

=====
Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700
Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: June 1996 archive - one BIG message

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

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

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

Shap Wolf
shap.wolf@asu.edu
AAPORNET volunteer host

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9606.
Part 1/1, total size 271260 bytes:

----- Cut here -----
>From hschuman@umich.edu Sat Jun 1 08:03:08 1996
Return-Path: hschuman@umich.edu
Received: from joust.rs.itd.umich.edu (joust.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.63.86])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA27069 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 1 Jun 1996 08:03:07 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from joust.rs.itd.umich.edu by joust.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.7.1/2.2)
id KAA21170; Sat, 1 Jun 1996 10:59:42 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Sat, 1 Jun 1996 10:59:42 -0400 (EDT)
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
X-Sender: hschuman@joust.rs.itd.umich.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Yankelovich-New Yorker Survey of Blacks
In-Reply-To: <A0B61345B93@wws.princeton.edu>
Message-ID:
<Pine.SOL.3.91.960601103718.19995B-100000@joust.rs.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On the relation (or really non-relation) of focussed interviews and focus groups, there is an interesting account by Robert Merton in POQ, Winter, 1987.

On Jennifer Hochschild's query about higher black choices of "working class" to subjective social class questions, I think there is evidence (perhaps in a 1972 U of Michigan dissertation by Johnnie Daniel--though I'm relying here on ancient memories) that choice of that alternative was often intended to indicate that the respondent was "working," not unemployed. (Other evidence

suggests that deliberate choice of "lower class" was related to political alienation.)

But the New Yorker article does not seem one that deserves much weight. It is largely a list of marginals, without question wordings, and with no awareness that answers can depend heavily on the way an issue is conceptualized and on other factors like wording, context, and, in the case of racial questions, the perceived race of the interviewer (which is seldom controlled even in over-time surveys). -Howard Schuman

>From jamwolf@indiana.edu Sun Jun 2 09:44:34 1996
Return-Path: jamwolf@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu
Received: from belize.ucs.indiana.edu (belize.ucs.indiana.edu [129.79.10.64])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA25527 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 Jun 1996 09:44:33 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu (jamwolf@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu [129.79.5.201]) by belize.ucs.indiana.edu (8.7.3/8.7.3/1.10IUPO) with ESMTTP
id LAA22501 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 Jun 1996 11:44:29 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from jamwolf@localhost) by falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu (8.7/8.7/regexp(\$Revision: 1.3 \$) id LAA02999; Sun, 2 Jun 1996 11:44:32 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sun, 2 Jun 1996 11:44:32 -0500 (EST)
From: Jim Wolf <jamwolf@indiana.edu>
X-Sender: jamwolf@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: census-school district information
In-Reply-To: <199605312111.RAA24502@mail-hub.interpath.net>
Message-ID:
<Pine.HPP.3.91.960602114009.2399A-100000@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Fri, 31 May 1996, John Bare wrote:

>
> A question for AAPORNET's Census experts: Anyone know if the U.S.
> Census Bureau collects and maintains information on the socioeconomic
> characteristics of public school districts nationwide?
<SNIP...>

I'm no Census expert, but I do know that about 10 years ago an outfit called QED (for "Quality Education Data" or something like that) provided school district info for the Nat'l Educ Longitudinal Survey setup we were doing back when I was at NORC. It was info compiled from Census data. I seem to remember that QED was based in D.C., but that's all I remember.

AAPORNETers at NORC should be able to expand on (or correct) my memories.

+-----+
Jim Wolf Internet: jamwolf@indiana.edu
Consulting Sociologist Voice: (317) 255-9621
6332 N. Guilford - Suite #207 FAX: (317) 255-9714
Indianapolis, IN 46220 Home: (317) 257-7062
>From BRAUN@zuma-mannheim.de Mon Jun 3 07:56:24 1996

Return-Path: BRAUN@zuma-mannheim.de
Received: from noc.belwue.de (root@noc.BelWue.DE [129.143.2.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA23211 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Jun 1996 07:56:22 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hp-zuma.zuma-mannheim.de (hp-zuma.zuma-mannheim.de
[193.196.10.1]) by noc.belwue.de with SMTP id QAA25685
(8.6.13/IDA-1.6 for <aapornet@usc.edu>); Mon, 3 Jun 1996 16:56:17 +0200
Received: from zum-1.zuma-mannheim.de by hp-zuma.zuma-mannheim.de with SMTP
(1.38.193.4/BelWue-1.0HP) id AA10268; Mon, 3 Jun 1996 16:56:16 +0200
Received: from ZUM-1/MAIL by zum-1.zuma-mannheim.de zum-1 (Mercury 1.11);
Mon, 3 Jun 96 16:56:12 +0100
Received: from MAIL by ZUM-1 (Mercury 1.11); Mon, 3 Jun 96 16:55:58 +0100
From: "Michael Braun" <BRAUN@zuma-mannheim.de>
Organization: ZUMA
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Mon, 3 Jun 1996 16:55:53 GMT+0100
Subject: Book Announcement
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail v3.1 (R1a)
Message-Id: <2EC9CED0952@zum-1.zuma-mannheim.de zum-1>

Zuell, Cornelia, Janet Harkness, Juergen Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik (1996):
ZUMA-Nachrichten Spezial, Text Analysis and Computers.
Mannheim: ZUMA
132 pages. US\$ 30.-. ISBN 3-924220-11-5
(available from ZUMA, PO Box 122155, D-68072 Mannheim, Germany,
Fax: +49/621-1246100, e-mail: zuell@zuma-mannheim.de)

The ZUMA Nachrichten Spezial "Text Analysis and Computers" documents
a cornerstone in an initiative to bring together scholars from
different disciplines engaged in the computer-assisted analysis
of texts. It presents reprints of the talks given by four keynote
speakers and the abstract of all the papers presented at the
Text Analysis and Computers Conference held in
Mannheim from September 18 - 21, 1995. The papers address four broad
areas - content analysis, qualitative approaches in the
social sciences, information processing and corpus linguistics;
each of the keynote speakers' paper reviews one of these areas:

Udo Kelle: Computer-Aided Qualitative Data Analysis: An Overview

Juergen Krause: Principles of Content Analysis for Information
Retrieval Systems

Christian Mair: Machine-Readable Text Corpora and the Linguistic
Description of Languages

E. Mergenthaler: Computer Assisted Content Analysis: An Overview

One of the main aims of the conference was to provide a forum for
an exchange on text analysis procedures and potentials across
disciplines, an ambitious undertaking in view of the
diversity of perspectives and interests involved. The conference
undoubtedly accomplished some of the ground work necessary for
an interdisciplinary discourse to begin; a number of

cooperative projects have been started - on new tools for text analysis, on establishing an internet discussion forum and on planning more intensive research cooperation between the humanities and the social sciences.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 4 05:03:34 1996

Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id FAA09970 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 05:03:32 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id FAA28137 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 05:03:31 -0700
(PDT)

Date: Tue, 4 Jun 1996 05:03:30 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: New Journal: Media and Culture

Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960604050015.27599D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

APOLLO: New Journal for Representation in Media and Culture

We will be interested in scholarly articles not exceeding 5,000 words, in any discipline. Manuscript material should be submitted in Chicago style, in one of the following forms, to either of the editors.

PRINT or DISK COPIES:

Pomerance/Sakeris

Department of Sociology

Ryerson Polytechnic University

350 Victoria Street

Toronto ON M5B 2K3

INCLUDE S.A.S.E.

on a disk formatted for MACINTOSH saved in ASCII

OR EMAIL:

mpomeran@acs.ryerson.ca

jsakeris@acs.ryerson.ca

info: <http://www.ryerson.ca/mediagroup/apollo.html>

*

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 4 05:47:31 1996

Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id FAA13167 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 05:47:29 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id FAA29535 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 05:47:28 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 4 Jun 1996 05:47:27 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Tenure-Track: Quant. Meth./Health Policy
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960604054506.27599I-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY. The Department of Sociology anticipates two tenure-track assistant professor positions, effective August 1997. Areas of specialization open, but preference will be given to candidates with interests in advanced quantitative methods and/or health and health policy. Successful candidates must demonstrate significant accomplishments in research and teaching as well as potential for seeking and obtaining external research support. Ph.D. in Sociology or closely related discipline required. Applications must be received by September 6, 1996 and should include: letter spelling out research agenda and teaching interests; curriculum vitae, names, addresses, and phone numbers of four professional references. Address to: Isaac W. Eberstein, Chair, Department of Sociology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2011. Florida State University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

>From David_Langley@bcbsme.com Tue Jun 4 06:54:43 1996
Return-Path: David_Langley@bcbsme.com
Received: from safety.worldcom.com (safety.worldcom.com [198.64.193.5])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id GAA18997 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 06:54:42 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from smtp@localhost) by safety.worldcom.com (8.7.1/8.6.9) id
IAA29594 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 08:51:53 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from worldcom-45.worldcom.com(198.64.193.76) by
safety.worldcom.com via smap (V1.3)
id sma029580; Tue Jun 4 08:51:46 1996
Received: by worldcom-45.worldcom.com (IBM OS/2 SENDMAIL VERSION 1.3.14/3.3)
id AA5814; Tue, 04 Jun 96 08:47:18 -0400
Message-Id: <9606041247.AA5814@worldcom-45.worldcom.com>
Received: from worldcom with "Lotus Notes Mail Gateway for SMTP" id
A6A3A9CC6CD9F9B28625633F004B57B2; Tue, 4 Jun 96 08:47:18
To: aapornet <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: David Langley <David_Langley@bcbsme.com>
Date: 4 Jun 96 9:29:51
Subject: Articles re: financial return valuation of strategic/market
research
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Text/Plain

I would be interested to know if any members of AAPORNET are aware of articles or other documentation which describe a methodology for determining the financial value (revenue-enhancements, cost-controls) of "market" research activity. For example, is there an established methodology for determining the financial return to the firm (or client) of expenditures on or investments

in

research activities like price-point assessments, satisfaction measurement, competitive intelligence, demand estimation, public opinion, corporate image, etc.?

>From MPRNJ!BGC@mprnj.com Tue Jun 4 06:55:13 1996
Return-Path: mprnj!MPRNJ!BGC@mprnj.com
Received: from tigger.jvnc.net (tigger.jvnc.net [128.121.50.145])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id GAA19049 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 06:55:10 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mprnj.com by tigger.jvnc.net with UUCP id AA11609
(5.65c/IDA-1.4.4 for aapornet@usc.edu); Tue, 4 Jun 1996 09:55:06 -0400
From: MPRNJ!BGC@mprnj.com (Brenda Cox)
Date: 4-Jun-1996 9:48:28 -0400
Received: by mprnj.com (UUCP-MHS-XtcN) Tue Jun 04 09:54:18 1996
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: 1996 Joint Statistical Meetings
Message-Id: A4328F5101DC3BD9
Importance: Normal
Encoding: 58 TEXT

If you are interested in, or attending the August 1996 Joint Statistical Meetings, the following should be of interest to you.

----- Forwarded Message Follows -----

ASA asked for help in getting the following message out to members. The Joint Meeting registration brochure was mailed last week, but, unfortunately, a number of them were labeled with address only and no name. Members who receive their mail at home will receive it as usual, but members who receive it at large work places (like Census, USDA, or BLS) may never see it. There will be a notice in the June Amstat News which goes to the printer today to alert members.

The solutions ASA came up with were:

1. Download from the ASA web site at
<http://www.amstat.org/meetings/jsm/1996/index.html>

2. Borrow from a colleague and photocopy the registration form

If none of these options are possible then they can call the ASA office (ext.

100 or 154) and they will mail a new one. ASA has only have a limited supply of extra brochures, so they would like to send them out only to people who cannot access one anywhere else.

Questions? Contact ASA electronically at meetings@asa.org

Brenda

```
>From larry_cohen@maca.sarnoff.com Tue Jun 4 09:16:08 1996
Return-Path: larry_cohen@maca.sarnoff.com
Received: from nova.sarnoff.com (nova.sarnoff.com [130.33.8.27])
    by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA02817 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 09:16:05 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from maca.sarnoff.com (maca.sarnoff.com [130.33.8.142]) by
nova.sarnoff.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP id MAA16604 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 12:21:05 -0400
Message-ID: <n1378232027.30516@maca.sarnoff.com>
Date: 4 Jun 1996 12:12:21 U
From: "Larry Cohen" <larry_cohen@maca.sarnoff.com>
Subject: Child-Free Households
To: aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer: Mail*Link SMTP-QM 3.0.2
```

	Subject:	Time:12:11 PM
OFFICE MEMO	Child-Free Households	Date:6/4/96

Does anyone have any survey research or census data that indicates if the proportion of households that are child-free (not empty nests, nor households that have not had children yet, but those who have made the conscious decision to be, and remain, child-free) are growing. How can this population be identified? Demographics? Attitudes? (Someone who says they are child-free may wind up marrying someone who already has children, or they might change their mind.) There are tremendous implications for consumer marketing, not to mention demographics, if this life style can easily be identified, analyzed, etc.

Please feel free to answer me either directly or through AAPORNET. THX

Larry Cohen

(609) 734-2048
lcohen@sarnoff.com

>From NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU Tue Jun 4 10:14:41 1996
Return-Path: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU
Received: from UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (uchimvs1.uchicago.edu [128.135.19.10])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA09254 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 10:14:38 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <199606041714.KAA09254@usc.edu>
Received: from UCHIMVS1.BITNET by UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (IBM MVS SMTP V3R1)
with BSMTMP id 1693; Tue, 04 Jun 96 12:13:39 CDT
Date: Tue, 04 Jun 96 12:07 CST
From: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU
To: aapornet@USC.EDU
Subject: Re: Child-Free Households

One possibility is to look at the GSS time series on CHLDIDEL (ideal number of children for a family) and CHLDMORE (additional children expected) by CHILDS (number of children ever born). While indirect I think this could generate some useful along the child-free lines. Also, for a much shorter period check the GSS items in 1988 and 1994 on children. tom w smith

>From D1992@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU Tue Jun 4 12:45:02 1996
Return-Path: D1992@PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU
Received: from pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (smtpe@pucc.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.99])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA29200 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 12:44:56 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <199606041944.MAA29200@usc.edu>
Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU by pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTMP id 6781; Tue, 04 Jun 96 15:45:24 EDT
Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (NJE origin VMMAIL@PUCC) by
PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 3238; Tue, 4 Jun 1996
15:45:21 -0400
Received: by PUCC (Mailer R2.10 ptf008) id 6157; Tue, 04 Jun 96 15:45:02 EDT
Date: Tue, 04 Jun 96 15:41:32 EDT
From: Richard Sobel <D1992@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU>
Subject: Yugo. vol.
To: aapornet@usc.edu

The Council on Foreign Relations will be publishing a book on "Yugoslavia and Its War" this summer. My contribution is a piece comparing American and European attitudes on intervention in Bosnia (cf. our AAPOR panel). The CFR staff has asked for a list of recommendations of colleagues who might be interested in assigning the book for a course. If you might be interested in assigning it (or have a colleague to suggest), please email name and address and what course you might consider the book for. (I can include these names but can't promise books.) Thanks. RS P.S. If you know of colleagues working on POFPP outside the US, please let me know. R.

>From GoldenbK@oews.psb.bls.gov Tue Jun 4 15:04:42 1996
Return-Path: GoldenbK@oews.psb.bls.gov
Received: from dcgate ([146.142.4.13])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id PAA16111 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 15:04:40 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from MS-SMTPGatewayPC (pol.cpi.bls.gov) by mailgate.bls.gov

(5.x/SMI-SVR4)

id AA07397; Tue, 4 Jun 1996 18:03:28 -0400
Received: by MS-SMTPGatewayPC with Microsoft Mail
id <31B4B314@MS-SMTPGatewayPC>; Tue, 04 Jun 96 18:05:08 EDT
From: Goldenberg_K <GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov>
To: "'aapornet'" <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>
Subject: AAPOR Member Survey Results
Date: Tue, 04 Jun 96 17:58:00 EDT
Message-Id: <31B4B314@MS-SMTPGatewayPC>
Encoding: 12 TEXT
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0

Interested in the results of the AAPOR member survey? Watch for the next issue of AAPOR News for a first look at who we are and what we think about our organization. Can't wait? We distributed copies of preliminary results (marginals) at the 1996 Conference, both at the Business Meeting and at the session on the survey. If you didn't get a copy, you can get one by snail mail from the AAPOR Secretariat. Send your request by email to aapor@umich.edu. PLEASE DO NOT "REPLY" TO THIS MESSAGE.

Karen Goldenberg
goldenbk@oeus.psb.bls.gov
>From Bobo@rsage.org Wed Jun 5 13:44:27 1996
Return-Path: Bobo@rsage.org
Received: from nysernet.org (nysernet.org [192.77.173.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA28691 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Jun 1996 13:44:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from sagesmtp (rsage.org [192.103.8.10]) by nysernet.org
(8.6.11/8.6.11) with SMTP id QAA15254 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Jun
1996 16:43:52 -0400
Received: by sagesmtp with Microsoft Mail
id <31B61B94@sagesmtp>; Wed, 05 Jun 96 16:43:16 PDT
From: Lawrence Bobo <Bobo@rsage.org>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Nominations for POQ Editor
Date: Wed, 05 Jun 96 16:47:00 PDT
Message-ID: <31B61B94@sagesmtp>
Encoding: 17 TEXT
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0

Stanley Presser will finish his four year term as editor of Public Opinion Quarterly in summer 1997. As a result, the POQ Advisory Committee has established a search committee composed of Lawrence Bobo (chair), Eleanor Singer, Howard Schuman, and Stanley Presser (ex officio) to make a recommendation to the full Advisory Committee and to AAPOR Council on the next editor. We are seeking nominations, including self-nominations, to be the next editor for POQ. Please send all nominations to Prof. Lawrence Bobo, Advisory Committee Chair, Department of Sociology, University of California, Box 951551, Los Angeles, CA. 90095-1551, or by e-mail (BOBO@RSAGE.ORG). The deadline for nominations is June 30th, 1996.

PLEASE DO NOT "REPLY" TO AAPORNET. SEND e-mail directly to:

BOBO@RSAGE.ORG

>From lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu Wed Jun 5 14:31:29 1996
Return-Path: lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu
Received: from relay.acns.nwu.edu (daemon@relay.acns.nwu.edu
[129.105.16.56])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA05076 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Jun 1996 14:31:26 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [129.105.9.173] (aragorn173.nuts.nwu.edu) by
relay.acns.nwu.edu with SMTP
(1.37.109.18/20.4) id AA020520306; Wed, 5 Jun 1996 16:31:46 -0500
X-Nupop-Charset: English
Date: Wed, 5 Jun 1996 15:32:00 -0600 (CST)
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>
Sender: lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu
Message-Id: <55936.lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu

* * * * *
* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.; Professor & Director *
* Northwestern Univ. Survey Lab; 625 Haven St.; Evanston IL 60208 *
* OFFICE: 847-491-8356; FAX: 847-467-1564 *
* * * * *

>From jamwolf@indiana.edu Thu Jun 6 14:26:38 1996
Return-Path: jamwolf@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu
Received: from cayman.ucs.indiana.edu (cayman.ucs.indiana.edu
[129.79.10.63])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA27234 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Thu, 6 Jun 1996 14:26:35 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu (jamwolf@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu
[129.79.10.42]) by cayman.ucs.indiana.edu (8.7.3/8.7.3/1.10IUPO) with ESMTTP
id QAA26052; Thu, 6 Jun 1996 16:27:05 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from jamwolf@localhost) by falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu
(8.7/8.7/regexp(\$Revision: 1.3 \$) id QAA08120; Thu, 6 Jun 1996 16:26:28
-0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 6 Jun 1996 16:26:28 -0500 (EST)
From: Jim Wolf <jamwolf@indiana.edu>
X-Sender: jamwolf@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu
To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU
cc: Society for Applied Sociology <appsoc@indiana.edu>
Subject: Public school districts charaterictics from census data (fwd)
Message-ID:
<Pine.HPP.3.91.960606162307.2673C-100000@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I recently received this info and thought it might be useful for anyone
working on school survey data. My apologies if this gets posted twice.

+-----+
Jim Wolf Internet: jamwolf@indiana.edu
Consulting Sociologist Voice: (317) 255-9621
6332 N. Guilford - Suite #207 FAX: (317) 255-9714
Indianapolis, IN 46220 Home: (317) 257-7062

>From Usapolls@aol.com Thu Jun 6 18:33:58 1996
Return-Path: Usapolls@aol.com
Received: from emout17.mail.aol.com (emout17.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.43])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id SAA27071 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Jun 1996 18:33:56 -0700
(PDT)
From: Usapolls@aol.com
Received: by emout17.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id VAA13040 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 6 Jun 1996 21:33:26 -0400
Date: Thu, 6 Jun 1996 21:33:26 -0400
Message-ID: <960606213324_551005499@emout17.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Reply to Dr. Stanle (concerning AAPORNET protocol)

I'd offer that I could tolerate a larger number of msgs if writers would use a really informative SUBJECT line. This would permit readers to "pick and choose" what to read.

I for one, read my mail in batches every week or two. This leaves me with a huge pile and I would rather skim subject lines than have to delete batches unread or spend forever reading-- or even skimming -- the full text of msgs of low priority.

Mike O'Neil
>From BLACKJS@aol.com Fri Jun 7 07:43:25 1996
Return-Path: BLACKJS@aol.com
Received: from emout19.mail.aol.com (emout19.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.45])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id HAA17839 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 Jun 1996 07:43:23 -0700
(PDT)
From: BLACKJS@aol.com
Received: by emout19.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id KAA12100; Fri, 7 Jun 1996 10:42:54 -0400
Date: Fri, 7 Jun 1996 10:42:54 -0400
Message-ID: <960607104253_409263071@emout19.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: carolhen@netins.net
Subject: Bowling Alone

While statistics on organizational memberships provide the basis for much of Robert Putnam's theory about the decline of "social capital" in the U.S., some of the statistics used in his 1995 article in the Journal of Democracy are based on trends studies conducted by AAPORNETers. As a result of extraordinary media attention, the issue of the Journal of Democracy in which the article was published is now out of print, but the article itself is being used by John Hopkins Press as an example of their plans to put a number of journals online. The article can be accessed by browsing the online journals at <http://muse.jhu.edu/>

In the April 1996 Notes and Comments of The Atlantic Monthly, Nicholas Lemann raises a number of questions about Putnam's theories. In one part, Lemann wonders if there are not other places for face-to-face contacts that have sprung up to replace the organizations whose memberships are declining, saying "many of the declining associations Putnam mentions are like episodes

of The Honeymooners seen today -- out of date." Of course, one of the problems with trend studies is that while holding structured items constant to accurately detect change, we sometimes miss emerging issues or interests.

Putnam hypothesizes that the "technological transformation of leisure," especially the increase in television viewing is part of the reason for the decline in face-to-face contacts, and wonders what the impact of electronic networks will be on social capital.

Do any AAPORites have something to add to the "Bowling Alone" discussion? If so, I'd like to hear from you, either to me personally or to AAPORNET if you think it is of general interest.

Joan Black
BLACKJS@aol.com

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Sun Jun 9 16:08:59 1996
Return-Path: pmeyer@email.unc.edu
Received: from login0.email.unc.edu (pmeyer@login0.email.unc.edu [152.2.25.14])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id QAA16557 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Jun 1996 16:08:58 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from pmeyer@localhost) by login0.email.unc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id TAA191314; Sun, 9 Jun 1996 19:08:55 -0400
Date: Sun, 9 Jun 1996 19:08:55 -0400 (EDT)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Bowling Alone
In-Reply-To: <960607104253_409263071@emout19.mail.aol.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.A32.3.91.960609190521.153377A-100000@login0.email.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Deborah Procopio, in her M.A. thesis at Chapel Hill this spring, found that Internet users were somewhat higher on the GSS trust-in-people questions, even after education was controlled. Trust is one way to operationalize Putnam's concept of social capital. Her study was based on 600 voting-age North Carolinians.

Phil Meyer

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Jun 10 06:09:54 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA25220 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 06:09:52 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id GAA10327 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 06:09:52 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Mon, 10 Jun 1996 06:09:51 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Job: Project Mgr, Drexel SRC
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960610060742.8591D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Date: Fri, 7 Jun 1996 12:37:41 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Dr. William L. Rosenberg" <rosenl@dunx1.ocs.drexel.edu>
Subject: Job Announcement

The Drexel University Survey Research Center (DUSRC) is seeking a project manager to supervise a field staff undertaking a multi-year evaluation study. The candidate should have experience with SPSSX and standard word processing programs, excellent interpersonal and communication skills and have prior research experience. This position has typically been held by MA or ABD individuals. The minimum educational requirement is a BA or BS degree. While not guaranteed, many of the project managers with advanced degrees have been offered adjunct teaching assignments. However, these are on case by case basis.

The Center is located in Philadelphia, on Drexel's main campus. The University has a student body of approximately 9,000 undergraduate and graduate students. Please contact the William L. Rosenberg, Director at rosenl@duvm.ocs.drexel.edu. Resumes may be faxed to 215-895-1305 to the attention of Dr. Rosenberg or sent via e-mail.

William L. Rosenberg, Ph.D.
Director
Drexel University Survey Research Center
32 nd and Chestnut Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19104
rosenl@duvm.ocs.drexel.edu
215-895-1302 Voice
215-895-1305 FAX

>From hochschi@wws.Princeton.EDU Mon Jun 10 10:17:54 1996
Return-Path: hochschi@wws.Princeton.EDU
Received: from Princeton.EDU (root@Princeton.EDU [128.112.128.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA22657 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 10:17:53 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU by Princeton.EDU
(5.65b/2.125/princeton)
id AA18895; Mon, 10 Jun 96 11:36:27 -0400
Received: from wws.princeton.edu (wws.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.240]) by
ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU (8.6.12/8.6.12) with ESMTTP id LAA26948; Mon, 10
Jun 1996 11:36:20 -0400
Received: from WWS/MAILQUEUE by wws.princeton.edu (Mercury 1.21);
10 Jun 96 11:39:04 EST
Received: from MAILQUEUE by WWS (Mercury 1.21); 10 Jun 96 11:38:37 EST
From: "Jennifer Hochschild" <hochschi@wws.Princeton.EDU>
Organization: WWS
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Mon, 10 Jun 1996 11:38:33 EST
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Bowling Alone
Cc: carolhen@netins.net

X-Confirm-Reading-To: "Jennifer Hochschild" <hochschi@wws.princeton.edu>
X-Pmrgc: 1
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.23)
Message-Id: <AFBBC84180B@wws.princeton.edu>

One of the tricky aspects of Bob Putnam's argument seems to me to be that, to the degree that it is true, the loss of social capital through the loss of collective engagements is due to a considerable degree to the fact of middle-class women moving into the workforce. (SOrry about that sentence- it is Monday morning.) My evidence here is largely my children's public schools; the mothers who are not working outside the home are often deeply involved in PTA, know each other well, make enormous efforts to get the rest of us involved (which we do through baking brownies at midnight, if at all). Clearly those mothers have a set of social connections that maybe other mothers used to have, and that maybe then involved the fathers, and neighbors.... Whether that translates into political democracy is another and not easily-resolved question.

Bob Putnam, no more than myself, wants to blame women for moving into the labor force, and he wants to be very careful not to provide ammunition for those who do want to blame women for so doing. But I would guess that the fact still remains -- is there more systematic evidence than my PTA stories? do women in the workforce create a different kind of social capital through a different set of networks etc. that substitutes for the old PTA-Girl and Boy Scouts-church socials etc. activities that are now struggling to find participants???

Jennifer Hochschild

Date: Fri, 7 Jun 1996 10:42:54 -0400
Reply-to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: BLACKJS@aol.com
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: carolhen@netins.net
Subject: Bowling Alone

While statistics on organizational memberships provide the basis for much of Robert Putnam's theory about the decline of "social capital" in the U.S., some of the statistics used in his 1995 article in the Journal of Democracy are based on trends studies conducted by AAPORNETers.....

Do any AAPORites have something to add to the "Bowling Alone" discussion? If so, I'd like to hear from you, either to me personally or to AAPORNET if you think it is of general interest.

Joan Black
BLACKJS@aol.com

xx

Jennifer Hochschild
Politics Dept/Woodrow Wilson School
Princeton University

nation embarked upon its third great wave of newcomers. Now, in an era of Congressional false economy (each question costs money to ask and process), demographers cannot get this item restored.

No matter what one's interest in how the characteristics and behavior of immigrants change in the next generation, the 2000 census as currently drawn up will not satisfy it. Efforts to develop programs for immigrant groups will be hamstrung for the ensuing decade, at a minimum. Only Congress can move to restore these questions.

But be fair to the Census Bureau and increase financing accordingly.

B. MEREDITH BURKE
Palo Alto, Calif., June 6, 1996

Copyright 1996 The New York Times

>From poch@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA Mon Jun 10 11:29:03 1996
Return-Path: uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA!poch@uipchr.freenet.kiev.ua
Received: from freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua (root@freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua [194.44.28.250])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA02116 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 11:28:57 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from uipchr.UUCP (uualexp@localhost) by freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua (8.6.13/osf3.2xla) with UUCP id VAA03533 for AAPORNET@usc.edu; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 21:07:31 +0300
Received: by uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA (UUPC/@ v5.09gamma, 14Mar93);
Mon, 10 Jun 1996 19:06:47 +0200
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu
Message-Id: <AAAd05lnan2@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA>
Organization: Ukrainian Institute of Peace, Conflicts and Humanity Rights Studies
From: "Georgiy G. Pocheptsov" <poch@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA>
Date: Mon, 10 Jun 96 19:06:47 +0200
X-Mailer: BML [MS/DOS Beauty Mail v.1.36]
Lines: 15

The Russian newspaper "Isvestia" (June 6, 1996) has published results of the sociological polls of the public opinion of rural population of Russia where rural population equals to 26% of voters. The part of these results are such: for the Soviet system are 39% of the whole population and 58% of the rural population, for the today's political system are 10% of the whole population and 6% of the rural population, for the Western type of democracy - 29% of the whole population and 16% of the rural population. And the resulting picture of the voters decision: for Yeltsin - 17%, for Zhirinovskiy - 9% and for Ziuganov - 38% (the date from the first part of May)

Prof. Dr. Georgij Pocheptsov
Institute of International Relations
University of Kiev
36/1 Melnikova Str.
254119 Kiev, UKRAINE

>From SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu Mon Jun 10 11:41:07 1996
Return-Path: <@YaleVM.CIS.Yale.Edu:SSDCF@UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU>
Received: from YaleVM.CIS.Yale.Edu (yalevm.ycc.yale.edu [130.132.21.136])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA03927 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 11:41:05 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU by YaleVM.CIS.Yale.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTMP id 0143; Mon, 10 Jun 96 14:39:46 EDT
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UCONNVM) by
UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 2585; Mon, 10 Jun 1996
14:40:28 -0400
Date: Mon, 10 Jun 96 14:36:07 EDT
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject: Bowling alone (reprise)
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-Id: <960610.144027.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>

Jennifer Hochschild raises some crucial points about the impact of women's
(increased) labor force participation. This would A PRIORI not only cut
down on women's availability for PTA, etc., while perhaps providing them
with social networks precisely through the workplace, but it would
indirectly affect the availability of their partners for certain activities
(e.g. bowling leagues). In addition,

it might well shift the balance of the KIND of association people engage in
with various consequences. All this must also be viewed in the context that
there are a variety of areas where the "common wisdom" of sharply declining
voluntary association seems to be drastically overstated. See the newest
number of the Roper Center's PUBLIC PERSPECTIVE for lots of interesting data
on this subject.

G. Donald Ferree, Jr. (860) 486-4440 / 6308 (FAX)
Institute for Social Inquiry/Roper Center SSDCF@UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU
University of Connecticut U-164 341 Mansfield Road, Room 421 Storrs CT
06269-1164

>From RUSCIANO@enigma.rider.edu Mon Jun 10 12:24:40 1996
Return-Path: RUSCIANO@enigma.rider.edu
Received: from enigma.rider.edu (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP
id MAA11234 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 12:24:37 -0700
(PDT)
From: RUSCIANO@enigma.rider.edu
Received: from enigma.rider.edu by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V4.3-7 #15764) id
<01I5QY5PFHDS90NC2E@enigma.rider.edu>; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 15:23:58 EDT
Date: Mon, 10 Jun 1996 15:23:58 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: Jennifer Hochschild's comments
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01I5QY5PH38Y90NC2E@enigma.rider.edu>
X-VMS-To: IN%"aapornet@usc.edu"
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Jennifer's comments are well taken. I would add an anecdotal point which I admit may not be of general applicability. While fraternal organizations and bowling leagues for adults may have declined, I wonder whether more adults are involved in their children's activities, and therefore socialize that way. For instance, I know that for many years, I have spent more weekends than I can count on the soccer fields with my son (as well as in wrestling, tennis, etc.). My parents, by contrast, belonged to bowling leagues and other groups with adults, but did not have the kind of group activities with their children that I see most parents today having. One should add, of course, that the parents spend a lot of time socializing with each other on the sidelines of their children's sports (not to mention in the hotels at tournaments). Since I am not familiar with Putnam's work, does he include such activities which are certainly more common than in our parents' day?

Frank L. Rusciano
Rider University

>From tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu Mon Jun 10 14:33:29 1996
Return-Path: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu
Received: from virginia.edu (mars.itc.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA29079 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 14:33:28 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from uva.pcmail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa28690;
10 Jun 96 17:33 EDT
Received: by uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU (8.6.10/1.34)
id RAA29574; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 17:33:22 -0400
Message-Id: <199606102133.RAA29574@uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU>
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu>
Date: Mon, 10 Jun 96 17:33:12 EDT
X-Mailer: UVa PCMail 1.9.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Bowling alone
Cc: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu

Amid all the insights and data being shared regarding Robert Putnam's thesis, I feel compelled to offer another, highly personal note.

After about five years of "bowling alone," I joined an actual bowling league a few weeks ago.

Several survey researchers of my acquaintance here joined at the same time. Imagine the transformation here: not only a new "league" bowler, but--with this posting--no longer a closet bowler!

Could we be the start of a great, yet unseen countertrend?

Or the exception that proves the rule?

More importantly--will my average go up?

. . . I feel so much better. . .

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (804) 924-6516
Sociology/Center for Survey Research FAX: (804) 924-7028
University of Virginia, 539 Cabell Hall
Charlottesville, VA 22903e-mail: TomG@Virginia.Edu
>From ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU Mon Jun 10 15:14:48 1996
Return-Path: ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU
Received: from hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu (hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.2])

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id PAA05076 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 15:14:45 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.96]) by hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george0995) with SMTP id
SAA14812; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 18:14:32 -0400
Date: Mon, 10 Jun 1996 18:16:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: Kenneth Sherrill <ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: aapornet@usc.edu, tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu
Subject: Re: Bowling alone and closet bowlers
In-Reply-To: <199606102133.RAA29574@uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.960610181434.10382C-100000@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

A propos of closet bowlers: There is a lesbian and gay bowling league at
the Bowlmore Lanes in New York City that claims to be the biggest bowling
league in the nation. I won't get into the question of constructed
community, but does anyone know where comparative bowling league data
might be available?

Ken Sherrill
Hunter College

On Mon, 10 Jun 1996, Thomas M. Guterbock wrote:

> Amid all the insights and data being shared regarding Robert
> Putnam's thesis, I feel compelled to offer another, highly personal note.
> After about five years of "bowling alone," I joined an actual bowling
> league a few weeks ago.
> Several survey researchers of my acquaintance here joined at the same
> time. Imagine the transformation here: not only a new "league" bowler,
> but--with this posting--no longer a closet bowler!
> Could we be the start of a great, yet unseen countertrend?
> Or the exception that proves the rule?
> More importantly--will my average go up?
> . . . I feel so much better. . .

Tom

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

>From poch@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA Tue Jun 11 05:01:11 1996
Return-Path: uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA!poch@uipchr.freenet.kiev.ua
Received: from freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua (root@freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua
[194.44.28.250])

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id FAA29566 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 05:01:05 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from uipchr.UUCP (uugas@localhost) by freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua
(8.6.13/osf3.2xla) with UUCP id OAA21164 for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 11 Jun
1996 14:41:37 +0300

Received: by uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA (UUPC/@ v5.09gamma, 14Mar93);

Tue, 11 Jun 1996 14:07:29 +0200

To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-Id: <AA16Mlnan2@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA>
Organization: Ukrainian Institute of Peace, Conflicts and Humanity
Rights Studies
From: "Georgiy G. Pocheptsov" <poch@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA>
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 96 14:07:29 +0200
X-Mailer: BML [MS/DOS Beauty Mail v.1.36]
Subject: Elections in Russia
Lines: 18

The Russian newspaper "Isvestia" (1996, June 11) has published the resulting picture of polls for prognosis of the elections: for Yeltsin - 36-40%, for Ziuganov - 29-33%, all other candidates will not have more than 7-10%. But other sociologists are not so optimistic. "Argumeny i fakty" (1996, N 23) is showing the equality of results: at the end of May Yeltzin has 26%, Ziuganov - 25%. So the prognosis states 36% for each of them at the resulting picture. "Isvestia" (1996, June 8) has also revealed the results of credibility to future elections: 29,8% thinks that elections will be fair, 24,9% - nonfair, 45,3% - don't know. The picture is complicated also by the number of supporters that are supposed to come: 75% supporters of Ziuganov are supposed to come and only 60-65% of the Yeltsin supporters ("Argumenty i fakty" (1996, N23)

Prof. Dr. Georgij Pocheptsov
Institute of International Relations
University of Kiev
36/1 Melnikova Str.
254119 Kiev, UKRAINE

>From EUSLANER@bss2.umd.edu Tue Jun 11 08:21:51 1996
Return-Path: EUSLANER@bss2.umd.edu
Received: from umail.UMD.EDU (umail.umd.edu [128.8.10.28])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id IAA18187 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 08:21:47 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by umail.UMD.EDU (5.57/Ultrix3.0-C)
id AA24983; Tue, 11 Jun 96 11:21:38 -0400
Received: from LEFRAK2/MAILQUEUE1 by bss2.umd.edu (Mercury 1.20);
11 Jun 96 11:21:45 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by LEFRAK2 (Mercury 1.20); 11 Jun 96 11:21:30
+1100
From: "Eric M. Uslaner" <EUSLANER@bss2.umd.edu>
Organization: University of Maryland, College Park
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 1996 11:21:27 EDT
Subject: Re: Bowling Alone
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail v3.31
Message-Id: <103B12C900A7@bss2.umd.edu>

As some of you may know, I have been working on social capital for some time. Jennifer Hochschild's note prompts me to respond. Neither Bob Putnam nor I have found that the movement of more women into the work force has had any impact on either trust or membership in organizations. My own work shows that except for willingness to serve on a jury, time constraints (such as working spouses or numbers

of hours worked overall) play little role in whether people participate in volunteering, working on community problems, and joining organizations. Why? Just as Jennifer spends her midnight hours baking cookies, busy people FIND time to get involved.

Who doesn't? People who are pessimists--about the future and their own sense of control. They are less trusting and through this less willing to get involved in their communities. They are the least likely to say that if their bosses were to give them an extra day off, they would spend it either volunteering their time or studying.

How can we build social capital? Maybe through bowling. People who play sports or even just attend sporting events (though we can't tell which ones from the General Social Survey) are both more trusting and more likely to join voluntary associations. My take on this is that playing sports brings you into contact with a wider group of people than you might otherwise meet. It helps build tolerance and thus trust and in turn participation.

Reactions would be welcome.

Ric Uslaner

Government and Politics

University of Maryland--College Park

Tydings 3140 College Park MD 20742

office: 301-405-4151 fax: 301-314-9690

home: 301-279-0414

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 11 09:01:32 1996

Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP

id JAA22441 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 09:01:31 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id JAA01476 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 09:01:30 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Tue, 11 Jun 1996 09:01:28 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Witt on Web for Politics Now

Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960611085817.1095A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

WITT ON WEB FOR POLITICS NOW

AAPORNETter G. Evans Witt has become the executive editor of Politics Now, the hottest political site on the World Wide Web. Launched last week at <http://www.politicsnow.com/> [no caps], out of an office highrise in Rosslyn, Virginia, Politics Now is a joint venture of three global media giants: Capital Cities/ABC Inc., the Washington Post Company, and Times Mirror. The site combines both the news and marketing talents of ABC News, The Washington Post, The Los Angeles Times, Newsweek and The National Journal.

Evans, who has covered politics for The Associated Press for some 20 years, most recently from its DC offices at 2021 K Street NW, will oversee the merger of two former sites: Election Line, a joint venture of Cap Cities/ABC and the Washington Post, and the Times Mirror's Politics USA. At the time of their consolidation, each site sustained more than 35 thousand pages on the Web.

The Web's remaining political super-site, CNN/Time Inc.'s All Politics (<http://allpolitics.com/>), is Politics Now's only major competitor. Recently All Politics began to survey visitors about their preferences among alternative means for paying for access to--or various uses of--its site.

Politics Now intends to keep user access free at least through January, according to yesterday's New York Times Business Today. At least five companies reportedly have agreed to pay \$10 thousand a month through the Presidential inauguration to advertise at the site. After that, Politics Now might adopt a three-tiered access, with one of its sections free of charge, another open for an individual fee, and a third--designed for researchers and operatives--accessible only by a steeper payment pegged for professionals.

#####

>From RCUMMINS@a1.aarp.org Tue Jun 11 09:09:53 1996
Return-Path: <@VM.usc.edu:RCUMMINS@a1.aarp.org>
Received: from VM.USC.EDU (vm.usc.edu [128.125.241.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA23215 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 09:09:50 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from gatekeeper.aarp.org by VM.USC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with
TCP;
Tue, 11 Jun 96 09:12:54 PDT
Received: from [170.109.2.29] by gatekeeper.aarp.org;
(5.65v3.0/1.1.8.2/18Apr95-1035AM)
id AA15318; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 12:07:19 -0400
Received: with SMTP-MR; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 12:03:20 EST
Mr-Received: by mta PEPSI; Relayed; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 12:03:20 -0500 (EST)
Alternate-Recipient: prohibited
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 1996 08:03:29 EST
From: Rachelle Cummins X6297 <RCUMMINS@a1.aarp.org>
Subject: ACTION: Bowling Alone
To: aapornet@vm.usc.edu
Message-Id: <B341ZWIOH8HLR*/R=MYSTIC/R=A1/U=RCUMMINS/@MHS>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN
Posting-Date: Tue, 11 Jun 1996 12:03:00 EST
Importance: normal
Priority: normal
Sensitivity: Company-Confidential
Ua-Content-Id: B341ZWIOH8HLR
X400-Mts-Identifier: [;02302111606991/270958@MYSTIC]
A1-Type: MAIL
Hop-Count: 0

6/11/96

I am interested in the discussion of Putnam's "bowling

alone." Is there a special body of opinion research that you would recommend reading beyond Putnam and whatever is in the Roper Center's Public Perspective? Also, what are the gaps in the literature?

Please respond to AAPORNET or to me personally:

Rachelle Cummins
rcummins@aarp.org
(202) 434-6297

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 11 09:17:15 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA25370 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 09:17:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA02277 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 09:17:12 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 1996 09:17:11 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Internet Index #13
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960611091429.1095D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The Internet Index
Number 13
Inspired by "Harper's Index"*
Compiled by Win Treese (treese@OpenMarket.com)
9 June 1996

Number of security incidents reported to the Computer Emergency Response
Team Coordination Center in 1995: 2412

Number of sites affected by those incidents: 12,000

Number reported in 1988: 6

Number of Christine Lavin songs containing a URL: 1

Estimated amount spent on advertising on the Internet in 1995: \$33,000,000

Estimated total amount spent on advertising in the U.S.: \$159,000,000,000

Percentage of comics in the Boston Globe listing e-mail addresses: 38

Percentage of comics in the Boston Globe listing URLs: 21

Number of TV networks planning to provide live video broadcast of the
1996 political conventions: 1

Number of Danish e-mail addresses listed in Tele Danmark's directory:
70,000

According to IBM, number of verbs connected companies live by: 5

Amount Bell Atlantic pays to Internet service providers for referring residential customers: \$15

Number of plaintiffs in lawsuit contesting the Communications Decency Act: 46

Number of Internet hosts, as of January, 1996: 9.5 million

Number of web servers counted in the June Netcraft Web Server Survey: 252,685

Number of new country Internet domains added in February, 1996: 3

Percentage increase in number of Portuguese Internet hosts, May, 1996: 17

"Harper's Index" is a registered trademark of Harper's Magazine Foundation. Copyright 1996 by Win Treese. Send updates or interesting statistics to treese@OpenMarket.com.

>From BROH@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU Tue Jun 11 09:34:14 1996

Return-Path: BROH@PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU

Received: from pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (smtpc@pucc.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.99])

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id JAA27362 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 09:34:10 -0700

(PDT)

Message-Id: <199606111634.JAA27362@usc.edu>

Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU by pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with BSMTMP id 6402; Tue, 11 Jun 96 12:28:57 EDT

Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (NJE origin VMMAIL@PUCC) by PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 1202; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 12:24:34 -0400

Received: by PUCC (Mailer R2.10 ptf008) id 8721; Tue, 11 Jun 96 12:24:33 EDT

Date: Tue, 11 Jun 96 11:47:39 EDT

From: "C. Anthony Broh" <BROH@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU>

Subject: Re: Bowling Alone

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

In-Reply-To: Message of Tue, 11 Jun 1996 11:21:27 EDT from

<EUSLANER@bss2.umd.edu>

Ric-

But Jennifer's point is that she bakes cookies at midnight rather than take part in social interaction with non-working mothers at girl scout meetings -- or the side-lines of at soccer games to pick up on another thread. This point is also made by Lynn Hunt from the University of Pennsylvania in her demographic analysis of faculty in the Humanities (at a Conference on Higher Education as part of Princeton's 250th celebration). Hunt argues that junior faculty women today do not have some of the advantages of junior faculty men from an earlier generation. The latter group met regularly at social events (that were organized by a non-working wife) and buildd social capital that could be used later in one's career. So Jennifer's experience is not unusual in that working women have less time to socialize among people who can affect their careers as well as those who might provide less

common customs and concerns. Does being active in AAPOR count as "community"? By some definitions, but not in the traditional sense of ongoing involvement with people in close geographical proximity. As an extreme example of "community" in the traditional sense, the Amish keep it together better than any other group of which I am aware. Of course, they do it by eschewing much of what we take for granted as the "modern world" (being nearly totally politically incorrect also may contribute).

If we had an idea of what sorts of changes have taken place in community participation, then it would make sense to analyze causes -- not only women in the workplace, but also mobility, suburbanization, TV, economic pressures in general, greater array of leisure options, greater degree of personal selfishness, etc. For example, throughout the east, volunteer fire companies have been declining for decades. This seems to be at least partially a result of small towns growing larger by virtue of influx of families whose breadwinners commute away from the community, or who work for corporations that do not allow time off to answer the fire alarm. Too bad, as it traditionally provided a means by which the men of the community could provide useful service and occasionally even do something heroic.

If PTA participation has declined, it may have something to do with women in the workplace, but other causes -- e.g., former PTA tasks having been taken over by paid professionals, lower % of children in public schools, pupils bussed out of the neighborhood, decline in commitment to education, etc -- may play a role also.

Another question is: how many of the people studying this would actually want to commit themselves to a "traditional community" situation? The answer to that might help in understanding why they are in decline.

Ray Funkhouser

```
>From Ludwigjh@aol.com Tue Jun 11 10:37:41 1996
Return-Path: Ludwigjh@aol.com
Received: from emout15.mail.aol.com (emout15.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.41])
    by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id KAA05376 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 10:37:39 -0700
(PDT)
From: Ludwigjh@aol.com
Received: by emout15.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id NAA03120 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 13:37:15 -0400
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 1996 13:37:15 -0400
Message-ID: <960611133654_411950306@emout15.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: AAPOR-negotiated book discounts
```

According to AAPOR Conference book exhibit organizer Phyllis Endreny, many conferees expressed interest in whether a discount could be obtained on the purchase of the Sudman "Asking Questions" and Schwarz/Sudman "Thinking About Answers" books:

Susan Cho, Associate Marketing Manager at Jossey Bass Publishers, has just communicated an offer of a 20% discount to all AAPORites and WAPORites who order the PAIR of books. The discount price on the PAIR will, therefore, be \$59. (Tax and shipping charges will be added to this amount).

PLEASE NOTE: ALL ORDERS TAKING ADVANTAGE OF THIS DISCOUNT (OR QUESTIONS ABOUT IT) SHOULD BE SENT DIRECTLY TO SUSAN CHO at:

Jossey-Bass Publishers,
350 Sansome Street
San Francisco CA 94104
Phone: 415-433-1740

Thanks to Phyllis for her work in organizing the book exhibit, and her relentless pursuit of book bargains.

Jack Ludwig
1996 AAPOR Conference Chair

```
>From hochschi@wws.Princeton.EDU Tue Jun 11 12:30:30 1996
Return-Path: hochschi@wws.Princeton.EDU
Received: from Princeton.EDU (root@Princeton.EDU [128.112.128.1])
    by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id MAA19222 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 12:30:28 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU by Princeton.EDU
(5.65b/2.125/princeton)
    id AA11527; Tue, 11 Jun 96 15:13:33 -0400
Received: from wws.princeton.edu (wws.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.240]) by
ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU (8.6.12/8.6.12) with ESMTMP id PAA10823; Tue, 11
Jun 1996 15:13:31 -0400
Received: from WWS/MAILQUEUE by wws.princeton.edu (Mercury 1.21);
    11 Jun 96 15:16:15 EST
Received: from MAILQUEUE by WWS (Mercury 1.21); 11 Jun 96 15:15:53 EST
From: "Jennifer Hochschild" <hochschi@wws.Princeton.EDU>
Organization: WWS
To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 1996 15:15:51 EST
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Bowling Alone
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.23)
Message-Id: <B175C534080@wws.princeton.edu>
```

all of this discussion of Putnam, working women, sports, closet bowlers... is fascinating, and I do hope we keep it going for a while -- data-driven, anecdote- (now called narrative-)driven, whatever.

Here I want to reiterate a part of my original musing that I did not emphasize enough: how does one deal with a potential explanation for a problem that is not itself (that is, the explanation) a problem, at least in one's own eyes? To be less obtuse, I have had the sense (though Ric Uslaner disagrees, and is closer to the issue than I am) that Bob Putnam is sort of dancing around the possibility that women in the work force is part of the explanation for the declines that he finds, because he does not want to castigate women for going to work or help others to so

castigate women. So he avoids that explanation, or seeks hard to disprove it....

I may be wrong about Putnam here, and Ric suggests that the whole potential explanation is wrong -- but my basic question still remains: are there better and worse ways to deal with a (possible) explanation for something when the use of that explanation threatens to blow up politically?

XX

Jennifer Hochschild
Politics Dept/Woodrow Wilson School
Princeton University
Princeton NJ 08544
o: 609-258-5634
fax: 609-258-2809
hochschi@wvs.princeton.edu

XX

>From smarcy@datastat.com Tue Jun 11 14:11:09 1996
Return-Path: smarcy@datastat.com
Received: from smarcy ([152.160.28.9])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA02102 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 14:11:07 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 96 17:10:56 EST
Message-Id: <9606111710.AA10572@smarcy>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
From: "Sherry Marcy" <smarcy@datastat.com>
Reply-To: <smarcy@datastat.com>
Sender: <smarcy@smarcy>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Bowling Alone
X-Mailer: <IMAIL v1.07.24>

Maybe I'm missing something here, but why does a suggestion that women contributed greatly in many ways (building neighborhoods, contributing to schools, caretaking of children and other family members, aiding the building of others' social capital, etc.) mean that they may be castigated for going to work?

Why not see it as an acknowledgement (however belated) that women have *always* contributed but, in the past at least, were not always rewarded for their important contributions?

In other words, suppose our culture were to value (maybe even value in an economic sense) caregiving or social capital building efforts of *anyone* (men included) more. Perhaps more people would decide to engage in these activities, rather than go to work, and maybe not all of them would be women. Granted I don't know much about this, but what am I missing?

>From dobson@usia.gov Tue Jun 11 14:31:48 1996
Return-Path: dobson@usia.gov
Received: from usia.gov (XGATE.USIA.GOV [198.67.64.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id OAA04455 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 14:31:46 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from Connect2 Message Router by usia.gov
via Connect2-SMTP 4.00; Tue, 11 Jun 96 17:32:10 -0400
Message-ID: <8A8DBD3101BD1110@usia.gov>
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 96 17:24:47 -0400
From: "Dobson, Richard" <dobson@usia.gov>
Sender: "Dobson, Richard" <dobson@usia.gov>
Organization: USIA
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: pincus@usia.gov (Pincus, Ann), grant@usia.gov (Grant, Steve)
Subject: Russian Pollsters: Can You Believe What You Read in the Papers?
X-mailer: Connect2-SMTP 4.00 MHS to SMTP Gateway

The following piece, which may be of interest to AAPORNET subscribers, was penned by Steven A. Grant. one of my colleagues in the Office of Research and Media Reaction at USIA. He has much experience working with Russian survey research firms. You may send comments to him at the address {GRANT@USIA.GOV}

Russian Pollsters: Can You Believe What You Read in the Papers? Steven A. Grant

Recent stories in the New York Times, Washington Post, and elsewhere have cast aspersions on the validity of public opinion polling in Russia--in particular, on polling for the upcoming presidential elections.

Claims by some Western reporters that Russian survey researchers are not up to the task are based largely on the alleged poor showing of these pollsters during past election campaigns and on claims of a renewed sense of fear among the Russian populace to respond to questions freely and openly. Other criticisms are that certain pollsters are "in the pocket" of the president (Boris Yeltsin's rating recently jumped up), that poll questions are often slanted to influence results, or that results are "cooked" to sway public opinion toward one candidate or another

The U.S. Information Agency has done business with Russian pollsters for over six years, and our experience does not bear out these charges. On the contrary, we find these allegations -- for the most part -- to be misleading and unfair. Having begun polling as far back as the 1950s, most of the leading survey experts have gained a lot also from working with Western clients over the years: their sampling and interviewing techniques, questionnaire construction, data entry and analysis are basically those used by Western polling firms.

Of course, societal conditions--economic fears, lack of stability--tend

to exaggerate the problems for Russian pollsters today. For a comparable situation, one need look no further than Israel, where polls showed Shimon Peres leading up to the final days--and were "right"--i.e., within about 3 percentage points of the final results--and all pollsters said the race was too close to call.

Let's look more closely at each of these accusations. First, that Russian pollsters somehow failed to predict the outcomes of the 1993 and 1995 parliamentary (Duma) elections. Experts at the University of Glasgow (including Stephen White and William L. Miller) who have examined closely Russian surveys in the 1993 Duma elections have found that these allegations simply do not hold up. In their article in the spring 1996 issue of Public Opinion Quarterly, they refute, on a point-by-point basis, claims that Russian surveys did not find the last-minute swing toward anti-government parties like Vladimir Zhirinovskiy's.

Similarly, for the Duma elections in late 1995, the best Russian firms were able to get the picture "right," with a fairly high degree of accuracy, for all but 2 or 3 of the more than 40 parties running. Several were right on the button for the Communist Party and Our Home is Russia; and, for most of the leading parties, they were easily within the "margin of polling error"--which might best be termed the degree of poll uncertainty. All polls have such a measure of uncertainty.

Second, about the renewed fear of respondents. It is true that the "refusal" rate among potential respondents (the share who decline to be interviewed) can reach 15-20 percent or more on many polls. This rate, however, is much lower than for many Western polls, and can be explained more easily by boredom with polling or politics than by fear of reprisal for saying the "wrong" thing. While outright lying is more difficult to detect, it is rather hard to pull off--given the many checks for internal consistency which we and others try to build into our survey instruments. Deliberate concealment of voting intentions or other attitudes is also of concern, but our experience would seem to argue for a smaller rather than larger proportion of respondents who practice such deception. There is simply no credible evidence at this point that respondents are deliberately misleading pollsters.

What of various Russian survey experts -- cited by the Western reporters -- who express doubts about some colleagues' practices? Often, denigration of others' work is a way to boost the

fortunes of their own firms in the fierce competition for polling funds. It may be indicative that none of the Russian pollsters quoted in the Times or Post articles is critical by name of the best Russian polling firms.

Third, on being "bought" by Yeltsin or others: It is true that many of the leading Russian firms either undertake surveys at the behest of various politicians or share poll results with them. But this does not necessarily vitiate the results. Most important, it defies logic that the best pollsters would jeopardize their reputation and their work for such small stakes as the short-term gratification of those ordering the polls. USIA-commissioned polls and those of private firms not on the government payroll, moreover, show the same results as those allegedly skewed for the government's benefit. It is always possible, of course, that some survey researchers do

manipulate findings, in order to create a bandwagon effect or the negative swings that American "push-polls" strive to achieve. But these practices are not found among the best firms.

While not without their share of problems (problems shared by virtually all Western firms), over the years Russian polling companies have made enormous strides in methods and do a creditable job in their surveys of public attitudes. Considering their difficulties, the best work of the best firms stacks up quite well with that of the best Western pollsters.

Steven A. Grant is Chief of the Russia, Ukraine, and Commonwealth Branch of the U.S. Information Agency's Office of Research and Media Reaction. The views expressed herein are his own and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of U.S.I.A. or the U.S. Government.

>From JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu Tue Jun 11 15:42:50 1996
Return-Path: JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu
Received: from umail.UMD.EDU (umail.umd.edu [128.8.10.28])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id PAA13753 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 15:42:46 -0700
(PDT)
From: JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu
Received: by umail.UMD.EDU (5.57/Ultrix3.0-C)
id AA06009; Tue, 11 Jun 96 18:42:38 -0400
Received: from BSOSCATI/MAILQUEUE1 by cati.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);
Tue, 11 Jun 96 18:42:46 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by BSOSCATI (Mercury 1.13); Tue, 11 Jun 96
18:42:30 +1100
Organization: Survey Research Center, UMCP
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 1996 18:42:27 EDT
Subject: Re: National Omnibus Deadline

Reply-To: johnny@cati.umd.edu
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: PMail v3.0 (R1)
Message-Id: <283E6E57273@cati.umd.edu>

There is still space available on the upcoming National Omnibus survey to be conducted by the Survey Research Center, University of Maryland.

Draft questions are due June 21.

\$650 per question.

For more information email: SRC@cati.umd.edu

>From SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU Tue Jun 11 17:31:51 1996
Return-Path: SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU
Received: from LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU (lsuvm.sncc.lsu.edu [130.39.128.22])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id RAA27542 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 17:31:49 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU by LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTMP id 6879; Tue, 11 Jun 96 19:31:38 CDT
Received: from LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU (NJE origin SOWEIL@LSUVM) by
LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 9184; Tue, 11 Jun 1996
19:31:39 -0500
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 96 19:06:26 CDT
From: Rick Weil <SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU>
Subject: Social Capital
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT
X-Mailer: MailBook 95.01.263
Message-Id: <960611.193137.CDT.SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU>

With regard to Sherry Marcy's comment about women's unpaid efforts - In the literature on social capital, this is one of its central features, though not specific to women. For instance, my former colleague, Min Zhou, studies how members of Asian immigrants' families often work unpaid in a family business for the purpose of (monetary) capital accumulation. They then transform this accumulation (profit) to human capital by sending their kids to school so that they (the kids) don't have to work in the @#!&*! restaurant or whatever. And if the kids keep their strong ties to their families once they make it, they help them out, partly returning the investment. This is, of course, exactly what previous generations of successful immigrants did, and it is one of the central features of social capital theory, as developed by Jim Coleman and others.

So you found the right thing to complain about, but as you can see, there are instances when people choose to engage in certain kinds of cooperative behavior that benefits the group of which they are part (family, community,

polity, whatever).

```
-----  
| Rick Weil | 504-388-1140 Phone |  
| Department of Sociology | 504-388-5102 FAX |  
| LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY | EMAIL: |  
| Baton Rouge, LA 70803 | SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU |  
-----
```

```
>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Tue Jun 11 20:33:59 1996  
Return-Path: pmeyer@email.unc.edu  
Received: from login1.email.unc.edu (pmeyer@login1.email.unc.edu  
[152.2.25.15])  
    by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
    id UAA11297 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 20:33:57 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: (from pmeyer@localhost) by login1.email.unc.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id  
XAA189872; Tue, 11 Jun 1996 23:33:57 -0400  
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 1996 23:33:57 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: ACTION: Bowling Alone  
In-Reply-To: <B341ZWIOH8HLR*/R=MYSTIC/R=A1/U=RCUMMINS/@MHS>  
Message-ID: <Pine.A32.3.91.960611231337.92287A-100000@login1.email.unc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
```

The gaps in the literature that I would like most to be filled are empirical verification of the notion that our society has swung too far toward libertarian individualism and needs to adjust in the direction of cooperative authoritarianism. Old guys have been saying this all my life, and now I'm at an age where I'm saying it, too. What's great about Putnam is that the points on his scatterplots line up so neatly, and I can see what I've been feeling intuitively.

Related literature includes Francis Fukuyama, "Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity," Amitai Etzioni, "The Spirit of Community," Daniel Yankelovich, "Coming to Public Judgment: Making Democracy Work in a Complex Society." Then, behind those guys you have the philosophers like Robert N. Bellah and his crew in "Habits of the Heart," and, of course, Habermas. The civic journalism movement is related to all of this as it tries to find a new theory of news that counters the social fragmenting effect resulting from the application of old standards to new technology. I'm looking for empirical verification that these efforts make any difference. Slim pickings thus far.

Phil Meyer

```
>From rea@iea.soc.umn.edu Wed Jun 12 06:57:18 1996  
Return-Path: rea@iea.soc.umn.edu  
Received: from atlas.socsci.umn.edu (atlas.socsci.umn.edu [134.84.151.2])  
    by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
    id GAA02013 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 06:57:16 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from iea.soc.umn.edu (iea.soc.umn.edu [134.84.155.239]) by  
atlas.socsci.umn.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP id IAA15478 for  
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 08:18:48 -0500  
Date: Wed, 12 Jun 1996 08:18:48 -0500 (CDT)
```

From: Ron Anderson <rea@iea.soc.umn.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Impact of Computing/Internet on Television Viewing?
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950720091631.2949K-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.960612081212.4687B-100000@iea.soc.umn.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I'm trying to find any good data on whether or not the use of home computing and/or the Internet is associated with change in the amount of time spent using television. Can anyone point me in a useful direction?

Prof. Ronald E. Anderson, 612-624-9554 624-4586(fax) <rea@iea.soc.umn.edu>
909 Social Sciences Bldg, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, 55455, USA

>From EUSLANER@bss2.umd.edu Wed Jun 12 06:58:01 1996
Return-Path: EUSLANER@bss2.umd.edu
Received: from umail.UMD.EDU (umail.umd.edu [128.8.10.28])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id GAA02148 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 06:57:57 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by umail.UMD.EDU (5.57/Ultrix3.0-C)
id AA02028; Wed, 12 Jun 96 09:22:10 -0400
Received: from LEFRAK2/MAILQUEUE1 by bss2.umd.edu (Mercury 1.20);
12 Jun 96 09:22:16 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by LEFRAK2 (Mercury 1.20); 12 Jun 96 09:22:08
+1100
From: "Eric M. Uslaner" <EUSLANER@bss2.umd.edu>
Organization: University of Maryland, College Park
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Wed, 12 Jun 1996 09:22:01 EDT
Subject: Re: Bowling Alone (at Midnight?)
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail v3.31
Message-Id: <105116401E5E@bss2.umd.edu>

At the risk of wearing out my welcome here, let me try to clarify what both Bob Putnam and I have found about time constraints on joining organizations (both of us) as well as volunteering, working on community problems, willingness to serve on a jury (myself):

Neither Bob Putnam nor I have treated the rise in working women as a likely cause in the decline of social capital. Rather, each of us has looked at it as one possible explanation of why membership in organizations (as well as volunteering) has declined. Neither of us has found any evidence that either for men or for women, changing time constraints have had any impact on the number of organizations that one belongs to or to the decision to volunteer. Now, I can only speak for myself, but I have talked with Bob (and heard him speak on numerous occasions) and I can assure everyone that neither of us is trying to hide any feelings of guilt about women increasing their prominence in the work force. Each of us has his own favored explanation (mine is the loss of optimism, Bob's is TV)--so neither

of us has any wish to see the time explanation as critical.

So why are Jennifer and Tony slaving over an oven at midnight--when 50 years ago Jennifer would have been home baking cookies in older-fashioned oven at noon? Let me suggest several possibilities:

1) Looking at a university community, especially Princeton or its counterparts, is not a good idea to see whether social capital has declined or whether social roles have changed. If you can't find social capital in university communities, you won't find it anywhere (yesterday's New York Times had a story about how Harvard's Michael Sandel's main preoccupation these days is coaching a Little League team).

2) Even within universities, some people (such as Jennifer) do more than others. So she is up late baking cookies. If she did not possess social capital, she would simply go to bed after finishing her work. Lots of other folks do.

3) But, yes, the amount of available time is finite. So the amount of time you can spend baking cookies or coaching or volunteering depends upon the number of hours you spend working. BUT the initial decision to join an organization or in particular to volunteer DOES NOT reflect time constraints. It does reflect your values. This is not simply splitting hairs. I think that the initial decision to volunteer is far more important than the number of hours someone gives. And I don't know of good trend data on the number of hours volunteering. And I have not investigated whether time constraints work differently for men and women. But I suspect that time in workplace is at best one diversion from volunteering. Maybe TV is another (though I am not yet convinced). More likely volunteering time reflects other decisions about how to spend leisure time.

Ric Uslaner

Government and Politics

University of Maryland--College Park

Tydings 3140 College Park MD 20742

office: 301-405-4151 fax: 301-314-9690

home: 301-279-0414

>From tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu Wed Jun 12 08:04:21 1996

Return-Path: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu

Received: from virginia.edu (mars.itc.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id IAA07285 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 08:04:18 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from uva.pcmail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa17334;
12 Jun 96 10:57 EDT

Received: by uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU (8.6.10/1.34)

id KAA04977; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 10:57:26 -0400

Message-Id: <199606121457.KAA04977@uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU>

From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu>

Date: Wed, 12 Jun 96 10:57:16 EDT

X-Mailer: UVa PCMail 1.9.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: ACTION: Bowling Alone

Cc: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu

More on related literature:

THANKS to Phil Meyer for bringing up the communitarian literature, which is in my view the proper intellectual background to the Robert Putnam piece.

For a quick intro I recommend a recently published collection edited by Mary Glendon, *Seedbeds of Virtue*. David Popenoe has an outstanding piece in there on the relation of community to desired social outcomes.

The only reason I didn't bring this up before is that the original request seemed to be for opinion research and opinion data. You won't find much of that in the Glendon book or in the literature that Phil Meyer has cited. But for anybody who is just starting to think through the full social import of informal association (= civic life), the Communitarian take on Tocquevillean theory is essential reading, whether or not you find yourself in full agreement with it.

Speaking of data, what about Miller McPherson's work on association memberships and their interconnection? I dimly remember some pretty good stuff from ten years ago . . . some of it dealt with the issue of single-sex versus cross-gender group memberships, another area of significant change.

Tom

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

>From mikemokr@ap.org Wed Jun 12 08:26:31 1996

Return-Path: mikemokr@ap.org

Received: from janus.ap.org (eos.ap.org [165.1.6.1])

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id IAA09040 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 08:26:29 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mjm.port.net.interport.net by janus.ap.org (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)

id LAA17101; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 11:23:00 -0400

Date: Wed, 12 Jun 1996 11:23:00 -0400

Message-Id: <199606121523.LAA17101@janus.ap.org>

X-Sender: mikemokr@eos.ap.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: mikemokr@ap.org (Mike Mokrzycki)

Subject: Re: Impact of Computing/Internet on Television Viewing?

At 08:18 AM 06/12/96 -0500, Ron Anderson wrote:

>

>I'm trying to find any good data on whether or not the use of home

>computing

>and/or the Internet is associated with change in the amount of time

>spent using television. Can anyone point me in a useful direction?

<http://www.people-press.org/mediarpt.htm>

Pew Research Center survey conducted April 1996.

Mike Mokrzycki [] Associated Press [] mikemokr@ap.org

>From JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu Wed Jun 12 10:47:57 1996
Return-Path: JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu
Received: from umail.UMD.EDU (umail.umd.edu [128.8.10.28])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA24292 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 10:47:53 -0700
(PDT)
From: JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu
Received: by umail.UMD.EDU (5.57/Ultrix3.0-C)
id AA02082; Wed, 12 Jun 96 13:47:46 -0400
Received: from BSOSCATI/MAILQUEUE1 by cati.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);
Wed, 12 Jun 96 13:47:52 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by BSOSCATI (Mercury 1.13); Wed, 12 Jun 96
13:47:15 +1100
Organization: Survey Research Center, UMCP
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Wed, 12 Jun 1996 13:47:13 EDT
Subject: Re: JOB OPENING: PROJECT COORDINATOR
Reply-To: johnny@cati.umd.edu
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: PMail v3.0 (R1)
Message-Id: <296FBCA7E98@cati.umd.edu>

SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK

[WASHINGTON D.C. METRO AREA]

Immediate opening for an entry level survey project coordinator.

Responsible for client liaison and for coordinating telephone and mail surveys. Opportunity for growth and eventually for participation in methodology studies.

Experience or directly applicable courses in survey research, particularly in data collection methods and questionnaire design and pretesting.

B.A./B.S. minimum. Starting salary \$22,000-27,000, full paid health, retirement and vacation benefits. Some support for UM courses and survey conference attendance.

Send resume and a cover letter describing experience, training and interests to:

Survey Research Center 1103 Art-Sociology Bldg,
University of Maryland, College Park 20742.

Fax to 301 314 9070.

Email SRC@cati.umd.edu

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Jun 12 10:52:17 1996

Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA24659 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 10:52:16 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA21237 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 10:52:16 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Wed, 12 Jun 1996 10:52:15 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Who Most Influences U.S. Public Opinion?
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960612104004.19482D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Who most influences U.S. public opinion? Time Inc.'s view of America as
grand salon...

>From today's DAILY REPORT of The Chronicle of Higher Education

A glance at the June 17 issue of "Time":

Who are the "25 most-influential Americans"? The editors of "Time" played this "provocative parlor game" and came up with some surprising picks. Among them: Carol Gilligan, a Harvard University psychologist who has "changed the assumptions of medical research" through her studies of how girls develop socially and psychologically; Toni Morrison, the Nobel Prize-winning novelist who teaches at Princeton University and has "inspired a generation of black artists and produced seismic effects on publishing"; the Harvard sociobiologist E.O. Wilson, who pioneered the controversial theory that social behavior is influenced by genes; the sociologist William Julius Wilson, an expert on the black underclass, who recently left the University of Chicago for Harvard; and the physicist Edward Witten, a professor at the Institute for Advanced Study, in Princeton, N.J., who is refining the "superstring" theory of all physical phenomena so that it can be tested. Among the other influential Americans cited by "Time": William Bennett, the Education Secretary turned conservative commentator and children's fabulist; Martha Stewart, the life-style maven for the rich and famous; and Courtney Love, the rock star.

Copyright (c) 1996 The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc.

>From IGEM100@INDYCMS.IUPUI.EDU Wed Jun 12 10:55:58 1996
Return-Path: IGEM100@INDYCMS.IUPUI.EDU
Received: from INDYCMS.IUPUI.EDU (indycms.iupui.edu [134.68.1.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA25298 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 10:55:54 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <199606121755.KAA25298@usc.edu>
Received: from INDYCMS.IUPUI.EDU by INDYCMS.IUPUI.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)

with BSMTTP id 7842; Wed, 12 Jun 96 07:05:09 EST
Received: from INDYCMS (IGEM100) by INDYCMS.IUPUI.EDU (Mailer R2.07) with
BSMTTP id 7673; Wed, 12 Jun 96 07:05:07 EST
Date: Wed, 12 Jun 96 06:48:02 EST
From: BRIAN VARGUS <IGEM100@INDYCMS.IUPUI.EDU>
Subject: Re: ACTION: Bowling Alone
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: Message of Tue, 11 Jun 1996 23:33:57 -0400 (EDT) from
<pmeyer@emai 1.unc.edu>

In response to Phil Meyer's comments. The strain of literature is even older. I think you will find its roots are Fourier in France and Bellamy in the U.S. It really is a kind of authoritarian socialism, as one writer termed it. The empirical evidence is based upon poor measures, even if you try to replicate. I have always found it amusing that since the famous 1950's-60's case in NY City of a woman murdered with no help from bystanders, a tradition of "helping" research in social psychology waxed and waned. Recently, when a similar incident -- disoriented ill man wandering near highway, later died -- happened in Indianapolis the paper, and my client, cited the decline of community. When I told the reporter the story was an old, as is the good samaritan in the Bible, he chose to leave it out of the story.

It also seems that people periodically rediscover Tocqueville and then try to show how we have lost our way. This may explain why, while Putnam and others are bemoaning this loss, Evangelical and Pentacostal Churches are welcoming

-- their reports here -- hoardes of new people. I have done surveys in conservative Indiana on interpersonal trust in the past year for WISH-TV and found residents here trust family, and then they are not sure about that. After all, therapists tell us we are "dysfunctional." As one who never saw anything wrong with individualism or the Enlightenment, I share with Meyer the desire to see some hard evidence that it is a real change. Take something like exploitation, in criminal ways, of children...wasn't that common at the turn of the century? Didn't Dickens find it source material? It seems, from a theory point of view, we are still dealing with the impact of the division of labor on human interaction. Kant and Simmel may have understood this better than any modern thinkers. There are internal and external matches of values, but who knows where they come from? Parsons always put values in "ultimate reality." That is the rub. A communal spirit is fine, but whose values are to be implemented. I'll go with individual choice every time. Thus, I do not visit my neighbors because I do not want to or need to. I visit my friends, who live other places. I donate to somethings and not others. I belong to a few things -- like AAPOR and Amnesty International -- but I rarely go to church. My wife works and my children are grown. I follow politics and find the community I live in to be oppressive and authoritarian. I do not want that community. Sometimes bowling alone is a rational choice and probably healthy. Hidden assumptions in the Putnam/Etzioni, et al, positions are in need of careful and prudent examination. This is an old issue, the individual versus society and, with Meyer, I want to see data. Let's see longitudinal data that is comparable. Let's examine the goals of the advocates. Why do I keep thinking of Ibsen's "Enemy of the People?" Brian Vargus

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Jun 12 11:27:02 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP

id LAA02284 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 11:27:01 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA23483 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 11:26:59 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Wed, 12 Jun 1996 11:26:58 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: DC Lecture on Confidentiality
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960612112431.22719A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Washington Statistical Society Presidential Invited Address
Towards a Unified Federal Approach to Statistical Confidentiality

Katherine K. Wallman, Chief Statistician of the United States, Office of
Management and Budget

Tuesday, June 18, 1996, 3:00 - 4:30 p.m. (Reception 4:30-5:00)

Room 227, Ross Hall, George Washington University, 2300 I Street, NW,
Washington, DC (adjacent to Foggy Bottom Metro)

ABSTRACT

Congress has recognized that a confidential relationship between statistical agencies and their respondents is essential for effective statistical programs. However, the specific statutory formulas devised to implement this principle have, in some cases, created barriers to effective working relationships among the statistical agencies. OMB recently prepared an order designed to clarify, and to make consistent, government policy protecting the privacy and confidentiality interests of individuals and organizations who provide data to Federal statistical programs. The order aims to resolve a number of ambiguities in existing law and to give additional weight and stature to policies that statistical agencies have pursued for decades. In a companion initiative, OMB has prepared a legislative proposal for a "Statistical Confidentiality Act" that makes prudent changes to existing laws that respect the privacy and confidentiality concerns of the public while making responsible improvements in the way statistical agencies operate in the public interest. This session will describe the nature of these recent initiatives and will discuss their implications for the Federal statistical community.

DISCUSSANTS

Joe Cecil, Federal Judicial Center
Tom Jabine, Independent Consultant
David McMillen, Staff, House Committee on Government Reform and
Oversight Operations

Chair

Ron Fecso, President, Washington Statistical Society

Sponsored by the Statistics and Public Policy Section

>From poch@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA Wed Jun 12 23:29:21 1996
Return-Path: uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA!poch@uipchr.freenet.kiev.ua
Received: from freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua (root@freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua
[194.44.28.250])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id XAA22508 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Jun 1996 23:29:16 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from uipchr.UUCP (uuwillis@localhost) by freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua
(8.6.13/osf3.2xla) with UUCP id JAA32758 for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 13 Jun
1996 09:11:00 +0300
Received: by uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA (UUPC/@ v5.09gamma, 14Mar93);
Thu, 13 Jun 1996 08:39:20 +0200
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-Id: <AANUxlnan2@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA>
Organization: Ukrainian Institute of Peace, Conflicts and Humanity
Rights Studies
From: "Georgiy G. Pocheptsov" <poch@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA>
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 96 08:39:19 +0200
X-Mailer: BML [MS/DOS Beauty Mail v.1.36]
Subject: Elections in Russia
Lines: 16

The recent report of VTSIOM (it is pro-Yeltsin sociological group) gives
such results in the three days before the elections ("Isvestia", June 13,
1996): Yeltsin - 36%, Zyuganov - 24%, Lebed - 10%, Yavlinsky - 8%,
Zhirinovskiy - 6%. At the second tour supposed to take part 73%, they will
vote: for Yeltsin - 53%, for Zyaganov - 36%, contra both - 5%, don't know -
6%. 1600 persons were asked at 58 places. Another article in "Isvestia"
gives the structure of today's Russian elite
origin: those who have come to power before Gorbachev - 49,8%, in time of
Gorbachev- 39,7%, in time of Yeltsin - 10,5%. So the elite is formed in
before time.

Prof. Dr. Georgij Pocheptsov
Institute of International Relations
University of Kiev
36/1 Melnikova Str.
254119 Kiev, UKRAINE

>From rbezilla@ix.netcom.com Thu Jun 13 05:46:20 1996
Return-Path: rbezilla@ix5.ix.netcom.com
Received: from dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.6])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id FAA07246 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 05:46:14 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [199.183.207.98] (prn-nj3-02.ix.netcom.com [199.183.207.98])
by dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com (8.6.13/8.6.12) with SMTP id FAA16237 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 05:44:19 -0700
Message-Id: <199606131244.FAA16237@dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com>
Subject: Effect of length on response rate
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 96 08:46:20 -0400
From: Robert Bezilla <rbezilla@ix.netcom.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0

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

A colleague recently completed a study in which the average telephone interview length was 22 minutes among a nationwide sample of adults. All prospective respondents were advised in advance of the potential length of interview. The client had been warned repeatedly that the length would result in a reduced response rate, but of course was shocked, absolutely shocked, to learn it indeed was substantially lower.

Does anyone have recent hard data or citations on:

1. The effect of interview length upon response rate.
2. The effect of prior notification of true length v. non-notification.

Thank you.

Robert Bezilla
rbezilla@ix.netcom.com

>From rshalp@cris.com Thu Jun 13 07:39:15 1996
Return-Path: rshalp@cris.com
Received: from franklin.cris.com (franklin.cris.com [199.3.12.31])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA18366 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 07:39:04 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from darius.cris.com (darius [199.3.12.32])
by franklin.cris.com (8.7.5/(96/06/11 2.45))
id KAA06776; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 10:35:17 -0400 (EDT)
[1-800-745-2747 The Concentric Network]
Errors-To: rshalp@cris.com
Received: from LOCALNAME (cnc028039.concentric.net [206.83.93.39])
by darius.cris.com (8.7.3)
id KAA12912; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 10:34:29 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 1996 10:34:29 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <2.2.16.19960613103502.08ff2608@pop3.concentric.net>
X-Sender: rshalp@pop3.concentric.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Richard S. Halpern (Dick)" <rshalp@cris.com>
Subject: Communications Decency Act -- Judges Ruling

Most of you know by now that major portions of the Communications Decency Act were declared unconstitutional by a three judge panel of the United States Court of Appeals. The decision was unanimous. It will probably now go to the Supreme Court. The three judges called Government attempts to regulate content on the Internet a "profoundly repugnant " affront to the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech.

For further details along with the full text of the ruling, information about the judges, coverage of the hearings since they began and an annotated guide to related information is available from the NY Times at <http://www.nytimes.com>. An analysis of the reasoning that led to the

judges conclusions is also featured.

Additional information can also be obtained from CNN's site at:
<http://cnn.com/US/9606/12/internet.indecency/>

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. Phone/Fax: (770) 434 4121
Halpern & Associates E-Mail: rshalp@cris.com
3837 Courtyard Drive E-Mail: rshalp@concentric.net
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-4248

>From tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu Thu Jun 13 09:22:41 1996
Return-Path: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu
Received: from virginia.edu (mars.itc.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA00320 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 09:22:39 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from uva.pcmail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa24430;
13 Jun 96 12:18 EDT
Received: by uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU (8.6.10/1.34)
id MAA24780; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 12:17:59 -0400
Message-Id: <199606131617.MAA24780@uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU>
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu>
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 96 12:17:53 EDT
X-Mailer: UVa PCMail 1.9.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Effect of length on response rate
Cc: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu

To: R. Bedzilla

I believe Harry O'Neill recently completed a study on behalf of CASRO that explores precisely the question you ask. Don't have details handy, but the report I saw covered both the issue of length itself and the issue of disclosure of length. Anybody got the cite?

Tom

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

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 13 12:40:30 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP
id MAA25837 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 12:40:29 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA06903 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 12:40:30 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 1996 12:40:29 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: NYT Web on Bosnia

Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960613123854.1718H-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Date: Wed, 12 Jun 1996 20:42:41 -0400
From: bosnia@nytimes.com
Subject: NYT Web Announcement

On Monday, June 10th, The New York Times on the Web launched an interactive multimedia photojournalism project that chronicles Bosnia's struggle for peace. "Bosnia: Uncertain Paths to Peace," features an electronic gallery of more than one hundred and fifty images by renowned photojournalist Gilles Peress, and a month-long worldwide discussion on war and peace in the former Yugoslavia. Anyone with Internet access can view and participate in the project without charge or registration at <http://www.nytimes.com/bosnia>.

Bosnia: Uncertain Paths to Peace encourages participation from individuals all over the world, particularly in locations closest to the conflict and its unfolding resolution. Live Internet connections through 15 publicly accessible terminals at Sarajevo University have been set up by the Soros Foundation so Bosnians themselves can take part. Terminals linked to the Web site have been installed by IBM at the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia in The Hague, Netherlands, and at the United Nations in New York. Global discussions are being initiated on the political, social and cultural issues raised by the war.

Peress' images are a personal and journalistic chronicle of the final weeks of the siege of Sarajevo, including the exodus of the Serbs from the city's suburbs. The interactive photo essay, combined with the photographer's narrative, provides the viewer with information and experiences similar to those encountered by journalists witnessing the end of the war.

Peress is known for his photographic coverage of conflicts in Iran, Northern Ireland, Rwanda, and Bosnia. Viewers are encouraged to submit comments and reactions. Individuals in the former Yugoslavia are being invited to email their own accounts of events.

More than ten Internet forums are being conducted by leading intellectual and political figures specializing in different aspects of the Bosnia conflict, including the war and its destruction, preceding historical events, the religious dimension, and political ramifications. Bernard Gwertzman, senior editor, is overseeing the forums. Hosts and participants include:

- * Madeleine Albright, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations
- * Ervin Staub, professor of psychology studying genocide at the University of Massachusetts
- * Steve Walker, formerly of the U.S. State Department
- * Manuela Dobos, professor of Balkanology at the City University of NY
- * Aryeh Neier, president of the Soros Foundation & the Open Society Institute
- * Christiane Amanpour, senior international correspondent for CNN

Users can also access multimedia background materials, color maps, audio clips, archival articles from New York Times correspondents, and links to relevant sites on the Web. Highlights of discussions and forum

contributions will be posted regularly on the site. The site itself will remain accessible until August.

So much of the imagery that comes at us from television leaves us unable to respond. This project, using a two-way medium, allows us to both feel the power of Peress' images, but also to respond, to join a worldwide community of others who can no longer be silent about what they see and hear through the media.

We invite you to visit this new and important Web site early and often. It can be reached either from The New York Times on the Web's home page (<http://www.nytimes.com>), or by pointing your browser to <http://www.nytimes.com/bosnia>.

```
>From ABIDER@american.edu Thu Jun 13 13:56:04 1996
Return-Path: ABIDER@AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (smtp@auvm.american.edu [147.9.1.2])
        by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
        id NAA08389 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 13:56:01 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <199606132056.NAA08389@usc.edu>
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
        with BSMTMP id 7505; Thu, 13 Jun 96 16:55:12 EDT
Received: from american.edu (NJE origin ABIDER@AUVM) by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 8661; Thu, 13 Jun 1996 16:55:12 -0400
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 96 16:35:59 EDT
From: Albert Biderman <ABIDER@american.edu>
Organization: The American University
Subject: Re: Effect of length on response rate
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: Message of Thu, 13 Jun 96 08:46:20 -0400 from
<rbezilla@ix.netcom.com>
```

I was called by a survey interviewer who told me that the interview would take about 20 minutes and asked (not necessarily in these words) if that would be OK. I said "No." She said "Thanks," and hung up. This call was three weeks ago or thereabouts, if memory serves. I was surprised that the interviewer did not follow up asking for a time she could call when I could give her that much time. Nor did she give any reason why that kind of demand on my time was legitimate. It seemed to me almost as if a refusal was being courted.

Albert Biderman

```
>From ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU Fri Jun 14 04:53:47 1996
Return-Path: ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU
Received: from hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu (hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.2])
        by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
        id EAA12853 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 04:53:46 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.96]) by hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george0995) with SMTP id
HAA24099; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 07:53:29 -0400
Date: Fri, 14 Jun 1996 07:55:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: Kenneth Sherrill <ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU>
To: Public Opinion Research Discussion <por@unc.edu>
cc: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: How's this for a suspect sample?
```

Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.960614075310.10999C-100000@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

THE WASHINGTON TIMES
3600 New York Avenue NE, Washington, DC, 20002
FAX 202-832-2982

(NOTE: The Washington Times welcomes letters to the editor from anyone in the country. Faxed letters to the editor must include signature.) Thursday, June 13, 1996 page A2

POLL FINDS MANY GAYS ARE PRO-LIFE

Thirty-two percent of homosexuals polled in a recent survey say abortion is wrong in most circumstances, according to the Pro-Life Alliance of Gays and Lesbians (PLAGAL).

In an informal survey sponsored by PLAGAL's Cleveland branch, 8 percent said abortion is wrong under any circumstances, 12 percent would use the procedure only to save the life of the mother, another 9 percent would also allow it in cases of rape or incest, and an additional 3 percent would also support it for mental retardation or deformity of the unborn child.

Considering that homosexuals have been categorized by the media as overwhelmingly pro-choice, the survey shows "extreme diversity" among them about abortion, said Cecilia Holesovsky, PLAGAL vice chairman.

The survey should dispel the popular perception of "the gay community as a monolithic, amoral entity devoid of individual opinion," she said.

>From regen!srg@uunet.uu.net Fri Jun 14 11:02:14 1996

Return-Path: regen!srg@uunet.uu.net

Received: from relay5.UU.NET (relay5.UU.NET [192.48.96.15])

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP

id LAA18666 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 11:02:08 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from uucp3.UU.NET by relay5.UU.NET with SMTP

(peer crosschecked as: uucp3.UU.NET [192.48.96.34])

id QQauce09194; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 14:02:03 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from regen.UUCP by uucp3.UU.NET with UUCP/RMAIL

; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 14:02:03 -0400

Received: by regen (AIX 3.2/UCB 5.64/4.03)

id AA55890; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 09:25:14 -0400

Date: Fri, 14 Jun 1996 09:25:14 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Sheldon R. Gawiser" <regen!srg@uunet.uu.net>

To: uunet!aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Reporting "informal" polls

Message-Id: <Pine.A32.3.91.960614092302.25794C-100000@regen>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I am very disappointed that anyone would report an "informal" poll as was done today. We cannot evaluate anything about that poll, and suspect, since it was done by an advocacy group that it is not worth reporting.

All of us in our profession have a responsibility to criticize any reporting of non scientific polls and clearly should not be repeating any reports of them for any purpose other than criticism.

Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D.

srg@regen.com
Regenerating Solutions
Gawiser Associates, Inc.
1375 Kings Highway East, Fairfield, CT 06430
203-331-9300
FAX 203-331-1750
NCP 800-239-0909

>From ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu Fri Jun 14 14:54:33 1996
Return-Path: ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu
Received: from sphinx.Gsu.EDU (sphinx.Gsu.EDU [131.96.1.22])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA17071 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 14:54:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from langate.gsu.edu (langate.Gsu.EDU [131.96.24.27]) by
sphinx.Gsu.EDU (8.7.3/8.7.3) with SMTP id RAA15856 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Fri, 14 Jun 1996 17:54:30 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from GSU-Message_Server by langate.gsu.edu
with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 17:57:47 -0500
Message-Id: <slcla81b.053@langate.gsu.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Fri, 14 Jun 1996 17:51:11 -0500
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Reporting "informal" polls -Reply

>I am very disappointed that anyone would report an "informal" poll as
>was done today. We cannot evaluate anything about that poll, and
suspect, since it was done by an advocacy group that it is not worth
reporting.

All of us in our profession have a responsibility to criticize any reporting
of non scientific polls and clearly should not be repeating any reports of
them for any purpose other than criticism.

Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. srg@regen.com
Regenerating Solutions
Gawiser Associates, Inc.
1375 Kings Highway East, Fairfield, CT 06430
203-331-9300
FAX 203-331-1750
NCP 800-239-0909

>From ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU Fri Jun 14 15:21:55 1996
Return-Path: ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU
Received: from hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu (hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id PAA20048 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 15:21:53 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.96]) by hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george0995) with SMTP id
SAA28915; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 18:21:40 -0400
Date: Fri, 14 Jun 1996 18:24:03 -0400 (EDT)

From: Kenneth Sherrill <ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Reporting "informal" polls -Reply
In-Reply-To: <s1c1a81b.053@langate.gsu.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.960614182221.2198A-100000@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Fri, 14 Jun 1996, Leo G. Simonetta wrote:

>
> >I am very disappointed that anyone would report an "informal" poll as
> >was done today. We cannot evaluate anything about that poll, and
> suspect, since it was done by an advocacy group that it is not worth
> reporting.
>
> All of us in our profession have a responsibility to criticize any
> reporting of non scientific polls and clearly should not be repeating
> any reports of them for any purpose other than criticism.
>
> Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. srg@regen.com
> Regenerating Solutions
> Gawiser Associates, Inc.
> 1375 Kings Highway East, Fairfield, CT 06430
> 203-331-9300
> FAX 203-331-1750
> NCPP 800-239-0909
>
>
>
>

Are there not questions about The Washington Times' decision to publish the results of "an informal poll"? Was it purely to advance their editorial preferences? Did it reflect any sort of news judgment?

Kenneth Sherrill
Hunter College

>From ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU Fri Jun 14 17:32:33 1996
Return-Path: ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU
Received: from hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu (hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id RAA03403 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 17:32:31 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.96]) by hcrelay.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george0995) with SMTP id UAA29312 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Jun 1996 20:32:19 -0400
Date: Fri, 14 Jun 1996 20:34:41 -0400 (EDT)
From: Kenneth Sherrill <ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Poll Finds No Consensus on Defense of Marriage Act (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.960614203432.4256A-100000@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0

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

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

Date: Wed, 12 Jun 1996 15:45:10 -0400
From: David B. O'Donnell <atropos@aol.net>
To: Multiple recipients of list GLB-PRESS <GLB-PRESS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM>
Subject: Poll Finds No Consensus on Defense of Marriage Act

[Originally posted by mills@COLORADO.EDU]

NEWS from the
Human Rights Campaign

1101 14th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
email: communications@hrcusa.org
WWW: <http://www.hrcusa.org>

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Wednesday, June 5, 1996

POLL FINDS NO CONSENSUS ON DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT
Americans Think Measure Should Not Be a Priority

COMPLETE POLL AVAILABLE ON HRC'S ONLINE ACTION CENTER
<http://www.hrcusa.org>

WASHINGTON -- There is no clear consensus among Americans on the so-called Defense of Marriage Act, according to a poll conducted for the Human Rights Campaign, the largest national gay and lesbian political organization. The survey also found Americans overwhelmingly believe this issue should not be a legislative priority, and that it will not be a litmus test for candidates.

According to the national poll of 1,022 Americans conducted between May 31 and June 2 by The Mellman Group, 37 percent of Americans support the bill "defining marriage as only between men and women for the purposes of federal law," while 29 percent said they oppose it.

This lack of agreement was confirmed in another line of questioning. A total of 39 percent of those polled said they think this legislation is unnecessary, while 31 percent termed it necessary; a full 30 percent said they were not sure of the importance of such a law.

"There is no consensus among Americans on the Defense of Marriage Act," said David M. Smith, communications director of the Human Rights Campaign. "These results indicate the Republican strategy of using the gay marriage issue as a political strategy is failing to gain traction with voters and has the potential to backfire."

While opinion on this bill remains muddled, an overwhelming majority of those surveyed agreed there are more pressing issues facing Congress than attempting to outlaw same-sex marriage.

Only 13 percent said that "passing this law should be an important priority." A total of 73 percent said "there are lots of other issues" that are much more important than creating a federal statute to define marriage as between a man and a woman.

Further, this legislation is more likely to be viewed as apolitical ploy than as an attempt to strengthen the American family. More Americans (32 percent) accept the view that "this law is just an attempt to play politics, scapegoat gays and embarrass supporters of civil rights for gays, and is not really very important" than adhere to the view that "gay marriage is a real threat to the American family and it is important to pass the law" (27 percent). Only 27 percent said they believe gay marriage is a threat to the family; 41 percent would not even venture a guess.

This issue will not be a litmus test for candidates in November, according to the poll. Only 17 percent said a candidate's vote against the Defense of marriage Act would be a "very convincing" reason to vote against that person. By contrast, 54 percent said a candidate's vote to cut Medicare would be a "very convincing" reason to vote against that individual.

Another indication of the low political resonance of this issue: Only 10 percent of those polled said they would be very likely to vote against a candidate with whom they otherwise agreed if he or she opposed this law. Six percent said they would be very likely to oppose a candidate with whom they otherwise agreed if that candidate supported the Defense of Marriage Act.

The bill was introduced last month in both the House and the Senate. One of its primary co-sponsors is Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole, the certain Republican nominee for president.

"It is sad that after a distinguished 35-year career in Congress, Senator Bob Dole will end his Senate career with a bill that is nothing more than cheap election-year gay-bashing," Smith said.

"Doesn't Congress have anything better to do?"

The poll results are based on a national survey of 1,022 adults interviewed by telephone between May 31 and June 2. The study is based on a random-digit dialing probability sample of all telephone households in the continental United States, which ensures that every telephone household had an equal chance of participating in the survey. The margin of error for the sample as a whole is +/- 3.1 percentage points at the 95 percent confidence level. The margin of error for subgroups varies and may be larger.

The Human Rights Campaign is the largest national lesbian and gay political organization, with members throughout the country. It effectively lobbies Congress, provides campaign support and educates the public to ensure that lesbian and gay Americans can be open, honest and safe at home, at work and in the community.

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA00966 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 16 Jun 1996 12:02:09 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from langate.gsu.edu (langate.Gsu.EDU [131.96.24.27]) by
sphinx.Gsu.EDU (8.7.3/8.7.3) with SMTP id PAA03733 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Sun, 16 Jun 1996 15:02:07 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from GSU-Message_Server by langate.gsu.edu
with Novell_GroupWise; Sun, 16 Jun 1996 15:05:19 -0500
Message-Id: <slc422ae.095@langate.gsu.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Sun, 16 Jun 1996 14:58:33 -0500
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Reporting "informal" polls -Reply -Reply

I agree that talking about newspapers reporting "informal" polls is well
within the compass of this group. I assumed that the purpose of reporting
this poll was to hold it up for criticism especially given the subject
heading.

Unfortunately instead of stating this I inadvertantly sent Sheldon R.
Gawiser's response back without what I had without adding my comments.

Whoops

Leo G. Simonetta
ARCLGS@LANGATE.GSU.EDU Applied Research Center
My opinions, mine, all mine.

"The truth is rarely pure and never simple." --
Oscar Wilde "The Importance of Being Earnest"

>>> Kenneth Sherrill <ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU> 06/14/96
05:24pm >>>

On Fri, 14 Jun 1996, Leo G. Simonetta wrote:

>>I am very disappointed that anyone would report an "informal" poll as
>>was done today. We cannot evaluate anything about that poll, and
>>suspect, since it was done by an advocacy group that it is not worth
>>reporting. All of us in our profession have a responsibility to
>>criticize any reporting of non scientific polls and clearly should not
>>be repeating any reports of them for any purpose other than
>>criticism.

> > Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. srg@regen.com
> Regenerating Solutions
> Gawiser Associates, Inc.
> 1375 Kings Highway East, Fairfield, CT 06430
> 203-331-9300
> FAX 203-331-1750
> NCPP 800-239-0909
> > >

Are there not questions about The Washington Times' decision to publish
the results of "an informal poll"? Was it purely to advance their
editorial preferences? Did it reflect any sort of news judgment?

Kenneth Sherrill
Hunter College

>From poch@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA Sun Jun 16 21:45:08 1996
Return-Path: uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA!poch@uipchr.freenet.kiev.ua
Received: from freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua (root@freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua
[194.44.28.250])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id VAA14479 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 16 Jun 1996 21:45:02 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from uipchr.UUCP (uuuipchr@localhost) by freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua
(8.6.13/osf3.2xla) with UUCP id HAA00007 for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 17 Jun
1996 07:38:54 +0300
Received: by uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA (UUPC/@ v5.09gamma, 14Mar93);
Mon, 17 Jun 1996 07:32:47 +0200
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-Id: <AA_tEnnan2@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA>
Organization: Ukrainian Institute of Peace, Conflicts and Humanity
Rights Studies
From: "Georgiy G. Pocheptsov" <poch@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA>
Date: Mon, 17 Jun 96 07:32:47 +0200
X-Mailer: BML [MS/DOS Beauty Mail v.1.36]
Subject: Elections in Russia
Lines: 22

The resulting picture with 72% of votes calculated gives almost equal positions to Yeltzin and Zyuganov- 34,27 and 32,45 respectively. So the prediction of N.Betanely group stressing the equality of results in the first tour was the nearest. A.Lebed has come to the unpredicted for him by everyone the third place. It has hapenned so as presidential advisers predicted that he will take away voices from G. Zyuganov and so Lebed has the unprecedentd time at TV and in newspapers during the last two weeks. As concerned B. Yeltzin he has received something like 80% of TV time of all the candidates as he is an acting president and was all the time moving through the regions. So the problem for the second tour lies in the votes of other candidates, to whom they will go? In one prediction of VCIOM ("Izvestia",1996, May 14) the voices of others can go in second tour in such manner: to Yeltzin - 10%, to Zyuganov - 15%. Such pattern has to make working hard B.Yeltzin advisers and supporters. And thir possibilities are much higher as he has at his side all the mechanisms of the existing state, including oriented pro-him main TV-channels. One more unexpected result is non-willingness to take part in voting in main cities Petersburg and Moscow. Prof.Dr.Georgij Pocheptsov Institute of International relations Univ. of Kiev 36/1 Melnikova Str. 254119 Kiev, UKRAINE

>From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Mon Jun 17 11:18:43 1996
Return-Path: Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com
Received: from latimes.com (by-line.latimes.com [192.187.72.9])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA07844 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Jun 1996 11:18:41 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from news.latimes.com (fowler.news.latimes.com [192.187.72.7]) by
latimes.com (8.6.10/8.6.9) with ESMTTP id LAA28779 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Mon, 17 Jun 1996 11:21:32 -0700
Received: (from pinkus@localhost) by news.latimes.com (8.6.9/8.6.9) id
LAA51691; Mon, 17 Jun 1996 11:21:32 -0700
Date: Mon, 17 Jun 1996 11:21:32 -0700 (PDT)

From: Susan Pinkus <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Effect of length on response rate
In-Reply-To: <199606131244.FAA16237@dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID:
<Pine.A32.3.91.960617111947.45833A-100000@fowler.news.latimes.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I, too, would be interested in this since our surveys are usually about that length or longer. Nationally, it doesn't seem to be a problem, but when we interview in California or more locally (LA County) we are starting to have a problem.

Thanks, Susan Pinkus

On Thu, 13 Jun 1996, Robert Bezilla wrote:

> A colleague recently completed a study in which the average telephone
> interview length was 22 minutes among a nationwide sample of adults. All
> prospective respondents were advised in advance of the potential length
> of interview. The client had been warned repeatedly that the length would
> result in a reduced response rate, but of course was shocked, absolutely
> shocked, to learn it indeed was substantially lower.

>
> Does anyone have recent hard data or citations on:

- >
> 1. The effect of interview length upon response rate.
>
> 2. The effect of prior notification of true length v.
> non-notification.

> Thank you.
>

>
>
> Robert Bezilla
> rbezilla@ix.netcom.com
>
>

Susan H. Pinkus
Los Angeles Times Poll
Internet:susan.pinkus@latimes.com
American Online: spinkus@aol.com
FAX: 213-237-2505

>From HRHBOYD@macc.wisc.edu Mon Jun 17 11:28:16 1996

Return-Path: HRHBOYD@macc.wisc.edu
Received: from vms2.macc.wisc.edu (vms2.macc.wisc.edu [128.104.30.11])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA09246 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Mon, 17 Jun 1996 11:28:14 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from VMSmail by vms2.macc.wisc.edu; Mon, 17 Jun 96 13:28 CDT
Message-Id: <26061713281418@vms2.macc.wisc.edu>
Date: Mon, 17 Jun 96 13:28 CDT
From: Heather Hartwig Boyd <HRHBOYD@macc.wisc.edu>
Subject: digest function
To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU
X-VMS-To: IN%"aapornet@usc.edu",HRHBOYD

Sorry to need the reminder, but how does one set AAPORNET to the "digest"
function? :

>From RONG@UConnVM.UConn.Edu Mon Jun 17 19:57:50 1996
Return-Path: <@YaleVM.CIS.Yale.Edu:RONG@UConnVM.UConn.EDU>
Received: from YaleVM.CIS.Yale.Edu (yalevm.ycc.yale.edu [130.132.21.136])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id TAA04477 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Mon, 17 Jun 1996 19:57:48 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.EDU by YaleVM.CIS.Yale.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTMP id 2898; Mon, 17 Jun 96 22:56:27 EDT
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin RONG@UConnVM) by
UConnVM.UConn.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 7265; Mon, 17 Jun 1996
22:57:14 -0400
Date: Mon, 17 Jun 96 22:56:03 EDT
From: Ji-qiáng Rong <RONG@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject: Survey of Chinese Consumers
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
X-Mailer: MailBook 95.01.000
Message-Id: <960617.225710.EDT.RONG@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>

THE CHINA MARKET:
CHINESE CONSUMER ATTITUDES TOWARD FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC PRODUCTS

On May 31, 1996, President Clinton formally renewed China's Most Favored Nation trade status. Concerns over the exclusion of American companies and workers from future business in one of the world most dynamic markets and extending an open field to American competitors are among the considerations that drove the President to this decision. Heated debate over the issue is expected in the U.S. Congress. However, largely due to the same concerns, it is highly unlikely that Congress will vote to block the President's decision.

While the Chinese market is playing an increasingly significant role in the making of U.S. policy towards China, many questions about this market are yet to be answered. The survey findings released here shed some light on a fundamental question: whether Chinese consumers prefer foreign or domestic products and what motivates their purchase decisions on imported or Chinese commodities.

The findings are primarily derived from questions on consumer attitudes toward color televisions. These questions serve our purpose for two reasons:
1. Due to over 20 years of manufacturing color televisions, the quality of

domestic products is comparable to that of foreign-made ones. Chinese consumers have thus relatively equal alternatives to make purchase decisions. 2. A 1994 Gallup study makes known that more Chinese intend to buy televisions than other big ticket items in the next two years. Questions about why consumers decide on foreign or domestic products is therefore less hypothetical to a larger number of Chinese.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

According to our survey of 2,140 Chinese urban and 240 rural consumers conducted between May 28 and July 5, 1995, Chinese consumers are practical shoppers. They shop for good quality, good service, and low price. Except older Chinese, few other consumers manifest the mentality that "A Chinese should buy Chinese products," and make spending decisions under the influence of nationalism. And none of them are willing to pay extra for foreign commodities for less substantial reasons such as a display of status. Types of products determine people's preferences for foreign and domestic consumer items. Apart from color televisions and other electronic durables, most Chinese favor Chinese products even if their earnings increase twice as much. On the other hand, in nearly every category of commodities we tested, younger age, better education, higher income, and urban residency make people more likely to buy foreign goods. Together, they appear to indicate that with further industrialization, urbanization, and economic growth in China, more Chinese consumers will be open to foreign commodities.

FOREIGN VERSUS DOMESTIC TELEVISIONS

By a 60% to 30% majority, Chinese urban consumers prefer foreign televisions over Chinese-made ones. "Good quality" is the single most important reason for them to opt for foreign products, chosen by a solid 84% of total respondents and 89% of potential foreign television buyers. It is trailed by "brand name" as a distant second reason, selected by 31% of those interviewed.

In contrast, urban consumers buy Chinese-made televisions for "low price" (60%) and "good service" (43%). "Good quality" is singled out by only 19% of city dwellers to account for their purchase intentions. An interesting phenomenon is that "low price" as the leading reason for buying Chinese products has been inflated by those who have no such purchase intentions. When one looks at the potential Chinese television buyers, "low price" drops to 48% while "good service" rises to 50%, making the two equally important in the decisions of those who intend to buy Chinese televisions.

ROLE OF NATIONALISM

Nationalism plays a very limited role in the spending decisions of urban consumers. Only one in five respondents (20%) identified with the statement that "A Chinese should buy Chinese products" while eight in ten (80%) did not endorse it. Not surprisingly, the strongest support for the statement came from older Chinese, those who are sixty years of age and above (41%).

Similarly, another popular belief that Chinese consumers buy foreign products for "showing status" is not supported. Unanimously, urban respondents rejected it as a reason that motivates their purchase intentions (98%).

TYPES OF PRODUCTS

Types of products rather than improved salary are the determining factors in the purchase intentions of urban consumers. When asked if you were to make twice as much money as what you are making now, would you buy Chinese products or foreign products, foreign electronic durables are favored by a 42% to 34% majority. However, when moving away from the high-tech products, the advantage of foreign commodities begins to diminish. Chinese-made cosmetics lead foreign-made ones by a 45% to 20% margin. By a 63% to 11% plurality, Chinese consumers are going to buy domestically manufactured clothes. 76% of respondents prefer Chinese food and beverages, as compared with only 5% favoring foreign products.

OTHER FACTORS

Besides types of products, education, income, age, and personal spending habits also influence the purchase intentions of urban consumers. In general, as education and income increase, preference for foreign products grows. Conversely, as respondents' age goes up, intentions for buying foreign items go down. Those who consider their spending decisions less carefully are more inclined to foreign products than those who shop more carefully.

	Foreign Television	Foreign Electronics	Foreign Cosmetics
800 yuan and over	86%	71%	33%
Less than 199 yuan	54	28	16
College and over	66	58	23
Less than high school	59	39	19
14-29 years old	68	54	29
60 years and over	28	16	4
Spend less carefully	75	63	27
Spend more carefully	52	34	17

The same pattern is also observed in the public's preference for foreign-manufactured clothes, with the exception that people with higher academic attainment display no increased interest in imported garments. Furthermore, younger Chinese and affluent Chinese are noticeably more willing to try foreign food and beverages even though an overwhelming majority of them still prefer Chinese diets and drinks.

RURAL CONSUMERS

Chinese rural consumers share the reasons for purchasing foreign and domestic televisions with their urban counterparts. They name "quality" (69%) and "brand name" (24%) as the major considerations to buy foreign products. They purchase Chinese televisions for "low price" (55%) and "good service" (40%). "Quality" remains a distant third reason for favoring domestic televisions (23%), and the statement that "a Chinese should buy Chinese products" is endorsed by equal percentage of rural (19%) and urban Chinese (20%).

They differ from urban consumers, however, in their overwhelming preferences for Chinese products when purchasing intentions were inquired. They favor Chinese televisions by a 58% to 31% majority. More than twice of them would buy domestic consumer electronics (58%) rather than foreign-made ones (21%). Six in ten opt for Chinese cosmetics, as compared with less than one in ten (9%) who prefer imported items. 80% of rural consumers will purchase Chinese clothes, food and beverages while 5% will pay for foreign products.

METHODOLOGY

Between May 28 and July 5, 1995, face-to-face interviews were conducted with a cross-section of 2,140 Chinese urban residents 14 years of age and above. The sample was drawn on the basis of PPS from 20 strata (cities) throughout the country, and has a margin of error of plus and minus three percentage points at the 95 percent confidence level. In addition to the urban sample, 240 rural consumers were interviewed for comparative purpose only.

The survey was jointly conducted by Ji-qiang Rong, an ABD in political science and research assistant at the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut, and Guo-ming Yu and Xia-yang Liu, professors of communication science and directors of Public Opinion Research Institute, People's University of China in Beijing. For more detailed information about this survey or survey research in China in general, interested people are welcome to contact Ji-qiang Rong at (860) 486-4440 or through email.

Ji-qiang Rong
rong@uconnvm.uconn.edu
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 18 10:35:20 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA02997 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Jun 1996 10:35:19 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA11800 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Jun 1996 10:35:17 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 1996 10:35:16 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
Reply-To: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Digest/Postpone/Vacations
In-Reply-To: <26061713281418@vms2.macc.wisc.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960618092019.4912D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Mon, 17 Jun 1996, Heather Hartwig Boyd wrote:

> Sorry to need the reminder, but how does one set AAPORNET to the
> "digest" function?

Because others may have the same question, you hardened AAPORNET irregulars will excuse this reply to Heather via our list.

Any request for changing the status of your subscription ought to be sent as a line of programming to a dumb machine, which resides at listproc@usc.edu Such messages ought to have NO subject header and nothing (not even a stray comma) other than the command itself.

To set your mail to "digest," which means that each day's postings will be packaged (in the order received) into a single often quite large message sent to you at midnight (3 am EDT), send the one-line, four-word command
set aapornet mail digest

(and absolutely nothing else) to listproc@usc.edu

If you should have a change of heart, and wish to return to the thrill of exchange in real time (more or less), the command is

```
set aapornet mail ack
```

The reason why the term is "ack," a word otherwise used only at bad moments by Cathy in the comic strip with her name, appears to be lost forever in the ancient history of the ARPANET.

AAPORNETters headed off on an extended vacation (not us, my friends) might consider either taking along a laptop or shutting off AAPORNET for the duration with

```
set aapornet mail postpone
```

For the dumb machine, "postpone" does not mean delay but rather terminate (blame it on ARPANET). To see what you missed, upon returning, send any ONE of the lines

```
get aapornet log9606 (for this month)
get aapornet log9607 (for next month)
get aapornet log9608 (for August)
get aapornet log9609 (for September)
```

Do NOT include the words in parentheses, of course (although they might not prove fatal).

To resume the flow of AAPORNET messages, upon returning from your vacation, the command is again

```
set aapornet mail ack
```

If you should have any problems, remember that it's the machine that's dumb, not you, and simply send them to beniger@rcf.usc.edu PLEASE DO NOT POST TO AAPORNET!

As the most general rule, remember: All clerical ephemera ought to go either to listproc@usc.edu or, failing there, to beniger@rcf.usc.edu Only things worthy of consideration by all 800-some of us hardly-dumb mammals ought to be sent to aapornet@usc.edu

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 18 12:06:10 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA15574 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Jun 1996 12:06:09 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA19211 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Jun 1996 12:06:08 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 1996 12:06:08 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Cultural Studies of Science/Gore on the Net
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960618120002.4912N-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

>From today's DAILY REPORT of The Chronicle of Higher Education:

MAGAZINES & JOURNALS

A glance at the July 1 issue of "The New Republic":

When the journal "Social Text" published an article by the physicist Alan Sokal without realizing that it was a hoax, the journal's editors seriously damaged the credibility of postmodernism as a scholarly approach, writes Peter Berkowitz, an associate professor of government at Harvard University. The "Social Text" editors agreed to publish Mr. Sokal's piece, which the author later acknowledged was "devoid of both evidence and reasoned argument," without consulting any physicists, who would have recognized the joke immediately, Mr. Berkowitz writes. The hoax highlights a "troubling" aspect of postmodern study -- its tendency to focus on the "cultural" or "critical" study of science. "By teaching that the distinction between true and false is one more repressive human fiction, postmodernism promotes contempt for the truth and undermines the virtue of intellectual integrity," he writes. "Those who have never performed an experiment or mastered an equation can, therefore, enjoy a sneering superiority based on the alleged insight that science is a form of literary invention distinguished by its outsized social cachet."

OF NOTE ON THE NET: Vice-President Gore circulated an e-mail message to M.I.T. students asking for help with his homework. His assignment: to write an address for delivery at the institute's commencement.

Copyright (c) 1996 The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc.

>From MPRNJ!JHH@mprnj.com Wed Jun 19 11:48:04 1996
Return-Path: mprnj!MPRNJ!JHH@mprnj.com
Received: from tigger.jvnc.net (tigger.jvnc.net [128.121.50.145])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA23124 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Jun 1996 11:48:02 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mprnj.com by tigger.jvnc.net with UUCP id AA24693
(5.65c/IDA-1.4.4 for aapornet@usc.edu); Wed, 19 Jun 1996 14:48:00 -0400
From: MPRNJ!JHH@mprnj.com (John Hall)
Date: 19-Jun-96 14:41:59
Received: by mprnj.com (UUCP-MHS-XtcN) Wed Jun 19 14:48:07 1996
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: <None>
Message-Id: 9BF39C3A01B4ACD1
Importance: Normal
Encoding: 27 TEXT

STATISTICIAN

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., a nationally recognized survey research organization, has an immediate opening in its Princeton, NJ office for a statistician to support its survey sampling and statistical analysis activities. The successful applicant will have a Masters degree (or equivalent) in statistics and a minimum of two years of relevant experience. The job involves creating and implementing sample designs, including developing frames, selecting samples, calculating weights, imputing missing data, and performing statistical and methodological analyses. Strong communication skills, familiarity with statistical software, and knowledge of sampling methodologies are essential. Additional years of experience and computer programming skills are highly desirable. Salary competitive and commensurate with experience. We offer an excellent benefits packaging including 3 weeks vacation and an on-site fitness center. Please submit your resume, salary requirements and references to:

Patricia Shirkness
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 20 09:57:41 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA10574 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jun 1996 09:57:40 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA07266 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jun 1996 09:57:39 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 20 Jun 1996 09:57:38 -0700 (PDT)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Int'l J of POR 8:1 (Spring 1996)
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960620094424.3804D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Date: Wed, 19 Jun 1996 16:26:06 -0400 (EDT)
From: Erich P. Staib, Oxford University Press Journals <eps@oup-usa.org>
Subject: IJPOR 8:1, Spring 1996

===== INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH =====
Volume 8, Number 1 Spring 1996 (Now Available)
=====

EDS: SEYMOUR MARTIN LIPSET, ELISABETH NOELLE-NEUMANN, ROBERT M. WORCESTER

ARTICLES

A New Direction for Survey Research. Daniel Yankelovich (p. 1)

A Study of Far Right Ressentiment in America. Howard Schuman and Maria Krysan (p. 10)

New Politics? The Mabo Debate and Public Opinion on Native Title in Australia. Gary N. Marks and Paula McDonnell (p. 31)

The Social Implications of Cable Television: Restructuring Connections with Self and Social Groups. Hillel Nosssek and Hanna Adoni (p. 51)

Providing Information in Public Opinion Surveys: Motivation and Ability Effects in the Information-and-Choice Questionnaire. Daan van Knipenberg and Dancker Daamen (p. 70)

RESEARCH NOTE

A Decision Aid in a Referendum. Peter Neijens, Mark Minkman, Jan de Ridder, Willem Saris, and Jeroen Slot (p. 83)

REVIEWS

Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann and Renate Kocher: Allensbacher Jahrbuch der Demoskopie, 1984-1992. Norbert Schwarz (p. 91)

Nikolai Popov: The Russian People Speak: Democracy at the Crossroads. Festus Eribo (p. 94)

Recent Books in the Field of Public Opinion Research. Compiled by William J. Gonzenbach and Susan Thompson (p. 97)

Recent Articles in the Field of Public Opinion Research. Compiled by Hans-Bernd Brosius (p. 101)

WAPOR News (p. 108)

Forthcoming Conferences and Seminars (p. 110)

=====

The International Journal of Public Opinion Research is a quarterly journal published by Oxford University Press in association with The World Association for Public Opinion Research.

A special rate is available to AAPOR members.

If you would like further details, please contact Oxford University Press:

Walton Street, Oxford OX2 6DP, UK. Tel: +44 1865 267907
Fax: +44 1865 267485 E-mail: jnl.orders@oup.co.uk

OR in North America: Oxford University Press, Journals Department, 2001 Evans Road, Cary NC 27513, USA. Toll-free within the US and Canada: 1-800-852-7323 or 919-677-0977 Fax: 919-677-1714 E-mail: jnlorders@oup-usa.org

Copyright in the table of contents listed above is held by OUP, but you are welcome to circulate them, provided that Oxford University Press is credited as publisher and copyright holder.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 20 10:08:40 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA11971 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jun 1996 10:08:39 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA08230 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jun 1996 10:08:38 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 20 Jun 1996 10:08:37 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Domain Name Protection Drive
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960620095836.3804E-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Date: Tue, 18 Jun 1996 20:31:41 -0700 (PDT)
From: American Association of Domain Names <domains@domains.org>
Subject: Protect your Domain Name(s)

=====

For Immediate Release: June, 18th 1996
Press Release: American Association of Domain Names
Contact : Chris Raines
E-mail: Chairman@domains.org
Web site: <http://www.domains.org>

"Current issues surrounding Domain Names spurs formation of Trade Organization for Domain Name Holders"

With recent controversy and lawsuits involving domain name disputes, it has

become increasingly clear that businesses and individuals that have registered domain names are not owners of those names but holders. As strictly holders, these domains and the businesses and individuals that have registered their domains, are subject to current and future policy deemed appropriate by Internic, and any possible future legislation. A group of domain name holders have formed a non-profit organization, "American Association of Domain Names."

The purpose of the AADN is to provide a united voice and support network for members. The AADN will also strive to provide informational, legal, and/or financial relief to members involved in litigation where the outcome of such cases affects the rights of all domain name owners.

The Association is in the grassroots stage and currently focusing on gaining momentum through a strong membership drive. Interested Domain Name Holders may learn more about domain names, and use the online membership form at "domains.org"

###

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 20 12:15:26 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA03167 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jun 1996 12:15:24 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA18165 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jun 1996 12:15:22 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 20 Jun 1996 12:15:21 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: SRI Study of Web Usage
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960620114926.12299D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

AAPORNETters interested in survey data about the Internet and World Wide Web who have not yet seen the results of SRI's ambitious study of roughly a year ago can find it at

<http://future.sri.com/vals/vals-survey.results.html>

Here is the introductory section, from which you might judge whether the rest would be worth your visit. Several important implications for public policy will be obvious...

Exploring the World Wide Web Population's Other Half

Reporting results from one of the largest Internet surveys to date, SRI International released new data about users of the World Wide Web--who is on it, how they use it, and why.

The effort is the first to augment standard demographics (such as age,

income, and gender) with a psychographic analysis of the Web population. Utilizing one of the world's leading psychographic systems, SRI's VALS 2*, the survey explored the psychology of people's choices and behavior on the Web.

The results paint a picture of two Web audiences. The first is the group that drives most of the media coverage and stereotypes of Web users, the "upstream" audience. Comprising 50% of the current Web population, this well-documented group is the upscale, technically oriented academics and professionals that ride on a variety of institutional subsidies. Yet because this group comprises only 10% of the U.S. population in the VALS 2 system, their behaviors and characteristics are of limited usefulness in understanding the future Web.

The second Web audience comprises a diverse set of groups that SRI calls the Web's "other half." Accounting for the other 90% of U.S. society, these groups are where Internet growth will increasingly need to take place if the medium is to go mainstream. Among the SRI survey's findings of the Web's other half are:

- The other-half gender split--64% male and 36% female--is significantly more balanced than the upstream group's split of 77% and 23%. (The gender split for the overall sample [figure] is 70% male and 30% female, a figure that did not change across the four-month sample period.)

- Many information-intensive consumers in the U.S. population are in the other-half population rather than the upstream population. These particular other-half consumers report the highest degree of frustration with the Web of any population segment. Although they drive much of the consumer-information industry in other media, they as a group have yet to find the Web particularly valuable.

- The "information have-nots"--those groups not on the Web at all--are excluded not because of low income but because of limited education. Although income for the Web audience [figure] is somewhat upscale (a median yearly income of \$40,000), it includes a substantial number of low-income users (28% have yearly incomes of less than \$20,000). The same cannot be said of education [figure], which basically has a high-end-only distribution: 97% of the upstream audience and 89% of the other-half audience reports at least some college education, including the low-income respondents. These results confirm that education is the key to Internet participation, which calls into question the effectiveness of proposals to empower information have-nots with income-targeted subsidies for Internet access.

>From Scheuren@aol.com Thu Jun 20 13:12:31 1996
Return-Path: Scheuren@aol.com
Received: from emout16.mail.aol.com (emout16.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.42])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA14595 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 Jun 1996 13:12:29 -0700
(PDT)
From: Scheuren@aol.com
Received: by emout16.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id QAA03990 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 20 Jun 1996 16:12:40 -0400
Date: Thu, 20 Jun 1996 16:12:40 -0400

Message-ID: <960620161236_221557449@emout16.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Survey Literacy Pamphlets

This is a request for pictures of survey-taking in action, old PAPI or one of the newer approaches. Focus groups too or one of the more recently introduced cognitive methods. Any stage from planning to presentation. State the circumstances, if you can, around the shots.

The pictures would be used as part of the continuing series of pamphlets being put out by the Section on Survey Research Methods of the American Statistical Association.

Cartoons on the survey process, that you liked, would also be appreciated.

Please send anything that you think appropriate to Fritz Scheuren, The George Washington University, Department of Statistics, Fungler Hall, 2201 G st. Washington DC 20052

>From 75604.2013@CompuServe.COM Fri Jun 21 07:28:49 1996

Return-Path: 75604.2013@CompuServe.COM

Received: from dub-img-5.compuserve.com (dub-img-5.compuserve.com [198.4.9.5])

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id HAA15380 for <aapornet@USC.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 07:28:46 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by dub-img-5.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id KAA14052; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 10:28:15 -0400

Date: 21 Jun 96 10:27:04 EDT

From: Kevin Hoyes <75604.2013@CompuServe.COM>

To: aapornet <aapornet@USC.edu>

Subject: culture of science

Message-ID: <960621142703_75604.2013_GHL118-1@CompuServe.COM>

For those that have been following the interesting debate concerning Alan Sokal's parody of postmodernism in "Social Text," Sokal now has set up a home page in which he includes the original text as well as numerous responses and counter responses from the "Social Text" editors as well as various reviews criticisms and general chit-chat about it (<http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/physics/faculty/sokal/index.html>). Together they make a fun read.

In my view, the article by Bruce Lewenstein in The Chronicle of Higher Education,

doesn't do the debate justice. His central point seems to be that Sokal is not fair to scholars

(like Lewenstein) who study the social construction of science. A valid point, but Sokal wasn't

criticizing ALL sociologists of science. His parody is aimed squarely at postmodernists and

those who suggest that there are NO objective standards in science. While the category

"postmodern" no doubt incorporates an array of approaches (how could it not!), one can

reasonably respond, "I know it when I read it".

The major problem with Lewenstein's attack, however, is that it seems to want to criticize Sokal for the WAY in which he sheds light on the

serious drawbacks of postmodern attacks on science ("Mr. Sokal is as blameworthy for perpetuating the hoax as the editors of "Social Text" are for letting the hoax get through"). This seems to be a recipe for academic balkanization (as in "this is your journal, this is mine..."). It is naive to assume that the gatekeepers at "Social Text" would have published Sokal's article if he had been honest about his intent. Second, Lewenstein misses the point that Sokal's hoax has more intellectual impact precisely because it was a hoax. Sokal's point is hardly new. Many luminaries of postmodernism (e.g., Stanley Fish, Jacques Derrida, Richard Rorty) and many scholars from just outside its borders (i.e., Terry Eagleton, Stuart Hall, Umberto Eco), have come to question the weakness of much post-structural writing. However, none of these writers have gone so far as to demonstrate their criticisms empirically! Moreover, several of the luminaries' own reputations rests upon the kind of ambiguity which Sokal was parodying.

Certainly, there is a "National Lampoon" feel to Sokal's article but I, for one, think that useful. The ironies of the reaction to Sokal's piece are delicious. For example, one of the editors of "Social Text", Andrew Ross, made his name with a well written book entitled "No Respect." The argument he put forward there was that popular culture sometimes shows no respect for intellectual culture....and this is a good thing (i.e., its represents an opposition to the dominant hegemony, etc.). Whether Rodney Dangerfield is really a threat to Western Civilization is questionable, but I find it amusing that Ross is now complaining that Sokal's act is "a breach of professional ethics" and "a boy prank." It seems to me that Ross just wants a little more respect himself!

Lewenstein makes a claim for the middle ground. Can't we can all get along? There is much to be said for the center but it is, surely, disingenuous to suggest that postmodernism speaks from that location (even though the editors of "Social Text" are now suggesting just this). Most scholars are relativists to some degree (after all, why study, if meaning is fixed?). What makes postmodernism different is its tendency to divide up the world into goodies....and, well, empiricists. Pushing the irony a little further, one might argue that Sokal's piece strikes a blow for the marginalized empiricist, and, indeed, undermining the hegemony of postmodernism.... It works for me.

>From GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov Fri Jun 21 08:49:29 1996

Return-Path: GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov
Received: from dcgate ([146.142.4.13])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id IAA25385 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 08:49:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from MS-SMTPGatewayPC (pol.cpi.bls.gov) by mailgate.bls.gov
(5.x/SMI-SVR4)
id AA22052; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 11:47:59 -0400
Received: by MS-SMTPGatewayPC with Microsoft Mail
id <31CAC49E@MS-SMTPGatewayPC>; Fri, 21 Jun 96 11:49:50 EDT
From: Goldenberg_K <GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov>
To: "'aapornet'" <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>
Subject: Membership renewals and address updates
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 96 11:49:00 EDT
Message-Id: <31CAC49E@MS-SMTPGatewayPC>
Encoding: 17 TEXT
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0

MEMBERSHIP RENEWALS:

Membership renewals for 1996 are now PAST DUE. Participation in AAPORnet is a privilege reserved for AAPOR members. If you do not pay your dues by June

30th, your name will be removed from the AAPORnet list. In addition, you will not be included in the 1996-97 AAPOR directory. Don't let this happen! If you need a renewal/registration form, send a message to AAPOR@umich.edu. Send dues renewals to AAPOR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248.

ADDRESS UPDATES:

If your address, telephone number, and/or email address have changed, please notify the Secretariat so that the information in the 1996-97 Directory is current. The Secretariat needs those changes by August 1, 1996. Send to AAPOR@umich.edu or to the address above.

Karen Goldenberg, Chair

Membership and Chapter Relations

>From mtrau@umich.edu Fri Jun 21 10:02:04 1996

Return-Path: mtrau@umich.edu

Received: from seawolf.rs.itd.umich.edu (seawolf.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.88])

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP

id KAA07226 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 10:02:01 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from seawolf.rs.itd.umich.edu by seawolf.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.7.1/2.2)

id NAA10536; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 13:01:44 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Fri, 21 Jun 1996 13:01:42 -0400 (EDT)

From: Michael W Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>

X-Sender: mtrau@seawolf.rs.itd.umich.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Membership renewals and address updates

In-Reply-To: <31CAC49E@MS-SMTPGatewayPC>

Message-ID:

<Pine.SOL.3.91.960621130121.8065B-100000@seawolf.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Please change my telephonen umber in the directory to 313 763-4702.
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jun 21 10:10:33 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA08912 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 10:10:31 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA08899 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 10:10:25 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 1996 10:10:23 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Survey Milestone?
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960621100528.8237A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

SURVEY MILESTONE?

Judging by the "Corrections" section in this morning's New York Times (June 21, 1996, p. A2), failure to include a statement of the statistical margin of error for a public opinion poll mentioned in a news story is now considered an error in reporting requiring a published correction. To my knowledge, this is the first such correction to appear in print in a major daily newspaper, which would make the words below yet another milestone in the development of scientific survey research and precision journalism. Obviously I would be delighted to learn that earlier such corrections have appeared, and therefore welcome AAPORNETters to post any evidence of previous examples if they can. -- JB

CORRECTIONS

An article on Wednesday about the Presidential contest in the South omitted the margin of sampling error for a New York Times/CBS News Poll taken May 31 through June 3, in which President Clinton led Bob Dole in the South by 47 percent to 41 percent. In a sample of the size used in that poll, the statistical margin of error is plus or minus six percentage points; that is, within accepted standards of probability, the result for either candidate in the entire South could have been as much as six points

lower or higher than the result in
the sample.

Copyright 1996 The New York Times

>From jbbare@Interpath.com Fri Jun 21 11:39:02 1996
Return-Path: jbbare@interpath.com
Received: from mail-hub.interpath.net (mail-hub.interpath.net [199.72.1.13])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA24939 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 11:39:00 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from LOCALNAME (raleigh2-38.interpath.net [199.72.147.38]) by
mail-hub.interpath.net (8.6.12/8.6.14) with SMTP id OAA26639 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 14:38:31 -0400
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 1996 14:38:31 -0400
Message-Id: <199606211838.OAA26639@mail-hub.interpath.net>
X-Sender: jbbare@Interpath.com
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: John Bare <jbbare@Interpath.com>
Subject: Re: ACTION: Bowling Alone

Phil,

I haven't read it yet, but the latest issue of The Public Perspective arrived in my mailbox today, offering this headline for the cover story: "A Vast Empirical Record Refutes the Idea of Civic Decline." I'm curious to see what's inside and to hear opinions from AAPORNETers on the issue.

John

At 11:33 PM 6/11/96 -0400, you wrote:

> The gaps in the literature that I would like most to be filled are
>empirical verification of the notion that our society has swung too far
>toward libertarian individualism and needs to adjust in the direction
>of cooperative authoritarianism. Old guys have been saying this all my
>life, and now I'm at an age where I'm saying it, too. What's great
>about Putnam is that the points on his scatterplots line up so neatly,
>and I can see what I've been feeling intuitively.
> Related literature includes Francis Fukuyama, "Trust: The Social
>Virtues
>and the Creation of Prosperity," Amitai Etzioni, "The Spirit of
>Community," Daniel Yankelovich, "Coming to Public Judgment: Making
>Democracy Work in a Complex Society." Then, behind those guys you have
>the philosophers like Robert N. Bellah and his crew in "Habits of the
>Heart," and, of course, Habermas. The civic journalism movement is
>related to all of this as it tries to find a
>new theory of news that counters the
>social fragmenting effect resulting from the application of old
>standards to new technology. I'm looking for empirical
>verification that these efforts make any difference. Slim pickings thus
far.
>
>Phil Meyer

>
>

>From GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov Fri Jun 21 11:55:37 1996
Return-Path: GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov
Received: from dagate ([146.142.4.13])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA27738 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 11:55:33 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from MS-SMTPGatewayPC (pol.cpi.bls.gov) by mailgate.bls.gov
(5.x/SMI-SVR4)
id AA23573; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 14:54:06 -0400
Received: by MS-SMTPGatewayPC with Microsoft Mail
id <31CAF03D@MS-SMTPGatewayPC>; Fri, 21 Jun 96 14:55:57 EDT
From: Goldenberg_K <GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov>
To: "'aapornet'" <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>
Subject: Clarification: Renewals and updates
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 96 14:54:00 EDT
Message-Id: <31CAF03D@MS-SMTPGatewayPC>
Encoding: 17 TEXT
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0

Renewals:

The message about dues renewals went to the entire AAPORnet list. If you paid your dues for 1996, thank you--the message does not apply to you. If you are not certain about your situation, contact the Secretariat at AAPOR@umich.edu.

Directory updates:

Please send updates, changes, etc. to the Secretariat. DO NOT "reply" to the message and send them to AAPORnet. DO NOT send them to me. The former action helps to annoy 800+ people, while the latter may or may not reach the

intended destination.

Karen Goldenberg

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Fri Jun 21 12:36:33 1996
Return-Path: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (root@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.96])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA07695 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 12:36:31 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from social54.socsci (social54.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.12.54]) by
shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george) with SMTP id PAA28840 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 15:38:47 -0400
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 1996 15:38:47 -0400
Message-Id: <1.5.4.16.19960621153602.22a7ab84@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (16)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Re: Clarification: Renewals and updates

How about checking first who has not paid up (not a major task given modern technology) and send a message to those concerned instead of issuing an obscure threat? We should be entitled to a little bit of service and courtesy. MK.

At 02:54 PM 6/21/96 EDT, you wrote:

>
>Renewals:
>The message about dues renewals went to the entire AAPORnet list. If
>you
>paid your dues for 1996, thank you--the message does not apply to you. If
>you are not certain about your situation, contact the Secretariat at
>AAPOR@umich.edu.
>
>Directory updates:
>Please send updates, changes, etc. to the Secretariat. DO NOT "reply"
>to
>the message and send them to AAPORnet. DO NOT send them to me. The former

>action helps to annoy 800+ people, while the latter may or may not reach
the
>intended destination.
>
>Karen Goldenberg
>
>
>
>
>

Manfred Kuechler
Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
695 Park Avenue, NY, NY 10021
Tel: 212-772-5588 Fax: 212-772-5645
Web: <http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/>

>From DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU Fri Jun 21 13:12:35 1996
Return-Path: <@UICVM.UIC.EDU:DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Received: from UICVM.UIC.EDU (UICVM-ETH2.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.24.54])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA14042 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 13:12:33 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU by UICVM.UIC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with TCP;
Fri, 21 Jun 96 15:12:42 CDT
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 15:07:35 -0500
Message-Id: <slcabab6.099@SRL.UIC.EDU>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 1996 15:10:00 -0500
From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: SURVEY MILESTONE? - Reply

It's certainly important to get an indication of the sampling variance,
particularly in cases of political trial heats where the confidence interval

may equal or exceed the range between the candidates (as in the + or - 6% and 47-41% straw vote example).
However, as they say, "a little knowledge can be a dangerous thing."
I've consulted with many people (academics as well as others) who worry ONLY about the + or - 3% (or 5% or 6%) to the exclusion of all other error.
(Maybe we need a law that would prohibit statisticians (or research methods instructors) from teaching survey sample variance without also giving a little time to nonsampling errors.*)
So, for example, they don't see the need to pay a few bucks more for better design (e.g., RDD with multiple callbacks, or followups to one mailing) when someone offers them cheap but + or - 5% (e.g., call directory-listed phone numbers and get interviews with the first 400 people available, or send out as many mail questionnaires as necessary (cases, not mailings) to get 400 back. Sometimes I think that publishing only the + or - x% (and not other information about the questionnaire, sampling and data collection) does not serve us well.

*Long ago when I first learned about sampling (BA/Soc/Psych 485 -- Sampling Methods & Theory), Prof. Sudman included a section on non-sampling errors (of course).

Diane O'Rourke
Survey Research Laboratory
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL

>>> James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu> 6/21/96, 12:10pm >>>

SURVEY MILESTONE?

Judging by the "Corrections" section in this morning's New York Times (June 21, 1996, p. A2), failure to include a statement of the statistical margin of error for a public opinion poll mentioned in a news story is now considered an error in reporting requiring a published correction. To my knowledge, this is the first such correction to appear in print in a major daily newspaper, which would make the words below yet another milestone in the development of scientific survey research and precision journalism. Obviously I would be delighted to learn that earlier such corrections have appeared, and therefore welcome AAPORNETters to post any evidence of previous examples if they can. -- JB

CORRECTIONS

An article on Wednesday about the Presidential contest in the South omitted the margin of sampling error for a New York Times/CBS News Poll taken May 31 through June 3, in which President Clinton led Bob Dole in the South by 47 percent to 41 percent. In a sample of

the size used in that poll, the statistical margin of error is plus or minus six percentage points; that is, within accepted standards of probability, the result for either candidate in the entire South could have been as much as six points lower or higher than the result in the sample.

Copyright 1996 The New York Times

>From fneurohr@interport.net Fri Jun 21 17:57:29 1996
Return-Path: fneurohr@interport.net
Received: from park.interport.net (park.interport.net [199.184.165.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA15535 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 17:57:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from fneurohr.port.net (fneurohr.port.net [205.161.151.127]) by
park.interport.net (8.7.3/8.7.3) with SMTP id UAA29769 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 20:57:24 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 1996 20:57:24 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199606220057.UAA29769@park.interport.net>
X-Sender: fneurohr@interport.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: fneurohr@interport.net (Fred Neurohr)
Subject: Statistics: US marriages by length of marriage

Hello all:

I am working on a project where I must estimate the number of Americans celebrating their 25th anniversary for a business plan. Any ideas how I may track and forecast the number of people who reach their 25th anniversary? NCHS does not keep track of marriages this way ... perhaps there are marriage "survival rates" out there? The Bureau of the Census could not help either.

Thanks,
Fred Neurohr
J. Walter Thompson Company
New York, NY

Fred Neurohr
37-05 79th Street, #6M
Jackson Heights, NY 11372-6741
718/446-3719

>From jwerner@vgernet.net Sun Jun 23 07:12:19 1996
Return-Path: jwerner@vgernet.net
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@[205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id HAA02792 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 23 Jun 1996 07:12:18 -0700

(PDT)

Message-ID: <31CD50C7.AF1@vgernet.net>
Date: Sun, 23 Jun 1996 10:12:23 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@vgernet.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02Gold (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Milestone?
References: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960621100528.8237A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

James Beniger wrote:

>
> SURVEY MILESTONE?
>
> Judging by the "Corrections" section in this morning's New York Times
> (June 21, 1996, p. A2), failure to include a statement of the
> statistical margin of error for a public opinion poll mentioned in a
> news story is now considered an error in reporting requiring a
> published correction. To my knowledge, this is the first such
> correction to appear in print in a major daily newspaper, which would
> make the words below yet another milestone in the development of
> scientific survey research and precision journalism.

Your faith in journalistic progress is touching, but misplaced. The primary, if not sole, purpose of such a statement is for the entity publishing the results of a survey to disclaim any responsibility for these being incorrect.

As in this case, little, if any, useful information is provided to determine validity of the results, except for the sample size.

Sampling error is only defined if the probability of selection is known, but I have yet to see any such disclaimer that includes data on response rates (number of calls made, actual contacts, refusals and completed interviews), and also notifies the reader that accepting the "margin of sampling error" means accepting the assumption that non-respondents distribute in the same manner as completed interviews.

>From daves@startribune.com Sun Jun 23 20:03:18 1996

Return-Path: daves@startribune.com

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

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id UAA09734 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 23 Jun 1996 20:03:17 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id WAA08111; Sun, 23 Jun 1996 22:01:34 -0500

Received: from unknown(132.148.71.45) by firewall2.startribune.com via smap (V3.1)

id xma008107; Sun, 23 Jun 96 22:01:25 -0500

Received: from STAR-Message_Server by gw.startribune.com

with Novell_GroupWise; Sun, 23 Jun 1996 22:05:25 -0600

Message-Id: <slcdbfa5.081@gw.startribune.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Sun, 23 Jun 1996 22:12:37 -0600

From: Rob Daves <daves@startribune.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu, jwerner@vgernet.net
Subject: Re: Survey Milestone? -Reply

Jan & AAPORNETfolk:

It's pretty tough to explain complex issues such as response rate in the short space journalists are given for the methods description, especially when there are so many definitions of response rate, each with its own hint about the quality of the sample.

What I try to do is cite correctly the margin of sampling error, and try to give the reader some basic information about non-random error. Minnesota Poll results -- and those of some other newspaper-sponsored polls I've seen -- are accompanied by language that explains that results may be influenced by several factors such as question wording and order, and news events that have occurred during the interviewing period.

That's not enough, of course, for the few of us who have a keen interest in polling particulars. But for most readers -- and tightfisted editors who treat newshole as if it were their personal piggy bank -- its viewed as more than enough.

Rob Daves, director, The Minnesota Poll

>From jwerner@vgernet.net Mon Jun 24 20:55:18 1996
Return-Path: jwerner@vgernet.net
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@[205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id UAA13216 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Jun 1996 20:55:17 -0700
(PDT)

Message-ID: <31CF6334.1943@vgernet.net>
Date: Mon, 24 Jun 1996 23:55:32 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@vgernet.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02Gold (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu, Rob Daves <daves@startribune.com>
Subject: Re: Survey Milestone? -Reply
References: <slcdbfa5.082@gw.startribune.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Rob Daves wrote:

>
> Jan & AAPORNETfolk:
>
> It's pretty tough to explain complex issues such as response rate in
> the short space journalists are given for the methods description,
> especially when there are so many definitions of response rate, each
> with its own hint about the quality of the sample.
>
> What I try to do is cite correctly the margin of sampling error, and
> try to give the reader some basic information about non-random error.
> Minnesota Poll results -- and those of some other newspaper-sponsored
> polls I've seen -- are accompanied by language that explains that
> results may be influenced by several factors such as question wording
> and order, and news events that have occurred during the interviewing

> period.
>
> That's not enough, of course, for the few of us who have a keen
> interest in polling particulars. But for most readers -- and
> tightfisted editors who treat newshole as if it were their personal
> piggy bank -- its viewed as more than enough.
>
> Rob Daves, director, The Minnesota Poll

My point is this:

The sampling error is unknown in any poll with a substantial non-response rate, regardless of how you report the non-response. If 75% of the people who pick up the phone actually complete a survey (an extraordinarily good response rate these days), there is no way that you can know whether those factors that caused the other 25% to hang up are orthogonal (the optimistic assumption) or collinear (the worst case scenario) to the factors measured by the survey.

While the results of such surveys may well represent how the entire population would respond to the questions asked, you cannot estimate accurately the probability of this being the case, because even if a proper random sample was selected, you do not know whether those responding were randomly distributed.

Under these circumstances, it is, in my opinion, grossly misleading to quote sampling error as if the actual probability of selection were known, because this implies a precision that simply does not exist in most surveys today, quite apart from wording or other questionnaire bias issues.

I am afraid that far too many editors and reporters do not understand this, nor do they care. From their point of view, the main advantage of printing a sampling error statement is that it provides a cheap way to lend "scientific" credibility to a survey.

This is a little like dressing an actor in a white frock and placing him in front of a full bookshelf to shoot a commercial about head-ache tablets: It makes the message seem more believable without actually providing any information that would allow the viewer to judge independently the validity of the message.

I don't have any easy answers to the problems faced by you and others in the news media (I worked there myself, once) when attempting to present complex

issues in
such a way that editors and reporters can grasp and convey without too much
distortion, but I do not believe that unsupported claims of "scientific"
accuracy
will do much to help the credibility of our profession in the long run.
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 25 05:54:42 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id FAA13857 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 05:54:41 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id FAA27210 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 05:54:39 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 25 Jun 1996 05:54:39 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: New Pew Study Released Today
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960625055143.27203A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Findings of the Pew Research Center's latest survey, to be released today,
are reported above the fold on the front page of this morning's New York
Times in a story by Gustav Niebuhr, "Public Supports Political Voice For
Churches."

"In evidence of a striking change in Americans' attitudes about religion and
politics," the story begins, "a majority of the public now believes that
churches should be allowed to express political opinions, a reversal from
what a majority believed a generation ago, according to a new nationwide
survey of religious identity and political opinion."

According to the story, "The Pew report found that among the groups it
surveyed, white evangelical Protestants had been the most politically
dynamic." Citing previous surveys, Niebuhr reports, the Pew Research Center
found that white evangelicals "had increased their strength to 23 percent of
the electorate, up from 19 percent of registered voters who identified
themselves as evangelicals in 1987."

The Times coverage includes one AAPORNETter: "Commenting on the new poll,
Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center said, 'The conservatism of
white evangelicals is the most powerful political force in the country.'"

As Niebuhr elaborates, "The survey showed that white evangelical Protestants
took more conservative positions than other religious groups, both on moral
issues and some secular issues."

Niebuhr's coverage includes two elaborate tables of percentages from the Pew
study which no AAPORNETter could possibly resist--part of a useful summary
well worth the Times cover price of a dollar, even if you do plan to
download the report from the Pew Research Center Web site at
<http://www.people-press.org/>

###

>From EXP12@PSUVM.PSU.EDU Tue Jun 25 06:34:18 1996
Return-Path: EXP12@PSUVM.PSU.EDU
Received: from PSUVM.PSU.EDU (psuvm.psu.edu [128.118.56.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id GAA18703 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 06:34:17 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <199606251334.GAA18703@usc.edu>
Received: from PSUVM.PSU.EDU by PSUVM.PSU.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTP id 8547; Tue, 25 Jun 96 09:31:29 EDT
Received: from PSUVM.PSU.EDU (NJE origin EXP12@PSUVM) by PSUVM.PSU.EDU
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with RFC822 id 2203; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 09:31:29 -0400
Date: Tue, 25 Jun 96 09:31 EDT
From: "Eric Plutzer 814-865-6576" <EXP12@PSUVM.PSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET digest 305
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: aapornet AT usc.edu -- Tue, 25 Jun 1996 01:00:34 PDT

Jan Werner is both correct, and over-reacting. Correct in that in any given poll, the correlates of non-response are unknown. Over-reacting in that the non-respondents of most polls are almost surely drawn from the *same population* of non-respondents.

This is why clusters of polls at the same time tend to yield estimates that correspond to the confidence intervals reported by the press.

Thus for trends, the confidence intervals turn out to be fairly accurate in practice. This is not to say that the polls are accurate but that non-response bias is more or less constant: when a candidate rises or falls in the polls, we can compare the magnitude of the rise to calculated confidence intervals.

Since trend analysis occupies the core of public opinion journalism, non-response in the 25% range is fairly benign.

~~~~~  
Eric Plutzer Department of Political Science  
e-mail: exp12@psuvm.psu.edu Pennsylvania State University  
Ph: 814-865-6576 Fx: 814-863-8979 University Park, PA 16802  
~~~~~

>From jamwolf@indiana.edu Tue Jun 25 07:27:47 1996
Return-Path: jamwolf@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu
Received: from roatan.ucs.indiana.edu (roatan.ucs.indiana.edu
[129.79.10.65])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP
id HAA24485 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 07:27:45 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu (jamwolf@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu
[129.79.5.201]) by roatan.ucs.indiana.edu (8.7.3/8.7.3/1.10IUPO) with ESMTMP
id JAA15753 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 09:28:09 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from jamwolf@localhost) by falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu
(8.7/8.7/regexp(\$Revision: 1.3 \$) id JAA02238; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 09:27:44
-0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 25 Jun 1996 09:27:44 -0500 (EST)

From: Jim Wolf <jamwolf@indiana.edu>
X-Sender: jamwolf@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Milestone?
In-Reply-To: <31CF6334.1943@vgnernet.net>
Message-ID:
<Pine.HPP.3.91.960625091955.24999E-100000@falstaff.ucs.indiana.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I share the hope of many that editors of our news media will consider including increasing amounts of information about polling methods as well as results. This process can only lead to a greater appreciation of how to best assess the quality of any given poll.

However, let's keep in mind that not too many years ago phrases like "margin of error" and "confidence interval" were almost never mentioned during the evening news. The persistent efforts of you media folk to impress your editors with the importance of presenting the whole story are paying off. Let's hope this trend doesn't stall.

+-----+
Jim Wolf Internet: jamwolf@indiana.edu
Consulting Sociologist Voice: (317) 255-9621
6332 N. Guilford - Suite #207 FAX: (317) 255-9714
Indianapolis, IN 46220 Home: (317) 257-7062
>From ccowan@fdic.gov Tue Jun 25 08:19:10 1996
Return-Path: ccowan@fdic.gov
Received: from bastion.fdic.gov (firewall-user@bastion.fdic.gov
[192.147.69.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id IAA02689 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 08:19:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by bastion.fdic.gov; id AA24092; Tue, 25 Jun 96 11:19:02 EDT
Received: from mailhub.fdic.gov(151.174.3.26) by bastion.fdic.gov via smap
(V3.1.1)
id xma023874; Tue, 25 Jun 96 11:18:31 -0400
Received: by DACS_DC_16.FDIC.GOV with VINES-ISMTTP; Tue, 25 Jun 96 11:18:24
EDT
Date: Tue, 25 Jun 96 11:02:46 EDT
Message-Id: <vines.3u06+2B+ola@DACS_DC_16.FDIC.GOV>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: "Charles Cowan" <ccowan@fdic.gov>
Subject: New Pew Study Released
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset=US-ASCII

I'm confused. The story cited says: "a majority of the public now believes that churches should be allowed to express political opinions, a reversal from what a majority believed a generation ago". Maybe my memory is blurred, but in the '50s and '60s, black churches agitated for civil rights, Jesuits vocally denounced the Vietnam War, and other religious groups spoke on

important issues (Catholics for Kennedy in the '60s). And my sense at the time was that the public felt this was an appropriate, important, and historically recognized function for these institutions.

Did I miss a generation? Did growing up in the Midwest bias me in some way?

I find it very hard to believe that the public believed that churches should not express political opinions. The Catholic church, black churches in the South, and other organizations have always had a strong influence on local and national political issues. Which of our majorities is being referred to

in the Times?

>From lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu Tue Jun 25 08:34:13 1996
Return-Path: lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu
Received: from casbah.acns.nwu.edu (casbah.acns.nwu.edu [129.105.16.52])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA05246 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 08:34:10 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [129.105.9.180] (aragorn180.nuts.nwu.edu) by
casbah.acns.nwu.edu with SMTP
(1.40.112.4/20.4) id AA252936794; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 10:33:14 -0500
X-Nupop-Charset: English
Date: Tue, 25 Jun 1996 10:36:54 -0600 (CST)
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>
Sender: lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu
Message-Id: <38226.lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re:Sources of survey error and news stories

Sampling error and Nonresponse error are two SEPARATE sources of Total Survey Error. The way one measures (or estimates) their sizes are different, as are the ways that one tries to reduce their size.

Whereas sampling error will always be present in a sample survey and can be calculated when a probability sampling design is employed, nonresponse error may or may not be present (or meaningful in size) and will depend on many factors, including the size of the nonresponse.

Those interested in this evolving AAPORNET exchange and who are not familiar with Bob Groves' 1989 book, SURVEY ERRORS AND SURVEY COSTS, should seek it out. I'd also encourage journalists, in particular, to look at Warren Mitofsky's chapter on reporting survey news stories in the 1995 edited book, PRESIDENTIAL POLLS AND THE NEWS MEDIA; Lavrakas, Traugott & Miller (eds.), Westview Press, Boulder CO, (paperback).

* * * * *
* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.; Professor & Director *
* Northwestern Univ. Survey Lab, 625 Haven, Evanston IL 60208 *
* Office: 847-491-8356 Fax: 847-467-1564 *
* * * * *

>From poch@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA Tue Jun 25 09:44:32 1996
Return-Path: uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA!poch@uipchr.freenet.kiev.ua
Received: from freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua (root@freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua
[194.44.28.250])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA15558 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 09:44:26 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from uipchr.UUCP (uucrane@localhost) by freelunch.freenet.kiev.ua (8.6.13/osf3.2xla) with UUCP id TAA22372 for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 19:30:46 +0300

Received: by uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA (UUPC/@ v5.09gamma, 14Mar93); Tue, 25 Jun 1996 19:12:39 +0200

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-Id: <AA7ulqnan2@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA>

Organization: Ukrainian Institute of Peace, Conflicts and Humanity Rights Studies

From: "Georgiy G. Pocheptsov" <poch@uipchr.FreeNet.Kiev.UA>

Date: Tue, 25 Jun 96 19:12:39 +0200

X-Mailer: BML [MS/DOS Beauty Mail v.1.36]

Subject: Elections in Russia

Lines: 24

Elections in Russia have come to the analysing part, especially in the proximity of the second tour. From the sum of 24 regions in 11 Yeltzin was ahead and in 13 - Zyuganov. But support in two main cities (Moscow - 11,5% and Petersburg - 4,9%) helped Yeltzin crucially. From the voters of Zyuganov 95% have not read his program, in case of Yeltzin - 97% ("Komsomol'skaja pravda", 1996, June 25) The prediction of the results of the first tour has not been exact as to vote come only 70% and not 73-75% as predicted. Especially it was harmful for Yeltzin as his electorate in cities has come in number at 15-20% less that was predicted/ VCIOM gives the following results for the second tour after questioning 1600 voters ("Izvestia", 1996, June 25): will come to vote - 76%, will not come - 15%, don't know - 9%. For Yeltzin - 49-57%, for Zyuganov - 30-38%. But we should take into account pro-governmental interests of VCIOM. Former USSR President (and non-sucessful candidate for new presidency) M. Gorbachev (@Moscow News", 1996, N 24) has stressed the results of the election of the mayor of Petersburg where former Mayor was two percent ahead in the first tour but failed in the second. He thinks that Lebed (the third result in the first tour) has taken the voices of Zhirinovskiy and not from communists as planned Yeltzin advisers. A. Lebed going after the first tour to the position in the National security council has said explaining his move: "In Russia it is impossible to live according to scientific tractatus or theoretical models" And his associates have rejected the rumours that he was helped by American

consultants: "they live according to their standarts and can understand very few things in our coutry. We have no need in their help" ("Komsomol'skaya pravda", 1996, June 25).

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 25 12:41:24 1996

Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135]) by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP

id MAA06349 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 12:41:22 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id MAA09091 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 12:41:21 -0700 (PDT)

Date: Tue, 25 Jun 1996 12:41:20 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Request: Academic Hazing Study

Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960625123612.8201C-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Please direct any replies to one or more of the addresses below; please DO NOT REPLY TO AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 25 Jun 1996 08:16:41 -0700 (PDT)
From: Melissa R Herman <manoki@leland.Stanford.EDU>
Subject: Academic Hazing

Dear Colleagues and Friends,

Occasionally we have heard doctoral students remark that they have had experiences which would be called hazing if they had been imposed by a fraternity instead of a faculty member. These comments have come from students in many fields, including student affairs preparation programs. While these remarks may have been intended humorously, they represent a serious ethical problem for our profession if they are true. We want to study whether some experiences in student affairs preparation programs might legitimately be called hazing.

WE ARE SEEKING VOLUNTEERS TO PARTICIPATE IN A STUDY OF ACADEMIC HAZING. We need people who are currently doctoral students in college student affairs preparation programs or who have ever been enrolled in such programs, whether they graduated or not, and who believe that they had experiences which might be characterized as academic hazing. We need at least 50 volunteers, and we will complete interviews beyond that number for as many volunteers as wish to participate until the closing date (September 1, 1996).

The purposes of this study are to document whether academic hazing exists in college student affairs preparation programs, to develop a definition of academic hazing which fits the experiences of the respondents, to discover the consequences of such experiences in the professional and personal lives of the respondents, and to propose changes in professional practice and ethical standards if the evidence warrants.

This is a qualitative study, with interviews conducted by e-mail. We will NOT ask for the name of the volunteer, the institution where the alleged hazing occurred, or the institution of current employment. Since volunteers may use any e-mail address for response, it will be impossible for us to know their identities, and we will delete screen headers before we print responses for analysis, to eliminate any indication of the computer address or the institution from which the response originated. Volunteers may choose instead to send answers by U.S. mail as a way of assuring anonymity, after they receive the interview questions by e-mail. We will delete or change any identifying information before using responses in journal articles or conference presentations.

The interview contains only nine questions, with the option for follow-up questions if necessary. The length of time required to complete the interview will depend on the experiences respondents choose to relate, and on their typing speed.

This study has been approved as "no-risk" by the Virginia Tech Institutional

Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects.

Interview questions will be sent to volunteers as soon as requests are received. Analysis of the interviews will begin in September, so no further volunteers will be accepted after September 1, 1996. Interested volunteers should respond to this address: ctg@vt.edu

PLEASE SHARE THIS REQUEST WITH OTHERS WHO MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY.

Thanks!

Cathryn Goree
Virginia Tech

Merrily Dunn
Mississippi State Univ.

Melanie McClellan
Mississippi State Univ.

##

Cathryn T. Goree
Dean of Students
Virginia Tech
107 Brodie Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0255

Phone: 540-231-3787
FAX: 540-231-4035
TDD: 540-231-8718

Melanie McClellan
Director of Housing & Residence Life
Box 9502
Mississippi State, MS 39762
melanie@housing.msstate.edu
Phone (601)325-3557 Fax (601)325-4663

Melissa Herman
Department of Sociology
Stanford University

manoki@leland.stanford.edu
Office: Room 039, Building 120
Office Phone: 723-1692

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 25 12:48:14 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA06999 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 12:48:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA09321 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 12:48:12 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 25 Jun 1996 12:48:11 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: JOB: Experienced Survey Researcher
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960625124322.8201E-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Date: Tue, 25 Jun 1996 14:17:07 -0400
Submitted by AAPORNETter Steven Kull <pipa610@aol.com> ...

The Center for the Study of Policy Attitudes, a small non-profit affiliated with the University of Maryland, is looking for a survey researcher with at least two years experience in questionnaire design, polling, and statistics. A political science/international affairs background is helpful. Please send resumes to CSPA, 11 Dupont Circle, Suite 785, Washington DC 20036.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 25 14:20:31 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA18513 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 14:20:30 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA12792 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 14:20:29 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 25 Jun 1996 14:20:28 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
Reply-To: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Summary: Pew Study of Religion
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960625141206.12464A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

>From the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
< <http://www.people-press.org/relgrpt.htm> >

THE DIMINISHING DIVIDE ...
AMERICAN CHURCHES, AMERICAN POLITICS

Religion is a strong and growing force in the way Americans think about politics. It has a bearing on political affiliation, political values, policy attitudes and candidate choice. Its increasing influence on political opinion and behavior rivals factors such as race, region, age, social class and gender.

More specifically, religion has a strong impact on the political views of Christian Americans who represent 84% of the voting age population. Christian political conservatism is associated with every religious dimension covered in The Pew Research Center For The People & The Press survey. Regardless of denomination, people who express more faith are more conservative. People who engage in more religious practices are more conservative. Those who say religion plays a very important role in their lives are more conservative. The Center's polling finds indications that religious influences lead to a more liberal position on some issues, but there is little indication of a coherent pattern of liberal belief associated with any major religion or religious group.

The full effect of religion on American politics is best observed when race is factored into the equation. The conservatism of white evangelical Protestants is clearly the most powerful religious force in politics today. Analysis of the survey reveals that the most meaningful distinction is between Protestants who self-identify as evangelical or born again vs. those who do not. While the classification cuts across denominational lines, Baptists make up the largest share of evangelicals. Mainline denominations such as Methodists, Lutherans and Presbyterians are predominant among non-evangelical Protestants [Throughout the report, the terms "non-evangelical Protestant" and "mainline Protestant" are used interchangeably].

White evangelical Protestants are not only much more conservative on policy questions that involve moral issues such as abortion, laws regarding homosexuality and family issues. But, they are also more conservative on a range of political values including environmentalism and beliefs about international security. Their greater conservatism on non-moral issues is independent of other factors in their backgrounds, such as income or the prevalence of evangelicals in the South according to analyses conducted for this study.

Rather these patterns reflect the increased politicalization of white evangelical Protestants. Compared to a decade ago, a greater percentage of them now self-identify as Republicans. The GOP has not made as many conversions among non-evangelical Protestants nor among white Catholics. Republican affiliation among white evangelical Protestants grew 9% points between 1978 and 1987 and 7% points more between 1987 and 1995 [CBS/New York Times survey, June 1978 (N=1,527); "The People, the Press, & Politics: The Times Mirror Study of the American Electorate." Times Mirror Center for the People & the Press, 1988. Washington, DC].

White evangelical Protestants have been much more critical of Bill Clinton than other white Christians. For example, in June of 1988 white evangelical Protestants gave 7% points more support than did non-evangelicals to George Bush when pitted against Michael Dukakis. That margin has swelled to 18% points in comparative support for Bob Dole.

	Trend In Party ID					
	--- 1987 ---			--- 1994-95* ---		
	Rep	Dem	Indep	Rep	Dem	Indep
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total	25	37	38	30	31	35
White Evangelical Protestant	35	29	36	42	25	29
White Mainline Protestant	31	29	40	34	26	37
White Catholics	25	38	37	30	32	34

* Based on 9,652 interviews conducted from July 1994-October 1995

White evangelical Protestants now represent 24% of registered voters, up from 19% in 1987. They also make up a greater share of voters who self-identify as Republicans (34% vs. 26%) ["The People, the Press & Politics: The Times Mirror Study of the American Electorate," 1988]. White

Catholics and white non-evangelical Protestants also now each represent about one-fourth of the electorate. Black Christians constitute 8% of registered voters, non-religious Americans 6% [Non-religious refers to those respondents who express no religious preference or say they are atheist or agnostic.], Hispanic Catholics 2%, Mormons 2%, Jews 2%, Orthodox Christians 1% and other religions 2%.

Americans report a significant amount of politicking from the pulpit, but it is not only occurring in the Baptist churches of white evangelical Protestants. Divisive moral issues such as abortion and prayer in school are being raised in church almost as often as traditional issues of conscience such as hunger and poverty and world trouble spots like Rwanda or Bosnia. Fully 60% of churchgoers say their clergy speak out about abortion and almost as many, 56%, cite prayer in schools. Individual churches clearly differ in the issues they speak out on.

Catholics hear about abortion (75%) and right to die laws (38%) more often than other churchgoers. White evangelical Protestants hear more frequently about abortion (66%), but their clergy also talk about pornography laws (59%), prayer in schools (71%) and laws about homosexuality (45%) more often than the average. African American churches have a mixed liberal/conservative political agenda. Black Christians are much more likely to have heard about health care reform (62%) from their ministers than white Christians (19%), but they just as often hear them speak out on prayer in schools (73%). Mainline Protestants report less talk in their churches about a range of contemporary political issues than do other religious groups.

As many as one-in-five churchgoers say that their clergy speak out on candidates and elections. However partisan politicking from the pulpit is reported much more often by African American Christians (47%) and by white evangelical Protestants (20%) than by white Catholics (12%) or by white mainline Protestants (12%). Reflecting this pattern, nearly one-in-five white evangelical Protestants (18%) and an even larger percentage of black Christians (29%) said that campaign information was made available in their churches prior to the 1994 midterm elections. About one-in-twenty mainline Protestants or Catholics made such reports.

The connection between politicking from the pulpit and public opinion is more apparent among some religious groups than others. White evangelical Protestants have the most ideologically consistent point of view. Besides taking strong conservative positions on the moral issues (such as opposition to abortion and gay marriages), they also are more apt than other white Christians to oppose handgun control and sending troops to Bosnia. White evangelical Protestants are less in favor of disseminating birth control information to teenagers and less certain that women in the work force is a good thing.

A Catholic Schism

White Catholics and mainline Protestants are less consistently conservative on moral issues. Majorities oppose gay marriages, but most in both groups take a pro-choice position on abortion. There is an indication of a clear ideological schism within the Catholic population. As many as 41% of self-defined "progressives" favor gay marriages, compared to 24% among "traditionalist" Catholics. The two groups, which divide the Catholic

population about evenly, also differ on abortion. Fully 73% of progressive Catholics support the availability of abortion, versus 43% among traditionalists. Few differences are seen in the views of the two Catholic groups on non-moral issues, except on the question of immigration and sending U.S. troops to Bosnia. Progressive Catholics divide evenly as to whether immigrants are a burden to the country or strengthen it. But a clear majority of traditional Catholics have a negative view of newcomers to the United States. On the issue of Bosnia, a majority of progressive Catholics favor U.S. involvement while a majority of traditional Catholics oppose it.

Progressive Catholics come closest to fitting the description of a religiously-based liberal group -- but they are nowhere near as consistently liberal on a broad range of issues as white evangelical Protestants are conservative. They are better described as moderates, which is the political label a 51% majority of the group applies to themselves. The views of black Christians reflect the mixed liberal/conservative agenda of their clergy. On the one hand, they express less support for the death penalty and more support for helping the poor than do other Christians. On the other hand, they oppose gay marriages and on balance take a pro-life position.

Those who profess no religion, who are mostly people under the age of 40, are predictably more liberal on moral issues -- 74% are pro-choice, 45% favor gay marriages -- but they are not much more liberal on issues such as helping the needy, support for the environment, opposition to the death penalty or having a favorable opinion of immigrants.

Acknowledging Religion's Impact

In follow-up questions the Center survey respondents acknowledged the importance of religion to their thinking about important policy questions, particularly those that their clergy emphasize. A 37% plurality said religion most influenced their views about gay marriages. Education (17%) and personal experiences (10%) were the factors mentioned next most often.

Religion was also most often cited as shaping views about abortion. Many interviewees (18%) said that religion is the most influential factor in their opinion of the death penalty, but about as many mentioned education (21%) and media (21%). In contrast, relatively few thought that religion was central to their opinions about welfare, the environment or women in the work force.

	% Citing Each As Biggest Influence			
	Religious Belief %	Education %	Personal Experience %	Media %
On Views About ...				
Gay Marriages	37	17	10	9
Abortion	28	22	18	7
Death Penalty	18	21	13	21
Bosnia	6	18	15	35
Welfare	6	24	26	22
Working Women	4	23	45	7
The Environment	3	36	22	24

NOTE: See questions 13-15 in the questionnaire for wording.

Personal experience was often cited as the dominant influence on views about working women, helping the needy and the environment. The news media were given credit by respondents for its effect on their thinking about Bosnia, the environment, welfare and the death penalty. Education was mentioned by a significant percentage as an important influence on every issue, but particularly with regard to the environment.

Not too surprisingly those who say their views on abortion and gay marriages were influenced by religion take more conservative positions than those who cite other factors. But those with religion-based views on the death penalty more often oppose it

(41%) than do those who attribute their positions to their education (17%) or to the news media (10%). Similarly, the small number of Americans who say that their views about welfare are religion-based are much more apt to favor more money for the needy (75%) than those who point to other factors (47%).

Church, State Divide Slipping

There is more public acceptance of the role of religion and clergy in the political process than there was 30 years ago, but concerns nonetheless remain about how much political power specific religions have these days.

In 1965 the Gallup Poll found that Americans by a margin of 53% to 40% thought that churches should keep out of political matters, and only 22% thought it was ever right for clergy to discuss political candidates or issues from the pulpit. In 1996 the balance of opinion has changed -- by a 54% to 43% margin, the public thinks the churches should express their views on day to day political and social issues, rather than staying out of politics. And 29% now favor outright politicking from the pulpit.

The division of opinion on these issues surprisingly occurs more along religious lines than along partisan ones. By a margin of almost three-to-one black Christians and white evangelical Protestants think that it is okay for the churches to be involved in politics. However, white Catholics and white mainline Protestants split evenly on the issue. Only majorities of progressive Catholics and the non-religious think the churches should stay out of politics. Remarkably similar majorities of Republicans, Democrats and Independents express support for church political involvement.

Less Political Power For "Them"

While in principle Americans approve of churches expressing their views on political matters, a plurality of Americans wants each of the major religious groups in America to have less influence on politics and government than they now do. By a margin of 44% to 33% the public thinks that Protestants should have less rather than more political power. Somewhat greater margins want to see Roman Catholics (53% to 27%), evangelicals (51% to 27%) and Jews (49% to 27%) have less power.

Most white evangelical Protestants want to see Protestants and evangelicals have more political power. But non-evangelical Protestants want these religious groups to have less political power and influence. Protestants of

all varieties favor less influence for Roman Catholics. Catholics themselves are divided about the political influence of their own church -- traditional-ists, on balance, want to see the church have more power, while progressives want to see it less influential. White mainline Protestants and white Catholics, as well as the non-religious, think Jews should have less political influence, but black Christians and white evangelicals are more evenly divided on the question.

Other Findings...

- * Just 16% think of Bill Clinton as very religious and 52% consider him somewhat religious. Somewhat fewer see Hillary Clinton as religious -- 11% very, 45% somewhat. Reagan was rated similarly to Clinton (18% very, 50% somewhat). But, fully 48% rated Jimmy Carter as very religious. While fewer Americans know about Bob Dole's religious commitment, those who have an opinion judge him about the way Clinton is rated.
- * About one-in-three Americans think that the news media portray very religious people unfairly (35%). A similar percentage (36%) believes news organizations are biased against fundamentalist Christians. However, discontent with media coverage is much greater among people with strong religious commitment (50% complain) and among white evangelical Protestants and black Christians (58% and 44% are displeased, respectively).
- * By a 59% to 40% margin, swing voters (those loosely committed to Clinton or Dole plus the undecideds) reject strict limits on, or the prohibition of, abortion. But, they oppose gay marriages 65% to 27%.
- * The Christian Coalition gets a mixed rating from the public at large (45% favorable, 35% unfavorable), but a better one than Pat Robertson receives (29% favorable, 48% unfavorable). The Christian Coalition gets a 64% favorable rating from white evangelical Protestants.
- * Only 7% of voters think of themselves as members of the "religious right".
- * Although the Pope gets a 93% favorable rating from American Catholics, only 40% of progressive Catholics have a very favorable opinion of the Pontiff.
- * The GOP is preferred over the Democrats by a 45% to 34% margin as the party most concerned with protecting religious values. That margin swells to 56% to 26% among white evangelical Protestants. Even as many as 34% of black Christians think the Republicans care more about religion than the Democrats.
- * Most Americans (62%) feel neither party is too closely tied to religious leaders these days -- 19% believe the Republicans are, 4% say the Democrats. But, 35% of those who profess no religious affiliation fault the GOP for its religious connections.

- * Christian media have large audiences -- 45% say they tune in to religious programs on radio or TV, and 45% listen to religious music. A 57% majority of those 50 years of age and older use Christian broadcast media.

In the sections that follow, the relationship between religion and politics is examined in more detail. Section I provides a profile of religion in America today, including religious affiliations, religious practices and beliefs. The link between religion and basic political attitudes is covered in Section II, and the connection between religion and values is presented in Section III. Section IV looks at the extent to which religion influences views on policy issues. Finally, Section V addresses politicking in American churches, outlining the issues discussed from the pulpit, as well as churchgoers' opinions about the role of the church in political debates.

Academic consultants to the Center for this project included John C. Green, Director of the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, University of Akron; Scott Keeter, Professor, Virginia Commonwealth University; and Michael J. Robinson, Fellow, Pew Research Center for The People & The Press.

>From the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press <<http://www.people-press.org/relgrpt.htm>>

>From jwerner@vgernet.net Tue Jun 25 16:34:34 1996
Return-Path: jwerner@vgernet.net
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@[205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id QAA03428 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Jun 1996 16:34:33 -0700
(PDT)
Message-ID: <31D07791.761F@vgernet.net>
Date: Tue, 25 Jun 1996 19:34:41 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@vgernet.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02Gold (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Sources of survey error and news stories
References: <38226.lavrakas@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. wrote:

>
> Those interested in this evolving AAPORNET exchange and who are not
> familiar with Bob Groves' 1989 book, SURVEY ERRORS AND SURVEY COSTS,
> should seek it out.

>From the summary to the chapter on nonresponse in the Groves book
>(p.182), which
I also strongly recommend, I quote:

"Do higher nonresponse rates suggest increasing nonresponse error in surveys over time? For the most part, we are forced to speculate on this. The speculation concerns whether the "distinctiveness" of nonrespondents

(relative to respondents) increases, decreases or stays the same as the proportion of nonrespondents grows larger. If the nonrespondents resemble the respondent group more closely as larger nonresponse rates occur, then it is possible that higher nonresponse rates have little ill effect on survey quality. That is a comforting but risky assumption."

This is very close to what I stated in my reply to Rob Daves. My contention is not that sampling error and nonresponse error are the same. They are not. What I do believe is that, given the nonresponse rates obtained today in many of the surveys published in the general press, the potential (but unmeasurable) nonresponse error is so large as to dwarf any sampling error.

Under these circumstances, quoting a "margin of error" based on sampling error alone is, in Bob Groves' words, "a risky assumption". The media have adopted this as a standard, not because it provides useful information to the reader, but because it provides an aura of credibility which may not be justified.

Yes, it is a sign of progress that the press publishes any information at all about how surveys have been conducted. But as professionals, it is our duty to point out the inadequacies in their statements, and to continue to lobby for more and better disclosure. That is a major reason for the existence of AAPOR.

>From Mitofsky@aol.com Wed Jun 26 00:03:31 1996
Return-Path: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: from emout16.mail.aol.com (emout16.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.42])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id AAA06326 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 00:03:25 -0700
(PDT)

From: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: by emout16.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id DAA23106 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 03:02:38 -0400
Date: Wed, 26 Jun 1996 03:02:38 -0400
Message-ID: <960626030237_225253962@emout16.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Milestone? -Reply

In a message dated 6/24/96 11:07:36PM, Jan Werner wrote:

>
>The sampling error is unknown in any poll with a substantial
>non-response rate, regardless of how you report the non-response. If
>75% of the people who
pick
>up
>the phone actually complete a survey (an extraordinarily good response rate
>these

>days), there is no way that you can know whether those factors that caused
>the
>other 25% to hang up are orthogonal (the optimistic assumption) or
collinear
>(the
>worst case scenario) to the factors measured by the survey.

Jan is partly right, but I do not agree with him in the main. The sampling error is unknown only because none of the media polls that report it actually compute it. They guess at it based on assumptions that may not be wholly justified. He is wrong in saying that because there is only a limited response that sampling error cannot be known. It can. The other parts of the mean square error are unknown.

As for nonresponse making surveys unusable, or at least making sampling error meaningless, I disagree. There is fairly good evidence from exit polls at least that shows that the response rate is uncorrelated with the error in the estimate of the vote from the exit poll. This true most of the time. There are notable exceptions. This topic was discussed in a chapter I wrote with Murray Edelman about the 1992 VRS exit polls in a book edited by Paul Lavraks and others.

I would not be surprised to learn that this lack of correlation applied to other survey estimates. In any case, the sampling error is still a useful tool when comparing estimates from two surveys or within the same survey. Sampling error should be reported by the media, not as a pseudo scientific gesture, but as a service to readers who care to use the information properly.

warren mitofsky
>From DMMerkle@aol.com Wed Jun 26 07:19:25 1996
Return-Path: DMMerkle@aol.com
Received: from emout07.mail.aol.com (emout07.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.22])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id HAA02835 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 07:19:23 -0700
(PDT)
From: DMMerkle@aol.com
Received: by emout07.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id KAA13327 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 10:18:51 -0400
Date: Wed, 26 Jun 1996 10:18:51 -0400
Message-ID: <960626101851_564441036@emout07.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Sources of survey error and news stories

In a message dated 96-06-25 19:48:29 EDT, Jan Werner wrote:

>Under these circumstances, quoting a "margin of error" based on
>sampling error alone is, in Bob Groves' words, "a risky assumption".
>The media have
adopted
>
>this as a standard, not because it provides useful information to the
reader,
>
>but because it provides an aura of credibility which may not be
>justified.

This discussion raises some interesting questions about media reportage of poll results. Did the media start reporting the margin of error because it "provides an aura of credibility" or did they start reporting it at the urging of survey professionals? Does reporting the margin of error "provide an aura of credibility" or does it cause readers to wonder why there is "error" in the poll?

Daniel Merkle

Voter News Service

>From murray1@nyc.pipeline.com Wed Jun 26 08:50:02 1996

Return-Path: murray1@pipeline.com

Received: from mailout1.h1.usa.pipeline.com (data1.h1.usa.pipeline.com [38.8.56.2])

by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id IAA14602 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 08:49:58 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from pipe4.ny3.usa.pipeline.com by mailout1.h1.usa.pipeline.com (8.6.9/2.1-PSINet/Pipeline)

id PAA24161; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 15:49:27 GMT

Received: by pipe4.ny3.usa.pipeline.com (SMI-8.6/SMI-5.4-PSI)

id PAA27080; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 15:49:26 GMT

Date: Wed, 26 Jun 1996 15:49:26 GMT

Message-Id: <199606261549.PAA27080@pipe4.ny3.usa.pipeline.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Sources of survey error and news stories

From: murray1@nyc.pipeline.com (Murray Edelman)

X-PipeUser: murray1

X-PipeHub: nyc.pipeline.com

X-PipeGCOS: (Murray Edelman)

X-Mailer: Pipeline v3.5.0

AAPORNETers,

Jan Werner's criticism of the Times for only reporting sample error can be applied to most research reported in the social science literature. I have found relatively few substantive journal articles that have had a real discussion of the effect of non-sampling error on their findings. POQ is ahead of the curve by requiring that the response rate be reported. But non-sampling error is much more than response rates.

Keep in mind, that when most scholarly articles report statistical analyses of survey data and use levels of significance as a guide, they are in effect only taking into account sampling error.

I am very aware of non-sampling errors as part of my job involves projecting election winners from exit poll data. Non-sampling errors can be deadly to us; others have the luxury of ignoring them.

I am pleased to see that it is a growing concern in our community. However, to single out the media for only reporting the margin of error is unfair when journal articles with much more space and a more sophisticated readership are as guilty as the Times.

Murray Edelman
Voter News Service

P.S. Some clarifications on previous messages on this topic:

1. The study, mentioned by Warren Mitofsky, showing no relationship between response rates and total survey error, was reported at the 1995 AAPOR conference in a paper by Dan Merkle and myself. We can send you a copy.

2. The recently maligned NY Times does state in their standard box :
"In addition to sampling error, the practical difficulties of conducting any survey of public opinion may introduce other sources of error into the poll."

On Jun 25, 1996 19:34:41, 'Jan Werner <jwerner@vgernet.net>' wrote:

>
>Under these circumstances, quoting a "margin of error" based on
>sampling
error
>alone is, in Bob Groves' words, "a risky assumption". The media have
adopted
>this as a standard, not because it provides useful information to the
reader,
>but because it provides an aura of credibility which may not be
>justified
From: beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Jun 26 11:30:36 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA11769 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 11:30:34 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA13108 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 11:30:32 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Wed, 26 Jun 1996 11:30:31 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Cog. Sci. Marches On
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960626112145.11249C-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Please send all responses to ics2@kuhub.cc.ukans.edu ;
please DO NOT REPLY TO AAPORNET.

Date: Sun, 23 Jun 1996 15:49:46 -0500 (UTC -05:00)
From: ics2@KUHUB.CC.UKANS.EDU
Subject: ANNOUNCING ICS

* ANNOUNCING *

THE INSTITUTE FOR COGNITIVE STUDIES IN FILM AND VIDEO
THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

The Institute for Cognitive Studies in Film and Video is a nonprofit organization attached to the Department of Theatre and Film at the University of Kansas. The Institute staff searches the literature of cognitive science for research findings that might have a bearing upon issues relevant to film and video. ICS conducts workshops and symposia which facilitate and promote discussion of problems of film theory in the context of the findings and the theoretical constructs of cognitive science, literary theory, and perceptual and cognitive psychology. It also carries out research, consistent with the methods and standards of cognitive science, specifically focused upon problems related to film and video, and serves as a clearinghouse for information gained from the above activities.

If you would like to know more about ICS, complete the following form and return it to the Institute.

I am interested in receiving more information about ICS. (There are no charges for any of the following.)

- Please send the information, and include a set of articles that will give me an overview of the field of cognitive science and its potential for film studies.
- Send just the information on ICS, do not include the articles.

Name: _____

Institution: _____

Check one: Faculty
 Graduate student
 Undergraduate
 Other _____

Special interest: _____

E-mail address: _____

Postal address: _____

I prefer to receive the materials requested by E-mail postal service

Send your request by postal service to: Institute for Cognitive Studies in
Film and Video
Department of Theatre and Film
356 Murphy Hall
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Or by e-mail:

ics@falcon.cc.ukans.edu

Or:

ics2@kuhub.cc.ukans.edu

Or find us on our Web Page:

<http://falcon.cc.ukans.edu/~ics>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Jun 26 13:26:11 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA29108 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 13:26:10 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA17273 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 13:26:08 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Wed, 26 Jun 1996 13:26:07 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Post-Doc in Stat. Methods
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960626132152.11249G-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Forwarded to AAPORNET; please DO NOT REPLY TO AAPORNET...

Tom Cook at Northwestern has recently acquired post-doc funds for two years for someone interested in school change who is also already experienced in multi-level modeling and knows about pooling data across school districts. The aim is to synthesize evaluations of the Comer School Development Program conducted in four districts using pretty much the same instrumentation. To meet this synthesis goal the post-doc will have to first analyze the already largely collected data from 20 Chicago schools and critically review the analyses from three other districts. A book and several articles will result, of which the postdoc will be a co-author.

Starting date is somewhat flexible, but the sooner the better. The candidate must have completed the doctorate by the time s/he starts. If you know of possible applicants, can you please let them know.

Candidates should contact Tom Cook directly:
[PLEASE DO NOT USE THE "REPLY" COMMAND]

e-mail: t-cook@nwu.edu
phone: (847) 491-4990
fax: (847) 491-9916
post: Center for Urban Affairs & Policy Research,
Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208

>From Mitofsky@aol.com Wed Jun 26 22:56:39 1996
Return-Path: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: from emout10.mail.aol.com (emout10.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.25])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id WAA21959 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Jun 1996 22:56:37 -0700
(PDT)
From: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: by emout10.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id BAA17518 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 01:56:43 -0400
Date: Thu, 27 Jun 1996 01:56:43 -0400
Message-ID: <960627015642_565062551@emout10.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Sources of survey error and news stories

In a message dated 6/25/96 6:48:32PM, Jan Werner writes:

>The media have adopted
>this [reporting sampling error] as a standard, not because it provides
useful information to the reader,
>
>but because it provides an aura of credibility which may not be
>justified.

The first consistent reports of sampling error in the media were by CBS News and the New York Times when they started their joint polling in 1975. The reason was not as Werner says "because it provides an aura of credibility." He does not know what he is talking about. Sampling error was reported because disclosure, as called for by the National Council on Public Polls and AAPOR called for complete candor with the public about the survey process. The NCPP Code, which I helped draft, specifically calls for reporting sampling error. In addition to full disclosure about sampling error and any other background on their surveys, both news organizations agreed to archive their surveys so they would be available for public use.

For Werner to attribute a reason to "the media," is a disservice to a rather concerted effort at full disclosure. Honest researchers disagree with him on the value of reporting sampling error. I count myself in that number.
warren mitofsky

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 27 09:25:30 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA25087 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 09:25:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA10505 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 09:25:26 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 27 Jun 1996 09:25:25 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Dismal Science in Cyberspace
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960627092040.9384C-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

DISMAL SCIENCE IN CYBERSPACE

>From today's DAILY REPORT of The Chronicle of Higher Education:

MAGAZINES & JOURNALS

A glance at the June 24 edition of "Slate":

In the inaugural edition of this on-line magazine, Paul Krugman, a professor of economics at Stanford University, writes that American workers are not as bad off as the media would have you believe. An official report saying just that, prepared by Joseph Stiglitz, the chairman of President Clinton's Council of Economic Advisers, was widely dismissed as an election-year attempt to paint a rosy economic picture of the country, Mr. Krugman writes. It is not surprising that the media should discount Mr. Stiglitz's report, he writes, because other members of the Clinton Administration -- notably Labor Secretary Robert Reich -- have been insisting that the middle class is being downsized right into the poorhouse. In fact, the well-publicized corporate layoffs have affected only a small percentage of American workers, Mr. Krugman writes. "The point is that Reich's style of economics -- which relies on anecdotes rather than statistics, slogans rather than serious analysis -- cannot do justice to the diversity and sheer size of this vast nation." (The article may be found at <http://www.slate.com/Dismal/Current/Dismal.asp>)

You may visit the Chronicle's Academe Today on the World-Wide Web at <http://chronicle.com>, or via telnet at [chronicle.com](telnet://chronicle.com) (enter "chronicle" as the initial login and password). For information, send a message to help-today@chronicle.com

Copyright (c) 1996 The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 27 10:29:03 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA06501 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 10:29:01 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA12346 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 10:28:59 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 27 Jun 1996 10:28:58 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: List of Country Domains
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960627101250.10802B-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0

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

LIST OF COUNTRY DOMAINS

Occasionally an AAPORNETter asks how to determine the country of origin for an Internet message. For your future reference, here's a list of the most commonly seen top-level or country domains (the very last section of an Internet address):

United States		.us/.bitnet/.int/.com/.mil/.net/.org	
Antigua and Barbuda	.ag	Argentina	.ar
Australia	.au	Austria	.at
Bahrain	.bh	Belgium	.be
Belize	.bz	Bermuda	.bm
Brazil	.br	Brunei Darussalam	.bn
Bulgaria	.bg	Cambodia	.kh
Canada	.ca	Chile	.cl
China	.cn	Cook Islands	.ck
Costa Rica	.cr	Croatia	.hr
Czech Republic	.cz	Denmark	.dk
Dominican Republic	.do	Ecuador	.ec
Egypt	.eg	Estonia	.ee
Finland	.fi	France	.fr
Germany	.de	Gibraltar	.gi
Great Britain	.gb	Greece	.gr
Guatemala	.gt	Hong Kong	.hk
Hungary	.hu	Iceland	.is
India	.in	Indonesia	.id
Iran	.ir	Ireland	.ie
Israel	.il	Italy	.it
Jamaica	.jm	Japan	.jp
Kuwait	.kw	Latvia	.lv
Lithuania	.lt	Macau	.mo
Macedonia	.mk	Malaysia	.my
Malta	.mt	Mexico	.mx
Mozambique	.mz	Mauritius	.mu
Namibia	.na	Netherlands	.nl
New Zealand	.nz	Norway	.no
Pakistan	.pk	Peru	.pe
Philippines	.ph	Poland	.pl
Portugal	.pt	Romania	.ro
Russia	ru/su	Saint Lucia	.lc
Saudi Arabia	.sa	Singapore	.sg
Slovakia (Slovak Rep)	.sk	South Africa	.za
South Korea	.kr	Spain	.es
Sweden	.se	Switzerland	.ch
Taiwan	.tw	Thailand	.th
Trinidad & Tobago	.tt	Turkey	.tr
Ukraine	.ua	United Arab Emirates	.ae
United Kingdom	.uk	US. outlying islands	.um
Uruguay	.uy	Uzbekistan	.uz
Venezuela	.ve	Vietnam	.vn
Zambia	.zm	Zimbabwe	.zw

United States

.us/.bitnet/.int/.com/.mil/.net/.org

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 27 10:48:44 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA09704 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 10:48:43 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA13077 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 10:48:41 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 27 Jun 1996 10:48:40 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Bowling Alone Revisited
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960627103548.10802D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Especially AAPORNETters who enjoyed our recent exchange on "Bowling Alone" might be interested in the latest edition of the Roper Center's public opinion journal, "The Public Perspective," which includes a section called "New Forms of Political Participation." This extended treatment of political participation, public opinion and the Internet includes the following four articles:

Lawrence K. Grossman, "Participation is Both Enhanced and Transformed in The Electronic Republic"

Birdsell, Muzzio, Taylor and Krane, "The Web Snares the Voters", which includes a data survey called "The Internet: A Data Story"

Richard P. Hiskes, "Acts of Democracy: Reconceptualizing Politics, Participation, and Competence"

Stephen K. Carter, "Two views of Civil Life in the Information Age"

#####

>From regen!srg@uunet.uu.net Thu Jun 27 12:06:40 1996
Return-Path: regen!srg@uunet.uu.net
Received: from relay5.UU.NET (relay5.UU.NET [192.48.96.15])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA24684 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 12:06:37 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from uucp6.UU.NET by relay5.UU.NET with SMTP
(peer crosschecked as: uucp6.UU.NET [192.48.96.37])
id QQavyi18989; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 15:06:36 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from regen.UUCP by uucp6.UU.NET with UUCP/RMAIL
; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 15:06:37 -0400
Received: by regen (AIX 3.2/UCB 5.64/4.03)
id AA44204; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 14:05:16 -0400
Date: Thu, 27 Jun 1996 14:05:16 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Sheldon R. Gawiser" <regen!srg@uunet.uu.net>
To: uunet!aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Sampling Error
Message-Id: <Pine.A32.3.91.960627140040.39507B-100000@regen>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

At the great risk of having to agree with Warren, I must remind all, as he did, of the history of the battle to get "at least" sampling error reported. Many of us remember when we were told by media management that it was impossible to include such "technical lanugage" in newspapers or on television.

While major media have been reporting sampling error for years, it is only relatively recently that most media reports of polls include such language.

The National Council on Public Polls continues to work to increase the amount of information available to the public for the evaluation of polls. We have had many discussions that reporting of sampling error, with no other statement of error, is not nearly as effective as a more complete statement about error in survey research.

Hopefully, ten years from now, we will be arguing whether or not that full paragraph explanation of error in reporting of polls is sufficient.

Or maybe we will even come up with some methods to reduce error!

Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D.
srg@regen.com
Regenerating Solutions
Gawiser Associates, Inc.
1375 Kings Highway East, Fairfield, CT 06430
203-331-9300
FAX 203-331-1750
NCP 800-239-0909

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 27 13:27:57 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA14979 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 13:27:55 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA18456 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 13:27:54 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 27 Jun 1996 13:27:53 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RUSE POLLS ATTACKED
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960627132637.18279C-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

RUSE POLLS ATTACKED

The news story below appears in this morning's New York Times (p. A10, national edition); it concerns AAPOR and AAPORNET in several ways which will clear from the text.

ASSOCIATION OF POLITICAL HANDLERS ATTACKS RUSE POLLS AS UNETHICAL

By ADAM CLYMER

WASHINGTON, June 26 -- The trade association of political managers today denounced phony "push polls," in which campaigns hire companies to make thousands of calls spreading negative and sometimes false information about an opponent while posing as pollsters.

Leading pollsters for both parties who are members of the organization said consultants should quit any campaign that engages in the practice.

President Clinton's campaign promptly praised the proposal, by the American Association of Political Consultants, and issued a statement saying, "We have not and will not use this unethical political tactic."

Bob Dole's campaign used push polling in Iowa and New Hampshire last winter, and today, Nelson Warfield, the campaign's press secretary, would not say whether it would be used in the general election.

.
. .

[Longtime AAPOR member] Gary Nordlinger, a Democratic pollster who is chairman of the association's ethics committee, called push polling an "underhanded stealth process." He said the practice became widespread during the 1994 election campaign, because new computer technology had lowered the cost of the brief calls to some 40 cents, from about \$1.

Mr. Nordlinger said the association had no objection to "persuasion calling," in which the information used is accurate, the source of the call is honestly and clearly identified, and there is no pretense that a legitimate poll is being conducted.

Ed Goeas, a Republican pollster who appeared at the association's news conference to announce the standard, said it was not enough for pollsters not to participate in push polls. He said he expected pollsters who found that their candidates were using the technique to say, "We will leave the campaign."

Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster, agreed, and said that when push polling was suggested in campaigns for which he had worked, he objected. The tactic was not used, he said.

But Mr. Mellman and Mr. Goeas acknowledged that push polling had been widely used by candidates of both parties, especially in Congressional races.

With its stand Wednesday, the consultants' group joined polling organizations in protesting the practice. An ad hoc group of 31 pollsters for both parties protested earlier this month and urged the association's action [letter previously posted to AAPORNET].

Both the American Association for Public Opinion Research and the National Council on Public Polls have taken stands against push polls, and on June 12 the council called on both President Clinton and his apparent opponent for the Presidency, Mr. Dole, to promise not to use them.

Today the consultants' association said it had no objection to true public opinion polls that seek to measure negative information's potential effect on a campaign.

As for persuasion calling, it said: "Voter persuasion by telephone is a perfectly legitimate campaign practice. What we condemn is advocacy phone calling that:

- "1. Masquerades as survey research,
- "2. Fails to clearly and accurately identify the sponsor of the call, or
- "3. Presents false or misleading information to the voter."

Most of the country's leading political consultants belong to the association, which has 750 members. Its board has equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats.

Copyright 1996 The New York Times Company

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 27 13:31:27 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA15830 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 13:31:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id NAA18520 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 13:31:18 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 27 Jun 1996 13:31:16 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Cybercommuting
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960627132950.18279D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

From: Pama.Mitchell@UC.Edu
Subject: Cybercommuting
To: aapornet@usc.EDU

Greetings to Aapornetters.

I'm working on an article about "cybercommuting"--something I'm engaged in myself these days--for the Atlanta Constitution, and am looking for people who are using computers and the Internet in particular to get their jobs done. After I relocated to Cincinnati (for matrimonial reasons) last fall, I have been able to keep doing my job as director of polling for the Atlanta newspaper thanks mostly to the Net and other technologies.

If you--or anyone you know--has a similar story to tell, I'd appreciate hearing from you. Don't post to Aapornet, please, but email me directly at:

mitchepm@ucbeh.san.uc.edu

Many thanks.

Pama Mitchell

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jun 28 10:17:27 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA25736 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jun 1996 10:17:26 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA17945 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Jun 1996 10:17:23 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Fri, 28 Jun 1996 10:17:22 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Science Magazine Issue On AIDS
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960628101251.16234G-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

SCIENCE ISSUE ON AIDS

>From today's DAILY REPORT of The Chronicle of Higher Education:

MAGAZINES & JOURNALS

A glance at today's issue of "Science":

A special package of opinion articles and news reports examines the state of AIDS research. One report, "The New Guard," profiles the latest generation of scientists making discoveries about AIDS. "Who Owns H.I.V.?" delves into the business issues behind a spate of patents related to the virus. Two other reports provide information about the latest drugs to be developed and take a look back at the questions that "Science" highlighted in a 1993 issue devoted to AIDS. Scientists are much closer than they were three years ago to answering questions about how the immune system collapses under the assault of H.I.V. and about how the virus's replication can be controlled, the writers say. Lastly, a collection of essays offer views on critical areas of research, such as whether there is a need for a vaccine and how well treatments for the virus have worked so far. (The magazine may be found at your library or newsstand. It is also available on the World-Wide Web at <http://www.sciencemag.org/>)

Copyright (c) 1996 The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc.

>From frankel@norcmail.uchicago.edu Fri Jun 28 13:40:52 1996
Return-Path: frankel@norcmail.uchicago.edu
Received: from cholera.spc.uchicago.edu (root@cholera.spc.uchicago.edu [128.135.252.3])
 by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
 id NAA27121; Fri, 28 Jun 1996 13:40:45 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])
by cholera.spc.uchicago.edu (8.6.9/8.6.4) with SMTP id PAA10573; Fri, 28 Jun 1996 15:40:46 -0500
Received: from cc:Mail by norcmail.uchicago.edu
 id AA836001603; Sat, 29 Jun 96 04:40:29 CST
Date: Sat, 29 Jun 96 04:40:29 CST
From: "FRANKEL-MARTY" <frankel@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
Message-Id: <9605288360.AA836001603@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
To: uunet!aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Sampling Error

I look forward to the day that those who report a margin of sampling error will recognize that the use of weights and clustering and stratification introduce a design effect. In general design effects increase the margin of error. It ain't just pq/n .

Marty Frankel
frankel@norcmail.uchicago.edu

Reply Separator

Subject: Sampling Error
Author: aapornet@usc.edu at INTERNET
Date: 6/28/96 1:42 PM

>From owner-aapornet@usc.edu
X-Envelope-From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
Received: from usc.edu (listproc@localhost [127.0.0.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA03188; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 12:44:55 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from relay5.UU.NET (relay5.UU.NET [192.48.96.15])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA24684 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 12:06:37 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from uucp6.UU.NET by relay5.UU.NET with SMTP
(peer crosschecked as: uucp6.UU.NET [192.48.96.37])
id QQavyi18989; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 15:06:36 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from regen.UUCP by uucp6.UU.NET with UUCP/RMAIL
; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 15:06:37 -0400
Received: by regen (AIX 3.2/UCB 5.64/4.03)
id AA44204; Thu, 27 Jun 1996 14:05:16 -0400
Message-Id: <Pine.A32.3.91.960627140040.39507B-100000@regen>
Date: Thu, 27 Jun 1996 14:05:16 -0400 (EDT)
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
Precedence: bulk
From: "Sheldon R. Gawiser" <regen!srg@uunet.uu.net>
To: uunet!aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Sampling Error
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
X-Listprocessor-Version: 7.2 -- ListProcessor by CREN

At the great risk of having to agree with Warren, I must remind all, as he did, of the history of the battle to get "at least" sampling error reported. Many of us remember when we were told by media management that it was impossible to include such "technical lanugage" in newspapers or on television.

While major media have been reporting sampling error for years, it is only relatively recently that most media reports of polls include such language.

The National Council on Public Polls continues to work to increase the amount of information available to the public for the evaluation of polls. We have had many discussions that reporting of sampling error, with no other statement of error, is not nearly as effective as a more complete statement about error in survey research.

Hopefully, ten years from now, we will be arguing whether or not that full paragraph explanation of error in reporting of polls is sufficient.

Or maybe we will even come up with some methods to reduce error!

Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D.
srg@regen.com
Regenerating Solutions
Gawiser Associates, Inc.
1375 Kings Highway East, Fairfield, CT 06430
203-331-9300
FAX 203-331-1750
NCPP 800-239-0909

>From D1992@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU Sun Jun 30 18:30:15 1996
Return-Path: D1992@PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU
Received: from pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (smtpb@pucc.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.129.99])
by usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id SAA04072 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Sun, 30 Jun 1996 18:30:13 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <199607010130.SAA04072@usc.edu>
Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU by pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTP id 3830; Sun, 30 Jun 96 21:30:41 EDT
Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (NJE origin VMMAIL@PUCC) by
PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 8017; Sun, 30 Jun 1996
21:30:42 -0400
Received: by PUCC (Mailer R2.10 ptf008) id 3961; Sun, 30 Jun 96 21:30:41 EDT
Date: Sun, 30 Jun 96 21:29:07 EDT
From: Richard Sobel <D1992@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU>
Subject: Bosnia attitudes
To: aapornet@usc.edu

For people interested in Bosnia, the Council on Foreign Relations in NYC
has just published an edited volume by Richard Ullman, *The World and
Yugoslavia's Wars*. It includes my chapter comparing American and European
Attitudes Toward Intervention in Bosnia. For info, 212-734-0400. RS