
Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700
Sender: AAPORnet American Association for Public Opinion Research
<AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: June 1995 archive - one BIG message

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

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

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

Shap Wolf
shap.wolf@asu.edu

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9506.
Part 1/1, total size 167020 bytes:

----- Cut here -----
>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Thu Jun 1 09:00:15 1995
Date: Thu, 1 Jun 1995 09:00:15 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject: AAPOR50 Abstracts, Papers on WWW

50TH CONFERENCE PROGRAM, ABSTRACTS AND PAPERS ON WORLD WIDE WEB

Although AAPOR's 50th Anniversary Conference is now but a memory, this memory will linger on in physical form on the World Wide Web (WWW). Within the next few weeks, all 198 abstracts published in the Conference Program--plus any others authors might still wish to cough up--will be available to the world (or at least that part of it with access to Web Browsers like Netscape, Mosaic, WinWeb or MacWeb) at the 50th Conference's URL (or universal resource locator, an address for a Website):

<http://www.csu.edu.au/special/conference/AAPOR>

As most of you know, the WWW is one of the newer systems for organizing information on the Internet; it uses hypertext links to enable jumping among screens and even Websites by simply clicking on highlighted words or images.

Authors of 50th Conference papers who wish to make them available at the same location (which has NO implications for copyright) must simply send

them, in ASCII or DOS text on diskette, to our ever- faithful WWW guru:

Ms. Sandy Tse
P.O. Box 839
Wagga Wagga NSW 2650
Australia

Because Sandy tells me that many universities in Australia and New Zealand, and throughout Asia, the Pacific, and the Pacific Rim, are currently eager to expand contact with North American and European researchers experienced in quantitative and other formal research styles, across all disciplines, I want strongly to encourage all 50th Conference authors to send in their papers for the WWW. Although all Websites are equally accessible from anywhere on Earth, of course, Sandy plans to include especially many effortless jumps from her various Asia-Pacific World Wide Web International Conference Websites to our own. By making the full texts of 50th Conference papers available in this way, our authors can make a lasting--and I think professionally rewarding--contribution to the global understanding of public opinion and its systematic study.

Papers added to the 50th Conference Website will be announced here on AAPORNET, from time to time, and also on POR and the other 14 now infamous selected lists in research methods, statistics, survey and market research and marketing, new technologies, and social and behavioral sciences more generally (the 15 lists to which we posted the Call for Papers and other notices for our 50th Conference). Under these circumstances, it is not unreasonable to expect that hundreds if not thousands of people will visit the papers on our Website, perhaps more than might see them in many academic journals (where you are also encouraged to publish them, of course).

Within the next few weeks, I shall also send to our Website the final official version of the AAPOR 50th Conference Program (the one that will appear in this Fall's issue of Public Opinion Quarterly), which includes the several session chairs and discussants whose names did not make the final printed booklet distributed in Fort Lauderdale, and also several last-minute additions and deletions of papers. For those who did not manage to attend the Conference, the Website will also include the printed program cover and explanation of its symbolism.

It is impossible to conclude a posting about our Website without again thanking Sandy Tse, who created it on March 10 on her own initiative. Many of us have since gotten to know Sandy and her husband, Philip Tsang, who presented a paper (coauthored with Noel Witney) in Fort Lauderdale in the session "Survey and Market Research Meet the Internet." Sandy's Asia-Pacific World Wide Web Conference '95, subtitled "WWW--Changing the Way We Work, Learn and Play," will be held September 18-21, 1995, at the Convention and Exhibition Centre, Darling Harbour, Sydney, Australia. If you'd like to know more, please contact her at stse@golum.riv.csu.edu.au, or Asia-Pacific WWW Conference Website URL, <http://www.csu.edu.au/special/conference/WWWWW.html> .

For those who missed the original announcement, although AAPOR's "golden" home page and Website for our Golden Anniversary Conference properly exists in cyberspace, its more physical roots might be found at Charles Sturt University, near Wagga Wagga, a city of about 50,000 in the rich agricultural valley of the Murrumbidgee River in New South Wales, Australia, about 220 miles southwest of Sydney and 100 miles due west of Canberra. If

you'd like to tour the university winery, by the way, which markets under its own label (I can now vouch for the cabernet, chardonnay and port), try: <http://www.csu.edu.au/research/rpcgwr/winery.htm> .

>From mbednarz@UMICH.EDU Thu Jun 1 14:13:13 1995
Date: Thu, 1 Jun 1995 14:13:13 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: POQs Available
In-Reply-To: <199506011602.MAA04649@judgmentday.rs.itd.umich.edu>

Per the request of Ray Funkhouser (506 Bellaire Ave., Fort Washington, PA 19034) I am forwarding the message:

"Ray Funkhouser has a fairly complete collection of POQ from the 1950s to 1989, which he would like to donate to a school, library or other educational institution."

Anyone interested should contact him at the above PA address.

>From COHENWAL@PUCC.BITNET Thu Jun 1 14:28:22 1995
Date: Thu, 1 Jun 1995 14:28:22 EDT
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "C.D.D. Walker Cohen" <COHENWAL@PUCC.BITNET>
Subject: Re: Data on tolerance in Poland
In-Reply-To: Message of Mon,
29 May 1995 09:29:07 -0400 from
<egolebio@MAGNUS.ACS.OHIO-STATE.EDU>

Jeffery Mondak (and others?) just presented a paper on political tolerance at the 50th AAPOR Conference -- on Romania, I believe. If you haven't heard from him directly, you might try contact: mondak@vms.cis.pitt (Univ. of Pittsburgh). Also, see papers/articles by Jim Gibson (Univ of Texas?) and related work by Cynthia Kaplan (U. Calif) -- dealing with CIS/Russia and Estonia. I'm sure others are doing similar things elsewhere. Some may be reported in American Poli. Sci. Review. Hope this helps. Cricket Cohen

~~~~~  
~~~  
| C.D.D. WALKER COHEN E-MAIL:
COHENWAL@PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU |
| DEPT OF POLITICS MAIL: 11 MELBOURNE LANE
| PRINCETON UNIVERSITY WILLINGBORO, NJ 08046-3143
| TEL: 609.258.2779 U.S.A.
| FAX: 609.258.1985 TEL: 609.877.4756
|
~~~~~  
~~~

>From featherstonf.rced@GAO.GOV Fri Jun 2 09:54:39 1995
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 1995 09:54:39 EST
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "Fran A. Featherston" <featherstonf.rced@GAO.GOV>
Subject: Re: AAPORNETiquette Again

Dear Colleagues:

I cannot reply to individuals on AAPORNET because our mail system at GAO only shows the most recent sender of the message rather than the complete history. (We are currently using CC:Mail.) So, for me, all I see is that the message is from "AAPORNEXT@VM.USC.EDU". I would appreciate your cooperation in providing your name and Internet address as part of your message so that I can respond to individuals. Also, would you send me a message at the address below if you are having the same problem?

I have suggested to Jim Beniger that our etiquette rules be amended to include names and Internet addresses as part of the message. I will let him know if it appears that GAO folks using our LAN are the only ones affected.

Thanks!

Fran Featherston
U.S. General Accounting Office
ADDRESS: featherstonf.rced@gao.gov
Phone: 202-512-4946

Reply Separator

Subject: AAPORNETiquette Again
Author: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR <AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU> at
INTERNET
Date: 5/26/95 6:07 PM

During the past few days, we have had several violations of the most basic principles of AAPORNETiquette, including at least a half dozen messages best sent to individuals that have been posted to the nearly 900 people on the Net. By far the most frequent complaint (indeed virtually the only complaint) about AAPORNET concerns the time wasted reading such messages.

Before posting a message, please think: Does this really need to be read by everyone in AAPOR, or might I achieve my desired goal by sending it to only one or two people? As the last thing you routinely do before pushing your "send" key, consider the Golden Rule of the Internet: Before posting a message, make certain that the "To:" line contains your desired receiver. Mistakes will usually embarrass you, sometimes also your intended recipient, and will occasionally delight all the rest of us--at your expense.

Complaints about transgressions should not be sent to me, but to the offenders themselves, and you are encouraged to do this. As in any social group, we will ultimately succeed only to the extent that we can enforce our own norms, person to person. But be gentle, please--many of us are new to

cyberspace. We have had an unusually large influx of new members since the AAPOR Newsletter article announcing AAPORNET and following the 50th Conference, and even oldtimers occasionally make mistakes, especially busy ones, at busy times.

For the benefit of the several hundred members who have joined us since the last posting of the following message (on December 23), here it is once again. The general principles are not peculiar to AAPORNET, but prevail throughout the Internet...

AAPORNETiquette (Fourth Posting--Updated)

Do NOT post to AAPORNET (currently 800+ members) messages intended for individuals, or better addressed to individuals.

Acceptable postings to AAPORNET include announcements and general questions--indeed these are encouraged. Replies to such postings, however, ought to be sent to the person who posted them (sender's address) and NOT to AAPORNET.

Try to keep all postings as brief as possible--fitting your entire message on a single screen is always appreciated. Please confine each message to a single topic, summarized in your subject line, so that those not interested might erase your message without bothering to read it.

If you think someone has violated AAPORNETiquette, send your complaint to the individual offender--posting such messages to AAPORNET only compounds the offense. Please do not apologize to all of AAPORNET for your own mistake, which also compounds the offense.

Treat everyone on AAPORNET as you would someone you will see regularly for the rest of your life because--since we are all AAPOR members--you probably will.

Suggestions for additions to AAPORNETiquette are welcomed at beniger@rcf.usc.edu

>From barbara_bryant@CCMAIL.BUS.UMICH.EDU Fri Jun 2 10:44:59 1995
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 1995 10:44:59 EDT
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "Barbara E. Bryant" <barbara_bryant@CCMAIL.BUS.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re[2]: AAPORNETiquette Again

We use cc:mail at the University of Michigan Business School and I have the same problem. I also suspect that cc:mail is broadcasting my replies marked only to "sender" to the whole network. If you are not Fran Featherstone and receive this message, this is happening.

Reply Separator

Subject: Re: AAPORNETiquette Again
Author: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR <AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU> at Internet
Date: 6/2/95 10:10 AM

Dear Colleagues:

I cannot reply to individuals on AAPORNET because our mail system at GAO only shows the most recent sender of the message rather than the complete history. (We are currently using CC:Mail.) So, for me, all I see is that the message is from "AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU". I would appreciate your cooperation in providing your name and Internet address as part of your message so that I can respond to individuals. Also, would you send me a message at the address below if you are having the same problem?

I have suggested to Jim Beniger that our etiquette rules be amended to include names and Internet addresses as part of the message. I will let him know if it appears that GAO folks using our LAN are the only ones affected.

Thanks!
Fran Featherston
U.S. General Accounting Office
ADDRESS: featherstonf.rced@gao.gov
Phone: 202-512-4946

Reply Separator

Subject: AAPORNETiquette Again
Author: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR <AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU> at INTERNET
Date: 5/26/95 6:07 PM

During the past few days, we have had several violations of the most basic principles of AAPORNETiquette, including at least a half dozen messages best sent to individuals that have been posted to the nearly 900 people on the Net. By far the most frequent complaint (indeed virtually the only complaint) about AAPORNET concerns the time wasted reading such messages.

Before posting a message, please think: Does this really need to be read by everyone in AAPOR, or might I achieve my desired goal by sending it to only one or two people? As the last thing you routinely do before pushing your "send" key, consider the Golden Rule of the Internet: Before posting a message, make certain that the "To:" line contains your desired receiver. Mistakes will usually embarrass you, sometimes also your intended recipient, and will occasionally delight all the rest of us--at your expense.

Complaints about transgressions should not be sent to me, but to the offenders themselves, and you are encouraged to do this. As in any social group, we will ultimately succeed only to the extent that we can enforce our own norms, person to person. But be gentle, please--many of us are new to cyberspace. We have had an unusually large influx of new members since the AAPOR Newsletter article announcing AAPORNET and following the 50th Conference, and even oldtimers occasionally make mistakes, especially busy

ones, at busy times.

For the benefit of the several hundred members who have joined us since the last posting of the following message (on December 23), here it is once again. The general principles are not peculiar to AAPORNET, but prevail throughout the Internet...

AAPORNETiquette (Fourth Posting--Updated)

Do NOT post to AAPORNET (currently 800+ members) messages intended for individuals, or better addressed to individuals.

Acceptable postings to AAPORNET include announcements and general questions--indeed these are encouraged. Replies to such postings, however, ought to be sent to the person who posted them (sender's address) and NOT to AAPORNET.

Try to keep all postings as brief as possible--fitting your entire message on a single screen is always appreciated. Please confine each message to a single topic, summarized in your subject line, so that those not interested might erase your message without bothering to read it.

If you think someone has violated AAPORNETiquette, send your complaint to the individual offender--posting such messages to AAPORNET only compounds the offense. Please do not apologize to all of AAPORNET for your own mistake, which also compounds the offense.

Treat everyone on AAPORNET as you would someone you will see regularly for the rest of your life because--since we are all AAPOR members--you probably will.

Suggestions for additions to AAPORNETiquette are welcomed at beniger@rcf.usc.edu

>From barbara_bryant@CCMAIL.BUS.UMICH.EDU Fri Jun 2 10:46:01 1995
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 1995 10:46:01 EDT
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "Barbara E. Bryant" <barbara_bryant@CCMAIL.BUS.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re[2]: AAPORNETiquette Again

Second reply: And I forgot to identify myself from University of Michigan Business School--Barbara Everitt Bryant

Reply Separator

Subject: Re: AAPORNETiquette Again
Author: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR <AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU> at Internet
Date: 6/2/95 10:10 AM

Dear Colleagues:

I cannot reply to individuals on AAPORNET because our mail system at GAO only shows the most recent sender of the message rather than the complete history. (We are currently using CC:Mail.) So, for me, all I see is that the message is from "AAPORNEXT@VM.USC.EDU". I would appreciate your cooperation in providing your name and Internet address as part of your message so that I can respond to individuals. Also, would you send me a message at the address below if you are having the same problem?

I have suggested to Jim Beniger that our etiquette rules be amended to include names and Internet addresses as part of the message. I will let him know if it appears that GAO folks using our LAN are the only ones affected.

Thanks!

Fran Featherston

U.S. General Accounting Office

ADDRESS: featherstonf.rced@gao.gov

Phone: 202-512-4946

Reply Separator

Subject: AAPORNETiquette Again

Author: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR <AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU> at INTERNET

Date: 5/26/95 6:07 PM

During the past few days, we have had several violations of the most basic principles of AAPORNETiquette, including at least a half dozen messages best sent to individuals that have been posted to the nearly 900 people on the Net. By far the most frequent complaint (indeed virtually the only complaint) about AAPORNET concerns the time wasted reading such messages.

Before posting a message, please think: Does this really need to be read by everyone in AAPOR, or might I achieve my desired goal by sending it to only one or two people? As the last thing you routinely do before pushing your "send" key, consider the Golden Rule of the Internet: Before posting a message, make certain that the "To:" line contains your desired receiver. Mistakes will usually embarrass you, sometimes also your intended recipient, and will occasionally delight all the rest of us--at your expense.

Complaints about transgressions should not be sent to me, but to the offenders themselves, and you are encouraged to do this. As in any social group, we will ultimately succeed only to the extent that we can enforce our own norms, person to person. But be gentle, please--many of us are new to cyberspace. We have had an unusually large influx of new members since the AAPOR Newsletter article announcing AAPORNET and following the 50th Conference, and even oldtimers occasionally make mistakes, especially busy ones, at busy times.

For the benefit of the several hundred members who have joined us since the last posting of the following message (on December 23), here it is once again. The general principles are not peculiar to AAPORNET, but prevail

throughout the Internet...

AAPORNETiquette (Fourth Posting--Updated)

Do NOT post to AAPORNET (currently 800+ members) messages intended for individuals, or better addressed to individuals.

Acceptable postings to AAPORNET include announcements and general questions--indeed these are encouraged. Replies to such postings, however, ought to be sent to the person who posted them (sender's address) and NOT to AAPORNET.

Try to keep all postings as brief as possible--fitting your entire message on a single screen is always appreciated. Please confine each message to a single topic, summarized in your subject line, so that those not interested might erase your message without bothering to read it.

If you think someone has violated AAPORNETiquette, send your complaint to the individual offender--posting such messages to AAPORNET only compounds the offense. Please do not apologize to all of AAPORNET for your own mistake, which also compounds the offense.

Treat everyone on AAPORNET as you would someone you will see regularly for the rest of your life because--since we are all AAPOR members--you probably will.

Suggestions for additions to AAPORNETiquette are welcomed at beniger@rcf.usc.edu

>From sandie@POSSUM.MED.UTAH.EDU Fri Jun 2 09:51:38 1995
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 1995 09:51:38 -0600
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Sandra Edwards <sandie@POSSUM.MED.UTAH.EDU>
Subject: query on collecting pedigrees

I working on a mail survey to be used for collecting detailed pedigree information from a cohort of high risk cancer families and a general population cohort. I would appreciate receiving any advice/survey insturments regarding the collection of detailed family history information.

Sandra Edwards
Sandie@possum.med.utah.edu
fax 801/585-3779

>From stakacs@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU Fri Jun 2 12:06:50 1995
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 1995 12:06:50 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>

From: "Scott J. Takacs" <stakacs@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: AAPORNETiquette Again
In-Reply-To: <199506021415.AA187391@garnet.acns.fsu.edu> from "Fran A. Featherston" at Jun 2, 95 09:54:39 am

Fellow AAPOR'ers:

[This letter explains some basic rules of netiquette. If you're already well versed in the subject, and promise to never spam the list, you can ignore the rest of this message.]

There was a Dilbert about this problem. The suggestion about adding your own e-mail address as part of the file makes good sense; one way to do this easily is to design a .sig file. Some systems add these manually, mine doesn't but I have several small files with various signatures (one professional, several personal), and then I "import" the file. (I also save keystrokes over typing out my full name.) Keeping your .sig to four lines or less is required with some systems and good netiquette generally. There used to be a net-culture that explained this to people, but lately people have been added so fast that training has been a bit erratic.

One other request is to please don't reply to a message with the full text unless you are responding to the full text. Most of us already know to do this, but for those who don't, remember: The "delete" key is your friend. The "undelete" key is an even better friend, but not all systems have one.

Scott J. Takacs
Doctoral Student, Marketing
The Florida State University
stakacs@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

P.S. "Spam" as a verb usually refers to sending off-topic postings, often to a number of lists or USENET groups, usually in an attempt to spread a chain letter or sell something. It's a great way to lose your account.

>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Fri Jun 2 17:18:52 1995
Date: Fri, 2 Jun 1995 17:18:52 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject: POQ: Vol. 59, No. 2 (Summer 1995)

PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY

VOLUME 59 / SUMMER 1995 / NUMBER 2

Articles

The Rise of Presidential Polling: The Nixon White House in Historical Perspective Lawrence R. Jacobs and Robert Y. Shapiro

Estimating Telephone Noncoverage Bias with a Telephone Survey Scott Keeter

Bias in List-Assisted Telephone Samples

J. Michael Brick, Joseph Waksberg, Dale Kulp, and Amy Starer

Using Survey Participants to Estimate the Impact of Nonparticipation I-Fen
Lin and Nora Cate Schaeffer

Research Note

Measuring Levels of Party Identification: Does Question
Order Matter?
Ian McAllister and Martin P. Wattenberg

The Polls

Review: The Holocaust Denial Controversy
Tom W. Smith

Trends: Public Opinion on Crime and Punishment
Mark Warr

Book Reviews

John Mueller, Policy and Opinion in the Gulf War
John Zaller

Steven J. Rosenstone and John Mark Hansen, Mobilization, Participation, and
Democracy in America Warren J. Mitofsky

Paul M. Sniderman and Thomas Piazza, The Scar of Race
Charlotte Steeh

Jean Morton-Williams, Interviewer Approaches
Lois Oksenberg

>From egolebio@MAGNUS.ACS.OHIO-STATE.EDU Sat Jun 3 14:28:38 1995
Date: Sat, 3 Jun 1995 14:28:38 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Ewa A Golebiowska <egolebio@MAGNUS.ACS.OHIO-STATE.EDU>
Subject: Re: Data on tolerance in Poland
In-Reply-To: <199506011848.OAA20431@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu> from
"C.D.D.

Walker Cohen" at Jun 1, 95 02:28:22 pm

Thanks very much for your help. It so happens that Jeff Mondak had seen my
post on AAPORNET and has already sent me a copy of the paper you're
referring to. Thanks for your other suggestions as well! Sincerely, Ewa
Golebiowska>

> Jeffery Mondak (and others?) just presented a paper on political
> tolerance at

t

> he 50th AAPOR Conference -- on Romania, I believe. If you haven't
> heard from

h

> im directly, you might try contact: mondak@vms.cis.pitt (Univ. of
> Pittsburgh

).
> Also, see papers/articles by Jim Gibson (Univ of Texas?) and related
> work by Cynthia Kaplan (U. Calif) -- dealing with CIS/Russia and
> Estonia. I'm sure o
th
> ers are doing similar things elsewhere. Some may be reported in
> American Pol
i.
> Sci. Review. Hope this helps. Cricket Cohen
>
> ~~~~~
> ~~~~~
~~
> | C.D.D. WALKER COHEN E-MAIL:
COHENWAL@PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU
|
> | DEPT OF POLITICS MAIL: 11 MELBOURNE LANE
|
> | PRINCETON UNIVERSITY WILLINGBORO, NJ
08046-3143
|
> | TEL: 609.258.2779 U.S.A.
|
> | FAX: 609.258.1985 TEL: 609.877.4756
|
> ~~~~~
> ~~~~~
~~
>

--
Ewa A. Golebiowska
Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, 2140 Derby Hall
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-292-1681, Fax: 614-292-2407

>From mas2@CHRISTA.UNH.EDU Sun Jun 4 12:19:48 1995
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 1995 12:19:48 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Murray A Straus <mas2@CHRISTA.UNH.EDU>
Subject: Re: SECOND MESSAGE ON SOURCES FOR CATI-like PROGRAM FOR USE
IN
THE FIELD WITH LAPTOP, ALSO TEST ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM
In-Reply-To: <199505311317.JAA28765@hopper.unh.edu>

When I sent the following message, I did not realize that I needed to
also give my E-Mail address. I am sorry to have to burden people with a
second message. But I am learning!

On Wed, 31 May 1995, Murray A Straus wrote:

> I am looking for an inexpensive CATI-like program which interviewers

> can use in the field with a laptop.
>
> I also want a program that respondents can use to take psychological
> tests. The program should be very easy to use, as crash-proof as
> possible, and be able to output sub-scale scores as well as a total
> score for the test. If it can also plot a "profile" of the sub-scale
> scores for each subject, that would also be desirable, but not
> essential.
>
> Thanks for your help
>
>
> Murray A. Straus
> Family Research Laboratory
> University of New Hampshire
>

>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Mon Jun 5 13:16:26 1995
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 1995 13:16:26 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject: Discussants' Comments Welcomed at 50th Website

DISCUSSANTS' COMMENTS WELCOMED AT 50TH WEBSITE

Several discussants on the 50th Conference Program have asked whether their written comments on papers in their sessions, as presented in Fort Lauderdale, might also be added to the Conference Website. And why not?

If you are a discussant interested in disseminating your comments to the world, why not treat them much as you would a presented paper? Simply give them a title (making clear in the subtitle that they represent the remarks of a discussant at a conference paper session) and add citations, notes and bibliography where appropriate (including careful citation of the session papers discussed, of course). Then send the result, as 50th Conference authors are sending their papers (with NO implications for copyright), in ASCII or DOS text on diskette, to our ever faithful WWW guru:

Ms. Sandy Tse
P.O. Box 839
Wagga Wagga NSW 2650
Australia

The results of all these efforts can be found at the 50th Conference's URL (or universal resource locator, an address for a Website), which remains:

<http://www.csu.edu.au/special/conference/AAPOR>

>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Mon Jun 5 15:58:52 1995
Date: Mon, 5 Jun 1995 15:58:52 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR

<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>

From: James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject: Top 15 Lists Revisited

A recent message here mentioned--in passing--"POR and the other 14 now infamous selected lists in research methods, statistics, survey and market research and marketing, new technologies, and social and behavioral sciences more generally." Because several newer AAPORNET members have asked for an explanation, it seems appropriate to repost a message which first appeared here on January 4, 1995:

TOP 15 LISTS OF INTEREST TO AAPOR MEMBERS

>From Jim Beniger...

Several AAPORNET members have asked me how to subscribe to various other lists on the Internet. One popular choice is POR, the list with the name most similar to AAPORNET. Devoted to the general topic of public opinion research, POR is particularly useful for those interested in polling and elections. Because many AAPOR members have professional interests that range far from these topics, however, some of you might be interested in how to join any one of the 15 lists (including POR) listed below. These are the 15 lists known to me that I personally consider of greatest interest to the various segments of the AAPOR membership (these 15 lists are all of those to which we posted the Call for Papers for our 50th Conference). Topics of these 15 lists include not only public opinion and polling, but research methods, statistics, survey and market research and marketing, new technologies, and social and behavioral science more generally.

TOP 15 LISTS OF INTEREST TO AAPOR MEMBERS
(listed alphabetically)

| Name of List | Title of List | No. of Members |
|--------------|---|----------------|
| COMSERVE | Comserve News Service (communications fields) | 3,035 |
| ELMAR | List for Marketing Academic Research | 908 |
| H-AMSTDY | American Studies Discussion List | 1,156 |
| H-POL | Political History Discussion List | 442 |
| MARKET-L | Discussion of Marketing | 752 |
| METHODS | Social Science Research Methods | 556 |
| MRKT-PHD | Marketing Doctoral Students | 154 |
| POLI-SCI | Political Science Digest | 876 |
| POR | Public Opinion Research | 593 |
| POSCIM | Political Sciences Mailing List | 209 |
| PSRT-L | Political Science Research and Teaching List | 1,315 |
| RITIM-L | Telecommunications and Information Marketing | 760 |
| SOCGRAD | Sociology Graduate Student Discussion | 266 |
| SOS-DATA | Social Science Data List | 461 |
| STAT-L | Statistical Consulting Discussion | 1,004 |

HOW TO JOIN ANY LIST ON THE INTERNET

To join any list on the Internet, you must program its list server with your address and name. Recall that a list server is a dumb machine for which only rigidly precise information will produce the desired effect. To join almost any list on the Internet, simply send a four-part, one-line command

(and absolutely nothing else) to the dumb machine (which usually has the address: listserv@etc.etc); be sure to leave the subject line blank. The four parts of the command are: the word "subscribe," the name of the list, your address, and your name.

For example, although it is impossible for anyone to subscribe to AAPORNET (because it is a private list, for AAPOR members only), were this not the case, here--as a model for you to use--is how I would subscribe to AAPORNET:

```
To the address: listserv@vm.usc.edu
Leaving the subject line of my message completely blank
I would send the four-part message (leaving only one space
between each part):
```

```
subscribe aapornet beniger@rcf.usc.edu James R. Beniger
```

With this as your model, all you now lack are the list server addresses for each of the top 15 lists of interest to AAPOR members. They are listed immediately below (note the singular exception of ELMAR, the List for Marketing Academic Research, which is controlled not by a dumb machine but by actual human beings, who can read requests in actual prose):

LIST SERVER ADDRESSES: TOP 15 LISTS OF INTEREST TO AAPOR MEMBERS

```
COMSERVE listserv@vm.its.rpi.edu
ELMAR (request in English prose to elmar@columbia.edu)
H-AMSTDY listserv@uicvm.uic.edu
H-POL listserv@uicvm.uic.edu
MARKET-L listserv@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu
METHODS listserv@unmvma.unm.edu
MRKT-PHD listserv@uga.cc.uga.edu
POLI-SCI listserv@rutvml.rutgers.edu
POR listserv@gibbs.oit.unc.edu
POSCIM listserv@vm.gmd.de
PSRT-L listserv@mizzoul.missouri.edu
RITIM-L listserv@uriacc.uri.edu
SOCGRAD listserv@uscd.edu
SOS-DATA listserv@gibbs.oit.unc.edu
STAT-L listserv@vm1.mcgill.ca
```

REQUEST FOR HELP

Obviously I am not familiar with every list of potential interest to AAPOR members. I'd be very disappointed if I didn't learn from you all of at least a few additional lists deserving of inclusion in the list above. If you will please send me the names and list server addresses of your favorite professional lists (no sports or pornography, please), I'll post a summary of the best things I've missed in my own Top 15 list here on AAPORNET in the next week or so. As you get involved in the lists presented here, I hope you won't forget the list where you first learned about them, and how to join: AAPORNET.

If you have problems, questions, or complaints concerning anything above, PLEASE DO NOT POST THEM TO AAPORNET. Instead, send them to beniger@rcf.usc.edu

>From rshalp@IX.NETCOM.COM Mon Jun 5 21:26:57 1995

Date: Mon, 5 Jun 1995 21:26:57 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "RICHARD S. HALPERN" <rshalp@IX.NETCOM.COM>
Subject: Re: Effect of phrasing on polling results

As if you ever wondered about the effect of question wording on poll results...

Page 1 of today's New York Times (June 5, 1995) has an article entitled: "Public Opinion Polls Swerve with the Turns of a Phrase"

Well worth getting a hold of. Discusses the effect of question wording on outcome of polling results (which we all know, of course) with particular reference to the way in which polls are being used by Republicans and Democrats. Illustrates how political pollsters are advising their clients...based on polling results using different question wordings.

"Advice to Republicans: Don't talk about cuts in Medicare spending...instead talk about reducing the rate of increase..."

"Advice to Democrats: Do talk about cuts in Medicare spending and do it often."

Example cited:

Do you favor or oppose the proposal for a constitutional amendment to require a balanced Federal Budget by the year 2003 and every year after that?

| | |
|--------|-----|
| Favor | 70% |
| Oppose | 18 |
| D.K. | 12 |

Do you favor or oppose the proposal for a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget that cuts government spending on Medicare by 20% over the next 7 years?

| | |
|--------|-----|
| Favor | 31% |
| Oppose | 58 |
| D.K. | 11 |

+++++

What I find interesting is not that the article tells us something that we didn't all (AAPOR members) know before but rather that the Times elected to place it on page 1. This is significant.

Dick Halpern

>From NanBelden@AOL.COM Thu Jun 8 11:29:55 1995
Date: Thu, 8 Jun 1995 11:29:55 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>

From: NanBelden@AOL.COM
Subject: sampling reviews again

In my communication a few minutes ago I forgot to note that I have of course articles contained in POQ on probability and quota. Am looking for others. Thanks. NanBelden@aol.com

>From NanBelden@AOL.COM Thu Jun 8 18:21:17 1995
Date: Thu, 8 Jun 1995 18:21:17 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: NanBelden@AOL.COM
Subject: Probability and quota samples

Please forgive any earlier confusion. Here is my request:

Does anyone know of any historical examinations/reviews/interesting notes about the use of quota samples and the adoption of probability? I have what is in POQ and A Meeting Place. Thanks. NanBelden@aol.com

>From murray1@PIPELINE.COM Thu Jun 8 23:08:37 1995
Date: Thu, 8 Jun 1995 23:08:37 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Murray Edelman <murray1@PIPELINE.COM>
Subject: Re: Probability and quota samples
In-Reply-To: <199506082227.SAA28902@mail.nyc.pipeline.com>

Nancy,

I forgive you.

NBC used barometric precincts for quite a while through the 70's. Warren should be able to tell you more.

Murray

On Thu, 8 Jun 1995 NanBelden@AOL.COM wrote:

> Please forgive any earlier confusion. Here is my request:
>
> Does anyone know of any historical examinations/reviews/interesting
> notes about the use of quota samples and the adoption of probability?
> I have what is in POQ and A Meeting Place. Thanks. NanBelden@aol.com
>

>From rshalp@IX.NETCOM.COM Thu Jun 8 20:58:12 1995
Date: Thu, 8 Jun 1995 20:58:12 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Comments: <Parser> W: TO field duplicated. Last occurrence was retained.

From: "RICHARD S. HALPERN" <rshalp@IX.NETCOM.COM>
Subject: Re: Probability and quota samples

You wrote:

>
>Please forgive any earlier confusion. Here is my request:
>
>Does anyone know of any historical examinations/reviews/interesting
notes
>about the use of quota samples and the adoption of probability? I
have what
>is in POQ and A Meeting Place. Thanks.
>NanBelden@aol.com
>
Nancy,

A fellow named Alfred Politz (President/CEO Alfred Politz Research, New York City -- but no longer in existence) introduced probability sampling into marketing research in the middle 50's. He insisted that probability sampling was the only valid approach and that quota sampling was very unscientific and should never be used. He convinced many clients of this and made a fortune in the process. During the period 1955-1965 (approximately) Politz was one of the biggest and most influential marketing research firms in the U.S. with major clients such as GM and Coca-Cola. Probability sampling became almost a fetish with him and because of its scientific aura it provided his company with a great niche. I think most market researchers give him credit for legitimizing and popularizing the use of probability sampling instead of quota despite its extra cost.

I don't know if I still have any quotes but I'll look. You might search the archives of Advertising Age. Another source is Jerry Greene who I think is still a member of AAPOR. He worked for Politz (as did I -- it was also my first job commercially).

Another source: Les Frankel and Sol Dudka of Audits and Surveys in New York. Sol is a leading exponent of probability sampling in marketing and opinion research and pretty much took up where Politz left off. Les also worked for Politz and was his head statistical wizard. I think his son teaches at CCNY -- also a statistical and math guru.

Hope this helps.

Dick Halpern

>From ABIDER@AMERICAN.EDU Fri Jun 9 00:39:36 1995
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 1995 00:39:36 EDT
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Albert Biderman <ABIDER@AMERICAN.EDU>
Organization: The American University
Subject: Re: Probability and quota samples
In-Reply-To: Message of Thu, 8 Jun 1995 18:21:17 -0400 from
<NanBelden@AOL.COM>

Fred (Frederick W.) Williams drew an area probability sample for the

Information Control Div (Off. of Mil. Govt for Germany) weekly PO survey of the U.S. Zone in the Fall of 1945. List sampling was possible within areas selected from ration card files.

Because of obvious problems with initially small samples (n=500) and distinctive character of each of the large cities, problem of what became later designated "design effects" were apparent which we "remedied" with a lot of stratification.

I can't remember at this point where documentation might be found. Alex George at RAND is one survivor of the operation who might know.

--Al Biderman

>From PSRA1@AOL.COM Fri Jun 9 09:15:15 1995
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 1995 09:15:15 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: PSRA1@AOL.COM
Subject: Re: Probability and quota sam...

Nancy:

You are probably aware of Jean Converse's history, Survey Research, but since your message does not mention it specifically, I thought I'd take a moment to commend it to you...Although it's been a few years since I read it, I recall that it's well documented with references in extensive endnotes. Jack

>From murray1@PIPELINE.COM Fri Jun 9 10:05:32 1995
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 1995 10:05:32 -0400
Reply-To: Murray Edelman <murray1@pipeline.com>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Murray Edelman <murray1@PIPELINE.COM>
Subject: Re: Probability and quota samples
In-Reply-To: <199506090506.BAA24877@mail.nyc.pipeline.com>

Since I am leading this parade by mistake late last night, allow me to try and correct it while it is still early.

Please send responses directly to the person making the request and not to the list. This appears to be an interesting topic and perhaps Nancy can make the information available to us in a digest form.

Please check the address of your message before sending it. Don't just assume that it is working correctly as I did last night.

>From ccowan@RTC.GOV Fri Jun 9 09:58:31 1995
Date: Fri, 9 Jun 1995 09:58:31 -24000
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "Charles D. Cowan" <ccowan@RTC.GOV>
Subject: Re: Probability and quota samples

Nancy,

A fine reference on effects of quota sampling with anecdotes and examples is Applied Sampling by your friend and mine, Seymour Sudman. Academic Press, 1976. See pages 191-200. His text also gives references to other works regarding the probity of quota sampling.

For a slightly more technical view of how one draws inferences from quota samples, you might want to look at Drawing Inferences from Self-Selected Samples, Edited by Howard Wainer. Springer-Verlag, 1986. There are also some fascinating references to inferential problems in articles on sampling in malls, but this may go to far afield for you.

Hope this helps.

Chuck

```
>From SRC114@UKCC.UKY.EDU Fri Jun 9 11:22:02 1995
Date:      Fri, 9 Jun 1995 11:22:02 EDT
Reply-To:   News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender:     News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From:       Jim Wolf <SRC114@UKCC.UKY.EDU>
Subject:    Re: Probability and quota samples
In-Reply-To: Message of Fri, 9 Jun 1995 09:58:31 -2400 from
<ccowan@RTC.GOV>
```

See also Notes on Social Measurement: Historical and Critical, by Otis Dudley Duncan (Sage Pub., 1984).

```
>From GOLQC@CUNYVM.BITNET Fri Jun 9 12:33:59 1995
Date:      Fri, 9 Jun 1995 12:33:59 EDT
Reply-To:   News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender:     News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From:       Al Gollin <GOLQC@CUNYVM.BITNET>
Subject:    Re: Probability and quota samples
In-Reply-To: Message of Thu, 8 Jun 1995 18:21:17 -0400 from
<NanBelden@AOL.COM>
```

A stab in the dark... try Gauging Public Opinion by Hadley Cantril (Princeton, 1944?) for methodologically sophisticated work in an era of quota sampling.
Al

```
>From MKlette@AOL.COM Sat Jun 10 15:52:11 1995
Date:      Sat, 10 Jun 1995 15:52:11 -0400
Reply-To:   News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender:     News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From:       MKlette@AOL.COM
Subject:    Re: Probability and quota sam...
```

Nancy,

I note that Murray has referred you to Warren about NBC sampling. I'm sure he can help, but since I'm at NBC I can probably answer your questions.

mary

>From pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU Sun Jun 11 19:19:51 1995
Date: Sun, 11 Jun 1995 19:19:51 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Probability and quota samples
In-Reply-To: <9506090400.AA103942@email.unc.edu>

Wasn't Politz also the guy who invented times-at-home weighting?

Phil Meyer

>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Mon Jun 12 11:06:33 1995
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 1995 11:06:33 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject: AAPORNET: The First 200 Days

AAPORNET: The First 200 Days

This past Saturday, June 10, marked AAPORNET's 200th day. Established on a trial basis by the AAPOR Executive Council at its November 18 meeting in New York City, AAPORNET was continued through the 50th Annual Conference by the Council at its January 13 meeting in Washington, D.C. At its May 18 meeting in Fort Lauderdale, the Council decided to continue AAPORNET indefinitely as an activity of AAPOR's Publications and Information Committee.

AAPORNET first appeared on the screens of AAPOR members on the morning before Thanksgiving, Wednesday, November 23. Begun with 260 net addresses (the non-bouncing addresses in the 1993-94 AAPOR Directory), AAPORNET in its first 200 days has grown to include 907 members in 15 countries (64 percent of the 1420 members listed in the 1994-95 Directory); 4.8 percent of current AAPORNET addresses are outside of the United States:

| | | | | |
|--------|-----|-------|---------------|-----|
| Nov 23 | 260 | 18.3% | United States | 865 |
| Nov 30 | 419 | 29.5% | Germany | 10 |
| Dec 7 | 561 | 39.5% | Canada | 9 |
| Dec 14 | 649 | 45.7% | Great Britain | 6 |
| Dec 21 | 719 | 50.6% | Sweden | 4 |
| Dec 28 | 729 | 51.3% | Australia | 3 |
| Jan 4 | 757 | 53.3% | Netherlands | 3 |
| Jan 11 | 781 | 55.0% | New Zealand | 2 |
| Jan 18 | 797 | 56.1% | Belgium | 1 |
| Jan 25 | 813 | 57.3% | Denmark | 1 |
| Feb 1 | 822 | 57.9% | Egypt | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----|-------|--|-----------|------------|
| | | | | Hong Kong | 1 |
| Feb 15 | 835 | 58.8% | | Italy | 1 |
| Mar 1 | 844 | 59.4% | | Mexico | 1 |
| Mar 15 | 852 | 60.0% | | Slovenia | 1 |
| Mar 29 | 860 | 60.6% | | | |
| Apr 12 | 867 | 61.1% | | | <u>909</u> |
| Apr 26 | 874 | 61.5% | | | |
| May 10 | 880 | 62.0% | | | |
| May 24 | 896 | 63.1% | | | |
| Jun 7 | 907 | 63.9% | | | |
| Jun 10 | 909 | 64.0% | | | |

During AAPORNET's first 200 days, 58 members removed themselves from the list. Of these 58 members, 23 have since rejoined. The 35 members who remain off the list represent a dropout rate of 3.7 percent of those ever subscribed.

Thus far, 115 non-AAPOR members have requested admission to AAPORNET; all have been turned away with a friendly form message describing AAPOR and how to join. The 50th Conference Call for Papers and/or Call for Student Award Papers were also sent to non-member applicants, as appropriate, until after the respective deadlines had passed.

```
>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Mon Jun 12 11:15:53 1995
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 1995 11:15:53 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject: Justice Information (fwd)
```

AAPORNET members interested in criminology, crime surveys and statistics, and justice-related information might wish to consider subscribing to the following new semimonthly Internet newsletter, for which there is no charge:

```
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 1995 09:44:38 CDT
Subject: NEW: JUSTINFO - Justice Information
```

JUSTINFO on listproc@ncjrs.aspensys.com

Justice Information (JUSTINFO) Electronic Newsletter.

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service announces its newest service, the Justice Information (JUSTINFO) electronic newsletter, designed to provide criminal justice professionals with accurate, current and useful criminal and juvenile justice-related information. In order to accomplish this goal, this list publishes a newsletter on the 1st and 15th of every month that reports on a wide variety of topics, including:

- o information from the OJP agencies and ONDCP
- o new products and services from NCJRS
- o updates on Federal legislation

- o important criminal justice resources on the Internet
- o NCJRS international services.

There is no cost to participate in this service, although users must have access to Internet email.

To join this electronic mailing list:

- o Send a message to listproc@ncjrs.aspensys.com
- o Leave the subject line blank
- o In the body of the message, type:

subscribe justinfo your name

For Example: subscribe justinfo Pat Jones

Owner: Anne Bolin abolin@aspensys.com

>From JTANUR@SBCCVM.BITNET Mon Jun 12 15:23:43 1995
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 1995 15:23:43 EDT
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Judy Tanur <JTANUR@SBCCVM.BITNET>
Organization: State University of New York at Stony Brook
Subject: Re: AAPORNET: The First 200 Days
In-Reply-To: Message of Mon,
12 Jun 1995 11:06:33 -0700 from <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>

I'm deliberately replying to the list in response to Jim's message marking aapornet's first 200 days -- I want to make public my congratulations to him for making such a success of the list! I'm mostly a browser, but I enjoy it enormously and keep learning new things. Judy Tanur

>From gcoryell@CCLINK.FHCRC.ORG Mon Jun 12 14:10:25 1995
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 1995 14:10:25 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Gayle Coryell <gcoryell@CCLINK.FHCRC.ORG>
Subject: Research Coordinator Position

Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center in Seattle is posting a position for a Survey Research Coordinator position in the Cancer Prevention Unit. It is a 80% - 100% position with full benefits. The ad is reproduced below. If you would like to discuss the position with me, please contact me directly:

Gayle Coryell
Field Services & Quality Control Manager
Evaluation Shared Resources
Cancer Prevention Research Program

gcoryell@cclink.fhcrc.org Phone (206) 667-5029

fax (206) 667-5977

Job #: KE-5642 Evaluation Shared Resource Coordinator

Oversee & coordinate the work flow of all units of the Evaluation Shared Resource inc. Field Services/Quality Control, Database Mgmt & Stat, Cost Analysis. Plan and schedule work across projects, anticipate & resolve scheduling conflicts, oversee budgets and project completion schedules. Provide input on questionnaire construction & sampling. MA in public health or related science, Ph.D. pref. Min 2 yrs supervisory exp in research w/public health focus. Min 2 yrs exp w/ questionnaire development. Knowledge of computing, research methodology and survey methods. Salary DOE + exc benefits. On site child care. Smoke-free environ.

Send resume & cover letter to: Human Resources Ofc #KE-5642
1124 Columbia Street, LV-201 Seattle, WA 98104

Or submit resume in person at 1300 Valley Street, 2nd Floor

EOE/Committed to Work Force Diversity

>From NanBelden@AOL.COM Mon Jun 12 22:36:29 1995
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 1995 22:36:29 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: NanBelden@AOL.COM
Subject: probability and quota

Thanks very, very much to all of you who have sent me ideas and those who have sent me their papers in the mail. Yes I will try to summarize the references I have been given -- in a couple of weeks or less for anyone who is interested. Again I really appreciate the help -- it is a great time saver and a very creative process. And (Jim B, I hope you are listening) it has made be a BELIEVER in the NET! Praise the Lord. Nancy B.

>From rshalp@IX.NETCOM.COM Mon Jun 12 21:28:23 1995
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 1995 21:28:23 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "RICHARD S. HALPERN" <rshalp@IX.NETCOM.COM>
Subject: Re: Probability and quota samples

You wrote:

>
> Wasn't Politz also the guy who invented times-at-home weighting?
>
>Phil Meyer

>
Phil,

Yes! (to the best of my knowledge and memory)

Dick

>From YOGI@VTVM1.CC.VT.EDU Tue Jun 13 12:00:39 1995
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 1995 12:00:39 EDT
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Alan Bayer <YOGI@VTVM1.CC.VT.EDU>
Subject: Times-at-home weight

I'd like to admit my ignorance (and hope maybe some others on this listserv share it) to ask that someone post a synopsis of the recently mentioned TIMES-AT-HOME WEIGHT. It sounds like something I should know!

Alan Bayer
Virginia Tech Survey Research Center
(yogi@vtvm1.cc.vt.edu)

>From TARNAI@WSUVM1.CSC.WSU.EDU Tue Jun 13 10:30:23 1995
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 1995 10:30:23 PDT
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: John Tarnai <TARNAI@WSUVM1.CSC.WSU.EDU>
Subject: Telephone Surveys

I am passing this information to the entire AAPORNET because it potentially affects all of us. Someone in my office gave me a copy of a page out of the July 1995 issue of the Ladies Home Journal. It was an abstract of a new book by Louise Rafkin, entitled "Street Smarts: A Personal Safety Guide for Women", to be published in August by Harper of San Francisco. Strategy number four on this page is as follows:

"Don't answer phone surveys. They are nearly always scams - either to get you to buy something or to get personal information about your household situation - for example, 'How many people live in your house?' or 'Are you married?'"

I wonder if the book elaborates further on this point. I don't know how many people read this magazine, but I hope it's not too many. What concerns me more is the book, and the misinformation that is being given out about telephone surveys.

Does anyone have suggestions about how to respond effectively to this publication, publisher, and author?

>From jes30@CORNELL.EDU Tue Jun 13 14:29:18 1995

Date: Tue, 13 Jun 1995 14:29:18 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: James Shanahan <jes30@CORNELL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Telephone Surveys

>I wonder if the book elaborates further on this point. I don't know how
>many
>people read this magazine, but I hope it's not too many. What concerns
>me
>more is the book, and the misinformation that is being given out about
>telephone surveys.
>
>Does anyone have suggestions about how to respond effectively to this
>publication, publisher, and author?

How do we know it is, in fact, misinformation?

=====
=
Jim Shanahan * jes30@cornell.edu * 607-255-8058 (voice) * 607-255-7905 (fax)
Dept. of Comm., 314 Kennedy Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853
=====
=

>From featherstonf.rced@GAO.GOV Tue Jun 13 14:51:28 1995
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 1995 14:51:28 EST
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "Fran A. Featherston" <featherstonf.rced@GAO.GOV>
Subject: Re: Telephone Surveys

I think there's a loop hole here, folks. You can send information
to the respondent ****before**** you call if you're not using random digit
dialing. That would make it a "research project" and not just a phone
survey.

Has anyone ever tried to generate random phone numbers and use
cross-directories to do a pre-notification letter? Did it work?

(fran)

Fran Featherston
U.S. General Accounting Office
E-mail: featherstonf.rced@gao.gov
Phone: 202-512-4946

_____ Reply Separator

Subject: Telephone Surveys
Author: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR <AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU> at
INTERNET
Date: 6/13/95 2:16 PM

I am passing this information to the entire AAPORNET because it potentially affects all of us. Someone in my office gave me a copy of a page out of the July 1995 issue of the Ladies Home Journal. It was an abstract of a new book by Louise Rafkin, entitled "Street Smarts: A Personal Safety Guide for Women", to be published in August by Harper of San Francisco. Strategy number four on this page is as follows:

"Don't answer phone surveys. They are nearly always scams - either to get you to buy something or to get personal information about your household situation - for example, 'How many people live in your house?' or 'Are you married?'"

I wonder if the book elaborates further on this point. I don't know how many people read this magazine, but I hope it's not too many. What concerns me more is the book, and the misinformation that is being given out about telephone surveys.

Does anyone have suggestions about how to respond effectively to this publication, publisher, and author?

>From R2190@VMCMS.CSUOHIO.EDU Tue Jun 13 15:46:27 1995
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 1995 15:46:27 EST
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Albert Smith <R2190@VMCMS.CSUOHIO.EDU>
Subject: telephone surveys

attached is a response on "telephone surveys" that i sent to the original author, concurring at least in spirit with both other postings that i have subsequently seen on this.

a.f.smith
>Date: 13 June 1995, 15:28:01 EST
From: R2190 at VMCMS.CSUOHIO.EDU
To: tarnai at wsuvm1.csc.wsu.edu
Subject: telephone surveys

it strikes me as being quite plausible that the majority of telephone calls that one receives that are nominally telephone surveys are in fact illegitimate. it might be worth checking on this before getting too upset with author, magazine, and publisher.

'a better approach might be to devise ways to alleviate the suspicions of the suspecting. for example, potential respondents might be asked to call the survey organization collect, or might be advised by letter in advance and given a telephone number to call with any concerns.

if i were a woman living alone or a man living alone, i would be very reluctant to say how many people were in my household.

>From stakacs@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU Tue Jun 13 18:25:50 1995
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 1995 18:25:50 -0400

Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "Scott J. Takacs" <stakacs@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Telephone Surveys
In-Reply-To: <199506131810.AA112399@garnet.acns.fsu.edu> from "John Tarnai"
at
Jun 13, 95 10:30:23 am

John Tarnai writes:

> by Louise Rafkin, entitled "Street Smarts: A Personal Safety Guide
> for
> Women",
> to be published in August by Harper of San Francisco. Strategy number
> four on this page is as follows:
>
> "Don't answer phone surveys. They are nearly always scams -
> either to get you to buy something or to get personal information
> about your household situation - for example, 'How many people
> live in your house?' or 'Are you married?'"
>
[other good points deleted]

> Does anyone have suggestions about how to respond effectively to this
> publication, publisher, and author?
>
Very carefully. The author is clearly against telephone surveys of any
kind. I've seen people who lump *any* unasked telephone call in with
telephone solicitation.

One approach would be to encourage people to ask questions about the
research before giving out *any* information, including a number to call
back (either collect or toll-free) to verify the research is legitimate.
Also note that legitimate researchers don't ask for credit card or check
numbers (except possibly in research to determine how gullible people are),
but scams often do.

I know that when I was at another university, the fundraising people had a
lot more success with a prenotification letter. One way to do
prenotification with random-digit dialing would be to do a direct mail drop
of the entire area to be surveyed, although this would be extremely
expensive (a mail drop with an invitation to call to participate if they are
not surveyed might also give some information about self-selection bias if
it were combined with random-digit dialing).

It seems to me that research follows a kind of Gresham's Law: Bad research
drives out good research. Maybe it would help to point out that we hate
phony "surveys" as much, or more, than anyone else. And if someone hears
what they believe to be a scam, call the police or the Attorney General's
office.

Scott J. Takacs
Doctoral Student, Marketing
The Florida State University
stakacs@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

>From mtrau@UMICH.EDU Tue Jun 13 19:00:50 1995
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 1995 19:00:50 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Michael W Traugott <mtrau@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Telephone Surveys
In-Reply-To: <199506131917.PAA04766@truelies.rs.itd.umich.edu>

Fran - I f you use dual frame designs that involve a part list sample, you can improve efficiency with advance letters. We published a POQ article a couple of years on this, and some additional work has been done. I think Paul Lavrakas has been administering a large-scale experiemtn.

>From pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU Tue Jun 13 23:10:34 1995
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 1995 23:10:34 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: telephone surveys
In-Reply-To: <9506131954.AA02562@email.unc.edu>

When a telephone interviewer asks my wife if there's a man in the house, she says, "Yes, but he can't come to the phone right now. He's busy cleaning his shotgun."

Phil Meyer

>From pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU Tue Jun 13 23:31:08 1995
Date: Tue, 13 Jun 1995 23:31:08 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Times-at-home weight
In-Reply-To: <9506131606.AA07356@email.unc.edu>

In a no-callback design, the respondent is asked if he or she was at home at this time yesterday, the day before, and the day before that. Then the cases are weighted to favor those who were at home less often. Gallup used it when most of his interviews were face-to-face. A clever idea, but ineffective in compensating for failure to reach the not-at-homes -- according to Kish.

Phil Meyer

>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Wed Jun 14 10:45:07 1995
Date: Wed, 14 Jun 1995 10:45:07 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>

From: James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject: SOS

>From Jim Beniger...

I'm sorry that I must report what most of us already know: Behavior on AAPORNET has suddenly taken a precipitous turn for the worse.

In the 18 days since my May 26 posting of "AAPORNETiquette Again," prompted by the then recent arrival on AAPORNET of "a least a half dozen messages best sent to individuals," 52 messages have been posted to our list, an average of 2.9 per day (a not unreasonable number). Of these, I find more than half inappropriate for posting to AAPORNET.

The Details

During the first 12 of the past 18 days, May 27-June 7, 28 messages were posted (2.3 per day), of which 19 (67.9 percent) were indeed appropriate for the list. These included 9 requests for help (from Ewa Golebiowska, Vasja Vehovar, Jack Ludwig, Mary Boynton, Murray Straus, Doris Northrup, Mark Schulman, Fran Featherstone, and Sandra Edwards), certainly among the more important applications of AAPORNET; 6 of these 9 messages included a reminder that replies ought to go to the poster and not to the list--always a welcome part of a request for help. The other 10 appropriate messages included 9 announcements of general interest and 1 summary of responses to a past request, the latter by Frank Rusciano. Because of such postings, these 12 days might well be considered the high point of AAPORNET's first seven months.

During the last 6 days, by contrast, 24 messages were posted (4 per day), of which only 5 (20.8 percent) were appropriate for the list. The appropriate messages included 2 requests for help (from Nancy Belden and John Tarnai), one job posting (from Gayle Coryell), and two announcements of general interest. It is the other 19 messages, inappropriate for our list, and all posted within the last 6 days, that prompt me to post this message of alarm that behavior on AAPORNET has strayed off course.

What types of messages are inappropriate for AAPORNET? The 28 such messages posted since May 27 might be classified as follows:

| | |
|--------------------------|----|
| replies to an individual | 22 |
| spontaneous musings | 2 |
| errors of transmission | 2 |
| apologies for errors | 1 |
| requests for removal | 1 |

Posted replies to an individual posting are inappropriate because they are likely to be numerous, duplicated or otherwise redundant, scattered over several days, and occasionally even misinformed--all reasons why they are best left for summary by the original poster of a request (as in Frank Rusciano's May 31 summary). Spontaneous musings result from responding to AAPORNET messages as if they constituted something akin to a video game, when we are in fact a real social group: AAPOR members meeting for common purpose.

Errors of transmission, like blank messages or references to previous messages not successfully sent, are obviously inappropriate but often

unavoidable. Apologies for inappropriate messages are themselves never appropriate: Because the only offense is the posting of an unnecessary message, any posted apology precisely doubles the offense (apologies sent to individuals who politely complain to you are always appropriate, of course). Requests for removal should never be posted to an entire list (a sure sign that the poster is new to the Internet) because an automatic machine-generated subscription notice informs each new arrival how to unsubscribe without help and, failing at this, you ought to send your request to the list manager (on AAPORNET, to beniger@rcf.usc.edu) and not to the list.

Explanations and Conclusions

Why must we collectively work to minimize inappropriate messages? Because these constitute the major if not only reason why AAPOR members who would otherwise belong to AAPORNET drop off our list. Because such dropouts often constitute the more knowledgeable and connected (but unfortunately very busy) AAPOR members, each inappropriate message threatens to diminish disproportionately the value of our list when we wish to rely on it for advice or other help--including the securing of new jobs (the Benthamite implication, of course, is that persistent transgressors should themselves be dropped from the list).

It is therefore hardly surprising that AAPOR's Executive Council, at its May 18 meeting in Fort Lauderdale, agreed without dissent that bringing in and keeping the largest possible number of AAPOR members on AAPORNET is the highest priority for our list. And who among us who has resorted to the list for help could possibly disagree? (certainly no Conference chair)

There is a second reason to minimize inappropriate messages to our list--the reason why I keep stressing the number of AAPORNET subscribers (currently around 900). Assuming that even the briefest message takes at least 20 seconds to scan and delete (certainly a conservative estimate), each inappropriate message to AAPORNET currently wastes a minimum of 5 person-hours of our collective time. Please try to keep each one of us 900 friends and colleagues in mind before you press whatever key irretrievably sends your message onto the Internet.

This plea has, of course, a downside: It might discourage those with appropriate messages from posting them to AAPORNET. If so, the cure will certainly be worse than the ailment. Those who might feel intimidated should know, however, that at least in my experience, virtually all AAPORNET members are willing to read any number of requests for legitimate help from fellow members (we all know this as the spirit of AAPOR). And everyone understands that even the most esoteric requests must be posted to the entire list, since no one can know in advance which few subscribers might be able to help.

What I do also find, however, is little tolerance for messages that are inept or frivolous (tolerance for the former being much greater than for the latter, in expectation that newcomers will learn quickly). Nor do I find much tolerance for requests that suggest laziness in research (questions like "Can anyone remind me of the definition of 'standard error'?" are obviously inappropriate).

How might you know if any given message is appropriate for posting to AAPORNET? Here's what I think the response of most people on our list would

be: If your message is a job posting, is a request for advice on a new line of research or a new course syllabus, is related to the annual conference or other formal AAPOR business, or is any other announcement likely to be of general interest to a reasonable number of AAPOR members, the answer is "yes." If, however, your message is an idle observation or question, a spontaneous witticism, a request to be educated on a narrow topic easily found in the index of a book, or a message better directed at one or a few known individuals, the answer is "no."

Who am I to say what is appropriate and what is not? The answer is that I am obviously not one to say, nor is anyone else. As in any social group in which each individual has complete freedom to act, the behavior of each can be checked only through the constructive criticism of all. If the rest of you do not join me in gently chiding each transgressor, we will soon have the AAPORNET we deserve--one with much idle chit chat, far fewer members, and especially fewer of those most likely to help each of us remaining on the list whenever it might be that we could profit from such help.

I welcome your comments, sent directly to me and NOT posted to the list--but of course!

>From lavrakas@CASBAH.ACNS.NWU.EDU Thu Jun 15 09:13:00 1995
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 1995 09:13:00 -0600
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas@CASBAH.ACNS.NWU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Telephone Surveys

For those interested in using advance letters in RDD surveys, request a copy of the recent AAPOR paper:

"USING ADVANCE LETTERS IN RDD TELEPHONE SURVEYS;" Camburn, Lavrakas, Battaglia, Massey & Wright.

This paper reports the findings of an experimental design which tested four different letter-conditions and had more than 60,000 households assigned across conditions.

Contact Maggie Venneri (Abt Associates) at 312-621-4147.
* * * * *
* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.; Professor & Director *
* Northwestern Univ. Survey Lab, 625 Haven, Evanston IL 60208 *
* Office: 708-491-8356 Fax: 708-467-1564 *
* * * * *

>From lavrakas@CASBAH.ACNS.NWU.EDU Thu Jun 15 09:36:14 1995
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 1995 09:36:14 -0600
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas@CASBAH.ACNS.NWU.EDU>
Subject: Discouraging participation in Telephone Surveys

I'm responding to John Tarnai's recent message about the Ladies Home Journal

article.

I plan to buy the magazine and if I find it both wrong and harmful towards serious survey research, which it seems likely that I will from John's message, I will write a letter to the LHJ editor. I encourage others to do the same. Some of my commentary to LHJ will address the issue of what questions a concerned respondent can and should ask an interviewer to develop more confidence that the call is a legitimate survey.

Some of the responses to John's message appear to have failed to take into account the facts that quality surveys still have good unit response rates and very good item response rates to personal demographics such as # of persons in the household, marital status -- with over 95% of the public answering these. Thus, we do not have a terribly paranoid public as yet, at least when we do our work in a professional manner that signals the respondent that we are on the up and up.

However, ignoring the harm that can be caused by this article (and book), assuming we judge them to be in error as it speaks to surveys, is quite dangerous for our profession.

* * * * *
* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.; Professor & Director *
* Northwestern Univ. Survey Lab, 625 Haven, Evanston IL 60208 *
* Office: 708-491-8356 Fax: 708-467-1564 *
* * * * *

>From ChunY@OEUS.PSB.BLS.GOV Thu Jun 15 15:18:00 1995
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 1995 15:18:00 EDT
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Chun_Y <ChunY@OEUS.PSB.BLS.GOV>
Subject: February Pentagon Paper

Last February, the Pentagon issued a major policy paper that laid out the administration's rationale for maintaining the 100,000 U.S. military troops in Asia, mostly in Japan and South Korea even after the Cold War ended. Its content provides important materials that help to study in an upcoming survey the public's perception of why U.S. troops are being stationed in that area.

If you know how to get a copy of this Pentagon paper, please reply to me directly at

ChunY@oeus.psb.bls.gov

Thanks in advance. - Young

>From kinder12@AZTEC.ASU.EDU Thu Jun 15 16:31:28 1995
Date: Thu, 15 Jun 1995 16:31:28 -0700
Reply-To: kinder12@aztec.asu.edu
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: BILL KINDER <kinder12@AZTEC.ASU.EDU>
Subject: help with questionnaire

Can someone on the AAPOR list refer me to a community that has successfully

used a public opinion poll to measure the perception of community safety. I am specifically concerned with the millions of tax dollars being wasted on ineffective and unmeasured responses to the youth gang and graffiti problem. My research has not uncovered one program in the US that has even made an attempt to create an effective measurement method short of the usual arrest records count or the number of square feet of wall painted over or cleaned of graffiti. Neither of these statistics address the public perception of vandalism and graffiti which in turn is reflected in poor retail sales, lower property values, high real estate turnover, etc.

I appreciate your help to one who is not an opinion research professional.

Please respond directly to kinder12@aztec.asu.edu not to the list.

```
>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Fri Jun 16 10:45:20 1995
Date:      Fri, 16 Jun 1995 10:45:20 -0700
Reply-To:  News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender:    News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From:      James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject:   How to Find Discussion Lists
```

How to Find Discussion Lists

The June 5 reposting of "Top 15 Lists of Interest to AAPOR Members" has brought a flood of requests for lists on a wide range of topics. Several such requests have also been posted to AAPORNET, for example, on April 17, when Frank Rusciano asked for suggestions for "discussion groups on the net dealing with anthropology, German studies, or European studies."

Considering this growing interest on AAPORNET in finding lists and discussions on specialized topics, there might also be interest in how personally to conduct searches for lists on whatever subject you like. I use the following algorithm (all lines are left-justified):

```
//ListSrch JOB   Echo=No
Database Search DD=Rules
//Rules DD *
search TOPIC in lists
index
search TOPIC in intgroup
index
search TOPIC in new-list
index
```

Simply store this EXACTLY as it appears above. When you wish to find a list or discussion group on any imaginable topic, say money, just call up the algorithm and substitute "money" for "TOPIC" (no quotation marks; case is irrelevant) in the three places in the algorithm where the latter term appears. Then send this, and ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ELSE (you are programming a computer in North Dakota here), to:

listserv@vm1.nodak.edu

Results of your search should arrive at your net address within a few hours (depending on the day and time). You might search any word you like, although obviously poorly chosen ones will produce inconveniently many

results or a null report (in the latter case, recheck the spelling).

Because this algorithm searches all of each of the brief descriptions of lists written by those who first establish them, it often turns up lists whose main topics have no direct link to your word: Were Professor Rusciano to search using "Europe," for example, he might be notified of lists devoted to food, geography, or NATO--all subsets of European studies as most broadly defined.

Because your search will be processed automatically by machine, you might well pursue your most secret fantasies using this algorithm. If you plan to run for high public office, however, I wouldn't. I also wouldn't if there is even the slightest chance that you might accidentally post your request to AAPORNET--although some of us might live in hope that at least a few ignore this advice.

If you find any really interesting lists, on whatever subject, please let me know and--with your permission--I'll eventually post a list of your lists here on AAPORNET.

```
>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Tue Jun 20 05:53:44 1995
Date: Tue, 20 Jun 1995 05:53:44 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject: In Case You Wouldn't Notice...
```

On or about this Wednesday, June 21, AAPORNET will move from Listserv/vm to Listproc 7.1 on unix.

This change will be all but invisible to anyone on AAPORNET who does not care to be bothered with it, with two exceptions:

- (1) "listserv" will become "listproc"
- (2) "vm.usc.edu" will simplify to "usc.edu"

If you do not interact with AAPORNET in any way, you will need to do nothing at all. If you do interact, either by posting messages to the list (i.e., to all of us), or by sending programming messages to listserv (soon to be listproc), you will want to note changes in the two relevant addresses:

| IN ORDER TO: | ADDRESS IS NOW: | IT WILL BECOME: |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| ----- | ----- | ----- |
| post to us all | aapornet@vm.usc.edu | aapornet@usc.edu |
| send programming | listserv@vm.usc.edu | listproc@usc.edu |

GOOD NEWS: If we forget, our mail to the list (AAPORNET) will be automatically forwarded to the new address; our mail to the former software (listserv) will return a message reminding us of the new software and address (listproc@usc.edu).

We will of course be notified of the change here on AAPORNET the minute it

occurs.

If you wish to talk out loud about this, note that "listproc" is pronounced with a hard "c"--as in "proctology."

Technophiles among us might already recognize this as a change for the better, one that will allow us eventually to do new things here on AAPORNET--things that many of us are eager to do (like form subgroups for more intense discussion of particular topics). But first things first...

>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Wed Jun 21 06:32:06 1995
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 1995 06:32:06 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject: E-journal Conference (fwd)

The following announcement has been sent to AAPORNET by two non-members, Dr. Zsolt Orczan and Csaba S. Orczan, who are the publisher and chief editor, respectively, of Magyar Elektronikus Tozsde (MET), the Hungarian Electronic Exchange. It is posted here because of its possible interest to some of us on AAPORNET. -- JRB

----- Forwarded message -----
Date: 21 Jun 95 09:58:06 +0100
From: H4458Orc@ella.hu
To: AAPORNET-REQUEST@VM.usc.edu
Subject: E-journal Conference

MAGYAR ELEKTRONIKUS TOZSDE HU-ISSN_1216-0229
HUNGARIAN ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE copyright 1990.

Dear Sir,

We organize an international

ELECTRONIC JOURNAL CONFERENCE

*** WE INVITE OWNERS, JOURNALISTS, MODERATORS, EDITORS and PUBLISHERS ***
to BUDAPEST, HUNGARY
on November 9-10-11 ,1995

TOPICS:

- * ELECTRONIC JOURNAL, NEWSLETTER WRITING, EDITING AND PUBLISHING
- * PUBLIC RELATIONS IN THE E-JOURNAL, GOPHER AND WWW

CALL FOR PAPERS

Papers are invited on all subjects mentioned. Please submit ASCII text and image (uencode) [written in English] 5.000 words containing a 65 character/line a brief abstract (at max. 5 lines long)

MET@huearn.sztaki.hu
subject: papers

Lecture Authors will be notified about the acceptance of papers by August

20, 1995. The conference proceedings are intended to be published on floppy disc.

CONFERENCE LANGUAGE: English (translation into Hungarian)

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Csaba S. Orczan [chair]
Zsolt Orczan Dr [co-chair] orczanz@mars.iif.hu

SOCIAL PROGRAMME

Welcome Cocktail November 9, 1995
Excursion , Theatre, Opera...

CALL FOR PARTICIPATION

To participate in the conference please fill in and e-mail the attached Registration Form to the met@huearn.sztaki.hu at your earliest convenience. Please note that for early registration a reduced fee is applicable. You will receive the confirmation of your participation and the detailed program in due time.

Early Registration until August 20, 1995

FEES

| | |
|-------------------|---------|
| before August 20, | after |
| 299 USD | 350 USD |

ACCOMPANYING PERSONS

are welcome and may attend the welcome cocktail, the Conference reception and the lunches on the conference days at a fee of: 120 USD

PAYMENT

Participants are kindly requested to transfer the fees to the following:

MoneyGram to AMERICAN EXPRESS BUDAPEST HUNGARY-1052, ORCZAN Zsolt

or POSTA BANK Budapest H-1920 account number: 131-121844 ORCZAN Zsolt

Please note that in case of cancellation only a 50 % of the paid fee will be refunded.

CONFERENCE SECRETARIAT

MET Budapest Pf.311 Hungary H-1536
e-mail: met@huearn.sztaki.hu

.....cut here.....

REGISTRATION FORM

Family Name:... ... male/female

First Name(s):...

Address:...

e-mail:...

Telephone:...

I intend to submit a paper ... yes/no

Title /area of paper:...

Technical equipment required:...

I pay the fee MoneyGram ... yes/no or Bank account ...yes/no
transaction date:... and number.....

I register ... accompanying persons.

Please send me information about available accomodations ... yes/no I need a hotel room ... single/double luxus...five star(*****)...four star (****)...three star (***)...yes/no Date from to

Please inform me about Excursion, Theatre, or Opera... yes/no

.....cut here.....

About BUDAPEST

In 1835, an English peer by the name of John Paget got his first look of Buda and Pest from the crest of Gellert Hill. Of what he saw there he wrote as follows: "Buda with its blue chain of hills, Pest with its yellow plain, and the majestic Danube with its green isles were all sprawled out at our feet... and we sat for some time, enthralled by all that beauty... One hundred and fifty years have passed since the ousting of the Turk, and in this space of time, the city has risen from squalid ruins to become one of the great cities of Europe. Pest owes its progress not to the good will of a benevolent ruler, but to its natural endowments and the energy of its people... It lies on the banks of a river that traverses half of Europe, and may expand unbounded in every direction. All this leads one to anticipate a splendid future for Pest-Buda."

It is interesting to compare Paget's description with the observation made by the geographer Kohl from Bremen just seven years later. The order-loving German appraised the city with satisfaction: "Pest was conceived in an orderly manner, the city plan was elaborated with proper circumspection. The main thoroughfares leading in every direction from the centre of the town are broad and straight." The haphazardness of Buda, however, was less to his liking. "There is no sign of planning. The streets are neither centralized nor straight; consequently, the town has no core, and in its network of streets, one will find nothing that resembles order. The reason for this is the unfavourable soil and the fact that the roads are cut off by hills, preventing the population from building their houses in a rational manner."

Whether we think of the past or the present, the description is faithful. Whether to its advantage or otherwise, Pest is comparable to other big cities lying on the plain. But Buda is unique, like Stockholm, Istanbul, or Rio, and this is due precisely to its "disorderliness". Pest may expand without constraint, but Buda is bound by the surrounding hill country. In the course of its development, Pest has smothered and devoured its environment, as most big cities do. But even today, Buda is inseparable from it, despite the fact that the "peaceful coexistence" between man and nature is being increasingly threatened. More and more houses are appearing on the formerly sparsely populated hillsides, and the tentacles of urbanization feel their way not only upward: they bore their way into the remotest hollows of the valleys. Small plots of land are being congested by large houses, and even sometimes entire neighbourhoods; the gardens are shrinking, the woods receding into the distance. New roads are being built, public utilities, service accommodations established.

Nevertheless, Buda continued to be characterized not so much by its wreath of hills as by the fragmentedness of its inner area. It has no rational geometrical scheme. The inner city hills - Rozsadbomb,

Naphegy, Varhegy (Castle Hill), Gellert-hegy and Sashegy, - which boast perhaps the world's only big city nature conservation area, divide the body of the town into sections, thus giving the whole a diversified, exciting aspect. The old sixteenth-century Italian saying according to which the world has three gems: Venice on the water, Florence on the plain, and Buda on the hill, in all probability still holds true, and so does the ironic saying of Hungarian architects, according to which the natural endowments of Buda are so beautiful that even they, the architects. can't wipe them out completely.

Please reply as soon as possible!
Yours sincerely,
Dr. ORCZAN, Zsolt & ORCZAN Csaba

| MET Publisher: ORCZAN, Zsolt e-mail.:orczanz@mars.iif.hu |
| MET Chief editor: ORCZAN, Csaba e-mail.:orczanc@mars.iif.hu |
**** MET BUDAPEST PoBox. 311. HUNGARY, H-1536 **** MET@HUEARN ****

>From beniger@RCF.USC.EDU Wed Jun 21 09:20:29 1995
Date: Wed, 21 Jun 1995 09:20:29 -0700
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: James Beniger <beniger@RCF.USC.EDU>
Subject: News of the Net

NEWS OF THE NET (AND TWO SURVEYS RELATED TO THE NET)

PUBLISHERS WARILY EYE THE NET

Members of the Association of American Publishers have decided that they must become actively involved in the deployment of online information distribution systems, or get left behind in the dust. Up until now, worries over rampant unauthorized dissemination have resulted in "significant hesitation about investing" in electronic publishing, says the chairman of the AAP's Enabling Technologies Committee. Now, they've decided to try to resolve copyright issues "before copyright infringement on the network becomes very widespread and assumed to be the way the network works. It's a recognition that whereas in the past, publishing members of the AAP have been able to leave technological concerns to suppliers -- such as compositors, typesetters and printers -- in network publishing we cannot leave it to others." (Chronicle of Higher Education 6/23/95 A18)

KICKING THE TIRES OF THE INTERNET

With more than 21,000 businesses -- up from 1,000 in 1990 -- on the Internet, business executives everywhere are asking, "What can the Net do for me?" But at this point industry analysts say most corporate Web pages are nothing more than electronic vanity plates on the information superhighway. "Right now, the large commercial customers that I deal with have great reservations about the Internet for any mission-critical applications," says Bell Atlantic's president for large business services. "There are security issues, network-access issues, control issues." A Yankee Group analyst refers to it as "still kicking the tires of the Internet." Still, more than a third of companies recently surveyed by the Yankee Group say they have plans to sell their products and services over the Internet, and a third plan to use the Web for advertising. Almost half are currently using the Net to track inventory or product schedules.

(Business Week 6/26/95 p.100)

EUROPEANS YAWN AT INTERACTIVE TV

Companies such as British Telecommunications and Deutsche Telekom are trying to figure out what it is that Europeans really want to do with their home computers -- and they're still not sure. A recent survey of European consumers indicates that very few are engaged in what are considered "precursor behaviors" to interactive television use, such as video rental, mail-order purchasing and home delivery of take-out food. While 75% of U.S. homes with VCRs rent a movie at least once a month, only 40% of Western Europeans do. Only 21% of Europeans have take-out food delivered, and an even smaller percentage -- 19% -- of consumers in France and Britain express a strong interest in video-on-demand services. (Wall Street Journal 6/20/95 B10B)

GERMANY'S MINISTER FOR THE FUTURE

In a forward-looking move, Germany has combined education, science, research and technology under the ministerial umbrella of "The Future." The ministry's goal is to build on Germany's advantage in terms of installed fiber optic cables and ISDN connections "to make projects out of new ideas," says Juergen Ruetters, the Minister for the Future. "We are on the brink of revolutionary changes, comparable to the leap from a bicycle to a jet plane. He who comes too late will be punished by the market." Still, there are many entrenched customs and practices to overcome, particularly Germany's strong labor representation and consensus management traditions. (Wall Street Journal 6/20/95 B10B)

MONTREAL FREE NET

The Quebec government has contributed \$616,000 toward setting up a Free Net in Montreal which will provide services in both French and English, as an integral part of the government's plan to bring the province up to speed on the info-highway and to promote the use of French on the Internet. (Montreal Gazette 6/20/95 A6)

>From Edupage (6/20/95), compiled by John Gehl and Suzanne Douglas.

>From RUSCIANO@ENIGMA.RIDER.EDU Thu Jun 22 15:39:07 1995
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 1995 15:39:07 -0400
Reply-To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
Sender: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR
<AAPORNET@USCVM.BITNET>
From: Frank Louis Rusciano <RUSCIANO@ENIGMA.RIDER.EDU>
Subject: Kennedy/Nixon debates

Colleagues:

I have a historical question regarding the Kennedy/Nixon debates that keeps coming up in discussions, and which bothers me from a methodological point of view. It is an almost apocryphal (sp?) story that individuals who watched the debate on TV thought Kennedy won, while individuals who heard the debate on radio thought Nixon had won (or more properly, a majority or plurality of\ each group held these opinions. This finding is usually cited as an example of the first evidence of the importance of image and style on television for Presidential campaigns.

Herein lies my question. First, where did this data come from? Second, and more importantly, did anyone ever test this thesis using the demographic characteristics of individuals owning TV's in 1960, as opposed to the demographic characteristics of individuals just owning radios. My point is that this finding (if it is correct) may have less to do with images on television, and more to do with the types of people who owned TV's or radios only in 1960. For example, perhaps people in more rural areas were less likely to have TV's, and more likely to be sympathetic to Nixon, thereby affecting their judgment of the results.

Any thoughts on this point-- a critical story in political communication-- would be greatly appreciated. Please respond directly to me, unless there is a general feeling that other individuals on the net would also be interested in the answers.

Thanks.

Frank L. Rusciano

email at rusciano@enigma.rider.edu

>From welliott@siu.edu Thu Jun 22 14:55:14 1995

Return-Path: <@VM.usc.edu,@SIUCVMB.SIU.EDU:welliott@SIU.EDU>

Received: from VM.USC.EDU (vm.usc.edu [128.125.241.1])

by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with SMTP

id OAA22347 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Thu, 22 Jun 1995 14:55:10 -0700

Received: from VM.USC.EDU by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with BSMTMP id 9108;

Thu, 22 Jun 95 15:00:17 PDT

Received: from USCVM (NJE origin SMTP@USCVM) by VM.USC.EDU (LMail

V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 7184 for <AAPORNET@USCVM>; Thu, 22 Jun 1995

15:00:16 -0700

Received: from SIUCVMB.SIU.EDU by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with TCP;

Thu, 22 Jun 95 15:00:15 PDT

Received: from [131.230.97.36] by SIUCVMB.SIU.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with TCP;

Thu, 22 Jun 95 16:52:52 CST

X-Sender: welliott@saluki-mail.siu.edu

Message-Id: <v01510101ac0f9de31995@[131.230.97.36]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Thu, 22 Jun 1995 16:55:52 -0600

To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR <AAPORNET@VM.usc.edu>

From: welliott@siu.edu (W. R. Elliott)

Subject: Re: Kennedy/Nixon debates

>Colleagues:

>

>I have a historical question regarding the Kennedy/Nixon debates that

>keeps coming up in discussions, and which bothers me from a

>methodological point of view. It is an almost apocryphal (sp?) story

>that individuals who watched the debate on TV thought Kennedy won,

>while individuals who heard the debate on radio thought Nixon had won

>(or more properly, a majority or plurality of\ each group held these

>opinions. This finding is usually cited as an example of the first

>evidence of the importance of image and style on television for

>Presidential campaigns.

>

>Herein lies my question. First, where did this data come from?

>Second, and more importantly, did anyone ever test this thesis using
>the demographic characteristics of individuals owning TV's in 1960, as
>opposed to the demographic characteristics of individuals just owning
>radios. My point is that this finding (if it is correct) may have less
>to do with images on television, and more to do with the types of
>people who owned TV's or radios only in 1960. For example, perhaps
>people in more rural areas were less likely to have TV's, and more
>likely to be sympathetic to Nixon, thereby affecting their judgment of
>the results.

>

>Any thoughts on this point-- a critical story in political
>communication-- would be greatly appreciated. Please respond directly
>to me, unless there is a general feeling that other individuals on the
>net would also be interested in the answers.

>

>Thanks.

>

>Frank L. Rusciano

>email at rusciano@enigma.rider.edu

In *Understanding Media* (1964, p. 261), Marshall McLuhan states the following:

"In the Kennedy-Nixon debates, those who heard them on radio received an overwhelming idea of Nixon's superiority. It was Nixon's fate to provide a sharp, high-definition image and action for the cool TV medium that translated that sharp image into the impression of a phony."

Hellweg, Pfau and Brydon (*Televised Presidential Debates*, 1992) provide a brief discussion of research suggesting that whatever evidence for this assertion that does exist is weak. Quoting Vancil and Pendell (*Central States Speech Journal*, 38, 16-27, 1987), they note that "none of the evidence in support of it withstands close scrutiny" (Vancil and Pendell 1987, p. 24).

I recall one study in the Kraus's *The Great Debates: Kennedy vs. Nixon, 1960* (1962) that did look at the radio audience but I do not have a copy of Kraus handy.

Hope this helps somewhat.

William R. Elliott
Associate Dean
College of Mass Communication and Media Arts
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale, IL 62901-6606
618/453-3267 VOICE
618/453-7714 FAX

>From BGROVES@survey.umd.edu Thu Jun 22 15:16:34 1995
Return-Path: <@VM.usc.edu:BGROVES@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
Received: from VM.USC.EDU (vm.usc.edu [128.125.241.1])
by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with SMTP
id PAA24921 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Thu, 22 Jun 1995 15:16:29 -0700
Received: from VM.USC.EDU by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with BSMTMP id

9184;

Thu, 22 Jun 95 15:21:27 PDT
Received: from USCVM (NJE origin SMTP@USCVM) by VM.USC.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 7348 for <aapornet@USCVM>; Thu, 22 Jun 1995 15:19:01 -0700
Received: from umail.UMD.EDU by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with TCP;
Thu, 22 Jun 95 15:18:57 PDT
Received: by umail.UMD.EDU (5.57/Ultrix3.0-C)
id AA10677; Thu, 22 Jun 95 18:13:43 -0400
Received: from SURVEY/MAILQUEUE1 by survey.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);
Thu, 22 Jun 95 18:16:43 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by SURVEY (Mercury 1.13); Thu, 22 Jun 95 18:16:13 +1100
From: "Bob Groves" <BGROVES@survey.umd.edu>
Organization: The Joint Program In Survey Meth.
To: aapornet@VM.usc.edu
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 1995 18:16:07 EST
Subject: Message from COSSA re NSF
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.01)
Message-Id: <FAE38607E93@survey.umd.edu>

I received from Howard Silver of COSSA the following message this afternoon about Congressional activities affecting NSF:

The Science Committee has postponed its markup of the NSF Reauthorization bill until next week, possibly Wednesday. As of today, Mr. Walker's intentions are: to insert in the bill itself a provision limiting NSF to only six Assistant Directors (it currently has seven). The names or jurisdictions of these are not specified. NSF will be given discretion as how they will achieve this reduction. They are required to report back to the Committee by November 15. There will be report language that suggests that SBE since it is the newest and smallest directorate should be scrutinized long and hard as to whether it supports basic research. The report language will give a strong suggestion that SBE be eliminated, but will not say so directly. George Brown is expected to offer a substitute amendment along the lines David J. suggested in his memo -- a study of NSF organization. He will probably lose. He will also write a dissenting views to the report that will stress the importance of the SBE sciences and its directorate. The Science Board met today and will meet again tomorrow. Walker had breakfast with them, but there are no indications that any direct discussion of SBE occurred. Herb Simon also made a presentation to the Board, at the invitation of the Computer Science Directorate. There was a comment that at a time when SBE was under attack Herb's presentation clearly made the case for the importance of behavioral research. (This was reported to me, I was not there.) Nobody informed us of his appearance. This is what I know. Howard

>From MKlette@aol.com Thu Jun 22 18:47:34 1995
Return-Path: <@VM.usc.edu:MKlette@AOL.COM>
Received: from VM.USC.EDU (vm.usc.edu [128.125.241.1])
by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with SMTP
id SAA11176 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Thu, 22 Jun 1995 18:47:32 -0700
Received: from VM.USC.EDU by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with BSMTMP id 9966;
Thu, 22 Jun 95 18:52:40 PDT

Received: from USCVM (NJE origin SMTP@USCVM) by VM.USC.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 9024 for <AAPORNET@USCVM>; Thu, 22 Jun 1995 18:52:40 -0700

Received: from mail04.mail.aol.com by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with TCP;

Thu, 22 Jun 95 18:52:39 PDT

Received: by mail04.mail.aol.com

(1.37.109.11/16.2) id AA153262049; Thu, 22 Jun 1995 21:47:29 -0400

Date: Thu, 22 Jun 1995 21:47:29 -0400

From: MKlette@aol.com

Message-Id: <950622214724_100505996@aol.com>

To: AAPORNET@VM.usc.edu

Subject: Re: Kennedy/Nixon debates

I don't have the specifics, but I think I can get you started. I heard that this was a market research poll done in the Philadelphia area. There was no screen, so young children may have been included. The question was a that was put in just for fun.

I do hope that someone knows the truth.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Jun 25 10:05:04 1995

Return-Path: <@VM.usc.edu:beniger@ALNITAK.USC.EDU>

Received: from VM.USC.EDU (vm.usc.edu [128.125.241.1])

by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with SMTP

id KAA10553 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Sun, 25 Jun 1995 10:05:03 -0700

Received: from VM.USC.EDU by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with BSMTMP id 9310;

Sun, 25 Jun 95 10:10:12 PDT

Received: from USCVM (NJE origin SMTP@USCVM) by VM.USC.EDU (LMail

V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 9756 for <aapornet@USCVM>; Sun, 25 Jun 1995

10:10:12 -0700

Received: from almaak.usc.edu by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with TCP;

Sun, 25 Jun 95 10:10:11 PDT

Received: (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.7+ucs)

id KAA13754; Sun, 25 Jun 1995 10:05:00 -0700

Date: Sun, 25 Jun 1995 10:04:58 -0700 (PDT)

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

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

Subject: AAPORNET Has Moved (to Listproc 7.1 on Unix)

Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950625095814.13305A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

In case you haven't notice (which was precisely the intention), AAPORNET moved from Listserv/vm to Listproc 7.1 on unix last Thursday, June 22, at approximately 1:20 pm PDT (4:20 pm EDT). A message from William R. Elliott was the first to be posted using Listproc; the one you are now reading is the fourth. All four of these messages were sent to AAPORNET's now obsolete Listserv address, proof enough that the automatic forwarding of such mail does indeed work.

To repeat from the announcement of this change posted here on June 20, the move to Listproc 7.1 on unix should be all but invisible to anyone on

AAPORNET who does not care to be bothered with it, with two exceptions:

- (1) "listserv" will become "listproc"
- (2) "vm.usc.edu" will simplify to "usc.edu"

If you do not interact with AAPORNET in any way, you will need to do nothing at all. If you do interact, either by posting messages to the list (i.e., to all of us), or by sending programming messages to listserv (soon to be listproc), you will want to note changes in the two relevant addresses:

| IN ORDER TO: | ADDRESS USED TO BE: | ADDRESS IS NOW: |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| ----- | ----- | ----- |
| post to us all | aapornet@vm.usc.edu | aapornet@usc.edu |
| send programming | listserv@vm.usc.edu | listproc@usc.edu |

GOOD NEWS: If we forget, our mail to the list (AAPORNET) will be automatically forwarded to the new address; our mail to the former software (listserv) will return a message reminding us of the new address (listproc@usc.edu).

If you wish to talk out loud about this, note that "listproc" is pronounced with a hard "c"--as in "ad hoc havoc" (what we are attempting to avoid in messages posted to AAPORNET).

The move to Listproc 7.1 on unix should enable us to do new things here on AAPORNET--and to do our already familiar things even better. More on this as we become better acquainted with our new unix home.

```
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Jun 26 12:47:52 1995
Return-Path: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
    by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with ESMTTP
    id MAA03848 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Jun 1995 12:47:51 -0700
Received: (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.7+ucs)
    id MAA12484; Mon, 26 Jun 1995 12:47:48 -0700
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 1995 12:47:47 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Zsolt Orczan
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950626122451.2557D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
```

After Zsolt Orczan sent his announcement of the Electronic Journal Conference in Budapest to AAPORNET on June 21, I answered his questions about AAPOR and asked him to describe his Magyar Elektronikus Tozsde (MET), the Hungarian Electronic Exchange, for AAPORNET subscribers; his reply follows. You are encouraged to email him if you should ever need a contact in--or information about--Hungary. -- JRB

```
----- Forwarded message -----
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 1995 12:45:01 +0200 (MET DST)
From: Zsolt Orczan <orczanz@mars.iif.hu>
```

To: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
Subject: Magyar Elektronikus Tozsde

_____MAGYAR ELEKTRONIKUS TOZSDE_____HU-ISSN_1216-0229
HUNGARIAN ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE copyright 1990.

What is the electronic journal?

'Digital express train around the world - news traveling around the world in minutes' we could go on quoting the slogans.

These electronic news surfaces that can be read on computers could be imagined as teletext at its the best, although they are more than that because they are more compact, more essential sources of information as they can be read in a much wider range. Messages sent through the computer networks that connect different parts of the world or through satellite networks can reach everywhere. What's more, these journals adopt the news from each other and thus the news is multiplied and sent on free of charge.

Our electronic stock exchange journal established in 1990 was supplemented by a new column 'Online Parliament' in 1993.

Our electronic journal was aimed at promoting Hungary's integration in Europe in an interactive way.

Our electronic journal in the Hungarian and English languages is circulated through world computer networks. (Our journal reaches to more than 50 countries through computer networks such as Bitnet, Earn, Internet, etc., and it could be read by 60 million people in the Hungarian or English languages.)

Our electronic journal is circulated free of charge through the main frame of HUEARN in accordance with Internet requirements, with the technical support of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and IIF programme.

After the successful launch of the Online Parliament column in the spring of 1994, about 50 international correspondents gave the news of our world leading interactive electronic journal.

At present we are making preparations for MET's new audio-visual real-time interactive electronic journal.

Subscription to/signing off our columns:

Send e-mail to LISTSERV@HUEARN address

Write in the body: sub MET-TOZS Full name

After sending the above line the listserv will answer soon telling you that you have subscribed to the Stock Exchange Column of the Hungarian Electronic Exchange.

Best wishes,
Dr ORCZAN Zsolt

| Rovataink Megrendelese, lemondasa: /sub; unsub by listserv@HUEARN |
|Tozsde: MET-TOZS; Online Orszghaz: MET-OHAZ; Online Parliament: MET-PARL |
| Publisher /Kiado: ORCZAN, Zsolt e-mail.:orczanz@mars.iif.hu |
| Chief editor /Foszerkeszto: ORCZAN, Csaba e-mail.:orczanc@mars.iif.hu |

| FREE SERVICE, DIJMENTES KIADVANY |
|but all contributions are welcome. / de koszonettel fogadjuk a
|tamogatast|
*** MET BUDAPEST PoBox. 311. HUNGARY, H-1536 *** IB000EA5@HUEARN ***
>From PMOY@macc.wisc.edu Mon Jun 26 14:12:38 1995
Return-Path: PMOY@macc.wisc.edu
Received: from vms2.macc.wisc.edu (vms2.macc.wisc.edu [128.104.30.11])
by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with SMTP
id OAA11640 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Mon, 26 Jun 1995 14:12:37 -0700
Received: from VMSmail by vms2.macc.wisc.edu; Mon, 26 Jun 95 16:12 CDT
Message-Id: <25062616123759@vms2.macc.wisc.edu>
Date: Mon, 26 Jun 95 16:12 CDT
From: Patricia Moy <PMOY@macc.wisc.edu>
Subject: MAPOR PANEL: PUBLIC OPINION IN EASTERN EUROPE
To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU
X-VMS-To: IN%"aapornet@usc.edu",PMOY

My apologies for any duplicate postings:

Annual Conference: Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research November
17-18, 1995 The Radisson Hotel & Suites Chicago Chicago, Illinois

The Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, a chapter of the
American Association for Public Opinion Research, invites proposals for
papers or presentations related to public opinion processes or opinion
research methods. Proposals on all topics in public opinion are welcome,
but must be directly related to public opinion, such as theoretical issues,
analysis of public opinion data, or survey methodologies.

A few AAPORNETters have, outside this forum, expressed interest in forming a
MAPOR panel on public opinion in Eastern Europe. As with the more general
MAPOR call for proposals, topics on this panel may include, but are not
limited to:

- * the analysis of quantitative and/or qualitative public opinion data in E.
Europe
- * the analysis of public opinion data across nations or other demographic
subgroups
- * the analysis of longitudinal data after the fall of the Iron Curtain
- * the role of the mass media in the formation of public opinion in E. Europe
- * the role of public opinion in (emerging) democracies
- * methodological issues as they relate to public opinion research in the
area
- * the role of qualitative research in the study of public opinion in E.
Europe

As you may recall, the MAPOR deadline is this Friday, 30 June. If you are
interested in joining this panel, or know someone who is, please respond
directly to me at PMOY@MACC.WISC.EDU.

Patricia Moy

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 27 08:59:45 1995
Return-Path: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with ESMTTP
id IAA13194 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Jun 1995 08:59:36 -0700

Received: (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.7+ucs)
id IAA04562; Tue, 27 Jun 1995 08:59:36 -0700
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 1995 08:59:35 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: NEWS OF THE NET OF INTEREST TO AAPORNET
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950627084146.2623C-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

NEWS OF THE NET (Including One Survey) OF INTEREST TO AAPORNET

KEEPING WEB NUMBERS HONEST

Up until now, the number of "hits" has been the primary benchmark for judging the popularity of a Web site. But, "a hit is a very deceiving number," says HotWired's advertising director. The truth is that hits count files, not people, and when a human browser clicks from icon to icon to view different parts of a Web site, each click is counted as a hit. HotWired says on a good day, it gets about 600,000 hits, but that represents only about 6,000 people -- maybe fewer if the same people are visiting more than once a day. Advertisers are starting to catch on, and are demanding much more detailed audience information than they were six months ago. Although some start-up companies are working to fill that need, the technology used by the new tracking systems is too rudimentary. The log files show that someone from CompuServe has tapped in, but can't identify which of CompuServe's millions of subscribers it is. For now, advertisers are relying on gut instinct and common sense about which Web sites have "Net credibility." (Wall Street Journal 6/21/95 B1)

SCIENTISTS LEAD THE WAY IN ONLINE PUBLISHING

Scientists who used to rely on print journals for research sharing and peer review increasingly are turning to the Net, and the \$4-billion technical publications industry is worried. The venerable New England Journal of Medicine is sticking to its guns -- an editorial to be published June 22 says it plans to "apply the same rules to Internet that apply to publishing anywhere else." In other words, if the article's appeared on the Internet, it won't be considered for publication. But other journals are looking at the numbers and deciding they can't afford to be left out. "Costs are up, postage is up, and ad revenues are down," says the American Medical Association's president for publishing and multimedia. "You can't grow enough new revenue sources. We've got to look at electronics as the future." Some scientists worry that bypassing the rigorous vetting process used by the journals will result in "low credibility, instant regurgitation." But others contend the peer review process enabled by electronic publishing can be just as thorough, and far more efficient. "We've only begun to scratch the surface of how much more effectively we can communicate," says the editor of Science. (Business Week 6/26/95 p.44)

NEWSPAPERS FACE STIFF COMPETITION IN ONLINE CLASSIFIEDS

The newspaper industry relies heavily on the \$12.5 billion generated through its classified ads last year -- and is finding itself challenged by online upstarts such as Electric Classifieds, Inc. which offers a classified service on the Web. Unlike traditional publishing companies, which have millions invested in physical plant, fleets of trucks, and tons of newsprint, electronic publishers can set up shop for next to nothing. To

combat this growing gang of competing Davids, the newspaper Goliaths are launching their own online efforts, but they may be overlooking the obvious, according to the editor of an electronic journal on online media is:
"Newspapers have a tremendous advantage, if they don't blow it, and that's the infrastructure to take the ads, run the ads and bill for the ads."
(Forbes 7/3/95 p.80)

WWW USER SERVER

Georgia Tech Gvu Center <http://www.cc.gatech.edu/gvu/user_surveys> has done its third WWW user survey and found that the mean age of Web browsers is 35 years, 80% are male, and the top five uses of the Web are browsing, entertainment, work, educational research, business research.

BEIJING PLANS TO "MANAGE" INTERNET

China's Minister of Posts and Telecommunications says the country will attempt to "manage" access to information available over international computer networks. "China, as a sovereign state, will also increase its control over information." He acknowledged that monitoring content on the Internet might prove to be difficult. China has begun to expand commercial access to the Internet in recent months, hoping to catch up technologically with other countries. (Wall Street Journal 6/23/95 B7B)

>From Edupage, 6/22/95 and 6/25/95, edited by John Gehl and Suzanne
>Douglas.

>From KSSHHC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU Tue Jun 27 16:01:49 1995
Return-Path: KSSHHC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU
Received: from CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (cunyvm.cuny.edu [128.228.1.2])
by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with SMTP
id QAA24583 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 27 Jun 1995 16:01:47 -0700
Resent-Message-Id: <199506272301.QAA24583@usc.edu>
Received: from CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU by CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTP id 6098; Tue, 27 Jun 95 18:59:28 EDT
Received: from CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (NJE origin KSSHHC@CUNYVM) by CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with RFC822 id 5554; Tue, 27 Jun 1995 18:59:28 -0400
Resent-Date: Tue, 27 Jun 95 18:59:22 EDT
Resent-From: Ken Sherrill <KSSHHC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU>
Resent-To: public opinion research list <por@gibbs.oit.unc.edu>,
AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Received: from CUNYVM (NJE origin SMTP3@CUNYVM) by CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (LMail
V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 1433; Tue, 27 Jun 1995 18:06:10 -0400
Received: from queernet.queernet.org by CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with TCP; Tue, 27 Jun 95 18:06:05 EDT
Received: by queernet.queernet.org (Smail3.1.29.1 #5)
id m0sQgv2-000D6oa; Tue, 27 Jun 95 13:07 PDT
Sender: owner-qn@QueerNet.ORG
Received: from mail06.mail.aol.com by queernet.queernet.org with smtp
(Smail3.1.29.1 #5) id m0sQgui-000D2rC; Tue, 27 Jun 95 13:07 PDT
Received: by mail06.mail.aol.com
(1.37.109.11/16.2) id AA069362500; Tue, 27 Jun 1995 15:48:20 -0400
Date: Tue, 27 Jun 1995 15:48:20 -0400
From: NGLTF@aol.com

Message-Id: <950627154819_79445792@aol.com>
Subject: Communications Decency - Frequent Questions
Sender: owner-qn@QueerNet.ORG
Precedence: bulk

-----Original message-----

=====

CAMPAIGN TO STOP THE COMMUNICATIONS DECENCY ACT
(SEE THE LIST OF CAMPAIGN COALITION MEMBERS AT THE END)

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQ) ABOUT THE 1995
COMMUNICATIONS DECENCY ACT
June 27, 1995

PLEASE WIDELY REDISTRIBUTE THIS DOCUMENT WITH THIS BANNER INTACT --
REDISTRIBUTE ONLY UNTIL July 25, 1995 REPRODUCE THIS FAQ ONLY IN RELEVANT
FORUMS

To get a copy of this document, please send mail to vtw@vtw.org
with a subject line of "send cdafaq" or check
URL:<http://www.panix.com/vtw/exon/index.html> or
via gopher at gopher.panix.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction
Brief analysis
Definitions
Myths surrounding the CDA
Typical questions asked by reporters
Bill chronology
Organizations opposing the CDA
Where you can go for more information
Credits

INTRODUCTION

The following FAQ contains everything you need to know to argue about the Communications Decency Act. The subtleties are easily lost on most people who think they know these issues, so please take the time to digest this information. Next time you get a call from a reporter, or are asked to do a radio show, keep a copy of this handy.

Changes/additions/corrections should be sent to vtw@vtw.org.

BRIEF ANALYSIS

The Communications Decency Act (CDA) is a poorly thought-out piece of legislation intended to restrict the access of minors to indecent and obscene material on the Internet.

It fails to meet those goals. It would, however, succeed in chilling free speech such that public discussions would be diluted to the level of that which is acceptable to children. Furthermore its whole approach is to treat computer communications as a broadcast medium, which fails to take into account the unique possibilities for parental control and "self-filtering" that are available to us in this medium.

Representatives Ron Wyden (D-OR) and Chris Cox (R-CA) are working on legislation that's to be introduced soon to keep government regulation out of cyberspace. The actual text of the legislation has not yet been introduced, but early press reports from Cox and Wyden indicate they're on the right track.

Please watch these newsgroups and subscribe to vtw-announce@vtw.org if you want to stay abreast of these issues.

DEFINITIONS

It's important when arguing that you're familiar with the terminology. This isn't an all-inclusive discussion of these issues; please refer to the relevant caselaw for more information.

OBSCENITY

Obscene material was determined as not deserving of Constitutional protection in Miller v. California (1973). In that decision, the Supreme Court provided a three-part test for determining if material was obscene.

1. Would the average person, applying contemporary standards of the state or local community find that the work, taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest?
2. Does the work depict or describe in a patently offensive way sexual conduct specifically defined by the applicable state law?
3. Does the work lack serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value?

If a work satisfies all three of these tests, then a court may determine it to be obscene. Notice that the three-part test above does not specify which media the work might be viewed, created, transmitted or stored in. This means that every time a new technology that allows expression is invented, the laws governing obscenity are automatically in force for it.

INDECENCY

Indecent material is sexually-explicit material which may be offensive to some or may be considered by some to be inappropriate for children, but which is protected by the First Amendment. In Sable Communications v. FCC, the Court found that any regulation of indecent material must use the "least intrusive means" for accomplishing the government's goal of protecting children. The Court has stated that restrictions on indecency cannot have the effect that they "reduce the adult population to only what is fit for children."

Given the existence of software and hardware that enable parents to block children's access to indecent material the regulation here does not constitute the "least restrictive means" requirement set out by the Supreme Court.

What are some examples of "indecent" content? The most famous example probably is the George Carlin comedy monologue that was the basis of the Supreme Court case FCC v. Pacifica Foundation (1978). In that monologue, Carlin discusses the "Seven Dirty Words" (i.e., certain profane language) that cannot be uttered in broadcast media. Other examples of "indecent" could include passages from John Updike or Erica Jong novels, certain rock lyrics, and Dr. Ruth Westheimer's sexual-advice column. Under the CDA, it would be criminal to "knowingly" publish such material on the Internet unless children were affirmatively denied access to it. It's as if the manager of a Barnes & Noble bookstore could be sent to jail simply because children were able to wander the store's aisles and search for the racy passages in a Judith Krantz or Harold Robbins novel.

LEWD/FILTHY/LASCIVIOUS EXPRESSION OR SPEECH

These are all also Constitutionally-protected expression, although there currently exists no legal definition for what constitutes this type of speech.

PORNOGRAPHY

Unless this is deemed as "obscene", this is Constitutionally protected as well.

MYTHS SURROUNDING THE (CDA) COMMUNICATIONS DECENCY ACT

M = Myth, R = Reality

CDA = the Communications Decency Act,

aka the Exon bill, the Exon/Gorton bill, the Exon/Coats bill

S 314, the Internet Censorship bill

MYTHS ABOUT EXPRESSION AND ONLINE SYSTEMS (SUCH AS THE INTERNET)

M: Obscene material is currently legal in electronic form. The CDA is needed to bring electronic networks in line with telephone and broadcast media.

R: Obscene material is already illegal in any medium, existing or in the future. No new legislation is needed.

M: There's lot of ``dirty stuff'' on the Internet that's protected because current law doesn't work there. The CDA would fix that.

R: Obscene material is already illegal on the net (or anywhere else). There's nothing for the CDA to fix.

M: The government has the right to control all speech in any electronic media through the FCC (Federal Communications Commission). They have previously done the very same thing for television and radio. This is just an extension to a new medium.

R: This is indeed a new medium. It is not a broadcast medium and should not be treated like the broadcast mediums the FCC currently is allowed to regulate. The government (and in particular the FCC) has only had content control over two specific types of media:

- (1) broadcasting media like TV and radio (and broadcasting-related technologies, such as cable TV), and
- (2) the narrow class of telephone-based commercial services that requires the assistance and support of government-regulated common carriers.

(eg 900 chat lines)

In all other communications media, the government has no constitutional authority to impose broad regulation of indecent content.

M: The CDA is just an extension of the already Constitutional "Dial-A-Porn" statutes into this new medium.

R: The Dial-A-Porn statutes were specifically written for telephone communications. They deal in a communications medium that is specifically point-to-point. Online communication on the other hand is many-to-many and cannot fit the same model. In particular, the Dial-A-Porn statutes do not criminalize speech between two adults in a non-commercial conversation, whereas the CDA does.

M: The only effect the CDA will have is to stop obscene material on the net.

R: Since the CDA would be a US law, and networks do not acknowledge geographical borders, it is unlikely that the CDA will stop anyone outside the US from sending lewd, lascivious, filthy, obscene, or indecent information into networks that traverse the United States.

More importantly, the effect of the CDA will be to impose a chilling effect on speech on the net, where only that which is appropriate for children is acceptable in public. Any discussion of Shakespeare or safe sex would not be allowable except in private areas, where someone can be paid for the task of rigidly screening participants.

M: There's no way to control what my child can see, and I cannot be bothered (nor am I capable) of monitoring them while they're using the computer. This is the only way.

R: Several large service providers (such as America OnLine, Prodigy, and Compuserve) have special areas specifically for kids on their systems. In addition there are a growing number of products for restricting access to the Internet. Software that filters all forms of Internet content including World Wide Web, Gopher, News, and Email is already available for some platforms.

M: The government is the best person to tell me what my child can see.

R: Parents are the best people to evaluate what they want their children to see, whereas government censors are probably the least appropriate. In Wisconsin v. Yoder (1972), the Supreme Court acknowledged that the right of parents to determine what is appropriate for their children is Constitutionally protected.

M: This will encourage other countries to extradite their citizenry back to the US, if the citizen violates this law.

R: Non-US citizens will be theoretically liable if they commit any element of the crime in the United States (e.g., if the indecent content reaches a minor in the United States). Normally, this theoretical liability won't translate into an actual attempt at prosecution unless the defendant has a high Noriega Quotient. (There has to be strong political pressure backing the prosecution.)

MYTHS ABOUT HARASSMENT

M: The CDA simply makes it illegal to harass another person electronically ("knowingly makes transmissions that are indecent or obscene with the intent to threaten or harass another person")

R: Obscene or harassing speech which "threatens", is not Constitutionally protected. However the CDA goes farther than that, prohibiting lewd, lascivious, filthy, obscene, or indecent speech even when it is intended to be ``annoying'' which is a Constitutionally-protected form of speech.

For example, if you wrote a letter to your Senator about his or her poor vote on the Exon bill, you might intend to annoy him.

MYTHS ABOUT LIABILITY OF SERVICE OR CONTENT PROVIDERS

M: The CDA makes each individual sysop responsible for the content they carry and provide to their users. This is not unreasonable, as you should be responsible for the material you store on your disks.

R: Even if a service provider took their entire staff and devoted them to reading all the email, news forums, and chat forums, that provider still could never be expected to keep up with the huge volume of information that travels the Internet every day. It is unreasonable to expect a service provider to be responsible for each piece of content that travels through or onto its systems.

M: The CDA says you're liable only if you "knowingly transmit or make available" this information to a minor. If you ask everyone on your system their age, won't this keep you from being liable?

R: No, it is a reasonable assumption that someone might not be telling you the truth. Simply asking age would not be strict enough measures.

M: I can claim I don't know the content of the stuff on the net, because I can't possibly be required to read it all. Won't that protect me from ``knowingly' transmitting it to a minor?

R: No, Senator Exon said he's found lewd, lascivious, filthy, indecent, and obscene material on the Internet during his investigation for the bill. If a Senator has noticed this, then you, an Internet Service Provider, should have too.

M: I don't actively send any data out, I simply leave it on a Web page for people to pick up. Therefore neither I nor my service provider are liable if a minor gets access to my web page and decides it is lewd, lascivious, filthy, indecent, and obscene.

R: The statute clearly states that you are responsible if you "make available" such information. You don't even have to be aware it is being downloaded to be liable.

M: If I'm providing a Fidonet or netnews relay for someone else, and I don't examine all the content, will I still be liable if someone downstream from me provides indecent content (that I carried for a time, however brief) to a minor?

R: Probably yes, though the statute leaves some room for interpretation.

TYPICAL QUESTIONS ASKED BY REPORTERS

This section is currently being completed. Please be patient.

BILL CHRONOLOGY

No more actions have been scheduled as of June 27, 1995.

Jun 21, '95 Several prominent House members publicly announce their opposition to the CDA, including Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-GA), Rep. Chris Cox (R-CA), and Rep. Ron Wyden (D-OR).

Jun 14, '95 The Senate passes the CDA as attached to the Telecomm reform bill (S 652) by a vote of 84-16. The Leahy bill (S 714) is not passed.

May 24, '95 The House Telecomm Reform bill (HR 1555) leaves committee in the House with the Leahy alternative attached to it, thanks to Rep. Ron Klink of (D-PA). The Communications Decency Act is not attached to it.

Apr 7, '95 Sen. Leahy (D-VT) introduces S.714, an alternative to the Exon/Gorton bill, which commissions the Dept. of Justice to study the problem to see if additional

legislation

(such as the CDA) is necessary.

Mar 23, '95 S314 amended and attached to the telecommunications reform bill by Sen. Gorton (R-WA). Language provides some provider protection, but continues to infringe upon email privacy and free speech.

Feb 21, '95 HR1004 referred to the House Commerce and Judiciary committees

Feb 21, '95 HR1004 introduced by Rep. Johnson (D-SD)

Feb 1, '95 S314 referred to the Senate Commerce committee

Feb 1, '95 S314 introduced by Sen. Exon (D-NE) and Gorton (R-WA).

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING THE CDA

In order to use the net more effectively, several organizations have joined forces on a single Congressional net campaign to stop the Communications Decency Act. The following list of groups are coordinating to stop the Communications Decency Act.

American Civil Liberties Union * American Communication Association * American Council for the Arts * Arts & Technology Society * Association of Alternative Newsweeklies * biancaTroll productions * Californians Against Censorship Together * Center For Democracy And Technology * Centre for Democratic Communications * Center for Public Representation * Citizen's Voice - New Zealand * Computer Communicators Association * Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility * Cross Connection * Cyber-Rights Campaign * CyberQueer Lounge * Dutch Digital Citizens' Movement * Electronic Frontier Canada * Electronic Frontier Foundation * Electronic Frontier Foundation - Austin * Electronic Frontiers Australia * Electronic Frontiers Houston * Electronic Frontiers New Hampshire * Electronic Privacy Information Center * Feminists For Free Expression * First Amendment Teach-In * Florida Coalition Against Censorship * Friendly Anti-Censorship Taskforce for Students * Hands Off! The Net * Human Rights Watch * Inland Book Company * Inner Circle Technologies, Inc. * Inst. for Global Communications * Internet On-Ramp, Inc. * Joint Artists' and Music Promotions Political Action Committee * The Libertarian Party * Marijuana Policy Project * Metropolitan Data Networks Ltd. * MindVox * National Bicycle Greenway * National Campaign for Freedom of Expression * National Coalition Against Censorship * National Gay and Lesbian Task Force * National Public Telecomputing Network * National Writers Union * Oregon

Coast RISC * Panix Public Access Internet * People for the American Way *
Rock Out Censorship * Society for Electronic Access * The Thing
International BBS Network * The WELL * Voters Telecommunications Watch

WHERE YOU CAN GO FOR MORE INFORMATION

Web Sites

URL:<http://www.panix.com/vtw/exon/>
URL:<http://epic.org/>
URL:<http://www.eff.org/pub/Alerts/>
URL:<http://www.cdt.org/cda.html>

FTP Archives

URL:<ftp://ftp.cdt.org/pub/cdt/policy/freespeech/00-INDEX.FREESPEECH>
URL:<ftp://ftp.eff.org/pub/Alerts/>

Gopher Archives:

URL:<gopher://gopher.panix.com/11/vtw/exon>
URL:<gopher://gopher.eff.org/11/Alerts>

Email:

vtw@vtw.org (put "send help" in the subject line)
cda-info@cdt.org (General CDA information)
cda-stat@cdt.org (Current status of the CDA)

CREDITS

Significant legal input came from Mike Godwin (mnemonic@eff.org) and Shari Steele (ssteele@eff.org) of the Electronic Frontier Foundation and Jonah Seiger (jseiger@cdt.org) and Danny Weitzner (djw@cdt.org) from the Center for Democracy and Technology.

Several coalition members contributed large amounts of text and suggestions to the document, including Andy Oram (CPSR Cyber Rights campaign), Bob Bickford (Libertarian Party), Anne Beeson (ACLU), Steven Cherry (Voters Telecommunications Watch) and Stanton McCandlish (EFF).

```
=====
>From moyl.rced@gao.gov Wed Jun 28 12:37:26 1995
Return-Path: moyl.rced@gao.gov
Received: from viper.gao.gov (viper.gao.gov [161.203.16.1])
    by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with ESMTTP
    id MAA13344 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Jun 1995 12:37:24 -0700
From: moyl.rced@gao.gov
Received: from mailgateway.gao.gov (mailgateway.gao.gov [161.203.15.2]) by
viper.gao.gov (8.6.11/8.6.10) with SMTP id PAA20957 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Wed, 28 Jun 1995 15:43:32 -0400
Received: from ccMail by mailgateway.gao.gov (SMTPLINK V2.10.04o)
    id AA804378979; Wed, 28 Jun 95 15:05:42 EST
Date: Wed, 28 Jun 95 15:05:42 EST
Message-Id: <9505288043.AA804378979@mailgateway.gao.gov>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: GAO Request for Survey Benchmarking Partners
```


I am forwarding the following on behalf of some colleagues at GAO who don't have access to the INTERNET. Please send any INTERNET e-mail responses to their request to me and I will forward them. Thank you.

Luann Moy
U.S. General Accounting Office
e-mail: moyl.rced@gao.gov

The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), a Congressional agency that evaluates federal programs, is planning to use a technique called benchmarking to improve its survey research process. More specifically, we would like to compare our questionnaire design, data collection, and data analysis processes to those of other organizations to identify ways in which we could conduct our research more efficiently.

Currently, we are seeking benchmarking partners--public or private organizations willing to share the techniques they use to conduct survey research as efficiently as possible, and interested in learning how GAO conducts (mostly mail, but often telephone) surveys to obtain information for the U.S. Congress about issues related to national policies.

If your organization conducts its own surveys (whether in house or with help from contractors), or performs survey tasks for others under contract, and (1) designs questionnaires, (2) collects data, or (3) analyzes it in a particularly efficient manner, we'd like to hear from you. Please write a very brief description of what you do related to one or more of these three survey research tasks that streamlines the process and send it to us via INTERNET (c/o Luann Moy, US General Accounting Office, e-mail: moyl.rced@gao.gov) or to me by mail within the next two weeks, along with the name and telephone number of someone we may contact. A few lines will do.

Thank you for your interest and help.

Bernie Ungar
Director for Quality Management
U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G Street, NW Room 6183
Washington, DC 20548

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 29 16:27:21 1995
Return-Path: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])

by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with ESMTP
id QAA08776 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Jun 1995 16:27:19 -0700
Received: (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.7+ucs)
id QAA01153; Thu, 29 Jun 1995 16:27:17 -0700
Date: Thu, 29 Jun 1995 16:27:16 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Internet Index #8 (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950629162252.20150H-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The Internet Index
Number 8
Inspired by "Harper's Index"*
Compiled by Win Treese (treese@OpenMarket.com)
29 June 1995

Venture capital invested in Internet companies, first quarter 1995:
\$47 million
Venture capital invested in Internet companies, all of 1994: \$42 million

Number of PBS stations with WWW home pages: 25

Percentage increase, last week, in number of listings on Open Market's
Commercial Sites Index: 7

Number of tennis Grand Slam tournaments on the World-Wide Web: 1

Telephone number for information about the National Information
Infrastructure: 1-800-NII-8818

Authorized funding, in FY95, for the Agricultural Telecommunications
Funding Program (US govt): \$1.2 million

Number of new Internet domains registered in British Columbia, May,
1995: 343

Number of new Internet domains registered in Manhattan, May, 1995: 340

Number of Internet access providers in Egypt: 4

Percentage of Internet users using local access providers: 28

Number of subscribers to the Internet Index mailing list: 7290

"Harper's Index" is a registered trademark of Harper's Magazine Foundation.
Copyright 1995 by Win Treese. Send updates or interesting statistics to
treese@OpenMarket.com.

Past issues and citations to sources can be found at
<http://www.openmarket.com/info/internet-index/>. To subscribe to future
issues of the Internet Index, send a message saying "subscribe
internet-index" in the body to internet-index-request@OpenMarket.com.

>From BGROVES@survey.umd.edu Fri Jun 30 06:09:50 1995
Return-Path: <@VM.usc.edu:BGROVES@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
Received: from VM.USC.EDU (vm.usc.edu [128.125.241.1])

by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with SMTP
id GAA06079 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 30 Jun 1995 06:09:43 -0700
Received: from VM.USC.EDU by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with BSMTMP id
6768;
Fri, 30 Jun 95 06:10:03 PDT
Received: from USCVM (NJE origin SMTP@USCVM) by VM.USC.EDU (LMail
V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 6391 for <aapornet@USCVM>; Fri, 30 Jun 1995
06:10:03 -0700
Received: from ument.umd.edu by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with TCP;
Fri, 30 Jun 95 06:10:01 PDT
Received: by ument.umd.edu (5.57/Ultrix3.0-C)
id AA12335; Fri, 30 Jun 95 09:04:43 -0400
Received: from SURVEY/MAILQUEUE1 by survey.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);
Fri, 30 Jun 95 9:07:51 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by SURVEY (Mercury 1.13); Fri, 30 Jun 95 9:07:31
+1100
From: "Bob Groves" <BGROVES@survey.umd.edu>
Organization: The Joint Program In Survey Meth.
To: aapornet@VM.usc.edu
Date: Fri, 30 Jun 1995 09:07:27 EST
Subject: NSF Markup
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail v3.21
Message-Id: <106518854EF3@survey.umd.edu>

I received this from COSSA today.

Bob Groves, for AAPOR Council

SENDBOUSE SCIENCE COMMITTEE MARKS UP NSF BILL: NSF REQUIRED TO ELIMINATE A
DIRECTORATE

In a marathon markup session, the House Science Committee, chaired by
Rep. Robert Walker (R-PA), reported out a reauthorization bill for the
National Science Foundation at 11:40 p.m. on June 28. A provision included
in the bill, H.R. 1852, limits NSF to "not more than 6 Assistant Directors
to assist in managing its divisions." There are currently 7 Assistant
Directors who head up the directorates, including the one for social,
behavioral and economic science (SBE). This change from the bill reported
out of the Basic Research Subcommittee was included in a bloc of amendments
offered by the Walker and adopted by the full committee.

The Foundation, by November 15, 1995, "shall transmit to the Congress a
report on the reorganization" required by the reduction in the number of
directorates. Although the bill language provides the NSF Director Neal
Lane with the discretion to decide on the reorganization, there will be
report language that strongly suggests that the SBE directorate should be
given close scrutiny and is the prime candidate for integration into the
other directorates. Report language does not have the same force as bill
language, but is often respected as an indication of the intent of the
legislators when bill language is left deliberately vague.

During the markup, Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-CA) offered an amendment to make
the reduction in Assistant Directors an option for reorganization. She also
wanted NSF "to carry out a review and analysis of the organizational
structure ... for the purpose of developing a plan for reorganization that

will result in reduced administrative costs, while maintaining the quality and effectiveness of the Foundation's programs." Lofgren's amendment also would have pushed back the timing for the reorganization report to February 15, 1996.

Walker opposed the Lofgren amendment and insisted on the reduction in the number of directorates citing reductions in the funds available for salaries and expenses in the near future. He claimed that during extensive discussions with Lane, he was told that the Director, while "not thrilled" with the change, could "live with it." Walker also asserted that Lofgren's provision to do a study would move the implementation of any reorganization into the next budget cycle denying NSF the savings it needed to concentrate its funds for supporting basic research. Since this discussion occurred at 11:30 p.m., other members were reluctant to join in and prolong the proceedings. Lofgren's amendment went down to defeat on a voice vote.

Other provisions in the Walker amendment called for:

- o a study by the Office of Science and Technology Policy to determine how the indirect costs of research can be reduced by 10 percent and how to reduce the variance among indirect cost rates of different institutions of higher education;

- o an anti-earmarking provision that excludes from NSF grants for five years, any person who received funds after FY 1995 from any Federal funding source for a project that was not subjected to a competitive, merit-based award process;

- o a name change from the Critical Technologies Institute to the Science Studies Institute; and

- o an anti-lobbying provision that prohibits the use of NSF funds for any activity whose purpose is to influence legislation before Congress;

The authorized funding levels remain the same as they emerged from the Subcommittee. The total for NSF is \$3.126 billion for FY 1996 and \$3.171 billion for FY 1997. Research and Related Activities is authorized at \$2.226 billion for FY 1996 and \$2.286 billion for FY 1997. SBE is authorized at \$111.3 million for FY 1996. For FY 1997 the bills does not authorize by research directorates. The legislation authorizes Education and Human Resources at \$600 million for both years.

The bill that emerged from the House Science Committee is not expected to reach the House floor until September. In the Senate, the Labor and Human Resources Committee and the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee have jurisdiction over NSF authorization. For the moment, neither committee has demonstrated any urgency to take up NSF.

The House VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations Committee markup was postponed from June 22 to July 10 to give White House and Congressional negotiators a chance to revise the FY 1995 rescissions bill to overcome Presidential objections that led to a veto. So far, no resolution of those difference has occurred. If no agreement is reached, it will make the Subcommittee's job more difficult in that more reductions from programs will be required.

>From SAMPLING@cati.umd.edu Fri Jun 30 08:49:09 1995

Return-Path: <@VM.usc.edu:SAMPLING@CATI.UMD.EDU>
Received: from VM.USC.EDU (vm.usc.edu [128.125.241.1])
by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with SMTP
id IAA15827 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 30 Jun 1995 08:49:08 -0700
Received: from VM.USC.EDU by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with BSMTMP id
7004;
Fri, 30 Jun 95 08:19:55 PDT
Received: from USCVM (NJE origin SMTP@USCVM) by VM.USC.EDU (LMail
V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 6820 for <aapornet@USCVM>; Fri, 30 Jun 1995
08:19:55 -0700
Received: from umail.UMD.EDU by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with TCP;
Fri, 30 Jun 95 08:19:50 PDT
Received: by umail.UMD.EDU (5.57/Ultrix3.0-C)
id AA27772; Fri, 30 Jun 95 11:14:34 -0400
Received: from BSOSCATI/MAILQUEUE1 by cati.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);
Fri, 30 Jun 95 11:14:34 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by BSOSCATI (Mercury 1.13); Fri, 30 Jun 95
11:14:06 +1100
From: "SRC SAMPLING" <SAMPLING@cati.umd.edu>
Organization: Survey Research Center, UMCP
To: aapornet@VM.usc.edu
Date: Fri, 30 Jun 1995 11:14:05 EDT
Subject: re: sampling bibliography
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: PMail v3.0 (R1)
Message-Id: <59F54416E41@cati.umd.edu>

The Survey Research Center at the University of Maryland is making available a bibliography it maintains on Sample Design for Household Telephone Surveys.

If you would like a copy, please send a message to

SAMPLING@CATI.UMD.EDU

In the subject header [not the body of the message] please write

send sampling bibliography

A copy of the bibliography in ASCII format will be forwarded to you.

We encourage suggestions for additions to future versions of the bibliography and would very much appreciate receiving any articles you think might be added to it.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jun 30 10:33:55 1995
Return-Path: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with ESMTMP
id KAA24464 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Jun 1995 10:33:53 -0700

Received: (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.7+ucs)
id KAA27513; Fri, 30 Jun 1995 10:33:52 -0700
Date: Fri, 30 Jun 1995 10:33:51 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: NEWS OF THE NET OF INTEREST TO AAPORNET
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950630101938.25534D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

NEWS OF THE NET (Including Three Surveys) OF INTEREST TO AAPORNET

DEEP CUTS IN FUNDING FOR NTIA

As part of a seven-year GOP plan to eliminate the U.S. Department of Commerce, the House Appropriations Committee has proposed to cut the Commerce Department budget by almost 20% below this year's level, which would have a strong impact on Clinton/Gore "information superhighway" hopes. Looking at a \$133.7 million request from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, the Committee gave it just \$78.7 million. (Washington Post 6/29/95 A19, BNA Daily Report for Executives 6/29/95)

WIRED IN THE HEARTLAND

The Rural Policy Research Institute reports that a larger percentage of the U.S. population located in remote areas uses PCs, faxes and e-mail than the population in general (46% vs. 33%). Medical services, education and business were listed as the top priorities. Residents in Iowa, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Kansas and Minnesota were polled. (Wall Street Journal 6/29/95 A1)

MAYBE IT'S HOMEWORK

A forthcoming report ("Marketing Pornography on the Information Superhighway") by Carnegie Mellon researchers says that at one U.S. university, 13 of the 40 most frequently visited newsgroups on the Internet had names like alt.sex.stories, rec.arts.erotica and alt.sex.bondage. (Time 7/3/95 P.38)

INTERNET CENSORSHIP CODE FOR AUSTRALIA

Australia's federal attorney general says that 99% of the material found on the Internet is reasonable, legitimate information, but is proposing enactment of legislation that would cover offensive material that would be banned in film, video or literature. The proposal was made after some Australian National University students searching the Internet found information on how to rape without getting caught and how to make bombs. (Herald Sun 6/25/95 p.30)

RETAILERS SLOW TO EMBRACE ONLINE SHOPPING

Although retailing organizations are planning to spend more money on information technology, those plans are focused on internal efficiencies rather than outside sales. Citing reasons such as high costs and the lack of paying customers, only 8% of the retail companies surveyed by Computer Sciences Corp. and Retail Info Systems News said they offer online shopping. (Computerworld 6/26/95 p.121)

EXPLORING TECHNOLOGY

The CEO of Opta Food Ingredients says he enjoys exploring technology: "My

primary interest outside of work is learning how the technology that exists today can make the workplace more effective. For example, at home I have a Macintosh 660 AV hooked up to my camcorder, and I can watch my infant son up in the corner of my computer screen in real time as I am doing anything else I want, like faxing or writing. Whenever he does something cute, I just hit command C to snap a picture, which I then print out on my Hewlett-Packard color printer. The next step is to bring that setup into the office and replace the receptionist or whoever greets people when they first enter." But can it serve coffee? (Inc. Technology, No. 2 '95 p.19)

Selected from Edupage (6/29/95), edited by John Gehl and Suzanne Douglas.
 >From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jun 30 12:12:05 1995
 Return-Path: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
 Received: from almaak.usc.edu (root@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
 by usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.4) with ESMTP
 id MAA02620 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Jun 1995 12:12:03 -0700
 Received: (beniger@localhost)
 by almaak.usc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.7+ucs)
 id KAA26061; Fri, 30 Jun 1995 10:14:54 -0700
 Date: Fri, 30 Jun 1995 10:14:52 -0700 (PDT)
 From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
 To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
 Subject: U.S. Senate on Internet
 Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950630101142.25534A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
 MIME-Version: 1.0
 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

This morning's New York Times includes an article (p. A15 in the National Edition), "In Appeal to Internet Surfers, Democrats Hope to Catch a Wave: A Cyber-Savvy Party Sees an Edge Over Republicans," by Francis X. Clines writing for the "Capitol Sketchbook." Clines reports that 28 senators (22 Democrats and 6 Republicans) now have home pages on the World Wide Web. If true, this would represent a 600 percent increase over the 3 Republicans (Dole, Lugar and Frist) and 1 Democrat (Kennedy) listed with www addresses in the current Senate Directory. The Directory shows 47 Senators on the Internet at 69 different addresses: 47 email, 18 ftp, 4 www. Considering Bob Grove's message earlier today on proposed funding cuts for NSF, it might be useful to some on AAPORNET to have the Directory list of Senate Internet addresses (see below). If anyone has a more current list on hand, I would appreciate having it. -- JRB (beniger@rcf.usc.edu)

UNITED STATES CONGRESS--SENATE DIRECTORY
 104th Congress, 1995-96

| P ST | Name | Internet Address(es) |
|------|----------------------|--|
| R AZ | Kyl, Jon | info@kyl.senate.gov |
| D CA | Boxer, Barbara | senator@boxer.senate.gov
ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/ca
/boxer/general/homepage.html |
| R CO | Brown, Henry | senator_brown@brown.senate.gov |
| D CT | Dodd, Christopher J. | sen_dodd@dodd.senate.gov |
| D CT | Lieberman, Joseph I. | senator_lieberman@lieberman.senate.gov
ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/ct/ |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| | lieberman/general/lieberman.html |
| R GA Coverdell, Paul | senator_coverdell@coverdell.senate.gov |
| D IA Harkin, Thomas | tom_harkin@harkin.senate.gov |
| | ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/ia/
harkin/general/harkin.html |
| R IA Grassley, Charles E. | chuck_grassley@grassley.senate.gov |
| R ID Craig, Larry E. | larry_craig@craig.senate.gov |
| R ID Kempthorne, Dirk | dirk_kempthorne@kempthorne.senate.gov |
| D IL Moseley-Braun, Carol | senator@moseley-braun.senate.gov |
| D IL Simon, Paul | senator@simon.senate.gov |
| R IN Lugar, Richard G. | lugar@iquest.net |
| | http://www.umn.edu/~sears/primary/
lugar.html |
| R KS Dole, Robert | http://www.seas.upenn.edu/~lapple/
bobdole.html |
| D KY Ford, Wendell H. | wendell_ford@ford.senate.gov |
| | ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/ky/
ford/general/ford.html |
| D LA Breaux, John B. | senator@breaux.senate.gov |
| | ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/la/
breaux/general/breaux.html |
| D LA Johnston, J. Bennett | senator@johnston.senate.gov |
| D MA Kennedy, Edward M. | senator@kennedy.senate.gov |
| | http://www.ai.mit.edu/projects/iiip/
Kennedy/homepage.html) |
| D MA Kerry, John F. | john_kerry@kerry.senate.gov |
| D MD Mikulski, Barbara A. | senator@mikulski.senate.gov |
| D MI Levin, Carl | senator@levin.senate.gov |
| | ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/mi/
levin/general/levin.html |
| D MN Wellstone, Paul | senator@wellstone.senate.gov |
| R MN Grams, Rod | mail_grams@grams.gov |
| R MO Ashcroft, John | john_ashcroft@ashcroft.senate.gov |
| | ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/mo/
ashcroft/general/ashcroft.html |
| D MT Baucus, Max | max@baucus.senate.gov |
| | ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/mt/
baucus/general/b2.html |
| R MT Burns, Conrad R. | conrad_burns@burns.senate.gov |
| D NE Kerrey, Bob | bob@kerrey.senate.gov |
| | ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/ne/
kerrey/general/kerrey.html |
| R NH Gregg, Judd | mailbox@gregg.senate.gov |
| R NH Smith, Robert | opinion@smith.senate.gov |
| D NJ Bradley, William | senator@bradley.senate.gov |
| | ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/nj/
bradley/general/bradley.html |
| D NM Bingaman, Jeff | Senator_Bingaman@bingaman.senate.gov |
| | ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/nm/
bingaman/general/jb.html |
| R NM Domenici, Pete V. | senator_domenici@domenici.senate.gov |
| R OH DeWine, Michael | senator_dewine.@dewine.senate.gov |
| | ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/oh/
dewine/general/dewine.html |
| R OK Nickles, Donald | nickles@rpc.senate.gov |
| R RI Chafee, John H. | senator_chafee@chafee.senate.gov |
| D SC Hollings, Ernest F. | senator@hollings.senate.gov |

D SD Daschle, Thomas A. tom_daschle@daschle.senate.gov
ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/sd/
daschle/general/daschle.html

R SD Pressler, Larry larry_pressler@pressler.senate.gov
R TN Frist, Bill senator_frist@frist.senate.gov
ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/tn/
frist/general/frist.html
http://www.surgery.mc.vanderbilt.edu/
frist/frist.html

R TX Hutchison, Kay Bailey senator@hutchison.senate.gov
D VA Robb, Charles S. Senator_Robb@robb.senate.gov
vascr@CapAccess.org
ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/va/
robb/general/robb.html

R VA Warner, John W. senator@warner.senate.gov
ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/va/
warner/general/warner.html

D VT Leahy, Patrick J. senator_leahy@leahy.senate.gov
ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/vt/
leahy/general/pjl/html

R VT Jeffords, James M. Vermont@jeffords.senate.gov
R WA Gorton, Slade Senator_Gorton@gorton.senate.gov
D WI Feingold, Russell russell_feingold@feingold.senate.gov
D WV Rockefeller, John D. senator@rockefeller.senate.gov
ftp://ftp.senate.gov/member/wv/
rockefeller/general/rockefeller.html

+++++