor@pollingreport.com">editor@pollingreport.com</a></font></font></p>
<br/>
<br/>
<br/>
<blockquote dir="ltr" style="PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">

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

<div style="FONT: 10pt arial">From: Nick Panagakis</div>

<div style="FONT: 10pt arial">To: mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu</div>

<div style="FONT: 10pt arial">Cc: Aapornet@Usc.Edu</div>


<div style="FONT: 10pt arial">Subject: Re: Race and the 2000 Election</div>

This is the NY Times' portrait of the electorate site.


According to their exit poll data, the GOP candidate got 8% of the black vote in 2000, 12% in 1996, 10% in 1992. After considering some sample error, I don't think that the fall-off in 2000 was all that precipitous.

But I would add this to our comments below.

I think the GOP's outreach to blacks at their convention was perceived as disingenuous. Do you recall how the pundits were say that there were more blacks on stage than in the hall; i.e., among the convention delegates.

I would also add that Gore had another factor in his favor - black support of Bill Clinton.

Nick

Michael O'Neill wrote:

<blockquote TYPE="CITE"><a href="cid:filelist.xml@01C10CA4.66D9BC80" rel=File-List><xml>!</a></xml>
I have been mulling an observation about the 2000 election for some time.

Background: the black vote has historically been overwhelmingly Democratic for about the last 40 years. Nothing in this election would lead one to have expected a reversal of this historical pattern.

Yet, if one were to look at the candidates and the campaign, one would be hard-pressed to find anything in Bush's record on race that would make him less attractive to blacks than most recent Republican Presidential candidates. Indeed, he seemed to make at least some effort to at least court the black vote (e.g., the Republican convention), unlike some recent predecessors who simply wrote it off.

Likewise, there was nothing about Gore's record on racial issues that would seem to make him MORE attractive to blacks than most recent Democratic presidential candidates. If anything, at first blush, by looking at the respective records, I think it would not have been unreasonable to have expected some very modest Republican inroads in relation to historical trends.

But, the reverse happened; this election, by most reports, produced black proportionate vote and especially turnout MORE Democratic than recent historical norms.
The question is this: why then was the black vote so abnormally pro-Gore?

My personal theory (based on no formal examination of data, just general observations of the election) is this: despite Bush's overtures and an adequate record on race, he was seen as a child of privilege, someone who throughout his entire life "got all the breaks." While voters of all races undoubtedly made this observation, my guess is that it was an unusually sensitive one to blacks.

I have never seen any polling on this, or any discussion on Aapornet. Did any question on any of the pre- or post-election surveys address this issue?
Michael O'Neil

www.oneilresearch.com
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Actually, there are some variations on this one.

Akin to the war of 1812, jurors can literally be impressed or "hijacked" off the street in some jurisdictions if there are too few that day. My impression of the literature is that this occurs rarely but it sure is dramatic when it does. Brian, if you're currently on this list, I think you can speak to Indiana on this one!
Second, pay varies enormously. In Florida, they don't even pay you for the first three days. After that, it's $15 a day. The feds pay $40 a day plus milage. Last I knew, DC paid $25 and was considering upgrading to $35.

No summoned jurors like the pay but it turns out to be a relatively minor item in the research on juror attitudes. Pay is a big issue, however, for the self-employed who lose without compensation. This is especially a tremendous hardship for blue collar workers, such as lawn service workers.

Juror response varies enormously by district. When Tom Bateman headed the assembly here, over 50% of those summoned appeared. In some jurisdictions, LA as I recall is one, it is as low as 10 percent. Most of the time there is no consequence if you are an FTA ("failure to appear"). [Should I be telling you guys this? You probably already knew.]

Undeliverable summonses are much higher than most Court Administrators realize because many of them are not returned by the post office.

One thing we found out was that former FTAs were not particularly hostile. They felt they had "postponed," but because they had less education, they didn't know how to formally request an excuse or a postponement. People who had a record of formal excusals were, in fact, more hostile. Just redesigning the forms helps. At our suggestion, Tom included a snap out letter in the summons to hand to employers (fire your employee and you can land in jail...). He also instituted an online system for people to submit postponement and excuse requests, with the opportunity to pick your own recall date for up to three months.

Obviously, our guy was dedicated to the jury trial. But we also found that most of our respondents saw jury service as necessary and a learning experience. What we should have asked about and didn't was the extreme irritation people felt about sitting and waiting, only to be discarded during voir dire (they don't generally pick U profs in my venue--guess LA is different, maybe that's Jim's demographic!). This is a mix of disappointment and irritation at wasting time. People who have more leisure time, particularly the retired, are pretty gung ho. (Students are the worst and had the worst FTA histories.)

Susan

At 09:49 PM 7/14/2001 -0700, you wrote:
> Seems to me that the judge is acting more akin to a bureaucrat protecting
> himself against something that could be personally embarrassing. I have
> been called for jury duty several times. Great lip service is always paid
> to the value of jurors. In practice, however, little or no value is
> attached to their time. I do understand that many cases are settled only at
> the last minute. Still, those who administer the jury process have, in
> effect, to perform a mathematical calculation. They have to calculate the
> probability of not having enough jurors against the risk of having a room
> full of uncalled jurors. In making such calculations, the value attached to
> a judge's time is virtually infinite while that of a juror is based on what
> they are paid (in our county, I think this is $12 per day....and they
> stopped providing parking a couple of years ago, so most of this will go to
> parking). I know the people who run the system in our county and discussed
> this once. If any judge EVER cannot get a jury when he needs one, there is
> hell to pay. So enough jurors have to be called that if NO case settles and
>every one goes to a jury trial (a very unlikely event), there is still a
>sufficient jury pool available to go to trial immediately. The inevitable
>result: a huge jury pool that does not get called. And our county is
>regarded as having one of the more efficient systems in the country (and did
>at least implement one reform—a one day, one trial obligation).
>
>Michael O'Neil
>www.oneilresearch.com
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
>Susan Losh
>Sent: Friday, July 13, 2001 12:36 PM
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Re: LA Superior Court Judge Bars Survey of Jury Pool (LATimes)
>
>Hi Guys,
>
>Our judge, Tom Bateman III, who is now a district judge, allowed us to
>gather data from nearly 1100 jurors in 1998 while they waited in the
>Assembly Room to finish being qualified. Our items address their attitudes
>toward jury duty. We have some questions comparable to Blasi's.
>
>One article from this study ("Reluctant Jurors") appeared in Judicature last
>summer. I have some limited hard copies to snail to folks (their articles
>are not online) who are interested. There are two other papers off these
>data, including a poster session that Rob Boatright and I presented in May.
>We will submit that paper later this summer.
>
>Susan
>
>At 09:31 AM 7/13/2001 -0700, you wrote:
>>
>Is AAPOR prepared to pay for a court ruling on whether
>conducting a scientific survey is an effective means to
>relieve boredom? Oh, and also—whether it's effective
>or not—is surveying out of boredom (i.e., SOOBing) a
>free-speech right, or not?
>
>-- Jim

>---------------------------------------------------------------------------
>Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
>---------------------------------------------------------------------------
>
>July 13 2001
>
>JUDGE BARS SURVEY OF JURY POOL
>
>COURT: THE WOULD-BE RESEARCHER,
>A BORED POTENTIAL JUROR, SAYS THE RULING
>VIOLATES HIS FREE-SPEECH RIGHTS.

>STEVE BERRY
UCLA law professor Gary Blasi isn't the first potential juror to gripe about the inconvenience and time-wasting aspects of jury service. But Blasi, 56, may be among the first whose pique subjected him to a gag order.

Concerned about the amount of idle time he and other prospective jurors were spending in the jury assembly room, he decided this week to conduct a survey of his fellow court captives to find out what their attitudes were about the process. But Thursday morning, Superior Court Judge Sam Ohta, who is in charge of Traffic Court at the Metropolitan Courthouse just south of downtown Los Angeles, quickly put a stop to it. Saying he feared that Blasi's survey might taint the "quasi-holy" jury process, Ohta issued a formal order preventing him from conducting any systematic interviews or surveys of prospective jurors.

"When Mr. Blasi is conducting this research with other potential jurors, it's possible that in some way it could influence jurors in a certain way," Ohta said.

Although Blasi's experience may amuse court critics, Ohta's decision also highlights serious questions about the extent to which judges have the power to limit free speech if they believe it jeopardizes their ability to seat impartial juries.

"There is a free speech question involved here," said Stan Goldman, a law professor at Loyola University and a former public defender. "But there has to be a balance of interests here," he said, speaking of the judge's duty to protect the integrity of the jury pool.

That said, Goldman declared, "It's a bit of a stretch to say this questionnaire would affect the integrity of the jury."

The dispute began to unfold Tuesday, when Blasi, after having sat for hours without being called to a courtroom, began asking other jurors how they felt about the idle time they were spending in the waiting room and their feelings about the entire jury process.

Being a researcher and seeing a chance to gather data for a newspaper "op-ed piece" or a journal article, Blasi decided to turn wasted time into something productive.

"As my annoyance increased, I decided I would do a little study," said the professor, who previously worked in legal aid for more than a decade. Instead of just chit-chatting about the issue, Blasi wanted to record the information in a more systematic way. He developed a two-page survey form. Part of the survey simply gathered information about people's jury service, such as how long they had been waiting and how many times they had been summoned to a courtroom. The second set of questions sought their opinions about how they were treated, whether they believed the court system showed sufficient respect for their time and whether they thought court officials could do a better job.

The courts need answers to those questions, Blasi said in an interview.
"When do you think is the last time a judge went down to a jury assembly to try to gather this kind of information?" he asked.

After court Wednesday, Blasi notified a jury service administrator by E-mail that he planned to distribute the survey form. On Thursday morning, the administrator told him his plan violated court policy.

Blasi challenged the administrator's decision but withheld the survey until she could discuss the matter with Ohta. Ohta called a brief hearing, and then ordered Blasi to abandon his survey.

"I agree, and the courts agree, with the importance of finding out how jurors feel about jury service and how the court can assist in making it better," Ohta said. "What he was trying to do was a good thing."

Nevertheless, doing it in the jury assembly room was "inappropriate," Ohta said.

"The jury pool is sacred," Ohta said. "They should come here with a clean slate, to serve the court, to do this solemn, quasi-holy duty. So you try to create an environment to foster that attitude."

Superior Court Assistant Presiding Judge Robert Dukes agreed. "The court has the responsibility of protecting privacy rights of jurors," he said. "They are there against their will. They are not free to just leave if another juror starts asking them questions."

Blasi scoffed at such notions. The questions would not inflame the juror, and any juror who didn't want to answer his questions could simply refuse and walk away.

"The gag order violates my 1st Amendment rights [to freedom of speech]," he said, adding that he is considering filing suit in federal court to challenge the decision.

If he does, he probably will not win, said Goldman, the Loyola Law School professor. Although Goldman says Blasi should have been allowed to do the survey, higher courts usually are reluctant to second-guess a trial judge's discretion in protecting a jury's integrity.

"Once a trial judge makes a decision like this, a higher court will usually go out of its way to find a good reason for letting him do it."

As for Blasi, he finally got summoned for a trial late Thursday. But if he had not, he was going to keep talking to fellow jurors.

"I just wouldn't do it systematically," he said.
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Both the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times have waited until today's Sunday editions--largest circulation of the week--to begin publishing their major investigative reporting on political influences on the Florida vote count--the count which tipped the 2000 presidential election to George W. Bush last November.

In a six-month investigation of 2,490 overseas ballots accepted after Election Day, the New York Times found 680 questionable votes, a number greater than Bush's 537-vote victory in Florida. The Times concludes that Bush would have likely defeated Al Gore even if the flawed ballots had been discarded.

This New York Times reporting, written by the investigative team of David Barstow and Don Van Natta Jr., begins at the top of page 1, columns 1-4, of today's Times, beneath the headline:

HOW BUSH TOOK FLORIDA:
MINING THE OVERSEAS ABSENTEE VOTE

Winning Margin Included Hundreds of Flawed Ballots

This front-page story jumps to a four-page spread--over pages 16-19 of the first section of today's Sunday Times--with byline reporting by Richard L. Berke, C.J. Chivers, Michael Cooper, and Josh Barbanel, and accompanied by lavish tables and graphics created by Archie Tse. Other reporters credited by the Times as part of the investigation are Christopher Drew and David Rohde.

*****

The Los Angeles Times story, which appears beneath the byline of Times staff writer Richard A. Serrano, head of a Times investigative team which also includes staff writers Mike Clary, Bob Drogin and Lisa Getter, runs over much of pages 14 and 15 of today's first section of the Times, beneath the four-column headline:
ABSENTEE VOTE DID IT FOR BUSH

ELECTION: Gov. Jeb Bush's letter helped provide the edge. But critics cry foul over its 'comfort' message and an image of the Florida state seal.

The Times reports that its investigative team also included staff writers Mike Clary, Bob Drogin and Lisa Getter.

*****

The Washington Post also ran the story--Associated Press wire copy about the investigative reporting of the New York Times, without a byline--on page A02 of today's editions of the Sunday Post. This story follows here; the other stories previously mentioned will come in successive postings.

-- Jim

Probe Questions 680 Ballots From Florida Absentee Voters

By Associated Press

An investigation into overseas ballots that helped George W. Bush win the presidency found that Florida election officials, facing intense GOP pressure to accept military votes, counted hundreds of overseas absentee ballots that failed to comply with state election laws.

In a six-month investigation of the 2,490 overseas ballots accepted after Election Day, the New York Times found 680 questionable votes. The Times published the results in today's editions.

But while that number is greater than Bush's 537-vote victory in Florida, the paper concluded that Bush still would likely have defeated Al Gore even if those flawed ballots had been discarded.

Gary King, a Harvard expert on voting patterns and statistical models, concluded that Bush's winning margin would most likely have been reduced to 245 votes if the overseas votes had been thrown out. There was only a slight chance that discarding those ballots would have made Gore the winner.

It was impossible to simply count the questionable votes because the ballots themselves are separated from the envelopes containing voter
The paper found no evidence of fraud by either party, though it did interview voters who admitted they had cast illegal ballots after Election Day. It found no support for suspicions that the Bush campaign had organized an effort to solicit late votes.


(C) 2001 The Washington Post Company

Susan: Yes I have been "lurking." Indiana's juror statutes allows a "highway and byway" procedure to impress jurors if necessary. Rarely used. The law allows also automatic excuses for veterinarians, people over 65 and operators of ferrys.

There are a couple other exceptions that are automatic. Urban areas--primarily Marion (Indianapolis) and Lake (Gary/Hammond) Counties--have trouble getting people to show. There is no penalty. In a survey of all judges in Indiana and a sample of citizens (which is web available from the Indiana Judicial Center) my lab found few citizens even knew they were paid for jury service. In another
survey we found that some people did not register to vote SOLELY to avoid jury
duty. In 91 of 92 Counties in IN. only registered voters are called. Many
judges want to expand to using state records of driver's license material--so far
not done. Some attorneys feel this is too exclude minorities from the
venery.
Judges are very concerned, in IN at least according to our survey of them, about
the "care and feeding" of jurors. They want to minimize the waits, etc. They
also are concerned about things such as physical facilities. In sum, there is
no penalty so a plurality of those summoned do not show in our most populous
areas. The judges are concerned. They do not know what to do about it. The
Court Clerk--who handles jurors, gives each one that appears--in our most
populous County--a survey about their background, etc. and excuses several on the
spot. Oh, self-employed generally are excused in most courts in IN. Some of
this is from memory but if you check the survey of Indiana's judges on the
Indiana Judicial Center site you will find some interesting variation in what
they excuse jurors for and what they expect of jurors.

Brian Vargus
Indiana Univ. Public Opinion Lab

Susan Losh wrote:

> Actually, there are some interesting variations on this one.
> 
> Akin to the war of 1812, jurors can literally be impressed or "hijacked"
off
> the street in some jurisdictions if there are too few that day. My
> impression of the literature is that this occurs rarely but it sure is
> dramatic when it does. Brian, if you're currently on this list, I think you
> can speak to Indiana on this one!
> 
> Second, pay varies enormously. In Florida, they don't even pay you for the
> first three days. After that, it's $15 a day. The feds pay $40 a day plus
> milage. Last I knew, DC paid $25 and was considering upgrading to $35.
> 
> No summoned jurors like the pay but it turns out to be a relatively minor
> item in the research on juror attitudes. Pay is a big issue, however, for
> the self-employed who lose without compensation. This is especially a
> tremendous hardship for blue collar workers, such as lawn service workers.
> 
> Juror response varies enormously by district. When Tom Bateman headed the
> assembly here, over 50% of those summoned appeared. In some jurisdictions,
> LA as I recall is one, it is as low as 10 percent. Most of the time there is
> no consequence if you are an FTA ("failure to appear").[Should I be telling
> you guys this? You probably already knew.]
> 
> Undeliverable summonses are much higher than most Court Administrators
> realize because many of them are not returned by the post office.
> 
> One thing we found out was that former FTAs were not particularly hostile.
They felt they had "postponed," but because they had less education, they didn't know how to formally request an excuse or a postponement. People who had a record of formal excusals were, in fact, more hostile. Just redesigning the forms helps. At our suggestion, Tom included a snap out letter in the summons to hand to employers (fire your employee and you can land in jail...). He also instituted an online system for people to submit postponement and excuse requests, with the opportunity to pick your own recall date for up to three months.

Obviously, our guy was dedicated to the jury trial. But we also found that most of our respondents saw jury service as necessary and a learning experience. What we should have asked about and didn't was the extreme irritation people felt about sitting and waiting, only to be discarded during voir dire (they don't generally pick U profs in my venue--guess LA is different, maybe that's Jim's demographic!). This is a mix of disappointment and irritation at wasting time. People who have more leisure time, particularly the retired, are pretty gung ho. (Students are the worst and had the worst FTA histories.)

Susan

At 09:49 PM 7/14/2001 -0700, you wrote:
> Seems to me that the judge is acting more akin to a bureaucrat protecting himself against something that could be personally embarrassing. I have been called for jury duty several times. Great lip service is always paid to the value of jurors. In practice, however, little or no value is attached to their time. I do understand that many cases are settled only at the last minute. Still, those who administer the jury process have, in effect, to perform a mathematical calculation. They have to calculate the probability of not having enough jurors against the risk of having a room full of uncalled jurors. In making such calculations, the value attached to a judge's time is virtually infinite while that of a juror is based on what they are paid (in our county, I think this is $12 per day....and they stopped providing parking a couple of years ago, so most of this will go to parking). I know the people who run the system in our county and discussed this once. If any judge EVER cannot get a jury when he needs one, there is hell to pay. So enough jurors have to be called that if NO case settles and every one goes to a jury trial (a very unlikely event), there is still a sufficient jury pool available to go to trial immediately. The inevitable result: a huge jury pool that does not get called. And our county is regarded as having one of the more efficient systems in the country (and did at least implement one reform-a one day, one trial obligation).

Michael O'Neil
>www.oneilresearch.com
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
Hi Guys,

Our judge, Tom Bateman III, who is now a district judge, allowed us to gather data from nearly 1100 jurors in 1998 while they waited in the Assembly Room to finish being qualified. Our items address their attitudes toward jury duty. We have some questions comparable to Blasi's.

One article from this study ("Reluctant Jurors") appeared in Judicature last summer. I have some limited hard copies to snail to folks (their articles are not online) who are interested. There are two other papers off these data, including a poster session that Rob Boatright and I presented in May.

We will submit that paper later this summer.

Susan

---

Is AAPOR prepared to pay for a court ruling on whether conducting a scientific survey is an effective means to relieve boredom? Oh, and also—whether it's effective or not—is surveying out of boredom (i.e., SOOBing) a free-speech right, or not?

-- Jim

--------------------------------
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JUDGE BARS SURVEY OF JURY POOL

COURT: THE WOULD-BE RESEARCHER,
A BORED POTENTIAL JUROR, SAYS THE RULING VIOLATES HIS FREE-SPEECH RIGHTS.

STEVE BERRY
TIMES STAFF WRITER

UCLA law professor Gary Blasi isn't the first potential juror to gripe about the inconvenience and time-wasting aspects of jury service.
But Blasi, 56, may be among the first whose pique subjected him to a gag order.

Concerned about the amount of idle time he and other prospective jurors were spending in the jury assembly room, he decided this week to conduct a survey of his fellow court captives to find out what their attitudes were about the process. But Thursday morning, Superior Court Judge Sam Ohta, who is in charge of Traffic Court at the Metropolitan Courthouse just south of downtown Los Angeles, quickly put a stop to it. Saying he feared that Blasi's survey might taint the "quasi-holy" jury process, Ohta issued a formal order preventing him from conducting any systematic interviews or surveys of prospective jurors.

"When Mr. Blasi is conducting this research with other potential jurors, it's possible that in some way it could influence jurors in a certain way," Ohta said.

Although Blasi's experience may amuse court critics, Ohta's decision also highlights serious questions about the extent to which judges have the power to limit free speech if they believe it jeopardizes their ability to seat impartial juries.

"There is a free speech question involved here," said Stan Goldman, a law professor at Loyola University and a former public defender. "But there has to be a balance of interests here," he said, speaking of the judge's duty to protect the integrity of the jury pool.

That said, Goldman declared, "It's a bit of a stretch to say this questionnaire would affect the integrity of the jury."

The dispute began to unfold Tuesday, when Blasi, after having sat for hours without being called to a courtroom, began asking other jurors how they felt about the idle time they were spending in the waiting room and their feelings about the entire jury process.

Being a researcher and seeing a chance to gather data for a newspaper "op-ed piece" or a journal article, Blasi decided to turn wasted time into something productive.

"As my annoyance increased, I decided I would do a little study," said the professor, who previously worked in legal aid for more than a decade.

Instead of just chit-chatting about the issue, Blasi wanted to record the information in a more systematic way. He developed a two-page survey form. Part of the survey simply gathered information about people's jury service, such as how long they had been waiting and how many times they had been summoned to a courtroom. The second set of questions sought their opinions about how they were treated, whether they believed the court system showed sufficient respect for their time and whether they thought court officials could do a better job.

The courts need answers to those questions, Blasi said in an interview. "When do you think is the last time a judge went down to a jury assembly
to try to gather this kind of information?" he asked.

After court Wednesday, Blasi notified a jury service administrator by E-mail that he planned to distribute the survey form. On Thursday morning, the administrator told him his plan violated court policy.

Blasi challenged the administrator's decision but withheld the survey until she could discuss the matter with Ohta. Ohta called a brief hearing, and then ordered Blasi to abandon his survey.

"I agree, and the courts agree, with the importance of finding out how jurors feel about jury service and how the court can assist in making it better," Ohta said. "What he was trying to do was a good thing."

Nevertheless, doing it in the jury assembly room was "inappropriate," Ohta said. "The jury pool is sacred," Ohta said. "They should come here with a clean slate, to serve the court, to do this solemn, quasi-holy duty. So you try to create an environment to foster that attitude."

Superior Court Assistant Presiding Judge Robert Dukes agreed. "The court has the responsibility of protecting privacy rights of jurors," he said. "They are there against their will. They are not free to just leave if another juror starts asking them questions."

Blasi scoffed at such notions. The questions would not inflame the juror, and any juror who didn't want to answer his questions could simply refuse and walk away.

"The gag order violates my 1st Amendment rights [to freedom of speech]," he said, adding that he is considering filing suit in federal court to challenge the decision.

If he does, he probably will not win, said Goldman, the Loyola Law School professor. Although Goldman says Blasi should have been allowed to do the survey, higher courts usually are reluctant to second-guess a trial judge's discretion in protecting a jury's integrity.

"Once a trial judge makes a decision like this, a higher court will usually go out of its way to find a good reason for letting him do it."

As for Blasi, he finally got summoned for a trial late Thursday. But if he had not, he was going to keep talking to fellow jurors.

"I just wouldn't do it systematically," he said.
HOW BUSH TOOK FLORIDA: MINING THE OVERSEAS ABSENTEE VOTE

By DAVID BARSTOW and DON VAN NATTA Jr.

On the morning after Election Day, George W. Bush held an unofficial lead of 1,784 votes in Florida, but to his campaign strategists the margin felt perilously slim. They were right to worry. Within a week, recounts would erode Mr. Bush's unofficial lead to just 300 votes.

With the presidency hanging on the outcome in Florida, the Bush team quickly grasped that the best hope of ensuring victory was the trove of ballots still arriving in the mail from Florida residents living abroad. Over the next 18 days, the Republicans mounted a legal and public relations campaign to persuade canvassing boards in Bush strongholds to waive the state's election laws when counting overseas absentee ballots.

Their goal was simple: to count the maximum number of overseas ballots in counties won by Mr. Bush, particularly those with a high concentration of military voters, while seeking to disqualify overseas ballots in counties won by Vice President Al Gore.

A six-month investigation by The New York Times of this chapter in the closest presidential election in American history shows that the Republican effort had a decided impact. Under intense pressure from the Republicans, Florida officials accepted hundreds of overseas absentee ballots that failed to comply with state election laws.

In an analysis of the 2,490 ballots from Americans living abroad that were counted as legal votes after Election Day, The Times found 680 questionable votes. Although it is not known for whom the flawed ballots were cast, four out of five were accepted in counties carried by Mr.
Bush, The Times found. Mr. Bush's final margin in the official total was 537 votes.

The flawed votes included ballots without postmarks, ballots postmarked after the election, ballots without witness signatures, ballots mailed from towns and cities within the United States and even ballots from voters who voted twice. All would have been disqualified had the state's election laws been strictly enforced.

The Republican push on absentee ballots became an effective counterweight to the Gore campaign's push for manual recounts in mainly Democratic counties in southern Florida.

In its investigation, The Times found that these overseas ballots - the only votes that could legally be received and counted after Election Day - were judged by markedly different standards, depending on where they were counted.

The unequal treatment of these ballots is at odds with statements by Bush campaign leaders and by the Florida secretary of state, Katherine Harris, that rules should be applied uniformly and certainly not changed in the middle of a contested election. It also conflicts with the equal protection guarantee that the United States Supreme Court invoked in December when it halted a statewide manual recount and effectively handed Florida to Mr. Bush.

After being told of The Times's findings, Ari Fleischer, the White House spokesman, said: "This election was decided by the voters of Florida a long time ago. And the nation, the president and all but the most partisan Americans have moved on."

The Times study found no evidence of vote fraud by either party. In particular, while some voters admitted in interviews that they had cast illegal ballots after Election Day, the investigation found no support for the suspicions of Democrats that the Bush campaign had organized an effort to solicit late votes.

Rather, the Republicans poured their energy into the speedy delivery and liberal treatment of likely Bush ballots from abroad. In a Tallahassee "war room" within the offices of Ms. Harris, veteran Republican political consultants helped shape the post-election instructions to county canvassing boards. In Washington, senior Bush campaign officials urged the Pentagon to accelerate the collection and delivery of military ballots, and indeed ballots arrived more quickly than in previous elections. Republicans on the House Armed Services Committee helped the campaign obtain private contact information for military voters.

Republicans provided their lawyers with a detailed playbook that included instructions on how to challenge likely Gore votes while fighting for the inclusion of likely Bush votes. In some counties where Mr. Gore was strong, Bush lawyers stood by silently while Gore lawyers challenged overseas ballots, even likely Gore ballots.

The effectiveness of the Republican effort is demonstrated by striking disparities in how different counties treated ballots with similar defects. For instance, counties carried by Mr. Gore accepted 2 in 10 ballots that had no evidence they were mailed on or before Election Day.
Counties carried by Mr. Bush accepted 6 in 10 of the same kinds of ballots. Bush counties were four times as likely as Gore counties to count ballots lacking witness signatures and addresses.

In reconstructing the story of the absentee vote, The Times collected copies of virtually all the overseas ballot envelopes that arrived after Election Day and built a comprehensive database for statistical analysis. The Times also examined thousands of pages of election documents and canvassing board meeting transcripts and interviewed more than 300 voters in 43 countries.

Because the ballots themselves are separated from the envelopes containing voter information, it is impossible to know whether the outcome of the election would have been different had the flawed ballot envelopes been treated consistently.

The Times asked Gary King, a Harvard expert on voting patterns and statistical models, what would have happened had the flawed ballots been discarded. He concluded that there was no way to declare a winner with mathematical certainty under those circumstances. His best estimate, he said, was that Mr. Bush's margin would have been reduced to 245 votes. Dr. King estimated that there was only a slight chance that discarding the questionable ballots would have made Mr. Gore the winner.

Separate from this investigation, a consortium of newspapers, including The Times, has hired experts to examine all ballots cast in Florida to see whether the official count was affected by faulty voting machines. The results are expected later this summer.

Many of the 680 flawed ballots in the analysis of the overseas envelopes had multiple defects, so the total number of flaws exceeds the number of defective ballots. The following questionable ballots were found:

* 344 ballots with no evidence they were cast on or before Election Day. They had late, illegible or missing postmarks.
* 183 ballots with United States postmarks.
* 96 ballots lacking the required signature or address of a witness.
* 169 ballots from voters who were not registered, who failed to sign the envelope or who had not requested a ballot. A request is required by federal law.
* 5 ballots received after the Nov. 17 deadline.
* 19 voters cast two ballots, both of which counted.

Canvassing board members struggled to strike a balance between counting as many votes as possible and safeguarding against fraud. Decisions were difficult, particularly with ballots that appeared to be from legitimate voters yet did not comply with the rules. In some cases, board members said they had used common sense and cited a Florida court decision that gave them some "latitude of judgment." For example, the boards accepted 87 overseas ballots that arrived without a postmark a day or two after
Election Day, judging that they most likely had been cast before Nov. 7.

Still, this benefit of the doubt was given to such ballots more than three times as often in counties carried by Mr. Bush, according to the Times database.

Both parties quickly recognized the importance to Mr. Bush of the uncounted overseas ballots, especially those from military installations. But the Democrats were preoccupied, particularly with their pursuit of manual recounts in several heavily Democratic counties. And their strategy for absentee ballots, which consisted of challenging as many overseas ballots as possible, backfired after they were accused of disenfranchising men and women in uniform.

The Republican effort on the absentees, by comparison, was methodical and unrelenting.

Benjamin L. Ginsberg, national counsel to the Bush campaign, recalled those days as being "as hardball a game as any of us had ever been involved in.

"For any given five-minute period, we were confident we were going to hold on to the lead, and for any given five-minute period we were confident we were going to lose it all.''

The canvassing board members also have sharp memories of those days. Judge Anne Kaylor, chairwoman of the Polk County board, said the combination of Republican pressure and court rulings caused it to count some ballots that would probably have been considered illegal in past years.

"I think the rules were bent,'" Judge Kaylor, a Democrat, said. "Technically, they were not supposed to be accepted. Any canvassing board that says they weren't under pressure is being less than candid.''

Mr. Ginsberg said, "We didn't ask anybody to do anything that wasn't in the law as it existed on Election Day.''

Florida's certified election results, listed on the Florida Department of State's Web site, show that the Republicans' sense of urgency was justified. Although Mr. Bush appeared to hold a fluctuating lead throughout the 36 days of recounts, the Web site shows that without the overseas absentee ballots counted after Election Day, Mr. Gore would have won Florida by 202 votes, and thus the White House. But no one knew that until the 36 days were over; by then, it was a historical footnote.

Plotting Strategy
To Protect a Lead

By midday on Wednesday, Nov. 8, Mr. Bush's aides were already plotting strategy on overseas ballots. Their first thoughts were about the potential for fraud, according to interviews and internal strategy documents. Might Democrats now quietly - illegally - reach out to overseas supporters, particularly in Israel, and urge them to send in their ballots? Could the Clinton-Gore administration interfere with the delivery of ballots from Navy ships, military installations and American
The opportunities with absentee ballots via the postal delivery and retention process could pose a significant threat to the outcome of the election of the United States,'" Brigham A. McCown, a Bush lawyer, warned in a memorandum to campaign strategists that week. His concern grew, he said, when he found a photograph of a smiling Al Gore on a postal union Web site.

Although most of the overseas ballots had already been counted on Election Day, Florida is among a handful of states that give extra time for ballots to arrive from around the world. Unlike domestic absentee votes, which must arrive by Election Day, the deadline for overseas ballots was Nov. 17.

By 4 p.m. the day after the election, the Bush campaign had begun a pre-emptive strike, faxing a letter to each of Florida's election supervisors. Under Florida law, candidates and parties can obtain the addresses of overseas voters. But to make it difficult for Mr. Gore's campaign to track those voters, Bush aides wanted the supervisors to reject any post-election requests for the identities of voters who had not yet sent in ballots.

``We believe that such a request could only be made for an illicit, fraudulent and improper purpose,'' William R. Scherer, state co-chairman of Lawyers for Bush, wrote.

But elsewhere, the Bush team was itself exploring the legality of late voting - not by Floridians in Israel but by members of the military, who, according to its internal memorandums, were `presumed' to `represent conservative electors.''

On Thursday, Nov. 9, Jeff Phillips, veterans' coalition director for the Bush campaign, sent an e-mail message to Samuel F. Wright, a Republican lawyer and an expert on overseas military voting. Mr. Phillips asked in the message: `Can a service member vote in FL (especially after Nov. 7); i.e., can a sailor on the USS Tarawa cast a write-in vote November 10?'
In his e-mail response, Mr. Wright cited Florida law, which makes clear that late voting is illegal.

``It finally came down to us finding out what was legal and doing what we could,''' Mr. Phillips said. ``And if anything was not legal, we didn't do it.''

That same day, Mr. Gore asked that four Democratic counties do manual recounts, a prospect further endangering Mr. Bush's lead. ``As soon as the Gore people said, `We want to count all the votes, but only in our counties, with our Democratic-dominated counting boards doing the counting, without any set standards, making up new rules of the game after the election,' that was a sign to us that this was going to be a ballot-by-ballot battle and we could take nothing for granted,'' Mr. Ginsberg, the Bush campaign counsel, said.

With the terrain shifting so rapidly, Mr. Ginsberg assembled a task force of political strategists and corporate lawyers to focus exclusively on overseas voters.
To manage the political strategy, the Bush team enlisted J. Warren Tompkins III, the consultant who had helped Mr. Bush fend off Senator John McCain in the bitter South Carolina primary. David Aufhauser, a Washington lawyer and Mr. Tompkins's old friend, was to manage the legal strategy.

"There were two first things of concern," Mr. Aufhauser, now general counsel of the Treasury Department, said. "One, were military ballots going to be properly counted? And two, were there overseas ballots that should be disqualified?"

To find out, Mr. Aufhauser and Mr. Tompkins sent lawyers and campaign aides to election offices in all 67 counties. To the Bush campaign's relief, local election supervisors had paid little attention to its letter about keeping overseas voter information confidential. There, lawyers gathered the names, foreign addresses and political affiliations of every overseas voter. They tracked which ballots had been returned, and which ones had yet to arrive.

"We wanted to know everything about this group - whether they were military or civilian, Democrat or Republican," Mr. Tompkins said. "And I'd send the numbers, constantly, back to Austin."

The teams made two critical discoveries. First, despite predictions by some Democrats that 1,000 ballots would arrive from Israel, just a few dozen were trickling in; ultimately, only 64 arrived.

Far more troubling were reports about military ballots. In county after county, Bush observers noticed that military ballots were arriving without postmarks.

Under a well-established legal standard in Florida, all overseas ballots must bear clear evidence they were cast on or before Election Day and mailed from outside the United States. State law required all overseas ballots to have foreign postmarks. In addition, a state rule said that such ballots must have been either "postmarked or signed and dated" by Election Day.

But most of the ballots did not have dated signatures because only one of Florida's 67 counties even provided a spot on the ballot for a voter to write a date next to his or her signature. In past elections, with few exceptions, the boards had routinely insisted on a postmark as proof of timeliness.

This seemingly obscure postmark standard was suddenly of crucial importance to the Bush strategists. Hundreds of overseas ballots that they wanted counted met neither requirement - the envelopes had no postmarks, and the signatures had no dates.

Not only were ballots coming in without postmarks, the Bush team had also heard scattered accounts of ballots sitting in mailbags on the decks of Navy ships.

By day's end on Saturday, Nov. 11, the Bush campaign understood that defending against fraud alone was too limited a strategy. To take full advantage of Mr. Bush's support in the military, offensive measures would be needed too. And with Mr. Gore closing the gap in the recounts, Bush
strategists said in interviews, they calculated that they would need a net gain of 1,000 votes among the overseas ballots to seal victory.

It was an ambitious goal. In 1996, Bob Dole beat Bill Clinton by just 208 votes among Florida's overseas voters. The Republicans decided they had to make sure as many military ballots as possible arrived in Florida in time to be counted on Nov. 17.

A Rush to Retrieve Military Ballots

Around the world, on Navy ships and military bases, in embassies and vacation homes, Florida's overseas voters were transfixed by the unfolding drama. Most could only watch and wait; by Election Day, they had already voted.

But after Nov. 7, some hurriedly mailed their ballots, unaware or unconcerned that late voting is illegal.

Aboard the George Washington, an aircraft carrier then in the Adriatic Sea, Michael J. Kohrt recalled fellow crew members gathering around television sets on the morning of Nov. 8. ``We saw Florida was deadlocked, and everyone on the ship said, 'Whoa, I have got to get my ballot in,''' he said. ``A lot of guys voted late.''

The Times investigation found a substantial number of people who, like Mr. Kohrt, knowingly cast their ballots after Election Day. Of the 91 voters interviewed whose ballots had either missing or late postmarks, 30 acknowledged marking ballots late. Only four were counted. Mr. Kohrt's vote, which he said was for Mr. Gore, was among those rejected.

In the days after Nov. 7, both the Postal Service and the Pentagon worked hard to ensure the timely delivery of absentee ballots to Florida.

``We need to make sure our Sailors have their vote count,'' said a Nov. 10 Navy e-mail message that urged at least 118 ships to check for any remaining ballots.

The Pentagon soon faced pressure from the Bush campaign. Leading Republicans in Congress wrote letters and made calls. Mr. Ginsberg, the campaign's chief counsel, faxed a letter to Defense Secretary William S. Cohen, the only Republican in the Clinton cabinet, on Nov. 11. ``We fear that, unless those ballots are collected immediately, they will not be delivered on or before November 17,'' Mr. Ginsberg wrote.

Robert Tyrer, Mr. Cohen's former chief of staff, said that Mr. Ginsberg, a friend of Mr. Tyrer's, seemed to be ``laying down a marker'' for the Republicans. But, he added, the secretary's office was ``determined not to be involved in the politics of the matter.''

In the end, the vast majority of the ballots - 97 percent - arrived before the Nov. 17 deadline. In previous elections, according to records and interviews, as many as a third arrived after the 10-day window had closed.

But The Times investigation indicated that the push to get the ballots in
quickly only aggravated a problem that had concerned the Bush camp: 17 percent of military ballots arrived without postmarks, despite military regulations that require all mail to be postmarked. There is no evidence that the Pentagon knowingly delivered ballots cast illegally after Election Day.

In interviews, Pentagon officials could not fully explain why so many ballots were arriving without postmarks. They noted that a survey conducted after the election found less than 1 percent of all overseas military mail arrived without a postmark.

But a General Accounting Office study in May found a range of problems with how the military handled the absentee ballot issue, including inadequate training and supervision in its voting program. As a result of that and mail problems, the report said, Florida officials received ballots without postmarks, or witnesses, or even signatures.

The lack of postmarks made it impossible for canvassing boards to answer the threshold questions that determined the validity of an overseas vote: Was the ballot indeed mailed from a foreign country? And was it mailed on or before Election Day?

The lack of postmarks also posed political problems for the Bush strategists. Some Bush advisers, still fearful of votes from Israel, were preparing to seek strict enforcement of the postmark standard, according to documents and interviews. The Bush campaign even dispatched Jim Smith, a former Florida secretary of state, to emphasize the postmarking rule at a news conference on Nov. 12.

``The privilege to vote abroad comes with the corresponding duty to follow practices adopted by the State of Florida to assure timely and fair elections,''' Mr. Smith said at the news conference.

But even as Mr. Smith spoke, Bush strategists were shifting gears. They realized that unless they could persuade some local election officials to set aside the state's rules on postmarking, hundreds of ballots from military personnel, a reliable voting bloc, would not be counted.

In a single phrase of federal law, they found the statutory tool by which the Bush team would seek to undo Florida's postmarking rules. The phrase was contained in the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, a 1986 federal law intended to make overseas voting easier. One part of the law, a directive to postal officials, states that overseas ballots ``shall be carried expeditiously and free of postage.''

Although the law said nothing about postmarks, in the view of Mr. Aufhauser, the Bush lawyer, those eight words demonstrated that Congress never intended to require postmarks on overseas military ballots.

The lawyers realized they were putting their faith in an untested legal theory. The same federal law emphasizes the importance of state election rules.

As a backup, they zeroed in on a 1975 Florida Supreme Court ruling that said as long as there were no signs of fraud, canvassing boards had some discretion to accept ballots with minor flaws, like putting a signature in the wrong place or omitting a witness's address. Mr. Aufhauser decided
that the Republicans would try to push this argument further than it had ever been pushed to get military ballots counted.

This conflicted with the Bush strategy to thwart manual recounts. In public statements by James A. Baker III, the former secretary of state leading the Bush recount team, and in the campaign's legal briefs, the Bush team argued repeatedly that it was unfair and patently unconstitutional for Mr. Gore to seek liberal recount standards in Democratic strongholds "after the game has already been played.''

``It is not fair to change the rules and standards governing the counting or recounting of votes after it appears that one side has concluded that is the only way to get the votes it needs,'' Mr. Baker said.

Clouding the Matter
Of the Postmark

As secretary of state, Katherine Harris wields considerable influence over the conduct of elections in Florida. Her office, which includes the Division of Elections, writes election rules, issues binding interpretations of election law and offers informal advice to election supervisors. But given her role as co-chairwoman of the Bush campaign in Florida, her statements and legal positions during the South Florida recount battles drew inevitable and scathing criticism from Democrats.

On the day after the election, Division of Elections staff members drafted a press release titled "Secretary Explains Overseas Ballot Procedures.''

It was meant to be a simple reminder from Ms. Harris, similar to those her predecessors had routinely sent out, that state election rules required overseas ballots to have been `postmarked or signed and dated' by Election Day.

By early that evening, the draft statement had been sent to Ms. Harris's e-mail basket for approval. It was never released.

Instead, Ms. Harris said nothing about the absentee ballots until Nov. 13, when she touched on them at the end of a televised statement that focused mainly on trying to bring an end to the South Florida recounts. In her statement, she said that the overseas ballots had to be `executed' - a vague word that could have meant either signed or both signed and dated - by Election Day and that they had to bear a foreign postmark. Then she added, `They are not required, however, to be postmarked on or prior to' Election Day.

Democratic strategists reacted with immediate suspicion, viewing that last line as a gift from Ms. Harris to her fellow Republicans.

``In our opinion, it was an effort by Katherine Harris to blur the rules,'" said Nick Baldick, a senior Gore strategist in Florida. ``And confusion about the rules would only help the Republicans get as many suspect ballots counted as possible.''

Two top Republican strategists, working as volunteers, were deeply involved in drafting the Nov. 13 statement, as well as other major pronouncements Ms. Harris made during the recounts.
One of the strategists, J.M. Stipanovich, a lawyer who had managed Jeb Bush's failed campaign for governor in 1994, said in an interview that he served as Ms. Harris's "personal attorney" in the three weeks after the election, guiding her through major decisions.

Although Mr. Stipanovich declined to say whether he had had any contacts with the Bush campaign, Mr. Ginsberg said he spoke with Mr. Stipanovich "three or four times" during the recounts. "At the time it was never clear if he was asking me something in his role as working for Katherine Harris, which was certainly well known at the time, or just out of curiosity," Mr. Ginsberg said.

The other strategist assisting Ms. Harris was Adam Goodman, a media consultant who had helped chart Ms. Harris's rapid ascension in the state Republican Party.

Typically, when it came to writing Ms. Harris's public statements, Mr. Stipanovich recalled, Mr. Goodman would start by gathering information from Ms. Harris's chief aides, like Clay Roberts, the director of the Division of Elections.

"Adam would knock off a draft, and I would comment on it," Mr. Stipanovich said. "Clay would put in his two cents. Katherine would tell us what she thought. And we would do it all over again."

Mr. Goodman added that their aim was always to "give it to people straight" and that usually "every word was parsed over."

Most of this work was done on computers in a conference room just off Ms. Harris's office. Her lawyers now say that many of the records from these computers have been erased, a potential violation of Florida's public records laws, and they refused a request from The Times to examine the computers' hard drives.

But they did release two versions of the Nov. 13 statement, which show that the sentence that upset the Democrats - and seemed to make it easier to accept ballots with late postmarks - was not inserted until the final draft.

A spokesman for Ms. Harris said she was unavailable for comment. The Times began seeking an interview with Ms. Harris two weeks ago, but her spokesman, David Host, said that Ms. Harris would prefer to comment in a written opinion article after she returns from a trip to Argentina this month.

Mr. Stipanovich and Mr. Goodman said they could not recall how the wording on Florida's overseas ballot rules was drafted, and both said there were never any discussions in Ms. Harris's office about changing the rules. Mr. Roberts said the statement was just an effort to paraphrase the traditional rules. "In retrospect," he said, "sticking to the strict statutory language might have been more clear."

Lawyers for Mr. Bush now say they too were unhappy with the statement. It had, after all, said explicitly that postmarks were required, calling only their dating into question. Mr. Aufhauser said he feared the statement would make it harder for the Republicans to push their argument that under federal law, postmarks were not required at all on military
Devising a Complex Approach to Challenging Ballots

Thanks to a network of local lawyers who had advised his brother Jeb, the governor of Florida, on judicial appointments, Mr. Bush had a ready source of politically connected legal talent to argue on his behalf before the 67 county canvassing boards. The campaign's preparations were meticulous. Six days before county officials were to begin examining the overseas ballots, Bush advisers were sending out detailed instructions on the legal intricacies of overseas voting. There were daily conference calls, spreadsheets to track ballots in each county, a phone number for emergency advice. One group of Bush lawyers christened itself the Overseas Absentee Ballot Task Force and even had its own letterhead.

Mr. Gore's top aides, preoccupied by recounts in South Florida, were poorly prepared by comparison. The Gore team, for instance, wanted its representatives in each county to estimate how many overseas ballots had flaws open to challenge. By the night before the counting, they had estimates from 10 of 67 counties.

Having assumed that Mr. Bush would win easily among overseas voters, the Gore strategy was predicated on knocking out overseas votes and fighting for the strictest readings of state law. Never mind Mr. Gore's repeated pledge to count every vote; his strategists calculated simply that the fewer overseas ballots counted the better.

It was left to Mark Herron, a Tallahassee election law specialist, to teach the Gore legal recruits the basics of overseas ballots, and on Wednesday, Nov. 15, Mr. Herron circulated a five-page memorandum that listed legal grounds for protesting overseas ballots when the canvassing boards reviewed them just two days later. Within a day, however, the Herron memorandum had fallen into the hands of the Bush lawyers, who instantly recognized its political value and later used it to discredit the Democrats' strategy on overseas ballots as an effort to disenfranchise voters.

``We were losing the public relations battle until we got the break with that stupid memo,'' said Mr. Tompkins, the senior Bush strategist.

But the Bush lawyers had a strategy memorandum of their own, recently obtained by The Times, that also set out detailed instructions for challenging overseas ballots. The 52-page document included all the information Bush lawyers might need to make their case before the canvassing boards, including a copy of Ms. Harris's Nov. 13 statement.

Unlike the single-minded approach of the Gore memorandum, the Bush instructions set forth a more adaptable, tactical approach aimed at achieving the largest possible net gain from overseas voters. Specifically, the Bush lawyers were told how to challenge ``illegal'' civilian votes that they assumed would be for Mr. Gore and also how to defend equally defective military ballots, the document shows.

The clearest illustration of the differing strategies was in the pre-printed protest forms that each campaign prepared for use with the ballots.
canvassing boards as they scrutinized each ballot envelope for legal defects.

The Gore instructions included one all-purpose protest form; the Bush instructions included two. The first Bush form protested defective ballots just as the Gore form did and listed many of the same potential flaws -- missing witnesses, late postmarks, domestic postmarks. In an accompanying ``letter of instruction'' the Bush lawyers were told that it was essential to check for defects and that there was to be no flexibility on the question of missing postmarks. To be valid, the letter said, ballots `must have' a military or foreign postmark.

The second form, which was used to protest the exclusion of military ballots, demanded that canvassing boards count military ballots that arrived without postmarks, or with illegible postmarks, or even in some cases with United States postmarks.

``To the extent that Florida purports to require that envelopes contain postmarks,' the instructions stated, `then with respect to members of the military overseas, Florida law is inconsistent with - and pre-empted by - federal law requiring the expeditious delivery of overseas ballots.'

In addition, the Bush instructions contended repeatedly that civilian ballots were not entitled to the same leeway as military ballots - a distinction not found in either Florida election law or in the federal law that governs overseas voting. One example involved overseas ballots delivered by Fed-Ex or other commercial express mail services. `Late shipment by civilians through such channels raises reasonable questions about the legitimacy of the ballot,'' the instructions said.

Asked why they prepared a protest form almost identical to the one they had criticized Mr. Gore for using, Mr. Ginsberg said, `I'm not sure it was operative still when people went into the counting boards.''

Questioning Civilian Ballots, Defending Military Ballots

On Friday, Nov. 17, county officials across the state began counting the overseas votes, the only ballots not yet examined by man or machine.

By then Mr. Bush's unofficial 1,784-vote lead had been reduced to 300. That very day, the Florida Supreme Court had barred Ms. Harris from certifying any final results until the justices, all Democratic appointees, decided whether to allow hand recounts to proceed in South Florida.

In recent interviews, the Bush lawyers involved in overseas ballots insisted that they had not approached that Friday with a two-tier strategy. Their overriding intent, they said, was to be rigorously consistent, even nonpartisan, in their arguments.

``There is no such strategy to do something in Palm Beach that we did not do in the Panhandle,'' Mr. Aufhauser said.

But a review of the transcripts, minutes and recordings of canvassing
board meetings shows otherwise. The records reveal example after example
of Bush lawyers' employing one set of arguments in counties where Mr.
Gore was strong and another in counties carried by Mr. Bush.

County by county, and sometimes ballot by ballot, they tailored their
arguments in ways that maximized Mr. Bush's support among overseas
voters. They frequently questioned civilian ballots, for example, while
defending military ballots with the same legal defects.

In Bush strongholds they pleaded with election officials to ignore
Florida's election rules. They ridiculed Gore lawyers for raising
concerns about fraud, while making eloquent speeches about the voting
rights of men and women defending the nation's interests in remote and
dangerous locations.

``If they catch a bullet, or fragment from a terrorist bomb, that
fragment does not have any postmark or registration of any kind,'' Fred
Tarrant, a Republican City Council member from Naples, Fla., told the
board in Collier County, a conservative outpost in southwest Florida.

Making frequent and effective use of the protest form they had developed
to defend military ballots without postmarks, the Bush lawyers succeeded
in persuading three counties in the western tip of the Panhandle, all of
them Bush strongholds, to disregard Florida's postmark rules.

The three counties, Escambia, Okaloosa and Santa Rosa, counted 72
overseas ballots without postmarks, 63 from members of the military.

``We had never done it before,'' Pat Hollarn, the veteran Okaloosa County
supervisor, said in an interview.

In Santa Rosa County, Doug Wilkes, the election supervisor, tried to
argue that ballots without postmarks should be rejected. ``The board
always stuck to the rules, to the letter of the law of the State of
Florida,'' he told his two fellow canvassing board members that Friday.

He was outvoted.

By contrast, in Democratic strongholds, Bush lawyers simultaneously
worked to exclude as many likely Gore votes as possible.

There they spoke not of the right to vote but of the importance of
following the letter of state election rules. The ``fundamental'' role of
election officials is to detect ``anything that could affect the honesty
or integrity of the election,'' Craig Burkhardt, a Bush lawyer, told the
Broward County canvassing board. At one point, Mr. Burkhardt grew so
angry insisting on his right to scrutinize voter signatures that a board
member told him, ``Calm down, chill out.''

In Broward and in other Gore strongholds, Bush lawyers questioned scores
of ballots, almost always from civilian Democrats but occasionally from
members of the military. They objected to the slightest of flaws,
including partial addresses of witnesses, illegible witness signatures
and slight variations in voter signatures. In at least six cases, the
Bush lawyers relied on the Republican protest form that was barely
distinguishable from the infamous protest form designed by Mr. Herron,
the Gore election law specialist.
Mr. Aufhauser said the Bush team had not encouraged such challenges. "You have field commanders, and they have to rely on the people in the field," he said. "In the 67 counties, I think we had substantial compliance with the directive that we be consistent."

But many of the challenges were consistent with the instructions provided by Mr. Aufhauser. The Bush lawyers, for example, followed the campaign's guidance in selectively challenging federal write-in ballots.

These were special last-resort ballots to be used only when a voter's regular state ballot failed to turn up in the mail. Under federal law, they can be used only after the voter has first made a request for a regular ballot at least 30 days before the election.

In Bush counties, Republican lawyers argued that write-in ballots from military voters should be counted even when there was no record of a request. But in Broward County, where at least 119 federal write-in ballots arrived, Republican lawyers took the opposite position. "Have we checked to see whether they've complied with the requirements of having requested 30 days prior?" a Bush lawyer demanded. Eighty-one of them were rejected.

When ballots were defended, they were from military voters. "I cannot believe that our service boys, fighting hard overseas, that their ballots would be disqualified," Mr. McCown, the Bush lawyer, told the Palm Beach County canvassing board. "All right," Judge Charles E. Burton, the board chairman, replied dryly. "We will file a protest and arrange for a violin."

Later, in their reports to senior Bush aides, the lawyers listed rejected ballots under two categories, "military" and "nonmilitary," and their differing approaches to civilian and military ballots are reflected by this finding: While canvassing boards accepted 30 percent of the flawed civilian ballots, they counted 41 percent of the flawed military ballots, according to The Times's database.

The duality of the Bush strategy was demonstrated in another way. In three South Florida counties, Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach, boards rejected as illegal 362 of 572 overseas ballots that Friday. Most -- including many military ballots -- were thrown out without a word of protest from Mr. Bush's lawyers.

Some of their work was done by the Gore lawyers, who, true to their strategy, challenged hundreds of overseas ballots with little discrimination. They objected to ballots from Democrats, Republicans, civilians, military personnel -- even in counties where Mr. Gore actually beat Mr. Bush among overseas voters.

Mixed Messages Concerning Postmarks and Patriotism

The Bush campaign's patriotic appeals were more persuasive in north Florida, home to several large military bases. In Panhandle communities like Pensacola, Port Walton Beach and Jacksonville, almost everyone knows
someone in the military. The deputy election supervisor in Jacksonville, a former Navy pilot, has a photograph above his desk of him in a fighter jet. In Fort Walton Beach, Ms. Hollarn has an office full of military memorabilia. For them and their fellow election officials, rejecting a single military vote was personally painful.

``Just heartbreaking,'' Ms. Hollarn said.

It was also politically difficult.

The Panhandle canvassing boards, made up mostly of elected officials, reflected the conservative, pro-military politics of their counties, and rejecting Bush votes -- particularly those from the military -- did not endear them to most of their constituents.

``Shame on Okaloosa County, on Florida and on you,'' a mother of three military sons wrote to Ms. Hollarn after the county rejected a handful of military ballots.

Ms. Hollarn, a staunch Republican and a stickler for rules, opted to accept ballots with missing postmarks, but only if they arrived by Nov. 13, six days after the election. It seemed only common sense, she said, to assume that these ballots were cast before Election Day, even if they did not comply with the letter of the law.

``You have no idea the soul-searching, and case-law-searching, that myself, my attorney and the canvassing board went through to come up with our final decision,'' Ms. Hollarn wrote in an e-mail response to the angry mother. For nearly two decades, she added, her canvassing board had rejected ballots with late or missing postmarks without any fuss.

Other Panhandle canvassing boards held the line on counting ballots with missing postmarks. ``What would prevent an elector overseas from voting after the date of the election?'' asked Rick Mullaney, a member of the Duval County canvassing board, which initially voted to reject such ballots.

But others, like the Escambia County canvassing board, accepted the Bush campaign's argument that federal law trumps state law. ``I'm not a great conflict-of-law scholar or anything,'' Judge Thomas E. Johnson, the canvassing board chairman, worried. ``Come on, I need some help here.''

The result was unequal treatment of ballots with the same flaws. While Bush counties accepted 70 of 109 ballots that arrived without postmarks within two days of the election, Gore counties accepted 17 of 63 such ballots.

In Alachua County, which was carried by Mr. Gore, the canvassing board's insistence on postmarks prevented it from counting the ballot of Jeff Livingston, a staff sergeant at an Air Force base in England who acknowledged voting for Mr. Bush after the election. His ballot, missing a postmark, arrived on Nov. 13, just three days after he dropped it off at the base post office. Under Ms. Hollarn's modified standards, his ballot would have been counted had it arrived in Okaloosa County.

In a climate of rampant confusion over how to judge overseas ballots, some election officials pointed fingers at Ms. Harris, saying she had
done little to bring clarity or consistency to the application of Florida's overseas ballot rules.

The issue was one Ms. Harris was familiar with. In 1999 she ordered each of Florida's counties to enforce newly tightened absentee ballot rules in a uniform manner. She warned that ''differing treatment would no doubt disenfranchise some voters simply based on where they live in violation of federal and state law.''

Beyond missing postmarks, canvassing boards were confronted with the question of what to do with more than 300 ballots that arrived after the election with domestic postmarks. Many were postmarked in military towns like Norfolk, Va., or San Diego.

And dozens of these voters acknowledged that they were in fact inside the United States on Election Day.

Their ballots were plainly illegal under Florida law, which requires all absentee voters inside the United States and its territories to get their ballots in by Election Day.

Most canvassing board members knew next to nothing about the workings of the military mail. The Bush lawyers, some citing their own military backgrounds, had a ready explanation for all the military ballots with United States postmarks. They told boards that mail for overseas military members was routinely postmarked when it arrived in this country.

One supervisor who checked with Ms. Harris's office said he had received similar assurances.

According to mail officials, those assurances were wrong.

Military mail is postmarked at the point of origin - a ship or a base. Then, as with all international mail, it enters the United States only through special processing centers where mail is subject to customs inspections, but not postmarking.

Those centers, postal officials said, are not even equipped with postmarking machines.

Yet based on the faulty information, canvassing boards accepted dozens of ballots that arrived after the election from military voters stationed inside the United States.

And when the counting ended in the early hours of Nov. 18, Mr. Bush had gained 1,380 votes to Mr. Gore's 750 votes.

But Mr. Bush's strategists wanted even more.

Thanksgiving Reprieve for Rejected Votes

Hours after the last overseas absentee ballot was counted, the Bush campaign unleashed a full-scale legal and public relations offensive with a single aim: persuading selected Bush counties to reconsider hundreds of overseas military ballots rejected the night before.
The public relations campaign began when Gov. Marc Racicot of Montana, a Bush supporter, said that Democratic lawyers had "gone to war" against military voters. Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf called it "a very sad day in our country." Robert Novak, the conservative newspaper columnist, called the Herron memorandum a "quickie guide for tossing out the serviceman's vote."

The candidate himself took up the theme, calling on election officials to count more military ballots.

Almost immediately, the Democrats were in full retreat.

On Sunday, Nov. 19, Mr. Gore's running mate, Joseph I. Lieberman, appeared on the NBC program "Meet the Press." Faced with a barrage of aggressive questions, he called on Florida's canvassing boards to reconsider their rejection of military ballots. The next day, the attorney general of Florida, a Democrat, said that local officials should "immediately revisit this issue."

This extraordinary political reversal, combined that week with new Republican lawsuits that asked 14 counties to reconsider rejected ballots, helped open the door for Mr. Bush to win still more absentee votes. A Democratic lawyer, Mitchell Berger, later referred to the additional Bush votes as "the Thanksgiving stuffing," a label that stuck.

As a legal matter, the lawsuits were a failure; not a single judge agreed with the Bush campaign's argument that Florida's postmarking requirements were invalid. A federal judge in Pensacola ordered canvassing boards to reconsider several hundred federal write-in ballots, but his ruling came too late to affect the final results.

Bush lawyers found their most persuasive argument in a Florida Supreme Court ruling on Tuesday of that week - a decision that actually favored his opponent. In an order that allowed manual recounts to resume, the justices declared that the will of the voter should take precedence over "hyper-technical reliance upon statutory provisions."

Even as their colleagues appealed the ruling to the United States Supreme Court, Republican lawyers adopted the term "hyper-technical" as a rallying cry, demanding that local officials overlook a broad range of legal flaws.

The Republicans had one other weapon in their public relations arsenal. They enlisted Republican members of the House Armed Services Committee, who used their influence with the Pentagon to help the Bush campaign contact military voters whose ballots had been rejected.

By the end of the week, canvassing boards in about a dozen Republican-leaning counties had reconvened for a second round of counting. In each place, longstanding election rules were bent and even ignored. Boards counted ballots postmarked as many as seven days after the election, including some from within the United States. They counted two ballots sent by fax. Officials in Santa Rosa County even counted five ballots that arrived after the Nov. 17 deadline. Again and again, election officials crossed out the words "REJECTED AS ILLEGAL" that had
been stamped on ballot envelopes.

In all, over the Thanksgiving week, the counties accepted 288 ballots that they had rejected days earlier.

In recent interviews, board members said they decided to meet again for a variety of reasons, ranging from intense pressure from their constituents to the specter of the Republicans' lawsuits, which had named individual members as defendants.

Just as Mr. Gore never sought manual recounts in Republican strongholds, Mr. Bush did not request a second look at overseas ballots in large Gore counties, like Miami-Dade and Broward, where 346 overseas ballots, including 164 from the military, were rejected and never given a second look. Instead, the Republicans fought pitched battles in smaller counties, like Pasco, where they had a better chance of picking up votes.

``It looks to me like we've got a lot of pressure here,'' Judge Robert P. Cole, chairman of the Pasco board, said as he faced a throng of cheering Republicans and more than a dozen Bush representatives. ``And to be honest with you, you know, I don't think this board should respond to that kind of pressure.''

Not a single Gore official bothered to attend the meeting.

``We felt our presence was not going to change what the canvassing board was going to do,'' said Michael Cox, then the chairman of the Pasco County Democratic Party. Mr. Cox added that the hour's drive from his home to the county building on a Sunday did not seem worth the effort. ``We were tired of it,'' he said.

Pasco County added 19 votes, giving Mr. Bush a net gain of 6.

There were other pressures exerted, too. A Republican lawyer told some canvassing board members that they faced federal prosecution and jail time if they persisted in rejecting overseas ballots. ``Disallowing these ballots would violate federal law, both in letter and spirit, and would subject the person so excluding these ballots to criminal sanctions,'' Edward Fleming, a Bush lawyer, wrote to officials in Santa Rosa County. The county accepted 38 of the 49 ballots it had previously rejected.

To give overseas residents plenty of time to vote, Florida officials mail out both a preliminary version of the absentee ballot and then, after the primaries, a final version. Voters are instructed to send in both, but the preliminary ballot is discarded if the final ballot arrives in time to be counted.

Yet for 19 voters - 15 of them Republican - Duval County election officials counted both ballots. Officials said it was a mistake, the product of long hours and the intense pressure to count every possible ballot.

One of the double voters, Nicholas Challen, 40, a senior chief petty officer in the Navy who cast his second vote from Jacksonville on Election Day, reacted with jubilation when told that both of his votes counted. He raised both arms as if he had just scored a touchdown and savored the two votes he had delivered to George W. Bush.
``Yes!'' he said, beaming.

When it was all over, the 14 counties involved in the '``Thanksgiving stuffing'" effort had given Mr. Bush a net gain of 109 votes. Overall, the overseas ballots provided Mr. Bush with a net gain of 739 votes over Mr. Gore. The final margin fell short of the Republicans' 1,000-vote goal.

But it was enough.

Supreme Court Steps In,
But Not on Absentee Votes

On Sunday, Nov. 26, while some Bush counties were counting a handful of rejected overseas ballots, the canvassing board in Palm Beach County frantically raced to finish its manual recount of nearly a half-million ballots. The board was trying to meet a 5 p.m. deadline for counties to submit official vote totals. By 1 p.m., it was clear to Mr. Burton, the canvassing board chairman, that Palm Beach County would miss the deadline. On national television, Mr. Burton pleaded for more time.

Inside Ms. Harris's war room, aides debated whether to grant an extension. Ms. Harris refused to budge. ``Katherine's job,'' said Mr. Stipanovich, the Republican consultant advising Ms. Harris, ``was to bring this election in for a landing.''

When Palm Beach County finally concluded its recount, two hours after the deadline, Mr. Gore had picked up 176 votes. Ms. Harris refused to include those votes in the final certified total, which showed Mr. Bush winning by 537 votes.

``In the end,'' Mr. Stipanovich said, ``the Palm Beach vote didn't matter.''

But it might have made a difference, if 680 flawed overseas ballots had not been included in her official returns.

Even before Ms. Harris announced the final results, the Gore campaign had decided to formally contest Mr. Bush's victory in a lawsuit. One important question, though, was whether to challenge the overseas ballots. Campaign strategists tried to persuade Mr. Gore to do just that, saying it would allow Democratic lawyers to argue that the Republicans had benefited from the unequal treatment of absentee ballots.

There was another potential benefit. Under Florida law, if the number of improper absentee ballots exceeds the margin of victory, a judge can, under some circumstances, disqualify all absentee ballots arriving after the election and base the results on only those ballots cast and received by Election Day. On the basis of the final official tally, that would have had Mr. Gore winning by 202 votes.

Mr. Gore rejected his aides' advice.

Joe Sandler, who was the Democratic National Committee's general counsel, recalled how Mr. Gore explained his decision. ``I can give you his exact
words: 'If I won this thing by a handful of military ballots, I would be hounded by Republicans and the press every day of my presidency and it wouldn't be worth having.'"

As the election contest wound its way through the courts, the Republicans pressed their argument that the manual recounts violated the Constitution's equal protection clause. In the United States Supreme Court, this contention provoked searching debate among the justices and the lawyers about the lack of consistent standards for counting dimpled ballots and hanging chads, and in its decision giving the election to George W. Bush, the court concluded that uniform treatment was a matter of fundamental fairness.

``Having once granted the right to vote on equal terms,'' the majority wrote, ``the State may not, by later arbitrary and disparate treatment, value one person's vote over that of another.''

The court did not consider the varying treatment of military and civilian votes. It did not address the unequal treatment of the 2,490 ballots that finally determined the election's outcome. Those issues were never raised.
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WASHINGTON, July 14 -- For many Democrats immersed in Florida's disputed presidential election, there was no worse moment than the one on Sunday, Nov. 19, when Senator Joseph I. Lieberman appeared on national television and said that election officials should give the "benefit of the doubt" to military voters.

Until then, the Democrats had conducted a full-scale effort to persuade counties to disqualify any overseas ballots that lacked postmarks or witness signatures. But on that morning, with Republicans attacking the Gore-Lieberman campaign for eliminating the votes of hundreds of men and women in the armed forces, Mr. Lieberman effectively disavowed the strategy.

"There was some gasping," recalled David Ginsberg, the research director for the Gore campaign, who watched it with other aides at Democratic headquarters in Washington. "People said: 'Wait a minute. That's really off. That's not what we're saying.' We could never effectively communicate why we were right because we got ourselves in a position where it looked like we were trying to throw out military ballots when we were trying to throw out illegal ballots."

Mark Herron, a Democratic lawyer in Tallahassee who drafted a memorandum detailing legal grounds on which to disqualify overseas ballots, said that when Mr. Lieberman failed to defend him on television, "I was watching with horror."

Again and again, several important players on Vice President Al Gore's team said Mr. Lieberman's comments that Sunday were the most telling example of the political lapses and public relations blunders committed in the Florida standoff. In numerous interviews, Democrats said they had no one to blame but themselves for failing to blunt the Republicans' successful drive to count overseas absentee ballots.

They said that they had allowed George W. Bush's lieutenants to outsmart them in their legal maneuvering and that the Republicans had been more nimble at turning public opinion to their side on counting votes from military personnel.

They said they had also been hampered by internal differences; Democrats on the ground in Florida favored a far more combative approach than did members of Mr. Gore's inner circle.

In the interviews, top Gore advisers tended to paint the Bush campaign as more ruthless than the Democrats in their approach to Florida's disputed
vote. But the Democrats had their own aggressive and far-reaching plan to maximize Gore votes in Democratic counties, while suppressing likely Bush votes from overseas.

As Mr. Herron's memorandum made clear, the Gore campaign sought to disqualify as many overseas ballots as possible, knowing that the state's complement of military voters overseas had regularly voted Republican in other elections. They pushed county election officials to apply the strictest interpretation of the rules.

They were equally calculating in their strategy with recounts, calling for them only in counties with large Democratic populations.

Even so, the Gore aides said their opponents were far more clever and aggressive on the overseas ballots. And despite their own battle plan for disqualifying votes, the Democrats said they were working under some constraints. Mr. Gore and his confidants, they said, wanted to hew to a consistent legal and political strategy rooted in Mr. Gore's demand that all votes be counted. Mr. Gore was also particularly sensitive to Republican criticism that challenging the votes of military personnel was unpatriotic.

"The Bush people were willing to do whatever it took to push the envelope and, arguably, in some cases push beyond the envelope," said Chris Lehane, who was Mr. Gore's press secretary. "The Gore forces, at the instruction of the vice president on down, were not able to follow that tack."

Both campaigns realized the critical role that county canvassing boards would play in determining which overseas ballots to accept as legal. In hopes of limiting the number of votes Mr. Bush could gain from military voters, Ronald A. Klain and other Gore advisers assigned Mr. Herron to draft a detailed memorandum for Gore lawyers to use in challenging ballots that did not comply with the law.

Bush advisers point to the Herron memorandum as evidence of how hard the Democrats were willing to fight to exclude military votes. "We knew that there was going to be a systematic effort by the Gore folks to not count military absentee ballots despite the claims that they were uttering at the time about count every vote," said Benjamin L. Ginsberg, the Bush campaign's chief counsel. "We knew they were important ballots, they knew they were important ballots. We wanted all the ballots to count. They wanted the ballots not to count."

In some ways, the Gore strategy paid off, as canvassing boards rejected hundreds of military votes that violated the law.

But the Gore camp was caught off guard -- and never quite recovered -- when the memorandum became public and the Bush organization used it as the centerpiece of a fierce public relations campaign featuring Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf and other surrogates who accused Mr. Gore of turning on men and women in the armed forces.

"We lost the public relations battle rather substantially," said Bob Kerrey, the former Democratic senator from Nebraska. Several Democrats acknowledge that they were slow to react -- and unsure how best to react when the Herron memorandum became public. They dispatched Mr. Lieberman
to make the rounds of the Sunday morning public affairs programs and
defend the Democrats against the accusation that they were unduly
punishing military personnel.

But instead of defending Mr. Herron's memorandum, Mr. Lieberman spoke of
the importance of counting military ballots.

"If I was there," he said on the NBC program "Meet the Press," "I would
give the benefit of the doubt to ballots coming in from military
personnel generally." Encouraging election officials in Florida to "go
back and take another look," Mr. Lieberman said, "Al Gore and I don't
want to ever be part of anything that would put an extra burden on the
military personnel abroad who want to vote."

Mr. Herron, who was watching from Tallahassee, said Mr. Lieberman's
comments had been devastating for both him and the campaign. "I got such
a sinking feeling in my stomach that I walked outside," he said. "You
don't like to see yourself barbecued on national television, especially
by guys on your team. It was tough. I just don't think he was prepared
for the question."

Told of Mr. Herron's remarks, Mr. Lieberman said, "I feel badly that he
felt that way." But he said he stood by his position. "What I was saying
was what I believed to be the campaign's position," he said. "We're not
going out of our way to exclude military ballots." (Mr. Lieberman ran
into Mr. Herron for the first time late last month, an aide said. He
apologized for any hurt he caused but did not waver from his belief that
he had done nothing wrong.)

Mr. Lieberman, who was briefed in a conference call the night before the
television appearance, said he was never urged to defend the memorandum.

"No one ever said to me, 'Senator, go out there and defend to the death
what we are doing regarding military ballots, do not give an inch, we
need you,' " Mr. Lieberman said. "That never happened. I was told there
was a fuss about military ballots. Honestly, I never got a clear message
on it. I can understand perhaps people on the ground who were under siege
might have felt otherwise. But in this case there was no clarity, no
clear conclusion to the telephone conference briefing."

Several Democrats said Mr. Lieberman's comments made it more difficult,
if not impossible, to block renewed efforts by the Republicans to get
overseas ballots accepted. Others said they failed to move quickly to
contain the fallout after Mr. Lieberman's appearance and in retrospect
wish they had found a middle ground to rally around.

"I wish we had stood up Monday morning and said, definitively, the
position of the Gore campaign is we would support the inclusion of any
ballot with a postmark or a date," Mr. Klain said. "We wound up paying
the price for being too lenient and too strict at the same time. They did
a very skillful job of making us seem unpatriotic."

Gore aides also realize now that they were too slow to counter the
Republicans' request for canvassing boards in 14 strongly military
counties to reconsider the rejected absentee ballots. One member of the
Democrats' legal team added that the Gore camp was hamstrung by their
candidate's concerns about being unpatriotic.
"All of a sudden, he was Jimmy Stewart," he said. "Gore got very stuck on the notion that if he became president it was not in the national interest that he have a relationship characterized by his mistrust of the military."

Aides to Mr. Gore also said they were outmaneuvered on the overseas ballots because they were putting most of their efforts in what many believed would be a more fruitful strategy: contesting the punch-card ballots in three large South Florida counties.

"There was plenty of tangential evidence that there were problems in Florida with military ballots," said William M. Daley, Mr. Gore's campaign chairman. "But to prove that in a short period when you could not control the levers of the system in Florida was pretty unrealistic." He said the military issue "was politically explosive and it was harder to prove than knowing that ballots were undercounted in Palm or Broward or Miami-Dade."

Several Democrats involved in the process said a turning point came 20 days after the election when Mr. Gore, resisting advice from some advisers, refused to challenge the counting of overseas absentee ballots in a lawsuit that contested Mr. Bush's victory in Florida. Gore advisers who were pressing for the military matter to be included said they wanted to underscore the inconsistency of the Bush forces changing the standards for counting military votes while sticking to stricter rules elsewhere.

"People used to say, `Al Gore would do anything to win,' " said Michael Whouley, who helped run the Gore operation in Florida. "But at the end of the day, he had a real chance at winning if he had taken these ballots on and if we had won the case. But he made a decision that it would not shine an honorable light on him."
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HOUSE REPUBLICANS PRESSED PENTAGON FOR E-MAIL ADDRESSES OF SAILORS

By C. J. CHIVERS

The day before Thanksgiving, the Pentagon received an urgent request from a Republican member of the House Armed Services Committee, Representative Steve Buyer of Indiana. Mr. Buyer had sent a letter to each of the armed services asking for phone numbers or e-mail addresses of a number of service men and women.

The information was needed by 5 p.m.

Military officers met that deadline, thinking they were answering a routine, if frantic, Congressional request, senior officers who were involved in the effort say.

The request was anything but routine.

The list Mr. Buyer requested included Florida voters whose absentee ballots had been disqualified in the wrangling over the presidential race the previous weekend.

The information was used to put sailors in contact with Florida Republicans who were organizing a public relations campaign to persuade counties to reconsider rejected ballots, according to e-mail messages obtained by The New York Times and interviews with four sailors.

It is a cornerstone of American military tradition that the armed services remain apolitical. Military regulations prohibit service members from participating in political activities. Similarly, House ethics rules and federal law forbid Congressional officials to perform political work with government resources or on government time.

Mr. Buyer's request was part of a broad effort by the Bush campaign to turn public opinion against Al Gore over the hundreds of military absentee ballots that had been rejected because of missing or late postmarks or other defects. Working first with Republican volunteers, Rob
Carter, the finance director of the Florida Republican Party, found military voters whose ballots had been rejected and helped circulate their accounts to the news media.

But over Thanksgiving, Mr. Carter also had the help of Republicans on the House Armed Services Committee. After the Pentagon responded to Mr. Buyer with contact information for 17 sailors, the committee sent e-mail to their ships alerting them that their ballots had been disqualified.

Combined, the broad effort by the Bush campaign and the Congressional outreach helped create a public relations firestorm for the Gore campaign, which eventually led some local officials to reconsider the previous rejections.

In a recent interview, Mr. Buyer, who at the time was chairman of the personnel subcommittee, described his outreach as appropriate. He said he was furious that Gore campaign lawyers had urged county canvassing boards to reject absentee ballots without postmarks. Florida law requires postmarks, and the Florida secretary of state, Katherine Harris, had reiterated the requirement. Mr. Buyer wrote to the services, he said, to help him understand how severely military voters had been affected.

"When you're in the epicenter of something, you're trying to define it," Mr. Buyer said. "That's the intent of this letter." Mr. Buyer then ended the interview and has declined requests for interviews since.

The committee staff has refused requests by The Times to release many documents related to its outreach efforts. Democrats on the committee say that they too have not been given documents related to Mr. Buyer's effort, and complain that they were not told about it as it occurred.

"On the surface, it looks as if this was a wholesale misuse of the subcommittee and its resources," said Representative Neil Abercrombie of Hawaii, the subcommittee's ranking Democrat.

Michael Higgins, the subcommittee employee who contacted sailors on Mr. Buyer's behalf, declined requests for an interview.

Ryan Vaart, the committee spokesman, said that Mr. Higgins only surveyed military members about their voting experiences. The sole purpose of the outreach, Mr. Vaart said, was to help Congress prepare bills to change voting law.

A copy of two of the e-mail messages shows that Mr. Higgins did more than that.

The first message, which The Times obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, was sent at 9:29 p.m. on Nov. 22 from Washington to senior officers on the George Washington in the Mediterranean.

In it, Mr. Higgins noted that he was working with "HQ Navy" and asked the ship's brass to track down 17 sailors he believed were with the carrier and have them contact him. He sent a copy to Mr. Carter, which provided the Republican campaign direct access to deployed sailors whose addresses the Navy normally considers private. It also gave the party access to the private dialogue between the Congressional staff and the ship.
In another message, sent on Nov. 24 to a sailor who had answered his first request, Mr. Higgins recommended Mr. Carter as a source for more information about ballot rejections.

At the time of this exchange, Mr. Carter was leading an aggressive effort to persuade canvassing boards to reconsider the ballots. Using a list of service members he had made from rejected ballot envelopes in Duval County, he had already contacted enough sailors to provide anecdotes of angry military voters to Representative Tillie K. Fowler, a Republican, who released them at a news conference at a memorial to the county's war dead.

Mr. Carter also tracked down the wife of a Navy pilot and helped arrange a press conference. This led to an interview with Katie Couric on the NBC program "Today" in which the wife, Abigail Krug, protested the disqualification of her husband's ballot.

"There was a P.R. element to what we were doing," Mr. Carter said.

His efforts were effective. By Nov. 25 Mr. Carter had sent e-mail to roughly two dozen sailors notifying them that three Florida canvassing boards, in Duval, Nassau and Clay Counties, had reversed themselves and counted their votes, sailors who received the message said. "Great news," Mr. Carter wrote. "Despite continued aggressive arguments by the Democrat attorneys, the individual boards, realizing the importance of not disenfranchising military personnel, reversed their opinion of a week ago."

Before being confronted with the e-mail messages, both the committee and Mr. Carter insisted they had acted independently.

Later, when Mr. Carter, who is now an employee of Hohlt and Associates, a Washington government relations firm, was told about the e-mail traffic from Mr. Higgins, he said he could not remember precisely with whom he had communicated. "I've just got no recollection," he said.
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TIMELY BUT TOSSED VOTES WERE SLOW TO GET TO THE BALLOT BOX

By MICHAEL COOPER

Karen Randle put an extra stamp on the envelope containing her absentee vote for Al Gore, just to be on the safe side. She signed the oath on the envelope, had it properly witnessed and mailed it in Orlando on Nov. 2, five days before the election.

Her ballot was rejected.

Ms. Randle's ballot was one of 86 -- including many from black Democrats like herself -- that were postmarked in Orlando on Nov. 2 but were not logged in across town at the Orange County elections office until Nov. 10, too late to be counted.

"This is totally ridiculous, totally crazy and totally outrageous," said Ms. Randle, who helps run a day-care center. "What more do I have to do to have my vote count?"

Postal officials cannot explain the delay. They said that 95 percent of first-class mail in Orlando is delivered in one day, and only a tiny fraction takes longer than three days. They said they knew of no problems in November to account for the eight-day lag.

Orange County election officials said they had hated to reject the ballots but their hands had been tied. Under the rules governing absentee voting in Florida, ballots sent from within the United States must be received by 7 p.m. on Election Day. The ballots from Ms. Randle and the others, they said, arrived after the deadline. Only ballots from overseas are supposed to get the benefit of a 10-day window after the election.

Those rules seek to strike a balance between making it easier for people
to vote even if they cannot get to the polls and safeguarding against fraud. But in November they were applied unevenly in Florida after an effort by the Bush campaign to persuade critical Republican counties to count as many absentee votes as possible, even if they did not strictly comply with rules. As a result, ballots with postmarks from within the United States that arrived after Election Day met different fates depending on which county was counting. The canvassing board in Escambia County, a Bush stronghold in the Panhandle, accepted some ballots that arrived late with domestic postmarks. But officials in nearby Okaloosa said that while they regretted it, they felt they were bound by law to reject them.

Some Okaloosa voters complained that their ballots had been disqualified by mail delays. Many had no postmarks to show when they had been mailed, but voter after voter said in interviews that they had mailed their ballots long before the election.

"I kicked it out as soon as I got it," said Michael E. Lukawski, a Technical Sergeant in the Air Force whose vote for George W. Bush did not get from Oklahoma City to Okaloosa until eight days after the election. "It was well before the election."

A further wrinkle compounded the difficulty canvassing boards faced when weighing ballots with late domestic postmarks: some actually were sent from overseas. Embassies sent ballots back in the diplomatic pouch that were not postmarked until they were mailed in the United States.

Other votes were endangered by a corporation's good deed. DHL Worldwide Express, the courier service, offered to ship absentee ballots back to the United States free, as it has in the past. But instead of taking the ballots to their final destinations, the company took them only as far as New York and then put them in the regular mail. Some wound up with domestic postmarks.

That is how Desiree Baron's vote, sent from Munich, where she works for the United States Consulate, wound up in Collier County with a Queens postmark. County officials initially voted to reject her ballot but later reconsidered, under pressure from the Bush campaign, and accepted it even though the postmark made it illegal. Ms. Baron said she was surprised to learn that the free offer had almost cost her her vote.

Some people whose ballots were accepted by lenient counties admitted in interviews that they had been in the United States and had simply waited too long before mailing their ballots. Others, like the 86 Orlando voters, voted correctly but had their ballots rejected for events beyond their control.

"It makes me really angry that my voice was not heard," said Anne Simmons, who took her ballot for Mr. Gore to the post office on Nov. 2. "I find it very, very upsetting knowing I did what I was supposed to."
HOW THE BALLOTS WERE EXAMINED

By JOSH BARBANEL

To analyze the treatment of overseas absentee ballots, The New York Times obtained photocopies of 3,704 overseas absentee ballot envelopes that were received by Florida's 67 election supervisors after Election Day 2000.

The Times did not have access to the individual ballots. To guarantee privacy the ballots were separated from the envelopes after canvassing board members examined postmarks and other information printed on the envelope and determined whether they met legal requirements.

From Nov. 17 to Nov. 26, the canvassing boards accepted and counted 2,490 ballots. According to the state's final certified results, George W. Bush received 1,575 overseas votes and Al Gore 836. Other candidates received the remaining 79.

All information contained on each ballot envelope was entered into a
database by a firm hired by The Times, Quality Data Systems Inc. of Crofton, Md. The ballots were then matched against voter registration records to verify eligibility and add information about individual voters to the database.

Each ballot was then checked against a list of specific flaws as detailed in Florida election law. Any one flaw would have been sufficient to invalidate a ballot.

In cases where copies were ambiguous or illegible, originals were re-examined by Times reporters or county election officials. The Times could not obtain 35 overseas ballots cast in four counties because officials failed to locate them. Most were cast in Broward, where officials said they had misplaced them.

To examine the potential impact of the flawed absentee ballots on the final results, The Times retained Gary King, a professor of government at Harvard who has developed new statistical methods to draw inferences about individual voting behavior based on group voting patterns. Dr. King is not affiliated with any political party.

In his analysis for The Times, Dr. King first examined the actual vote and the count of flawed ballots, and he computed the maximum and minimum numbers of absentee votes that Mr. Gore and Mr. Bush could possibly have received in each county. He then used the methodology described in his book, "A Solution to the Ecological Inference Problem," to estimate the unknown voting behavior of the 680 voters whose votes were found to be flawed, and subtracted them from the vote totals.

The analysis took into account actual overseas absentee vote totals for each county that were certified on Nov. 26 by Secretary of State Katherine Harris. Dr. King also weighed other factors, like the race and party of overseas voters and their military status, and other election results in each county. The analysis then averaged these 62 separate but similar models, weighting each according to its statistical importance, to produce a single best estimate of the results.
FLORIDA RECOUNT

ABSENTEE VOTE DID IT FOR BUSH

ELECTION: GOV. JEB BUSH'S LETTER HELPED PROVIDE THE EDGE. BUT CRITICS CRY FOUL OVER ITS 'COMFORT' MESSAGE AND AN IMAGE OF THE FLORIDA STATE SEAL

By RICHARD A. SERRANO
Times Staff Writer

CINCINNATI -- WASHINGTON--In an extraordinary get-out-the-vote effort that helped put George W. Bush in the White House, Florida's Republican Party mounted an aggressive appeal to party faithful--complete with a letter from Gov. Jeb Bush--to cast absentee ballots before the Nov. 7 election.

"Vote from the comfort of your home," Jeb Bush urged in the letter, which was superimposed over what appeared to be an image of the state seal.

And vote they did. A survey of Florida's 67 counties shows that more than 700,000 Florida voters--or almost 1 in 8--voted absentee.

George W. Bush, the governor's brother, captured about 125,000 more absentee votes than his Democratic rival, Al Gore.

That margin dwarfs Bush's official 537-vote edge in the Sunshine State. And Florida in turn put Bush over the top in the electoral college.

The gigantic but largely invisible absentee ballot blitz was the GOP's secret weapon in the Florida campaign. But it was almost entirely overlooked during the suspenseful five-week recount of the Florida vote last fall, when the presidency hung in the balance.
Republicans say it was a smart, successful gambit. But some Democrats believe it took unfair advantage of both the governor's office and the absentee voting process.

Under Florida law, voters could cast absentee ballots only if they were unable to go to their regular polling places on election day. But Jeb Bush's letter didn't say that (although the absentee ballot application that came with it did). Many voters appear to have cast their ballots absentee merely as a matter of convenience, as Bush's letter suggested.

Moreover, Florida law forbids using the state seal for partisan purposes.

Two civil suits were filed challenging the Republican absentee voter drive. Both were dismissed, and one of the judges suggested that criminal prosecutions might have been more appropriate. Local prosecutors took no such action.

Some Republican operatives admit that if either of the civil suits had prevailed, enough absentee ballots could have been thrown out to swing the election to Gore.

"It was a hidden time bomb," Barry Richard, George W. Bush's lead attorney in Tallahassee during the recount period, acknowledged in a recent interview. "It was our first battle, but nobody noticed it. And it could have ended the whole case."

By national standards, the incidence of absentee voting in Florida was not exceptionally high. In California, for example, 1 in 4 ballots last November was absentee.

But in Florida, absentee voting may never have been more common. While 1 voter in 8 voted absentee last year, only 1 in 11 did in 1996. The 700,000-plus absentee ballots cast in Florida last year exceeded the total in the 1996 presidential race by nearly 50%. Of the additional 690,000 votes cast in Florida in 2000 over 1996, absentee ballots accounted for one-third.

In virtually every county, Bush ran far stronger among the absentees than among those who turned out at the polls on election day.

In Florida's largest county, Miami-Dade, Gore rolled to a nearly 47,000-vote victory on election day. But among the absentees, Bush outpolled Gore by more than 7,000 votes, reducing his countywide margin to fewer than 40,000.

David Leahy, the county election supervisor, said he had no doubt that Jeb Bush's letter--and the accompanying ballot application--drove the high GOP absentee turnout.

"A lot of people voted absentee ballots because of it, and it might have been the difference in the election," Leahy said. "The people who received these letters acted on them. We got a significant amount of response to them."

Florida's GOP spent $500,000 producing the letter and mass-mailing it to Republican voters. The envelopes urged voters to "Please open
immediately. . . . Important message from Governor Jeb Bush enclosed.

Next to that was the headline, "Vote by Mail"; next to that, a picture of a mailbox.

The letter, over Jeb Bush's signature, was titled: "From the Desk of Governor Jeb Bush; Vote From the Comfort of Your Home."

The letter was superimposed over what appears to be the state imprimatur, the Great Seal of the State of Florida.

"Dear Fellow Republican," the letter began. "It has been an exciting year in the state of Florida." The letter noted GOP efforts to reduce taxes and at the same time improve education, health care and the environment.

"You may vote early by requesting a mail-in ballot by using the request card attached," the letter said. The card said the undersigned would not be able to go to the polls on election day.

"Simply sign the card, provide the last four digits of your Social Security number, as required by law, and mail it in today," the letter instructed. "Within a few weeks you will receive your ballot material. You may then vote from the comfort of your own home."

The cards were addressed to the GOP Ballot Assistance Committee, which saw to it that the voters were given absentee ballots. For voters who did not mail in their absentee ballots, Republican operatives arranged rides to polling places in the days before the election.

"I've never seen so many people wanting to vote absentee, and in person," said Leahy of Miami-Dade County. "We've never had anything quite like this turnout."

Jamie Wilson, executive director of the Florida Republican Party through the election, said the absentee ballot drive was "massive. . . . It was a significant effort to make sure folks who wanted the opportunity to vote could vote."

He defended the Jeb Bush letter, saying, "The governor is head of the Republican Party. He was making a request of voters."

The Democrats had a much more modest absentee drive, centered on a traditional mailer about the importance of voting. It gave voters a number to call to get a ride to the polls.

On Oct. 20, 2 1/2 weeks before the election, the Democrats filed suit in Tallahassee accusing the governor of misusing the state seal and asking him to apologize.

On Nov. 3, four days before the election, Leon County Judge Terry P. Lewis dismissed the suit, saying that citizens did not have the right to disenfranchise other voters.

He suggested, instead, that a criminal law may have been broken because it is illegal to use the state seal for political purposes.

Aides said the governor did not know the seal would be used on the letter. In fact, Barry Richard, who defended Jeb Bush in the lawsuit and
later defended George W. Bush in the recount, said the real state seal was not used.

Richard said the Florida Republican Party contracted with a Texas printer to prepare the letter but did not supply the printer with a copy of the state seal. The printer turned to the Internet for a copy, Richard said, and stumbled on an out-of-date version.

James Foster, head of James Foster and Associates, the printer, declined to discuss how he came to use an obsolete seal. "I don't talk to reporters," he said.

Alvin Peters, a Panama City, Fla., attorney, brought the second suit on Nov. 22 on behalf of Cynthia McCauley, a schoolteacher, Republican voter and the wife of his law partner.

"It made me mad on a hundred levels," she said of the Jeb Bush letter. "When I got the governor's little brochure, with the gold tint on the seal, I was just kind of turning in circles."

Peters wanted all of the absentee votes in his community, Bay County, thrown out. George W. Bush received 8,969 absentee votes to Gore's 3,327. The difference--5,642 votes--was large enough that, had the suit prevailed, Gore would have won the election. "It was quite a get-out-the-vote technique," Peters said.

But Leon County Judge L. Ralph Smith Jr. dismissed the suit, saying that he too believed a criminal complaint was the proper course.

"That violation can be prosecuted by the proper public officials of this state," the judge ruled. "And if there was any violation of the law for misstating the Florida law regarding absentee voting, that violation can also be prosecuted by public officials."

No criminal charges were filed. Peters appealed to the state Supreme Court, which ruled the matter moot after the U.S. Supreme Court brought an end to the recount.

Richard, the lawyer for the Bush brothers, said that, had either the Tallahassee or the Bay County lawsuit succeeded, the GOP would have had no place to go. The federal courts, he said, would not have heard appeals because they would have viewed the cases as strictly state matters.

McCauley agreed. "It would have ended it for Bush. There were truckloads of absentee ballots, and, truly, the average person, when they got the letter, thought that this was fine.

"That explains why the polls were overwhelmed with absentees. The workers had to walk down the line with baskets and have people dump their ballots into the baskets, the lines were so long."

In Bay County, 1 voter in 5 voted absentee--one of the highest ratios in the state. The same ratio prevailed in Okaloosa County in the Florida panhandle.

Okaloosa County Elections Supervisor Pat Hollarn said she brought in about 14 extra temporary workers to handle the crush in what is
historically GOP territory. "This is a military community. We have multiple military bases here, and we are infested with military retirees like me. So really, we weren't surprised by anything that happened."

At the polls on election day, Bay County voters chose Bush over Gore by nearly 2 to 1. But among the absentee voters, his margin was greater than 2 1/2 to 1.

As in Bay County, precinct workers throughout Florida remember large lines of absentee voters dropping off their ballots at polling places during the days before election day. Armies of temporary workers were hired to handle the crowds. Extra equipment was brought in to accommodate the crush.

Republicans had anticipated that the overseas military vote might be crucial. They outspent the Democrats, 8 to 1, in advertising designed to reach overseas military personnel.

The GOP's $650,000 advertising campaign, which featured full-page ads in Stars and Stripes and television commercials on CNN International in September and October, took Democrats by surprise.

"It happened so late," said Tom Fina, executive director of Democrats Abroad.

Fina said the Democrats had concentrated their efforts months earlier, figuring that a late campaign would not give overseas voters enough time to get ballots and mail them back to Florida. He decided that most Democrats who voted overseas had already sent in their absentee ballots before election day.

The Republicans, by contrast, concluded that many overseas ballots were still outstanding as election day approached--and that many were military votes that would benefit Bush. The job of tracking those ballots--and making sure they were counted--fell to Republican strategist Warren Tompkins of South Carolina.

Republicans called each of Florida's 67 county election supervisors for information on counting how many ballots had been sent out, who had requested them and how many had been returned.

Day by day, they tracked the ballots as they trickled in. "We started getting calls from servicemen, saying their spouse or daughter or son voted and the ballot was still sitting on a ship somewhere," Tompkins recalled.

Republican members of Congress lobbied the Defense Department to do everything it could to make sure the mail was delivered in time for Florida's Nov. 17 deadline for military ballots.

At one point, Tompkins said, Republicans learned that 1,000 votes were outstanding in Jacksonville. "The margin of victory," he said, "was in those ballots."

The New York Times conducted a six-month investigation of only those absentee ballots sent from abroad. Of the 2,490 such ballots counted after election day, the newspaper found 680 questionable votes, according
to a report in today's editions. Those included ballots without postmarks to prove they were mailed by Nov. 7 and duplicate ballots from the same voter. Florida law says U.S.-mailed ballots must be counted by election day, while overseas ballots have an extra 10 days.

In response to an aggressive effort by the Bush campaign, the newspaper said, election officials were much more likely to count questionable overseas ballots in Bush strongholds than in counties that Gore won.

But the paper said it did not know for whom those 680 ballots were cast. A statistician consulted by the newspaper concluded that, if those 680 ballots had not counted, Bush probably would still have won, but by only 245 votes. He said there was only a "slight chance" that discarding those ballots would have swung the election to Gore.

Thanks to the overall absentee vote, Bush already led Gore in Florida by 125,000 votes when election day dawned. Gore was the choice of voters on Nov. 7—but, according to the official certified results, by 537 fewer votes than Bush's margin among absentee voters.

On election night, GOP operatives were aware that the absentee voters had not participated in the exit polls that the television networks were using to determine the winner of Florida's presidential sweepstakes. So they were not unduly alarmed when the networks at first put Florida in Gore's camp.

Randy Enwright, a Bush consultant and former state Republican executive director who helped develop the party's drive for absentee votes, said: "That was a large part of the reason I didn't think the election was over on election night."

Times staff writers Mike Clary, Bob Drogin and Lisa Getter contributed to this story.
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Can someone recommend a focus group facility in suburban Newark, NJ (or Summit or Short Hills, NJ) and one in western Long Island (close to the city - say in the Garden City area). We want participants who are more "normal" than the ones we generally find in Manhattan (no offense intended) - thanks
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From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of James Beniger
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2001 12:31 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: LA Superior Court Judge Bars Survey of Jury Pool (LATimes)

Is AAPOR prepared to pay for a court ruling on whether conducting a scientific survey is an effective means to relieve boredom? Oh, and also--whether it's effective or not--is surveying out of boredom (i.e., SOOBing) a free-speech right, or not?

-- Jim

Julie 13 2001

JUDGE BARS SURVEY OF JURY POOL

COURT: THE WOULD-BE RESEARCHER, A BORED POTENTIAL JUROR, SAYS THE RULING VIOLATES HIS FREE-SPEECH RIGHTS.

STEVE BERRY
TIMES STAFF WRITER
UCLA law professor Gary Blasi isn't the first potential juror to gripe about the inconvenience and time-wasting aspects of jury service.

But Blasi, 56, may be among the first whose pique subjected him to a gag order.

Concerned about the amount of idle time he and other prospective jurors were spending in the jury assembly room, he decided this week to conduct a survey of his fellow court captives to find out what their attitudes were about the process. But Thursday morning, Superior Court Judge Sam Ohta, who is in charge of Traffic Court at the Metropolitan Courthouse just south of downtown Los Angeles, quickly put a stop to it. Saying he feared that Blasi's survey might taint the "quasi-holy" jury process, Ohta issued a formal order preventing him from conducting any systematic interviews or surveys of prospective jurors.

"When Mr. Blasi is conducting this research with other potential jurors, it's possible that in some way it could influence jurors in a certain way," Ohta said.

Although Blasi's experience may amuse court critics, Ohta's decision also highlights serious questions about the extent to which judges have the power to limit free speech if they believe it jeopardizes their ability to seat impartial juries.

"There is a free speech question involved here," said Stan Goldman, a law professor at Loyola University and a former public defender. "But there has to be a balance of interests here," he said, speaking of the judge's duty to protect the integrity of the jury pool.

That said, Goldman declared, "It's a bit of a stretch to say this questionnaire would affect the integrity of the jury."

The dispute began to unfold Tuesday, when Blasi, after having sat for hours without being called to a courtroom, began asking other jurors how they felt about the idle time they were spending in the waiting room and their feelings about the entire jury process.

Being a researcher and seeing a chance to gather data for a newspaper "op-ed piece" or a journal article, Blasi decided to turn wasted time into something productive.

"As my annoyance increased, I decided I would do a little study," said the professor, who previously worked in legal aid for more than a decade. Instead of just chit-chatting about the issue, Blasi wanted to record the information in a more systematic way. He developed a two-page survey form. Part of the survey simply gathered information about people's jury service, such as how long they had been waiting and how many times they had been summoned to a courtroom. The second set of questions sought their opinions about how they were treated, whether they believed the court system showed sufficient respect for their time and whether they thought court officials could do a better job.

The courts need answers to those questions, Blasi said in an interview. "When do you think is the last time a judge went down to a jury assembly to try to gather this kind of information?" he asked.
After court Wednesday, Blasi notified a jury service administrator by E-mail that he planned to distribute the survey form. On Thursday morning, the administrator told him his plan violated court policy.

Blasi challenged the administrator's decision but withheld the survey until she could discuss the matter with Ohta. Ohta called a brief hearing, and then ordered Blasi to abandon his survey.

"I agree, and the courts agree, with the importance of finding out how jurors feel about jury service and how the court can assist in making it better," Ohta said. "What he was trying to do was a good thing."

Nevertheless, doing it in the jury assembly room was "inappropriate," Ohta said.

"The jury pool is sacred," Ohta said. "They should come here with a clean slate, to serve the court, to do this solemn, quasi-holy duty. So you try to create an environment to foster that attitude."

Superior Court Assistant Presiding Judge Robert Dukes agreed. "The court has the responsibility of protecting privacy rights of jurors," he said. "They are there against their will. They are not free to just leave if another juror starts asking them questions."

Blasi scoffed at such notions. The questions would not inflame the juror, and any juror who didn't want to answer his questions could simply refuse and walk away.

"The gag order violates my 1st Amendment rights [to freedom of speech]," he said, adding that he is considering filing suit in federal court to challenge the decision.

If he does, he probably will not win, said Goldman, the Loyola Law School professor. Although Goldman says Blasi should have been allowed to do the survey, higher courts usually are reluctant to second-guess a trial judge's discretion in protecting a jury's integrity.

"Once a trial judge makes a decision like this, a higher court will usually go out of its way to find a good reason for letting him do it."

As for Blasi, he finally got summoned for a trial late Thursday. But if he had not, he was going to keep talking to fellow jurors.

"I just wouldn't do it systematically," he said.
Oh, sure, those are definitely places to find "normal" people. :-)
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Can someone recommend a focus group facility in suburban Newark, NJ (or Summit or Short Hills, NJ) and one in western Long Island (close to the city - say in the Garden City area). We want participants who are more "normal" than the ones we generally find in Manhattan (no offense intended) - thanks
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JUDGE BARS SURVEY OF JURY POOL

COURT: THE WOULD-BE RESEARCHER, A BORED POTENTIAL JUROR, SAYS THE RULING VIOLATES HIS FREE-SPEECH RIGHTS.

STEVE BERRY
TIMES STAFF WRITER

UCLA law professor Gary Blasi isn't the first potential juror to gripe about the inconvenience and time-wasting aspects of jury service. But Blasi, 56, may be among the first whose pique subjected him to a gag order.

Concerned about the amount of idle time he and other prospective jurors were spending in the jury assembly room, he decided this week to conduct a survey of his fellow court captives to find out what their attitudes were about the process. But Thursday morning, Superior Court Judge Sam Ohta, who is in charge of Traffic Court at the Metropolitan Courthouse just south of downtown Los Angeles, quickly put a stop to it. Saying he feared that Blasi's survey might taint the "quasi-holy" jury process, Ohta issued a formal order preventing him from conducting any systematic interviews or surveys of prospective jurors.

"When Mr. Blasi is conducting this research with other potential jurors, it's possible that in some way it could influence jurors in a certain way," Ohta said.

Although Blasi's experience may amuse court critics, Ohta's decision also highlights serious questions about the extent to which judges have the power to limit free speech if they believe it jeopardizes their ability to seat impartial juries.
"There is a free speech question involved here," said Stan Goldman, a law professor at Loyola University and a former public defender. "But there has to be a balance of interests here," he said, speaking of the judge's duty to protect the integrity of the jury pool.

That said, Goldman declared, "It's a bit of a stretch to say this questionnaire would affect the integrity of the jury."

The dispute began to unfold Tuesday, when Blasi, after having sat for hours without being called to a courtroom, began asking other jurors how they felt about the idle time they were spending in the waiting room and their feelings about the entire jury process.

Being a researcher and seeing a chance to gather data for a newspaper "op-ed piece" or a journal article, Blasi decided to turn wasted time into something productive.

"As my annoyance increased, I decided I would do a little study," said the professor, who previously worked in legal aid for more than a decade. Instead of just chit-chatting about the issue, Blasi wanted to record the information in a more systematic way. He developed a two-page survey form. Part of the survey simply gathered information about people's jury service, such as how long they had been waiting and how many times they had been summoned to a courtroom. The second set of questions sought their opinions about how they were treated, whether they believed the court system showed sufficient respect for their time and whether they thought court officials could do a better job.

The courts need answers to those questions, Blasi said in an interview. "When do you think is the last time a judge went down to a jury assembly to try to gather this kind of information?" he asked.

After court Wednesday, Blasi notified a jury service administrator by E-mail that he planned to distribute the survey form. On Thursday morning, the administrator told him his plan violated court policy.

Blasi challenged the administrator's decision but withheld the survey until she could discuss the matter with Ohta. Ohta called a brief hearing, and then ordered Blasi to abandon his survey.

"I agree, and the courts agree, with the importance of finding out how jurors feel about jury service and how the court can assist in making it better," Ohta said. "What he was trying to do was a good thing."

Nevertheless, doing it in the jury assembly room was "inappropriate," Ohta said.

"The jury pool is sacred," Ohta said. "They should come here with a clean slate, to serve the court, to do this solemn, quasi-holy duty. So you try to create an environment to foster that attitude."

Superior Court Assistant Presiding Judge Robert Dukes agreed. "The court has the responsibility of protecting privacy rights of jurors," he said. "They are there against their will. They are not free to just leave if another juror starts asking them questions."

Blasi scoffed at such notions. The questions would not inflame the juror,
and any juror who didn't want to answer his questions could simply refuse and walk away.

"The gag order violates my 1st Amendment rights [to freedom of speech]," he said, adding that he is considering filing suit in federal court to challenge the decision.

If he does, he probably will not win, said Goldman, the Loyola Law School professor. Although Goldman says Blasi should have been allowed to do the survey, higher courts usually are reluctant to second-guess a trial judge's discretion in protecting a jury's integrity.

"Once a trial judge makes a decision like this, a higher court will usually go out of its way to find a good reason for letting him do it."

As for Blasi, he finally got summoned for a trial late Thursday. But if he had not, he was going to keep talking to fellow jurors.

"I just wouldn't do it systematically," he said.
Try something a little closer to central NJ: Menlo Park/Edison, East Brunswick,
Old Bridge, New Brunswick for "normal people".

Agreed!

John Mitchell
Old Bridge, New Brunswick for "normal people".
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X-Authentication: IMSP
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But to answer Jim's question directly: It seems to me that a survey
researcher generally cannot conduct an in-person, on-site survey without
permission of the propieters. You can't do it at the Mall, at Wal-mart,
or in most government buildings . . . or in my survey lab.

Given the sanctity of the jury process, how could responsible
officials--the judge or others--allow potential jurors to be approached by
outsiders without ensuring that the questions would not bias them in some
way, or burden them unduly? Surely the officials have authority to review
and approve a survey questionnaire in advance, or to deny access in their
waiting room if they so choose. In the instant case, the researcher was
himself a waiting juror, but I don't see how that exempts him from the
authority that would apply to an outside researcher. Jurors and potential
jurors are appropriately subject to all kinds of restrictions on what they
say, read, or do.

I have a free-speech right to send out a survey questionnaire, or call
people at home to ask for a voluntary interview, but I don't think I have a
right to walk into a jury waiting room and talk to jurors in any manner I
choose, while they await assignment. It's up to me to persuade those in
charge that my research is objective and will, in the long run, be
beneficial to their values.

My 2 cents . . .

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434) 243-5223
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
Fahgetaboutit!!

Reply to:
James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Survey Technology Branch
Defense Manpower Data Center
703-696-5848
caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil <mailto:caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>

-----Original Message-----
From: John Mitchell [SMTP:jmitchell@elementusa.com]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2001 10:47 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: fg recommendation

Agreed!

John Mitchell

element

The leading provider of youth data and insight
55 Washington Street
Suite 8A
Brooklyn, NY 11201
ph. 646-827-8380
fax 646-827-8381
jmitchell@elementusa.com
www.elementcentral.com
Try something a little closer to central NJ: Menlo Park/Edison, East Brunswick,
Old Bridge, New Brunswick for "normal people".

Yep, this is what I wrote Jim last week. Through "our judge's" permission, my colleagues and I, in one study or another, passed out thousands of questionnaires to summoned jurors (Adina Wasserman, my coauthor, collected her dissertation data via the same court venue too). My analogy to Jim concerned a group who, to encourage "rooming in" of newborns and mommies, staged a protest by visiting the newborn section of the local publicly supported hospital. Public or not, they couldn't just "barge in."

We had an 82 percent completion rate and only a six percent refusal rate (the remainder were people with literacy problems; we needed a backup verbal interviewer too as we learned to our chagrin). Most people enjoyed filling out the questionnaires because it was a respite from sitting in a pretty nondescript jury assembly room. They don't like waiting either and there wasn't much to do (more solvent--or considerate courts--provide very comfortable chairs, lots of snacks, cable TV--all our district shows is CNN, current magazines, babysitting, free parking, meal vouchers, etc. Oh well.)
Having said my piece, while on sabbatical a couple of years ago, I was a federal grand juror for 13 months. While by month 10 it was getting old, it was a fascinating experience and I am very glad I did it. In addition to doing my civic duty, watching the group dynamics as 23 disparate individuals became a group, watching commitment processes firsthand, I will tell you that America's Dumbest Criminals is no lie. By law, I cannot describe our cases and it's too bad because our district certainly could have given ADC a run for its money.

Susan

At 11:17 AM 7/16/2001 -0400, you wrote:
>But to answer Jim's question directly: It seems to me that a survey
>researcher generally cannot conduct an in-person, on-site survey without
>permission of the proprieters. You can't do it at the Mall, at Wal-mart,
>or in most government buildings . . . or in my survey lab.
> Given the sanctity of the jury process, how could responsible
>officials--the judge or others--allow potential jurors to be approached by
>outsiders without ensuring that the questions would not bias them in some
>way, or burden them unduly? Surely the officials have authority to review
>and approve a survey questionnaire in advance, or to deny access in their
>waiting room if they so choose. In the instant case, the researcher was
>himself a waiting juror, but I don't see how that exempts him from the
>authority that would apply to an outside researcher. Jurors and potential
>jurors are appropriately subject to all kinds of restrictions on what they
>say, read, or do.
> I have a free-speech right to send out a survey questionnaire, or call
>people at home to ask for a voluntary interview, but I don't think I have a
>right to walk into a jury waiting room and talk to jurors in any manner I
>choose, while they await assignment. It's up to me to persuade those in
>charge that my research is objective and will, in the long run, be
>beneficial to their values.
> My 2 cents . . .
> Tom
>
>Thomas M. Guterbock
> Voice: (434) 243-5223
> NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
> Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
> University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
> P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
> Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu
>
>Susan Carol Losh, PhD
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
The Public Opinion Laboratory at Northern Illinois University seeks to fill the position of Director. The director is generally responsible for the external research mission and administrative leadership for a 32-station CATI facility. The primary responsibilities of the director are to secure funded projects and to develop and manage client relations. Administrative leadership of the lab also includes oversight of research projects, proposal preparation, and recruitment and development of professional staff. The director promotes survey research and training on campus through collaborative projects with faculty and students.
Applicants must have an earned doctorate in a relevant discipline; broad experience in designing, implementing and interpreting survey research; and a record of successful proposal submissions.

Demonstrated leadership ability is required; a record of excellence in scholarship is highly desirable.

A minimum of three years' senior management experience in a survey research lab, including personnel and budget responsibilities, is expected.

A tenure-track joint appointment in an academic department is negotiable for applicants with strong scholarly records.

Salary commensurate with experience.

Preference will be given to completed applications received by October 1, 2001. However, applications will be accepted until position is filled.

Send application letter, curriculum vita, and three current letters of recommendation to:

Harvey Smith, Chair  POL Director Search
Social Science Research Institute
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

Northern Illinois University is an affirmative action/equal employment opportunity institution.

For more information go to http://www.pol.niu.edu.

Robin Bebel
Field Operations
Northern Illinois University's
Public Opinion Laboratory
148 North Third Street
DeKalb, IL 60115
815-753-0710 voice
815-753-2305 fax
RBebel@niu.edu
Try AIM in Morristown (close to Short Hills). They just recently completed two focus groups for us and they are wonderful to work with. Their number is 973-267-7060

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Phillip Downs
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2001 9:52 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: fg recommendation

Can someone recommend a focus group facility in suburban Newark, NJ (or Summit or Short Hills, NJ) and one in western Long Island (close to the city - say in the Garden City area). We want participants who are more "normal" than the ones we generally find in Manhattan (no offense intended) - thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of James Beniger
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2001 12:31 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: LA Superior Court Judge Bars Survey of Jury Pool (LATimes)

Is AAPOR prepared to pay for a court ruling on whether conducting a scientific survey is an effective means to relieve boredom? Oh, and also--whether it's effective or not--is surveying out of boredom (i.e., SOOBing) a free-speech right, or not?

-- Jim

July 13 2001

JUDGE BARS SURVEY OF JURY POOL

COURT: THE WOULD-BE RESEARCHER,
A BORED POTENTIAL JUROR, SAYS THE RULING
UCLA law professor Gary Blasi isn't the first potential juror to gripe about the inconvenience and time-wasting aspects of jury service.

But Blasi, 56, may be among the first whose pique subjected him to a gag order.

Concerned about the amount of idle time he and other prospective jurors were spending in the jury assembly room, he decided this week to conduct a survey of his fellow court captives to find out what their attitudes were about the process. But Thursday morning, Superior Court Judge Sam Ohta, who is in charge of Traffic Court at the Metropolitan Courthouse just south of downtown Los Angeles, quickly put a stop to it. Saying he feared that Blasi's survey might taint the "quasi-holy" jury process, Ohta issued a formal order preventing him from conducting any systematic interviews or surveys of prospective jurors.

"When Mr. Blasi is conducting this research with other potential jurors, it's possible that in some way it could influence jurors in a certain way," Ohta said.

Although Blasi's experience may amuse court critics, Ohta's decision also highlights serious questions about the extent to which judges have the power to limit free speech if they believe it jeopardizes their ability to seat impartial juries.

"There is a free speech question involved here," said Stan Goldman, a law professor at Loyola University and a former public defender. "But there has to be a balance of interests here," he said, speaking of the judge's duty to protect the integrity of the jury pool.

That said, Goldman declared, "It's a bit of a stretch to say this questionnaire would affect the integrity of the jury."

The dispute began to unfold Tuesday, when Blasi, after having sat for hours without being called to a courtroom, began asking other jurors how they felt about the idle time they were spending in the waiting room and their feelings about the entire jury process.

Being a researcher and seeing a chance to gather data for a newspaper "op-ed piece" or a journal article, Blasi decided to turn wasted time into something productive.

"As my annoyance increased, I decided I would do a little study," said the professor, who previously worked in legal aid for more than a decade. Instead of just chit-chatting about the issue, Blasi wanted to record the information in a more systematic way. He developed a two-page survey form. Part of the survey simply gathered information about people's jury service, such as how long they had been waiting and how many times they had been summoned to a courtroom. The second set of questions sought their opinions about how they were treated, whether they believed the court system showed sufficient respect for their time and whether they
thought court officials could do a better job.

The courts need answers to those questions, Blasi said in an interview. "When do you think is the last time a judge went down to a jury assembly to try to gather this kind of information?" he asked.

After court Wednesday, Blasi notified a jury service administrator by E-mail that he planned to distribute the survey form. On Thursday morning, the administrator told him his plan violated court policy.

Blasi challenged the administrator's decision but withheld the survey until she could discuss the matter with Ohta. Ohta called a brief hearing, and then ordered Blasi to abandon his survey.

"I agree, and the courts agree, with the importance of finding out how jurors feel about jury service and how the court can assist in making it better," Ohta said. "What he was trying to do was a good thing."

Nevertheless, doing it in the jury assembly room was "inappropriate," Ohta said.

"The jury pool is sacred," Ohta said. "They should come here with a clean slate, to serve the court, to do this solemn, quasi-holy duty. So you try to create an environment to foster that attitude."

Superior Court Assistant Presiding Judge Robert Dukes agreed. "The court has the responsibility of protecting privacy rights of jurors," he said. "They are there against their will. They are not free to just leave if another juror starts asking them questions."

Blasi scoffed at such notions. The questions would not inflame the juror, and any juror who didn't want to answer his questions could simply refuse and walk away.

"The gag order violates my 1st Amendment rights [to freedom of speech]," he said, adding that he is considering filing suit in federal court to challenge the decision.

If he does, he probably will not win, said Goldman, the Loyola Law School professor. Although Goldman says Blasi should have been allowed to do the survey, higher courts usually are reluctant to second-guess a trial judge's discretion in protecting a jury's integrity.

"Once a trial judge makes a decision like this, a higher court will usually go out of its way to find a good reason for letting him do it."

As for Blasi, he finally got summoned for a trial late Thursday. But if he had not, he was going to keep talking to fellow jurors.

"I just wouldn't do it systematically," he said.


---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
The New York Times ends its extended reporting of its own investigation of the November 2000 balloting for president in Florida with a lead editorial in this morning's editions (see below). What do you think will happen as a result of these findings, if anything?

Yes, sad to say, I'm afraid you're right...

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

JUL 16, 2001

FLORIDA'S FLAWED BALLOTS

History can now add another inequity to the long list of problems that distorted the balloting for president in Florida and threw last year's election into doubt for more than a month. Overseas ballots were judged by vastly different standards depending on where they were counted. The Democrats were clearly outhustled and outmaneuvered in the scramble for a small but vital batch of these ballots, the only votes that could legally be received and counted after Election Day. The Republicans pursued these votes with aggressive precision, tailoring their legal arguments to suit
the different political leanings of various counties, while the Democrats were hobbled by indecision and contradictory strategies.

These are among the findings of a six-month investigation by The New York Times of the overseas ballots, which provided an important part of George W. Bush's margin in Florida. The most important lesson of the investigation, whose results were reported yesterday, involves the uneven application of Florida's ballot laws. The Times study is an argument for applying uniform standards, not only in Florida but elsewhere.

The Times found 680 questionable votes among the 2,409 overseas ballots that were counted as legal after Election Day -- ballots without postmarks, for example, or ballots without witness signatures. Had the state laws been strictly enforced, all of these ballots would have been thrown out. One expert told The Times that if the flawed ballots had not been accepted, Mr. Bush's margin of victory would have dropped from 537 votes to 245 votes, not quite enough to have tipped the state to Al Gore.

This page argued for allowing as many votes to be counted as possible under the imperfect circumstances prevailing at Florida polling places, and we also called for a liberal standard in counting overseas absentee ballots from members of the armed services. But the study found that Republican counties were far more likely to count the flawed overseas ballots than were Democratic counties -- a difference attributable in part to the relentless, aggressive efforts of Mr. Bush's Florida advisers. When it became clear that the overseas ballots could be decisive, teams of Bush lawyers fanned out to all 67 canvassing boards, armed with one strategy to get as many ballots counted as possible in Republican counties, and another set of tactics aimed at challenging likely Gore votes in Democratic counties.

Meanwhile, nothing the Democrats did went right. Their first instinct was to challenge all questionable overseas ballots on the reasonable assumption that most of them were Mr. Bush's. But when a memo outlining that strategy surfaced, the Republicans denounced them for disenfranchising service members abroad. The Democrats then retreated, with Senator Joseph Lieberman asserting on television that election officials should give military ballots the "benefit of the doubt." That was a responsible gesture, but the same standards should have been applied to all absentee ballots from abroad, not just those in Republican-dominated counties.


Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

*****
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Three websites with African-American news and information:

(1) The Internet Black Pages: http://www.blackpgs.com/

(2) The Afro-American:
http://www.afroam.org/information/news/current/ne.html

(2) The Black World Today: http://www.tbwt.com/

Some items from tbwt:

Where Do Black Republicans Go From Here?
By Webster Brooks 3rd
http://www.tbwt.com/content/article.asp?articleid=1053
Black Republican Network: http://www.blackrepublican.org/
Since George Bush's election as President in December 2000, Black Republicans have engaged in far reaching efforts to marshal our forces and pass over to the political offensive. Intuitively, Black Republicans sensed the new GOP majority spawned by the 2000 elections, created an opening to certify our credentials as an emerging political force.
To that end, Black Republicans surged through fissure to secure positions at all echelons of Bush's Administration, the Republican National Committee and state party organizations. New Black voices
have surfaced in the media to extol the virtues of Republican ideals and promising candidates in 2002 elections are out of the starting blocks and running. Once passive cells of Black Republican activists at the state and local levels, are being re-generated and a spate of meetings over the past five months suggest a vigorous contest is unfolding to create a viable national Black Republican organization. Quibble over the details if one must, but the fact remains, Black Republicans are on the move.

This unprecedented outbreak of activity inspires and animates, but also gives rise to a larger and more fundamental question; Just where are we trying to take Black America? As the charter generation of 21st Century Black Republicans, can we now lay before Black America and the nation, a practical and visionary roadmap to future progress? Or, is our political DNA reducible to shifting legislative agendas, a handful of principles and Black Republicans galloping from one election cycle to the next, oblivious as to how their industry fits into a larger universe of possibilities. Thirty years after the historic San Francisco Fairmont Conference launched the modern Black Republican movement, we have arrived at a critical juncture that requires of us, the articulation of a clear and compelling path to Black advancement. It is our good fortune that the ascendance of Black Republicans as a political force is occurring at the same time that profound structural and economic changes are altering the face of Black America. Irrespective of partisan considerations, these changes are forcing many to re-think the dominant assumptions of the past about how we live, work, educate our children, communicate and engage in the public square. More importantly, the shifting demographics and class stratification of Black America is creating more demand for political options and receptivity to alternative Republican ideas. The fact that Black America continues to vote overwhelmingly liberal and Democratic does not diminish this reality, but has the consequence of blurring the change on the horizon. To dwell on today's election returns as the barometer of our future actions, is to miss the undercurrents of political change swirling beneath the waters in Black America--undercurrents that will surface in the years to come and portend a re-alignment of the Black electorate.

Black Republicans must now offer a new 21st Century framework that captures the trajectory of Black America as it transitions out of the post-civil rights era, to a higher station in the estate of American democracy. This new Black America is one in which more Blacks are attending college, owning and operating businesses, purchasing homes, investing in growth funds and engaging in public service at the highest levels of government than at any time in our history. This new Black America is also punctuated by the harsh reality that one-third of all African-Americans continue to languish in generational poverty, marred by dysfunctional families, crime, and social maladies that threaten their conversion into a permanent underclass in the new global economy. The Black Papers argues that the distinguishing feature of 21st Black America is the emergence of Two Black Americas--both moving in opposite directions. Prattle on about the differences between Blacks and whites, but the gap in wealth between middle- and lower-income blacks is widening faster than the corresponding gap between Blacks and whites. Thus, a valid question arises; Can Black Republicans fashion a politics that accelerates the growth of the burgeoning black middle and upper-classes, while at the same time, find practical remedies to elevate low-income Black America to a higher economic and
social station? This is the cardinal issue before us; How do we complete Black America's unfinished agenda? Despite our lack of organization, resources and a shared vision of 21st Century Black America, Black Republicans are close to providing the kind of leadership that is responsive to the unique characteristics of contemporary Black America evolving to another stage of development. When Black Republicans argue for home-ownership for low-income Blacks, faith based initiatives that maximize impact at the community level to combat social ills and school choice initiatives that enable parental participation, are we not arguing for policies that create greater opportunities for the Black poor? When Black Republicans advocate for enterprise zones, capital gains tax cuts on business, lower taxes on middle and upper income Blacks, eliminating the estate tax (which was supported by BET President Robert Johnson and a coalition of three dozen Black business leaders) and the repeal of the marriage tax, are we not arguing for policies that strengthen the Black middle- and upper-classes?

We are not losing the political argument in Black America today because we are on the wrong path. Nor is it insignificant that we are trying to overcome eighty years of the dominant civil rights orthodoxy. But, we will continue to lose the argument on the Black Street if we cannot clearly define where today's battle line is for Black America and where the finish line is in the future. Black America's struggle for full incorporation into the estate of American democracy is not an act in perpetuity!

Lamentably, liberals and the civil rights establishment have convinced far too many African Americans who should know better, that despite our progress, we remain a beleaguered group of second class citizens, who can be thrown back into a state of semi-slavery if certain bills are passed, or if certain "racists" elements have their way. How preposterous. Nevertheless, in order for Black Republicans to make real progress, we must change the current perception of the state of Black America, and speak of the new possibilities. Our poetry and political prose must reflect our optimism for the future. We must argue for a different vision of Black America--a Black America that stands on the verge of a new frontier of economic prosperity and full engagement in the social/political mainstream of American society--a Black America that is well educated, culturally adventurous and one which effectuates real solutions to the seemingly intractable problems of the black poor.

If Booker T. Washington at the outset of the 20th Century could dominate Black American life for two decades with his "Gospel of Wealth" preached to a nation of Blacks who were overwhelmingly propertyless, uneducated, unskilled, moneyless, and divested of all political power, cannot 21st Century Black Republicans win the argument for a new Black America whose aggregate economic power is the equivalent of the 10th largest economy in the world?

Some may be reluctant to publicly admit that a profound fault line exist between upper- and middle class Blacks, and low-income Black America. The facts however, argue otherwise. This is not simply a mechanical economic equation. The new divide is also most dramatically expressed in the culture of the inner cities, and the chasm between Black youth and our elder generations. We must muster the courage to speak of class issues and new realities, while rebuffing our detractors attempts to savage us with charges of promoting division and class warfare within Black America. These same detractors have never been the champions of the Black business and entrepreneurial
community. They built their political fortress on the rhetoric of being the guardians of the Black poor and the disadvantaged. But here too, three decades and $5 trillion of public expenditures on Great Society programs, has not transformed the condition of the Black poor. Since the death of Martin Luther King in 1968, many have insisted, with justification, that a leadership crisis has existed in Black America. As the "Black loyal opposition," our political trend developed in response to the shortcomings of the civil rights orthodoxy. For Black Republicans, the crisis of Black leadership was therefore a crisis of Black liberalism. As critics of the party opposite, who controlled the levers of governmental power, we relished a comfort zone that afforded us the luxury of blaming the other side for all the problems attendant to Black America.

But the time has come for Black Republicans to leave that era behind. In the post-civil rights era, we can no longer allow ourselves to be defined by our opposition to the civil rights movement. We must define ourselves by our vision and program for the emergence of a new 21st Century Black America. If we fail to do so, we too will become part of the Black Leadership Crisis. Where do Black Republicans go from here? Let us direct our energies, passion and resolve to end the leadership crisis and lay the foundation for a new 21st Century community, marked by full incorporation of all Black America into the estate of our nation's democracy!

Webster Brooks is the Editor of the National Black Republican Network, an Internet-based community of Black Republicans and friends nationwide. The Network was founded in January 2001 in Washington D.C. The Black Papers is the first in a series of arguments initiated by the Network. Responses to the Black Papers series may be submitted to the "Issue Forum Page" under the category Politics at the Network's website located at: www.blackrepublican.org or comments may be forwarded to editor@blackrepublican.org.

Blacks And The Presidential Election Of 2004
By Ron Daniels
http://www.tbwt.com/content/article.asp?articleid=1050
The theft of the 2000 presidential election by the Bush brothers and company was a tragic and traumatic event in the life and times of Africans in America. In the face of an ominous conservative onslaught that threatened to further erode the civil, social and economic gains of the movements of the 60's, Black America pragmatically turned to the Democratic standard bearer, Vice-President Al Gore to block Bush from ascending to the presidency.

As a consequence of this "lesser evil" strategy/approach, however, with the exception of a few passing references to racial profiling, issues of concern to the majority of Blacks were entirely absent from the campaign. This egregious omission was compounded by the failure of Al Gore to address the racial dimensions of the massive disenfranchisement of voters that occurred in Florida. This posture angered many Black political activists and elected officials. Shortly after the election I bumped into Congresswoman Maxine Waters in Washington, D.C. She complained bitterly about the lack of attention the Gore-Lieberman team had devoted to Black issues. Her conclusion and recommendation was that "never again" should there be a Democratic Primary without a Black candidate to articulate and promote an agenda of issues and concerns of importance to the vast majority of Black people.
Almost on cue, twenty years after the Rev. Jesse L. Jackson launched his crusade for the presidency, a Jackson protégé, Rev. Al Sharpton has proclaimed that he is actively exploring the possibility of a presidential bid in 2004. Setting aside the question of who should be the candidate, Sharpton's rationale is consistent with Congresswoman Waters's "never again" stance and strategy. Indeed, it is consistent with Professor Ronald Walter's concept of the Black vote as a force to be "leveraged" for the betterment of the Black community in presidential politics.

The Jackson for President campaigns of 1984 and 1988 were predicated on the notion that Blacks should comprise the core constituency for a progressive "rainbow coalition" that could compel the Democratic Party to address the concerns of Blacks and the vast majority of poor and working people in this country. Without question Rev. Jackson's campaigns projected a progressive agenda and had the effect of educating and energizing millions of voters to engage in the electoral political process.

Though Rev. Sharpton's base and appeal is not as wide and deep as Jackson's was when he launched his campaigns, there is little doubt that a Sharpton for President campaign would ensure that a progressive Black agenda would be on the table in the Democratic primaries. Rev. Sharpton would likely emerge as a potential power broker within the Democratic Party and his stature as a national leader would be significantly enhanced. But if the Jackson for President campaigns is the model, there is a real question as to whether at the end of the day; the eventual Democratic nominee will really adopt a more race conscious and progressive stance on issues in the general election in 2004.

When Rev. Jackson ran in 1984, the Democratic Party ultimately refused to incorporate most of the positions he had articulated during the primaries into the platform, prompting Maxine Waters and others to call for a Black walkout at the convention in San Francisco. Jackson eventually settled for an opportunity to address the convention in a prime time slot where his speech would reach millions of Americans. In 1988 after doubling his 1984 vote, carrying 100 congressional districts and garnering more than 1200 delegates, the Dukakis forces yielded little more than a few seats on the Democratic National Committee and another prime time address for Rev. Jackson as a gallant but defeated candidate. Dukakis proceeded to wage a lackluster campaign avoiding the use of the "L" word and race conscious policy prescriptions. And, when William Jefferson Clinton won the Democratic nomination and eventually the presidency in 1992, he did so by consciously shunning the "Jackson wing" of the Democratic Party and any clear references to Black issues.

The Jackson for President campaigns, as magnificent as they were, ultimately failed to deliver for Blacks and the progressive movement because they were a part of an "inside-outside" strategy that never developed the "outside" component. The theory was that progressives should run a candidate inside the Democratic Party to push it as far to the liberal-left side of the political spectrum as possible. If the Democrats failed to be responsive to interests of Blacks and progressives, the progressive movement would have an independent strategy including an independent presidential candidate in place as an alternative vehicle to gather up and galvanize Blacks and other disaffected constituencies to garner a significant block of votes outside the Democratic Party. This is precisely what Perot accomplished with his center/right independent campaign for president
in 1992 where he won 19% of the vote, thereby becoming a force to be
courted by both establishment parties.
For all of his vision and audacity, the progressive movement was never
able to persuade Rev. Jackson to break with the Democratic Party to
run as an independent candidate for President as a vehicle for
building the outside component -- an independent, "third force" in
American politics. In a real sense, the question is whether a Sharpton
for President campaign which retreads ground already covered by Rev.
Jesse Jackson in 1984 and 1988 will take Black America and the
progressive movement any further down the road of breaking the
dependency on the Democratic Party which many Black politicos feel is
the only way to avoid the "greater evil" of a conservative dominated
Republican Party. In my view a much bolder approach is required to
liberate Black voters and the progressive movement from the "lesser
evil" bind which we suffered through again with the race neutral,
centrist campaign of Al Gore in Election 2000.
Ron Daniels can be reached at RONMAE@aol.com <mailto:RONMAE@aol.com>
///

Progressive Racism:
The Great Impediment Towards Real Social Change
By Teresa Williams
http://www.tbwt.com/content/article.asp?articleid=1084

Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008
202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com

 MARKDAVID-RICHARDS@AOL.COM <mailto:MARKDAVID-RICHARDS@AOL.COM>
Three websites with African-American news and information:

(1) The Internet Black Pages: [http://www.blackpgs.com/](http://www.blackpgs.com/)


(2) The Black World Today: http://www.tbwt.com/

Some items from tbwt:
Where Do Black Republicans Go From Here?

By Webster Brooks 3rd

Since George Bush's election as President in December 2000, Black Republicans have engaged in far reaching efforts to marshal our forces and pass over to the political offensive. Intuitively, Black Republicans sensed the new GOP majority spawned by the 2000 elections, created an opening to certify our credentials as an emerging political force. To that end, Black Republicans surged through fissure to secure positions at all echelons of Bush's Administration, the Republican National Committee and state party organizations. New Black voices have surfaced in the media to extol the virtues of Republican ideals and promising candidates in 2002 elections are out of the starting blocks and running. Once passive cells of Black Republican activists at the state
local levels, are being re-generated and a spate of meetings over the past five months suggest a vigorous contest is unfolding to create a viable national Black Republican organization. Quibble over the details if one must, but the fact remains, Black Republicans are on the move. This unprecedented outbreak of activity inspires and animates, but also gives rise to a larger and more fundamental question: Just where are we trying to take Black America? As the charter generation of 21st Century Black Republicans, can we now lay before Black America and the nation, a practical and visionary roadmap to future progress? Or, is our political DNA reducible to shifting legislative agendas, a handful of principles and Black Republicans galloping from one election cycle to the next, oblivious as to how their industry fits into a larger universe of possibilities. Thirty years after the historic San Francisco Fairmont Conference launched the modern Black Republican movement, we have arrived at a critical juncture that requires of us, the articulation of a clear and compelling path to Black advancement.

It is our good fortune that the ascendance of Black Republicans as a political force is occurring at the same time that profound structural and economic changes are altering the face of Black America. Irrespective of partisan considerations, these changes are forcing many to re-think the dominant assumptions of the past about how we live, work, educate our children, communicate and engage in the public square. More importantly, the shifting demographics and class stratification of Black America is creating more demand for political options and receptivity to alternative Republican ideas. The fact that Black America continues to vote overwhelmingly liberal and Democratic does not diminish this reality, but has the consequence of blurring the change on the horizon. To dwell on today's
election returns as the barometer of our future actions, is to miss the undercurrents of political change swirling beneath the waters in Black America—undercurrents that will surface in the years to come and portend a re-alignment of the Black electorate. Black Republicans must now offer a new 21st Century framework that captures the trajectory of Black America as it transitions out of the post-civil rights era, to a higher station in the estate of American democracy. This new Black America is one in which more Blacks are attending college, owning and operating businesses, purchasing homes, investing in growth funds and engaging in public service at the highest levels of government than at any time in our history. This new Black America is also punctuated by the harsh reality that one-third of all African-Americans continue to languish in generational poverty, marred by dysfunctional families, crime, and social maladies that threaten their conversion into a permanent underclass in the new global economy. The Black Papers argues that the distinguishing feature of 21st Black America is the emergence of Two Black Americas—both moving in opposite directions. Prattle on about the differences between Blacks and whites, but the gap in wealth between middle- and lower-income blacks is widening faster than the corresponding gap between Blacks and whites. Thus, a valid question arises; Can Black Republicans fashion a politics that accelerates the growth of the burgeoning black middle and upper-classes, while at the same time, find practical remedies to elevate low-income Black America to a higher economic and social station? This is the cardinal issue before us; How do we complete Black America's unfinished agenda? Despite our lack of organization, resources and a shared vision of 21st Century
Black America, Black Republicans are close to providing the kind of leadership that is responsive to the unique characteristics of contemporary Black America evolving to another stage of development. When Black Republicans argue for home-ownership for low-income Blacks, faith based initiatives that maximize impact at the community level to combat social ills and school choice initiatives that enable parental participation, are we not arguing for policies that create greater opportunities for the Black poor? When Black Republicans advocate for enterprise zones, capital gains tax cuts on business, lower taxes on middle and upper income Blacks, eliminating the estate tax (which was supported by BET President Robert Johnson and a coalition of three dozen Black business leaders) and the repeal of the marriage tax, are we not arguing for policies that strengthen the Black middle- and upper-classes? We are not losing the political argument in Black America today because we are on the wrong path. Nor is it insignificant that we are trying to overcome eighty years of the dominant civil rights orthodoxy. But, we will continue to lose the argument on the Black Street if we cannot clearly define where today's battle line is for Black America and where the finish line is in the future. Black America's struggle for full incorporation into the estate of American democracy is not an act in perpetuity! Lamentably, liberals and the civil rights establishment have convinced far too many African Americans who should know better, that despite our progress, we remain a beleaguered group of...
second class citizens, who can be thrown back into a state of semi-slavery if certain bills are passed, or if certain “racists” elements have their way. How preposterous. Nevertheless, in order for Black Republicans to make real progress, we must change the current perception of the state of Black America, and speak of the new possibilities. Our poetry and political prose must reflect our optimism for the future.

We must argue for a different vision of Black America—a Black America that stands on the verge of a new frontier of economic prosperity and full engagement in the social/political mainstream of American society—a Black America that is well educated, culturally adventurous and one which effectuates real solutions to the seemingly intractable problems of the black poor.

If Booker T. Washington at the outset of the 20th Century could dominate Black American life for two decades with his “Gospel of Wealth” preached to a nation of Blacks who were overwhelmingly propertyless, uneducated, unskilled, moneyless, and divested of all political power, cannot 21st Century Black Republicans win the argument for a new Black America whose aggregate economic power is the equivalent of the 10th largest economy in the world?

Some may be reluctant to publicly admit that a profound fault line exist between upper- and middle class Blacks, and low-income Black America. The facts however, argue otherwise. This is
not simply a mechanical economic equation. The new divide is also most dramatically expressed in the culture of the inner cities, and the chasm between Black youth and our elder generations. We must muster the courage to speak of class issues and new realities, while rebuffing our detractors attempts to savage us with charges of promoting division and class warfare within Black America. These same detractors have never been the champions of the Black business and entrepreneurial community. They built their political fortress on the rhetoric of being the guardians of the Black poor and the disadvantaged. But here too, three decades and $5 trillion of public expenditures on Great Society programs, has not transformed the condition of the Black poor. Since the death of Martin Luther King in 1968, many have insisted, with justification, that a leadership crisis has existed in Black America. As the "Black loyal opposition," our political trend developed in response to the shortcomings of the civil rights orthodoxy. For Black Republicans, the crisis of Black leadership was therefore a crisis of Black liberalism. As critics of the party opposite, who controlled the levers of governmental power, we relished a comfort zone that afforded us the luxury of blaming the other side for all the problems attendant to Black America. But the time has come for Black Republicans to leave that era behind. In the post-civil rights era, we can no longer allow ourselves to be defined by our opposition to the civil rights movement. We must define ourselves by our vision and program for the emergence of a new 21st Century Black America. If we fail to do so, we too will become part of the
Black Leadership Crisis. Where do Black Republicans go from here?

Let us direct our energies, passion and resolve to end the leadership crisis and lay the foundation for a new 21st Century community, marked by full incorporation of all Black America into the estate of our nation's democracy!

Webster Brooks is the Editor of the National Black Republican Network, an Internet-based community of Black Republicans and friends nationwide. The Network was founded in January 2001 in Washington D.C. The Black Papers is the first in a series of arguments initiated by the Network. Responses to the Black Papers series may be submitted to the "Issue Forum Page" under the category Politics at the Network's website located at: www.blackrepublican.org or comments may be forwarded to editor@blackrepublican.org.
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Blacks And The Presidential Election Of 2004
By Ron Daniels

The theft of the 2000 presidential election by the Bush brothers and company was a tragic and traumatic event in the life and times of Africans in America. In the face of an ominous conservative onslaught that threatened to further erode the civil, social and economic gains of the movements of the 60's, Black America pragmatically turned to the Democratic standard bearer, Vice-President Al Gore to block Bush from ascending to the presidency. 

As a consequence of this "lesser evil" strategy/approach, however, with the exception of a few passing references to racial profiling, issues of concern to the majority of Blacks were entirely absent from the campaign. This egregious omission was compounded by the failure of Al Gore to address the racial dimensions of the massive disenfranchisement of voters that occurred in Florida. 

This posture angered many Black political activists and elected officials. Shortly after the election I bumped into Congresswoman Maxine Waters in Washington, D.C. She complained bitterly about the lack of attention the Gore-Lieberman team had devoted to Black issues. Her
conclusion and recommendation was that "never again" should =
there be =
a Democratic Primary without a Black candidate to articulate and promote =
an agenda of issues and concerns of importance to the vast majority of =
Black people. <span style='font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'></span><o:p></o:p><span style='font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'></span><o:p></o:p></span></font><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DVerdana><span =
style='font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'></span><o:p></o:p></span></font></p>

<p><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DVerdana><span =
style='font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'></span><o:p></o:p></span></font></p>

Almost on cue, twenty years after the =
Rev. Jesse L. Jackson launched his crusade for the presidency, a Jackson =
protégé, Rev. Al Sharpton has proclaimed that he is actively exploring the =
possibility
of a presidential bid in 2004. Setting aside the question of who should =
be the
candidate, Sharpton's rationale is consistent with Congresswoman Water's =
"never again" stance and strategy. Indeed, it is consistent =
with
Professor Ronald Walter's concept of the Black vote as a force to be =
leveraged; for the betterment of the Black community in =
presidential
politics. <span style='font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'></span><o:p></o:p><span style='font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'></span><o:p></o:p></span></font><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DVerdana><span =
style='font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'></span><o:p></o:p></span></font></p>

The Jackson for President campaigns of =
1984
and 1988 were predicated on the notion that Blacks should comprise the =
core
constituency for a progressive "rainbow coalition" that could =
compel
the Democratic Party to address the concerns of Blacks and the vast =
majority of
poor and working people in this country. Without question Rev. Jackson's =
campaigns projected a progressive agenda and had the effect of educating =
and
energizing millions of voters to engage in the electoral political =
process. <span style='font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'></span><o:p></o:p><span style='font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'></span><o:p></o:p></span></font><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DVerdana><span =
style='font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'></span><o:p></o:p></span></font></p>

Though Rev. Sharpton's base and appeal =
is not
as wide and deep as Jackson's was when he launched his campaigns, there =
is
little doubt that a Sharpton for President campaign would ensure that a
progressive Black agenda would be on the table in the Democratic =
primaries. Rev. Sharpton would likely emerge as a potential power broker within the =
Democratic Party and his stature as a national leader would be =
significantly enhanced. But if the Jackson for President campaigns is the model, there =
is a real question as to whether at the end of the day; the eventual =
Democratic nominee will really adopt a more race conscious and progressive stance =
on issues in the general election in 2004. </span></font><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack =
face=3DVerdana><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black; =
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<p>&lt;font size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DVerdana&gt;&lt;span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt; font-family:Verdana;color:black'&gt;When Rev. Jackson ran in 1984, the =
Democratic Party ultimately refused to incorporate most of the positions he had =
articulated during the primaries into the platform, prompting Maxine =
Waters and others to call for a Black walkout at the convention in San Francisco. =
Jackson eventually settled for an opportunity to address the convention in a =
prime time slot where is speech would reach millions of Americans. In 1988 after =
doubling his 1984 vote, carrying 100 congressional districts and garnering more =
than 1200 delegates, the Dukakis forces yielded little more than a few seats =
on the Democratic National Committee and another prime time address for Rev. =
Jackson as a gallant but defeated candidate. Dukakis proceeded to wage a =
lackluster campaign avoiding the use of the &quot;L&quot; word and race conscious =
policy prescriptions. And, when William Jefferson Clinton won the Democratic =
nomination and eventually the presidency in 1992, he did so by consciously shunning =
the &quot;Jackson wing&quot; of the Democratic Party and any clear =
references to Black issues. &lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;font size=3D2 color=3Dblack =
face=3DVerdana&gt;&lt;span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;font-family:Verdana;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'&gt;&lt;o:p&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;

&lt;p&gt;&lt;font size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DVerdana&gt;&lt;span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt; font-family:Verdana;color:black'&gt;The Jackson for President campaigns, as =
magnificent as they were, ultimately failed to deliver for Blacks and =
the progressive movement because they were a part of an =
strategy that never developed the "outside" component. The theory was that progressives should run a candidate inside the Democratic Party to push it as far to the liberal-left side of the political spectrum as possible. If the Democrats failed to be responsive to interests of Blacks and progressives, the progressive movement would have an independent strategy including an independent presidential candidate in place as an alternative vehicle to gather up and galvanize Blacks and other disaffected constituencies to garner a significant block of votes outside the Democratic Party. This is precisely what Perot accomplished with his center/right independent campaign for president in 1992 where he won 19% of the vote, thereby becoming a force to be courted by both establishment parties. For all of his vision and audacity, the progressive movement was never able to persuade Rev. Jackson to break with the Democratic Party to run as an independent candidate for President as a vehicle for building the outside component -- an independent, "third force" in American politics. In a real sense, the question is whether a Sharpton for President campaign which retreads ground already covered by Rev. Jesse Jackson in 1984 and 1988 will take Black America and the progressive movement any further down the road of breaking the dependency on the Democratic Party which many Black politicos feel is the only way to avoid the "greater evil" of a conservative dominated Republican Party. In my view a much bolder approach is required to liberate Black voters and the progressive movement from the "lesser evil" bind which we suffered through again with the race neutral, centrist campaign of Al Gore in Election 2000.
Progressive Racism: The Great Impediment Towards Real Social Change

By Teresa Williams

http://www.tbwt.com/content/article.asp?articleid=1084
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Continuing the discussion about the flaws in the past election.................it's all pretty sad and the question, as Jim=20
alluded to, is whether anything will be done in time to correct the problems before the next go around. And people complain about exit polls????

Dick Halpern

JUL 17, 2001

Study Says 2000 Election Missed Millions of Votes

By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

new study of the 2000 presidential election has found that 4 million to 6 million votes of the 100 million cast last November were not counted. The survey cited faulty voting equipment, confusing ballots, voter error and problems at polling places, including long lines, short hours and inconvenient locations.

The study, released yesterday by scientists from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and California Institute of Technology, did not try to determine whether the lost or ruined votes would have changed the outcome of the race between George W. Bush and Al Gore.

The estimate of lost votes is at least twice as high as one released earlier this month by House Democrats, who said that about two million votes, or nearly 2 percent of the total, had not been counted.

More than eight months after Election Day, voting experts are still sorting through the aftermath of one of the closest presidential races ever. Yesterday's report is one of several expected in the next several weeks that will examine what went wrong and make recommendations to guide Congress and local governments as they seek to avoid the pitfalls of 2000.

While some analysts say time is running out to enact changes that could be in place by the elections in 2002, the bipartisan sponsors of a bill expected to be voted on in the House Science Committee this week are hoping the M.I.T.-Caltech study will give their bill new urgency. The bill would direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology, a federal laboratory, and state and local election officials to set new technical standards for voting equipment.

The academic study concluded that many of the mechanical and human problems...
experienced last November could be solved if counties eliminated punch-cards and lever machines and bought optical-scan equipment, in which voters use pencils to fill in circles, as on standardized tests.

The best such optical-scan equipment, the study said, counts ballots at the precinct level and kicks them back to voters if they have been filled out incorrectly. Other studies have reached the same conclusion.

"The U.S. can lower the number of lost votes in 2004 by replacing punch-cards and lever machines with optical scanning," the report said.

It also said counties needed to upgrade their voter registration systems, chiefly by consolidating their registration lists in single databases that are available by computer at each precinct. And it endorsed provisional ballots, which allow a voter to vote even if his registration is in question and to have the ballot counted later. Nineteen states now use provisional ballots.

Such changes in the nation's election system could cost about $400 million a year. The report said the nation's 3,000 counties spent $1 billion on election administration in 2000.

"We view the price of these reforms =97 $4 per voter per year =97 as insurance against problematic elections in the future, insurance that each vote will be counted," the report said.

The report was the result of a six-month examination of the nation's voting system by a team of computer scientists, mechanical engineers and social scientists from the two universities, the nation's premier technical institutes.

The goal of their continuing project, financed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, is to make recommendations about how computing technology can best be harnessed to improve elections.

No system is fool-proof, the scientists said. Jehoshua Bruck, an electrical engineer at Caltech, joked that the perfect system would read a voter's mind while she imagined a picture of the White House.

Short of that, Stephen Ansolabehere, a political scientist at M.I.T., acknowledged that so far, the two institutes had determined that one of the two best solutions was low-tech, the hand-counted paper ballot.

Just as reliable, the report said, are the optical-scan machines that count ballots at the precinct level and give voters a second chance if they make
The scientists were skeptical of voting over the Internet. The Internet is too vulnerable to large-scale fraud, they said.
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The academic study concluded that many of the mechanical and human problems experienced last November could be solved if counties eliminated punch cards and lever machines and bought optical-scan equipment, in which voters use pencils to fill in circles, as on standardized tests.

The best such optical-scan equipment, the study said, counts ballots at the precinct level and kicks them back to voters if they have been filled out incorrectly. Other studies have reached the same conclusion. "The U.S. can lower the number of lost votes in 2004 by replacing punch cards and lever machines with optical scanning," the report said.

It also said counties needed to upgrade their voter registration systems, chiefly by consolidating their registration lists in single databases that are available by computer at each precinct. And it endorsed provisional ballots, which allow a voter to vote even if his registration is in question and to have the ballot counted later. Nineteen states now use provisional ballots.

Such changes in the nation's election system could cost about $400 million a year. The report said the nation's 3,000 counties spent $1 billion on election administration in 2000.

"We view the price of these reforms =97 $4 per voter per year =97 as insurance: insurance against problematic elections in the future, insurance that each vote will be counted," the report said.

The report was the result of a six-month examination of the nation's voting system by a team of computer scientists, mechanical engineers and social scientists from the two universities, the nation's premier technical institutes.

The goal of their continuing project, financed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, is to make recommendations about how computing technology can best be harnessed to improve elections. No system is fool-proof, the scientists said. Jehoshua Bruck, an electrical engineer at Caltech, joked that the perfect system would read a voter's mind while she imagined a picture of the White House. Short of that, Stephen Ansolabehere, a political scientist at M.I.T., acknowledged that so far, the two institutes had determined that one of the two best solutions was low-tech, the hand-counted paper ballot.

Just as reliable, the report said, are the optical-scan machines that count ballots at the precinct level and give voters a second chance if they make a mistake.

The scientists were skeptical of voting over the Internet. The Internet is too vulnerable to large-scale fraud, they said.
Study Finds Millions of Votes Lost
Universities Urge Better Technology, Ballot Procedures
By Guy Gugliotta
Washington Post Staff Writer
Tuesday, July 17, 2001; Page A01
Between 4 million and 6 million Americans either failed to cast votes or had their votes invalidated in last year's presidential election because of faulty equipment, mismarked ballots, polling place failures and foul-ups with registration or absentee voting, a study by two leading universities reported yesterday.
The study recommended that election boards get rid of punch cards and
lever machines, curb absentee voting, institute registration reforms and discard any consideration of Internet voting for the foreseeable future. It urged the federal government to help fund equipment upgrades, to create a new agency to set up election technology standards and to conduct research into improved electronic voting systems.

"The main conclusion is that there has been precious little study of these issues and precious few resources" applied to resolve them, said California Institute of Technology President David Baltimore. "The voting process has previously simply not been taken seriously."

The Voting Technology Project report, by the California Institute of Technology and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has been eagerly anticipated by both elected officials and other would-be reformers as a nonpartisan and carefully researched scientific study of the mechanics -- and not the politics -- of holding an election. The report said that in presidential elections, punch card ballots -- like those that caused last year's Florida debacle -- have an error rate of 2.5 percent, the worst of any method used. Lever machines, while maintaining a relatively low rate of error for presidential voting -- 1.5 percent -- were the worst performers when voters cast ballots for lower offices. The incidence of invalidated ballots rose to 7.6 percent for governor or senator.

But while the university recommendations received a generally warm reception, several officials and organizations expressed reservations about the report's emphasis on technology and its promotion of a federal role in a process that traditionally has been controlled by state and local governments.

In Little Rock yesterday, the National Association of Secretaries of State presented a summary of the "best practices" used in member states, suggesting that election officials consider a broad spectrum of reforms. Secretaries of state, whether elected or appointed, oversee elections in most states.

The NASS recommendations overlapped many of those of Caltech and MIT, but they focused more on voter education and the training of election officials. "I hope people aren't convinced that simply plugging in new voting systems around the country is going to solve our problems," said Kansas Secretary of State Ron Thornburgh, the newly elected NASS president.

Congress has several competing election reform bills pending, and many of them accept a federal role in the process. In the House, Reps. Robert W. Ney (R-Ohio) and Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.), the chairman and ranking member of the House Administration Committee, respectively, plan a bipartisan bill that would eliminate punch cards and provide assistance to states to upgrade equipment.

"This study backs up what Mr. Ney and I have contended -- the federal government must play a role in replacing antiquated election systems as part of the effort to ensure that every vote cast is a vote counted," Hoyer said. But he noted that a cornerstone of the legislation will be that "the federal government should not mandate solutions."

Caltech and MIT, funded by the Carnegie Corporation, announced the voting project last December, with Baltimore suggesting that since the Florida debacle was largely a technological mishap, technology specialists ought to be called upon to fix it.

The teams did not consider political or sociological issues -- such as the high rate of invalidated ballots in minority precincts. But the two university teams, composed of political scientists and
technologists, went far beyond a simple machinery analysis to look at every aspect of election procedures.
The teams used figures from the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey, which showed that 40 million registered voters in the United States did not participate in the November 2000 elections. Roughly 7 percent -- or about 3 million voters -- said they didn't vote because of registration problems, and another 1 million cited "long lines" or other polling place shortcomings. Researchers said the registration foul-ups could be lower or higher.
And using election returns data, the teams estimated that faulty equipment or confusing ballots caused 1.5 million to 2 million votes to be unmarked or mismarked. In all, the researchers estimated that between 4 million and 6 million votes were lost in the election. "There are failures at every step," said MIT political scientist Stephen Ansolabehere. "That's an unacceptably high rate of vote loss, and by 2004, the United States can cut the number of lost votes in half using existing technology."
The study recommended getting rid of punch cards, used by one-third of America's voters, and lever machines, used by 17.8 percent of voters. It also recommended that elections boards discard the more primitive electronic on-screen machines because they are confusing and slow.
About 11 percent of voters used electronic ballots in 2000. To replace these technologies, the report suggested a move to optical-scan ballots, like the answer sheets in college board exams, and research on new forms of electronic voting. The report emphasized that optical-scan ballots should be authenticated at the precinct level, so voters will know when they have made a mistake and be able to correct it.
The report laid great emphasis on the need to reform registration processes and polling place techniques. It suggested giving election officials computer access to the complete voter rolls at the polling place to facilitate checks, and proposed that states develop qualified voter files.
The report was harshly critical of absentee voting, saying it reopened the electoral system to coercion, a popular Election Day ploy during the 19th century, and did not increase voter turnout. The report suggested that on-demand absentee voting be "restricted or abolished."
The teams expressed even less enthusiasm for Internet voting, which "has all the problems of absentee voting and adds problems of security," said MIT computer scientist Ron Rivest. "At least a decade of further research on the security of home computers is needed before Internet voting can come in."
Staff writer Shankar Vedantam contributed to this report.
© 2001 The Washington Post Company
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Continuing the discussion about the flaws in the past election.................it's all pretty sad and the question, as Jim alluded to, is whether anything will be done in time to correct the problems before the next go around. And people complain about exit
new study of the 2000 presidential election has found that 4 million to 6 million votes of the 100 million cast last November were not counted. The survey cited faulty voting equipment, confusing ballots, voter error and problems at polling places, including long lines, short hours and inconvenient locations.

The study, released yesterday by scientists from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and California Institute of Technology, did not try to determine whether the lost or ruined votes would have changed the outcome of the race between George W. Bush and Al Gore.

The estimate of lost votes is at least twice as high as one released earlier this month by House Democrats, who said that about two million votes, or nearly 2 percent of the total, had not been counted.

More than eight months after Election Day, voting experts are still sorting through the aftermath of one of the closest presidential races ever. Yesterday's report is one of several expected in the next several weeks that will examine what went wrong and make recommendations to guide Congress and local governments as they seek to avoid the pitfalls of 2000.

While some analysts say time is running out to enact changes that could be in place by the elections in 2002, the bipartisan sponsors of a bill expected to be voted on in the House Science Committee this week are hoping the M.I.T.-Caltech study will give their bill new urgency. The bill would direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology, a federal laboratory, and state and local election officials to set new technical standards for voting equipment.

The academic study concluded that many of the mechanical and human problems experienced last November could be solved if counties eliminated punch cards and lever machines and bought optical-scan equipment, in which voters use pencils to fill in circles, as on standardized tests.

The best such optical-scan equipment, the study said, counts ballots at the precinct level and kicks them back to voters if they have been
filled out incorrectly. Other studies have reached the same conclusion.

"The U.S. can lower the number of lost votes in 2004 by replacing punch cards and lever machines with optical scanning," the report said.

It also said counties needed to upgrade their voter registration systems, chiefly by consolidating their registration lists in single databases that are available by computer at each precinct. And it endorsed provisional ballots, which allow a voter to vote even if his registration is in question and to have the ballot counted later. Nineteen states now use provisional ballots.

Such changes in the nation's election system could cost about $400 million a year. The report said the nation's 3,000 counties spent $1 billion on election administration in 2000.

"We view the price of these reforms - $4 per voter per year - as insurance: insurance against problematic elections in the future, insurance that each vote will be counted," the report said.

The report was the result of a six-month examination of the nation's voting system by a team of computer scientists, mechanical engineers and social scientists from the two universities, the nation's premier technical institutes.

The goal of their continuing project, financed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, is to make recommendations about how computing technology can best be harnessed to improve elections.

No system is fool-proof, the scientists said. Jehoshua Bruck, an electrical engineer at Caltech, joked that the perfect system would read a voter's mind while she imagined a picture of the White House.

Short of that, Stephen Ansolabehere, a political scientist at M.I.T., acknowledged that so far, the two institutes had determined that one of the two best solutions was low-tech, the hand-counted paper ballot.

Just as reliable, the report said, are the optical-scan machines that count ballots at the precinct level and give voters a second chance if they make a mistake.

The scientists were skeptical of voting over the Internet. The Internet is too vulnerable to large-scale fraud, they said.
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Study Finds Millions of Votes Lost

Universities Urge Better Technology, Ballot Procedures

By Guy Gugliotta

Washington Post Staff Writer

Tuesday, July 17, 2001; Page A01
Between 4 million and 6 million Americans either failed to cast votes or had their votes invalidated in last year's presidential election because of faulty equipment, mismarked ballots, polling place failures and foul-ups with registration or absentee voting, a study by two leading universities reported yesterday.

The study recommended that election boards get rid of punch cards and lever machines, curb absentee voting, institute registration reforms and discard any consideration of Internet voting for the foreseeable future. It urged the federal government to help fund equipment upgrades, to create a new agency to set up election technology standards and to conduct research into improved electronic voting systems.

"The main conclusion is that there has been precious little study of these issues and precious few resources applied to resolve them, said California Institute of Technology President David Baltimore. "The voting process has previously simply not been taken seriously."
The Voting Technology Project report, by the California Institute of Technology and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has been eagerly anticipated by both elected officials and other would-be reformers as a nonpartisan and carefully researched scientific study of the mechanics -- and not the politics -- of holding an election.

The report said that in presidential elections, punch card ballots -- like those that caused last year's Florida debacle -- have an error rate of 2.5 percent, the worst of any method used. Lever machines, while maintaining a relatively low rate of error for presidential voting -- 1.5 percent -- were the worst performers when voters cast ballots for lower offices. The incidence of invalidated ballots rose to 7.6 percent for governor or senator.

But while the university recommendations received a generally warm reception, several officials and organizations expressed reservations about the report's emphasis on technology and its promotion of a federal role in a process that traditionally has been controlled by state and local governments.

In Little Rock yesterday, the National Association of Secretaries of State presented a summary of the "best practices" used in member states, suggesting that election officials consider a broad spectrum of reforms. Secretaries of state, whether...
elected or appointed, oversee elections in most states.</span></font><flushend><p><font size=3D2 color=3Dnavy face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:navy;mso-color-alt:windowtext'&gt;&lt;o:p&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;&lt;p&gt;&lt;font size=3D2 color=3Dnavy face=3DArial&gt;&lt;span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:navy'&gt;The NASS recommendations overlapped many of those of Caltech and MIT, but they focused more on voter education and the training of election officials. &quot;I hope people aren't convinced that simply plugging in new voting systems around the country is going to solve our problems,&quot; said Kansas Secretary of State Ron Thornburgh, the newly elected NASS president.</span></font><flushend><p><font size=3D2 color=3Dnavy face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:navy;mso-color-alt:windowtext'&gt;&lt;o:p&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;&lt;p&gt;&lt;font size=3D2 color=3Dnavy face=3DArial&gt;&lt;span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:navy'&gt;Congress has several competing election reform bills pending, and many of them accept a federal role in the process. In the House, Reps. Robert W. Ney (R-Ohio) and Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.), the chairman and ranking member of the House Administration Committee, respectively, plan a bipartisan bill that would eliminate punch cards and provide assistance to states to upgrade equipment.</span></font><flushend><p><font size=3D2 color=3Dnavy face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:navy;mso-color-alt:windowtext'&gt;&lt;o:p&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;&lt;p&gt;&lt;font size=3D2 color=3Dnavy face=3DArial&gt;&lt;span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:navy'&gt;&quot;This study backs up what Mr. Ney and I have contended -- the federal government must play a role in replacing antiquated election systems as part of the effort to ensure that every vote cast is a vote counted,&quot; Hoyer said. But he noted that a cornerstone of the legislation will be that &quot;the federal government should not mandate solutions.&quot;</span></font><flushend><p><font size=3D2 color=3Dnavy face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:navy;mso-color-alt:windowtext'&gt;&lt;o:p&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;
Caltech and MIT, funded by the Carnegie Corporation, announced the voting project last December, with Baltimore suggesting that since the Florida debacle was largely a technological mishap, technology specialists ought to be called upon to fix it.

The teams did not consider political or sociological issues -- such as the high rate of invalidated ballots in minority precincts. But the two university teams, composed of political scientists and technologists, went far beyond a simple machinery analysis to look at every aspect of election procedures.

The teams used figures from the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey, which showed that 40 million registered voters in the United States did not participate in the November 2000 elections. Researchers said the registration foul-ups could be lower or higher.
And using election returns data, the teams estimated that faulty equipment or confusing ballots caused 1.5 million to 2 million votes to be unmarked or mismarked. In all, the researchers estimated that between 4 million and 6 million votes were lost in the election.

“There are failures at every step,” said MIT political scientist Stephen Ansolabehere. “That's an unacceptably high rate of vote loss, and by 2004, the United States can cut the number of lost votes in half using existing technology.”

The study recommended getting rid of punch cards, used by one-third of America's voters, and lever machines, used by 17.8 percent of voters. It also recommended that elections boards discard the more primitive electronic on-screen machines because they are confusing and slow. About 11 percent of voters used electronic ballots in 2000.

To replace these technologies, the report suggested a move to optical-scan ballots, like the answer sheets in college board exams, and research on new forms of electronic voting. The report emphasized that optical-scan ballots should be authenticated at the precinct.
level, so voters will know when they have made a mistake and be able to correct it.

The report laid great emphasis on the need to reform registration processes and polling place techniques. It suggested giving election officials computer access to the complete voter rolls at the polling place to facilitate checks, and proposed that states develop qualified voter files.

The report was harshly critical of absentee voting, saying it reopened the electoral system to coercion, a popular Election Day ploy during the 19th century, and did not increase voter turnout. The report suggested that on-demand absentee voting be "restricted or abolished." The teams expressed even less enthusiasm for Internet voting, which "has all the problems of absentee voting and adds problems of security," said MIT computer scientist Ron Rivest. "At least a decade of further research on the security of home computers is needed before Internet voting can come in."
Shankar Vedantam contributed to this report.
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new study of the 2000 presidential election has found that 4 million to 6 million votes of the 100 million cast last November were not counted. The survey cited faulty voting equipment, confusing ballots, voter error and problems at polling places, including long lines, short hours and inconvenient locations.

The study, released yesterday by scientists from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and California Institute of Technology, did not try to determine whether the lost or ruined votes would have changed the outcome of the race between George W. Bush and Al Gore.

The estimate of lost votes is at least twice as high as one released earlier this month by House Democrats, who said that about two million votes, or nearly 2 percent of the total, had not been counted.

More than eight months after Election Day, voting experts are still sorting through the aftermath of one of the closest presidential races ever. Yesterday's report is one of several expected in the next several weeks that will examine what went wrong and make recommendations to guide Congress and local governments as they seek to avoid the pitfalls of 2000.

While some analysts say time is running out to enact changes that could be in place by the elections in 2002, the bipartisan sponsors of a bill expected to be voted on in the House Science Committee this week are hoping the M.I.T.-Caltech study will give their bill new urgency. The bill would direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology, a federal laboratory, and state and local election officials to set new technical standards for voting equipment.

The academic study concluded that many of the mechanical and human problems experienced last November could be solved if counties eliminated punch cards and lever machines and bought optical-scan equipment, in which voters
pencils to fill in circles, as on standardized tests.<br>
The best such optical-scan equipment, the study said, counts ballots at =
the
precinct level and kicks them back to voters if they have been filled =
out
incorrectly. Other studies have reached the same conclusion.<br>
&quot;The U.S. can lower the number of lost votes in 2004 by replacing =
punch
cards and lever machines with optical scanning,&quot; the report =
said.<br>
It also said counties needed to upgrade their voter registration =
systems,
chiefly by consolidating their registration lists in single databases =
that are
available by computer at each precinct. And it endorsed provisional =
balloons,
which allow a voter to vote even if his registration is in question and =
to have
the ballot counted later. Nineteen states now use provisional =
balloons.<br>
Such changes in the nation's election system could cost about $400 =
million a
year. The report said the nation's 3,000 counties spent $1 billion on =
election
administration in 2000.<br>
&quot;We view the price of these reforms $4 per voter per year =
insurance: insurance against problematic elections in the future, =
that each vote will be counted,&quot; the report said.<br>
The report was the result of a six-month examination of the nation's =
voting
system by a team of computer scientists, mechanical engineers and social
scientists from the two universities, the nation's premier technical =
institutes. <br>
The goal of their continuing project, financed by the Carnegie =
Corporation of
New York, is to make recommendations about how computing technology can =
best be
harnessed to improve elections. <br>
No system is fool-proof, the scientists said. Jehoshua Bruck, an =
electrical
engineer at Caltech, joked that the perfect system would read a voter's =
mind
while she imagined a picture of the White House.<br>
Short of that, Stephen Ansolabehere, a political scientist at M.I.T., =
acknowledged that so far, the two institutes had determined that one of =
the two
best solutions was low-tech, the hand-counted paper ballot.<br>
Just as reliable, the report said, are the optical-scan machines that count ballots at the precinct level and give voters a second chance if they make a mistake.<br>
The scientists were skeptical of voting over the Internet. The Internet is too vulnerable to large-scale fraud, they said.
One problem with all this research is that it is a one cell design. I have no idea whether past elections had these same flaws with the same magnitudes or we are looking at something new or a one-time problem. Since more optical scanning was used this time than in the past and at least our small state was 100% electronic, the numbers should be better not worse. If paper ballot is the most reliable method what constraints does that imply for complex ballots and initiatives? What happens as the electorate grows? Are these instruments more or less accessible to the average voter?

Ed Ratledge
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The study, released yesterday by scientists from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and California Institute of Technology, did not try to determine whether the lost or ruined votes would have changed the outcome of the race between George W. Bush and Al Gore.

The estimate of lost votes is at least twice as high as one released earlier this month by House Democrats, who said that about two million votes, or nearly 2 percent of the total, had not been counted.

More than eight months after Election Day, voting experts are still sorting through the aftermath of one of the closest presidential races ever. Yesterday's report is one of several expected in the next several weeks that will examine what went wrong and make recommendations to guide Congress and local governments as they seek to avoid the pitfalls of 2000.

While some analysts say time is running out to enact changes that could be in place by the elections in 2002, the bipartisan sponsors of a bill expected to be voted on in the House Science Committee this week are hoping the M.I.T.-Caltech study will give their bill new urgency. The bill would direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology, a federal laboratory, and state and local election officials to set new technical standards for voting equipment.

The academic study concluded that many of the mechanical and human problems experienced last November could be solved if counties eliminated punch cards and lever machines and bought optical-scan equipment, in which voters use pencils to fill in circles, as on standardized tests.

The best such optical-scan equipment, the study said, counts ballots at the precinct level and kicks them back to voters if they have been filled out incorrectly. Other studies have reached the same conclusion.

"The U.S. can lower the number of lost votes in 2004 by replacing punch cards and lever machines with optical scanning," the report said.
It also said counties needed to upgrade their voter registration systems, chiefly by consolidating their registration lists in single databases that are available by computer at each precinct. And it endorsed provisional ballots, which allow a voter to vote even if his registration is in question and to have the ballot counted later. Nineteen states now use provisional ballots.

Such changes in the nation's election system could cost about $400 million a year. The report said the nation's 3,000 counties spent $1 billion on election administration in 2000.

"We view the price of these reforms - $4 per voter per year - as insurance: insurance against problematic elections in the future, insurance that each vote will be counted," the report said.

The report was the result of a six-month examination of the nation's voting system by a team of computer scientists, mechanical engineers and social scientists from the two universities, the nation's premier technical institutes.

The goal of their continuing project, financed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, is to make recommendations about how computing technology can best be harnessed to improve elections.

No system is fool-proof, the scientists said. Jehoshua Bruck, an electrical engineer at Caltech, joked that the perfect system would read a voter's mind while she imagined a picture of the White House.

Short of that, Stephen Ansolabehere, a political scientist at M.I.T., acknowledged that so far, the two institutes had determined that one of the two best solutions was low-tech, the hand-counted paper ballot.

Just as reliable, the report said, are the optical-scan machines that count ballots at the precinct level and give voters a second chance if they make a mistake.

The scientists were skeptical of voting over the Internet. The Internet is too vulnerable to large-scale fraud, they said.
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I wasn't thinking about the danger of network security problems.

Although security issues are sadly neglected by too many users, I don't think there is generally much danger from computer security lapses with respect to surveys conducted online, and whatever there might be would be more of a nuisance than a serious compromise of respondents' privacy. Furthermore, I believe that the vast majority of researchers abide by stringent principles of confidentiality.

However, if you are conducting online surveys and were presented with a subpoena to turn over your records, including hard disks, backup tapes, etc., would you be able to guarantee that respondents could not be traced? To do so, at a minimum, you would have to run from your own
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I wasn't thinking about the danger of network security problems.

Although security issues are sadly neglected by too many users, I don't think there is generally much danger from computer security lapses with respect to surveys conducted online, and whatever there might be would be more of a nuisance than a serious compromise of respondents' privacy. Furthermore, I believe that the vast majority of researchers abide by stringent principles of confidentiality.

However, if you are conducting online surveys and were presented with a subpoena to turn over your records, including hard disks, backup tapes, etc., would you be able to guarantee that respondents could not be traced? To do so, at a minimum, you would have to run from your own
dedicated server connected directly to the Internet, and have it configured to regularly delete logs, reset time stamps both for files and within databases, purge all caches and possibly wipe disks using a high security algorithm. You would also have to make sure that such steps were taken before all system backups, which would leave your operation at enormous risk in case of technical problems.

This covers only some of the items under your own direct control. Respondents under suspicion would have to be at least as savvy to be able to cover their tracks at their end.

Contrast this with paper questionnaires, where one can easily place all identifying information on a single sheet that can be removed and destroyed before archiving the instruments, making it virtually impossible to trace respondents if related call record information sheets are also destroyed.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Reg_Baker@marketstrategies.com wrote:
> Confidentiality and anonymity are, of course, two fundamentally different things. Regardless, (and presuming that the real issue is holding survey responses confidential), the same techniques used to keep economic transaction information confidential can be used for survey information. To quote Gregory Rawlins in his book Slaves of the Machine, "Today's encryption technology could, if used widely enough, make us the last generation ever to have to fear for our privacy... if misued, it could make us the last generation with any notion of personal privacy at all." Judging from the flood of privacy policy statements in my mailbox these days I would say that the great privacy debate is already under way and that the direction is clear.
> The principle of respondent confidentiality is alive and well, even for Internet research. Let's stay clear of the word "impossible."
>
Reg Baker
www.ms-interactive.com

Jan Werner
<jwerner@jwdp.com> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> cc: Sent by: Subject: Internet privacy and survey research
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Please respond to
jwerner
The issue of Internet privacy is beginning to command serious attention in regard to marketing and similar abuses, and I believe that the "opt-out vs. opt-in" question, which means little to most people today, will soon become a major item in the public dialog.

I predict that this concern will accelerate as understanding of the privacy implications of Microsoft’s "Smart Tags" and "Hailstorm" technologies spreads beyond a small circle of computer experts now warning of the extraordinary potential for abuse in these and similar technologies.

But there is another aspect of Internet privacy that may be of greater import to most AAPOR members over the next few years, and that is the inability to guarantee respondent confidentiality in online surveys.

It is relatively easy to separate identifying materials from recorded survey instruments for paper surveys, and somewhat harder, but still feasible, to do the same for CATI surveys. But the electronic trail created by Internet transactions makes it impossible to promise anonymity to respondents who fill out a survey online, no matter how diligent the survey takers may be in attempting to provide confidentiality.

Under section II-D of the AAPOR Code of Ethics, this should pose serious concerns to anyone conducting surveys on sensitive topics.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com
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Hello,

It may be a little gauche to ask this so publically, but here goes...

Does anyone think there's a market for temporary, part-time work for a survey methodologist? I got my MA in survey methodology from Michigan and now I'm working on my PhD from Temple. Basically, I do a little bit of everything. The reason I'm looking is that I want to work on my studies full-time, and I'm just looking for work to fill in the gaps. I know there must be a market out there for part-time work because every office I've been in has had occasional periods where an extra pair of hands were needed. Plus the nature of this work is cyclical.

Anyone have any ideas on the subject?

Thanks,
Wendy Landers
wendylanders@hotmail.com
202-237-2432
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SENIOR RESEARCH POSITION AVAILABLE

The Washington, D.C. office of Knowledge Networks is seeking to fill the position of Director within the firm's Public Opinion, Public Policy and Political Research practice. The Director will be responsible for overall project management for all studies fulfilled by the practice. The Director will work closely and coordinate with Knowledge Networks' panel operations team to oversee the successful implementation of all research projects. The
Director will also work closely with the practice's Managing Director and clients to ensure that all survey work aligns with the client's project objectives. The Director will ensure that the projects fulfilled by the practice stay on schedule and are executed with the highest levels of quality. Often the Director will be responsible for delivering final project findings to clients, including preparation of topline and written reports, as well as presentations.

The Director will be the primary point of contact and first line of support for existing clients' project questions and inquiries. The Director will have at least one Research Analyst reporting to her/him and will be partially responsible for ensuring the professional growth of the Research Analysts within the practice.

Applicants must have at least a Master's Degree in the social sciences, public policy, survey research, statistics or a directly related field. Experience in designing, implementing and interpreting survey research projects is a must. Experience assisting in business development activities including the preparation of proposals, and supervision of professional staff would be a definite plus. Candidate must demonstrate excellent writing and oral communications skills.

Salary and full compensation package is commensurate with experience.

To apply, submit your resume and cover letter by e-mail, regular mail or fax. No telephone calls please.

E-mail: mbrossard@knowledgenetworks.com

Snail mail: Mario Brossard
Knowledge Networks
1522 K Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

Fax: (202) 289-9268

ABOUT KNOWLEDGE NETWORKS

Knowledge Networks is a Silicon Valley-based consumer research and opinion polling firm founded by two Stanford University Professors of Political Science who were dissatisfied with the current state of survey research. They developed a proprietary method of combining the multimedia power of Web interviewing with the science of probability sampling to offer our clients a richer, faster form of survey research that for the first time delivers valid, scientific data over the internet. Our clients include news media and entertainment companies, advertising agencies, product manufacturers, universities and polling firms among others.

Knowledge Networks is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

For more information about Knowledge Networks go to www.knowledgenetworks.com.

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Jul 17 12:52:55 2001
My web site has a personal account of a situation with striking similarities to what happened in Florida last year involving punch card ballots in the 1966 Georgia gubernatorial election (http://www.jwp.com/ga1966.html).

There is also a link there to a National Academy of Science report on voting that was published 13 years ago and that made many of the same points made by the Caltech/MIT report.

The full Caltech/MIT report and related materials can be obtained from http://vote.caltech.edu.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwp.com
15:01:48
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtp.lucky.net (smtp.lucky.net [193.193.193.117])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA05107 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Jul 2001 15:01:41 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ln1-211.users.lucky.net (ln1-211.users.lucky.net [193.193.195.211])
    by smtp.lucky.net (20001217) with ESMTP id 5905F2C710A
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001 01:01:38 +0300 (EEST)
Date: Wed, 18 Jul 2001 01:00:50 +0300
From: "Vladimir I. Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>
X-Mailer: The Bat! (v1.47 Halloween Edition) Personal
Reply-To: "Vladimir I. Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
Message-ID: <712267331.20010718010050@kmis.kiev.ua>
To: AAPOR Network <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Ukraine August 2001 Omnibus Wave
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

17 July 2001

Dear Colleagues,

Between July 31 and August 10 the Kiev International Institute of Sociology will conduct an omnibus-survey of the adult population of Ukraine (18+). A large part of the questionnaire is reserved for potential clients. We are inviting you to take part in this survey.

Enclosed you will find information about survey and about conditions of including your questions in the questionnaire;

We would be glad to cooperate with you.

For more information, write or call

Natalya Kharchenko, Deputy Director of KIIS

Office phone / fax: (380-44)-463-5868, 238-2567, 238-2568,
http://www.kiis.com.ua

E-mail: office@kiis.com.ua

Copy to: paniotto@kmis.Kiev.ua
khmelko@kiis-1.kiev.ua
omnlist@kiis.com.ua
The Survey Research Laboratory (SRL) of the University of Illinois has immediate openings in both its Champaign-Urbana and Chicago offices for a Visiting Project Coordinator to design, manage, and coordinate survey projects. Responsibilities include working with research investigators and staff on survey design, proposal development, budgeting, questionnaire development and programming, interviewer training, report writing, and data analysis.

Minimum Requirements: BA/BS in social sciences with demonstrated survey management experience. Familiarity with CASES programming language and SPSS/SAS a plus.

For full consideration, mail or fax a resume and cover letter outlining your qualifications no later than August 31, 2001 to:

Jennifer Parsons
University of Illinois at Chicago
Survey Research Laboratory (MC 336)
412 S. Peoria Street, 6th floor
Chicago, IL 60607
Fax: 312-996-3358

No phone calls please. For more information about SRL, please visit our web site at www.srl.uic.edu
Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay
kagay@nytimes.com

>From lees@gwu.edu Wed Jul 18 10:32:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
George Bishop et al. did this in multiple articles 15-20 years ago.

> ===== Original Message From Michael Kagay <kagay@nytimes.com> =====
> Greetings and all best wishes.
> 
> Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?
> 
> V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.
> 
> Do you know of any more recent examples?
> 
> It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.
> 
> And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.
> 
> If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.
> 
> Thanks for any tips.
What you may be thinking of is an experiment conducted by George Bishop at the University of Cincinnati in 1978 in which he asked respondents about the "Public Affairs Act of 1975."

The Washington Post repeated the experiment in 1995 using the same fictitious act. Rich Morin should be able to give you more details about their results.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Michael Kagay wrote:
>
> Greetings and all best wishes.
>
> Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?
>
> V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.
>

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It
could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have
any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years
or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this,
but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right.

We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay

kagay@nytimes.com

Bishop G.F. "Opinions on Fictitious Issues: The Pressure to Answer Survey
Questions" Public Opinion Quarterly 50:2:240-50 '86

Michael Kagay wrote:
Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay
kagay@nytimes.com

From smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu Wed Jul 18 10:53:55 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f6IHrsJ10208 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001
Bishop G.F. "Opinions on Fictitious Issues: The Pressure to Answer Survey Questions" Public Opinion Quarterly 50:2:240-50 '86

Michael Kagay wrote:

> Greetings and all best wishes.
> >
> > Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?
> >
> > V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act"
> > (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.
> >
> > Do you know of any more recent examples?
> >
> > It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.
And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right.

We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay

kagay@nytimes.com

Mike,

We routinely ask about a fictitious case when doing surveys related to jury selection and change of venue. You may call me at 619-594-2280 if this is what you're looking for.

Doug Coe
SDSU
Mike,<n>

We routinely ask about a fictitious case when doing surveys related to jury selection and change of venue. You may call me at 619-594-2280 if this is what you're looking for.<n>

Doug Coe

SDSU

---

Douglas S. Coe, Director

doug.coe@sdsu.edu

Social Science Research Laboratory

San Diego State University

San Diego, California 92182-4540

619-594-2280; fax: 619-594-1358

http://ssrl.sdsu.edu/
Mike,


George

P.S. The "Metallic Metals Act" tale, as Howard Schuman and Stan Presser (1981) observed, is (as far as we know) an undocumented anecdote in the lore of public opinion research.

At 01:00 PM 7/18/01 -0400, you wrote:
> Greetings and all best wishes.
> 
> Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?
> 
> V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.
> 
> Do you know of any more recent examples?
> 
> It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.
> 
> And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.
> 
> If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.
> 
> Thanks for any tips.
We sometimes include fictitious products or organizations when we are
surveying members of associations to assess their awareness of
association-provided products or competing associations. Most of the time
the percentage of respondents who claim to know of products that are not
offered ranges between 5% and 15%. In 1 environmental survey, 35% of
Floridians claimed to have heard of The Environmental Forum (fictitious).
We concluded that we had selected a fictitious name that was "too good."

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
lees
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2001 1:34 PM
To: aapornet; Michael Kagay
Subject: RE: Can Anyone Give an Example of a Poll....

George Bishop et al. did this in multiple articles 15-20 years ago.
V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported
that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act"
(or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people
were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It
could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have
any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years
or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this,
but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right.
We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay
kagay@nytimes.com

About 20 years ago, we had a name recognition item in the Carolina Poll
for various persons who had been mentioned as possible candidates for
governor. To test the noise level, Jane Brown and I put in a fictitious
character, "Phil Brown." Ten percent recognized him. The Greensboro Daily
News editorialized that, considering the quality of the real potential candidates, it was a shame that "good 'ol Phil Brown" didn't exist.

On Wed, 18 Jul 2001, Doug Coe wrote:

> Date: Wed, 18 Jul 2001 11:00:52 -0700
> From: Doug Coe <Doug.Coe@sdsu.edu>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Can Anyone Give an Example of a Poll....
> 
> Mike,
> 
> We routinely ask about a fictitious case when doing surveys related to jury selection and change of venue. You may call me at 619-594-2280 if this is what you're looking for.
> 
> Doug Coe
> SDSU
> 
> * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
>
> Douglas S. Coe, Director
doug.coe@sdsu.edu
> Social Science Research Laboratory
> San Diego State University
> San Diego, California 92182-4540
> 619-594-2280; fax: 619-594-1358
> http://ssrl.sdsu.edu
>
> --
> From wkay@mail.nih.gov Wed Jul 18 11:40:03 2001
> Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
>    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
>       id f6IIe3J20437 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001 11:40:03
> -0700 (PDT)
> Received: from ims.hub.nih.gov (ims.hub.nih.gov [128.231.90.111])
>    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
>       id LAA01323 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001 11:40:03 -0700 (PDT)
> Received: by ims.hub.nih.gov with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
>    id <3W8GPXAL>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001 14:40:03 -0400
> Message-ID: <D3B5A98CD201B445ACB41149384BACD2EEFD0A8@nihexchange5.nih.gov>
> From: "Kay, Ward (NIAAA)" <wkay@mail.nih.gov>
> To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Subject: RE: Can Anyone Give an Example of a Poll....
> Date: Wed, 18 Jul 2001 14:39:58 -0400
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
When I worked at a newspaper, we would add a fictitious columnist to the list of columnists. The 5% readership for the fictitious columnist seemed reasonable, but the Metro columnist with an 8% readership looked to be in trouble.

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Phillip Downs [SMTP:pd@kerr-downs.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2001 2:01 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: Can Anyone Give an Example of a Poll....
> 
> We sometimes include fictitious products or organizations when we are surveying members of associations to assess their awareness of association-provided products or competing associations. Most of the time the percentage of respondents who claim to know of products that are not offered ranges between 5% and 15%. In 1 environmental survey, 35% of Floridians claimed to have heard of The Environmental Forum (fictitious). We concluded that we had selected a fictitious name that was "too good."
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of lees
> Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2001 1:34 PM
> To: aapornet; Michael Kagay
> Subject: RE: Can Anyone Give an Example of a Poll....
> 
> George Bishop et al. did this in multiple articles 15-20 years ago.
> 
> >===== Original Message From Michael Kagay <kagay@nytimes.com> =====
> >Greetings and all best wishes.
> >
> >Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?
> >
> >V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.
> >
> >Do you know of any more recent examples?
> >
> >It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.
> >
> >And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.
> >
> >If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right.
> >We will gladly follow up and contact them.
> >
Mike,

Without knowing why you ask this, nor what you intend to do with such poll questions, let me suggest the following:

Such questions might be best analyzed in conjunction with their precise opposite, which also have a venerable tradition—as I know you know—in American public opinion research: Poll questions which ask respondents to judge something long part of reality *as if* it were still an idea or proposal or utopian ideal.

One early example of this, often repeated, are the poll questions which present parts of the Bill of Rights [first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution] to respondents as if they were recent proposals to Congress, and thus still the object of lively public debate.

I personally see the problems associated with asking hypothetical questions (and thus accessing respondents' imaginations) as the single greatest methodological obstacle confronting survey research today—and also its best current chance to make further major contributions to intellectual life and to democratic politics.

Indeed, this was the only real shortcoming I found in the Markle Foundation survey on the Internet—it too strongly required respondents to imagine their ideal Internets, in effect (something I've already discussed here on AAPORNET).
For what it's worth, I see the measurement and analysis of public opinion on things only vaguely imagined today as among the most urgent tasks that society currently demands of survey and market research and public opinion polling, and yet the one thing that we currently know least well how to do.

I wouldn't care so much, I'm sure, if I weren't myself on both sides of the problem: I would dearly love public surveys to be able to do this well, even while I myself have only the foggiest ideas about how to do it (I can, however, point to many actual examples of how I think this ought *not* to be done).

The image that survey research consists of rational interviewers reading rational questions to rational respondents has long outlived its intellectual supports, it seems to me. The rational development of statistics and statistical methods remains unchallenged, however, which I think only highlights our problem: Rational theories and techniques can be applied only to things we ourselves have developed to be rational (like arithmetic, probability theory, and statistical methods). They cannot, however, be directly extended to human thought, behavior or culture (the intellectual history of economics is largely the history of that discipline's gradually overcoming this very mistake).

The best solution, I think, would be to attempt to attract to survey research (and to AAPOR) more cognitive scientists, cognitive linguists, and cognitive ethnographers, not necessarily because their disciplines are better than any others, but rather because they best know the things we today most need to know—what's going on in that one thing that all of us survey researchers and analysts really care to know about: that black box we laughing call "the respondent's head."

I have much more to say—as always, I suppose you are thinking—but I am now receiving signals from deep inside my own black box that I have already strayed much too far from Mike Kagay's original question, and that it is time for me to stop.

-- Jim

On Wed, 18 Jul 2001, Michael Kagay wrote:

> Greetings and all best wishes.
>
> Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?
>
> V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.
>
> Do you know of any more recent examples?
>
> It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could
> be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have
> any information because it doesn't really exist.
>
> And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years
> or so would do.
>
> If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this,
> but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right.
> We will gladly follow up and contact them.
>
> Thanks for any tips.
>
> Cheers, - Mike Kagay
> kagay@nytimes.com

>From fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu Wed Jul 18 12:17:56 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f61JHujJ24606 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001
12:17:56 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu [130.39.19.63])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA02657 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001 12:17:55 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from c54386a ([24.4.42.222]) by pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (AIX4.3/UCB
8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id OAA16340 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001
14:03:48 -0500
Message-ID: <00b501c10fbd$f5a6a7e0$de2a0418@btnrug1.1a.home.com>
Reply-To: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>
From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <4.1.20010718123854.00935390@mail.nytimes.com>
Subject: Re: Can Anyone Give an Example of a Poll....
Date: Wed, 18 Jul 2001 14:15:03 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

The Institut fuer Demoskopie Allensbach (the oldest polling organization in
Germany) used to include that kind of question as a regular feature in their
monthly polls. If I recall right, they did it over several decades, and
they might still be doing it. Also, if I recall, very few respondents
claimed to know about the fictitious object.

Rick Weil

Frederick Weil
Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay
kagay@nytimes.com
In the past, (perhaps 10 years) I have included a fictitious name in our name
ID/opinion question to determine the level of false recognition.

We got about 10% - 15% But it does depend on the name.

The question begins "Here are the names of people who may or may not be known in
your area..."

Michael Kagay wrote:

> Greetings and all best wishes.
> 
> Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a
> polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked
> the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?
> 
> V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported
> that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act"
> (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people
> were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.
> 
> Do you know of any more recent examples?
> 
> It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could
> be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have
> any information because it doesn't really exist.
> 
> And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years
> or so would do.
> 
> If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this,
> but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right.
> We will gladly follow up and contact them.

> Thanks for any tips.
> 
> Cheers, - Mike Kagay
> 
> kagay@nytimes.com
Mike,

When I was teaching at Princeton, sometime in the mid-80s, I conducted a mail survey along with one of my graduate students, Wesley Shrum (you might remember him from our dinners at Stevenson Hall), to determine the interpersonal networks among scientists in a still small but growing field with a number of different specialties.

In order to measure precisely the actual interactions among various scientists, we needed information from each one in the survey about their various relations (not *all* relations, of course) with each other scientist in the field--in this way producing, in effect, two different views of the same objective interactions, or lack of interactions.

Included among the names we used were perhaps a half-dozen or more that Wes and I fabricated, while being careful to check that our synthetic names were not similar to those of actual scientists working in related areas, but not in our own sample.

Because we drew our inspiration for this approach from at least a few other published network studies at the time, I can't claim this technique was original to us--I'm sure that it was not.

What might interest you, Mike, in whatever you are doing, is that Wes and I did find considerable cheating among our respondents, even though all of them seemed to take our survey very seriously, and virtually all answered every last question in surprising detail.

I conclude that our unusually bright, well-educated, and well-motivated
respondents came to realize that participation in the larger professional network would only enhance their own reputations, while failure even to have heard of the names of some of the specialists we named (which was one of our questions) would identify their own selves as not central to the field.

In any event, almost all such "cheating"--as we were able to detect it--was in the direction of increased status, if you can imagine that.

This reminds me of one of the first examples in Darrell Huff's "How to Lie with Statistics": A British survey which asked respondents (among many other things, I would hope) how often they bathed produced a result which would have required each day, if true, all of the water consumed in Britain in a year (or some overestimate similarly amazing--I don't now have a copy of the book in my study). In short, we report that we bathe often because we know that we should, and wish that we did, and can even *imagine*--in our own minds--bathing more often than we in fact do.

I hope I don't overstay my welcome on AAPORNET by pointing out, yet again, that as I view your own category, Mike, of "a FICTITIOUS or an IMAGINARY entity," any question like "how often do you bathe?" is itself a fictitious one, by any reasonable understanding of "cognition," and for much the same reasons as is the question, say, "What where you doing last February 23, at precisely 10:17 pm, your own local time?" (as precise and factual as this might otherwise sound--the question as received is entirely imaginary and entirely fictitious, by any reasonable definition of these two terms, don't you think?).

This does *not* hold for the bath question, however, for any respondent who might say something like: "I bathe every Thursday and Sunday afternoon, from 3:25 to 4:15, no matter what." If most humans were like this one, survey research would be much easier, of course, but life itself would hardly be worth living--no more than the life of, say, "economic man," wouldn't you agree? (I've found that most economists immediately agree). Particle physicists do not have such problems, of course--lucky them.

I believe that Wes and I published our study in either a government or a general science or a network studies journal, or perhaps the proceedings of the conference at which we presented it, but I cannot recall the citation at this moment (and "Google" has just failed me, which means the study is not likely now available online, in any event).

Because the technique I described was not uncommon at the time--and might still be common, for all I know--you will undoubtedly find much more interesting examples than my own (should you be interested at all) from those who routinely conducted or still conduct network surveys--most of whom are only a local call away from the New York Times Building, or at least used to be.

Best of luck, at whatever you are up to, My Friend.

-- Jim

******
On Wed, 18 Jul 2001, Michael Kagay wrote:

> Greetings and all best wishes.
> > Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a
> > polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked
> > the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?
> >
> > V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported
> > that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act"
> > (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people
> > were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.
> >
> > Do you know of any more recent examples?
> >
> > It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could
> > be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have
> > any information because it doesn't really exist.
> >
> > And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years
> > or so would do.
> >
> > If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this,
> > but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right.
> > We will gladly follow up and contact them.
> >
> > Thanks for any tips.
> >
> > Cheers, - Mike Kagay
> > kagay@nytimes.com
>

>From dhalpern@bellsouth.net Wed Jul 18 14:11:28 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f61LBRRJ03436 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001
14:11:28 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from imf09bis.bellsouth.net (mail309.mail.bellsouth.net
[205.152.58.169])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA27780 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001 14:11:26 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from w5y0s9.bellsouth.net ([66.20.182.84])
    by imf09bis.bellsouth.net (InterMail vM.5.01.01.01 201-252-104)
    with ESMTP
    id <20010718211141.CTX25519.imf09bis.bellsouth.net@w5y0s9.bellsouth.net>;
    Wed, 18 Jul 2001 17:11:41 -0400
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20010718170817.029c8650@pop3.norton.antivirus>
X-Sender: dhalpern@mail.atl.bellsouth.net@pop3.norton.antivirus
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Wed, 18 Jul 2001 17:09:28 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>
Subject: VIRUS WARNING: Snowhite and the Seven Dwarfs - The REAL story!
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Hi.

If you get a message whose subject is "Snowhite and the Seven Dwarfs - The REAL story" don't open it. It is a virus. According to Norton AntiVirus, the attachment "midgets.zlq" is infected with the: "W95.Hybris.worm" virus. It isn't new. My antivirus program stopped it. It will cause all sorts of damage.

The body of the message reads:

>Today, Snowhite was turning 18. The 7 Dwarfs always where very educated and polite with Snowhite. When they go out work at mornign, they promissed a *huge* surprise. Snowhite was anxious. Suddlently, the door open, and the Seven Dwarfs enter...

Good luck,
Dick

--
POSITION AVAILABLE
Field Director
Survey Research Center

The Survey Research Center at the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville is seeking applicants for the 12-month position of field director.

RESPONSIBILITIES:
Manage day-to-day activities of ongoing surveys conducted via a variety of methods; work cooperatively to develop, plan, implement & monitor research designs including questionnaire designs; supervise all aspects of field projects including personnel; consult on stages of research design including sampling, data collection, and analysis; draft some proposals and many reports. Responsible for interfacing with Computing Services; managing personnel who oversee routine maintenance of PCs; assisting with other technical details, including CATI system management and some client interaction.

QUALIFICATIONS:
Requires a record of successfully implementing surveys or managing complex research projects. A BS/BA is required; a masters degree in progress or completed will be considered. Required are: an ability to assume multiple assignments, often under tight time frames; very good oral and written communications and an ability to write clear research reports for professional and public audiences; very good interpersonal skills; supervisory experience; experience with computers in a networked environment; some evening and weekend work. Desirable qualities include: Experience using a CATI system, e-mail and/or other web-based surveys, mail and/or in-person surveys, and/or focus groups; knowledge of sampling methods; strong background in social science research in general & survey methodology in particular or evaluation; knowledge/experience with SAS or SPSS or other statistical packages and data analysis; computer programming; experience with client interactions and/or client development.

Salary depends on academic preparation and professional experience. Starting date is negotiable. Start may be immediate, but no later than September 1, 2001. Review of applications will begin August 1 and continue until position is filled. Interested persons should send a resume, official college transcripts, & three letters of recommendation to: Molly Longstreth, Survey Research Center, University of Arkansas, HOTZ 123, Fayetteville, AR 72701. src@uark.edu. For more information please visit this web address: http://hr.uark.edu/employment/listingsjob.asp?ListingID=520.

The University of Arkansas is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer and applications will be accepted without regard to age, race, color, sex or national origin. Persons hired must have proof of legal authority to work in the United States.
POSITION AVAILABLE<br><br>Field Director<br>Survey Research Center<br><br>The Survey Research Center at the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville is seeking applicants for the 12-month position of field director.<br><br>RESPONSIBILITIES:<br>Manage day-to-day activities of ongoing surveys conducted via a variety of methods; work cooperatively to develop, plan, implement & monitor research designs including questionnaire designs; supervise all aspects of field projects including personnel; consult on stages of research design including sampling, data collection, and analysis; draft some proposals and many reports. Responsible for interfacing with Computing Services; managing personnel who oversee routine maintenance of PCs; assisting with other technical details, including CATI system management and some client interaction.<br><br>QUALIFICATIONS:<br>Requires a record of successfully implementing surveys or managing complex research projects. A BS/BA is required; a masters degree in progress or completed will be considered. Required are: an ability to assume multiple assignments, often under tight time frames; very good oral and written communications and an ability to write clear research reports for professional and public audiences; very good interpersonal skills; supervisory experience; experience with computers in a networked environment; some evening and weekend work. Desirable qualities include: Experience using a CATI system, e-mail and/or other web-based surveys, mail and/or in-person surveys, and/or focus groups; knowledge of sampling methods; strong background in social science research in general & survey methodology in particular or evaluation; knowledge/experience with SAS or SPSS or other statistical packages and data analysis; computer programming; experience with client interactions and/or client development. Salary depends on academic preparation and professional experience. Starting date is negotiable. Review of applications will begin August 1 and continue until position is filled. Interested persons should send a resume, official college transcripts, & three letters of recommendation to: Molly Longstreth, Survey Research Center, University of Arkansas, HOTZ 123, Fayetteville, AR 72701. For more information please visit this web address: http://hr.uark.edu/employment/listingsjob.asp?ListingID=3D520=eudora=3D"autourl"=3D520/</a>. The University of Arkansas is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer and applications will be accepted without regard to age, race, color, sex or national origin. Persons hired must have proof of
legal authority to work in the United States.

Molly Longstreth, Ph.D.
Director, Survey Research Center
University of Arkansas
HOTZ 123, Fayetteville, AR 72701

--=====================_26947748==_.ALT--

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Wed Jul 18 20:57:54 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6J3vrJ24487 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001
20:57:53 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from c001.snv.cp.net (c001-h017.c001.snv.cp.net [209.228.32.131])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id UAA01180 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Jul 2001 20:57:51 -0700 (PDT)
From: jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
Received: (cpmta 23277 invoked from network); 18 Jul 2001 20:57:21 -0700
Date: 18 Jul 2001 20:57:21 -0700
Message-ID: <20010719035721.23276.cpmta@c001.snv.cp.net>
X-Sent: 19 Jul 2001 03:57:21 GMT
Received: from [63.42.61.161] by mail.jpmurphy.com with HTTP;
    18 Jul 2001 20:57:21 PDT
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline
Mime-Version: 1.0
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer: Web Mail 3.9.3.5
Subject: Re: Can Anyone Give an Example of a Poll....
X-Sent-From: jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

I believe that some of the early research on prejudice asked respondents
about
a
non-existant group or nationality called the Walloonians (or something like
that) but
the studies are much more than ten years old.

On Wed, 18 July 2001, Michael Kagay wrote:

>  
> Greetings and all best wishes.
>
Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay
kagay@nytimes.com

Any assistance in finding survey instruments/items for research on usage, attitudes, preferences, or demand for complimentary or alternative medicine (CAM) would be greatly appreciated.

We already have the items that can be gleaned from Eisenberg et al.'s
Hi, Mike, and AAPOR folk:

I'll join the chorus. When I was doing the Observer Carolinas Poll in Charlotte in the 1980s (that's when the PTL Club/Jim Bakker news was hot), we asked name recognition of a number of religious leaders and religious groups, including...
the
"First Follower's Coalition," a name I made up. I don't recall the exact
percentages
but I think it was about 12%-15% said they knew about the group. That was
interesting, but what surprised me were the handful of respondents who had
not
heard
of fellow-North Carolinian Billy Graham!

Go figure.

You can check with the folks at the Observer if you want to track down the
details.

Good luck in your quest.

Rob

Robert P. Daves, director                       v: 612.673-7278
The Minnesota Poll                                 f:  612.673-4359
Star Tribune                                            e:
daves@startribune.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN  USA  55488

>>> Michael Kagay <kagay@nytimes.com> 07/18 11:00 AM >>>
Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a
polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked
the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported
that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act"
(or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people
were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It
could
be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have
any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years
or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this,
but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right.
We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay
kagay@nytimes.com
LAKE GEORGE, N.Y. -- The artist Martin Johnson Heade came here in 1862, checked into the finest hotel in what was already a bustling resort, strolled down to the shore and painted a scene that made it look as if he had trekked to the ragged edge of the frontier. The manicured lawns, colonnaded verandas and parasol-carrying ladies that were the hallmarks of Victorian-era tourism here were all carefully omitted. A soft bed awaited at the end of a day of arduous wilderness art.

Lake George is still like that: part jaw-dropping natural beauty, and part good old human hokum and winking deception on the other. It's a long-running formula that worked then and still works now.

"You don't get bored here," said Allen Croteau, a 41-year-old maintenance supervisor at a hospital in Boston, who was sitting with his daughter Kelsey, 6, outside the House of Frankenstein Wax Museum on a recent July day, a block from the lake. Behind them, skulls in the
museum's window display rose and fell like dancers in a macabre conga line as throngs of visitors streamed past. "There's restaurants, shops -- always something to do," Mr. Croteau said.

Like every other 19th-century tourist spot, from Atlantic City to Niagara Falls, Lake George is a human invention -- a deliberate construction of imagery and association that was born with the arrival of the first real American middle class in the early to mid-1800's. The lake's stunning vistas have been here for millennia, but what the place has come to be, through generations of American strivers, is a structure that was built piece by piece, and is still under construction today.

And the painters played a central role, helping forge a connection that exists to this day in tourism around the world. But it made its first appearance in the haunts of the Hudson River School: natural beauty as a commodity that could be bought, sold and consumed.

People could visit a place, and then they could hang pictures of it on their walls, and both were signs of having arrived. Over time, the artists themselves even became part of the landscape attractions that they were helping promote and create.

"Sighting live artists under their white umbrellas sketching in the countryside became an image to be collected on one's vacation, like spotting a moose or a rare fern," writes Rebecca Bedell, an assistant professor of art at Wellesley College, in her recently published book, "The Anatomy of Nature: Geology and American Landscape Painting, 1825-1875" (Princeton University Press).

But the 19th century had other obsessions that have been handed down here: the divisions of class and money. Although the resort began its life as a playground for the wealthy, the new, growing economy of the mid-1800's -- and the political philosophy of Jacksonian democracy that celebrated the common man -- gradually broadened the demographics of who could come here. Over time, two landscape art markets evolved as well, and part of what distinguished them was the old Lake George question of what was seen and not seen.

The rich, who bought oil paintings like Heade's, flattered themselves that they could read literary or historical allusions into Lake George art, and so they were generally happy to be deceived by having the tourist elements omitted, historians like Professor Bedell say.

The new middle classes, on the other hand, who could only afford engravings of the places that they visited, were still thrilled to be vacationing at all and wanted to be reminded of what they had experienced. So they bought art with the human trappings left in.

"The whole rise of landscape tourism is a facet of the growth of the urban middle class," said Kenneth Myers, an assistant curator at the Smithsonian Institution's Freer Gallery of Art in Washington. What had been the exclusive province of the moneyed classes was opening up -- a process that Dr. Myers called "the democratization of gentility."

It was a trend that was not to be stopped.
A Multicultural Haven

Dilip Kakkad came to the United States from his native India in 1974. A year later he came to Lake George. It's a story as old as Horatio Alger, and as deeply ingrained in many immigrant communities as a first high school prom or a first car: the American vacation.

Mr. Kakkad, 48, who owns a textile importing business and lives in Watchung, N.J., said he was lucky. Most immigrants he knows take 10 or 15 years to feel comfortable enough to take much time off. "Otherwise they're working Saturday and Sunday," he said.

This month, Mr. Kakkad and his wife, Indira, were introducing a visiting couple from India to the pleasures of Lake George. The men sat on one beachside bench, the women on the other.

"The way I see it, where in the world can you have a quiet holiday for this price?" Mr. Kakkad asked. "A 200-mile ride doesn't cost you much -- $20 gas -- and motels here are probably $50."

Lake George has worked hard to build exactly those kinds of associations.

"This is where you become an American," said Bob Flacke, the chief executive officer of the Fort William Henry Resort and Conference Center, which is descended from the hotel where Heade stayed in the 1860's. (The original Fort William Henry burned in 1909; the current incarnation prominently features a print of Heade's painting over the front desk.)

Mr. Flacke said that because of Lake George's historic links to New York City -- about 70 percent of guests at the Fort William Henry live in the metropolitan region -- the place has become an upstate echo of the multicultural changes that have occurred in places like Queens and New Jersey, which are major Lake George markets. "Here you see the Indian grandmother walking down the street complete with the sari -- she probably speaks no English; the daughter is half-and-half Americanized and her kids are all American," Mr. Flacke said.

But a phenomenon like that does not happen by itself. Fort William Henry, which owns two other hotels along with restaurants and shops and is one of the biggest employers in town, has deliberately cultivated the immigrant market.

The hotel advertises heavily in one of New York City's biggest Chinese-language daily newspapers, The World Journal. Fort William Henry also targets specific types of immigrants who are deemed the most likely to become Americanized, put down roots and spread the word about Lake George. Catholic Chinese, for example, who form a close-knit community in New York and are persecuted in China, have been singled out as Lake George material. An advertising campaign using the back of church bulletins was used to try and reach them. Other recent campaigns have been aimed at Afghan and Pakistani immigrants in New York.

The company also advertises Lake George to immigrant groups who are not quite economically or culturally ready. The idea is that by the time they reach the comfort level to take a vacation, Lake George will be the place they think of first.
"The Russians, the Vietnamese, the Bulgarians and the other Eastern Europeans are all five years out," said Sam Luciano, the resorts manager at Fort William Henry. "They'll evolve."

And now the multicultural arc of Lake George is extending beyond United States borders. In the last few years, hotels and restaurants have begun bringing in hundreds of foreign students to work the summer season. This year, local business owners estimate that as many as 500 students -- out of a total summer work force of perhaps 6,000 to 7,000 -- have been brought in from dozens of countries. They're getting, in many cases, their first taste of American life on these old shores.

Stas Tchernykh, 19, is working as a pool waiter at the Fort William Henry this summer. He has been struck, he said, by how much the lake reminds him of his native Siberia, in the area around Novisibirsk, where he is in college studying economics.

"Same trees, same grass -- when I go sit near the beach I start feeling I am in Russia still," he said.

Mr. Tchernykh conceded that there was no place back home quite like Lake George's Canada Street strip, where places like the House of Frankenstein and Alien Encounter, an extraterrestrial museum and research center, ply their trades. But, he said, only time will tell what happens in Russia.

"Tourism is just beginning," he said.

The contrasting elements of Lake George that would have been known to Heade -- scenic nature existing alongside often comic elements of human nature -- are more than just traits. They are ultimately part of the attraction that still brings people here.

Anthony Earls and his wife, Christine, who live near Saratoga Springs and who met at the electronics factory where they work, say that people-watching is the main reason to come. If they want real backwoods camping, which they also love, they will go farther north to Long Lake or Tupper Lake in the Adirondacks. Lake George, they say, is for the buzz, the carnival atmosphere, the silliness and especially the variety of people who can be seen just walking around looking back at them.

"We just love to watch people, and here you see all kinds," Mr. Earls said, holding his 11-week-old son, Nathan, on his shoulder.

And there are still quiet places, too.

Jeffrey A. George, a risk analyst at MetLife Auto and Home Insurance who lives in Taberg, about three hours west, was fishing one morning, not far from where his wife, Julie, and their two children were still asleep in their tent at the Adirondack Camping Village. He had not caught anything, he said, and did not care. The morning was too beautiful.

No Comment From a Monster

The old questions Heade also knew -- what is proper to reveal about Lake George or not -- are apparently also still alive and well.
Outside the House of Frankenstein, a ghoulish character in Frankenstein monster mask and three-inch black platform monster boots stood on the sidewalk, posing for pictures and giving a hideously deformed thumbs-up sign whenever a passer-by would call out his name. "Hey, Frank!" people say to him, over and over.

The general manager of the House of Frankenstein, David B. Stanton, refused to let a reporter interview the monster. "We want to maintain the mystique," Mr. Stanton said. "You wouldn't do a story about the character who plays Santa Claus, would you?"

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/07/19/nyregion/19HUDS.html
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>From jdfranz@earthlink.net Thu Jul 19 08:50:50 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6JFonJ03059 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001
08:50:49 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from scaup.mail.pas.earthlink.net (scaup.mail.pas.earthlink.net [207.217.121.49])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA08861 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001 08:50:50 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from earthlink.net (sdn-ar-020casfrMP112.dialsprint.net [158.252.248.114])
   by scaup.mail.pas.earthlink.net (EL-8_9_3_3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA15039;
   Thu, 19 Jul 2001 08:50:48 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <3B56FF3B.691CEC7F@earthlink.net>
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2001 08:39:39 -0700
From: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@earthlink.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.74 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Response Aggregation
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have a client who, in a series of ratings of various aspects of customer service, consistently rated slightly to somewhat better than competitors. None of the differences are statistically significant, however; the differences are too small.

Now this person is suggesting that if we somehow aggregated the ratings into one large measure of satisfaction, the statistical significance of the total could be tested, and it would be more likely to achieve a positive (i.e., statistically significant) result. Thus of course "proving" that this client is better than competitors.
Aside from the whole approach being somewhat suspect, I have never heard of such a procedure. Is there a legitimate way to do this?

>From dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com Thu Jul 19 08:58:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6JFwwJ03785 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001
08:58:58
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from kopl550145.db.smartrevenue.com (mail.smartrevenue.com
[164.109.30.90])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA14209 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001 08:58:58 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from danlaptop (cp150604-a.mtgmary1.md.home.com [65.1.244.88]) by
kopl550145.db.smartrevenue.com
    (Rockliffe SMTPRA 3.4.5) with SMTP id
<B0000098026@kopl550145.db.smartrevenue.com>
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001 11:55:02 -0400
Reply-To: <dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>
From: "Daniel B. Navarro" <dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Projectability question
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2001 11:59:49 -0400
Message-ID: <LPBBINMPOBMDJCBNLJGIEFFDDAA.dan.navarro@smartrevenue.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)
In-Reply-To: <LPBBINMPOBMDJCBNLJGIEFFCPAA.dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Dear Aapornet,

We are designing a sample for a major study of retail stores. However, we've been asked by the client to recommend some numbers for projectability. The inquiry is below.

>From the client:
"If instead of working with consumers we were polling store managers or reporting on various in-store practices, how many responses or reports would we have to deliver to be able to project the results chainwide for the following retailers, given their total store counts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retailer</th>
<th>Stores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wal Mart Super Centers</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal Mart Stores</td>
<td>1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kmart</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staples</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walgreens</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVS</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is there some rule of thumb to apply to this? What might we have to do to make regional breakouts valid as well?"

Any advice would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,
Dan

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Daniel B. Navarro
Director, Project Management and Operations
SmartRevenue.com
Tel:  301-424-4146
Fax:  240-465-0572
Web:  www.smartrevenue.com

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Thu Jul 19 09:36:30 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6JGaUJ08975 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001
09:36:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA11665 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001 09:36:31 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (garnet3-fi.acns.fsu.edu [192.168.197.3])
   by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA13588
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001 12:36:31 -0400
Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial1332.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.38.47])
   by garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id MAA36032
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001 12:36:28 -0400
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2001 12:36:28 -0400
Message-Id: <200107191636.MAA36032@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Can Anyone Give an Example of a Poll....

This was cited in Gordon Allport's 1954 book, "The Nature of Prejudice." Allport may have done this one himself. But it is older than 10 years.

Susan

At 08:57 PM 7/18/2001 -0700, you wrote:
> I believe that some of the early research on prejudice asked respondents about a non-existant group or nationality called the Wallooinians (or something like that) but the studies are much more than ten years old.
>
> On Wed, 18 July 2001, Michael Kagay wrote:
> 
>>
>> Greetings and all best wishes.
Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay

kagay@nytimes.com

Susan Carol Losh, PhD
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776
(1) Opening: Associate Director for Research Development and Surveys. Odum Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Responsibilities: (1) Coordinator of survey research, involving acquisition of survey contracts and grants, supervision of staff, writing-up results, and teaching short courses and consulting with faculty and graduate students and (2) Coordinator of External Funding activities, involving development of Odum Institute proposals and assisting faculty and graduate students with proposal development.

Full description at: www.odum.unc.edu

Application deadline: August 31, 2001

(2) Opening: Statistical Analyst, Odum Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Major functions: (1) high-level statistical consultant, (2) teach short courses in logistic or probit regression, structural equation models, meta-analysis, test theory, econometric techniques, longitudinal analysis, outlier diagnostics, resampling techniques, social network analysis, spatial analysis or other new methods in social science research, (3) consultant on analytical issues in spatial analysis.

Full description at www.odum.unc.edu
Application deadline: August 31, 2001

>From jbeverly@gte.net Thu Jul 19 12:44:23 2001
Fellow AAPORNETers,

For a global violence-prevention program I am seeking measures of peacefulness. Surely, this will not be as illusive as peace! Rather than grapple with this independently, I'm requesting ideas and leads to previous studies from this august body of researchers.

More specifically, can anyone direct me to:

1) studies or measures regarding violence in schools; more than number of guns or knives brought into the school, but such civilities as increased inter-racial and inter-ethnic cross-overs in the lunchroom

2) measures of a civil society; changes in crime statistics are quite commonly used as measures, but what makes a society more gentle, kind, and tolerant, in other words more CIVIL?

Any ideas, thoughts, or leads to studies will be appreciated.

Beverly A. Jensen, Ph.D.
Virtues Project International
Fellow AAPORNETers,

For a global violence-prevention program I am seeking measures of peacefulness. Surely, this will not be as illusive as peace! Rather than grapple with this independently, I'm requesting ideas and leads to previous studies from this august body of researchers.

More specifically, can anyone direct me to:

1. studies or measures regarding violence in schools; more than number of guns or knives brought into the school, but such civilities as increased inter-racial and inter-ethnic cross-overs in the lunchroom

2. measures of a civil society; changes in crime statistics are quite commonly used as measures, but what makes a society more gentle, kind, and tolerant, in other words more CIVIL?

Any ideas, thoughts, or leads to studies will be appreciated.

Beverly A. Jensen, Ph.D.
Virtues Project International

---

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jul 19 18:13:25 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f6K1DPJ13674 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001 18:13:25 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id SAA17111 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Jul 2001 18:13:24 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
Although the comScore research here lacks such essentials as frame, random selection, and thus all possibility of inference to larger populations, just imagine what we might learn when cognitive subcultures (or subcultural cognitions--take your pick) are linked to other traditional survey variables. We are not *asking* people about their cultural tastes here, keep in mind--we are following them around on the Web, recording their every move, the one exception being "pornographic" sites--comScore does *not* track porno visits (why not, I can't imagine). Or, as UPI National Correspondent Steve Sailer puts it below, "All of these participants are volunteers who allow their behavior to be recorded in return for comScore accelerating their downloads--comScore guarantees their anonymity" (a charitable gesture, to be sure, with no human subjects committee in sight). In reading this most fascinating wire service copy, much of the very earliest and pioneering American sociology flashed before my eyes. Is marketing research via the Internet about to take us all back again to such timeless questions as, say, how to tell whether our neighbors vote Democrat or Republican, based on the stuff they have on display in the picture window of their living room? ["picture window," something found virtually nowhere outside of the continental United States, entered the English language in 1938, just a few months before the birth of American sociology]. Can you even begin to imagine what Lester Frank Ward and William Graham Sumner might have accomplished, if only they had been able to accelerate people's downloads? Me neither, me neither.

-- Jim


Tuesday, 17 July 2001 13:29 (ET)

ANALYSIS: THE WEB'S TRUE DIGITAL DIVIDE

By STEVE SAILER, UPI National Correspondent
LOS ANGELES, July 17, (UPI) -- The much-discussed "digital divide" in Internet access is closing steadily. Yet a spectacularly detailed new source of data on what sites Web surfers visit suggests that a chasm remains between how the highly educated and the less educated use the Internet.

This implies that the Internet will never provide a magical cure for economic inequality, and may in fact widen the gap.

The ambitious Internet marketing researcher comScore automatically collects complete Internet usage data -- both sites surfed and online buying -- from 1.5 million Web-connected PCs each month. These are split among home, work, university and international users.

All of these participants are volunteers who allow their behavior to be recorded in return for comScore accelerating their downloads. comScore guarantees their anonymity.

The comScore database is designed to help corporate advertisers. Chairman Gian Fulgoni, former CEO of marketing research giant Information Resources Inc., lauds his database as "the 'Holy Grail' that Internet executives and marketers have been waiting for." Yet, it also offers the analyst of social trends and patterns a trove of data on what interests different kinds of people.

Chicago-based comScore compiles demographic profiles of the visitors to the 5,000 most popular Web domains (not counting pornographic sites, which comScore does not track).

The data are remarkably sensitive and can pinpoint seemingly obscure interests.

For example, it can identify those Web sites whose audiences are most tilted toward Asian-Americans. Many will be surprised to learn that, leaving aside domains specifically aimed at immigrants or Asians, the most Asian-oriented general interest site is StreetRacing.org. Its visitors are 25.1 percent Asian-Americans, even though Asians make up only 4.6 percent of online Americans.

Other hot-rod Web sites with audiences that are highly Asian include SuperCars.net, Acura.com and OverBoost.com.

Because the American media pay little attention to young Asian-Americans, their fascination with modifying mundane four-cylinder Japanese imports into what they affectionately call "rice rockets" was completely off the media's radar, until the movie "The Fast and the Furious" became a surprise hit last month. And even in the movie, the Asian characters were relegated to being the bad guys.

In contrast to the flamboyant tastes of traditional hot rodders, Asian-American preferences are so understated and refined that it's been easy to overlook this entire social phenomenon. For example, a 20-year-old Japanese-American fellow who lives across the street from me has a compact Acura sports coupe with $15,000 worth of modifications, including a nitrous oxide injection system. Still, if he hadn't gone over the upgrades with me, I probably never would have noticed there was
anything unusual about his car.

Yet, this quiet hobby jumps out from the comScore data.

Because the media cover African-American avocations much more avidly than Asian-American interests, the Web sites with the largest shares of visitors who are black are more predictable. For instance, highly black-skewed domains include NBA.com, Bible.com, Foot Locker.com and child rappers' sites LilBowWow.com and LilRomeo.com.

The comScore database is so large that it can also identify those Web sites that least interest blacks. Out of 5,000 Web sites, the 10 where blacks make up the smallest share of the audience: LLBean.com (clothes for the Puritans' descendants, whether genealogical or psychological); USGA.org (the blue-blooded United States Golf Association); CountryStars.com.

Also, RedSox.com (the Boston Red Sox baseball team -- very few blacks visit any baseball Web sites); HarleyDavidson.com (motorcycles); GoCampingAmerica.com; Metallica.com (a metal rock band); NASCAR.com (stock car racing); TheRainForestSite.com; and AKC.org (American Kennel Club).

To validate the representativeness of these 1.5 million computers that comScore tracks, the firm interviews 1,000 random American households per week about whether they are online. Its latest surveys find the gap between blacks and whites is rapidly vanishing due to three times faster growth among African-Americans. Today, 51 percent of black households are online, vs. 59 percent of white households. (Overall, 58 percent of American households have an Internet connection.)

Further, less rich Americans are closing the gap with the affluent, largely because the wealthier segment is now almost saturated. Among those making over $75,000, 83 percent are already online. And so is 74 percent of the $50,000 to $75,000 group. Yet, even among those making under $25,000, 36 percent are now on the Web. And that segment grew 28 percent in the last year.

Among those over age 55, 37 percent are now using the Internet, and they make up the fastest-growing segment.

Yet, a more detailed comparison of the Web surfing habits of Americans from different realms of society suggests that hooking everybody to the Web will not mean that all Web surfers will soon be created equal. Adding the other 42 percent of households to the Web will only increase the number who don't use it to make money.

By sorting the top 5,000 domains in order of the educational level of their American visitors, what jumps out is that the people with the least education seem to have the most fun on the Web.

The six Web sites most oriented toward people who have never been to college are ZapSpot.com, FunFlat.com, HaHaSoFunny.com, TiggysRibTicklers.com, ReflectiveGreetings.com and BingoFun.com.

In contrast, the six most skewed toward the highly educated include three legal sites (WestLaw.com, Lexis.com, and Martindale.com), a textbook
publisher (Reed-Elsevier.com), the Chronicle of Higher Education trade journal (Chronicle.com), and a Chinese business portal (Sina.com).

It appears that the less-educated use the Web to amuse themselves and their friends. In contrast, the well-educated use the Web as part of their careers.

CastleMountains.net ("Your source for the best free greetings!") is a representative example of a downscale site. This distributor of whimsical virtual gewgaws that your e-mail buddies might get a kick out of comes in as 10th most popular among households with no more than a high school education. Further, it winds up dead last out of 5,000 sites among households headed by holders of grad degrees and among households with over $100,000 in income.

WestLaw.com, however, the site with the most educated audience, features this announcement under "what's new": "KeyCite Notes -- view cases and other sources, with citations counts, that cite a case for a particular legal issue." Whew, who wouldn't want to get an e-mail from his best friend with that included in it?

After my wife and I spent 15 enjoyable minutes at CastleMountains.net looking at pictures of cute babies and funny monkeys and trying to answer riddles about fruit ("Q. Why did the melon get married in a church? A. She can't elope!") she said, "Maybe people with graduate degrees just don't know about these sites."

Or perhaps they are too busy at grinding away at other post-grad skewing domains such as BarChart.com, Senate.gov, UN.org, Law.com, FindLaw.com, and USLegalForms.com. There are quite a few sites in the Grad Degree 100 devoted to making business travel reservations and quite a few for users of electronic organizers. Even the rare sports site is not too pulse-quickening: for example, Cricket.com and NCAABaseball.com.

For pure reading excitement, though, I must give a plug to No. 64 on the Grad Degree 5,000, VNY.com (Virtual New York), where you can always find the latest United Press International stories.

The serious press will be amazed to learn that No. 53 in terms of best-educated audience is Matt Drudge's political tabloid DrudgeReport.com. Establishment journalists love to look down their noses at Drudge for breaking the Monica Lewinsky story and for his addiction to headlines about vicious animals eating people. Yet, venerable mainstream magazine Time.com ranks only No. 1,208 for most-schooled readers.

The serious point, though, is that connecting everybody to the Web isn't going to reduce economic inequality.

Putting all the information in the world at everybody's fingertips most benefits those who have a knack for digesting and efficiently making sense of information. From the comScore data, it appears that people with the brainpower and the self-discipline to make it through many years of schooling are using the Web to make money, while those who didn't like school are using it to enjoy themselves and stay in touch with pals. Those are by no means bad uses.

Yet, as an economic tool, the Web most helps those who could already
Wallonians do exist. In Belgium there are two groups Flemish who speak Flemish- Dutch) and Wallonians, who speak French. Historically these two groups were opposed. By the way Wallonians make jokes about the French, the French about Wallonians, the Dutch about Flemish and the Flemish about Dutch (how was copper wire invented? two Dutch fighting over a penny!)

Happy holidays from Amsterdam, Holland,

Edith
On Wed, 18 July 2001, Michael Kagay wrote:

Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollieter who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right.

We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay

kagay@nytimes.com

Susan Carol Losh, PhD
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97
e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

If that's all you ask,
My Sweetest, My Featest, Compleatest, And Neatest
I'm proud of the Task!

>From edithl@xs4all.nl Fri Jul 20 02:55:55 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6K9tsJ08744 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001
02:55:54 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtp9.xs4all.nl (smtp9.xs4all.nl [194.109.127.135])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id CAA00811 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 02:55:56 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from hera.xs4all.nl (s340-isdn356.dial.xs4all.nl [194.109.181.100])
    by smtp9.xs4all.nl (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAAl1527
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 11:55:03 +0200 (CEST)
Message-Id: <5.0.2.1.2.20010720113955.01b67120@pop.xs4all.nl>
X-Sender: edithl@pop.xs4all.nl
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2
Date: Fri, 20 Jul 2001 11:48:04 +0200
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@xs4all.nl>
Subject: Re: Response Aggregation
In-Reply-To: <3B56FF3B.691CEC7F@earthlink.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Dear jennifer,

If you look at psychology and psychological measurement, they often use multiple question to measure one underlying concept. For instance five questions on satisfaction (satisfaction in general, satisfaction with housing, with health, with income, etc) Each question of course is measured with a certain amount of measurement error. If the error is uncorrelated, combining the questions gives a more reliable estimate of the underlying concept. Usually in psychology, one first checks whether you are allowed to combine the questions. That is do all questions measure the same concept (one underlying factor, check with for instance factor analysis), do the questions hang reliably together (SPSS reliability) etc. If so, the questions are combined into one overall score (for instance a sum score), which is used in further analysis.

The above is a simple manner that can easily be done with for instance Spss or other packages and standard statistical knowledge. There are more sophisticated psychometric methods, but they need special software and knowledge about psychometrics.

Good luck, Edith

At 08:39 AM 7/19/01 -0700, you wrote:
> I have a client who, in a series of ratings of various aspects of
customer service, consistently rated slightly to somewhat better than
competitors. None of the differences are statistically significant,
however; the differences are too small.
>
Now this person is suggesting that if we somehow aggregated the ratings into one large measure of satisfaction, the statistical significance of the total could be tested, and it would be more likely to achieve a positive (i.e., statistically significant) result. Thus of course "proving" that this client is better than competitors.

Aside from the whole approach being somewhat suspect, I have never heard of such a procedure. Is there a legitimate way to do this?

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97
e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl
-----------------------------------------------------------
If that's all you ask,
My Sweetest, My Featest, Compleatest, And Neatest
I'm proud of the Task!

>From gauthier@circum.com Fri Jul 20 02:55:56 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f6K9ttJ08754 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 02:55:55
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from VL-MS-MR002.scl.videotron.ca (relais.videotron.ca [24.201.245.36])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id CAA00822 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 02:55:57 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from benoit ([24.200.5.172]) by
  VL-MS-MR002.scl.videotron.ca (Netscape Messaging Server 4.15)
  with SMTP id GGRNJ902.506 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 05:54:45 -0400
Message-ID: <004e01c11102$8ead1880$0201a8c0@VIDEOTRON.CA>
From: "Benoit Gauthier" <gauthier@circum.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <3B56FF3B.691CEC7F@earthlink.net>
Subject: Re: Response Aggregation
Date: Fri, 20 Jul 2001 05:58:42 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4522.1200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4522.1200
(2001.07.20, 05:56)

Now this person is suggesting that if we somehow aggregated the ratings into one large measure of satisfaction, the statistical significance of the total could be tested, and it would be more likely to achieve a positive (i.e., statistically significant) result. Thus of course "proving" that this client is better than competitors.
Aside from the whole approach being somewhat suspect, I have never heard
of such a procedure. Is there a legitimate way to do this?

If you can empirically demonstrate (factor analysis, alpha coefficient, latent trait, etc.) that the individual ratings actually constitute components of a larger attitude (satisfaction), it is fine to aggregate them numerically. This assumes that the math of it is appropriate (i.e., right level of measurement).

Benoît Gauthier, mailto:gauthier@circum.com
Rêseau Circum inc. / Circum Network Inc.

Enregistrez votre adresse e-mail pour être informé des nouvelles de Circum à l’URL http://circum.com

Register your e-mail to be informed of Circum news at http://circum.com

74, rue du Val-Perché, Hull, Québec (Canada) J8Z 2A6
+1 819.770.2423 téléc. fax: +1 819.770.5196

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

> From smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu Fri Jul 20 05:10:44 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6KCAiJ15721 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001
  05:10:44 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu
    [128.135.45.28])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id FAA02477 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 05:10:45 -0700
(PDT)
From: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])
    by genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id HAA29720;
    Fri, 20 Jul 2001 07:07:46 -0500
Received: from ccMail by norcmail.uchicago.edu (ccMail Link to SMTP
R8.30.00.7)
    id AA995631323; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 07:15:25 -0500
Message-Id: <0107209956.AA995631323@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.30.00.7
Date: Fri, 20 Jul 2001 07:15:20 -0500
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Response Aggregation
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

Depending on how this is done, it can be very legitimate as a form of meta analysis.
I have a client who, in a series of ratings of various aspects of customer service, consistently rated slightly to somewhat better than competitors. None of the differences are statistically significant, however; the differences are too small.

Now this person is suggesting that if we somehow aggregated the ratings into one large measure of satisfaction, the statistical significance of the total could be tested, and it would be more likely to achieve a positive (i.e., statistically significant) result. Thus of course "proving" that this client is better than competitors.

Aside from the whole approach being somewhat suspect, I have never heard of such a procedure. Is there a legitimate way to do this?

One of our clients just decided to "internationalize" a consumer based study
by broadening the sample to Western Europe and Southeast Asia. We have both email addresses and phone numbers (Europe only) of potential respondents. Where can I find information about general response rates in these regions compared those in the US? Are surveys more accepted in Europe and Asia than here? Any words of advice?

Also, does anyone know of a reputable sampling company that has RDD for Asia (the company with whom we're working only has RDD for Europe).

Thanks,
Dan

-------------------
Daniel B. Navarro
Director, Project Management and Operations
SmartRevenue.com
Tel:  301-424-4146
Fax:  240-465-0572
Web:  www.smartrevenue.com

>From richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu Fri Jul 20 06:50:48 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6KDomJ20863 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001
   06:50:48 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ropercenter.uconn.edu (mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu [137.99.36.157])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA01353 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 06:50:50 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from richard-nt (d37h91.public.uconn.edu [137.99.37.91])
   by ropercenter.uconn.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA14312
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 09:48:06 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.20010720095322.00a5f200@mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu>
X-Sender: richard@mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Fri, 20 Jul 2001 09:53:22 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Richard C. Rockwell" <richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu>
Subject: Re: Complimentary and Alternative Medicine survey items
In-Reply-To: <OF6DAFC2A6.685E7597-ON86256A8E.00465A64@fhsu.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Many items on alternative medicine are accessible in the Roper Center collection of questions. You can get to this database by going through the kaisernetwork.org Web site and clicking on Health Poll Search. kaisernetwork.org is a generally useful site beyond Health Poll Search; go to http://www.kaisernetwork.org/index.cfm and look at the lists of conferences, news briefings, ad watch, etc., all of which may also be relevant from time to time.

You will probably need to use the Advanced Search option rather than the pre-selected topics to fully mine this database. However, if you go to the topic Nutrition and Exercise, click "display subtopics," and click
"vitamins," you will (currently) find 146 questions, many of which are relevant.

Here are the "view selection" results for the first question in this collection:

1. Wirthlin Quorum Poll [July 2000]

(Many people take vitamins and minerals, herbal remedies, and nutritional supplements, on a regular basis safely and confidently. But others have expressed concerns about the risks of taking them.) Please tell me whether you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned about... the safety of the ingredients.

\[\begin{array}{l|l}
\text{%} & \text{Response} \\
50 & \text{Very concerned} \\
28 & \text{Somewhat concerned} \\
12 & \text{Not too concerned} \\
10 & \text{Not at all concerned} \\
\ast & \text{Don't know/Refused} \\
\end{array}\]

Notes: * = less than .5 percent

Topics: Health Mood Nutrition Consumer

Methodology
Survey firm: Wirthlin Worldwide
Field Dates: Jul 20, 2000 to Jul 24, 2000
Interview Method: Telephone
Sample: National adult
Sample Size: 1012
[USWIRTH.00JUL.R8B]

Data provided by The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT

Using Advanced Search, I found 32 questions that employ the term "alternative medicine," but there are surely many more questions that are relevant that happen not to use that term (look also at holistic medicine, herbal remedies, homeopathy, meditation, etc., using Advanced Search)

At 07:56 AM 7/19/01 -0500, you wrote:
>Any assistance in finding survey instruments/items for research on usage, attitudes, preferences, or demand for complimentary or alternative medicine (CAM) would be greatly appreciated.
>
>We already have the items that can be gleaned from Eisenberg et al.'s (1993) "Unconventional Medicine in the United States." New England Journal of Medicine. pp. 246-252.
>
>Would anyone recommend other sources?
>
>Thanks.
>
>Brett Zollinger
>Director, University Center for Survey Research
>Docking Institute of Public Affairs
>785-628-5881
** Reply Requested When Convenient **

If you assume that there is an underlying construct, one can use structural equation modeling to perform a multi-group analysis. First, you would constrain the means to be equal across groups and then free the constraint and perform a chi-sq. difference test to see if the means are, in fact, different across groups.

At 08:39 AM 7/19/01 -0700, you wrote:
>I have a client who, in a series of ratings of various aspects of customer service, consistently rated slightly better than competitors. None of the differences are statistically significant, however; the differences are too small.
>
Now this person is suggesting that if we somehow aggregated the ratings into one large measure of satisfaction, the statistical significance of the total could be tested, and it would be more likely to achieve a positive (i.e., statistically significant) result. Thus of course "proving" that this client is better than competitors.

Aside from the whole approach being somewhat suspect, I have never heard of such a procedure. Is there a legitimate way to do this?

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
tel + 31 20 622 34 38  fax + 31 20 330 25 97
e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

If that's all you ask,
My Sweetest, My Featest, Compleatest, And Neatest
I'm proud of the Task!

Greetings--
Does anyone know of lit or ongoing research related to information-education campaigns/programs (or communication patterns in general) among Hmong populations in the U.S.? Or among any other smaller populations?

The specific issue here involves designing and evaluating programs aimed at maternal child and health care.

Thanks in advance for any assistance --

Garrett O'Keefe
Greetings--

Does anyone know of lit or ongoing research on information-education campaigns/programs (or communication patterns in general) among Hmong populations in the U.S.? Or on any other smaller populations?

The specific issue here involves designing and evaluating programs aimed at maternal child and health care.

Thanks in advance for any assistance --

Garrett O'

begin:vcard
n:;
tel;cell:608.345.4703
tel;fax:970.491.2908
tel;home:970.225.9915
tel;work:970.491.3703
x-mozilla-html:FALSE
org:Colorado State University;Journalism and Technical Communication
version:2.1
e-mail:internet:gjokeefe@lamar.colostate.edu
title:Professor and Chair
adr;quoted-printable;;C-225 Clark Building=0D=0A;Fort Collins;Colorado;80523;USA
fn:Garrett O'Keefe
end:vcard

--------------------------8C6DCDA765F23980762B0A47A--

> From Worc@mori.com Fri Jul 20 11:20:04 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
Hi Mike

I've always thought the Metallic Metals Act was in Don Rugg's thesis in =
about 1938 when he had Hadley Cantrill as his tutor at Princeton. He found =
that 38% had a view.

Harry, is this true? John robinson's another who might know for sure.

Anyway, I used it in a lecture just yesterday at the University of =
Bradford, at the Management Centre Seminar, after receiving an honorary =
degree there in the morning.

We traditionally used our college (Sir) Stewart Lewis (not really a Sir) =
in our lists of impressive captains of industry, and he always gets a few =
points.

And in 'what does this company make' type questions using show cards, we =
always got about ten percent who guesses that ICI (the largest British =
industrial company) makes bicycles and electric turbines, neither of which =
they do.

Cheers

Bob

Robert M. Worcester
Chairman, MORI
32 Old Queen Street
London SW1H 9HP
(44)207 222 0232 Tel
(44)207 227 0404 Fax
worc@mori.com

>>> daves@startribune.com 19/07/01 16:02:43 >>>
Hi, Mike, and AAPOR folk:

I'll join the chorus. When I was doing the Observer Carolinas Poll in =
Charlotte in the 1980s (that's when the PTL Club/Jim Bakker news was hot), =
we asked name recognition of a number of religious leaders and religious =
groups, including the "First Follower's Coalition," a name I made up. I =
don't recall the exact percentages but I think it was about 12%-15% said =
they knew about the group. That was interesting, but what surprised me =
were the handful of respondents who had not heard of fellow-North =
Carolinian Billy Graham!

Go figure.

You can check with the folks at the Observer if you want to track down the =
details.

Good luck in your quest.

Rob=20

Robert P. Daves, director v: 612.673-7278
The Minnesota Poll f: 612.673-4359
The Tribune e: daves@startribun=
e.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488
Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay
kagay@nytimes.com
University of Bradford, at the Management Centre Seminar, after receiving an honorary degree there in the morning.

We traditionally used our colleague (Sir) Stewart Lewis (not really a Sir) in our lists of impressive captains of industry, and he always gets a few points.

And in 'what does this company make' type questions using show cards, we always got about ten percent who guesses that ICI (the largest British industrial company) makes bicycles and electric turbines, neither of which they do.

Cheers

Bob

Robert M. Worcester
Chairman, MORI
32 Old Queen Street
London SW1H 9HP
(44)207 222 0232 Tel
(44)207 227 0404 Fax
worc@mori.com

Hi, Mike, and AAPOR folk:

I'll join the chorus. When I was doing the Observer Carolinas Poll in Charlotte in the 1980s (that's when the PTL Club/Jim Bakker news was hot), we asked name recognition of a number of religious leaders and religious groups, including the "First Follower's Coalition," a name I made up. I don't recall the exact percentages but I think it was about 12%-15% said they knew about the group. That was interesting, but what surprised me were the handful of respondents who had not heard of fellow-North Carolinian Billy Graham!

Go figure.

You can check with the folks at the Observer if you want to track down the details.

Good luck in your quest.

Rob

Robert P. Daves, director
v: 612.673-7278
f: 612.673-4359

The Minnesota Poll

Star Tribune
Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity? V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples? It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist. And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do. If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thank you for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike

kagay@nytimes.com

---_E2B88CB7.C3A2C598--

---_E2B88CB7.CCADCA97
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="Worc.vcf"

BEGIN:VCARD
VERSION:2.1
X-GWTYPE:USER
FN:Bob Worcester
ORG:;CO
EMAIL;WORK;PREF;NGW:Bob.Worcester@mori.com
N:Worcester;Bob
TITLE:Chairman
X-GWUSERID:RMW
END:VCARD

BEGIN:VCARD
VERSION:2.1
X-GWTYPE:USER
FN:Bob Worcester
---_E2B88CB7.CCADCA97--

From smithh@norcmail.uchicago.edu Fri Jul 20 11:33:15 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6KIXEJ04198 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001
11:33:14
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu
[128.135.45.28])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA05898 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 11:33:16 -0700
(PDT)
From: smithh@norcmail.uchicago.edu
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])
    by genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id NAA01157;
Fri, 20 Jul 2001 13:30:17 -0500
Received: from ccMail by norcmail.uchicago.edu (ccMail Link to SMTP
R8.30.00.7)
    id AA995654274; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 13:37:55 -0500
Message-Id: <0107209956.AA995654274@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.30.00.7
Date: Fri, 20 Jul 2001 13:37:50 -0500
To: <daves@startribune.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re[2]: Can Anyone Give an Example of a Poll....
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="simple boundary"

--simple boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

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

Disclaimer

This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the
individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented are
solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of
MORI Limited.

If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have
received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination,
forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly
prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please either
notify the MORI Systems Helpdesk by telephone on 44 (0) 20 7347 3000
or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.
Metallic Metals is used in Payne's The Art of Asking Questions. He cites
Sam Gill, "How Do You Stand on Sin?" Tide magazine, March 14, 1947, pp. 72ff.
I looked at this article many years ago and Gill presents the figures cited by Payne, but gives few details on their source as I recall.

Hi Mike
I've always thought the Metallic Metals Act was in Don Rugg's thesis in about 1938 when he had Hadley Cantrill as his tutor at Princeton. He found that 38% had a view.
Harry, is this true? John robinson's another who might know for sure.
Anyway, I used it in a lecture just yesterday at the University of Bradford, at the Management Centre Seminar, after receiving an honorary degree there in the morning.
We traditionally used our colleague (Sir) Stewart Lewis (not really a Sir) in our lists of impressive captains of industry, and he always gets a few points.
And in 'what does this company make' type questions using show cards, we always got about ten percent who guesses that ICI (the largest British industrial company) makes bicycles and electric turbines, neither of which they do.
Cheers
Bob
Robert M. Worcester  
Chairman, MORI  
32 Old Queen Street  
London SW1H 9HP  
(44)207 222 0232 Tel  
(44)207 227 0404 Fax  
worc@mori.com

>>> daves@startribune.com 19/07/01 16:02:43 >>>
Hi, Mike, and AAPOR folk:

I'll join the chorus. When I was doing the Observer Carolinas Poll in =  
Charlotte in the 1980s (that's when the PTL Club/Jim Bakker news was hot), =  
we asked name recognition of a number of religious leaders and religious =  
groups, including the "First Follower's Coalition," a name I made up. I =  
don't recall the exact percentages but I think it was about 12%-15% said =  
they knew about the group. That was interesting, but what surprised me =  
were the handful of respondents who had not heard of fellow-North =  
Carolinian Billy Graham!

Go figure.

You can check with the folks at the Observer if you want to track down the =  
details.

Good luck in your quest.

Rob=20

Robert P. Daves, director v: 612.673-7278  
The Minnesota Poll f:  612.673-4359  
Star Tribune e: daves@startribune.com  
e.com  
425 Portland Av. S.  
Minneapolis MN  USA  55488

>>> Michael Kagay <kagay@nytimes.com> 07/18 11:00 AM >>>
Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a 
 polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked 
 the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported 
that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" 
(or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people=20 
were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It = 
could  
be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have 
any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years 
or so would do.
If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay
kagay@nytimes.com

Hi Mike

I've always thought the Metallic Metals Act was in Don Rugg's thesis in about 1938 when he had Hadley Cantrill as his tutor at Princeton. He found that 38% had a view.

Harry, is this true? John robinson's another who might know for sure.

Anyway, I used it in a lecture just yesterday at the University of Bradford, at the Management Centre Seminar, after receiving an honorary degree there in the morning.

We traditionally used our colleague (Sir) Stewart Lewis (not really a Sir) in our lists of impressive captains of industry, and he gets a few points.

And in 'what does this company make' type questions using show cards, we always got about ten percent who guesses that ICI (the largest industrial company) makes bicycles and electric turbines, neither of which they do.

Cheers

Bob
Hi, Mike, and AAPOR folk:

I'll join the chorus. When I was doing the Observer Carolinas Poll in Charlotte in the 1980s (that's when the PTL Club/Jim Bakker news was hot), we asked name recognition of a number of religious leaders and religious groups, including the "First Follower's Coalition," a name I made up. I don't recall the exact percentages but I think it was about 12%-15% said they knew about the group. That was interesting, but what surprised me were the handful of respondents who had not heard of fellow-North Carolinian Billy Graham!

Go figure.

You can check with the folks at the Observer if you want to track down the details.

Good luck in your quest.

Rob

Robert P. Daves, director
The Minnesota Poll; f: 612.673-4359
Star Tribune; e: daves@startribune.com 425 Portland Av. S. Minneapolis MN USA 55488

07/18 11:00 AM &gt;&gt;&gt; Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity? V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?
people=20
couldn't possibly have<BR>any information because it doesn't really=20
exist.<BR>And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last =
ten=20
years<BR>or so would do.<BR>If you know of a pollster or polling=20
organization who has done this,<BR>but don't have the details handy, =
that's=20
quite all right.<BR>We will gladly follow up and contact them.<BR>Thank=20
s for=20
any tips,<BR>Cheers, - Mike=20
Kagay<BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;=
<br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;=20
kagay@nytimes.com <BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;=
<br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;=20

--=_E2B88CB7.C3A2C598--

--simple boundary--

>From richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu Fri Jul 20 11:38:03 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6K1c2J04901 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001
11:38:02
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from ropercenter.uconn.edu (mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu
[137.99.36.157])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA10375 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 11:38:04 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from richard-nt (d37h91.public.uconn.edu [137.99.37.91])
    by ropercenter.uconn.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA15132
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 14:36:46 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.20010720144104.00aee820@mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu>
X-Sender: richard@mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Fri, 20 Jul 2001 14:41:04 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Richard C. Rockwell" <richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu>
Subject: Re: Can Anyone Give an Example of a Poll....
In-Reply-To: <sb586cb7.032@mori.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

>From a syllabus at MIT:

  o Catherine Marsh, "Opinion Polls-Social Science or Political Manoeuvre?"
in John Irvine, Ian Miles, and Jeff Evans, editors, Demystifying Social

This article is a very useful critique of public opinion polling. Don't be
put off by its emphasis on the British context; the underlying issues are
exactly the same no matter what the country. Her list of questions that
should be routinely asked of any public opinion poll should be framed and
hung on any newspaper reader's wall. As you read the article you should
find yourself wondering how you might have felt about the Metallic Metals
Act of 1947.

and a document at Ricks College:
Writing in Time magazine, March 14, 1947, Sam Gill reported the results of a public opinion poll in which he asked respondents, "Which of the following statements most closely coincides with your opinion of the Metallic Metals Act? (a) It would be a good move on the part of the United States. (b) It would be a good thing but should be left to individual states. (c) It is all right for foreign countries but should not be required here. (d) It is of no value at all." Seventy percent of the respondents chose one of the alternatives; 30 percent said they had no opinion. The surprising feature of this poll was that the Metallic Metals Act was a fictitious issue—a creation of Sam Gill's imagination.

At 05:38 PM 7/20/01 +0100, you wrote:
> =============== Disclaimer This e-mail is confidential and
> intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any
> views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not
> necessarily represent those of MORI Limited. If you are not the intended
> recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that
> any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is
> strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please
> either notify the MORI Systems Helpdesk by telephone on 44 (0) 20 7347
> 3000 or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.
> =============== Hi Mike He found that 38% had a view.
> John robinson's another who might know for sure. Anyway, I used it
> in a lecture just yesterday at the University of Bradford, at the
> Management Centre Seminar, after receiving an honorary degree there in the
> morning. We traditionally used our colleague (Sir) Stewart Lewis (not
> really a Sir) in our lists of impressive captains of industry, and he
> always gets a few points. And in 'what does this company make' type
> questions using show cards, we always got about ten percent who guesses
> that ICI (the largest British industrial company) makes bicycles and
> electric turbines, neither of which they do. Cheers Bob Robert M.
> Worcester
> Chairman, MORI
> 32 Old Queen Street
> London SW1H 9HP
> (44)207 222 0232 Tel
> (44)207 227 0404 Fax
> worc@mori.com
> >>>>>>>>
> Hi, Mike, and AAPOR folk:
> That was interesting, but what surprised me were the handful of
> respondents who had not heard of fellow-North Carolinian Billy Graham!
> Go figure.
> You can check with the folks at the Observer if you want to track down the
> details.
> Good luck in your quest.
> Rob
> v: 612.673-7278
> 612.673-4359
Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay

kagay@nytimes.com

Attachment Converted: "C:\Eudora\Attach\Worc2.vcf"

Please note change of e-mail address:

Richard C. ROCKWELL
Executive Director, The Roper Center & Institute for Social Inquiry
Professor of Sociology
341 Mansfield Road, U-164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA
V +1 860 486-4440
F +1 860 486-6308
richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu

From george.bishop@uc.edu Fri Jul 20 11:48:43 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f6KImgJ06220 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 11:48:42 -0700 (PDT)
I have also read Gill's original article, Payne's book, and combed Rugg's thesis at Bob Worcester's request about a year ago, and I could not find anything in any of these sources to document the survey that was supposedly done on the "Metallic Metals Act." Perhaps someone else who is more familiar with the polls in that era can track it down for the rest of us.

GB

At 01:37 PM 7/20/01 -0500, you wrote:

> ================
> > Disclaimer
> > This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the
> > individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented are
> > solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of
> > MORI Limited.
> >
> > If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have
> > received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination,
> > forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly
> > prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please either
> > notify the MORI Systems Helpdesk by telephone on 44 (0) 20 7347 3000
> > or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.
> >
> > ================
> >
Metallic Metals is used in Payne's The Art of Asking Questions. He cites

Sam Gill, "How Do You Stand on Sin?" Tide magazine, March 14, 1947, pp. 72ff.

I looked at this article many years ago and Gill presents the figures cited by Payne, but gives few details on their source as I recall.

---_E2B88CB7.C3A2C598
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi Mike

I've always thought the Metallic Metals Act was in Don Rugg's thesis in about 1938 when he had Hadley Cantrill as his tutor at Princeton. He found that 38% had a view.

Harry, is this true? John robinson's another who might know for sure.

Anyway, I used it in a lecture just yesterday at the University of Bradford, at the Management Centre Seminar, after receiving an honorary degree there in the morning.

We traditionally used our colleague (Sir) Stewart Lewis (not really a Sir) in our lists of impressive captains of industry, and he always gets a few points.

And in 'what does this company make' type questions using show cards, we always got about ten percent who guesses that ICI (the largest British industrial company) makes bicycles and electric turbines, neither of which they do.

Cheers

Robert M. Worcester
Chairman, MORI
32 Old Queen Street
London SW1H 9HP
(44)207 222 0232 Tel
(44)207 227 0404 Fax
worc@mori.com

Hi, Mike, and AAPOR folk:
I'll join the chorus. When I was doing the Observer Carolinas Poll in Charlotte in the 1980s (that's when the PTL Club/Jim Bakker news was hot), we asked name recognition of a number of religious leaders and religious groups, including the "First Follower's Coalition," a name I made up. I don't recall the exact percentages but I think it was about 12%-15% said they knew about the group. That was interesting, but what surprised me were the handful of respondents who had not heard of fellow-North Carolinian Billy Graham!

Go figure.

You can check with the folks at the Observer if you want to track down the details.

Good luck in your quest.

Rob

Robert P. Daves, director
The Minnesota Poll
Star Tribune
e.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488

Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay
Hi Mike

I've always thought the Metallic Metals Act was in Don = Rugg's=20 thesis
in about 1938 when he had Hadley Cantrill as his tutor at=20 Princeton. He
found that 38% had a view.

Harry, is this true? John robinson's another who = might=20 know for sure.

Anyway, I used it in a lecture just yesterday at = the=20 University of
Bradford, at the Management Centre Seminar, after receiving = an=20
honorary degree there in the morning.

We traditionally used our colleague (Sir) Stewart Lewis = (not=20 really a
Sir) in our lists of impressive captains of industry, and he = always=20
gets a few points.

And in 'what does this company make' type questions = using show=20 cards,
we always got about ten percent who guesses that ICI (the largest =
British=20 industrial company) makes bicycles and electric turbines,
neither of which = they=20 do.

Cheers

Bob

Robert M. Worcester
Chairman, MORI
32 Old = Queen=20 Street
London SW1H 9HP
<(44)207 222 0232 Tel
<(44)207 227 0404 = Fax
<worc@mori.com>

Hi, Mike, and = AAPOR=20 folk:

I'll join the chorus. When I was doing the Observer = Carolinas=20 Poll
in Charlotte in the 1980s (that's when the PTL Club/Jim Bakker news =
was=20 hot), we asked name recognition of a number of religious leaders
and = religious=20 groups, including the "First Follower's Coalition," a
name I made = up. I=20 don't recall the exact percentages but I think it
was about 12%-15% said = they=20 knew about the group. That was
interesting, but what surprised me = were the=20 handful of respondents
who had not heard of fellow-North Carolinian = Billy=20 Graham!

Go figure.

You can check with the folks at the = Observer if=20 you want to track
down the details.

Good luck in your quest.
Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a fictitious law or an imaginary entity? 

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metalic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thank you for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay

kagay@nytimes.com
I have also read Gill's original article, Payne's book, and combed Rugg's thesis at Bob Worcester's request about a year ago, and I could not find anything in any of these sources to document the survey that was supposedly done on the "Metallic Metals Act." Perhaps someone else who is more familiar with the polls in that era can track it down for the rest of us.

At 01:37 PM 7/20/01 -0500, you wrote:

I looked at this article many years ago and Gill presents the figures as I recall.

If not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please either notify the MORI Systems Helpdesk by telephone on 44 (0) 20 7347 3000 or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.

Metallic Metals is used in Payne's The Art of Asking Questions. He cites Sam Gill, "How Do You Stand on Sin?" Tide magazine, March 14, 1947, pp. 72ff.

I looked at this article many years ago and Gill presents the figures as I recall.
Hi Mike

I've always thought the Metallic Metals Act was in Don Rugg's thesis in about 1938 when he had Hadley Cantrill as his tutor at Princeton. He found that 38% had a view.

Harry, is this true? John robinson's another who might know for sure.

Anyway, I used it in a lecture just yesterday at the University of Bradford, at the Management Centre Seminar, after receiving an honorary degree there in the morning.

We traditionally used our colleague (Sir) Stewart Lewis (not really a Sir) in our lists of impressive captains of industry, and he always gets a few points.

And in 'what does this company make' type questions using show cards, we always got about ten percent who guesses that ICI (the largest British industrial company) makes bicycles and electric turbines, neither of which they do.

Cheers

Bob

Robert M. Worcester
Chairman, MORI
32 Old Queen Street
London SW1H 9HP
(44)207 222 0232 Tel
(44)207 227 0404 Fax
worc@mori.com

Hi, Mike, and AAPOR folk:

I'll join the chorus. When I was doing the Observer Carolinas Poll in Charlotte in the 1980s (that's when the PTL Club/Jim Bakker news was hot), =
we asked name recognition of a number of religious leaders and religious=
= groups, including the "First Follower's Coalition," a name I
= made up. I don't recall the exact percentages but I think it was about 12%-15% said =
= they knew about the group. That was interesting, but what surprised me were the handful of respondents who had not heard of fellow-North Carolinian Billy Graham! Go figure.

You can check with the folks at the Observer if you want to track down the details. Good luck in your quest.

Rob=20

Robert P. Daves, director
p; v: 612.673-7278
The Minnesota Poll
p; f: 612.673-4359
Star Tribune
p

e: daves@startribune.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488

Greetings and all best wishes.

Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a
polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?

V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act" (or some such), which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.

Do you know of any more recent examples?

It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course; It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.

And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.

If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.

Thanks for any tips.

Cheers, - Mike Kagay

Hi Mike

I've always thought the Metallic Metals Act was in Don Rugg's thesis in about 1938 when he had Hadley Cantrill as his tutor at Princeton. He found that 38% had a view.

Harry, is this true? John robinson's another who = might know for sure.

Anyway, I used it in a lecture just yesterday at the University of Bradford, at the Management Centre Seminar, after receiving an honorary degree there in the morning.

We traditionally used our colleague (Sir) Stewart Lewis = (not really a Sir) in our lists of impressive captains of industry, and he always gets a few points.
And in 'what does this company make' type questions = using show=20
cards, we always got about ten percent who guesses that ICI (the largest =
British=20 industrial company) makes bicycles and electric turbines,
neither of which = they=20 do.<br>

Cheers<br>

Bob<br>

Robert M. Worcester<br>Chairman, MORI<br>32 Old = Queen=20 Street<br>London SW1H 9HP<br>(44)207 222 0232 Tel<br>(44)207 227 0404 = Fax<br><a href="3d.htm">worc@mori.com</a><br><br>&gt;&gt;&gt; =20 daves@startribune.com 19/07/01 16:02:43<br>&gt;&gt;&gt;<br>Hi, Mike, and = AAPOR=20 folk:<br><br>I'll join the chorus. When I was doing the Observer = Carolinas=20
Poll in Charlotte in the 1980s (that's when the PTL Club/Jim Bakker news =
was=20 hot), we asked name recognition of a number of religious leaders
and = religious=20 groups, including the &quot;First Follower's
Coalition,&quot; a name I made = up.&nbsp; I=20 don't recall the exact
percentages but I think it was about 12%-15% said = they=20 knew about
the group.&nbsp; That was interesting, but what surprised me = were
the=20 handful of respondents who had not heard of fellow-North
Carolinian = Billy=20 Graham!<br>Go figure.<br>Your can check with the folks at the = Observer if=20 you want to track
down the details.<br>Good luck in your quest.<br>= Rob=20<br>Robert P. Daves,=20
director=&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;=20 v:
612.673-7278<br>The Minnesota=20
Poll=nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;=20 v:
612.673-4359
Star=20
Tribune=nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;=20 v:
Greetings and all best wishes.<n
Can anyone give an example of a poll question, a polling organization, or a particular pollster who asked the public about a FICTITIOUS law or an IMAGINARY entity?<n
V. O. Key, Jr. years ago, I seemed to remember, once reported that respondents were asked about "The Metallic Metals Act," which didn't exist, but about which many people were nonetheless willing to express support or opposition.<n
Do you know of any recent examples?<n
It wouldn't have to be about a fictitious legislative act, of course. It could be any imaginary topic about which people couldn't possibly have any information because it doesn't really exist.<n
And it doesn't have to be a really recent example. The last ten years or so would do.<n
If you know of a pollster or polling organization who has done this, but don't have the details handy, that's quite all right. We will gladly follow up and contact them.<n
Thank you for any tips.<n
Cheers, - Mike Kagay
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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
I suggest you contact Prof. Ann Gill Taylor, Director of the NIH-funded Center for Complementary and Alternative Therapies here at UVA. Her e-mail address is agt@virginia.edu.

Tom

On Thu, 19 Jul 2001 07:56:08 -0500 bzolling@fhsu.edu wrote:

> Any assistance in finding survey instruments/items for research on usage, 
> attitudes, preferences, or demand for complimentary or alternative medicine 
> (CAM) would be greatly appreciated.
> 
> We already have the items that can be gleaned from Eisenberg et al.'s 
> of Medicine. pp. 246-252.
> 
> Would anyone recommend other sources?
> 
> Thanks.
> 
> Brett Zollinger
> Director, University Center for Survey Research
> Docking Institute of Public Affairs
> 785-628-5881

NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu
Garrett,

I would recommend contacting the Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (http://www.searac.org/) in DC. Though the thrust of their work is on Vietnamese and Cambodian populations, there is a chance they have done something akin to what you are describing for the Hmong population. If not, someone there probably knows who is.

Best,

Chris

Christian Collet, Ph.D.
Department of Political Science
University of California, Irvine
3151 Social Science Plaza
Irvine, CA 92697-5100
DIRECT: (949) 370-6331
FAX: (949) 857-0518

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Garrett O'Keefe
Sent: Friday, July 20, 2001 10:52 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Research on Hmong

Greetings--

Does anyone know of lit or ongoing research on information-education campaigns/programs (or communication patterns in general) among Hmong populations in the U.S.? Or on any other smaller populations?

The specific issue here involves designing and evaluating programs aimed at maternal child and health care.

Thanks in advance for any assistance --

Garrett O'

>From hschuman@umich.edu Fri Jul 20 15:16:10 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6KMGAJ09028 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001
15:16:10 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.162])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id PAA11360 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Jul 2001 15:16:13 -0700
Several comments on the exchanges over supposedly fictional items:

1. The original experiment on non-existent nationality groups is reported in "Problems of Prejudice" by Eugene Hartley, 1946. The terms were "Danireans," "Pireneans," and "Wallonians." The latter is pretty close to, but not quite the same as, the term "Walloon" given in the American Heritage Dictionary for French-speaking people of southern Belgium, but whether it is the same or a little different points up the problem of this type of item—though it is unlikely that many Americans have heard of Walloon or Wallonian or anything similar.

2. The problem with the Metallic Metals Act (Gill 1947) was that no N was given and the population was identified only as "a group of people," so the results were meaningless, though the item had the virtue being ridiculous.

3. Bishop, et al.'s "Public Affairs Act" (1980) and my & Presser's "Agricultural Trade Act" ([1981] 1996)—the former fictional, the latter deliberately obscure—could be and were often interpreted in reasonable ways by respondents, which allowed them to produce appropriate attitudes. Such responses correlate with other attitudes in meaningful ways and show reliability over time.

4. What is fictional or non-fictional depends on one's perspective. Some non-fictional items asked in ordinary surveys are probably fictional from the standpoint of many respondents. That is, they have no idea what the interviewer is talking about. Or maybe they have just heard the name somewhere, as in the case of a recent respondent who identified Columbus as "our first president."

5. Respondents are less apt to answer questions they know nothing about if a DK alternative is explicitly offered, more apt to answer if interviewers press them for a response. This is especially true of less educated respondents. So in part, the fault Brutus is in ourselves.

Howard
Bob- re the Metalics Metals Act, I think it was Don Rugg.     Harry

In Howard Schuman's final two points here, he echoes what I have been
trying to say about surveys of opinions of imagined situations, here on AAPORNET, for the past several days. The only major difference is that Howard says them shorter, clearer, and smarter. Aside from that, I find us but two peas in the same pod.

-- Jim

On Fri, 20 Jul 2001, Howard Schuman wrote:

> 4. What is fictional or non-fictional depends on one's perspective. Some
> non-fictional items asked in ordinary surveys are probably fictional from
> the standpoint of many respondents. That is, they have no idea what the
> interviewer is talking about. Or maybe they have just heard the name
> somewhere, as in the case of a recent respondent who identified Columbus
> as "our first president."
>
> 5. Respondents are less apt to answer questions they know nothing about if
> a DK alternative is explicitly offered, more apt to answer if interviewers
> press them for a response. This is especially true of less educated
> respondents. So in part, the fault Brutus is in ourselves.
>
> Howard

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Jul 21 12:02:52 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6LJ2pJ04543 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 21 Jul 2001
12:02:51
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id MAA20128 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 21 Jul 2001 12:02:52 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6LJ2qW07368 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 21 Jul 2001 12:02:52 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Sat, 21 Jul 2001 12:02:52 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Rep. Gary Condit Has an Alibi Witness: VP Dick Cheney (MSNBC.com)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0107211148590.23776-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

This report convinces me that history will note the Condit-Levy story as the one which first alerted most Americans to just how little privacy they have, in their activities on the World Wide Web—a result not without implications for those who might wish to conduct surveys on the Web. What do you all think?

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
July 20, 2001

CONDIT HAS AN ALIBI

Dick Cheney has emerged as a surprise witness for the beleaguered congressman, NEWSWEEK has learned

By Michael Isikoff and Mark Hosenball
NEWSWEEK WEB EXCLUSIVE

July 20 -- Vice President Dick Cheney has emerged as a surprise alibi witness for Rep. Gary Condit in the investigation into the disappearance of missing Washington intern Chandra Levy, NEWSWEEK has learned.

CONDIT HAD A PRIVATE MEETING with Cheney on Capitol Hill on Tuesday, May 1, to discuss the California energy crisis, according to White House and law-enforcement sources. The meeting began at 12:30 p.m. EDT and lasted for about 20 to 25 minutes, the sources said.

It was at that very moment that, according to police, Levy was in her Dupont Circle apartment wrapping up a three-hour-plus session on her laptop computer in which she sent out e-mails and surfed the Internet. She searched for plane schedules for return trips to California, looking for discount fares on Southwest Airlines, and clicked on various Web sites, apparently to check out locations in Washington, including, law-enforcement sources say, a Baskin-Robbins ice-cream store.

Analysis of the hard drive on Levy's laptop shows she signed off the computer about 1 p.m., the last moment for which police can account for the 24-year-old former Bureau of Prisons intern. For the past two months, her disappearance has been the subject of a massive and virtually unprecedented investigation that has thoroughly baffled federal and local law-enforcement officials and generated international media attention--much of it fueled by speculation about her secret romantic relationship with Condit.

But not until today did Cheney's name surface as a potentially important witness in establishing a precise accounting for Condit's activities during the moments that Levy is believed to have vanished. White House sources say that, so far, neither the vice president nor anybody on his staff has been contacted by the Washington police department. Sources familiar with the meeting say that Cheney and two aides met with Condit that day at the suggestion of Republican leaders who view Condit, a moderate Democrat, as a potential ally of the White House. The sources say that Condit did not appear to be overly distracted or under stress during the meeting, which revolved around talks about the vice president's energy plan and soaring electricity prices in California. "There was nothing unusual about the meeting," a White House official said.
One unanswered question is why the vice president's office, in response to questions from NEWSWEEK and other news organizations, waited until today to confirm that Cheney met privately with Condit on one of the most important days in the Levy investigation. Cheney aides appeared loathe to discuss the meeting apparently out of fear that the vice president's name might be associated in any way, even tangentially, with a tawdry Washington scandal. "I have no comment," said Julianna Glover Weiss, the vice president's press secretary.

After that, police and other sources say, Condit returned to his office on Capitol Hill and stayed there until about 5 p.m. doing office work, taking phone calls and meeting with staff members. He may also have gone to the House gym and worked out. Around 5 p.m., Condit left his office and went to a doctor's appointment, returning to Capitol Hill sometime after 6 p.m. to vote twice on the House floor on resolutions involving autism and supporting National Charter Schools Week. Condit also submitted a written speech into the Congressional Record praising Tom Sawyer, the sheriff and coroner of Merced County. About 7 p.m., a staff member drove Condit to his Washington apartment where, the congressman has said, he spent the rest of the evening with his wife, Carolyn, who was visiting from California.

Despite their continued frustration with the level of Condit's cooperation, law-enforcement officials say the timing of the session with Vice President Cheney--and the rest of Condit's activities that day--provide a reasonably persuasive account that makes it less likely Condit had any direct role in Levy's disappearance. "He was in his office [that afternoon]," said one law-enforcement official. "We've spoken to his staff and we're comfortable with their responses. His time is accounted for."

Late today, Washington police released a complete list of 30 Web sites Levy visited on her computer on May 1. They included the official House of Representatives Web site, as well as the site for the House Agriculture Committee, on which Condit serves. Among others were the sites for The Washington Post, The Modesto Bee, USA Today, National Geographic and the Drudge Report, as well as Amtrak, Southwest Airlines and GoFrance.About.com. Investigators say they have been unable to glean anything especially noteworthy from the list of Web sites, a point perhaps best underscored by Levy's visit to the Baskin-Robbins Web site. Sources say Levy apparently was checking out the address of a nearby Baskin-Robbins on Connecticut Avenue. She also had downloaded discount ice-cream coupons that were found in her apartment, along with her clothing, her credit cards, her ATM bank card and two pairs of sneakers, after she disappeared. A visit to the site suggests that Levy may have been planning a visit to Baskin-Robbins the following evening, May 2, which was billed as "Free Scoop Night."


MSNBC News 1½ 2001 Newsweek, Inc.

*****
With apologies for any cross posting, here is our new e-mail address:

mail@marketsharescorp.com

Thanks.

Nick Panagakis
Over the past two days, AAPORNET itself has provided a fascinating juxtaposition that illustrates a major difficulty in interpreting the results of any poll or survey.

On July 19th, the following question was posted:

I have a client who, in a series of ratings of various aspects of customer service, consistently rated slightly to somewhat better than competitors. None of the differences are statistically significant, however; the differences are too small.

Now this person is suggesting that if we somehow aggregated the ratings into one large measure of satisfaction, the statistical significance of the total could be tested, and it would be more likely to achieve a positive (i.e., statistically significant) result. Thus of course "proving" that this client is better than competitors.

Aside from the whole approach being somewhat suspect, I have never heard of such a procedure. Is there a legitimate way to do this?

To me at least, the question asked whether or not there exists some
aggregation procedure that would allow a client to claim a 
"statistically significant" advantage over competitors when ratings on 
individual attributes indicate no such significance. In other words, it 
asks whether there is some "legitimate way" to satisfy a client's 
illegitimate demands to cook the statistics, while expressing a 
well-deserved skepticism. 

But several of the (IMHO) most consistently enlightened contributors to 
this list appear to have understood the question as asking whether it is 
possible to gain additional insights into the data by aggregating 
individual ratings and responded accordingly. 

The reason is that an answer never relates to the question asked, but 
only to the question heard. Here, we see individuals who may never have 
to cope with such grubby concerns as a client asking to cook the results 
of a survey, or who may be influenced by the elevated context of 
discourse within a professional group, perceiving a completely 
different, but not completely unrelated, query about analytical methods. 

Simultaneously, a thread has been discussing responses to questions 
about fictional events or persons. These mean one thing to the 
researcher, and something completely different to all but the most 
cylical of respondents. A critical issue in interpreting such results is 
just what question is actually being heard and answered. That, of 
course, can depend on a great many factors, including whether the 
question is perceived as pertaining to some other real event or person. 
So we have a situation where we know that one party (the researcher) is 
attempting to mislead the other, but we cannot know whether the 
respondent is faking an answer or telling the truth to the best of his 
or her knowledge. 

As demonstrated by the responses on AAPORNET to the post quoted above, 
where we know that all parties (with the possible exception of the 
poster's client) were acting in good faith, one should pause before 
making any assumption that questions like the those about the Public 
Affairs Act of 1975 indicate anything about the integrity of respondents 
or how well informed they may be. 

Jan Werner 
jwerner@jwdp.com 

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Jul 21 14:37:20 2001 
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) 
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP 
   id f6LLbKJ19677 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 21 Jul 2001 
14:37:20 -0700 (PDT) 
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167]) 
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP 
   id OAA26535 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 21 Jul 2001 14:37:21 -0700 
   (PDT) 
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost) 
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP 
   id f6LLbLj03469 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 21 Jul 2001 14:37:21 -0700 
   (PDT) 
Date: Sat, 21 Jul 2001 14:37:21 -0700 (PDT) 
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu> 
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
This Mercury News story of July 19 includes the following report on a CBS News poll of the same day:

However, a CBS News poll released early today of 556 residents in his district showed that a majority of Condit’s constituents like the job he has been doing and believe he should finish his term, but would not vote for him for re-election.

Nearly two-thirds of those polled also said his job performance has been affected by his reported affair with Levy. Nearly two-thirds think the 53-year-old married Democrat from Ceres has seriously hurt the investigation, according to the poll. A majority -- 55 percent -- believe he hasn't told police all he knows about her disappearance.

-- Jim

Copyright (C) 2001 The Mercury News - The Newspaper of Silicon Valley
http://www0.mercurycenter.com/premium/nation/docs/websites19.htm
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National News

Levy may have tracked Condit via Web on day she disappeared

BY ROXANNE STITES AND LORI ARATANI
Mercury News

WASHINGTON -- Chandra Levy bounced from one Web site to another on the day she disappeared, police said Wednesday.

She scanned more than a dozen sites -- including the Modesto Bee, the Drudge Report, the House Agricultural Committee and an Internet superstore -- and wrote e-mail messages to friends and family, police said. She also visited sites for Southwest Airlines and Amtrak.

``She was all over the place, some for a tenth of a second,'’ said Washington, D.C., Executive Assistant Police Chief Terrance Gainer. While Levy's connection to U.S. Rep. Gary Condit, D-Modesto, is no longer a secret, her Web activity is revealing, he said.

``Clearly, she was tracking Condit,'’ Gainer said in an interview Wednesday. He would offer no further explanation, but said some sites
browsed by the 24-year-old criminal justice major show more than a casual interest in government.

Also on Wednesday, FBI experts and police dismissed the results of Condit's privately administered polygraph as useless and said they may request a fourth interview with the Central Valley congressman.

``We weren't in the room when he took the polygraph,'' said Police Chief Charles Ramsey. ``We can't be sure the answers even go with the questions.''

WEB SITES LEVY VISITED

This is a partial list of the Internet sites that police say Chandra Levy visited between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. on May 1. The Web sites were provided to the Mercury News. Police say they will release a complete list today.

* Amtrak
* Drudge Report
* House: Agricultural Committee
* Los Angeles Times
* Modesto Bee
* National Geographic
* Rock Creek Park
* Southwest Airlines
* USA Today
* Washington Post

Abbe Lowell, Condit's attorney, could not be reached for comment. Lowell caught police by surprise late last week when he announced at a press conference that Condit had taken and passed a polygraph.

For now, police are hoping the public release of the Web sites Levy visited will trigger new leads.

In addition to the site for the House Agricultural Committee, which Condit serves on, Levy also clicked on a site that tracks legislation, Gainer said. A more complete rundown of her computer activity is expected to be released by police today.

``Maybe somebody can put a context to those things that our detectives could not,'' Gainer said.

Levy, who grew up in Modesto but most recently lived in Washington, D.C., while interning at the federal Bureau of Prisons, has been missing for nearly three months. She was last seen in person April 30, but police are convinced she spent at least three hours on her laptop on the morning of May 1 before disappearing.

Between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m., Levy sent e-mail messages
to friends and family but received no replies from them in return. Police said an analysis of the data on her computer's hard drive showed that her Web surfing and messaging on the morning of May 1 was similar to her pattern on other days for the previous month.

``Who knows what these mean?'' said Ramsey, referring to many of the sites. ``Maybe she gets up in the morning and reads newspapers on the computer. Maybe she was checking the weather. The point is we don't know, but somebody might.''

Earlier this week, police released the name of one site that Levy had visited -- Rock Creek Park, which is near her Washington apartment -- but three consecutive days of searching through woods and trails there have yielded nothing. Police recruits and cadaver dogs will continue scouring the park and others for several more weeks.

Meanwhile, dozens of Condit supporters held a noontime rally Wednesday outside the congressman's Modesto district office to show he still has support despite his link to Levy.

However, a CBS News poll released early today of 556 residents in his district showed that a majority of Condit's constituents like the job he has been doing and believe he should finish his term, but would not vote for him for re-election.

Nearly two-thirds of those polled also said his job performance has been affected by his reported affair with Levy. Nearly two-thirds think the 53-year-old married Democrat from Ceres has seriously hurt the investigation, according to the poll. A majority -- 55 percent -- believe he hasn't told police all he knows about her disappearance.

The demonstration Wednesday, just one day after a Fresno-based conservative group held a similar event calling for Condit to resign, was organized by Mary Schatz, 70, a member of Stanislaus County's Democratic Central Committee. Schatz said she was just trying to pay Condit back for his years of service to the district, and said she acted as an individual and not for the party committee.

``Hell no, Gary won't go,'' read one sign. ``God bless America and the Condit family,'' read another. Supporters said Condit has served the district well and should be re-elected.

Jarnail Dosanjh, 71, said it was unfair to link Condit to Levy's disappearance. ``He's being blamed for something he didn't do,'' he said. ``He's a good man, and he stands by his people. We as people want to stand by him.''

--------

Roxanne Stites reported from Washington, Lori Aratani from Modesto.

http://www0.mercurycenter.com/premium/nation/docs/websites19.htm
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I agree the task can be done. We routinely use AMOS to develop structural equation models for customer satisfaction data. It works well and identifies drivers that can actually be used to improve service and therefore satisfaction. What it usually DOES NOT do is to increase the overall satisfaction for the client company. Look at it this way. If I aggregate 17 items, each of which suggests that company A has .025 points greater satisfaction than company B, my aggregate measure is quite likely to show that Company A has .025 points higher aggregate satisfaction.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Craig S Gordon
Sent: Friday, July 20, 2001 4:50 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Response Aggregation

** Reply Requested When Convenient **

If you assume that there is an underlying construct, one can use structural equation modeling to perform a multi-group analysis. First, you would constrain the means to be equal across groups and then free the constraint and perform a chi-sq. difference test to see if the means are, in fact,
different across groups.

At 08:39 AM 7/19/01 -0700, you wrote:
>I have a client who, in a series of ratings of various aspects of
>customer service, consistently rated slightly to somewhat better than
>competitors. None of the differences are statistically significant,
>however; the differences are too small.
>
>Now this person is suggesting that if we somehow aggregated the ratings
>into one large measure of satisfaction, the statistical significance of
>the total could be tested, and it would be more likely to achieve a
>positive (i.e., statistically significant) result. Thus of course
>"proving" that this client is better than competitors.
>
>Aside from the whole approach being somewhat suspect, I have never heard
>of such a procedure. Is there a legitimate way to do this?

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
tel + 31 20 622 34 38  fax + 31 20 330 25 97
e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

If that's all you ask,
My Sweetest, My Featest, Compleatest, And Neatest
I'm proud of the Task!
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<P><FONT SIZE=3D2>I agree the task can be done. We routinely use =
AMOS to develop structural equation models for customer satisfaction =
data. It works well and identifies drivers that can actually be =
used to improve service and therefore satisfaction. What it =
usually DOES NOT do is to increase the overall satisfaction for the =
client company. Look at it this way. If I aggregate 17 =
items, each of which suggests that company A has .025 points greater =
satisfaction than company B, my aggregate measure is quite likely to =
show that Company A has .025 points higher aggregate =
satisfaction.</FONT></P>

<P><FONT SIZE=3D2>-----Original Message-----</FONT>
If you assume that there is an underlying construct, one can use structural equation modeling to perform a multi-group analysis. First, you would constrain the means to be equal across groups and then free the constraint and perform a chi-sq. difference test to see if the means are, in fact, different across groups.

At 08:39 AM 7/19/01 -0700, you wrote:

> I have a client who, in a series of ratings of various aspects of customer service, consistently rated slightly to somewhat better than competitors. None of the differences are statistically significant.

However; the differences are too small.

Now this person is suggesting that if we somehow aggregated the ratings into one large measure of satisfaction, the total could be tested, and it would be more likely to achieve a positive (i.e., statistically significant) result. Thus of course that this client is better than competitors.

Aside from the whole approach being somewhat suspect, I have never heard of such a procedure. Is there a legitimate way to do this?
Once heard a "old saying" about this issue of respondents answers about fictitious people, phantom products, non-existent laws and issues and so forth that went like this:

"Respondents are like cats, if you give them a box, they will go in it."

Cynical but sometimes true.

Barry
On Sat, 21 Jul 2001, Jan Werner wrote:

> The reason is that an answer never relates to the question asked, but
> only to the question heard.

I cannot believe that this is really any problem at all. If it were,
all human languages would fail, much more often than not. We humans
would not have developed language at all, were it the case that--to
paraphrase the above--the words said were never the words heard. This
may often be the case with young children, I have recently come to
relearn, but watching children overcome the problem, for their own
convenience, is to appreciate why we bother to learn language at all:
language works, it's useful, it helps us to get what we want, and to
give others "a piece of our mind" (folk culture knows what's up).

The major failing of language is a quite different one: words like
"tree" and "dog" cause different people to see different trees and
different dogs (not even to mention words like "love" or "perhaps").
On the positive side: No language would have true poetry were it not
for this failing, which thereby reassures us that *each* human
language can have its *own* poetry.

I can't say that I've ever talked with anyone known for writing good
interview or questionnaire items who didn't fully understand this
particular failing of language, however, and didn't know a wide
variety of ways to circumvent it--even students in their first survey
methods class get the idea, sooner or later. And I've long enjoyed
seeking out and talking with noted artists of instrument construction
(as many of you will know) for just this reason (try it yourself, if
you haven't already, and see if you don't find it interesting as well).

Cognitive linguistics could do worse than to direct its collective
attention to intensive studies of those rare and valued people
especially good at writing questions for general population samples.
Has anyone here besides me ever wished that every last one of us humans
had this particular talent, to avoid what we commonly call "talking past
one another"? (folk culture strikes again)

The real problem under discussion here, however, for the past several
days, does not really concern language at all, nor "asking" vs.
"hearing" (whatever "hearing" might mean here, considering that it
implies an absolute message--I assume known only to an omniscient
third-party observer). The real problem concerns what Howard Schuman
told us yesterday, and may now need revisiting:

On Fri, 20 Jul 2001, Howard Schuman wrote:
4. What is fictional or non-fictional depends on one's perspective. Some non-fictional items asked in ordinary surveys are probably fictional from the standpoint of many respondents. That is, they have no idea what the interviewer is talking about. Or maybe they have just heard the name somewhere, as in the case of a recent respondent who identified Columbus as "our first president."

5. Respondents are less apt to answer questions they know nothing about if a DK alternative is explicitly offered, more apt to answer if interviewers press them for a response. This is especially true of less educated respondents. So in part, the fault Brutus is in ourselves.

Howard

Howard's two points well describe two problems survey research actually does have—and has always had, and probably always will. The best we might do is to accept the problem, and be ever humbled in its presence. The recent Markle survey would have been better as a result, in my own opinion, in its tackling of such obviously difficult questions as public preferences for the future of the Internet.

-- Jim

P.S. Is it just me, or do others of you also think you might have seen Howard's example of identifying Columbus as "our first president" in one of Jay Leno's street interviews? I ask because, if this does indeed come from some classic of the survey research literature, we will at least know that Leno's highly-paid stable of writers is putting its undergraduate training in survey methodology to good practical use. Howard?

******
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Andy Kohut, in today’s op-ed section of the NY TIMES, observes that the intense media focus on certain kinds of sensational news stories (Chandra Levy, for example) does not necessarily reflect the interests of the American public but rather that of a small core of viewers/readers who are more or less addicted to that kind of news.

He makes the point, for example, "Are the news executives misguided about what appeals to their audiences? The answer is no. Television news producers get instant feedback from the ratings, and they know what makes the needle move. But at the same time, what works for cable television shows watched by relatively small audiences does not necessarily have broad public appeal."

Dick Halpern

JUL 22, 2001

The Tabloid Public Is Not the Majority

By ANDREW KOHUT

12f511.jpg

ASHINGTON =97 The country has been inundated with news about Chandra Levy, the missing Washington intern. The coverage has seemed almost nonstop on cable television news, and the story has been Topic A on the chat shows. Even Dan Rather, who had resisted covering what he considered a tabloid story, had to give in and let his news show include a summary of the search for Ms. Levy and the initial reluctance of Representative Gary Condit to help Washington police by talking with them about his last meetings with her.
The relentless, sensational coverage might make observers despair about the tastes and values of the American public. But in fact, most Americans are not captivated by the Chandra Levy story.

The latest nationwide news interest survey by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press finds only 16 percent of Americans "very interested" in the story—a low number not only in absolute terms, but compared with the percentages of people highly interested in other celebrity scandals that we have polled about over the years: the O. J. Simpson story had 48 percent of respondents "very interested" at its peak, and the Bill Clinton-Monica Lewinsky scandal had 36 percent.

Even less prominent incidents generated more intense interest than Chandra Levy's disappearance: for example, the "very interested" figure was 32 percent for both Mike Tyson's rape trial and Marion Barry's legal problems, and 27 percent for William Kennedy Smith's rape trial in Florida.

So what's going on here? Are the news executives misguided about what appeals to their audiences? The answer is no. Television news producers get instant feedback from the ratings, and they know what makes the needle move. But at the same time, what works for cable television shows watched by relatively small audiences does not necessarily have broad public appeal.

A central problem in television journalism today is that audiences are so fragmented that it takes only a small increase or decrease to make a big economic difference to the networks. If a cable show regularly draws 600,000 viewers, an increase to 900,000 is a very big deal. And all that's required is a story that appeals to the minority of the public that is attracted to news about celebrities in trouble—regardless of disinterest or even outrage about extensive coverage from the majority of the public.

There is a tabloid audience that goes from one saga to the next. Last year, at the height of the Eli Elñ Gonzàles news craze, a nationwide Pew survey found that an extraordinary 61 percent of that story's core audience had also been strongly attracted to news about the death of John F. Kennedy Jr. in a plane crash in 1999. The overlaps did not stop there: fully 73 percent of those drawn to news about Mr. Kennedy had been close followers of the untimely death of Britain's Princess Diana in 1997. And it comes as no surprise that large percentages of each of these core audiences had also been closely attentive to the O. J. Simpson murder trial and the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal.

Our poll found that one-third of the public followed three or more of these stories about Eli Elñ, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Simpson, Princess Diana, and Mr.
Clinton and Ms. Lewinsky very closely. The vast majority of the public (67 percent) was much less interested: 34 percent gave none of these tabloid best-seller stories a lot of attention, and 33 percent were closely attentive to only one or two of them.

So far the Chandra Levy audience has not matched those for the tabloid heavyweights of the recent past, but these are slow news times even on the tabloid scene. The Levy-Condit story has become prominent enough to bring many of the commentators whose faces became so familiar in the O. J. Simpson case back to the TV screen.

Cable news and talk shows and the print tabloid media have little to lose and much to gain in the short run by pitching to the hard-core audience for celebrities' misfortunes. But past surveys show the vast majority of the public is put off by coverage of these stories that is so extensive as to be inescapable for viewers.

Most Americans blanch at the blatant exploitation of the people being covered, and they indicate in surveys that they feel the press pursues stories like these not to protect the public interest, but to enlarge audiences. These same surveys show significant numbers of Americans doubting the worth of the traditional watchdog role of the press.

One can only question the wisdom of alienating a large percentage of a public that now has the ability to screen out the news it does not want by turning to the Internet. And despite the short-term gains from the tabloid news coverage, cable and broadcast news audiences continue to decline.

Andrew Kohut is the director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.

Andy Kohut, in today's op-ed section of the NY TIMES, observes that the intense media focus on certain kinds of sensational news stories (Chandra Levy, for example) does not necessarily reflect the interests of the American public but rather that of a small core of viewers/readers who are more or less addicted to that kind of news. He makes the point, for example, "Are the news executives misguided about what appeals to their audiences? The answer is no. Television news producers get instant feedback from the ratings, and they know what makes the needle move. But at the same time, what works for cable television shows watched by relatively small audiences does not necessarily have
The country has been inundated with news about Chandra Levy, the missing Washington intern. The coverage has seemed almost nonstop on cable television news, and the story has been Topic A on the chat shows. Even Dan Rather, who had resisted covering what he considered a tabloid story, had to give in and let his news show include a summary of the search for Ms. Levy and the initial reluctance of Representative Gary Condit to help Washington police by talking with them about his last meetings with her.

The relentless, sensational coverage might make observers despair about the tastes and values of the American public. But in fact, most Americans are not captivated by the Chandra Levy story.

The latest nationwide news interest survey by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press finds only 16 percent of Americans "very interested" in the story—a low number not only in absolute terms, but compared with the percentages of people highly interested in other celebrity scandals that we have polled about over the years: the O. J. Simpson story had 48 percent of respondents "very interested" at its peak, and the Bill Clinton-Monica Lewinsky scandal had 36 percent.

So what's going on here? Are the news executives misguided about what appeals to their audiences? The answer is no. Television news producers get instant feedback from the ratings, and they know what makes the needle move. But at the same time, what works for cable television shows watched by relatively small audiences does not necessarily have broad public appeal.

A central problem in television journalism today is that audiences are so fragmented that it takes only a small increase or decrease to make a big economic difference to the networks. If a cable show regularly draws 600,000 viewers, an increase to 900,000 is a very big deal. And all that's required is a story that appeals to the minority of the public that is attracted to news about celebrities in trouble—regardless of disinterest or even outrage about extensive coverage from the majority of the public.

There is a tabloid audience that goes from one saga to the next. Last year, at the height of the Eli=
Elm Gonz=Elles news craze, a nationwide Pew survey found that an extraordinary 61 percent of that story's core audience had also been strongly attracted to news about the death of John F. Kennedy Jr. in a plane crash in 1999. The overlaps did not stop there: fully 73 percent of those drawn to news about Mr. Kennedy had been close followers of the unending accounts of the untimely death of Britain's Princess Diana in 1997. And it comes as no surprise that large percentages of each of these core audiences had also been closely
attentive to the O. J. Simpson murder trial and the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal.

Our poll found that one-third of the public followed three or more of these stories =97 about Eli=E1n, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Simpson, Princess Diana, and Mr. Clinton and Ms. Lewinsky =97 very closely. The vast majority of the public (67 percent) was much less interested: 34 percent gave none of these tabloid best-seller stories a lot of attention, and 33 percent were closely attentive to only one or two of them.<br>
So far the Chandra Levy audience has not matched those for the tabloid heavyweights of the recent past, but these are slow news times even on the tabloid scene. The Levy-Condit story has become prominent enough to bring many of the commentators whose faces became so familiar in the O. J. Simpson case back to the TV screen.<br>

Cable news and talk shows and the print tabloid media have little to lose and much to gain in the short run by pitching to the hard-core audience for celebrities’ misfortunes. But past surveys show the vast majority of the public is put off by coverage of these stories that is so extensive as to be inescapable for viewers.<br>

Most Americans blanch at the blatant exploitation of the people being covered, and they indicate in surveys that they feel the press pursues stories like these not to protect the public interest, but to enlarge audiences. These same surveys show significant numbers of Americans doubting the worth of the traditional watchdog role of the press.<br>

One can only question the wisdom of alienating a large percentage of a public that now has the ability to screen out the news it does not want by turning to the Internet. And despite the short-term gains from the tabloid news coverage, cable and broadcast news audiences continue to decline.

Andrew Kohut is the director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.
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From the OP-ED page in today's NY TIMES. The author focuses on two major points: the differences in response caused by differences in question wording and the significance of poll findings based on issues that the public doesn't know much about.
The Unbearable Lightness of Public Opinion Polls

By ADAM CLYMER

WASHINGTON – A week during which one politician or interest group after another brandished a poll to prove conclusively that the public backs federal funding of human embryonic stem cell research, it may come as a surprise to learn that American public opinion on the subject doesn't exist at least not yet. The subject is just too new and too complicated.

Polls seem to say otherwise. There is a NBC News/ Wall Street Journal poll with 69 percent in favor and 23 percent opposed, a Gallup Poll for CNN and USA Today that found 54 percent in favor and a poll done by ABC News and Beliefnet, a religious Web site, that found 58 percent support. A survey done for the Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the other hand, found only 24 percent approval, while the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, as part of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, came up with a 70 percent figure.

The advocates of stem cell research certainly believe the numbers should persuade President Bush who promised in the 2000 campaign to oppose funding that the politically smart course is to change course.

Representative Connie Morella, a moderate Republican from Maryland, said last week, "Three to one, the Americans, when polled, are in favor of stem cell research under particular strong guidelines." About the same time, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation ran an advertisement in The Washington Times claiming, "A recent national survey shows conclusively that 70 percent support human embryonic stem cell research, including Catholics (72 percent). . . ."

But the large variations in the polls cited, which can generally be traced to how the poll questions were worded, suggest that the opinions of respondents are not fully formed, or firmly held. And that is very much the case in the matter of stem cell research, as a crucial finding in the
Gallup poll, ignored by the combatants, shows.

Before having the issue explained to them, 57 percent of the public said they did not know enough to say whether they favored or opposed stem cell research (the pollsters then offered some information and pressed for opinions). The Gallup survey was the only one that specifically offered respondents that choice.

And a no-opinion number that high, said Herbert L. Asher, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, indicated that all these polls "are measuring non-attitudes."

Some professional pollsters disagree sharply. A firm defense of polling on questions about which the public may not yet have strong feelings comes from Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who does the NBC/ Journal poll with Robert Teeter, a Republican. He argues that "wording is all-important," and that even if the poll question itself is the first thing someone has heard on a subject, it at least shows the potency various arguments will have once the subject becomes part of a public dialogue.

In the case of stem cell research, Mr. Hart and his colleagues at other polling organizations tried to write questions that fairly stated both sides of the argument.

Writing a balanced question, especially one that is not so long that the respondent hangs up in the middle, is a difficult art, not a science. Honest pollsters try to avoid phrasing that leads the respondents toward one answer or another, though they don't always succeed. But can the argument against human embryo research be adequately conveyed by saying it involves "potentially viable human embryos," as the Journal/NBC poll asked?

The key question in the bishops' poll, on the other hand, included a line that read, "the live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development."

This question, which also used phrases like "your federal tax dollars" and speaks only of "experiments," not the lofty goals of the research, was not written by a pollster but by the bishops' chief lobbyist on the issue, Richard A. Doerflinger. And it was ridiculed by other pollsters. As Professor Asher said, "It's loaded."

Whatever their language, all the polls on stem cell research asked long involved questions. And that is a tipoff that the issue is remote from most people, said Bernard Roshco, a former editor of Public Opinion Quarterly.

"Americans are acquiescent so they'll give you an answer," he said. But "the mere fact that you've got to offer a lengthy summary implies that it's
POLLSTERS regularly prove that point by eliciting opinions from people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people. This strongly suggests that the opinions people offer on subjects that are real but remote may be equally unreliable.

One safeguard is to ask a lot of questions, using different phrasings, and asking things like, "Would you still support X if you knew . . ." But that costs money. So it is not easy for pollsters and their clients to take the advice of academics like Professor Asher or Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, and explore difficult issues with a series of questions.

Without such persistence, said Professor Presser, a past director of the university's survey research center, pollsters and the politicians who seek their wisdom can be trapped by eager-to-please respondents, who answer questions not based on fully formed attitudes and strong feelings, but who, in effect, are "constructing them as the interview progresses."

Which means that, sometimes, the pollsters are measuring phantoms, and the politicians are calling on them for support.

---

From the OP-ED page in today's NY TIMES. The author focuses on two major points: The differences in response caused by differences in question wording and the significance of poll findings based on issues that the public doesn't know much about.
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WASHINGTON =97 AFTER a week during which one politician or interest group after another brandished a poll to prove conclusively that the public backs federal funding of human embryonic stem cell research, it may come as a surprise to learn that American public opinion on the subject doesn't exist =97 at least not yet. The subject is just too new and too complicated.

Polls seem to say otherwise. There is a NBC News/ Wall Street Journal poll with 69 percent in favor and 23 percent opposed, a Gallup Poll for CNN and USA Today that found 54 percent in favor and a poll done by ABC News and Beliefnet, a religious Web site, that found 58 percent support. A survey done for the Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the other hand, found only 24 percent approval, while the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation,
as part of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, came up with a 70 percent figure. The advocates of stem cell research certainly believe the numbers should persuade President Bush who promised in the 2000 campaign to oppose funding that the politically smart course is to change course.

Representative Connie Morella, a moderate Republican from Maryland, said last week, "Three to one, the Americans, when polled, are in favor of stem cell research under particular strong guidelines." About the same time, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation ran an advertisement in The Washington Times claiming, "A recent national survey shows conclusively that 70 percent support human embryonic stem cell research, including Catholics (72 percent)..."

But the large variations in the polls cited, which can generally be traced to how the poll questions were worded, suggest that the opinions of respondents are not fully formed, or firmly held. And that is very much the case in the matter of stem cell research, as a crucial finding in the Gallup poll, ignored by the combatants, shows.

Before having the issue explained to them, 57 percent of the public said they did not know enough to say whether they favored or opposed stem cell research (the pollsters then offered some information and pressed for opinions). The Gallup survey was the only one that specifically offered respondents that choice.

And a no-opinion number that high, said Herbert L. Asher, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, indicated that all these polls are measuring non-attitudes.

Some professional pollsters disagree sharply. A firm defense of polling on questions about which the public may not yet have strong feelings comes from Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who does the NBC/ Journal poll with Robert Teeter, a Republican. He argues that wording is all-important; and that even if the poll question itself is the first thing someone has heard on a subject, it at least shows the potency various arguments will have once the subject becomes part of a public dialogue.

In the case of stem cell research, Mr. Hart and his colleagues at other polling organizations tried to write questions that fairly stated both sides of the argument.

Writing a balanced question, especially one that is not so long that the respondent hangs up in the middle, is a difficult art, not a science. Honest pollsters try to avoid phrasing that leads the respondents toward one answer or another, though they don't always succeed. But can the argument against human embryo research be adequately conveyed by saying it involves "potentially viable human embryos," as the Journal/NBC poll asked?

The key question in the bishops' poll, on the other hand, included a line that read, "the live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development." This question, which also used phrases like "your federal tax dollars;" and speaks only of "experiments;" not the lofty goals of the research, was not written by a pollster but by the bishops' chief lobbyist on the issue, Richard A. Doerflinger. And it was ridiculed by other pollsters. As Professor Asher said, "It's loaded.

Whatever their language, all the polls on stem cell research asked long, involved questions. And that is a tipoff that the issue is remote from most people, said Bernard Roshco, a former editor of Public Opinion Quarterly.
“Americans are acquiescent so they'll give you an answer,” he said. But the mere fact that you've got to offer a lengthy summary implies that it's too early to sort it out.

Pollsters regularly prove that point by eliciting opinions from people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people. This strongly suggests that the opinions people offer on subjects that are real but remote may be equally unreliable.

One safeguard is to ask a lot of questions, using different phrasings, and asking things like, “Would you still support X if you knew . . .” But that costs money. So it is not easy for pollsters and their clients to take the advice of academics like Professor Asher or Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, and explore difficult issues with a series of questions.

Without such persistence, said Professor Presser, a past director of the university's survey research center, pollsters and the politicians who seek their wisdom can be trapped by eager-to-please respondents, who answer questions not based on fully formed attitudes and strong feelings, but who, in effect, are constructing them as the interview progresses.

Which means that, sometimes, the pollsters are measuring phantoms, and the politicians are calling on them for support.

--=====================_2077454==_.ALT--
The reason is that an answer never relates to the question asked, but only to the question heard.

I cannot believe that this is really any problem at all. If it were, all human languages would fail, much more often than not. We humans would not have developed language at all, were it the case that--to paraphrase the above--the words said were never the words heard. This may often be the case with young children, I have recently come to relearn, but watching children overcome the problem, for their own convenience, is to appreciate why we bother to learn language at all: language works, it's useful, it helps us to get what we want, and to give others "a piece of our mind" (folk culture knows what's up).

The major failing of language is a quite different one: words like "tree" and "dog" cause different people to see different trees and different dogs (not even to mention words like "love" or "perhaps"). On the positive side: No language would have true poetry were it not for this failing, which thereby reassures us that *each* human language can have its *own* poetry.

Thank you Jim!

An illustration always helps to get a point across, and you have provided a good one: Your first paragraph indicates that you did not "hear" what I said, while your second paragraph indicates that you may in fact agree with what I said.

Perhaps I should not use the word "hear" in academic circles, where a four syllable word always outranks a four letter one, but my preference is to express thoughts using the simplest possible vocabulary. By "hear" I mean whatever image or concept forms in your mind as a result of what someone said or wrote. If you can provide a better single word that is not limited to an esoteric jargon, I would be happy to use it instead.

To elaborate on what I mean, the phrase "the cat runs" means something completely different in the following contexts:

1) A family member at home.
2) A Jazz musician on stage.
3) A zoo keeper.
4) A fashion designer.
5) A worker on a heavy construction site.

What you "hear" when you hear that phrase depends on the context in which you find yourself, and even on the context of the sentence in which it appears, since "runs" might be either a verb or a noun in most of the above.

The same is true when a respondent is asked a question in a survey. I see no conflict between what I am saying here and Howard Schumann's point that...

4. What is fictional or non-fictional depends on one's perspective. Some non-fictional items asked in ordinary surveys are probably fictional from the standpoint of many respondents. That is, they have no idea what the interviewer is talking about. Or maybe they have just heard the name
somewhere, as in the case of a recent respondent who identified Columbus as "our first president."

Certainly, asking about a fictitious event or person in the context of an otherwise factual survey forces a respondent to interpret the question in that context and therefore to assign some meaning to it, or, in my words, "hear" something that makes sense to him or her. Of course, we might consider ourselves fortunate that respondents in this situation do not generally perceive that they are being mislead and tell the questioner to go to hell.

Jan Werner
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Question wording differences appear here:

http://www.publicagenda.org/issues/major_proposals_detail.cfm?issue_type=medi_c
al_resea
rch&list=4
dick halpern wrote:

> From the OP-ED page in today's NY TIMES. The author focuses on two
> major points: The differences in response caused by differences in
> question wording and the significance of poll findings based on issues
> that the public doesn't know much about.
>
> Dick Halpern
>
>
> > NY TIMES, JULY 22, 2001
> >
> > The Unbearable Lightness of Public Opinion Polls
> >
> > By ADAM CLYMER
> >
> > WASHINGTON - AFTER a week during which one politician or interest
> > group after another brandished a poll to prove conclusively that the
> > public backs federal funding of human embryonic stem cell research, it
> > may come as a surprise to learn that American public opinion on the
> > subject doesn't exist - at least not yet. The subject is just too new
> > and too complicated.
>
> > Polls seem to say otherwise. There is a NBC News/ Wall Street Journal
> > poll with 69 percent in favor and 23 percent opposed, a Gallup Poll
> > for CNN and USA Today that found 54 percent in favor and a poll done
> > by ABC News and Beliefnet, a religious Web site, that found 58 percent
> > support. A survey done for the Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the
> > other hand, found only 24 percent approval, while the Juvenile
> > Diabetes Foundation, as part of the Coalition for the Advancement of
> > Medical Research, came up with a 70 percent figure.
>
> > The advocates of stem cell research certainly believe the numbers
> > should persuade President Bush - who promised in the 2000 campaign to
> > oppose funding - that the politically smart course is to change
> > course.
>
> > Representative Connie Morella, a moderate Republican from Maryland,
> > said last week, "Three to one, the Americans, when polled, are in
> > favor of stem cell research under particular strong guidelines." About
> > the same time, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation ran an advertisement
> > in The Washington Times claiming, "A recent national survey shows
> > conclusively that 70 percent support human embryonic stem cell
> > research, including Catholics (72 percent). . . . ."
>
> > But the large variations in the polls cited, which can generally be
> > traced to how the poll questions were worded, suggest that the
> > opinions of respondents are not fully formed, or firmly held. And that
> > is very much the case in the matter of stem cell research, as a
> > crucial finding in the Gallup poll, ignored by the combatants, shows.
Before having the issue explained to them, 57 percent of the public said they did not know enough to say whether they favored or opposed stem cell research (the pollsters then offered some information and pressed for opinions). The Gallup survey was the only one that specifically offered respondents that choice.

And a no-opinion number that high, said Herbert L. Asher, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, indicated that all these polls "are measuring non-attitudes."

Some professional pollsters disagree sharply. A firm defense of polling on questions about which the public may not yet have strong feelings comes from Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who does the NBC/Journal poll with Robert Teeter, a Republican. He argues that "wording is all-important," and that even if the poll question itself is the first thing someone has heard on a subject, it at least shows the potency various arguments will have once the subject becomes part of a public dialogue.

In the case of stem cell research, Mr. Hart and his colleagues at other polling organizations tried to write questions that fairly stated both sides of the argument.

Writing a balanced question, especially one that is not so long that the respondent hangs up in the middle, is a difficult art, not a science. Honest pollsters try to avoid phrasing that leads the respondents toward one answer or another, though they don't always succeed. But can the argument against human embryo research be adequately conveyed by saying it involves "potentially viable human embryos," as the Journal/NBC poll asked?

THE key question in the bishops' poll, on the other hand, included a line that read, "the live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development."

This question, which also used phrases like "your federal tax dollars" and speaks only of "experiments," not the lofty goals of the research, was not written by a pollster but by the bishops' chief lobbyist on the issue, Richard A. Doerflinger. And it was ridiculed by other pollsters. As Professor Asher said, "It's loaded."

Whatever their language, all the polls on stem cell research asked long, involved questions. And that is a tipoff that the issue is remote from most people, said Bernard Roshco, a former editor of Public Opinion Quarterly.

"Americans are acquiescent so they'll give you an answer," he said. But "the mere fact that you've got to offer a lengthy summary implies that it's too early to sort it out."

Pollsters regularly prove that point by eliciting opinions from people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people. This strongly suggests that the opinions people offer on subjects that are real but remote may be equally unreliable.

One safeguard is to ask a lot of questions, using different phrasings, and asking things like, "Would you still support X if you knew . . ."
But that costs money. So it is not easy for pollsters and their clients to take the advice of academics like Professor Asher or Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, and explore difficult issues with a series of questions.

Without such persistence, said Professor Presser, a past director of the university's survey research center, pollsters and the politicians who seek their wisdom can be trapped by eager-to-please respondents, who answer questions not based on fully formed attitudes and strong feelings, but who, in effect, are "constructing them as the interview progresses."

Which means that, sometimes, the pollsters are measuring phantoms, and the politicians are calling on them for support.

Question wording differences appear here:

Dick Halpern wrote:

From the OP-ED page in today's NY TIMES. The author focuses on two major points: The differences in response caused by differences in question wording and the significance of poll findings based on issues that the public doesn't know much about.

Dick Halpern

NY TIMES, JULY 22, 2001

WASHINGTON - AFTER a week during which one politician or interest group after another brandished a poll to prove conclusively that the public backs federal funding of human embryonic stem cell research, it may come as a
surprise to learn that American public opinion on the subject doesn't exist - at least not yet. The subject is just too new and too complicated.

Polls seem to say otherwise. There is a NBC News/ Wall Street Journal poll with 69 percent in favor and 23 percent opposed, a Gallup Poll for CNN and USA Today that found 54 percent in favor and a poll done by ABC News and Beliefnet, a religious Web site, that found 58 percent support. A survey done for the Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the other hand, found only 24 percent approval, while the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, as part of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, came up with a 70 percent figure.

The advocates of stem cell research certainly believe the numbers should persuade President Bush - who promised in the 2000 campaign to oppose funding - that the politically smart course is to change course.

Representative Connie Morella, a moderate Republican from Maryland, said last week, "Three to one, the Americans, when polled, are in favor of stem cell research under particular strong guidelines." About the same time, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation ran an advertisement in The Washington Times claiming, "A recent national survey shows conclusively that 70 percent support human embryonic stem cell research, including Catholics (72 percent). . . ."

But the large variations in the polls cited, which can generally be traced to how the poll questions were worded, suggest that the opinions of respondents are not fully formed, or firmly held. And that is very much the case in the matter of stem cell research, as a crucial finding in the Gallup poll, ignored by the combatants, shows.

Before having the issue explained to them, 57 percent of the public said they did not know enough to say whether they favored or opposed stem cell research (the pollsters then offered some information and pressed for opinions). The Gallup survey was the only one that specifically offered respondents that choice.

And a no-opinion number that high, said Herbert L. Asher, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, indicated that all these polls "are measuring non-attitudes."

Some professional pollsters disagree sharply. A firm defense of polling on questions about which the public may not yet have strong feelings comes from Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who does the NBC/ Journal poll with Robert Teeter, a Republican. He argues that "wording is all-important," and that even if the poll question itself is the first thing someone has heard on a subject, it at least shows the potency various arguments will have once the subject becomes part of a public dialogue.

In the case of stem cell research, Mr. Hart and his colleagues at other polling organizations tried to write questions that fairly stated both sides of the argument.

Writing a balanced question, especially one that is not so long that the respondent hangs up in the middle, is a difficult art, not a science. Honest pollsters try to avoid phrasing that leads the respondents toward one answer or another, though they don't always succeed. But can the argument against human embryo research be adequately conveyed by saying it involves "potentially viable human embryos," as the Journal/NBC poll asked?

THE key question in the bishops' poll, on the other hand, included a line that read, "the live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development."

This question, which also used phrases like "your federal tax dollars" and speaks only of "experiments," not the lofty goals of the research, was not written by a pollster but by the bishops' chief lobbyist on the issue, Richard A. Doerflinger. And it was ridiculed by other pollsters. As Professor Asher said, "It's loaded."
Whatever their language, all the polls on stem cell research asked long, involved questions. And that is a tipoff that the issue is remote from most people, said Bernard Roshco, a former editor of Public Opinion Quarterly.

"Americans are acquiescent so they'll give you an answer," he said. But "the mere fact that you've got to offer a lengthy summary implies that it's too early to sort it out."

POLLSTERS regularly prove that point by eliciting opinions from people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people. This strongly suggests that the opinions people offer on subjects that are real but remote may be equally unreliable.

One safeguard is to ask a lot of questions, using different phrasings, and asking things like, "Would you still support X if you knew . . . ." But that costs money. So it is not easy for pollsters and their clients to take the advice of academics like Professor Asher or Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, and explore difficult issues with a series of questions.

Without such persistence, said Professor Presser, a past director of the university's survey research center, pollsters and the politicians who seek their wisdom can be trapped by eager-to-please respondents, who answer questions not based on fully formed attitudes and strong feelings, but who, in effect, are "constructing them as the interview progresses."

Which means that, sometimes, the pollsters are measuring phantoms, and the politicians are calling on them for support.

---
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Thought provoking article, thanks for sharing. Mark Richards

I found myself thinking, Polls-You can't live with 'em and you can't live without 'em.

Something in recent messages reminded me of two authors who stretch the imagination; here are a couple excerpts!

>From Jean Baudrillard's "Simulations."

Today, the object is no longer 'functional' in the traditional meaning of the word; it no longer serves you, it tests you. It has nothing to do with the object of yesteryear, no more than does media news with a 'reality' of facts. Both objects and information result already from a selection, a montage, from a point-of-view. They have already tested 'reality,' and have asked only questions that 'answered back' to them. They have broken down reality in to simple elements that they have reassembled into scenarios of regulated oppositions, exactly in the same way that the photographer imposes his contrasts, lights, angles on this subject . It is exactly like the test of the referendum when they translate a conflict or problem into a game of questions/answer. . All is presented today in a spread-out series, or as part of a line of products, and this fact alone tests you already,
because you are obliged to make decisions. This approximates our
gen-eral attitude toward the world around us to that of a reading, and
to a selective deciphering. Just like cutting out a sample for the
ends of the survey, the media frame and excise their message bundles,
which are in fact bundles of selected questions, samples of their
audience. 'Public opinion' is evidently the prettiest of these
samples—not an unreal political substance, but one that is hyperreal—a
fantastic hyperreality that lives only off of montage and
test-manipulation.

The eruption of the binary scheme question/answer is of an
incalculable importance. It renders inarticulate every discourse. It
short-circuits all that was, in a golden age come again, the dialectic
of signifier and signified, of a representing and a represented. It
is the end of objects whose meaning would be function, and of opinions
that 'representative' representatives would be able to vote for. It
is the end of the real interrogation to which it was possible to
answer (the end especially to unanswerable questions).

This entire analysis send us back to McLuhan's formula: 'The Medium is
the Message.' It is in effect the medium—the very style of montage,
of decoupage, of interpellation, solicitation, summation, by the
medium—which controls the process of meaning. And you understand why
McLuhan saw in the era of the great electronic media an era of tactile
communication. Everywhere you're tested, palpated, the method is
'tactical,' the sphere of communication is 'tactile.' Without even
speaking of the ideology of 'contact,' that is being pushed in all its
forms as a substitute for social rapport, there is an entire social
configuration that orbits around the test (the question/answer cell)
as around the commandments of the molecular code.

The political sphere entirely loses its specificity when it enters
into the game of the media and public opinion polls, that is to say
into the sphere of the integrated circuit of question/answer. The
electoral sphere is in any case the first great institution where
social exchange is reduced to obtaining an answer. It is due to this
sign-simplification that it is the first one to become universal.
Universal suffrage is the first of the mass-media. All through the
19th and 20th centuries political and economic practice merge
increasingly into the same type of discourse. Propaganda and
advertising fuse in the same marketing and merchandising of objects
and ideologies. This convergence of language between the economic and
the political is furthermore what marks a society such as ours, where
'political economy' is fully realized. It is also by the same token
its end, since the two spheres are abolished in an entirely separate
reality, or hyperreality, which is that of the media. There, too,
there is an elevation of each term to a greater power, that of the
third-order simulacra.

'That many regret the 'corruption' of politics by the media, deploring
that TV and public opinion polls have replaced so quickly the
formation of opinion, shows only that they understand nothing about
politics'

What is characteristic of this phase of political hyperrealism is the
necessary conjunction between the bipartite system and the entry in to
the play of the polls as mirror of this alternating equivalence of the
political game.

The polls are located in a dimension beyond all social production. They refer only to a simulacrum of public opinion. A mirror of opinion analogous in its way to that of the Gross National Product: imaginary mirror of the productive forces, without regard to their social ends or lack thereof.

The polls manipulate that which cannot be decided. Do they really affect the vote? True, false? Do they give an exact picture of reality, or simple tendencies, or the refraction of this reality in a hyperspace of simulation, whose curve even is unknown? True, false, undecidable. Their most sophisticated analyses leave room always for the reversibility of the hypotheses. Statistics is only casuistry. This undecidable quality is proper to any process of simulation. The internal logic of these procedures (statistics, probability, operation cybernetics) is certainly rigorous and 'scientific'; somehow though it does not stick, it is a fabulous fiction whose index of refraction in any reality (true or false) is nil. This is even what gives these models their forcefulness.

What is true of the statistics scenario is also true of the regulated partition of the political sphere: the alternation of the forces in power, majority/minority, substitutive, etc. On this limit of pure representation, 'that' no longer represents anything. Politics dies of the too-well-regulated game of distinctive oppositions. The political sphere (and that of power in general) becomes empty. This is somehow the payment for the accomplishing of the political class' desire: that of a perfect manipulation of social representation. Surreptitiously and silently, all social substance has left this machine in the very moment of its perfect reproduction.

The same holds true for the polls. The only ones who believe in them finally are the members of the political class, just as the only ones who really believe in advertising and market studies are the marketers and advertisers. That is not because they are particularly stupid (though that we can't exclude either) but because the polls are homogenous with the current functioning of politics. They take on a 'real' tactical value, they come into play as a factor in the regulation of the political class according to its own rules of the game. It therefore has reason to believe in them, and it believes. But who else does, really? It is the political class' burlesque spectacle, hyper-representative of nothing at all, that people taste by way of the polls and media. There is a jubilation proper to spectacular nullity, and the last form it takes is that of statistical contemplation. This is accompanied always, we know, by a profound disappointment—the kind of disillusion that the polls provoke in absorbing so utterly the public's voice, in short-circuiting all process of expression.

>From Milan Kundera's "Slowness."

"Are you really from the twentieth century?"
"I certainly am, old man. There are amazing things happening in this century. Moral liberation. I tell you, I've just spent a terrific night."
"So have I," the Chevalier says once more, and he prepares to tell about his.
"A very strange night, very strange, incredible," repeats the man in the helmet, his stare heavy with insistence.
"The Chevalier sees in this stare the stubborn urge to speak. Something in that stubbornness disturbs him. He understands that the impatience to speak is also an implacable uninterest in listening. Having run up against that urge to speak, the Chevalier instantly loses the taste for saying anything at all, and at once he ceases to see any reason to prolong the encounter. He feels a new wave of weariness. He strokes his face with his hand and catches the scent of love Madame de T. has left on his fingers. That scent stirs him to nostalgia, and he wants to be alone in the chaise to be carried slowly, dreamily to Paris."
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>From the OP-ED page in today's NY TIMES. The author focuses on two major points: The differences in response caused by differences in question wording and the significance of poll findings based on issues that the public doesn't know much about.

Dick Halpern

NY TIMES, JULY 22, 2001

The Unbearable Lightness of Public Opinion Polls

By ADAM CLYMER

WASHINGTON - AFTER a week during which one politician or interest group after another brandished a poll to prove conclusively that the public backs federal funding of human embryonic stem cell research, it may come as a surprise to learn that American public opinion on the subject doesn't exist - at least not yet. The subject is just too new and too complicated.

Polls seem to say otherwise. There is a NBC News/ Wall Street Journal poll with 69 percent in favor and 23 percent opposed, a Gallup Poll for CNN and USA Today that found 54 percent in favor and a poll done by ABC News and Beliefnet, a religious Web site, that found 58 percent support. A survey done for the Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the other hand, found only 24 percent approval, while the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, as part of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, came up with a 70 percent figure.
The advocates of stem cell research certainly believe the numbers should persuade President Bush — who promised in the 2000 campaign to oppose funding — that the politically smart course is to change course.

Representative Connie Morella, a moderate Republican from Maryland, said last week, "Three to one, the Americans, when polled, are in favor of stem cell research under particular strong guidelines." About the same time, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation ran an advertisement in The Washington Times claiming, "A recent national survey shows conclusively that 70 percent support human embryonic stem cell research, including Catholics (72 percent) . . . ."

But the large variations in the polls cited, which can generally be traced to how the poll questions were worded, suggest that the opinions of respondents are not fully formed, or firmly held. And that is very much the case in the matter of stem cell research, as a crucial finding in the Gallup poll, ignored by the combatants, shows.

Before having the issue explained to them, 57 percent of the public said they did not know enough to say whether they favored or opposed stem cell research (the pollsters then offered some information and pressed for opinions). The Gallup survey was the only one that specifically offered respondents that choice.

And a no-opinion number that high, said Herbert L. Asher, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, indicated that all these polls "are measuring non-attitudes."

Some professional pollsters disagree sharply. A firm defense of polling on questions about which the public may not yet have strong feelings comes from Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who does the NBC/Journal poll with Robert Teeter, a Republican. He argues that "wording is all-important," and that even if the poll question itself is the first thing someone has heard on a subject, it at least shows the potency various arguments will have once the subject becomes part of a public dialogue.

In the case of stem cell research, Mr. Hart and his colleagues at other polling organizations tried to write questions that fairly stated both sides of the argument.

Writing a balanced question, especially one that is not so long that the respondent hangs up in the middle, is a difficult art, not a science. Honest pollsters try to avoid phrasing that leads the respondents toward one answer or another, though they don't always succeed. But can the argument against human embryo research be adequately conveyed by saying it involves "potentially viable human embryos," as the Journal/NBC poll asked?

The key question in the bishops' poll, on the other hand, included a line that read, "the live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development."

This question, which also used phrases like "your federal tax dollars" and speaks only of "experiments," not the lofty goals of the research, was not written by a pollster but by the bishops' chief lobbyist on
the issue, Richard A. Doerflinger. And it was ridiculed by other pollsters. As Professor Asher said, "It's loaded."

Whatever their language, all the polls on stem cell research asked long, involved questions. And that is a tipoff that the issue is remote from most people, said Bernard Roshco, a former editor of Public Opinion Quarterly.

"Americans are acquiescent so they'll give you an answer," he said. But "the mere fact that you've got to offer a lengthy summary implies that it's too early to sort it out."

POLSTERS regularly prove that point by eliciting opinions from people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people. This strongly suggests that the opinions people offer on subjects that are real but remote may be equally unreliable.

One safeguard is to ask a lot of questions, using different phrasings, and asking things like, "Would you still support X if you knew . . . ." But that costs money. So it is not easy for pollsters and their clients to take the advice of academics like Professor Asher or Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, and explore difficult issues with a series of questions.

Without such persistence, said Professor Presser, a past director of the university's survey research center, pollsters and the politicians who seek their wisdom can be trapped by eager-to-please respondents, who answer questions not based on fully formed attitudes and strong feelings, but who, in effect, are "constructing them as the interview progresses."

Which means that, sometimes, the pollsters are measuring phantoms, and the politicians are calling on them for support.
Thought-provoking article, thanks for sharing. Mark Richards

I found myself thinking, Polls—You can't live with 'em and you can't live without 'em.

Polls; You can't live with 'em and you can't live without 'em.
So something in recent messages reminded me of two authors who stretch the imagination; here are a couple excerpts!

From Jean Baudrillard’s “Simulations.”

Today, the object is no longer ‘functional’ in the traditional meaning of the word; it no longer serves you, it tests you. It has nothing to do with the object of yesteryear, no more than does media news with a reality of facts. Both objects and information result already from a selection, a montage, from a point-of-view. They have already tested reality, and have asked only questions that answered back to them. They have broken down reality into simple elements that they have reassembled into scenarios of regulated oppositions, exactly in the same way that the photographer imposes his contrasts, lights, angles on this subject.
It is exactly like the test of the referendum when they translate a conflict or problem into a game of questions/answer. All is presented today in a spread-out series, or as part of a line of products, and this fact alone tests you already, because you are obliged to make decisions. This approximates our general attitude toward the world around us to that of a reading, and to a selective deciphering. Just like cutting out a sample for the ends of the survey, the media frame and excise their message bundles, which are in fact bundles of selected questions, samples of their audience. Public opinion is evidently the prettiest of these samples; not an unreal political substance, but one that is hyperreal; a fantastic hyperreality that lives only off of montage and test-manipulation.

The eruption of the binary scheme question/answer is of an incalculable importance. It renders inarticulate every discourse. It short-circuits all that was, in a golden age come again, the dialectic of signifier and signified, of a representing and a represented. It is the end of objects whose meaning would be function, and of opinions that representative representatives would be able to vote for. It is the end of the real interrogation to which it was possible to answer (the end especially to unanswerable questions).
This entire analysis sends us back to McLuhan’s formula: ‘The Medium is the Message.’ It is in effect the medium—the very style of montage, of decoupage, of interpellation, solicitation, summation, by the medium—which controls the process of meaning. And you understand why McLuhan saw in the era of the great electronic media an era of tactile communication. Everywhere you’re tested, palpated, the method is tactical; the sphere of communication is tactile. Without even speaking of the ideology of contact; that is being pushed in all its forms as a substitute for social rapport, there is an entire social configuration that orbits around the test (the question/answer cell) as around the commandments of the molecular code.

The political sphere entirely loses its specificity when it enters into the game of the media and public opinion polls, that is to say into the sphere of the integrated circuit of question/answer. The electoral sphere is in any case the first great institution where social exchange is reduced to obtaining an answer. It is due to this sign-simplification that it is the first one to become universal. Universal suffrage is the first of the mass-media. All through the 19th and 20th centuries political and economic practice merge increasingly into the same type of discourse.
Propaganda and advertising fuse in the same marketing and merchandising of objects and ideologies. This convergence of language between the economic and the political is furthermore what marks a society such as ours, where political economy is fully realized. It is also by the same token its end, since the two spheres are abolished in an entirely separate reality, or hyperreality, which is that of the media. There, too, there is an elevation of each term to a greater power, that of the third-order simulacra.

That many regret the 'corruption' of politics by the media, deploring that TV and public opinion polls have replaced so quickly the formation of opinion, shows only that they understand nothing about politics; what is characteristic of this phase of political hyperrealism is the necessary conjunction between the bipartite system and the entry into the play of the polls as mirror of this alternating equivalence of the political game.
The polls are located in a dimension beyond all social production. They refer only to a simulacrum of public opinion. A mirror of opinion analogous in its way to that of the Gross National Product: imaginary mirror of the productive forces, without regard to their social ends or lack thereof.

Do they really affect the vote? Do they give an exact picture of reality, or simple tendencies, or the refraction of this reality in a hyperspace of simulation, whose curve even is unknown? Their most sophisticated analyses leave room always for the reversibility of the hypotheses. Statistics is only casuistry. This undecidable quality is proper to any process of simulation.

The internal logic of these procedures (statistics, probability, operation cybernetics) is certainly rigorous and scientific; somehow though it does not stick, it is a fabulous fiction whose index of refraction in any reality (true or false) is nil.

This is even what gives these models their forcefulness.
What is true of the statistics scenario is also true of the regulated partition of the political sphere: the alternation of the forces in power, =
majority/minority, substitutive, etc. On this limit of pure representation, it no longer represents anything. Politics dies of the too-well-regulated game of distinctive oppositions. The political sphere (and that of power in general) becomes empty. This is somehow the payment for the accomplishing of the political class' desire: that of a perfect manipulation of social representation. Surreptitiously and silently, all social substance has left this machine in the very moment of its perfect reproduction. The only ones who believe in them finally are the members of the political class, just as the only ones who really believe in advertising and market studies are the marketers and advertisers. That is not because they are particularly stupid (though that we can't exclude either) but because the polls are homogenous with the current functioning of politics. They take on a tactical value, they come into play as a factor in the regulation of the political class according to its own rules of the =
It therefore has reason to believe in them, and it believes. But who else does, really? It is the political class’ burlesque spectacle, hyper-representative of nothing at all, that people taste by way of the polls and media.

There is a jubilation proper to spectacular nullity, and the last form it takes is that of statistical contemplation. This is accompanied always, we know, by a profound disappointment; the kind of disillusion that the polls provoke in absorbing so utterly the public’s voice, in short-circuiting all process of expression.

From Milan Kundera’s “Slowness.”

Are you really from the twentieth century?
"I certainly am, old man. There are amazing things happening in this century. Moral liberation. I tell you, I've just spent a terrific night." 

"So have I," the Chevalier says once more, and he prepares to tell about his. 

"A very strange night, very strange, incredible," repeats the man in the helmet, his stare heavy with insistence. 

The Chevalier sees in this stare the stubborn urge to speak. Something in that stubbornness disturbs him. 

He understands that the impatience to speak is also an implacable uninterest in listening. Having run up against that urge to speak, the Chevalier instantly loses the taste for saying anything at all, and at once he ceases to see any reason to prolong the encounter. 

He feels a new wave of weariness. He strokes his face with his hand and catches the scent of love Madame de T. has left on his fingers. That scent stirs him to nostalgia, and he wants to be alone in the chaise to be carried slowly, dreamily to Paris. 

"The Chevalier sees in this stare the stubborn urge to speak. Something in that stubbornness disturbs him."
From the OP-ED page in today's NY TIMES.
The author focuses on two major points: The differences in response caused by differences in question wording and the significance of poll findings based on issues that the public doesn't know much about. 

Dick Halpern
WASHINGTON — AFTER a week during which one politician or interest group after another brandished a poll to prove conclusively that the public backs federal funding of human embryonic stem cell research, it may come as a surprise to learn that American public opinion on the subject doesn't exist — at least not yet. The subject is just too new and too complicated.

Polls seem to say otherwise. There is a NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll with 69 percent in favor and 23 percent opposed, a Gallup Poll for CNN and USA Today that found 54 percent in favor and a poll done by ABC News and Beliefnet, a religious Web site, that found 58 percent support. A survey done for the Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the other hand, found only 24 percent approval, while the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, as part of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, came up with a 70 percent figure.

The advocates of stem cell research certainly believe the numbers should persuade President Bush; who promised in the 2000 campaign to oppose funding that the politically smart course is to change course. Representative Connie Morella, a moderate Republican from Maryland, said last week, "Three to one, the Americans, when polled, are in favor of..."
stem cell research under particular strong guidelines." About the same time, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation ran an advertisement in The Washington Times claiming, "A recent national survey shows conclusively that 70 percent support human embryonic stem cell research, including Catholics (72 percent)."

But the large variations in the polls cited, which can generally be traced to how the poll questions were worded, suggest that the opinions of respondents are not fully formed, or firmly held. And that is very much the case in the matter of stem cell research, as a crucial finding in the Gallup poll, ignored by the combatants, shows.

Before having the issue explained to them, 57 percent of the public said they did not know enough to say whether they favored or opposed stem cell research (the pollsters then offered some information and pressed for opinions). The Gallup survey was the only one that specifically offered respondents that choice.

And a no-opinion number that high, said Herbert L. Asher, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, indicated that all these polls "are measuring non-attitudes." Some professional pollsters disagree sharply. A firm defense of polling on questions about which the public may not yet have strong feelings comes from Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who does the NBC/Journal poll with Robert Teeter, a Republican. He argues that "wording is all-important," and that even if the poll question itself is the first thing someone has heard on a subject, it at least shows the potency various arguments will have once the subject becomes part of a public dialogue.

In the case of stem cell research, Mr. Hart and his colleagues at other polling organizations tried to write questions that fairly stated both sides of the argument.

Writing a balanced question, especially one that is not so long that the
respondent hangs up in the middle, is a difficult art, not a science. = Honest pollsters try to avoid phrasing that leads the respondents toward one = answer or another, though they don't always succeed. But can the argument against = human embryo research be adequately conveyed by saying it involves = "potentially viable human embryos," as the Journal/NBC poll asked?<br>
<br>
THE key question in the bishops' poll, on the other hand, included a = line that read, "the live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development." <br>
<br>
This question, which also used phrases like "your federal tax dollars" and speaks only of "experiments," not the lofty = goals of the research, was not written by a pollster but by the bishops' chief lobbyist on the issue, Richard A. Doerflinger. And it was ridiculed by = other pollsters. As Professor Asher said, "It's loaded." <br>
<br>
Whatever their language, all the polls on stem cell research asked long, involved questions. And that is a tipoff that the issue is remote from = most people, said Bernard Roshco, a former editor of Public Opinion Quarterly.<br>
<br>
"Americans are acquiescent so they'll give you an answer," he = said. But "the mere fact that you've got to offer a lengthy summary = implies that it's too early to sort it out." <br>
<br>
POLLSTERS regularly prove that point by eliciting opinions from people = on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people. This strongly suggests = that the opinions people offer on subjects that are real but remote may be = equally unreliable.<br>
<br>
One safeguard is to ask a lot of questions, using different phrasings, = and asking things like, "Would you still support X if you knew ..." But that costs money. So it is not easy for pollsters and their clients = to take the advice of academics like Professor Asher or Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, and explore difficult issues with a series of questions. <br>
<br>
Without such persistence, said Professor Presser, a past director of the university's survey research center, pollsters and the politicians who = seek their wisdom can be trapped by eager-to-please respondents, who answer =
questions not based on fully formed attitudes and strong feelings, but who, in effect, are &quot;constructing them as the interview progresses.&quot;

Which means that, sometimes, the pollsters are measuring phantoms, and the politicians are calling on them for support.

Bev Jensen, Ph.D. (UW, '87)

--- Original Message ---
From: James P. Murphy <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: H. Stuart Elway <hstuart@elwayresearch.com>; 'AAPORNET' <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2001 1:17 PM
Subject: Re: Non-medical determinants of health

> What about contact with physicians?
>
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> -----Original Message-----
> From: H. Stuart Elway <hstuart@elwayresearch.com>
> To: 'AAPORNET' <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Date: Thursday, June 28, 2001 1:14 PM
> Subject: Non-medical determinants of health
>
>
> Aapornetters,
>     We are starting a project on "non-medical determinants of health" and I
> am looking for pertinent opinion research. Variables on the current list
> include such things as: lifestyle, income, diet, exercise, alcohol, fire
> arms, excessive attention to polls, etc. It's a wide net at this point.
>     As always, I would appreciate any references and/or guidance.
> H.Stuart Elway
> Elway Research, Inc.
> 206/264-1500
> NEW E-MAIL:  hstuart@elwayresearch.com
> Website:  www.elwayresearch.com
>
This is a very nice try at analyzing multiple poll results by someone not qualified as a public opinion researcher. I wish someone would take over and write columns like this who knows how to do it. "Would you still support X if you knew..." is an approach that has been associated with extreme bias if not 'push polling.' Asking many questions about a topic may be a good idea. That one question won't do it is not necessarily a sign that public opinion is uniformed.

Jeanne Anderson  
(formerly)  
Jeanne Anderson Research

Nick Panagakis wrote:

> Question wording differences appear here:
> http://www.publicagenda.org/issues/major_proposals_detail.cfm?issue_type=medical_research&list=4
>
dick halpern wrote:
>
>> From the OP-ED page in today's NY TIMES. The author focuses on two major points: The differences in response caused by differences in question wording and the significance of poll findings based on issues that the public doesn't know much about.
>> Dick Halpern
>>
>> NY TIMES, JULY 22, 2001
>>
>> The Unbearable Lightness of Public Opinion Polls
>>
>> By ADAM CLYMER
>>
>> WASHINGTON - AFTER a week during which one politician or interest group after another brandished a poll to prove conclusively that the public backs federal funding of human embryonic stem cell research,
it may come as a surprise to learn that American public opinion on the subject doesn't exist - at least not yet. The subject is just too new and too complicated.

Polls seem to say otherwise. There is a NBC News/ Wall Street Journal poll with 69 percent in favor and 23 percent opposed, a Gallup Poll for CNN and USA Today that found 54 percent in favor and a poll done by ABC News and Beliefnet, a religious Web site, that found 58 percent support. A survey done for the Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the other hand, found only 24 percent approval, while the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, as part of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, came up with a 70 percent figure.

The advocates of stem cell research certainly believe the numbers should persuade President Bush - who promised in the 2000 campaign to oppose funding - that the politically smart course is to change course.

Representative Connie Morella, a moderate Republican from Maryland, said last week, "Three to one, the Americans, when polled, are in favor of stem cell research under particular strong guidelines." About the same time, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation ran an advertisement in The Washington Times claiming, "A recent national survey shows conclusively that 70 percent support human embryonic stem cell research, including Catholics (72 percent). . . ."

But the large variations in the polls cited, which can generally be traced to how the poll questions were worded, suggest that the opinions of respondents are not fully formed, or firmly held. And that is very much the case in the matter of stem cell research, as a crucial finding in the Gallup poll, ignored by the combatants, shows.

Before having the issue explained to them, 57 percent of the public said they did not know enough to say whether they favored or opposed stem cell research (the pollsters then offered some information and pressed for opinions). The Gallup survey was the only one that specifically offered respondents that choice.

And a no-opinion number that high, said Herbert L. Asher, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, indicated that all these polls "are measuring non-attitudes."

Some professional pollsters disagree sharply. A firm defense of polling on questions about which the public may not yet have strong feelings comes from Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who does the NBC/ Journal poll with Robert Teeter, a Republican. He argues that "wording is all-important," and that even if the poll question itself is the first thing someone has heard on a subject, it at least shows the potency various arguments will have once the subject becomes part of a public dialogue.

In the case of stem cell research, Mr. Hart and his colleagues at other polling organizations tried to write questions that fairly stated both sides of the argument.
Writing a balanced question, especially one that is not so long that
the respondent hangs up in the middle, is a difficult art, not a
science. Honest pollsters try to avoid phrasing that leads the
respondents toward one answer or another, though they don't always
succeed. But can the argument against human embryo research be
adequately conveyed by saying it involves "potentially viable human
embryos," as the Journal/NBC poll asked?

The key question in the bishops' poll, on the other hand, included a
line that read, "the live embryos would be destroyed in their first
week of development."

This question, which also used phrases like "your federal tax
dollars" and speaks only of "experiments," not the lofty goals of
the research, was not written by a polister but by the bishops'
chief lobbyist on the issue, Richard A. Doerflinger. And it was
ridiculed by other pollsters. As Professor Asher said, "It's
loaded."

Whatever their language, all the polls on stem cell research asked
long, involved questions. And that is a tipoff that the issue is
remote from most people, said Bernard Roshco, a former editor of
Public Opinion Quarterly.

"Americans are acquiescent so they'll give you an answer," he said.
But "the mere fact that you've got to offer a lengthy summary
implies that it's too early to sort it out."

Pollsters regularly prove that point by eliciting opinions from
people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people. This
strongly suggests that the opinions people offer on subjects that
are real but remote may be equally unreliable.

One safeguard is to ask a lot of questions, using different
phrasings, and asking things like, "Would you still support X if you
knew . . ." But that costs money. So it is not easy for pollsters
and their clients to take the advice of academics like Professor
Asher or Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, and explore
difficult issues with a series of questions.

Without such persistence, said Professor Presser, a past director of
the university's survey research center, pollsters and the
politicians who seek their wisdom can be trapped by eager-to-please
respondents, who answer questions not based on fully formed
attitudes and strong feelings, but who, in effect, are "constructing
them as the interview progresses."

Which means that, sometimes, the pollsters are measuring phantoms,
and the politicians are calling on them for support.
This is a very nice try at analyzing multiple poll results by someone not qualified as a public opinion researcher. I wish someone would take over and write columns like this who knows how to do it. "Would you still support X if you knew..." is an approach that has been associated with extreme bias if not 'push polling.' Asking many questions about a topic may be a good idea. That one question won't do it is not necessarily a sign that public opinion is unformed.

Jeanne Anderson
(formerly)
Jeanne Anderson Research

Nick Panagakis wrote:

Question wording differences appear here:

http://www.publicagenda.org/issues/major_proposals_detail.cfm?issue_type=medical_research&list=4

Dick Halpern wrote:

From the OP-ED page in today's NY TIMES. The author focuses on two major points: The differences in response caused by differences in question wording and the significance of poll findings based on issues that the public doesn't know much about.

Dick Halpern

NY TIMES, JULY 22, 2001

WASHINGTON - AFTER a week during which one politician or interest group after another brandished a poll to prove conclusively that the public backs federal funding of human embryonic stem cell research, it may come as a surprise to learn that American public opinion on the subject doesn't exist - at least not yet. The subject is just too new and too complicated. Polls seem to say otherwise. There is a NBC News/ Wall Street Journal poll with 69 percent in favor and 23 percent opposed, a Gallup Poll for CNN and USA Today that found 54 percent in favor and a poll done by ABC News and Beliefnet, a religious Web site, that found 58 percent support. A survey done for the Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the other hand,
found only 24 percent approval, while the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, as part of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, came up with a 70 percent figure.

The advocates of stem cell research certainly believe the numbers should persuade President Bush - who promised in the 2000 campaign to oppose funding - that the politically smart course is to change course.

Representative Connie Morella, a moderate Republican from Maryland, said last week, "Three to one, the Americans, when polled, are in favor of stem cell research under particular strong guidelines." About the same time, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation ran an advertisement in The Washington Times claiming, "A recent national survey shows conclusively that 70 percent support human embryonic stem cell research, including Catholics (72 percent). . ." 

But the large variations in the polls cited, which can generally be traced to how the poll questions were worded, suggest that the opinions of respondents are not fully formed, or firmly held. And that is very much the case in the matter of stem cell research, as a crucial finding in the Gallup poll, ignored by the combatants, shows.

Before having the issue explained to them, 57 percent of the public said they did not know enough to say whether they favored or opposed stem cell research (the pollsters then offered some information and pressed for opinions). The Gallup survey was the only one that specifically offered respondents that choice.

And a no-opinion number that high, said Herbert L. Asher, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, indicated that all these polls "are measuring non-attitudes."

Some professional pollsters disagree sharply. A firm defense of polling on questions about which the public may not yet have strong feelings comes from Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who does the NBC/Journal poll with Robert Teeter, a Republican. He argues that "wording is all-important," and that even if the poll question itself is the first thing someone has heard on a subject, it at least shows the potency various arguments will have once the subject becomes part of a public dialogue.

In the case of stem cell research, Mr. Hart and his colleagues at other polling organizations tried to write questions that fairly stated both sides of the argument.

Writing a balanced question, especially one that is not so long that the respondent hangs up in the middle, is a difficult art, not a science. Honest pollsters try to avoid phrasing that leads the respondents toward one answer or another, though they don't always succeed. But can the argument against human embryo research be adequately conveyed by saying it involves "potentially viable human embryos," as the Journal/NBC poll asked?

The key question in the bishops' poll, on the other hand, included a line that read, "the live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development."

This question, which also used phrases like "your federal tax dollars" and speaks only of "experiments," not the lofty goals of the research, was not written by a pollster but by the bishops' chief lobbyist on the issue, Richard A. Doerflinger. And it was ridiculed by other pollsters. As Professor Asher said, "It's loaded."

Whatever their language, all the polls on stem cell research asked long, involved questions. And that is a tipoff that the issue is remote from most people, said Bernard Roshco, a former editor of Public Opinion Quarterly.

"Americans are acquiescent so they'll give you an answer," he said. But "the mere fact that you've got to offer a lengthy summary implies that it's too early to sort it out."
POLLSTERS regularly prove that point by eliciting opinions from people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people. This strongly suggests that the opinions people offer on subjects that are real but remote may be equally unreliable.

One safeguard is to ask a lot of questions, using different phrasings, and asking things like, "Would you still support X if you knew . . ." But that costs money. So it is not easy for pollsters and their clients to take the advice of academics like Professor Asher or Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, and explore difficult issues with a series of questions.

Without such persistence, said Professor Presser, a past director of the university's survey research center, pollsters and the politicians who seek their wisdom can be trapped by eager-to-please respondents, who answer questions not based on fully formed attitudes and strong feelings, but who, in effect, are "constructing them as the interview progresses."

Which means that, sometimes, the pollsters are measuring phantoms, and the politicians are calling on them for support.

Jan Werner,

I find the fact of language much simpler than do you, and certainly not more complicated, as you say. Even if you don't agree, please don't blame academics generally for making language more complicated than you yourself find it to be, because I don't think many academics have held a view of our language as complicated as your own for roughly 30 years.

The essential problem of language is certainly not that words like "tree"
are not "heard," as you say, but rather than "tree"--and most words in any human language--can denote a wide range of quite different things (tens of thousands of different things, in the case of "tree"). The problem arises because human cultures develop largely independently of the development of language, even though the reverse is rarely true.

Survey research has realized the importance of this problem from the outset, and the field does indeed appreciate those skilled at working around the problem in constructing questionnaire and interview items. For these reasons, I do not see yours as a pressing concern of the profession, at least not compared to the other related concerns expressed by several other members of our list.

A very good reason for not describing the problem as one of "hearing," as you seem to insist on doing, is that this implies that written and spoken messages have inherent or intrinsic meanings, which might be known by a third-party observer, independent of both sender and receiver. Were this true, not only would most poets be out of work, but also most lawyers as well. This is the reason why we find more technical jargon in POQ than we do in newspaper stories about polls--jargon serves to signal that very precise meanings are both intended and also required, in order to "hear" the *precise* meanings of our research reports. Unfortunately for our general population surveys, however, this "jargon solution" is out of the question in such surveys, I think for obvious reasons. And so we do the best that we can, relying only on our few experts in empathy (empathy with the entire range of possible respondents, that is to say), and usually on a little pretesting as well.

I bother to object to your own word "hearing," and the inherent-or-intrinsic-meaning view of language content which it implies, because--in addition to being untenable--it grossly slights the talent required to write good survey research items. As Howard Schuman put it in his Friday message: The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves.

The problem is indeed in ourselves, and I think survey research has long understood the problem, taken considerable pains to overcome it, and has it well under control, especially considering the complexity of the problem--not even to mention the variety of cultures and respondents in general population surveys. My original complaint was with questions about subjective views of hypothetical futures for the Internet, after all. It was Howard who linked such complaints to the much larger traditional survey problems of language, wording, and variety of possible meanings. I not only embrace this idea, I wish that I had thought of it myself.

-- Jim

P.S. Because my goal is ever to write as simply and clearly as I can (being neverless far from perfect at this), you will always be doing me a considerable favor by pointing out where I have used academic argot to replace more common ways of saying something, which will never be my intention, believe me. Jan?
I am sure it was not the intention of the contributors or the author but this article really seemed to be insulting to poll respondents (again with the "masses are asses")

It seems to me that because a person does not know a lot about an issue in advance does not mean that their gut reaction to that issue based upon a particular question wording is not legitimate and, in fact, is quite politically relevant. Of course, over time a gut reaction MIGHT be more likely to change than a long-standing belief, but it seems that this type of criticism would by necessity exclude the public's views on issues until they have been around long enough so that elites can "simplify" the terms of the debate. It makes perfect sense for people's gut reactions to differ based on question wording especially if some elites are trying to shape the dialogue around a new issue with loaded questions. Rather than unreliable responses, the differences in support might reflect unreliable survey items due to elites not quite agreeing on and figuring out how to describe this issue yet. (I don't think this is just semantics). Further, I don't quite understand how needing an issue described and then giving a gut level response is the same as "polisters.... eliciting opinions from people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people." (I suppose b/c both opinions are presumed to =
be based on reactions to the items??). Or why this means that "....the =
opinions people offer on subjects that are real but remote may be =
equally unreliable." Why aren't opinions on remote topics reliable?? And =
what does "remote" mean exactly in this context--new, removed from =
people's daily lives, complicated...?=

Nancy Wiefek, Ph.D.
(253) 859-0313

----- Original Message ------
From: Jeanne Anderson Research
To: mail@marketsharescorp.com ; aapornet@usc.edu
Sent: Sunday, July 22, 2001 9:06 PM
Subject: Re: The Unbearable Lightness of Public Opinion Polls

This is a very nice try at analyzing multiple poll results by someone =
not qualified as a public opinion researcher. I wish someone would take =
over and write columns like this who knows how to do it. "Would you =
still support X if you knew..." is an approach that has been asssociated =
with extreme bias if not 'push polling." Asking many questions about a =
topic may be a good idea. That one question won't do it is not =
necessarily a sign that public opinion is unformed.=

Jeanne Anderson=20
(formerly)=20
Jeanne Anderson Research=20

Nick Panagakis wrote:

=20
Question wording differences appear here:=

http://www.publicagenda.org/issues/major_proposals_detail.cfm?issue_type=3D=medical_research&list=3D4=

dick halpern wrote:

From the OP-ED page in today's NY TIMES. The author focuses on =
two major points: The differences in response caused by differences in =
question wording and the significance of poll findings based on issues =
that the public doesn't know much about.=

Dick Halpern=20
=20
=20

NY TIMES, JULY 22, 2001

The Unbearable Lightness of Public Opinion Polls

By ADAM CLYMER
WASHINGTON - AFTER a week during which one politician or interest group after another brandished a poll to prove conclusively that the public backs federal funding of human embryonic stem cell research, it may come as a surprise to learn that American public opinion on the subject doesn't exist - at least not yet. The subject is just too new and too complicated.

Polls seem to say otherwise. There is a NBC News/ Wall Street Journal poll with 69 percent in favor and 23 percent opposed, a Gallup Poll for CNN and USA Today that found 54 percent in favor and a poll done by ABC News and Beliefnet, a religious Web site, that found 58 percent support. A survey done for the Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the other hand, found only 24 percent approval, while the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, as part of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, came up with a 70 percent figure.

The advocates of stem cell research certainly believe the numbers should persuade President Bush - who promised in the 2000 campaign to oppose funding - that the politically smart course is to change course.

Representative Connie Morella, a moderate Republican from Maryland, said last week, "Three to one, the Americans, when polled, are in favor of stem cell research under particular strong guidelines." About the same time, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation ran an advertisement in The Washington Times claiming, "A recent national survey shows conclusively that 70 percent support human embryonic stem cell research, including Catholics (72 percent). . . ."

But the large variations in the polls cited, which can generally be traced to how the poll questions were worded, suggest that the opinions of respondents are not fully formed, or firmly held. And that is very much the case in the matter of stem cell research, as a crucial finding in the Gallup poll, ignored by the combatants, shows.

Before having the issue explained to them, 57 percent of the public said they did not know enough to say whether they favored or opposed stem cell research (the pollsters then offered some information and pressed for opinions). The Gallup survey was the only one that specifically offered respondents that choice.

And a no-opinion number that high, said Herbert L. Asher, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, indicated that all these polls "are measuring non-attitudes."

Some professional pollsters disagree sharply. A firm defense of polling on questions about which the public may not yet have strong feelings comes from Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who does the NBC/WSJ poll with Robert Teeter, a Republican. He argues that "wording is all-important," and that even if the poll question itself is the first thing someone has heard on a subject, it at least shows the potency various arguments will have once the subject becomes part of a public dialogue.

In the case of stem cell research, Mr. Hart and his colleagues at other polling organizations tried to write questions that fairly stated both sides of the argument.
Writing a balanced question, especially one that is not so long that the respondent hangs up in the middle, is a difficult art, not a science. Honest pollsters try to avoid phrasing that leads the respondents toward one answer or another, though they don't always succeed. But can the argument against human embryo research be adequately conveyed by saying it involves "potentially viable human embryos," as the Journal/NBC poll asked?

The key question in the bishops' poll, on the other hand, included a line that read, "the live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development."

This question, which also used phrases like "your federal tax dollars" and speaks only of "experiments," not the lofty goals of the research, was not written by a pollster but by the bishops' chief lobbyist on the issue, Richard A. Doerflinger. And it was ridiculed by other pollsters. As Professor Asher said, "It's loaded."

Whatever their language, all the polls on stem cell research asked long, involved questions. And that is a tipoff that the issue is remote from most people, said Bernard Roshco, a former editor of Public Opinion Quarterly.

"Americans are acquiescent so they'll give you an answer," he said. But "the mere fact that you've got to offer a lengthy summary implies that it's too early to sort it out."

Pollsters regularly prove that point by eliciting opinions from people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people. This strongly suggests that the opinions people offer on subjects that are real but remote may be equally unreliable.

One safeguard is to ask a lot of questions, using different phrasings, and asking things like, "Would you still support X if you knew . . ." But that costs money. So it is not easy for pollsters and their clients to take the advice of academics like Professor Asher or Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, and explore difficult issues with a series of questions.

Without such persistence, said Professor Presser, a past director of the university's survey research center, pollsters and the politicians who seek their wisdom can be trapped by eager-to-please respondents, who answer questions not based on fully formed attitudes and strong feelings, but who, in effect, are "constructing them as the interview progresses."

Which means that, sometimes, the pollsters are measuring phantoms, and the politicians are calling on them for support.
I am sure it was not the intention of the contributors or the author but this article really seemed to be insulting to poll respondents (again with the "masses are asses")

It seems to me that because a person does not know a lot about an issue in advance does not mean that their gut reaction to that issue based upon a particular question wording is not legitimate and, in fact, is quite politically relevant. Of course, over time a gut reaction MIGHT be more likely to change than a long-standing belief, but it seems that this type of criticism would by necessity exclude the public's views on issues until they have been around long enough so that elites can "simplify" the terms of the debate. It makes perfect sense for people's gut reactions to differ based on question wording especially if some elites are trying to shape the dialogue around a new issue with loaded questions. Rather than unreliable responses, the differences in support might reflect unreliable survey items due to elites not quite agreeing on and figuring out how to describe this issue yet. (I don't think this is just semantics). Further, I don't quite understand how needing an issue described and then giving a gut level response is the same as "pollsters...eliciting opinions from people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people." (I suppose b/c both opinions are presumed to be based on reactions to the items??). Or why this means that "opinions people offer on subjects that are real but remote may be equally unreliable." Why aren't opinions on remote topics reliable?? And what does "remote" mean exactly in this context--new, removed from people's daily lives, complicated...? 

--- Original Message ---
From: Jeanne Anderson Research

To: mail@marketsharescorp.com, aapornet@usc.edu

Sent: Sunday, July 22, 2001 9:06 PM

Subject: Re: The Unbearable Lightness of Public Opinion Polls

This is a very nice try at analyzing multiple poll results by someone not qualified as a public opinion researcher. I wish someone would take over and write columns like this who knows how to do it. "Would you still support X if you knew..." is an approach that has been associated with extreme bias if not 'push polling.' Asking many questions about a topic may be a good idea. That one question won't do it is not necessarily a sign that public opinion is unformed.

Jeanne Anderson (formerly) Jeanne Anderson Research

Nick Panagakis wrote:

Question wording differences appear here:

http://www.publicagenda.org/issues/major_proposals_detail.cfm?issue_type=medical_research&amp;list=3D4

Dick Halpern wrote:

From the OP-ED page in today's NY TIMES. The author focuses on two major points: The differences in response caused by differences in question wording and the significance of poll findings based on issues that the public doesn't know much about.

Dick Halpern
WASHINGTON — AFTER a week during which one politician or interest group after another brandished a poll to prove conclusively that the public backs federal funding of human embryonic stem cell research, it may come as a surprise to learn that American public opinion on the subject doesn't exist; at least not yet. The subject is just too new and too complicated.

Polls seem to say otherwise. There is a NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll with 69 percent in favor and 23 percent opposed, a Gallup Poll for CNN and USA Today that found 54 percent in favor and a poll done by ABC News and Beliefnet, a religious Web site, that found 58 percent support. A survey done for the Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the other hand, found only 24 percent approval, while the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, as part of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, came up with a 70 percent figure.

The advocates of stem cell research certainly believe the numbers should persuade President Bush, who promised in the 2000 campaign to oppose funding; that the politically smart course is to change course.

Representative Connie Morella, a moderate Republican from Maryland, said last week, "Three to one, the Americans, when polled, are in favor of stem cell research under particular strong guidelines." About the same time, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation ran an advertisement in The Washington Times claiming, "A recent national survey shows conclusively that 70 percent support human embryonic stem cell research, including Catholics (72 percent). . . ."

But the large variations in the polls cited, which can generally be traced to how the poll questions were worded, suggest that the opinions of respondents are not fully formed, or firmly held. And that is very much the case in the matter of stem cell research, as a crucial finding in the Gallup poll, ignored by the combatants, shows.

Before having the issue explained to them, 57 percent of the public said they did not know enough to say whether they favored or . . .
opposed cell research (the pollsters then offered some information and pressed for opinions). The Gallup survey was the only one that specifically offered respondents that choice.

And a no-opinion number that high, said Herbert L. Asher, a professor of political science at Ohio State University, indicated that all these polls "are measuring non-attitudes."

Some professional pollsters disagree sharply. A firm defense of polling on questions about which the public may not yet have strong feelings comes from Peter Hart, a Democratic pollster who does the NBC/Journal poll with Robert Teeter, a Republican. He argues that "wording is all-important," and that even if the poll question itself is the first thing someone has heard on a subject, it at least shows the potency various arguments will have once the subject becomes part of a public dialogue.

In the case of stem cell research, Mr. Hart and his colleagues at other polling organizations tried to write questions that fairly stated both sides of the argument.

Writing a balanced question, especially one that is not so long that the respondent hangs up in the middle, is a difficult art, not a science. Honest pollsters try to avoid phrasing that leads the respondents toward one answer or another, though they don't always succeed. But can the argument against human embryo research be adequately conveyed by saying it involves "potentially viable human embryos," as the Journal/NBC poll asked?

The key question in the bishops' poll, on the other hand, included a line that read, "the live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development."

This question, which also used phrases like "your federal tax dollars" and speaks only of "experiments," not the lofty goals of the research, was not written by a pollster but by the bishops' chief lobbyist on the issue, Richard A. Doerflinger. And it was ridiculed by other pollsters.

Professor Asher said, "It's loaded."

Whatever their language, all the polls on stem cell research =
long, involved questions. And that is a tipoff that the issue is =
remote from most people, said Bernard Roshco, a former editor of Public =
Opinion Quarterly.

"Americans are acquiescent so they'll give you an answer," he =
said.

But "the mere fact that you've got to offer a lengthy summary =
implies that it's too early to sort it out." POLLSTERS regularly prove that point by eliciting opinions from =
people on nonexistent laws and even nonexistent people. This strongly =
suggests that the opinions people offer on subjects that are real but =
remote may be equally unreliable.

One safeguard is to ask a lot of questions, using different =
phrasings, and asking things like, "Would you still support X if you knew . . =
." But that costs money. So it is not easy for pollsters and their =
clients to take the advice of academics like Professor Asher or Stanley =
Presser of the University of Maryland, and explore difficult issues with a =
series of questions.

Without such persistence, said Professor Presser, a past =
director of the university's survey research center, pollsters and the =
politicians who seek their wisdom can be trapped by eager-to-please respondents, =
who answer questions not based on fully formed attitudes and strong =
feelings, but who, in effect, are "constructing them as the interview =
progresses." Which means that, sometimes, the pollsters are measuring =
phantoms, and =
the politicians are calling on them for support.

--------=_NextPart_000_0039_01C1131B.9954C9C0--
It's the same as a regular survey except you can adjust your estimates based on something called "sampling from a finite population" which is described in many statistics books.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
Any advice would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,
Dan

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Daniel B. Navarro
Director, Project Management and Operations
SmartRevenue.com
Tel:  301-424-4146
Fax:  240-465-0572
Web:  www.smartrevenue.com

From simonetta@artsci.com Mon Jul 23 06:55:28 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/uscd) with ESMTP
    id f6NDtSJ15998 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Jul 2001
06:55:28 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscd) with ESMTP
    id GAA24074 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Jul 2001 06:55:28 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
    id <PK6XWJTC>; Mon, 23 Jul 2001 09:41:52 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D6E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F316D330@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Using Usenet for Survey Research
Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2001 09:41:51 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
       charset="iso-8859-1"

Here we can see what happened to some unfortunate academic researchers when
they posted requests to multiple Usenet newsgroups asking people to fill out
a survey on Use of the Internet at Work. They posted their request to at
least 55 different Usenet newsgroups.

(I have removed the identifying material)

First (on Monday July 16th) they posted a request in selected newsgroups

Dear newsgroup user:

We apologize for our cross-posting, but we needed representative
coverage of a relatively small subset of current newsgroups. We have
embarked on a study to learn more about personal use of the Internet while
at work. We think you will find this an
unusually interesting questionnaire to complete. Please click here:

URL REMOVED
If you are currently employed or have held a job providing some access to the Internet, please consider completing this short questionnaire, whether or not you used the Internet for personal goals while on the job.

Please answer honestly, and be assured that your identity is completely unknown. We have not set and do not read any "cookies," we do not run any covert code, we do not "pop up" a stream of browser windows, and we do not trick your system into revealing your identity. You are welcome to examine the source code for this page to verify that.

If you would like to express any comments about our study or request a copy of our results, we would be happy to read and respond. It might take a few days for our responses, so please be patient. To enter your comments, please click the "comment" button near the bottom of the form. A new window will pop up with a separate form for this purpose.

We hope you find this study interesting.

Then they posted this apology page:

An Apology to the Usenet Community

Because of the seriousness with which some of the readers have responded to our study, we wanted to post this public apology for our actions, although we would understand if you choose not to accept it. What we did was seriously in contradiction to Usenet norms, which we misunderstood. We cannot emphasize enough our deep regret for our outrageous multiple posting. Naturally, it would be counterproductive to post this apology to the same newsgroups, so this is the most we dare to do.

We intended to have representative coverage of a relatively small subset of the 40,000+ newsgroups in existence. Although the material is not specifically "on topic" for any particular newsgroup, we believe it is relevant in general terms to all of them. But not everyone shares this belief, and we certainly respect diversity of opinion.

We initiated this study under the assumption that it is consistent with one major early goal of the Internet community--research (before commercial applications existed). However, thanks to the merciless pounding Internet users have gotten, and are getting, from the commercial sector, it seems that sensitivities are very high and patience is very thin. It would be an understatement to say that there have been some negative reactions; we therefore will not ever post messages to multiple newsgroups like this again. If you are contemplating doing this for any reason, no matter how noble you feel the cause, believe me, it is not worth it! This has been one of the most unpleasant 24-hour intervals I've spent in a long, long time.

We trust that no matter what we would say, it will only make the "spam watchers" more angry. I have to say that in spite of their angry and obscene language, through this I see a deep desire to have spammers learn their lesson. I share that desire when receiving e-mails about sales of pornographic material or "get rich quick" schemes. But although we believed this was a worthwhile post, it was a mistake. Therefore, we would like to find a way to remove as many of our multiple postings as possible through
automatic means. If anyone has tools to remove them automatically, we would appreciate any help you might be able to provide and we will promptly cooperate. We are using a Windows 2000 Server.

One observer told us that because we didn't disguise our identities, this made us immediately and unusually accessible to the angry "spam watchers." Usually the spammers open an account, create false names, "spoof" some other account or domain, send their spams to e-mail (a technology that is most obtrusive because it is completely "push" by nature), and then close their account. This practice makes tracking down the sender a high-effort task. We felt strongly that we would avoid the "spam" label if we provided our real names, and an honest subject header to reduce the effort and time to handle (that is, skip over) our posting. Our experiences using newsgroups in a GUI environment over a LAN gave us misguided confidence that cost and effort would be minimal given the descriptive subject header. We have learned a great deal in these unpleasant 24 hours.

One final note: Our systems department has received plenty of complaints and we have found out that these complaints are placing some stress on their staff. They are certainly dealing with us in an appropriate manner. If you feel strongly that they need to be aware of your anger, please consider an alternative and perhaps more useful path. It would be more constructive and perhaps helpful to the Usenet community if you could instead help me reduce the impact of this particular incident while it is still festering, by letting me know about any automated method you might have to remove the messages from the groups. I know this cannot hope to reverse our action but it can diminish its effect greatly.

Again, we will not be repeating a study like this! Thanks for reading this far and we hope that you will believe me when I say that we have received ample punishment for our actions. The Tums company has made some money on me today!

I suspect that Usenet is completely poisoned for this kind of research.

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

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Mon Jul 23 07:53:03 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6NEr2J24574 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Jul 2001
    07:53:02 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.138])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA16965 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Jul 2001 07:53:01 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from login1.isis.unc.edu (pmeyer@login1.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.98])
    by smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.1) with ESMTP id KAA14782
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Jul 2001 10:52:59 -0400 (EDT)
Received: (from pmeyer@localhost)
    by login1.isis.unc.edu (AIX4.3/8.9.3/8.9.3) id KAA38846;
Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2001 10:52:58 -0400 (EDT)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
For example, Hubert M. Blalock, "Social Statistics," 1960. The error margin is reduced by \(\sqrt{1-n/m}\) where \(n\) is the sample size and \(m\) is the finite population size. It's worth using if the sample is more than about one fifth of the population.

On Mon, 23 Jul 2001, James P. Murphy wrote:

> Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2001 09:23:43 -0400
> From: James P. Murphy <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com, aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Projectability question
>
> It's the same as a regular survey except you can adjust your estimates based on something called "sampling from a finite population" which is described in many statistics books.

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

"If instead of working with consumers we were polling store managers or reporting on various in-store practices, how many responses or reports would we have to deliver to be able to project the results chainwide for the"
following retailers, given their total store counts?

Wal Mart Super Centers 1065 stores
Wal Mart Stores 1665
Kmart 2015
Target 1000
Sears 875
Staples 1300
Walgreens 4200
CVS 3500

Is there some rule of thumb to apply to this? What might we have to do to make regional breakouts valid as well?"  

Any advice would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,
Dan

Daniel B. Navarro
Director, Project Management and Operations
SmartRevenue.com
Tel: 301-424-4146
Fax: 240-465-0572
Web: www.smartrevenue.com

For an intuitive--I hope--understanding of the underlying problem:
As sample size goes to the enumeration size (100% sample) as a limit, error variances go to zero--if we count, say, only nine people in a room, that count needs no confidence interval (although we might wish to count again--a quite separate consideration).

After we randomly count somewhere around 5 percent of the people in a large and crowded room, as Phil Meyer tells us, we are beginning to move (actually Phil's n/m is beginning to move) appreciably away from a sample and toward an enumeration (often called a "census", the condition that n/m = 1). "Appreciably" is a weasel word here, of course, but "significantly" is not appropriate, and I can't think of any simple way to describe the related function as n/m moves to 1 as a limit (n cannot exceed m -- except with replacement, of course). Perhaps Phil has the formula for sampling with replacement--anyone see how to describe this as a function of n/m going to 1?

-- Jim

********

On Mon, 23 Jul 2001, Philip Meyer wrote:

> For example, Hubert M. Blalock, "Social Statistics," 1960. The error margin is reduced by sqrt(1-n/m) where n is the sample size and m is the finite population size. It's worth using if the sample is more than about one fifth of the population.

> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
> CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
> University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
> Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

On Mon, 23 Jul 2001, James P. Murphy wrote:

> Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2001 09:23:43 -0400
> From: James P. Murphy <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com, aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Projectability question
>
> It's the same as a regular survey except you can adjust your estimates based on something called "sampling from a finite population" which is described in many statistics books.

> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> ------Original Message------
> From: Daniel B. Navarro <dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Date: Friday, July 20, 2001 3:09 AM
Subject: Projectability question

Dear Aapornet,

We are designing a sample for a major study of retail stores. However, we've been asked by the client to recommend some numbers for projectability.

The inquiry is below.

From the client:

"If instead of working with consumers we were polling store managers or reporting on various in-store practices, how many responses or reports would we have to deliver to be able to project the results chainwide for the following retailers, given their total store counts?

Walmart Super Centers 1065 stores
Walmart Stores 1665
Kmart 2015
Target 1000
Sears 875
Staples 1300
Walgrenns 4200
CVS 3500

Is there some rule of thumb to apply to this? What might we have to do to make regional breakouts valid as well?"

Any advice would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,

Dan

Daniel B. Navarro
Director, Project Management and Operations
SmartRevenue.com
Tel: 301-424-4146
Fax: 240-465-0572
Web: www.smartrevenue.com
Imputing a wish on the part of the client to overstate the findings may be unjustified. I have seen several situations in which intellectually honest sponsors have raised exactly this question.

Keep in mind the fact that, although the differences are not statistically significant, the calculated scores are still the best estimates of the true values. This is why (I think) the sponsor feels that if it "just won" on each of numerous comparisons, then a meaningful overall difference probably does exist. It is intuitive. (A student who tests in the 90th percentile in each of verbal and math generally is reported in the 95th or higher percentile overall.)

Of course, differences of the magnitude recorded would easily achieve statistical significance if the samples were large enough, or if you adjusted the level of confidence, which is completely arbitrary anyhow.

Although it would be a misuse of that test as it is described in textbooks, an application of something resembling the Sign Test (plus or minus for differences from individual subjects serving as their own controls) is defensible, I think. For small samples (i.e. numbers of comparisons) the calculations are the same as the binomial. Cribbing from page 71 of my copy of Siegel, I see that his example of 11 "wins" out of 14 comparisons yields a p of 0.029 -- significant at the 97% level of confidence!

As several others noted, you have to rule out an underlying factor or construct being responsible for all these victories and, again, you have to assume that the comparisons really do reflect wins and losses.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@earthlink.net>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Friday, July 20, 2001 3:07 AM
Subject: Response Aggregation
I have a client who, in a series of ratings of various aspects of customer service, consistently rated slightly to somewhat better than competitors. None of the differences are statistically significant, however; the differences are too small.

Now this person is suggesting that if we somehow aggregated the ratings into one large measure of satisfaction, the statistical significance of the total could be tested, and it would be more likely to achieve a positive (i.e., statistically significant) result. Thus of course "proving" that this client is better than competitors.

Aside from the whole approach being somewhat suspect, I have never heard of such a procedure. Is there a legitimate way to do this?

From Michael.Margolis@uc.edu Tue Jul 24 06:35:25 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6OD2PJ19727 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Jul 2001
06:35:25 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtp.uc.edu (newman.edw2.uc.edu [129.137.2.198])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA01353 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Jul 2001 06:35:22 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from [129.137.72.182] (margolis.crs.uc.edu [129.137.72.182])
    by smtp.uc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.2) with ESMTP id HAA01476;
    Tue, 24 Jul 2001 07:45:16 -0400
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Sender: margolis@email.uc.edu
Message-Id: <p05100302b78320963abf0[129.137.72.182]>
Date: Tue, 24 Jul 2001 09:37:05 -0400
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: Mike Margolis <Michael.Margolis@uc.edu>
Subject: Re: Using Usenet for Survey Research
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="-------------_-1216140666___ma-------------"

---------------_-1216140666___ma-------------
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

Some of the difficulties of conducting survey research on Usenet newsgroups that Leo Simonetta reports could have been anticipated. We made similarly embarrassing errors when conducting an online survey in 1994. See Bonnie Fisher, Michael Margolis and David Resnick, "A New Way of Talking Politics: Democracy on the Internet," http://www.eff.org/Activism/E-voting/net_civics.survey, a paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association in September 1994. We also presented two papers, "A Study of Civic Life on the Internet," (with George Bishop) and "Survey Research in Cyberspace: Breaking Ground on the Virtual Frontier," at the AAPOR annual meeting in May 1995 that highlighted some of these difficulties.

Mike Margolis

Original message from Leo Simonetta:

Here we can see what happened to some unfortunate academic researchers when they posted requests to multiple Usenet newsgroups asking people to fill out a survey on Use of the Internet at Work. They posted their request to at least 55 different Usenet newsgroups.

(I have removed the identifying material)

First (on Monday July 16th) they posted a request in selected newsgroups

Dear newsgroup user:

We apologize for our cross-posting, but we needed representative coverage of a relatively small subset of current newsgroups. We have embarked on a study to learn more about personal use of the Internet while at work. We think you will find this an unusually interesting questionnaire to complete. Please click here:

URL REMOVED

If you are currently employed or have held a job providing some access to the Internet, please consider completing this short questionnaire, whether or not you used the Internet for personal goals while on the job.

Please answer honestly, and be assured that your identity is completely unknown. We have not set and do not read any "cookies," we do not run any covert code, we do not "pop up" a stream of browser windows, and we do not trick your system into revealing your identity. You are welcome to examine the source code for this page to verify that.

If you would like to express any comments about our study or request a copy of our results, we would be happy to read and respond. It might take a few days for our responses, so please be patient. To enter your comments, please click the "comment" button near the bottom of the form. A new window will pop up with a separate form for this purpose.

We hope you find this study interesting.

Then they posted this apology page:

An Apology to the Usenet Community

Because of the seriousness with which some of the readers have responded to our study, we wanted to post this public apology for our actions, although we would understand if you choose not to accept it. What
we did was seriously in contradiction to Usenet norms, which we
misunderstood. We cannot emphasize enough our deep regret for our outrageous
multiple posting. Naturally, it would be counterproductive to post this
apology to the same newsgroups, so this is the most we dare to do.

We intended to have representative coverage of a relatively small
subset of the 40,000+ newsgroups in existence. Although the material is not
specifically "on topic" for any particular newsgroup, we believe it is
relevant in general terms to all of them. But not everyone shares this
belief, and we certainly respect diversity of opinion.

We initiated this study under the assumption that it is consistent
with one major early goal of the Internet community--research (before
commercial applications existed). However, thanks to the merciless pounding
Internet users have gotten, and are getting, from the commercial sector, it
seems that sensitivities are very high and patience is very thin. It would
be an understatement to say that there have been some negative reactions; we
therefore will not ever post messages to multiple newsgroups like this
again. If you are contemplating doing this for any reason, no matter how
noble you feel the cause, believe me, it is not worth it! This has been one
of the most unpleasant 24-hour intervals I've spent in a long, long time.

We trust that no matter what we would say, it will only make the
"spam watchers" more angry. I have to say that in spite of their angry and
obscene language, through this I see a deep desire to have spammers learn
their lesson. I share that desire when receiving e-mails about sales of
pornographic material or "get rich quick" schemes. But although we believed
this was a worthwhile post, it was a mistake. Therefore, we would like to
find a way to remove as many of our multiple postings as possible through
automatic means. If anyone has tools to remove them automatically, we would
appreciate any help you might be able to provide and we will promptly
cooperate. We are using a Windows 2000 Server.

One observer told us that because we didn't disguise our identities,
this made us immediately and unusually accessible to the angry "spam
watchers." Usually the spammers open an account, create false names, "spoof"
some other account or domain, send their spams to e-mail (a technology that
is most obtrusive because it is completely "push" by nature), and then close
their account. This practice makes tracking down the sender a high-effort
task. We felt strongly that we would avoid the "spam" label if we provided
our real names, and an honest subject header to reduce the effort and time
to handle (that is, skip over) our posting. Our experiences using newsgroups
in a GUI environment over a LAN gave us misguided confidence that cost and
effort would be minimal given the descriptive subject header. We have
learned a great deal in these unpleasant 24 hours.

One final note: Our systems department has received plenty of
complaints and we have found out that these complaints are placing some
stress on their staff. They are certainly dealing with us in an appropriate
manner. If you feel strongly that they need to be aware of your anger,
please consider an alternative and perhaps more useful path. It would be
more constructive and perhaps helpful to the Usenet community if you could
instead help me reduce the impact of this particular incident while it is
still festering, by letting me know about any automated method you might
have to remove the messages from the groups. I know this cannot hope to
reverse our action but it can diminish its effect greatly.
Again, we will not be repeating a study like this! Thanks for reading this far and we hope that you will believe me when I say that we have received ample punishment for our actions. The Tums company has made some money on me today!

I suspect that Usenet is completely poisoned for this kind of research.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com
--
Michael Margolis                    Tel: 513-556-3310
Department of Political Science                 Fax: 513-556-2314
University of Cincinnati
P.O. Box 210375
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375
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<div>Some of the difficulties of conducting survey research on Usenet newsgroups that Leo Simonetta reports could have been anticipated. We made similarly embarrassing errors when conducting an online survey in 1994. See Bonnie Fisher, Michael Margolis and David Resnick, "A New Way of Talking Politics," http://www.eff.org/Activism/E-voting/net_civics.survey, a paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association in September 1994. We also presented two papers, "A Study of Civic Life on the Internet," and "Survey Research in Cyberspace: Breaking Ground on the Virtual Frontier," at the AAPOR annual meeting in May 1995 that highlighted some of these difficulties.</div>


Mike Margolis
Original message from Leo Simonetta:
Here we can see what happened to some unfortunate academic researchers when they posted requests to multiple Usenet newsgroups asking people to fill out a survey on Use of the Internet at Work. They posted their request to
at least 55 different Usenet newsgroups.

First (on Monday July 16th) they posted a request in selected newsgroups

Dear newsgroup user:

We apologize for our cross-posting, but we needed representative coverage of a relatively small subset of current newsgroups. We have embarked on a study to learn more about personal use of the Internet while at work. We think you will find this an unusually interesting questionnaire to complete. Please click here:

URL REMOVED

If you are currently employed or have held a job providing some access to the Internet, please consider completing this short questionnaire, whether or not you used the Internet for personal goals while on the job.

Please answer honestly, and be assured that your identity is completely unknown. We have not set and do not read any &quot;cookies,&quot; we do not run any covert code, we do not &quot;pop up&quot; a stream of browser windows, and we do not trick your system into revealing your identity. You are welcome to examine the source code for this page to verify that.

If you would like to express any comments about our study or request a copy of our results, we would be happy to read and respond. It might take a few days for our responses, so please be patient. To enter your comments, please click the &quot;comment&quot; button near the bottom of the form. A new window will pop up with a separate form for this purpose.

Then they posted this apology page:
An Apology to the Usenet Community

Because of the seriousness with which some of the readers have responded to our study, we wanted to post this public apology for our actions, although we would understand if you choose not to accept it. What we did was seriously in contradiction to Usenet norms, which we misunderstood. We cannot emphasize enough our deep regret for our outrageous multiple posting. Naturally, it would be counterproductive to post this apology to the same newsgroups, so this is the most we dare to do.

We intended to have representative coverage of a relatively small subset of the 40,000+ newsgroups in existence. Although the material is not specifically "on topic" for any particular newsgroup, we believe it is relevant in general terms to all of them. But not everyone shares this belief, and we certainly respect diversity of opinion.

We initiated this study under the assumption that it is consistent with one major early goal of the Internet community--research (before commercial applications existed). However, thanks to the merciless pounding Internet users have gotten, and are getting, from the commercial sector, it seems that sensitivities are very high and patience is very thin. It would be an understatement to say that there have been some negative reactions; we therefore will not ever post messages to multiple newsgroups like this again. If you are contemplating doing this for any reason, no matter how noble you feel the cause, believe me, it is not worth it! This has been one of the most unpleasant 24-hour intervals I've spent in a long, long time.

We trust that no matter what we would say, it will only make the "spam watchers" more angry. I have to say that in spite of their angry and obscene language, through this I see a deep desire to have spammers learn their lesson. I share that desire when receiving e-mails about sales of pornographic material or "get rich quick" schemes. But although we believed this was a worthwhile post, it was a mistake. Therefore, we would like
find a way to remove as many of our multiple postings as possible through automatic means. If anyone has tools to remove them automatically, we would appreciate any help you might be able to provide and we will promptly cooperate. We are using a Windows 2000 Server.

One observer told us that because we didn't disguise our identities, this made us immediately and unusually accessible to the angry "spam watchers." Usually the spammers open an account, create false names, "spoof" some other account or domain, send their spams to e-mail (a technology that is most obtrusive because it is completely "push" by nature), and then close their account. This practice makes tracking down the sender a high-effort task. We felt strongly that we would avoid the "spam" label if we provided our real names, and an honest subject header to reduce the effort and time to handle (that is, skip over) our posting. Our experiences using newsgroups in a GUI environment over a LAN gave us misguided confidence that cost and effort would be minimal given the descriptive subject header. We have learned a great deal in these unpleasant 24 hours.

One final note: Our systems department has received plenty of complaints and we have found out that these complaints are placing stress on their staff. They are certainly dealing with us in an appropriate manner. If you feel strongly that they need to be aware of your anger, please consider an alternative and perhaps more useful path. It would be more constructive and perhaps helpful to the Usenet community if you could instead help me reduce the impact of this particular incident while it is still festering, by letting me know about any automated method you might have to remove the messages from the groups. I know this cannot hope to reverse our action but it can diminish its effect greatly.

Again, we will not be repeating a study like this! Thanks for reading this far and we hope that you will believe me when I say that we
have received ample punishment for our actions. The Tums company has made some money on me today!

I suspect that Usenet is completely poisoned for this kind of research.

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

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

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

--
Michael Margolis
Department of Political Science
University of Cincinnati
P.O. Box 210375
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375
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Assistant or Associate Professor in health policy survey research

The Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard School of Public Health, is seeking to recruit an assistant or associate professor specializing in the conduct of survey research on health policy issues. Candidates should possess a broad knowledge of the use of survey methodologies. Ideally the candidate would be equipped to develop indicators that could assess patients’ experience with the health care system including outcomes, satisfaction and indicators of quality, public and health professional policy preferences and perceptions, and experience related to current and emerging health policy issues. Relevant research includes the review, design, conduct, and quantitative analysis of surveys and polls on access to health, studies of the impact of health services innovations in organization and/or finance, and views of major health policy debates. Candidates should have demonstrated experience and skills to play a central role in the research and teaching program in the Department.

Candidates should hold a doctoral degree in health policy, sociology, social psychology, political science, survey research, or other closely related social science discipline. Other qualifications include the demonstrated capacity to manage national and international survey projects, to collaborate with professionals in other disciplines, and to teach health policy survey methods at the graduate level.

Please send a letter of application and the names of three references to:

Chair, Search Committee/Health Policy Survey Research
Department of Health Policy and Management
Harvard School of Public Health
677 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115

Harvard University is committed to increasing representation of women and minority members among its faculty and particularly encourages applications from such candidates. EOE
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Over the past several months AAPORNet has carried several discussions with a common thread: the role of public opinion polls in a democracy. The July/August 2001 issue of Public Perspective speaks to this issue from a variety of standpoints. The relevant articles are available on the Web at: http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pp_curr.html

The articles report on three surveys (of the general public, policy leaders, and journalists) that the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation undertook in collaboration with Public Perspective. The field work was carried out by Princeton Survey Research Associates on behalf of Kaiser.

The surveys focus on the role of polls in policymaking. What role does the public think polls should and do play in policymaking? What are American’s views on the role polls can and do play in communicating their policy preferences to the policymakers? How do their views compare to those of policy leaders and journalists?
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>From mark@bisconti.com Tue Jul 24 12:29:16 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6OJTFJ29165 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Jul 2001
12:29:15
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from epimetheus.hosting4u.net
(epimetheus.hosting4u.net.2.15.209.in-addr.arpa [209.15.2.70] (may be forged))
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id MAA21482 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Jul 2001 12:29:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (gmail 20777 invoked from network); 24 Jul 2001 19:29:01 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
    by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 24 Jul 2001 19:29:01 -0000
Received: from mark ([138.88.86.160]) by bisconti.com ; Tue, 24 Jul 2001
14:28:42
-0500
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Federal election/voting reform
Date: Tue, 24 Jul 2001 15:25:20 -0400
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEEENLLLCTIBKEDKDGA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="---_NextPart_000_000E_01C11454.D96D6C80"
Someone recently asked what we could expect to see happen to improve the accuracy/fairness of elections, if anything. It appears to be difficult to get agreement... Following are some proposed bills, etc., that have been introduced in Congress since January. To search for a summary, exact text, co-sponsors, status, etc., go to: http://thomas.loc.gov/ or try clicking on the name of the person who introduced the bill (that should bring up everything they have recently introduced). I don't know which, if any, of these bills may evolve, grow legs, and walk. but S565 sponsored by Sen Dodd, Christopher J. <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003 +@4((@1(Sen+Dodd++Christopher+J.))+00302))> (introduced 3/19/2001) seems to have a lot of co-sponsors (50). Perhaps someone can provide insights. Cheers, Mark Richards

H.R.49
Sponsor: Rep Clyburn, James E. <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003 +@4((@1(Rep+Clyburn++James+E.))+00208))> (introduced 1/3/2001)
Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To establish the United States Commission on Election Law Reform to study election procedures used in the United States and issue a report and recommendations on revisions to such procedures, and for other purposes.

H.R.50
Sponsor: Rep Markey, Edward J. <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003 +@4((@1(Rep+Markey++Edward+J.))+00735))> (introduced 1/3/2001)
Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To amend title 3, United States Code, and the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to establish a single poll closing time for Presidential general elections.

H.J.RES.1
Sponsor: Rep Clyburn, James E. <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003 +@4((@1(Rep+Clyburn++James+E.))+00208))> (introduced 1/3/2001)
Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment by the States of Electors for the election of the President and Vice President on the basis of the popular vote of each Congressional district of the State and for the appointment of two electors by each State on the basis of the total popular vote of the State.
H.J.RES.3
Sponsor: Rep Green, Gene
Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

H.CON.RES.5
Sponsor: Rep Jackson-Lee, Sheila
Title: Expressing the sense of the Congress that the States should adopt uniform voting procedures to carry out the election of the President and Vice President.

H.R.57
Sponsor: Rep DeFazio, Peter A.
Title: To establish a commission to study and make recommendations with respect to the Federal electoral process.

H.R.60
Sponsor: Rep Jackson-Lee, Sheila
Title: To establish a commission to develop uniform standards which may be adopted by the States for the administration of elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

H.R.119
Sponsor: Rep Holt, Rush D.
Title: To establish a Commission to study and make recommendations on the implementation of standardized voting procedures in the Federal, State, and local electoral process, and for other purposes.

H.R.128
Sponsor: Rep Luther, Bill
Title: To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require States to permit individuals to register to vote in an election for Federal office on the date of the election.

H.R.150
Sponsor: Rep Petri, Thomas E.
Title: To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require certain disclosure and reports relating to polling by telephone or electronic device.

H.R.159
Sponsor: Rep Riley, Bob

Title: To prohibit a State from determining that a ballot submitted by an absent uniformed services voter was improperly or fraudulently cast unless the State finds clear and convincing evidence of fraud, and for other purposes.

H.R.189
Sponsor: Rep Stump, Bob

Title: To repeal the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

H.R.263
Sponsor: Rep Davis, Tom

Title: To establish an Election Administration Commission to study Federal, State, and local voting procedures and election administration and provide grants to modernize voting procedures and election administration, and for other purposes.

H.R.283
Sponsor: Rep Maloney, Carolyn B.

Title: To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require the disclosure of certain information by persons conducting phone banks during campaigns for election for Federal office, and for other purposes.

H.J.RES.5
Sponsor: Rep Delahunt, William D.

Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.
H.R.310
Sponsor: Rep Upton, Fred
<introduced 1/30/2001>Referred to House subcommittee
Title: To amend title 5, United States Code, to move the legal public holiday known as Washington's Birthday to election day in Presidential election years.

H.R.311
Sponsor: Rep Vitter, David
<introduced 1/30/2001>Referred to House committee
Title: To prohibit a State from determining that a ballot submitted by an absent uniformed services voter was improperly or fraudulently cast unless the State finds clear and convincing evidence of fraud, to direct the Secretary of Defense to prepare and submit a plan for electronic voting by absent uniformed services voters, and for other purposes.

H.R.354
Sponsor: Rep Hutchinson, Asa
<introduced 1/31/2001>Referred to House committee
Title: To establish a grant program to assist State and local governments with improving the administration of elections through activities which may include the modernization of voting procedures and equipment, and for other purposes.

H.R.366
Sponsor: Rep Moore, Dennis
<introduced 1/31/2001>Referred to House committee
Title: To amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful the knowing dissemination of false information regarding elections for Federal office with the intent of discouraging another person from voting.

H.R.430
Sponsor: Rep Delahunt, William D.
<introduced 2/6/2001>Referred to House committee
Title: To establish a bipartisan commission to study the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures and develop standards for the conduct of Federal elections, and to authorize grants and technical assistance to the States to assist them in implementing such standards.

H.R.492
Sponsor: Rep Bachus, Spencer
<introduced 2/7/2001>Referred to House committee
Title: To prohibit a State from determining that a ballot submitted by an absent uniformed services voter was improperly or fraudulently cast unless the State finds clear and convincing evidence of fraud, to direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of methods to improve the procedures used to enable absent uniformed services voters to register to vote and vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

H.R.506
Sponsor: Rep Hastings, Alcee L.
<introduced 2/7/2001>
Latest Major Action: 2/23/2001 Referred to House subcommittee

Title: To establish a commission to make recommendations on the appropriate size of membership of the House of Representatives and the method by which Representatives are elected.

H.J.RES.18
Sponsor: Rep Engel, Eliot L.
<introduced 2/13/2001>
Latest Major Action: 2/13/2001 Referred to House committee

Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a new procedure for appointment of Electors for the election of the President and Vice President.

H.J.RES.17
Sponsor: Rep Engel, Eliot L.
<introduced 2/13/2001>
Latest Major Action: 2/13/2001 Referred to House committee

Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a new procedure for appointment of Electors for the election of the President and Vice President.

H.R.561
Sponsor: Rep Dingell, John D.
<introduced 2/13/2001>
Latest Major Action: 2/13/2001 Referred to House committee

Title: To establish the Bipartisan Commission on Election Reform to study and make recommendations on issues affecting the conduct and administration of elections in the United States, and for other purposes.

H.CON.RES.40
Sponsor: Rep Burton, Dan
<introduced 2/27/2001>
Latest Major Action: 3/14/2001 Referred to House subcommittee

Title: Expressing the sense of the Congress that national news organizations should refrain from projecting the winner of a Presidential election until all of the polls in the Continental United States have closed.

H.R.752
Sponsor: Rep King, Peter T.
H.R.775
Sponsor: Rep Hoyer, Steny H.
Title: To develop voluntary consensus standards to ensure the accuracy and validation of the voting process, to direct the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to study voter participation and emerging voting technology, to provide grants to States to improve voting methods, and for other purposes.

H.J.RES.25
Sponsor: Rep Leach, James A.
Title: To establish a program to provide funds to State and local governments to replace punch card voting systems, to establish the Election Administration Commission to make grants to State and local governments to assist in the administration of Federal elections, to develop a model election code, and otherwise provide assistance with the administration of certain Federal election laws and programs, and for other purposes.

H.R.829
Sponsor: Rep Hastings, Alcee L.
Title: To direct the Federal Election Commission to set uniform national standards for Federal election procedures, change the Federal election day, and for other purposes.

H.CON.RES.48
Sponsor: Rep Paul, Ron
Title: Expressing the sense of the Congress in reaffirming the United States of America as a republic.

H.R.920
Sponsor: Rep Lampson, Nick
Title: To establish the Federal Elections Review Commission to study the nature and consequences of the Federal electoral process and make recommendations to ensure the integrity of, and public confidence in, Federal elections.
H.R.934
Sponsor: Rep Jackson-Lee, Sheila
Title: To amend title 5, United States Code, to establish election day in Presidential election years as a legal public holiday, and for other purposes.

H.J.RES.37
Sponsor: Rep Clement, Bob
Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment and voting, by congressional district, of electors for the election of President and Vice President, and to provide procedures for electing the President and Vice President if no candidate receives a majority of electoral votes.

H.R.1004
Sponsor: Rep Schakowsky, Janice D.
Title: To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to establish a procedure under which individuals whose names do not appear on the list of registered voters in an election for Federal office at a particular polling place may cast provisional votes at the polling place, and for other purposes.

H.Con.Res.63
Sponsor: Rep Langevin, James R.
(introduced 3/14/2001) Latest Major Action: 3/14/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: Expressing the sense of Congress that Congress should act quickly to enact significant election administration reforms which may be implemented prior to the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in 2002.

H.R.1151
Sponsor: Rep Langevin, James R.
(introduced 3/21/2001) Latest Major Action: 3/21/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To direct the Federal Election Commission to issue voluntary standards to promote the accessibility and effective use of voting systems, voting equipment, and polling places, to make grants to assist States in complying with such standards and carrying out other activities to promote accessibility in voting, and for other purposes.

H.R.1165
Sponsor: Rep Barcia, James A.
(introduced 3/22/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/3/2001 Referred to House subcommittee
Title: To provide for the establishment of an Election Voting Systems Standards Commission, and for other purposes.

H.R.1170
Sponsor: Rep Conyers, John, Jr.<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003 +@4((@1(Rep+Conyers++John++Jr.))+00229))>  (introduced 3/22/2001)
Latest Major Action: 3/22/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To protect voting rights, and for other purposes.

H.R.1189
Sponsor: Rep McKinney, Cynthia A.<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003 +@4((@1(Rep+McKinney++Cynthia+A.))+00780))>  (introduced 3/22/2001)
Latest Major Action: 3/22/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To provide that a State may use a proportional voting system for multiseat congressional districts, and for other purposes.

H.R.1193
Sponsor: Rep Norton, Eleanor Holmes<brhttp://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003 +@4((@1(Rep+Norton++Eleanor+Holmes))+00868))>  (introduced 3/22/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/19/2001 Referred to House subcommittee
Title: To provide for full voting representation in the Congress for the citizens of the District of Columbia, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that individuals who are residents of the District of Columbia shall be exempt from Federal income taxation until such full voting representation takes effect, and for other purposes.

H.R.1228
Sponsor: Rep Davis, Danny K.<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003 +@4((@1(Rep+Davis++Danny+K.))+01477))>  (introduced 3/27/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/19/2001 Referred to House subcommittee
Title: To provide fairness in voter participation.

H.R.1377
Sponsor: Rep Thornberry, William (Mac)<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003 +@4((@1(Rep+Thornberry++William++(Mac)))+01155))>  (introduced 4/3/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/24/2001 Referred to House subcommittee
Title: To ensure that military personnel do not lose the right to cast votes in elections in their domicile as a result of their service away from the domicile, to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to extend the voter registration and absentee ballot protections for absent uniformed services personnel under such Act to State and local elections, and for other purposes.

H.R.1482
Sponsor: Rep Langevin, James R.<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003 +@4((@1(Rep+Langevin++James+R.))+01668))>  (introduced 4/4/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/4/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To establish a grant program administered by the Federal
Election Commission for the purpose of assisting States to upgrade voting systems to use more advanced and accurate voting devices and to enhance participation by military personnel in national elections.

H.R.1558
Sponsor: Rep Hilliard, Earl F.
<intro> (introduced 4/24/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/24/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To prohibit States from denying any individual the right to register to vote for an election for Federal office, or the right to vote in an election for Federal office, on the grounds that the individual has been convicted of a Federal crime, and for other purposes.

H.R.1559
Sponsor: Rep Hilliard, Earl F.
<intro> (introduced 4/24/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/24/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To require that general Federal elections be held over the 48-hour period that begins with the first Saturday in November, to prohibit States from preventing citizens who are registered to vote from voting in Federal elections and from carrying out certain law enforcement activities which have the effect of intimidating individuals from voting, and for other purposes.

H.R.1666
Sponsor: Rep Quinn, Jack
<intro> (introduced 5/1/2001)
Latest Major Action: 5/1/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To establish a uniform closing time for the operation of polls on the date of the election of the President and Vice President.

H.RES.139
Sponsor: Rep Cummings, Elijah E.
<intro> (introduced 5/9/2001)
Latest Major Action: 5/9/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: Expressing the sense of Congress regarding commitment to the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

H.R.1971
Sponsor: Rep Meek, Carrie P.
<intro> (introduced 5/23/2001)
Latest Major Action: 5/23/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require States to give notice and an opportunity for review prior to removing individuals from the official list of eligible voters in elections for Federal office by reason of criminal conviction, and for other purposes.

H.R.2356
Sponsor: Rep Shays, Christopher
<intro>
S.27  
Sponsor: Sen McCain, John  
Latest Major Action: 6/18/2001 Referred to House subcommittee  
Title: A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

S.28  
Sponsor: Sen Gramm, Phil  
Latest Major Action: 1/22/2001 Referred to Senate committee  
Title: A bill to guarantee the right of all active duty military personnel, merchant mariners, and their dependents to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

S.50  
Sponsor: Sen Stevens, Ted  
Latest Major Action: 1/22/2001 Referred to Senate committee  
Title: A bill to amend title 3, United States Code, and the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to establish a single poll closing time for Presidential general elections.

S.122  
Sponsor: Sen Campbell, Ben Nighthorse  
Latest Major Action: 1/22/2001 Referred to Senate committee  
Title: A bill to prohibit a State from determining that a ballot submitted by an absent uniformed services voter was improperly or fraudulently cast unless that State finds clear and convincing evidence of fraud, and for other purposes.

S.154  
Sponsor: Sen Shelby, Richard C.  
Latest Major Action: 1/23/2001 Referred to Senate committee  
Title: A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to ensure uniform treatment by States of Federal overseas absentee ballots, to amend titles 10 and 18, United States Code, and the Revised Statutes to remove the uncertainty regarding the authority of the Department of Defense to permit buildings located on military
installations and reserve component facilities to be used as polling places in Federal, State, and elections for public office, and for other purposes.

S.175
Sponsor: Sen Hutchison, Kay Bailey
<introduction link>
Latest Major Action: 1/24/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to establish a national uniform poll closing time and uniform treatment of absentee ballots in Presidential general elections.

S.216
Sponsor: Sen Specter, Arlen
<introduction link>
Latest Major Action: 1/30/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to establish a Commission for the comprehensive study of voting procedures in Federal, State, and local elections, and for other purposes.

S.218
Sponsor: Sen McConnell, Mitch
<introduction link>
Identical bill as introduced by Rep Davis, Tom
Related Bills: H.R.263
Latest Major Action: 1/30/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to establish an Election Administration Commission to study Federal, State, and local voting procedures and election administration and provide grants to modernize voting procedures and election administration, and for other purposes.

S.241
Sponsor: Sen Reid, Harry M.
<introduction link>
Latest Major Action: 2/1/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to direct the Federal Election Commission to set uniform national standards for Federal election procedures, change the Federal election day, and for other purposes.

S.368
Sponsor: Sen McCain, John
<introduction link>
Latest Major Action: 5/8/2001 Senate committee/subcommittee actions
Title: A bill to develop voluntary consensus standards to ensure accuracy and validation of the voting process, to direct the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to study voter participation and emerging voting technology, to provide grants to States to improve voting methods, and for other purposes.
S.379  
Sponsor: Sen Schumer, Charles E.  
(introduced 2/15/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 2/15/2001 Referred to Senate committee  

title: A bill to establish the National Commission on the Modernization of Federal Elections to conduct a study of Federal voting procedures and election administration, to establish the Federal Election Modernization Grant Program to provide grants to States and localities for the modernization of voting procedures and election administration, and for other purposes.

S.381  
Sponsor: Sen Allard, Wayne  
(introduced 2/15/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 2/15/2001 Referred to Senate committee  

title: A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, and title 10, United States Code, to maximize the access of uniformed services voters and recently separated uniformed services voters to the polls, to ensure that each vote cast by such a voter is duly counted, and for other purposes.

S.467  
Sponsor: Sen Roberts, Pat  
(introduced 3/6/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 3/6/2001 Referred to Senate committee  

title: A bill to provide grants for States to adopt the Federal write-in absentee ballot and to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to require uniform treatment by States of Federal write-in absentee ballots.

S.470  
Sponsor: Sen Bond, Christopher S.  
(introduced 3/6/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 3/6/2001 Referred to Senate committee  

title: A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to ensure that each vote cast by such voter is duly counted, and for other purposes.

S.479  
Sponsor: Sen Cleland, Max  
(introduced 3/7/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 3/7/2001 Referred to Senate committee  

title: A bill to establish a grant program administered by the Federal Election Commission for the purpose of assisting States to upgrade voting systems to use more advanced and accurate voting devices and to enhance participation by military personnel in national elections.

S.528  
Sponsor: Sen Bond, Christopher S.  
(introduced 3/7/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 3/7/2001 Referred to Senate committee  

title: A bill to establish a grant program administered by the Federal Election Commission for the purpose of assisting States to upgrade voting systems to use more advanced and accurate voting devices and to enhance participation by military personnel in national elections.
S.565
Sponsor: Sen Dodd, Christopher J.
Title: A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to modify the requirements for voter mail registration and for other purposes.

S.603
Sponsor: Sen Lieberman, Joseph I.
Title: A bill to establish the Commission on Voting Rights and Procedures to study and make recommendations regarding election technology, voting, and election administration, to establish a grant program under which the Office of Justice Programs and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall provide assistance to States and localities in improving election technology and the administration of Federal elections, to require States to meet uniform and nondiscriminatory election technology and administration requirements for the 2004 Federal elections, and for other purposes.

S.602
Sponsor: Sen Domenici, Pete V.
Title: A bill to provide for full voting representation in the Congress for the citizens of the District of Columbia to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that individuals who are residents of the District of Columbia shall be exempt from Federal income taxation until such full voting representation takes effect, and for other purposes.

S.729
Sponsor: Sen Nelson, Bill
Title: A bill to reform Federal election law.

S.731
Sponsor: Sen Nelson, Bill
Title: A bill to ensure that military personnel do not lose the right to cast votes in elections in their domicile as a result of their service away from the domicile, to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to extend the voter registration and
absentee ballot protections for absent uniformed services personnel 
under such Act to State and local elections, and for other purposes.

S.738
Sponsor: Sen Smith, Bob
<introduced 4/6/2001>
Latest Major Action: 4/6/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to protect the 
voting rights of members of the Armed Forces.

S.953
Sponsor: Sen McConnell, Mitch
<introduced 5/24/2001>
Latest Major Action: 5/24/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to establish a Blue Ribbon Study Panel and an Election 
Administration Commission to study voting procedures and election 
administration, to provide grants to modernize voting procedures and 
election administration, and for other purposes.

H.CON.RES.159
Sponsor: Rep Brown, Corrine
<introduced 6/13/2001>
Latest Major Action: 6/18/2001 Referred to House subcommittee
Title: Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to rights each 
registered voter in the United States should have. Expresses the 
sense of Congress that each registered voter in the United States 
should have the right: (1) to vote and have his or her vote accurately 
counted; (2) to cast a vote if he or she is in line when the polls are 
closing; (3) to ask for and receive assistance in voting; (4) if he or 
she has voted in error, to at least 3 successive opportunities to 
correct that error through replacement ballots; (5) to an explanation 
if his or her registration is in question; (6) if his or her 
registration is in question, to cast a provisional ballot; (7) to 
prove his or her identity by signing an affidavit if election 
officials doubt that identity; (8) to written instructions to use when 
voting, and, upon request, oral instructions in voting from elections 
officers; (9) to vote free from coercion or intimidation by elections 
officers or any other person; and (10) to vote on a voting machine 
that is in working condition and that will allow votes to be 
accurately cast.

Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008
202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com
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Someone recently asked what we could expect to see happen to improve the accuracy/fairness of elections, if anything. It appears to be difficult to get agreement... Following are some proposed bills, etc., that have been introduced in Congress since January. To search for a summary, exact text, co-sponsors, status, etc., go to: http://thomas.loc.gov/ or try clicking on the name of the person who introduced the bill (that should bring up everything they have recently introduced). I don’t know which, if any, of these bills may evolve, grow legs, and walk. Perhaps someone can provide insights... Cheers, Mark Richards

Sen Dodd, Christopher J. (introduced 3/19/2001) seems to have a lot of co-sponsors (50). Perhaps someone can provide insights... Cheers, Mark Richards

H.R.49
To establish the United States Commission on Election Law Reform to study election procedures used in the United States and issue a report and recommendations on revisions to such procedures, and for other purposes.

To amend title 3, United States Code, and the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to establish a single poll closing time for Presidential general elections.

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment by the States of Electors for the election of the President and Vice President on the basis of the popular vote of each Congressional district of the State and for the appointment of two electors by each State on the basis...
of the total popular vote of the State.<p>

H.J.RES.3  
Sponsor: Rep Green, Gene (introduced 1/3/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee  
Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

H.CON.RES.5  
Sponsor: Rep Jackson-Lee, Sheila (introduced 1/3/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee  
Title: Expressing the sense of the Congress that the States should adopt uniform voting procedures to carry out the election of the President and Vice President.

H.R.57  
Sponsor: Rep Jackson-Lee, Sheila (introduced 1/3/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee  
Title: Expressing the sense of the Congress that the States should adopt uniform voting procedures to carry out the election of the President and Vice President.
Rep DeFazio, Peter A. (introduced 1/3/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee<br>
Title: To establish a commission to study and make recommendations with respect to the Federal electoral process. <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class="MsoNormal"><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book Antiqua"><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'><![if !supportEmptyParas]>&nbsp;<![endif]><o:p></o:p></span></font></p>

<p class="MsoNormal"><b><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book Antiqua"><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;font-weight:bold'>H.R.60</span></font></b> = <br>
Sponsor: <a href=3D"http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&amp;Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Jackson-Lee++Sheila))+00588))">Rep Jackson-Lee, Sheila</a> (introduced 1/3/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee<br>
Title: To establish a commission to develop uniform standards which may be adopted by the States for the administration of elections for Federal office, and for other purposes. <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class="MsoNormal"><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book Antiqua"><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'><![if !supportEmptyParas]>&nbsp;<![endif]><o:p></o:p></span></font></p>

<p class="MsoNormal"><b><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book Antiqua"><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;font-weight:bold'>H.R.119</span></font></b> = <br>
Sponsor: <a href=3D"http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&amp;Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Holt++Rush+D.))+01580))">Rep Holt, Rush D.</a> (introduced 1/3/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee<br>
Title: To establish a Commission to study and make recommendations on the implementation of standardized voting procedures in the Federal, State, and local electoral process, and for other purposes. <o:p></o:p></p>
H.R.128 =<br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=3D0FIELD(FLD003+84(@(1(Rep+Luther++Bill))+00718))">Rep Luther, Bill</a> (introduced 1/3/2001) <br>Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee<br>Title: To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require States to permit individuals to register to vote in an election for Federal office on the date of the election. <o:p></o:p></p><br><br>H.R.150 =<br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=3D0FIELD(FLD003+84(@(1(Rep+Petri++Thomas+E.))+00912))">Rep Petri, Thomas E.</a> (introduced 1/3/2001) <br>Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee<br>Title: To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require certain disclosure and reports relating to polling by telephone or electronic device. <o:p></o:p></p><br><br>H.R.159 =<br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=3D0FIELD(FLD003+84(@(1(Rep+Riley++Bob))+01517))">Rep Riley, Bob</a> (introduced 1/3/2001) <br>Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee<br>Title: To prohibit a State from determining that a ballot submitted by an absent uniformed services voter was improperly or fraudulently cast unless the State finds clear and convincing evidence of fraud, and for other purposes. <o:p></o:p></p>
**H.R.189**

Sponsor: [Rep Stump, Bob](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Stump++Bob))+01122))) (introduced 1/3/2001)

Latest Major Action: 1/3/2001 Referred to House committee

Title: To repeal the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

---

**H.R.263**

Sponsor: [Rep Davis, Tom](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Davis++Tom))+00274))) (introduced 1/30/2001) (Identical bill introduced by [Sen McConnell, Mitch](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Sen+McConnell++Mitch))+01395))) 1/30/2001)

Related Bills: [S.218](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d107:SN00218:")

Latest Major Action: 1/30/2001 Referred to House committee

Title: To establish an Election Administration Commission to study Federal, State, and local voting procedures and election administration and provide grants to modernize voting procedures and election administration, and for other purposes.
H.R.283

Sponsor: Rep Maloney, Carolyn B.
Latest Major Action: 1/30/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require the disclosure of certain information by persons conducting phone banks during campaigns for election for Federal office, and for other purposes.

H.J.RES.5

Sponsor: Rep Delahunt, William D.
Latest Major Action: 1/30/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

H.R.310

Sponsor: Rep Upton, Fred
Latest Major Action: 2/13/2001 Referred to House subcommittee
Title: To amend title 5, United States Code, to move the legal public holiday known as Washington's Birthday to election day in Presidential election years.
**H.R.311**

Sponsor: [Rep Vitter, David](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Vitter++David))+01609))]

Latest Major Action: 1/30/2001 Referred to House committee

Title: To prohibit a State from determining that a ballot submitted by an absent uniformed services voter was improperly or fraudulently cast unless the State finds clear and convincing evidence of fraud, to direct the Secretary of Defense to prepare and submit a plan for electronic voting by absent uniformed services voters, and for other purposes.

---

**H.R.354**

Sponsor: [Rep Hutchinson, Asa](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Hutchinson++Asa))+01493))]

Latest Major Action: 1/30/2001 Referred to House committee

Title: To establish a grant program to assist State and local governments with improving the administration of elections through activities which may include the modernization of voting procedures and equipment, and for other purposes.

---

**H.R.366**

Sponsor: [Rep Moore, Dennis](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Moore++Dennis))+01561))]

Title: To establish a grant program to assist State and local governments with improving the administration of elections through activities which may include the modernization of voting procedures and equipment, and for other purposes.
Moore, Dennis (introduced 1/31/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 1/31/2001 Referred to House committee <br>
Title: To amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful the knowing dissemination of false information regarding elections for Federal office with the intent of discouraging another person from voting. <o:p></o:p></p><p class="MsoNormal"><font size="3" color="#000000" face=""Book Antiqua""><span style='font-size:12.0pt'><o:p>&nbsp;</o:p></span></font></p><p class="MsoNormal"><b><font size="3" color="#000000" face=""Book Antiqua""><span style='font-size:12.0pt;font-weight:bold'>H.R.430</span></font></b> = <br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Delahunt++William+D.))+01480))">Rep Delahunt, William D.</a> (introduced 2/6/2001) <br>Latest Major Action: 2/6/2001 Referred to House committee <br>Title: To establish a bipartisan commission to study the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures and develop standards for the conduct of Federal elections, and to authorize grants and technical assistance to the States to assist them in implementing such standards. = <o:p></o:p></p><p class="MsoNormal"><font size="3" color="#000000" face=""Book Antiqua""><span style='font-size:12.0pt'><o:p>&nbsp;</o:p></span></font></p><p class="MsoNormal"><b><font size="3" color="#000000" face=""Book Antiqua""><span style='font-size:12.0pt;font-weight:bold'>H.R.492</span></font></b> = <br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Bachus++Spencer))+00038))">Rep Bachus, Spencer</a> (introduced 2/7/2001) <br>Latest Major Action: 2/7/2001 Referred to House committee <br>Title: To prohibit a State from determining that a ballot submitted by an absent uniformed services voter was improperly or fraudulently cast unless the State finds clear and convincing evidence of fraud, to direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of methods to improve the procedures used to enable absent uniformed services voters to register to vote and vote in =
elections for Federal office, and for other purposes. <p>

H.R.506 =
Sponsor: Rep Hastings, Alcee L. (introduced 2/7/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 2/23/2001 Referred to House subcommittee <br>
Title: To establish a commission to make recommendations on the appropriate size of membership of the House of Representatives and the method by which Representatives are elected. <p>

H.J.RES.18 =
Sponsor: Rep Engel, Eliot L. (introduced 2/13/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 2/13/2001 Referred to House committee <br>
Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a new procedure for appointment of Electors for the election of the President and Vice President. <p>

H.J.RES.17 =
Sponsor: Rep Engel, Eliot L. (introduced 2/13/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 2/13/2001 Referred to House committee <br>
Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a new procedure for appointment of Electors for the election of the President and Vice President.
Engel, Eliot L. (introduced 2/13/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 2/13/2001 Referred to House =
committee</LACTD></LACT> <br>
Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States =
to
provide a new procedure for appointment of Electors for the election of =
the
President and Vice President. <o:p></o:p></p><p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>&lt;[if =
!supportEmptyParas]&nbsp;&lt;![endif]&gt;&lt;/p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;
<br>
Sponsor: <a href=3D"http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&amp;Db=3D3dd107&amp;querybd=
=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Dingell++John+D.))+00299))"&gt;Rep
Dingell, John D.&lt;/a&gt; (introduced 2/13/2001) &lt;br&gt;
Latest Major Action: 2/13/2001 Referred to House =
committee</LACTD></LACT> &lt;br&gt;
Title: To establish the Bipartisan Commission on Election Reform to =
study and
make recommendations on issues affecting the conduct and administration =
of
elections in the United States, and for other purposes. &lt;o:p&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/p&gt;
<br>
Sponsor: <a href=3D"http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&amp;Db=3D3dd107&amp;querybd=
=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Burton++Dan))+00154))"&gt;Rep
Burton, Dan&lt;/a&gt; (introduced 2/27/2001) &lt;br&gt;
Latest Major Action: 3/14/2001 Referred to House =
subcommittee</LACTD></LACT> &lt;br&gt;
Title: Expressing the sense of the Congress that national news =
organizations
should refrain from projecting the winner of a Presidential election =
until all
of the polls in the Continental United States have closed. =
&lt;o:p&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/p&gt;
H.R.752 = Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+King++Peter+T.))+00635))">Rep King, Peter T.</a> (introduced 2/27/2001) Latest Major Action: 3/5/2001 Referred to House subcommittee
Title: To develop voluntary consensus standards to ensure the accuracy and validation of the voting process, to direct the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to study voter participation and emerging voting technology, to provide grants to States to improve voting methods, and for other purposes.

Title: To establish a program to provide funds to State and local governments to replace punch card voting systems, to establish the Election Administration Commission to make grants to State and local governments to assist in the administration of Federal elections, to develop a model election code, and otherwise provide assistance with the administration of certain Federal election laws and programs, and for other purposes.

Title: To establish a program to provide funds to States to improve voting methods, and for other purposes.
Leach, James A. (introduced 3/1/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 3/1/2001 Referred to House committee</LACTD></LACT> = <br>
Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and establish a new procedure for electing the President and Vice President. <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book = Antiqua"&gt;&lt;span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'&gt;&lt;![if = !supportEmptyParas]&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;![endif]&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;

<p class=3DMsoNormal><b><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book = Antiqua"><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;font-weight:bold'>H.R.829</span></font></b> = <br>
Sponsor: &lt;a href=3D"http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&amp;Db=3Dd107&amp;amp;queryb= =3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Hastings++Alcee+L.))+00511))"&gt;Rep Hastings, Alcee L.&lt;/a&gt; (introduced 3/1/2001) &lt;br&gt;
Latest Major Action: 3/1/2001 Referred to House committee</LACTD></LACT> = <br>
Title: To direct the Federal Election Commission to set uniform national standards for Federal election procedures, change the Federal election day, and for other purposes. <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book = Antiqua"&gt;&lt;span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'&gt;&lt;![if = !supportEmptyParas]&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;![endif]&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;

<p class=3DMsoNormal><b><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book = Antiqua"><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;font-weight:bold'>H.CON.RES.48</span></font></b> = <br>
Sponsor: &lt;a href=3D"http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&amp;Db=3Dd107&amp;amp;queryb= =3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Paul++Ron))+00900))"&gt;Rep Paul, Ron&lt;/a&gt; (introduced 3/6/2001) &lt;br&gt;
Latest Major Action: 3/6/2001 Referred to House committee</LACTD></LACT> = <br>
Title: Expressing the sense of the Congress in reaffirming the United States of America as a republic. <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book = Antiqua"&gt;&lt;span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'&gt;&lt;![if = !supportEmptyParas]&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;![endif]&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;

<p class=3DMsoNormal><b><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book = Antiqua"><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;font-weight:bold'>H.R.920</span></font></b> = <br>

Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd= =3D@FIELD(FLD003+84({@1(Rep+Lampson++Nick))+01500}))">Rep Lampson, Nick</a> (introduced 3/7/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 3/7/2001 Referred to House committee</LACTD></LACT>  
Title: To establish the Federal Elections Review Commission to study the nature and consequences of the Federal electoral process and make recommendations to ensure the integrity of, and public confidence in, Federal elections.  

<p class="DMsoNormal"><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book = Antiqua">H.R.934</font></p>

Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd= =3D@FIELD(FLD003+84({@1(Rep+Jackson-Lee++Sheila))+00588}))">Rep Jackson-Lee, Sheila</a> (introduced 3/7/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 3/15/2001 Referred to House subcommittee</LACTD></LACT>  
Title: To amend title 5, United States Code, to establish election day in Presidential election years as a legal public holiday, and for other purposes.  

<p class="DMsoNormal"><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book = Antiqua">H.J.RES.37</font></p>

Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd= =3D@FIELD(FLD003+84({@1(Rep+Clement++Bob))+00205}))">Rep Clement, Bob</a> (introduced 3/13/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 3/13/2001 Referred to House committee</LACTD></LACT>  
Title: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment and voting, by congressional district, of electors for the election of President and Vice President, and to provide procedures for electing the President and Vice President if no candidate receives a majority of electoral votes.
H.R.1004  
Sponsor: Rep Schakowsky, Janice D. (introduced 3/13/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 3/13/2001 Referred to House committee  
Title: To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to establish a procedure under which individuals whose names do not appear on the list of registered voters in an election for Federal office at a particular polling place may cast provisional votes at the polling place, and for other purposes.

H.CON.RES.63  
Sponsor: Rep Langevin, James R. (introduced 3/14/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 3/14/2001 Referred to House committee  
Title: Expressing the sense of Congress that Congress should act quickly to enact significant election administration reforms which may be implemented prior to the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in 2002.
H.R.1151

Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Langevin++James+R.))+01668))">Rep Langevin, James R.</a> (introduced 3/21/2001)  

Latest Major Action: 3/21/2001 Referred to House committee

Title: To direct the Federal Election Commission to issue voluntary standards to promote the accessibility and effective use of voting systems, voting equipment, and polling places, to make grants to assist States in complying with such standards and carrying out other activities to promote accessibility in voting, and for other purposes.

H.R.1165

Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Barcia++James+A.))+00052))">Rep Barcia, James A.</a> (introduced 3/22/2001)

Latest Major Action: 4/3/2001 Referred to House subcommittee

Title: To provide for the establishment of an Election Voting Systems Standards Commission, and for other purposes.

H.R.1170

Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Conyers++John++Jr.))+00229))">Rep Conyers, John, Jr.</a> (introduced 3/22/2001)

Latest Major Action: 3/22/2001 Referred to House committee

Title: To protect voting
rights, and for other purposes.

H.R.1189

Latest Major Action: 3/22/2001 Referred to House committee

Title: To provide that a State may use a proportional voting system for multiseat congressional districts, and for other purposes.

H.R.1193

Sponsor: Rep Norton, Eleanor Holmes (introduced 3/22/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/19/2001 Referred to House subcommittee

Title: To provide for full voting representation in the Congress for the citizens of the District of Columbia, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that individuals who are residents of the District of Columbia shall be exempt from Federal income taxation until such full voting representation takes effect, and for other purposes.
H.R.1228 =
Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd= =3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Davis++Danny+K.))+01477))">Rep Davis, Danny K.</a> (introduced 3/27/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 4/19/2001 Referred to House =
subcommittee</LACTD></LACT> <br>
Title: To provide fairness in voter participation.<o:p></o:p></p>

H.R.1377 =
Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd= =3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Thornberry++William++(Mac)))+01155))">Rep Thornberry, William (Mac)</a> (introduced 4/3/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 4/24/2001 Referred to House =
subcommittee</LACTD></LACT> <br>
Title: To ensure that military personnel do not lose the right to cast =
votes in elections in their domicile as a result of their service away from the domicile, to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting =
Act to extend the voter registration and absentee ballot protections for absent uniformed services personnel under such Act to State and local =
elections, and for other purposes.<o:p></o:p></p>

H.R.1482 =
Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd= =3D@FIELD(FLD003+@4((@1(Rep+Langevin++James+R.))+01668))">Rep Langevin, James R.</a> (introduced 4/4/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 4/4/2001 Referred to House committee</LACTD></LACT> =
<br>
Title: To establish a grant program administered by the Federal Election Commission for the purpose of assisting States to upgrade <b>voting</b> systems to use more =
advanced and accurate <b>voting</b> devices =
and to
enhance participation by military personnel in national elections.

H.R.1558
Sponsor: Rep Hilliard, Earl F. (introduced 4/24/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/24/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To prohibit States from denying any individual the right to register to vote for an election for Federal office, or the right to vote in an election for Federal office, on the grounds that the individual has been convicted of a Federal crime, and for other purposes.

H.R.1559
Sponsor: Rep Hilliard, Earl F. (introduced 4/24/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/24/2001 Referred to House committee
Title: To require that general Federal elections be held over the 48-hour period that begins with the first Saturday in November, to prohibit States from preventing citizens who are registered to vote from voting in Federal elections and from carrying out certain law enforcement activities which have the effect of intimidating individuals from voting, and for other purposes.
**H.R.1666**

Sponsor: Rep Quinn, Jack (introduced 5/1/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 5/1/2001 Referred to House committee  
Title: To establish a uniform closing time for the operation of polls on the date of the election of the President and Vice President.

**H.RES.139**

Sponsor: Rep Cummings, Elijah E. (introduced 5/9/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 5/9/2001 Referred to House committee  
Title: Expressing the sense of Congress regarding commitment to the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

**H.R.1971**

Sponsor: Rep Meek, Carrie P. (introduced 5/23/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 5/23/2001 Referred to House committee  
Title: To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require States to give notice and an opportunity for review prior to removing individuals from the official list of eligible voters in elections for Federal office by reason
of criminal conviction, and for other purposes. <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class="3DMsoNormal"><font size="3D" color="#000000" face="Book Antiqua"><span style='font-size:12.0pt'><o:p></o:p></span></font></p>

<p class="3DMsoNormal"><b><font size="3D" color="#000000" face="Book Antiqua"><span style='font-size:12.0pt;font-weight:bold'>H.R.2356</span></font></b> =<br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=3D@FIELD(FLDD003+@4((@1(Rep+Shays++Christopher))+01048))">Rep Shays, Christopher</a> (introduced 6/28/2001) <br>Related Bills: <a =
href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d107:HE00188:">H.RES.188</a>, <a =

<p class="3DMsoNormal"><font size="3D" color="#000000" face="Book Antiqua"><span style='font-size:12.0pt'><o:p></o:p></span></font></p>

<p class="3DMsoNormal"><b><font size="3D" color="#000000" face="Book Antiqua"><span style='font-size:12.0pt;font-weight:bold'>S.27</span></font></b> <br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=
3D@FIELD(FLDD003+@4((@1(Sen+McCain++John))+00754))">Sen McCain, John</a> (introduced 1/22/2001) <br>Related Bills: <a =

<p class="3DMsoNormal"><font size="3D" color="#000000" face="Book Antiqua"><span style='font-size:12.0pt'><o:p></o:p></span></font></p>

<p class="3DMsoNormal"><b><font size="3D" color="#000000" face="Book Antiqua"><span style='font-size:12.0pt;font-weight:bold'>S.28</span></font></b> <br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=d107&amp;querybd=
3D@FIELD(FLDD003+@4((@1(Rep+Gregg++James))+01348))">Rep Gregg, James</a> (introduced 1/4/2001) <br>Related Bills: <a =
Sen Gramm, Phil (introduced 1/22/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 1/22/2001 Referred to Senate committee/LACTD/LACT  
Title: A bill to guarantee the right of all active duty military personnel, merchant mariners, and their dependents to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

S.50  
Sponsor: Sen Stevens, Ted (introduced 1/22/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 1/22/2001 Referred to Senate committee/LACTD/LACT  
Title: A bill to amend title 3, United States Code, and the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to establish a single poll closing time for Presidential general elections.

S.122  
Sponsor: Sen Campbell, Ben Nighthorse (introduced 1/22/2001)  
Latest Major Action: 1/22/2001 Referred to Senate committee/LACTD/LACT  
Title: A bill to prohibit a State from determining that a ballot submitted by an absent uniformed services voter was improperly or fraudulently cast unless that State finds clear and convincing evidence of fraud, and for other purposes.
<p class="3DMsoNormal"><b><font size="3D" color="3Dblack" face="Book Antiqua">S.154</font></b> <br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd=3D0FIELD(FLD003+84(@(1(Sen+Shelby++Richard+C.))+01049))">Sen Shelby, Richard C.</a> (introduced 1/23/2001) <br>Latest Major Action: 1/23/2001 Referred to Senate committee <br>Title: A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to ensure uniform treatment by States of Federal overseas absentee ballots, to amend titles 10 and 18, United States Code, and the Revised Statutes to remove the uncertainty regarding the authority of the Department of Defense to permit buildings located on military installations and reserve component facilities to be used as polling places in Federal, State, and elections for public office, and for other purposes.</p>

<p class="3DMsoNormal"><b><font size="3D" color="3Dblack" face="Book Antiqua">S.175</font></b> <br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd=3D0FIELD(FLD003+84(@(1(Sen+Hutchison++Kay+Bailey))+01368))">Sen Hutchison, Kay Bailey</a> (introduced 1/24/2001) <br>Latest Major Action: 1/24/2001 Referred to Senate committee <br>Title: A bill to establish a national uniform poll closing time and uniform treatment of absentee ballots in Presidential general elections.</p>

<p class="3DMsoNormal"><b><font size="3D" color="3Dblack" face="Book Antiqua">S.216</font></b> <br>Sponsor: <a href="http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/?&Db=3Dd107&amp;querybd=3D0FIELD(FLD003+84(@(1(Sen+Specter++Arlen))+01437))">Sen Specter, Arlen</a> (introduced 1/30/2001) <br>Latest Major Action: 1/30/2001 Referred to Senate committee</p>
Title: A bill to establish a Commission for the comprehensive study of voting procedures in Federal, State, and local elections, and for other purposes. 

S.218
Sponsor: Sen McConnell, Mitch (introduced 1/30/2001; Identical bill as introduced by Rep Davis, Tom 1/30/2001, H.R.263)
Related Bills: H.R.263
Latest Major Action: 1/30/2001 Referred to Senate committee

Title: A bill to establish an Election Administration Commission to study Federal, State, and local voting procedures and election administration and provide grants to modernize voting procedures and election administration, and for other purposes. 

S.241
Sponsor: Sen Reid, Harry M. (introduced 2/1/2001) 
Related Bills: H.R.263
Latest Major Action: 2/1/2001 Referred to Senate committee
S.368
Sponsor: Sen McCain, John (introduced 2/15/2001)
Latest Major Action: 5/8/2001 Senate committee/subcommittee =
Title: A bill to develop voluntary consensus standards to ensure =
accuracy and
validation of the voting process, to direct the Director of the National
Institute of Standards and Technology to study voter participation and =
emerging
voting technology, to provide grants to States to improve voting =
methods, and
for other purposes. <o:p></o:p></p>

S.379
Sponsor: Sen Schumer, Charles E. (introduced 2/15/2001)
Latest Major Action: 2/15/2001 Referred to Senate =
Title: A bill to establish the National Commission on the Modernization =
of
Federal Elections to conduct a study of Federal <b><span =
style="font-weight:
bold">voting</span></b> procedures and election administration, to =
establish
the Federal Election Modernization Grant Program to provide grants to =
States
and localities for the modernization of <b><span =
style="font-weight:
bold">voting</span></b> procedures and election administration, and for other purposes. =

S.381

Sponsor: Sen Allard, Wayne (introduced 2/15/2001)

Latest Major Action: 2/15/2001 Referred to Senate committee

Title: A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, and title 10, United States Code, to maximize the access of uniformed services voters and recently separated uniformed services voters to the polls, to ensure that each vote cast by such a voter is duly counted, and for other purposes.

S.467

Sponsor: Sen Roberts, Pat (introduced 3/6/2001)

Latest Major Action: 3/6/2001 Referred to Senate committee

Title: A bill to provide grants for States to adopt the Federal write-in absentee ballot and to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to require uniform treatment by States of Federal write-in absentee ballots.

S.470

Sponsor: Sen Bond, Christopher (introduced 3/6/2001)

Latest Major Action: 3/6/2001 Referred to Senate committee

Title: A bill to require grants for States to adopt the Federal write-in absentee ballot and to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to require uniform treatment by States of Federal write-in absentee ballots.
Bond, Christopher S. (introduced 3/6/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 3/6/2001 Referred to Senate =
committee</LACTD></LACT> <br>
Title: A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee =
Voting Act,
the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to ensure that each =
vote
cast by such voter is duly counted, and for other purposes. =
<br/>

S.479 Sponsor: Sen Cleland, Max (introduced 3/7/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 3/7/2001 Referred to Senate =
committee</LACTD></LACT> <br>
Title: A bill to establish a grant program administered by the Federal =
Election
Commission for the purpose of assisting States to upgrade voting systems to use more =
advanced and accurate devices and to enhance participation by military personnel in national elections. =
<br/>

S.528 Sponsor: Sen Bond, Christopher S. (introduced 3/14/2001) <br>
Latest Major Action: 3/14/2001 Referred to Senate =
committee</LACTD></LACT> <br>
Title: A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to modify the requirements for voter mail registration and for other purposes. =
<br/>
S.565
Sponsor: Sen. Dodd, Christopher J. (introduced 3/19/2001)
Latest Major Action: 3/19/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to establish the Commission on Voting Rights and Procedures to study and make recommendations regarding election technology, voting, and election administration, to establish a grant program under which the Office of Justice Programs and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall provide assistance to States and localities in improving election technology and the administration of Federal elections, to require States to meet uniform and nondiscriminatory election technology and administration requirements for the 2004 Federal elections, and for other purposes.

S.603
Latest Major Action: 3/23/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to provide for full voting representation in the Congress for the citizens of the District of Columbia to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that individuals who are residents of the District of Columbia shall be exempt from Federal income taxation.
until such full voting representation takes effect, and for other purposes.

S.602
Sponsor: Sen Domenici, Pete V. (introduced 3/22/2001)
Latest Major Action: 3/22/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to reform Federal election law.

S.729
Sponsor: Sen Nelson, Bill (introduced 4/6/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/6/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to provide grant money to States to enable States to expand the opportunity for citizens to vote over the Internet.

S.731
Sponsor: Sen Nelson, Bill (introduced 4/6/2001)
Latest Major Action: 4/6/2001 Referred to Senate committee
Title: A bill to ensure that military personnel do not lose the right to cast votes in elections in their domicile as a result of their service away from the domicile, to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens absentee Voting Act to extend the voter registration and absentee ballot protections for absent uniformed services personnel under such Act to State and local elections, and for other purposes.

S.738
Sponsor: Sen Smith, Bob
Latest Major Action: 4/6/2001 Referred to Senate committee

Title: A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to protect the voting rights of members of the Armed Forces.

S.953
Sponsor: Sen McConnell, Mitch
Latest Major Action: 5/24/2001 Referred to Senate
Title: A bill to establish a Blue Ribbon Study Panel and an Election Administration Commission to study voting procedures and election administration, to provide grants to modernize voting procedures and election administration, and for other purposes.

Title: Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to each registered voter in the United States should have. Expresses the sense of Congress that each registered voter in the United States should have the right: (1) to vote and have his or her vote accurately counted; (2) to cast a vote if he or she is in line when the polls are closing; (3) to ask for and receive assistance in voting; (4) if he or she has voted in error, to at least 3 successive opportunities to correct that error through replacement ballots; (5) to an explanation if his or her registration is in question; (6) if his or her registration is in question, to cast a provisional ballot; (7) to prove his or her identity by signing an affidavit if election officials doubt that identity; (8) to written instructions to use when voting, and, upon request, oral instructions in voting from elections officers; (9) to vote free from coercion or intimidation by elections officers or any other person; and (10) to vote on a voting machine that is in working condition and that will allow votes to be accurately cast.
Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist

Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
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Chris Dodd's proposed bill (S565) is titled the "Equal Protection of Voting Rights Act of 2001" and is co-sponsored by the 49 other Democrats in the Senate and Independent James Jeffords.

It has already been read and referred to the Rules Committee, so it may well be brought to the Senate floor whenever the leadership decides to make a political point, but there are no Republican co-sponsors and I do not believe that an identical bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives.

In other words, this is not likely to get to the President's desk unless a major public outcry for electoral reform develops, which does not seem to be happening.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com
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A correction to my original message: John Conyers has introduced a bill (HR1170) in the House which is not identical to S565 but does include many of the same provisions, notably for a bipartisan commission to investigate the electoral process, and it bears the same title as the Senate bill.

HR1170 has attracted 139 co-sponsors, all of them Democrats, as far as I can see, but I very much doubt that the Republicans in the House would let ANY bill on this subject reach the President's desk because the Democrats could (and would) use it to attack the legitimacy of Bush's election.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com
Mark David Richards wrote:
>
> Thanks ... Is there ANY bill that has a remote chance of reaching the
> President ... ? Looks like most of the items introduced are probably
token,
> public relations items. mark
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
> Jan
> Werner
> Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2001 4:11 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Federal election/voting reform
>
> Chris Dodd's proposed bill (S565) is titled the "Equal Protection of
> Voting Rights Act of 2001" and is co-sponsored by the 49 other Democrats
> in the Senate and Independent James Jeffords.
>
> It has already been read and referred to the Rules Committee, so it may
> well be brought to the Senate floor whenever the leadership decides to
> make a political point, but there are no Republican co-sponsors and I do
> not believe that an identical bill has been introduced in the House of
> Representatives.
>
> In other words, this is not likely to get to the President's desk unless
> a major public outcry for electoral reform develops, which does not seem
> to be happening.
>
> Jan Werner
> jwerner@jwdp.com
> From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Jul 25 10:14:07 2001
> Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> id f6PHE7J15926 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 25 Jul 2001
> 10:14:07 -0700 (PDT)
> Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> id KAA09051 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 25 Jul 2001 10:14:08 -0700
> (PDT)
> Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
> by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> id f6PHE6Z27026 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 25 Jul 2001 10:14:06 -0700
> (PDT)
> Date: Wed, 25 Jul 2001 10:14:05 -0700 (PDT)
> From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
> To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Subject: HOW TO ACCESS THE AAPORNET ARCHIVES
> Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0107251003460.27869-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
In response to a timely question, here's a posting we have not seen here often enough recently, for which I apologize.  

-- Jim

******

HOW TO ACCESS THE AAPORNET ARCHIVES

(Yes, every word ever posted to AAPORNET is available to all members of the list, any time, day nor night, even on major holidays.)

*** To: listproc@usc.edu, with *NO* subject header, send the one-line command:  get aapornet logYYMM  
where YY is the two-digit year (1999 is 99, etc.) and where MM is the two-digit month (03 is March, etc.)

NOTE: The archives are available in one-month chunks only; they are *NOT* available by days, weeks, years, decades, or centuries

*** FOR EXAMPLE, to get the January 1999 archive, 
send to: listproc@usc.edu 
the one-line command: get aapornet log9901 and *ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ELSE*

Within a minute or two after sending this, you will receive, from listproc@usc.edu, and with your own one-line command in the subject header, a massive file with every message received during January 1999, in the order posted.

To find then the topic of interest to you, you will do best to search the archive by keywords using your own internet mail software.

Because of the size of most monthly archives, I cannot personally recommend that you order more than one in a single message--the server can handle more, but I'm not sure you wish to have more than one sitting in your mail files at any one time.

-- Jim

----------

EXAMPLE ONLY...
----------

Here's the beginning of the January 1999 archive, as mailed to me on February 11, 2000...

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2000 09:14:13 PST
From: "CREN ListProcessor(tm) at USC" <listproc@usc.edu>
To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Subject: GET aapornet log9901 (1/1)
AAPOR might have gained an important supporter of its position on Census sampling estimation. The latest estimates reported in the Washington Post today are that Illinois will just barely miss losing a seat in the 2000 reapportionment. Thus, Illinois might be one of the states that would .
.
.
.
.
.
.
.

*****
PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS ANNOUNCE NEW STUDY SHOWING MAJOR SHIFTS IN THE FUTURE OF THE PERFORMING ARTS

RAND Report Cites Economic Pressures on Midsize Groups, Proliferation of Grassroots and Amateur Organizations, Decline in Professional Live Performance

PHILADELPHIA--July 23, 2001--A fundamental shift is taking place in the structure of the performing arts system in America. In a handful of the biggest cities, the largest and best-known organizations continue to grow by focusing on star-studded productions that pull in the crowds. In smaller communities across America, small dance and music groups and theater ensembles are proliferating, performing for little or no pay. But conventional mid-sized arts organizations--often viewed as the foremost purveyors of culture to middle America--face increasing financial stress, as Americans have come to rely more on their televisions and CD players for art as well as entertainment. These and other developments suggest that more emphasis should be placed on strategies that encourage greater participation in the arts by a wider range of Americans in a more diverse range of art forms.

These are among the major findings of a new study of trends in the performing arts over the past 30 years conducted by RAND, a private nonprofit research organization, and supported by The Pew Charitable Trusts as part of the Trusts' five-year, multi-million dollar initiative, Optimizing America's Cultural Resources. The Trusts' initiative is designed to strengthen financial and policy support for American arts and culture.
Marian A. Godfrey, director of the Culture Program for the Pew Charitable Trusts, said, "This report provides us with a research benchmark that captures the state of the performing arts today. It not only points to the gaps in existing knowledge and data on every aspect of the performing arts system, but it also suggests a range of issues that need to be confronted by the arts community, funders and policy makers."

The report, The Performing Arts in a New Era, by Kevin McCarthy, Arthur Brooks, Julia Lowell, and Laura Zakaras, is the first to analyze the entire performing arts system--theater, opera, dance and music in the commercial, professional nonprofit, and the community-oriented volunteer sector--over the past 35 years. The major objective of the study was to examine trends affecting audiences, artists, organizations and finances and to identify the policy implications of those trends.

The authors observe that performing arts organizations are becoming increasingly polarized by size rather than by their focus on the high arts or mass entertainment. Large organizations, both commercial and nonprofit, rely increasingly on massive advertising and marketing campaigns promoting celebrity artists to attract large audiences for both live and recorded products. Small performing arts organizations are becoming more diverse, focusing on low-budget live productions that rely largely on volunteer labor. Midsize organizations producing live performances face the most serious financial strain. Either they will have to become larger and more prestigious--which many lack the resources to do--or they will have to cut their budgets and become more community oriented, using local talent to keep costs down. Those that are not able to adapt may disappear.

According to Kevin McCarthy, who led the RAND study, "We see evidence of a real shift in what American arts consumers want. Because their free time is so fragmented, Americans are pursuing arts activities that allow them to choose what they want to do, when and where they want to do it--a trend that attracts them to home-based entertainment rather than live performances. At the same time, Americans are participating in a remarkable variety of productions within their own communities. These trends may not bode well for many established arts organizations with more conventional offerings and program schedules."

If current trends continue, the authors argue, they seem certain to affect the accessibility and quality of the performing arts Americans will enjoy in the future. By and large, Americans will have access to a growing variety of recorded performances, but the types of live performances available to them could increasingly depend upon where they live. Residents of major metropolitan areas will continue to have access to top-echelon live performances. But audiences in smaller towns and cities that cannot support their own full-time professional performing arts companies may increasingly depend upon touring artists and productions as well as local arts groups that provide low-budget productions of great cultural and artistic diversity often performed largely by volunteers.

These trends could also affect the quality of performing arts in the future. If the number of midsize organizations contracts, young artists may have fewer opportunities to gain experience in their fields, and if financial pressures lead performing arts organizations to rely
increasingly on programming to mass audiences, artistic innovation may be discouraged.

Instead of narrowly focusing on supporting production and performers in traditional institutions, the authors suggest that developing policies for the arts today requires a deeper understanding of the public interests served by the arts--and the role of government in supporting those interests. In particular, they recommend that greater resources be brought to bear on stimulating public involvement in the arts--such as increased support for public education about and appreciation for the arts, developing the Internet as a platform for the arts and programs designed to diversify and broaden audiences for non-traditional as well as traditional art forms.

OTHER FINDINGS

The Decline of Live Performance

While the proportion of the population purchasing recorded performances has been growing steadily over the past 30 years, the proportion of the public that attends live performances has remained stable, despite the intensive efforts at marketing and audience development. The report points to several socio-demographic factors that may dampen future demand for live performances, including slower population growth, growing preferences among Americans for home-based leisure activities and the emergence of a younger generation that is comfortable with entertainment delivered by the Internet and other technologies.

Funding for the Arts Increasingly Has Strings Attached

Nonprofit arts organizations rely on three main sources for their revenues: earnings, direct government subsidies, and philanthropic contributions. While earned income has remained relatively steady--performing arts institutions on average appear to be as dependent upon the market as they have in the past--federal government funding of the arts has decreased 50% in real terms since the early 1990s. This decline has been moderated by increased funding from state and local governments. Individual contributions, while increasing more than any other single source of giving, have come in the form of more numerous but smaller donations that require higher development costs. At the same time, corporate contributions, while growing, have been increasingly tied to individual corporate marketing campaigns.

The Number of Artists has been Increasing Despite their Employment Conditions

The number of self-proclaimed professional artists doubled between 1970 and 1990, and amateur performing artists--those who pursue their craft as an avocation--are estimated to outnumber professionals by 20 or 30 to 1. Despite this increase, the pay and job security of artists have scarcely improved since the 1970s. On average, performing artists earn less, work fewer weeks, face higher unemployment and are much more likely to take jobs outside their profession than other professionals with comparable education. At the same time, a few superstar artists enjoy wages far greater than others in their fields do.
For Many Artists, the Internet May Prove a Double-edged Sword

The advent of the Internet, web-based e-commerce and dramatic improvement in reproduction technology and broad-band transmission have made it possible for many performers to produce and distribute their work on their own. Composers and musicians, for example, can now produce their own recordings, identify and reach potential audiences and promote and distribute their work without relying on intermediaries such as record companies. However, as more artists make their work available over the Internet, the proliferation of choices may overload audiences, who will seek intermediaries to help them navigate the many offerings. Further, the report suggests that the Internet also seems to be marking it harder for artists to retain artistic control--as well as creative property rights--over their work.

---------

Based in Santa Monica, California, RAND (www.rand.org) is a nonprofit institution that helps improve policy and decisionmaking through research and analysis. RAND's areas of expertise include health, education, civil and criminal justice, child policy, environment and energy, international policy, national security, and science and technology.

The Pew Charitable Trusts (www.pewtrusts.com) support nonprofit activities in the areas of culture, education, the environment, health and human services, public policy and religion. Based in Philadelphia, the Trusts make strategic investments to help organizations and citizens develop practical solutions to difficult problems. In 2000, with approximately $4.8 billion in assets, the Trusts committed more than $235 million to 302 nonprofit organizations.

##

http://www.rand.org/hot/Press/arts.7.23.01.html

*****

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Jul 25 18:45:26 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f6Q1jPJ18264 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 25 Jul 2001
18:45:25 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id SAA19398 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 25 Jul 2001 18:45:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
Not the 'Net? Don't Need it

According to the April 2001 "General Internet User Survey" from Content Intelligence, a division of Lyra Research, 24% of internet users in the US have canceled subscriptions to general news magazines since they began using the internet. The study also found that some users are paying for online content -- though most (8.3%) are doing so for "adult" content, 5% say they pay for access to an industry-specific site.

The company questioned 1,112 US adults (ages 18 and over) online. Although the individuals were chosen randomly, the company did so from a database of people who agreed to join the panel. Content Intelligence found that 24% of female internet users and 34% of male users have been online for more than five years. Additionally, the report says that 50% of users have had more than a college education and 36% have annual salaries of $75,000 or more.

The study also found that the percentage of users who have substantially decreased their usage of other media is generally greater than the percentage of those who have substantially increased usage of other media. For example, 19% of users significantly decreased their magazine reading and only 2% significantly increased their reading of magazines.

Delayed Gratification For UK Banners

UK-based Just-Sites.com studied the effectiveness of a banner ad campaign on Engage's business-to-business (B2B) network between March and April 2001. Just-Sites measured traffic to three of its properties (just-food.com, just-drinks.com and just-auto.com) and found that 53% of
the response to banners was direct, while 47% was indirect (visiting the site later without clicking the ad). Of the indirect responses, 30% came within 30 minutes, 40% came within an hour, 90% came within a week and all came within four weeks.

Richard, thank you so much for providing this study. It's very useful! Could you please tell me if the questionnaires for this study are available and/or the data? Thanks Janice Ballou
a common thread: the role of public opinion polls in a democracy. The July/August 2001 issue of Public Perspective speaks to this issue from a variety of standpoints. The relevant articles are available on the Web at: http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pp_curr.html

The articles report on three surveys (of the general public, policy leaders, and journalists) that the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation undertook in collaboration with Public Perspective. The field work was carried out by Princeton Survey Research Associates on behalf of Kaiser.

The surveys focus on the role of polls in policymaking. What role does the public think polls should and do play in policymaking? What are American's views on the role polls can and do play in communicating their policy preferences to the policymakers? How do their views compare to those of policy leaders and journalists?

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

Please note change of e-mail address:

Richard C. ROCKWELL
Executive Director, The Roper Center &
Institute for Social Inquiry
Professor of Sociology
341 Mansfield Road, U-164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA
V +1 860 486-4440
F +1 860 486-6308
richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu

--------------57B4E94D4D9F5A85499837ED
Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii;
   name="jballou.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: Card for Janice Ballou
Content-Disposition: attachment;
   filename="jballou.vcf"

begin:vcard
n:Ballou;jballou@rci.rutgers.edu
tel;fax:(732) 932-1551
tel;work:(732) 932-9384 x240
x-mozilla-html:FALSE
org:Center for Public Interest Polling
version:2.1
e-mail;internet:jballou@rci.rutgers.edu
title:Director
adr;quoted-printable::;185 Ryders Lane=0D=0DWood Lawn Carriage House;New Brunswick;New Jersey;08901;
x-mozilla-cpt::768
fn:jballou@rci.rutgers.edu
end:vcard

--------------57B4E94D4D9F5A85499837ED--

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Jul 26 07:30:47 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6QEU1J21546 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Jul 2001
  07:30:47

> a common thread: the role of public opinion polls in a democracy. The
> July/August 2001 issue of Public Perspective speaks to this issue from a
> variety of standpoints. The relevant articles are available on the Web at:
> http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pp_curr.html
>
> The articles report on three surveys (of the general public, policy
> leaders, and journalists) that the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation
> undertook in collaboration with Public Perspective. The field work was
> carried out by Princeton Survey Research Associates on behalf of Kaiser.
>
> The surveys focus on the role of polls in policymaking. What role does the
> public think polls should and do play in policymaking? What are American's
> views on the role polls can and do play in communicating their policy
> preferences to the policymakers? How do their views compare to those of
> policy leaders and journalists?
> --------------------------
> Please note change of e-mail address:
> 
> Richard C. ROCKWELL
> Executive Director, The Roper Center &
> Institute for Social Inquiry
> Professor of Sociology
> 341 Mansfield Road, U-164
> Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA
> V +1 860 486-4440
> F +1 860 486-6308
> richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu
> 
> ---------------57B4E94D4D9F5A85499837ED
> Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii;
> name="jballou.vcf"
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
> Content-Description: Card for Janice Ballou
> Content-Disposition: attachment;
> filename="jballou.vcf"
> 
> begin:vcard
> n:Ballou;jballou@rci.rutgers.edu
tel;fax:(732) 932-1551
tel;work:(732) 932-9384 x240
x-mozilla-html:FALSE
org:Center for Public Interest Polling
version:2.1
e-mail;internet:jballou@rci.rutgers.edu
title:Director
adr;quoted-printable::;185 Ryders Lane=0D=0DWood Lawn Carriage House;New Brunswick;New Jersey;08901;
x-mozilla-cpt::768
fn:jballou@rci.rutgers.edu
end:vcard

--------------57B4E94D4D9F5A85499837ED--

> From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Jul 26 07:30:47 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6QEU1J21546 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Jul 2001
  07:30:47
This complaint marks the emergence into the public eye of a debate about certain aspects of Microsoft's XP, .NET and Hailstorm initiatives that has been raging among software professionals for many months.

Survey researchers need to become familiar with this issue, as it threatens to pollute online research more rapidly and more thoroughly than telemarketing, slamming and other phone scams have already done for telephone interviewing.

Jan Werner

Privacy Proponents to Put Pressure on Microsoft
By Dominic Gates
Jul 25 2001 05:25 PM PDT

Watchdog groups will file a complaint with the FTC over the company's plan to gather personal data of Windows XP users. They want XP's release stopped pending the outcome.

UPDATE Pressure on Microsoft is rapidly mounting over the way it plans to incorporate Internet services into its upcoming Windows XP operating system. In addition to the antitrust suit by the Department of Justice and state attorneys general and the planned congressional hearings into the company's practices, the Federal Trade Commission might have to weigh in.

On Thursday, an alliance of consumer-privacy watchdog bodies will file a complaint with the FTC raising privacy and security concerns, and accusing Microsoft of "unfair and deceptive trade practices."

The complaint focuses on the integration of Windows XP with a
centralized identity-authentication service called Passport. The complaint asks for an FTC investigation of the way Microsoft intends to collect personal information of users of Windows XP and related services. According to Marc Rotenberg, executive director of the Electronic Privacy Information Center, one of the lead plaintiffs, the filing requests an injunction "to stop the release of XP" pending the outcome.

This latest turn of the screw raises more doubt about the Redmond, Wash.-based software behemoth's ability to ship XP on schedule in October. "Time has become of the essence," Rotenburg said.

Although not directly related to the antitrust suit, the complaint draws on the ruling in that lawsuit, which found Microsoft to be a monopolist. A copy of the complaint to the FTC will also be forwarded to the Department of Justice and the state attorneys general involved in the antitrust suit.

"It is Microsoft's monopoly power in the operating system market that allows it to coerce from consumers personal information that they would not otherwise volunteer," said Jason Catlett, president of Junkbusters, another of the complainants.

In a conference call Wednesday, Rotenberg and Catlett, along with Privacy Foundation CTO Richard Smith, outlined the substance of their complaint. It alleges that Microsoft's plans for Windows XP violate Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

"This complaint concerns the privacy implications of the Microsoft XP operating system that is expected to become the primary means of access for consumers in the United States to the Internet," the document begins. "Microsoft has engaged in and is engaging in unfair and deceptive trade practices intended to profile, track and monitor millions of Internet users."

It goes on to detail privacy issues with Microsoft's .Net initiative for integrating Web services with its products and, in particular, the plan to link those services through Passport. Currently, consumers browsing the Web are often tracked by the sites they visit through the use of cookies, small pieces of code that record a user's movements. The cookies are stored on a user's machine and inspected on subsequent visits to the same site. By contrast, the Passport system stores such information, including passwords and personal data, on central Microsoft servers.

Microsoft's rationale for this centralization is its vision of a highly connected world with users accessing Web services not only from their PCs, but from devices such as handheld computers, phones and game consoles. Such a vision requires that authentication be tied not to a specific machine, but to the user, accessible through the "Internet cloud" from any device. Users already experience this when they use Web-based e-mail. Microsoft wants to expand that model to encompass
almost everything on the Net, including access to Web sites and e-commerce.

The promise is convenience. The danger is that if the monopoly of the Windows desktop is leveraged to make Passport a universal identifier on the Internet, Microsoft becomes the middleman for most Internet transactions.

Privacy groups are not alone in worrying about that danger.

"[Microsoft is] not trying to control people," said Esther Dyson, chairman of EDventure Holdings and founding chairwoman of the domain-names organization ICANN. "They're just trying to get money out of people's pockets." Dyson described the Passport design as "a brilliant business plan" but also "a scary notion."

"I don't want the government, or Microsoft, asking me for my ID," she said.

Dyson considers Passport an aggressive move at this juncture in the antitrust case. "I find it kind of amazing," she said. "You sit and think, 'Can they actually do this? Is it believable?' One hopes not."

In response to the announcement of the complaint to the FTC, Microsoft spokesman Jim Cullinan insisted that the company's design of Passport leaves users in control of their personal information. "The user is the one who controls how and with whom their data is shared," said Cullinan, who added that a user may currently sign up for Passport by inputting nothing more than an e-mail address and a password.

Cullinan argued that Windows XP requires Passport only when someone uses a feature, such as instant messaging, that requires authentication. "That's to protect the user," he said. "So that only you have access to your buddy list or your Hotmail e-mail messages."

The privacy complaint to the FTC calls for investigation of a long series of related services and products. Those include the tie-in between Windows XP and Passport; the Hotmail e-mail service; the sharing of information within the Microsoft network; the harvesting of e-mail addresses; and the profiling of Internet users.

Current beta versions of the XP operating system require the user to register for a Passport for full functionality, specifically for access to real-time communications features such as chat, instant messaging and videoconferencing.

Catlett demanded that Microsoft redesign its services so that the disclosure of personal information would not be a requirement. "There should be warnings akin to a cigarette-package label," he added. "Your information may be inadvertently disclosed to third parties because of
our inadequate security procedures."

Catlett referred to the history of security breaches with Microsoft network systems as "a long, sad saga of errors and defects." This, he suggested, raised doubts about the wisdom of centralizing user data in this way even assuming good faith. Microsoft has offered repeated promises that it would neither mine the Passport data for marketing purposes nor share it with anyone else.

Microsoft is due to ship final XP code to computer makers next month. With preliminary settlement talks in the government's antitrust suit barely under way and congressional hearings scheduled for September in the Senate Judiciary Committee, the FTC complaint opens one more front for Redmond.

>From hfienberg@stats.org Thu Jul 26 09:43:18 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6QGhHJ05525 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Jul 2001
09:43:17 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net (smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net
[207.172.4.60])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us) with ESMTP
   id JAA29718 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Jul 2001 09:43:20 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from 209-122-199-89.s89.apx1k.lnh.md.dialup.rcn.com
([209.122.199.89]
   helo=howard)
   by smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net with smtp (Exim 3.31 #3)
   id 15PoEG-00047u-00
   for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 26 Jul 2001 12:43:17 -0400
Reply-To: <hfienberg@stats.org>
From: "Howard Fienberg" <hfienberg@stats.org>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Another Dubious Zogby Poll
Date: Fri, 27 Jul 2001 00:39:11 -0400
Message-ID: <002701c11656$5dd938c0$0a742c42@howard>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4522.1200

from OpinionJournal's Best of the Web today:

Another Dubious Zogby Poll
Shibley Telhami, who holds the prestigious title of Anwar Sadat Professor for Peace and Development at the University of Maryland, pens a Washington Post op-ed piece about Arab sentiments toward the Palestinian problem. He writes:
To get a rare view of Arab public opinion, I commissioned a survey (through
Zogby International) in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt and Lebanon. The results indicate that Arab leaders may even be underestimating public opinion on this issue. In each of four countries surveyed, about 60 percent of the public reported that the Palestinian issue "is the single most important issue" to them personally, and more than 20 percent more ranked it "among the top three most important issues." Remarkably, this is true even of public opinion in Kuwait, which has had a troubled relationship with the Palestinians since the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990. In all, about 85 percent of people in the five states ranked the Palestinian issue among the top three issues. The results from the fifth state, Egypt, were even more impressive: Seventy-nine percent of Egyptians said that the Palestinian issue is "the single most important issue" to them personally. Telhami then goes on to analyze what drives Arabs to be so concerned about the Palestinians. But there's a fundamental problem here: The concept of "public opinion" presupposes a democratic context that does not exist in any of the countries Zogby polled. Freedom House every nation on the globe for its annual survey of Freedom in the World <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/index.htm>. It assigns each country two numbers, for civil and political rights, on a seven-point scale, with 1 being freest and 7 being least free, and it designates each country as "free," "partly free" or "not free." Of the five countries Zogby surveyed, only Kuwait <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/kuwait.htm> (which scores 4 for political rights and 5 for civil rights) is rated "partly free." Egypt <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/egypt.htm>, Lebanon <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/lebanon.htm> and the Emirates <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/unitedarab.htm> all score 6 for political rights and 5 for civil rights; all are listed as "not free." Saudi Arabia <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/saudi.htm>, which scores an unfree 7 in both categories, is one of the few nations in the world that don't even pretend to be governed by the people (even Iraq <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/iraq.htm> calls itself a "republic"). Are respondents to "public opinion" polls in these nations free to express their real views? Can they develop fully informed opinions when the government controls many of the media and restricts their access to information? In his analysis, Telhami never discusses the degree to which "public opinion" in these unfree countries is shaped by their authoritarian governments. Nor does he address the point that it is in the interest of an authoritarian government to have an enemy--in this case Israel--to rally the public behind. And again, we have to ask: What's with Zogby? Doesn't he know better than to conduct "polls" in Saudi Arabia, as if it were a liberal democracy?
Howard has raised some important and interesting questions regarding public opinion polls in nondemocratic countries. From my studies and work in the Moslem world--including some 100 experiments in "mass communication" over social networks in Cairo--I can add some insights to this discussion. In the Moslem world, the citizens are well aware of their autocratic and tyrannical governments; they don't trust the government nor the government-controlled media. The mass media is only one source among many to be checked; mass media does not hold the preemptive position of mass communication that it does in the West. My students' experiments in Cairo were to test or determine the socially understood rules of sender and receiver behavior. They discovered explicit rules for verifying accuracy of (orally delivered) news reports, determinants for the sender/reporter's character (such as reliability), and they had an explicit definition of rumor, which was not this entire process of oral transmission of news, as the West calls it.

With their multiple sources of news (and satellite transmissions have added to the number of sources), and sitting in the geo-political crossfires of global politics, the men in the tea shops of Egypt's and Iran's villages (two areas I know, and I wouldn't slide them all into the "Arab/Persian world") are far more interested, informed, and opinionated about world news than one might ever suspect sitting here at our computers in the US (though the Internet might save us from 2-3 sources). Now I have also conducted market research in Egypt so I have seen the response to being asked an opinion by a researcher (first concern: is this a gov't ploy to get me?), but after one gets past that, they're eager to share opinions, and they've got opinions!

So, the question is, is a democratic government a requirement for a populace to be informed and hold and express opinions? In the Moslem world, I daresay no, not necessary.

Beverly A. Jensen, Ph.D.
Communications Strategist, International Development

----- Original Message -----
from OpinionJournal's Best of the Web today:

Another Dubious Zogby Poll

Shibley Telhami, who holds the prestigious title of Anwar Sadat Professor for Peace and Development at the University of Maryland, pens a Washington Post op-ed piece about Arab sentiments toward the Palestinian problem. He writes:

To get a rare view of Arab public opinion, I commissioned a survey (through Zogby International) in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt and Lebanon. The results indicate that Arab leaders may even be underestimating public opinion on this issue.

In each of four countries surveyed, about 60 percent of the public reported that the Palestinian issue "is the single most important issue" to them personally, and more than 20 percent more ranked it "among the top three most important issues." Remarkably, this is true even of public opinion in Kuwait, which has had a troubled relationship with the Palestinians since the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990. In all, about 85 percent of people in the five states ranked the Palestinian issue among the top three issues.

The results from the fifth state, Egypt, were even more impressive:

Seventy-nine percent of Egyptians said that the Palestinian issue is "the single most important issue" to them personally.

Telhami then goes on to analyze what drives Arabs to be so concerned about the Palestinians. But there's a fundamental problem here: The concept of "public opinion" presupposes a democratic context that does not exist in any of the countries Zogby polled.

Freedom House every nation on the globe for its annual survey of Freedom in the World <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/index.htm>. It assigns each country two numbers, for civil and political rights, on a seven-point scale, with 1 being freest and 7 being least free, and it designates each country as "free," "partly free" or "not free."

Of the five countries Zogby surveyed, only Kuwait <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/kuwait.htm> (which scores 4 for political rights and 5 for civil rights) is rated "partly free." Egypt <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/egypt.htm>, Lebanon <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/lebanon.htm> and the Emirates <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/unitedarab.htm> all score 6 for political rights and 5 for civil rights; all are listed as "not free." Saudi Arabia
<http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2001/countryratings/saudi.html>, which scores an unfree 7 in both categories, is one of the few nations in the world that don't even pretend to be governed by the people (even Iraq). Are respondents to "public opinion" polls in these nations free to express their real views? Can they develop fully informed opinions when the government controls many of the media and restricts their access to information? In his analysis, Telhami never discusses the degree to which "public opinion" in these unfree countries is shaped by their authoritarian governments. Nor does he address the point that it is in the interest of an authoritarian government to have an enemy--in this case Israel--to rally the public behind. And again, we have to ask: What's with Zogby? Doesn't he know better than to conduct "polls" in Saudi Arabia, as if it were a liberal democracy?

>From aubinp@EM.AGR.CA Thu Jul 26 13:57:21 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6QKvGJ19957 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Jul 2001
13:57:16 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from gw.agr.ca (gw.agr.ca [192.197.71.131])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA05972 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Jul 2001 13:57:17 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from [192.197.71.135] (agrgate2.agr.ca [192.197.71.135])
   by gw.agr.ca (8.11.3/8.11.3) with SMTP id f6QKw1k20045
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Jul 2001 16:58:01 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from agrin1.agr.ca by [192.197.71.135]
   via smtpd (for agrout1.agr.ca [192.197.71.131]) with SMTP; 26 Jul 2001
20:55:50 UT
Received: from EM.AGR.CA (em.agr.ca [142.61.33.38])
   by agrin1.agr.ca (8.11.3/8.11.3) with SMTP id f6QKsXD16807
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Jul 2001 16:54:33 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from AGCAN-Message_Server by EM.AGR.CA
   with Novell GroupWise; Thu, 26 Jul 2001 16:58:04 -0400
Message-Id: <sb604c1c.013@EM.AGR.CA>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Thu, 26 Jul 2001 16:56:24 -0400
From: "Pierre Aubin" <aubinp@EM.AGR.CA>
Sender: Postmaster@EM.AGR.CA
Reply-To: aubinp@EM.AGR.CA
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Je serai à l'extérieur du bureau jusqu'au lundi 13 août, date à laquelle je lirai votre message.

Si vous avez besoin d'une réponse immédiate, veuillez s'il vous plaît contacter Claude Perreault au (514) 283-3815 poste 485 (Montréal).

I will be outside of the office until Monday August 13, 2001, at which date I will read your message.

If you need immediate assistance, please contact Claude Perreault at (514) 283-3815 ext. 485 (Montreal).

Merci ! / Thanks !
TIME IS GROWING SHORT!!!
RSVP by e-mail or phone by close of business, Monday, July 30
E-mail:  dc-aapor.admin@erols.com
Phone:  Call Kathy Herring at 202-691-6371.
Leave your name and telephone number.

Cost is $20.00 per person.
Pay at the door. Checks only, please: Payable to DC AAPOR.

Here are the details:

SUMMER SOCIAL EVENING
Come join the fun!

What:  Dinner and a social evening
Mix and mingle
Introduction of the new officers

Date & Time:  Thursday, August 2, 2001
6:30 - 9:00 p.m.

Location: USA Today, 17th Floor
1000 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA

Parking: Available at 1000 Wilson (@ N. Arlington Ridge Rd.)
Gate will open if closed.
Take elevator from garage to "mall."
Walk to USA Today front desk.

Metro: Ride Blue or Orange Line to Rosslyn.
Walk to Gannett Tower, 1100 Wilson (@ Lynn St.).
Take escalator from lower mall up to mall level.
Follow mallway to USA Today front desk.

Hope to see you there!
Several people have inquired where to find more information on the "Poll on Polls." The combined questionnaires (public, journalists, policy leaders) with toplines, plus a press release and a chartpack, are available at:

http://www.kff.org/content/2001/3146/

--------------------------------------
Richard C. ROCKWELL
Executive Director, The Roper Center & Institute for Social Inquiry
Professor of Sociology
University of Connecticut
341 Mansfield Road, U-164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA
V +1 860 486-4440
F +1 860 486-6308
Richard.Rockwell@uconn.edu

Thanks for this link; this is one of the best polls on this subject I've seen. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
Thanks for this link; this is one of the best polls on this subject I've seen. &nbsp;JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

I agree. I am embarrassed that I missed it. Mahalo nui loa.
Thanks for this link; this is one of the best polls on this subject I've seen.  JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
We the CERT/CC, along with other organizations listed below are jointly publishing this alert about a serious threat to the Internet

For Immediate Release: 3:00 PM EDT July 29, 2001

A Very Real and Present Threat to the Internet: July 31 Deadline For Action

Summary: The Code Red Worm and mutations of the worm pose a continued and serious threat to Internet users. Immediate action is required to combat this threat. Users who have deployed software that is vulnerable to the worm (Microsoft IIS Versions 4.0 and 5.0) must install, if they have not done so already, a vital security patch.

How Big Is The Problem?

On July 19, the Code Red worm infected more than 250,000 systems in just 9 hours. The worm scans the Internet, identifies vulnerable systems, and infects these systems by installing itself. Each newly installed worm joins all the others causing the rate of scanning to grow rapidly. This uncontrolled growth in scanning directly decreases the speed of the Internet and can cause sporadic but widespread outages among all types of systems. Code Red is likely to start spreading again on July 31st, 2001 8:00 PM EDT and has mutated so that it may be even more dangerous. This spread has the potential to disrupt business and personal use of the Internet for applications such as electronic commerce, email and entertainment.

Who Must Act?

Every organization or person who has Windows NT or Windows 2000 systems AND the IIS web server software may be vulnerable. IIS is installed automatically for many applications. If you are not certain, follow the instructions attached to determine whether you are running IIS 4.0 or 5.0. If you are using Windows 95, Windows 98, or Windows Me, there is no action that you need to take in response to this alert.

What To Do If You Are Vulnerable?
a. To rid your machine of the current worm, reboot your computer.
b. To protect your system from re-infection: Install Microsoft?s patch for the Code Red vulnerability problem:
   * Windows NT version 4.0:
   * Windows 2000 Professional, Server and Advanced Server:

Step-by-step instructions for these actions are posted at
www.digitalisland.com/codered

Microsoft's description of the patch and its installation, and the vulnerability it addresses is posted at:


Because of the importance of this threat, this alert is being made jointly by:

Microsoft
The National Infrastructure Protection Center
Federal Computer Incident Response Center (FedCIRC)
Information Technology Association of America (ITAA)
CERT Coordination Center
SANS Institute
Internet Security Systems
Internet Security Alliance

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP 6.5.8
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CZsaPzqP2/GMgAePJHNum43QBSzr+h96f/5c7op9a1SezuyWS14z+BhBXr6mf
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>From hfienberg@stats.org Mon Jul 30 08:14:10 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f6UFEAJ15994 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 30 Jul 2001
08:14:10 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net (smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net
[207.172.4.60])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA06848 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 30 Jul 2001 08:14:10 -0700
Pollsters slam health care survey: 4.1 million households
April Lindgren
Southam News
July 30, 2001
The Ontario government's massive health care survey of 4.1 million households is good public relations but a lousy way to gauge public attitudes, polling experts say.

"From the point of view of getting public opinion, this is grossly inefficient," said Ekos Research president Frank Graves. "But I'm sure the government knew that and part of the reason they are doing this is to give everybody a sense that they had a chance to participate and express their views."

Billed as an opportunity for Ontarians to communicate what they think works and what doesn't in Ontario's public health care system, the eight-page survey goes out in the mail today. It asks for citizens' opinions on a range of issues, including recent experiences with emergency room services, hospitals, doctors, long-term care and home care. In addition to measuring general satisfaction levels, some of the 20 questions ask for suggestions for service improvements.

Notably absent are queries on hot-button issues such as greater private sector involvement in the health care sector, which health-care services should be covered by the public system and the importance of health care spending relative to other priorities such as tax cuts or education.

Polling experts say the government can expect to get completed surveys from one to 10 per cent of all recipients -- that is anywhere from 41,000 to 410,000 replies. They also insist that if the government wants an accurate view of Ontarians' health care opinions, it would be better served by a scientific survey of 1,000 people.

"There's no methodological reason to mail out this number of surveys unless you want to make people feel they are involved in the process or there are messages somewhere in the package that you want people to see," noted Pollara Inc. senior vice-president Don Guy.

Professional pollsters said that a survey of 1,000 people would produce results accurate to within three percentage points 19 times out of 20. A larger sample would not produce major gains in accuracy, Mr. Graves pointed out, noting that the margin of error for even 10,000 respondents is plus or
minus 0.9 percentage points.
Polling experts also question whether the survey in its present form will produce results that accurately reflect the opinions of the general population.
People who speak languages other than English, those with poor reading skills and individuals put off by the questionnaire's length are among those who are unlikely to respond, they suggested. Access to the Internet may also skew the results, because up to three surveys can be submitted from any single e-mail account before the government stops accepting responses from that address.

Mr. Graves said he believes the government is taking a positive step in going directly to the public for their opinions: "People don't want to leave this issue to health economists and politicians and experts."
But he also said the survey in the end may amount to little more than a "pro forma public relations exercise where they aren't going to change or alter in any substantial way the direction they've already chosen."

Dozens of polls have shown a disconnect between general perceptions of the health care system and individual experiences. While most people believe the system is in decline, they also say their individual experiences have been good or excellent. In one recent survey, for example, 88% of patients who spent time in an Ontario hospital said their treatment was good or very good. COMPAS Inc. president Conrad Winn said Ontario's effort, which is costing $1.35-million just for printing and the initial mail-out, is more of a consultation exercise than an actual poll.

"We're talking about a mass encounter group -- a kind of conservative version of the 1960s teach-in where you get countless people to think about an issue."

At a minimum, Mr. Winn suggested, the goal is to show disgruntled taxpayers that the government is concerned about the future of the health care system. The governing Tories, he added, are also trying to shape Ontarians' attitudes so they will be more receptive to increased competition from private health care companies and non-profit agencies.

"So what they are engaged in is a war of minds," Mr. Winn said, adding that the questionnaire will engage average citizens in a discussion of the health care system and ways to make it better.

Gord Haugh, a spokesman for Tony Clement, Minister of Health, said the survey did not ask about user fees or more private-sector involvement because those would be leading questions. "If people want to talk about it they can talk about it [on the survey]; if they want to say they don't want it to happen, they can say so.
"We didn't want to lead them one way or the other in the survey."

Mr. Haugh acknowledged a structured survey of 1,000 people would have produced good data on how Ontarians view the health care system.
"But I don't think people would have thought they'd had a chance to contribute. This way every household and almost every individual has the opportunity to respond," he said, noting that the questionnaire also includes information on income, age and other demographic indicators, which will help determine whether the sample is representative.

The government has not said when the results of the survey will be available. Responses will be analyzed by Strategic Counsel, a firm chaired by Allan Gregg, former pollster for the Mulroney-era federal Tories.

Mr. Haugh said Strategic Counsel is on a government list of pre-approved pollsters and had to compete for the contract. The cost of its services is still being negotiated, he said.

Page URL:
Voter News Service LLC, (VNS) operated by ABC News, the Associated Press, CBS News, CNN, Fox News, and NBC News to conduct election exit polls, collect, tabulate and disseminate vote returns, and make election projections, is currently seeks a Manager of Surveys and a Statistical Associate. These are full-time, permanent positions located in New York City.

Manager of Surveys: This junior-level position provides an ideal opportunity for an individual with a background in survey research and an interest in politics to gain valuable experience while being part of a high-profile data collection effort. The Manager of Surveys is...
responsible
for the setup and testing of VNS exit poll databases and systems and helps
cordinate the telephone surveys of absentee and early voters. This
includes working with computer programmers, setting up questionnaires in the
database, testing the survey input systems, and supervising a staff of
temporary employees. On Election Day, the Manager of Surveys oversees the
weighting and processing of the survey data. Between elections, the Manager
of Surveys helps conduct evaluation research and maintains the online
database of past exit poll data.

The ideal applicant will be well organized and detail oriented, hold a
Bachelor’s degree (Master’s degree preferred) in a social science
discipline, have a background in survey research and/or statistics, be proficient in a statistical package such as SPSS or SAS, and have an interest in politics. Previous work experience in a survey or market research organization is preferred. Salary and full compensation package is commensurate with experience.

Statistical Associate: This position provides an opportunity to apply statistics in a real time application that is seen by millions across the
country. The successful applicant will work under the supervision of senior
statisticians and will be involved in the set-up and operation of the VNS
election night system as it relates to the exit polls and projections. Job responsibilities include setting up, maintaining and testing election night
databases, running statistical programs, interfacing with research staff and
computer programmers, performing data analysis with SAS or SPSS, creating
test data, and performing ad hoc analysis on election night.

Applicants must hold at minimum of a Bachelor’s degree with some coursework
in statistics. The ideal applicant will be well organized, detail oriented, and have a knowledge of Excel and a statistical package such as SPSS or SAS. A background in survey research, experience working with relational databases, knowledge of SQL and an interest in politics would all be definite assets. Salary and full compensation package is commensurate with experience.

To apply, submit your resume and cover letter by e-mail, regular mail or fax. No telephone calls please.
Submit applications to:

Fax: (212) 947-7756
E-mail: careers@vnsusa.org
Regular mail: Trevor Tompson
Associate Director of Surveys
Voter News Service
225 West 34th Street, Suite 310
New York, NY 10122
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A computer virus recently invaded my computer, temporarily blocking access to the Internet, e-mail, Word and other programs. It also invaded my address book--actually every person who has ever sent e-mail--and randomly sent out messages that said something like "Hi, how are you?" in my name. You can imagine the consequences I would have had to face had the message been profane.

So, just for the record, and especially to those people I have never met who received the message, it was the result of a hacker who cost me a good deal of work time.

Best regards,

Bryan Denham
Zogby's name is now associated in my mind with what I see as the double-reverse of the Nuremberg defense: My staff was just *not* following my own guidance, which I was *not* there to provide.

Has anyone besides me noticed that young children (like, say, age six years and three months, for example) tend to explain away their accidents and misbehavior by attributing intentional actions to inanimate objects, as in, say, "the glass suddenly broke" or "this question slipped into our survey"?
On Mon, 30 Jul 2001, Howard Fienberg wrote:

> OpinionJournal.com's Best of the Web Today - July 30, 2001
> By JAMES TARANTO
> Zogby's Apology
> Last week we criticized <http://opinionjournal.com/best/?id=95000872> the
> Zogby International polling firm for conducting an outrageously biased
> survey on behalf of the puerile left-wing Web site Buzzflash.com
> <http://buzzflash.com/>. Reader Cliff Peterson wrote Zogby to complain, and
> received the following reply, the authenticity of which John Zogby confirms
> in an e-mail to us this morning:
> I have to admit to you that I was overseas when this question slipped in to
> our survey. A lame excuse because I do have a team of gifted--and very
> customer oriented--employees. I agree with you and the many who have also
> complained. It is a terrible question. Please remember all of the good ones
> and I will personally work to ensure that this doesn't happen again.
> Regards,
> John Zogby
>
>From HOneill536@aol.com Mon Jul 30 13:34:38 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f6UKYbJ22777 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 30 Jul 2001
  13:34:38 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from imo-m01.mx.aol.com (imo-m01.mx.aol.com [64.12.136.4])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id NAA08414 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 30 Jul 2001 13:34:39 -0700
  (PDT)
From: HOneill536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill536@aol.com
  by imo-m01.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31.9.) id 5.f7.d31eed1 (7878)
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 30 Jul 2001 16:34:05 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <f7.d31eed1.28971ebc@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 30 Jul 2001 16:34:04 EDT
Subject: Re: more on the Zogby question
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 138

Jim - I think Zogby's explanation is rational. Perhaps you are perfect, but
few of us are. Harry

Jim - I think Zogby"s explanation is rational. Perhaps you are perfect, but
few of us are. Harry
Harry,
Is there something that went before this?
warren

At 04:34 PM 7/30/2001 -0400, you wrote:
>Jim - I think Zogby's explanation is rational. Perhaps you are perfect, but few of us are. Harry

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com
http://www.MitofskyInternational.com
For those of you confused about what to expect next from the Code Red worm, here's about the simplest informed explanation I can imagine, courtesy of PBS and its regular information technology columnist, Robert Cringely. Because Cringely can oversimplify to the point of being misleading, and I do not feel competent to judge everything he says here, I think we will all welcome any corrections or clarifications any of you might have to make. One thing I can report: The strong consensus of computer people around usc.edu is that the Code Red Worm will definitely come back to life tomorrow night (North American time zones) -- what happens after that remains a matter of considerable dispute.

-- Jim
Normally my columns appear on Thursday, but this is a special week and deserves a special column because of the very interesting events that could soon take place on the Internet as the Code Red worm comes back to life.

Two weeks ago I wrote about the likelihood of a worm or virus being spawned that would essentially live forever on the Net. I didn't think then that such vermin was already in action, but it apparently was in Code Red. This worm infects computers running Microsoft's Internet Information Server web server software. It starts with a 19-day infection cycle during which it seeks out new machines to infect, then goes through an eight-day attack cycle during which all infected servers attack the same IP address or host name. Each server devotes 99 threads to attacking the target with a massive Distributed Denial of Service attack, delivering something on the order of 20 gigabits-per-second straight at a single target.

In July the target was an IP address assigned back then to www.whitehouse.gov. Then, on the 28th day, Code Red shut down forever. Or did it? There is good reason to believe, based on disassembly of the worm and analysis by Steve Gibson of Gibson Research that the worm is only resting until the start of the following month. That's midnight, Greenwich Mean Time, on August 1st when it all starts over again. For those readers in the United States, that is 7:00 PM Eastern and 4:00 PM Pacific time on Tuesday, July 31.

If the virus spreads as expected, we won't notice much at first on Tuesday night, just an increase in overall traffic on the Internet backbones as uninfected servers are contacted and infected. There is a way to avoid infection by installing a software patch available from Microsoft, but hundreds of thousands -- perhaps millions -- of IIS servers remain unpatched. There are just under five million IIS servers presently in operation.

Last month the infection rate was much greater and faster than anyone expected or was reported in the news. According to a study conducted by the Cooperative Association for Internet Data Analysis (CAIDA) at the UC San Diego Supercomputer Center, more than 359,000 servers were infected during a 14-hour period on July 19th alone as the worm grew geometrically. Had it grown for even another day, all of the IIS servers on Earth would probably have been infected.

When the witching hour strikes on Tuesday, what happens could be very different than last month. Some experts believe nothing will happen at all but I believe that's just plain wrong. The information I will use to support this assertion was acquired either from those, like Steve Gibson, who have disassembled and examined the Code Red worm or from the
officials charged with fighting it, including sources at the CERT data security coordination center at Carnegie-Mellon University, eEye Digital Security, in law enforcement, and at several very large corporations. The FBI knows what you and I know, they just have no idea what to do about it.

Point One. The White House thinks it is safe from attack because it has transferred the whitehouse.gov website to the widely distributed servers of Akamai, where it can be shuffled around the Web at will. This is just in case the worm has gotten smarter and shifted from attacking a static IP address to going after the whitehouse.gov host name, itself, using DNS lookups to follow the IP address as it changes.

Point Two. Whether Code Red turned itself off forever or not on July 28th, there are approximately 2,000 infected IIS servers that don't know they are supposed to be turned off and are running right now, trying to infect other servers. These 2,000 IIS servers are ones with broken clocks. They have no idea what the date is, so they are still in infection mode. The only good news here is that these machines never know to turn from infection to attack, either.

As long as even one of these clockless machines remains up and running, Code Red will start over on the first of every month. Forever.

Point Three. There are around 200,000 IIS servers that are still both unpatched and infected. If the worm didn't turn itself off for good on the 28th, every one of these machines is going to move into infection mode on Tuesday. So there will definitely be a reinfection, but the only question is whether the seed starts with 2,000 clockless machines or 200,000 infected machines. Either way, 19 days will be plenty to reach any unpatched servers.

An interesting sidelight here should show how little the authorities can do about an attack of this nature. It's not that they don't have the technology, they don't have a consensus about how to use that technology. For example, one proposal that was floated was essentially an anti-worm -- sending a second infection that would turn off the first. This was rejected as acting too much like the bad guys. A second proposal was to simply send an e-mail to the registered administrator of every infected IP address saying "Hey, your server is infected, patch it!" This, too, was rejected, because the authorities didn't want to scare poor sysadmins by asking them to do their jobs. That they didn't at least try the e-mail route astounds me. They have a list of all the IP addresses. It would have taken an hour, but it didn't happen, according to sources who were present at the meeting.

Even if they had tried the e-mail route, though, the chances are very slim of getting 100 percent of the servers shut down and patched. Many of the infected servers aren't really being used at all. They are still showing their default Microsoft homepages and are simply running as a service under Windows NT. In those cases, the people on whose computers IIS is running probably don't even know they have a web server.

So the authorities, including Microsoft, have decided to hold a big press conference Monday to announce at least some of what you are reading in this column. It probably won't work, of course, since it is hard to warn people who don't even know they are running a web server at
all.

Point four. The Code Red worm can be changed from turning itself off on the 28th to never turning itself off at all by twiddling a single program bit. It can be retargetted from whitehouse.gov to amazon.com, to cringely.com in an instant. Someone wrote this thing and that someone can change it. Even worse, there are plenty of people who wouldn't be capable of writing such a program who still know enough to make the simple sort of changes I just mentioned.

This thing, or something very much like it, is going to be with us for a very, very long time.

And what happens on the 20th, when the attack cycle begins? It depends on the number of infected machines and the nature of the chosen target, but the worst case says the Internet simply comes to a standstill and we go back to watching TV and talking on the phone until the 28th day of the month and potentially until every 28th day of the month thereafter.

This is very, very bad news, but there is a solution that will shortly be presented that will be claimed to save the day. This miracle solution will be the subject of my regular column this week, which will appear, as usual, on Thursday. Please come back then. Because while there is a solution, I believe that many people will see the cure as being nearly as bad as the disease.

http://www.pbs.org/cringely/pulpit/pulpit20010730.html

*****
The following is the lead article on the front page of today's Washington Post.

The full report to which the article refers is to be posted today at 12 noon (EDT) on the web site of the National Commission on Federal Election Reform (http://reformelections.org/).

In addition to reforms in electoral procedures, the commission specifically condemns the use of exit polls to project election results and calls for congressional restrictions if the media don't address the matter voluntarily.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Report Urges New Voting Standards
By David S. Broder
Washington Post Staff Writer
A bipartisan commission headed by former presidents Jimmy Carter and Gerald R. Ford has recommended the creation of uniform statewide standards for counting ballots in an effort to avoid the kind of polling-place controversies that marred last November's presidential election in Florida.

Congress should offer states about $150 million or $200 million a year to upgrade voting equipment and operations, with states adding an equal amount, but not mandate a specific set of equipment or procedures, the commission said.

The report, to be delivered today to President Bush at the White House, urges broadcasters to withhold airing the presidential election results from any state until all 48 continental states have closed their polls. It also suggests that Election Day be made a national holiday.

White House officials said yesterday the president may endorse many of its recommendations, if not the entire report.

The recommendations of the privately financed National Commission on Federal Election Reform are timed with a view to influencing Congress, which may take up the issue this autumn. Hearings have been held in Senate and House committees, but no legislation has reached the floor. The commission's 19 members included a wide spectrum of political views and most of the recommendations were unanimous.

While outlining a supportive role for the federal government, the commission said key decisions should be made by the states, which traditionally have been responsible for running elections.

In Florida last November, many voters who thought they were registered were denied ballots. The commission said this problem could be solved if each state set up a statewide registration system, in which a citizen could get on the list anywhere and have the information relayed to his or her precinct. If a dispute arises about a prospective voter's eligibility, a provisional ballot should be allowed -- with a later determination of whether it will count.

The commission cautioned Congress not to attempt to solve the problems that appeared in Florida simply by paying states to discard the punch-card voting machines that were involved in many jurisdictions with large numbers of discarded ballots. Replacing them with modern optical-scan equipment might create other problems, especially for visually handicapped people, the commission said.

Instead of mandating specific kinds of equipment, the commission said each state should set performance standards and measure how well jurisdictions meet those standards. The federal government could usefully test and certify high-quality voting equipment, which allows voters to correct errors before leaving the polling place.

Each state should set uniform standards for what constitutes a valid vote and spell out its recount and certification procedures, the
commission said. Such standards and procedures varied from county to county in Florida -- confusing the 36-day recount of its crucial presidential vote.

The commission criticized the television and cable networks, decrying the use of exit polls to project results and calling for a voluntary embargo on airing the vote until the West Coast has completed its balloting. It urged the broadcasters to do this voluntarily but said that if necessary, Congress might legislate a ban on disclosure of official results until 11 p.m. Eastern time -- after polls close on the West Coast -- or set a uniform national poll closing time.

The recommendation that Election Day be made a national holiday is one that has come from a variety of congressional and private sources. But some state election officials have cautioned that it might make it harder to recruit volunteers to work at the polls if people were on vacation that day.

In other recommendations, the commission suggested ways to simplify absentee voting by members of the armed forces and urged the states to speed the return of voting rights to former prisoners, once they have completed their sentences and are no longer on probation.

The commission was selected and sponsored by the Miller Center of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia and the Century Foundation. It held four public hearings around the country. The final recommendations were reached at a 9 1/2-hour session in early July at the Miller Center.

The co-chairs with Carter and Ford were former House minority leader Robert H. Michel (R) and Washington attorney Lloyd N. Cutler, a onetime White House counsel to President Bill Clinton.

Carter and Michel are to present the report to Bush at the White House.
Dear AAPORNET,

Does anyone know of a vendor that will supply names and contact information for some people 65 years old and older residing in a couple of target states? The goal is to pretest a telephone instrument.

Thanks!

Trish Gallagher

Patricia M. Gallagher, PhD  
Center for Survey Research  
University of Massachusetts  
Boston MA 02125

Last night, some members of the broadcast media reported that the Zogby poll showed more disapproval than approval of the job Bush is doing is doing in office.

Zogby uses a 4-point excellent, good, fair, poor scale. The results are then collapsed into two measures and treated as if they were equivalent to the dichotomous form; i.e., approve/disapprove. (One other firm - Harris - uses a 4-point but the second and third points are "pretty good" and "only fair".)

About 20 years ago, at the request of a Chicago Mayor, I tested the 4-point against approve/disapprove. Open-end response showed that many
of the "fair" raters gave reasons such as "done a pretty fair" job as the reason for their rating. And, many of these same raters said "approve" to the dichotomous question. I have been using approve/disapprove ever since.

The Zogby language leads to a much lower "approval" level a.k.a. excellent or good. This has been true of the Zogby poll and others who do the same.

Compare Zogby's numbers vs. the other polls - George W's ratings below from The Polling Report (last night's figures are not included yet):

http://www.pollingreport.com/BushJob.htm

The same trend is evident in Clinton's ratings trend:

http://www.pollingreport.com/clinton-.htm

Notice that the margins between excellent/good and fair/poor scores in Zogby are *generally smaller* than the margin in other polls using the dichotomous approve/disapprove form.

The point is why use a 4-point scale if the media and/or the pollster collapses them into two and treats them as if they were dichotomous. Why the media treats them as the same is another issue - one that could be addressed by those of you who work for the networks.

This not only applies to Zogby's poll - but to all other polls some of you do using the same 4 point language and then treating the results as if they were dichotomous.

Nick
Survey Sampling, Inc.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]
On Behalf Of Patricia Gallagher
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2001 8:54 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: 65+ Pretest Sample

Dear AAPORNET,

Does anyone know of a vendor that will supply names and contact information for some people 65 years old and older residing in a couple of target states? The goal is to pretest a telephone instrument.

Thanks!

Trish Gallagher

Patricia M. Gallagher, PhD
Center for Survey Research
University of Massachusetts
Boston MA 02125

>From vector@sympatico.ca Tue Jul 31 09:02:20 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f6VG2KJ22060 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 31 Jul 2001 09:02:20 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from tomts14-srv.bellnexxia.net (tomts14.bellnexxia.net [209.226.175.35]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA05010 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 31 Jul 2001 09:02:21 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from i7slu9 ([64.228.110.102]) by tomts14-srv.bellnexxia.net (InterMail vM.4.01.03.16 201-229-121-116-20010115) with SMTP id <20010731154033.BGIG16691.tomts14-srv.bellnexxia.net@i7slu9> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 31 Jul 2001 11:40:33 -0400
Message-ID: <000f01cl19d6$e8941880$666ee440@i7slu9>
Reply-To: "Marc Zwelling" <marc@vectorresearch.com>
From: "Marc Zwelling" <vector@sympatico.ca>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <5309A83D07C5D211A2970000F80836D80479A52E@ems.cc.umb.edu>
Subject: Re: 65+ Pretest Sample
Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2001 11:38:54 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
Any list broker.

- Marc Zwelling -
Vector Research + Development Inc.
Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991

See what's new at Vector:
http://www.vectorresearch.com/

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Patricia Gallagher" <Patricia.Gallagher@umb.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2001 9:54 AM
Subject: 65+ Pretest Sample

> Dear AAPORNET,
> 
> Does anyone know of a vendor that will supply names and contact information
> for some people 65 years old and older residing in a couple of target states? The goal is to pretest a telephone instrument.
> 
> Thanks!
> 
> Trish Gallagher
> 
> 
> Patricia M. Gallagher, PhD
> Center for Survey Research
> University of Massachusetts
> Boston MA 02125
> 
>From gordon.e@ghc.org Tue Jul 31 10:01:05 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f6VH15J28986 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 31 Jul 2001
10:01:05 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from inet-gw.ghc.org by usc.edu via smtpd (for
  [128.125.253.136]) with SMTP (PDT)
  id KAA19174 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 31 Jul 2001 10:01:01 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ROC0SK.ghc.org by inet-gw.ghc.org
  via smtpd (for [128.125.253.136]) with SMTP; 31 Jul 2001 17:00:59 UT
One of the investigators at our center has fielded a questionnaire for use in an Acupuncture Pilot study. There are a few questions that are Alternative Medicine specific. I would be glad to send you a WORD document of the questionnaire.

Ellen

Ellen Gordon, Ph.D.
Survey Program Director
Center for Health Studies
(206) 442-4041
(206) 287-2871 (FAX)
gordon.e@ghc.org

Any assistance in finding survey instruments/items for research on usage, attitudes, preferences, or demand for complimentary or alternative medicine (CAM) would be greatly appreciated.

We already have the items that can be gleaned from Eisenberg et al.'s (1993) "Unconventional Medicine in the United States." New England Journal of Medicine. pp. 246-252.

Would anyone recommend other sources?

Thanks.

Brett Zollinger
Director, University Center for Survey Research
Docking Institute of Public Affairs
785-628-5881

>From bzolling@fhsu.edu Tue Jul 31 12:13:39 2001
We would appreciate that very much. Thanks in advance!

Brett

Warren - Zogby apparently had a couple of questions in a recent survey (I don't know what they were) that were critisized for showing bias. Zogby relpied that he agreed, but was out of the country when the questionnaire was put together and someone slipped up. Jim put on the net what I regarded as a snotty comment about blaming others. Hence my comment.

Harry
Anyone with an interest in sampling issues as they affect Internet surveys might want to read "A Need To Study Web Survey Addicts" published in Market Research News (http://www.mrnews.com/sample7.html).

Two of the sites mentioned are:

www.surveys4money.com or

www.freestuffpage.com (click on "Rewards Programs/Surveys")

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