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

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

Turning this into individual messages that ASU's Listserv software can
index and sort means a lot of reformating. We will do this as time
permits.
New messages are of course automatically formatted correctly, and I have
converted November 1994 through January 1995 and June 2002 to the present.

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

Begin archive:
-------------------------------------------------------------------
Archive aapornet, file log9906.
Part 1/1, total size 454422 bytes:

---------------------------------- Cut here -----------------------------
This message is brought to your courtesy of Washington Evaluators

> **************************************************************************

>

> The National Science Foundation has posted the following announcement
> in the Commerce Business Daily as of 5/26/99. NSF seeks contractors
> for carrying out evaluation tasks under Task Order Contracts. Both
> profit and non-profit organizations are eligible. The RFP will be
> available electronically the week of June 14-18 with proposals due
> approximately July 15th.
>
>
The National Science Foundation (NSF) is soliciting proposals to obtain technical support and expertise in carrying out an array of activities for which the Division of Research, Evaluation, and Communication (REC) within the Directorate of Education and Human Resources (EHR) is responsible. These responsibilities include: (1) working with programs to devise, implement, and report results of accountability systems measuring performance for Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) purposes; (2) designing and supervising 3rd party evaluations of EHR programmatic activities; (3) assisting programs in carrying out monitoring of current projects; (4) providing technical assistance, e.g. developing databases to carry out these activities; (5) building capacity in the field through training of evaluators; and providing other resources that will enhance EHR's capability to carry out its mission.; (6) designing and coordinating communication activities for EHR, disseminating evaluation information, encouraging research on evaluation methodology and outcomes in active collaboration.
with other Federal agencies and other external groups. NSF anticipates awarding multiple IDIQ contracts for services for a period of performance of five years. Task orders under these contracts will be issued on a cost reimbursable, fixed-fee basis. Potential offerors are expected to have a broad range of technical skills and expertise, including expertise in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology, in order to accomplish planning for program evaluations and monitoring, dissemination of information, creation and maintenance of databases, and performance of quantitative and qualitative studies. Offerors are encouraged to form partnerships in seeking these contracts. All potential offerors should download this solicitation from the following Website: http://www.nsf.gov/bfa/cpo/contract/sol.htm All amendments to the solicitation will also be included at the Website referenced. Telephone requests will NOT be honored. It is anticipated that the solicitation will be available around the week of June 14-18. To ensure receipt of all special notices and communications that might not be posted to the Website, organizations should submit a notice via e-mail to "dprice@nsf.gov" indicating potential interest and providing a return address for receipt of these communications. Full and open communication is solicited under SIC code 8742. Since this is an unrestricted acquisition, a price evaluation adjustment will be provided for small, disadvantaged businesses.

From rmatovic@ssk.com Tue Jun 1 08:31:26 1999

Received: from ssk.com (ssk.com [204.254.230.66]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id IAA18620 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Jun 1999 08:31:25 -0700 (PDT)
Anyone know any big tracking surveys been done on a regular basis tracking =
needs, viewpoints, product usage, etc. of the baby boom generation?

(i.e, not a tracking survey of the population as a whole that points out =
BB'ers as a sub-group, but a study of this particular population over time)=

I have a feeling I must have seen fifteen different studies taht deal with =
this, but can't bring them to mind.

Thanks,
Rebecca Matovic
Are the words "frugging" and "sugging" acronyms? If so, what do they stand for?

thanks,

Lynda Voigt
Karen Goldenberg raised the question of AAPOR creating position papers like that on push polling for sugging and frugging. There is a long history of this. Among other activities, AAPOR years ago joined with other research organizations in the Research Industry Coalition. RIC has produced a variety of position papers that AAPOR has endorsed, including one on "phony polls."

The problem, of course, is that these are long-standing concerns, and the original adoption of the position paper occurred more than a decade ago. At the time of adoption, they were distributed to members. All the RIC position papers can be found at RIC's website:

www.researchindustry.org.

Kathy Frankovic
FRUG - Fund Raising Under the Guise (of a survey)

SUG - Selling Under the Guise (of a survey)

Karen Goldenberg

> ---------

> From: Voigt, Lynda[SMTP:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]

> Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 1999 12:03 PM

> To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU'

> Subject: RE: "FRUGging" -Reply

> Are the words "fruggling" and "suggling" acronyms? If so, what do they stand for?

> thanks,

> Lynda Voigt
Karen Goldenberg raised the question of AAPOR creating position papers like that on push polling for sugging and frugging. There is a long history of this. Among other activities, AAPOR years ago joined with other research organizations in the Research Industry Coalition. RIC has produced a variety of position papers that AAPOR has endorsed, including one on "phony polls."

The problem, of course, is that these are long-standing concerns, and the original adoption of the position paper occurred more than a decade ago. At the time of adoption, they were distributed to members. All RIC position papers can be found at RIC's website:

www.researchindustry.org.
FRUGGING = Fundraising Under the Guise (of market research) SUGGING = Selling Under the Guise (of market research) *****Original Message*****

From: Voigt, Lynda <lvoigt@fhcrc.org>
To: 'AAPORNET@USC.EDU' <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>
Date: 01 June 1999 17:05
Subject: RE: "FRUGging" -Reply

>Are the words "fruggling" and "sugging" acronyms? If so, what do they
Karen Goldenberg raised the question of AAPOR creating position papers like that on push polling for sugging and frugging. There is a long history of this. Among other activities, AAPOR years ago joined with other research organizations in the Research Industry Coalition. RIC has produced a variety of position papers that AAPOR has endorsed, including one on "phony polls."

The problem, of course, is that these are long-standing concerns, and the original adoption of the position paper occurred more than a decade ago. At the time of adoption, they were distributed to members. All the RIC position papers can be found at RIC's website:

www.researchindustry.org.
In addition I think there is cugging which is voter canvassing or developing membership lists under the guise of doing a survey. Please correct me if I am wrong. ===========

shameless plug-now in print from Harcourt Brace -"We Shocked World-A Case Study of Jesse Ventura's Election as Governor of MN. " by Steven Wagner and Steve Frank

Dr. Steve Frank, Department of Political Science
St. Cloud State University St. Cloud, MN. 56301
Of course there's a lot of knowledge in universities: the freshmen bring a little in; the seniors don't take much away, so knowledge sort of accumulates....

Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell

>From Mark@bisconti.com Tue Jun 1 15:51:21 1999

Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id PAA00127 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Jun 1999 15:51:04 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org (Content
  Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000586434@medusa.nei.org> for
  <aapornet@usc.edu>;  Tue, 01 Jun 1999 18:49:26 -0400
Received: from MARK-BRI ([10.2.0.182]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP
  (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2448.0)
  id LFZC440Q; Tue, 1 Jun 1999 18:50:17 -0400
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
  id <01BEAC5E.15620040@mark-bri>; Tue, 1 Jun 1999 18:39:29 -0400
Message-Id: <01BEAC5E.15620040@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Census aricle, new spin
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 18:39:28 -0400
Seems there's a new twist in the census battle—the Honest Count = Coalition is working to stop Census from "deleting real people from the = final count by using 'arithmetic adjustment.'" The Washington Times (June 1, 1999) published "Census Bureau's secret" = by Grover Norquist, president of Americans for Tax Reform and chairman = of the Citizens for an Honest Count Coalition. Here's a bit of the = latest rhetorical spin which is probably part of an effort to get a lot = of people up in arms and generate a flurry of letters and calls to the =

Hill:
"Millions of Americans who don't own two homes and didn't send in two = census forms are not going to be counted. We're talking about Joe and = Joan America not being counted because the Census Bureau claims that = people like them are overrepresented in the United States. What's = ironic, and so typical of our government, is that for the first time in = history the Census Bureau is going to use paid advertisements. Millions = of dollars will be spent to encourage people to fill out their census = forms and send them in, just to have some bureaucrat determine that the = form shouldn't count. =20 The plan, in simple form, works like this. The Census Bureau will = conduct two censuses. The first complies with the Supreme Court and is = a full enumeration. The second is an adjustment based on a personal = visit to 300,000 previously selected households (there are approximately = 125 million households in America). The two censuses are then compared. = If you appear in the first census, but not in the second, you and = people who share your demographics are considered overcounted and = subtracted from the final count. If you appear in the second and not in =
the first, you and people who share your demographics are considered =
undercounted and added to the final count. If you appear in both, then =
everything is just right. =20 Sounds like a little 'Goldie Locks and the
Three Bears,' but this is far = from a fairy tail. It's a real live
nightmare. ...This is a numbers = racket and if the numbers don't add up,
you don't get counted. ... At a recent congressional hearing, Ken Prewitt,
director of the Census = Bureau was asked, if people were going to be
deleted from the 2000 = census. He said no, absolutely not. We're not
going to delete anyone's = 'records.' We're going to use 'arithme�c
adjustment.' Well, I've paid = enough 'user fees' to know they are really
taxes. And I've heard enough = Pentagon briefings to know I never want to
be referred to as 'collateral = damage.' I also know enough about the 2000
census to know I don't want = to be an 'arithme�c adjustment.' I just want
to be counted."

>From mdbenson@compuserve.com Tue Jun  1 18:54:58 1999
Received: from hpdmgaaa.compuserve.com (dh-
img-1.compuserve.com [149.174.206.131])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id SAA10074 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Jun 1999 18:54:47 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from mailgate@localhost)
    by hpdmgaaa.compuserve.com (8.8.8/8.8.8/HP-1.4) id VAA29168
    for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 1 Jun 1999 21:51:44 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 21:51:17 -0400
From: Mark Benson <mdbenson@compuserve.com>
Subject: Opportunity for Research Professional
Sender: Mark Benson <mdbenson@compuserve.com>
The APCO Insight Group is the research and message development division of APCO Associates, a global public affairs/strategic communications firm based in Washington, DC. APCO maintains offices throughout North America, Europe and Asia and is a subsidiary of New York-based Grey Advertising.

The Insight Group is beginning the process of locating opinion research professionals who can contribute to the rapid growth of APCO by bringing a wide range of talent to a senior position with our research organization.

Public affairs and political experience is a plus. Exceptional writing skills and a desire to build a global research practice is a must.

Attributes should also include:

1. Strong methodological problem-solving skills
2. Background in qualitative and quantitative methods
3. Superior drafting and reporting skills
4. Client relations and presentation skills
5. An ability to adapt to a high-energy work environment -- and have some
fun too 6. A willingness to travel extensively

In the coming months, the Insight Group will be adding staff in our Washington, Seattle and Sacramento offices. Later North American expansion is also likely.

Research professionals interested in exploring an opportunity with APCO should respond BY LETTER/E-MAIL ONLY by sending a resume and related information to:

Mr. Mark Benson
President, APCO Insight Group
1615 L Street NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC  20036
(FAX) (202) 778-1710
mbenson@apcoinsight.com
mdbenson@compuserve.com

>From mkshares@mcs.net Wed Jun  2 05:33:22 1999
Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id FAA12319 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Jun 1999 05:33:21 -0700
      (PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P33-Chi-Dial-5.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.33]) by
Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id HAA05620 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Wed, 2 Jun 1999 07:33:21 -0500 (CDT)
Message-ID: <3755247A.EFAF4240@mcs.net>
Thanks to Rob, Cheryl, Jim and Paul for the nice comments.

A somewhat softened version of my letter did appear in the Sun-Times today. Go to www.suntimes.com, click commentary/letters, then letters to the editor to get there.

The article below will appear in the June 7 edition of Polling Report.

Nick

FIGURES DON'T LIE

Arianna Huffington has very strong opinions about political polling. A column filed on May 24 titled "How To Rid Your House Of Annoying Pollsters " sums up the feelings she has been asserting for several years - that polls produce inaccurate readings of public sentiments which in turn influence spineless elected officials which results in bad public policy. Her solution is for the public to quit responding to poll interviews and subject polls to
the same legislation restricting tele-marketing sales calls.

Arianna Huffington warns her readers that polls "enable a habit that is hazardous to our political health". To demonstrate this hazard, she cites polls in early April showing a consensus of Americans favoring the use of allied ground troops in Kosovo and then a decline in support to only 15% in a mid-May Zogby poll. She says this reversal of support led to a policy change by the poll-driven Clinton administration.

Indeed, several polls asking whether or not ground troops should be used in Kosovo were showing consensus support for ground troops in early April. They included a Zogby poll showing 55% responding yes to the same question. But according to the Zogby release Huffington cites, 50% answered yes to the same question in mid-May - not 15% as Huffington says in her column.

It was a different Zogby question that showed 15% favoring ground troops. This question asked which one of three choices were preferred: ground troops, continued bombing or diplomatic solution. Other options were favored over ground troops as a first choice if offered. Moreover, the 15% favoring ground troops in May was down slightly from 17% in April when the same question was asked. This means use of ground troops is down only two points when offered as one of three choices and down five points when it is the only choice - not down approximately 40 points as Huffington suggests.

In the April poll, continued bombing ranked first among the three options offered. In the mid-May poll, more respondents chose a diplomatic solution than bombing which Zogby described as a "reversal of opinion". But Huffington takes this quote out of context and associates it with a decline in ground troop support instead. Columnists are entitled to their own
opinions. But should they be entitled to their own facts?

Yes Arianna, there is a hazard to using poll results in politics - but only when results are in the hands of someone unable to make valid analytical comparisons or someone who misinterprets results to advance a particular point of view.

>From vector@sympatico.ca Wed Jun  2 06:41:41 1999
Received: from smtp13.bellglobal.com (smtp13.bellglobal.com [204.101.251.52])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA22642 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Jun 1999 06:41:37 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from m-zwelling (ppp8418.on.bellglobal.com [207.236.124.82])
    by smtp13.bellglobal.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA14173
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Jun 1999 09:42:27 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <37553321.7E07@sympatico.ca>
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 09:35:29 -0400
From: Marc Zwelling <vector@sympatico.ca>
Reply-To: vector@sympatico.ca
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-SYMPA (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: More Arianna
References: <3755247A.EFAF4240@mcs.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
Good reply, Nick. Opinion research people should vow to respond to all stupid attacks on our business. I have long thought that my real competition is not other polltakers but ignorance about the value and methods of opinion and market research. - Marc Zwelling/Vector Research + Development Inc.

Nick Panagakis wrote:
>
> Thanks to Rob, Cheryl, Jim and Paul for the nice comments.
>
> A somewhat softened version of my letter did appear in the Sun-Times today. Go to www.suntimes.com, click commentary/letters, then letters to the editor to get there.
>
> The article below will appear in the June 7 edition of Polling Report.
>
> Nick
>
> FIGURES DON'T LIE
>
> Arianna Huffington has very strong opinions about political polling. A column filed on May 24 titled "How To Rid Your House Of Annoying Pollsters " sums up the feelings she has been asserting for several years - that polls produce inaccurate readings of public sentiments which in turn influence spineless elected officials which results in bad public policy. Her solution is for the public to quit responding to poll interviews and subject polls to the same legislation restricting tele-marketing sales calls.
>
> Arianna Huffington warns her readers that polls "enable a habit that
is hazardous to our political health”. To demonstrate this hazard, she cites polls in early April showing a consensus of Americans favoring the use of allied ground troops in Kosovo and then a decline in support to only 15% in a mid-May Zogby poll. She says this reversal of support led to a policy change by the poll-driven Clinton administration.

Indeed, several polls asking whether or not ground troops should be used in Kosovo were showing consensus support for ground troops in early April. They included a Zogby poll showing 55% responding yes to the same question. But according to the Zogby release Huffington cites, 50% answered yes to the same question in mid-May - not 15% as Huffington says in her column.

It was a different Zogby question that showed 15% favoring ground troops. This question asked which one of three choices were preferred: ground troops, continued bombing or diplomatic solution. Other options were favored over ground troops as a first choice if offered.

Moreover, the 15% favoring ground troops in May was down slightly from 17% in April when the same question was asked. This means use of ground troops is down only two points when offered as one of three choices and down five points when it is the only choice - not down approximately 40 points as Huffington suggests.

In the April poll, continued bombing ranked first among the three options offered. In the mid-May poll, more respondents chose a diplomatic solution than bombing which Zogby described as a "reversal of opinion". But Huffington takes this quote out of context and associates it with a decline in ground troop support instead.
Columnists are entitled to their own opinions. But should they be entitled to their own facts?

Yes Arianna, there is a hazard to using poll results in politics - but only when results are in the hands of someone unable to make valid analytical comparisons or someone who misinterprets results to advance a particular point of view.

From Mark@bisconti.com Wed Jun 2 07:54:32 1999

Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA06366 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Jun 1999 07:54:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org  (Content Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000587284@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>;  Wed, 02 Jun 1999 10:53:59 -0400
Received: from MARK-BRI ([10.2.0.182]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2448.0)
    id LFZC4V5F; Wed, 2 Jun 1999 10:54:47 -0400
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
    id <01BEACE4.D53E3F60@mark-bri>; Wed, 2 Jun 1999 10:44:04 -0400
Message-Id: <01BEACE4.D53E3F60@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: More Arianna
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 10:44:03 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
And, even if letters are not published, the editors/gatekeepers will have been informed—very important audience. Mark Richards

---------

From: Marc Zwelling
Sent: Wednesday, June 02, 1999 9:35 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: More Arianna

Good reply, Nick. Opinion research people should vow to respond to all stupid attacks on our business. I have long thought that my real competition is not other polltakers but ignorance about the value and methods of opinion and market research. - Marc Zwelling/Vector Research + Development Inc.

Nick Panagakis wrote:
>
>
>Thanks to Rob, Cheryl, Jim and Paul for the nice comments

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Jun 2 08:52:58 1999
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/us) with ESMTP
    id IAA19148 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Jun 1999 08:52:58 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/us) with SMTP
    id IAA07157 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Jun 1999 08:52:56 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 08:52:55 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
On letters to editors...

Mark and Marc are of course correct. But perhaps the most important reason of all for writing letters to editors is that these usually determine which topics will be covered in the letters section of an op-ed page.

When only a few letters are received on a topic, that topic is unlikely to be included at all (unless a writer has celebrity status). When several hundred letters are received on a single topic, by contrast, at least two or three letters are almost certain to appear in print. In other words, your letter might help mine to be published, and vice versa.

In addition, the letters that do appear are likely to represent the rough distribution of all opinion received. If the several hundred letters in hand are 3-to-1 against, for example, the editors might run, say, 2 letters pro and 1 con. Not all newspapers and magazines operate this way, of course, but the better ones do (thereby making their letters sections rather crude opinion surveys).
Conclusion: We can all help to make the world safer for scientific sampling and surveying and responsible data reporting by writing our favorite publications on these topics just as often as possible--just short of appearing to be a crackpot, of course.

Personal tip (which will at least save you time): The shorter your letter, the better its chances of being published. Editors are just as lazy as the all the rest of us--they don't like to edit any more than absolutely necessary. Of course, quality trumps even brevity, as Nick's fine effort certainly does attest.

-- Jim

******

On Wed, 2 Jun 1999, Mark Richards wrote:

> And, even if letters are not published, the editors/gatekeepers will
> have been informed-very important audience. Mark Richards
>
> >
> > -------
> > From: Marc Zwelling
> > Sent: Wednesday, June 02, 1999 9:35 AM
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Re: More Arianna
> >
> > Good reply, Nick. Opinion research people should vow to respond to all
> > stupid attacks on our business. I have long thought that my real
> > competition is not other polltakers but ignorance about the value and
> > methods of opinion and market research. - Marc Zwelling/Vector
> > Research
> + Development Inc.
> Nick Panagakis wrote:
> >
> > Thanks to Rob, Cheryl, Jim and Paul for the nice comments

I agree that we should be developing strategies for obtaining representative samples of individuals, given the changes in technology. But I believe household samples will still be possible given the strong likelihood that communication/entertainment services will be "bundled" in the future. That is, telephone/television/internet access will all come into the household through the same wire for a flat fee. Thus, telephones (and internet access
as well) will have a geographic connection to household. In other words, I think we will be "saved".

I also want to say again that if you are doing survey research work by internet, and allowing respondents to answer from work sites, you must remind them that their responses are NOT confidential because most businesses monitor and/or record e-mail. You, the researcher, can only guarantee confidentiality at your end, not theirs. To in any way indicate to respondents total anonymity and/or confidentiality under such circumstances I believe is misleading.

Lance M. Pollack
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Karen Donelan [SMTP:kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu]
Sent: Friday, May 28, 1999 9:27 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Data on Internet Use

Thanks to Jim for the posting. While these numbers are relevant if we are thinking about sampling households, they are troubling if we think about individual internet use. The reality is that cheapos like me do most of my on-line work at WORK, not at home. At home I need a usable phone line, an online service and the stomach to pay the charges.

When you ask if people access from any site (home, school, office,
library)

during the week the user numbers rise appreciably.

Given the RDD response rate discussion, the proliferation of cell
phones
and phone lines, and the future of web use I think we should be
looking
to a future of sampling individuals, not households, and spend a
decade
or so preparing for how we are going to do that.

Karen Donelan
Harvard School of Public Health

James Beniger wrote:

> Folks,
> 
> > Here's some very welcome data, for those who haven't already
> > seen it. It looks like the Internet might yet become a
> > legitimate means to conduct national surveys in many of our
> > lifetimes.
> > -- Jim
> > ******
> >
> > The Internet has not penetrated the majority of American homes,
according to studies from major Internet consulting firms Inteco, Forrester Research, and Neilsen Media Research. Neilsen found that one-third of U.S. households have Internet access, and only one-third of those, or 13 percent of all U.S. households, go online more than once a week. This reluctance to use the Internet at home can be attributed to fears that technology is difficult to learn as well as perceptions that the Web is full of scams. Although many adults have yet to become acclimated to technology, as many as 81 percent of teenagers are using the Internet frequently and knowledgeably. The next generation is expected to usher in the rise of household Internet acceptance, with 90 percent of U.S. households predicted to have Internet access by 2005 or 2010. (Puget Sound Business Journal Online 05/24/99)
Members in the market research business might want to take a look at SB 988. This bill establishes a "no call" list for consumers in the State of California and bars telemarketers and legitimate market researchers alike from calling them.

What is AAPOR's position on this bill? I, for one, believe that regulation of telemarketing activity is badly needed because of its obvious negative impact on legitimate survey activity. A bill allowing consumers to avoid receiving telemarketing calls and prohibiting faux surveying could make most of our jobs a lot easier. However, because the prohibitions and penalties in the bill will be applied to legitimate market research, I think
AAPOR must oppose it. What we need here is some legislation that pulls
the weeds in the industry not something that defoliates the forest instead.

Comments?

>From jbason@arches.uga.edu Wed Jun  2 12:33:56 1999

Received: from mailgw.cc.uga.edu (mailgw.cc.uga.edu [128.192.1.101])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA07801 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Jun 1999 12:33:51 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from archa5.cc.uga.edu (archa5.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu
  (LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.00D7618C@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>;
  Wed, 2 Jun 1999 15:32:25 -0400
Received: from jud.ibr.uga.edu (jud.ibr.uga.edu [128.192.63.15])
  by archa5.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id PAA27614;
    Wed, 2 Jun 1999 15:33:24 -0400
From: James Bason <jbason@arches.uga.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: por@unc.edu
Subject: Many Thanks
Message-ID: <SIMEON.9906021526.R@jud.ibr.uga.edu>
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 15:35:26 -0700 (Pacific Daylight Time)
X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.3 Build (39)
X-Authentication: IMSP
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Many Thanks to all who responded concerning my request for information
on surveys on watershed management. I am passing along all of the
information sent to my graduate student and will post back to the
list(s) a summary of what she finds in her search.

Thanks a bunch.

Jim

James J. Bason, Ph.D.
Director
Survey Research Center
University of Georgia
114 Barrow Hall
Athens, GA 30602
jbason@arches.uga.edu
(706) 542-6110
(706) 542-4057 FAX

>From singer@rti.org Thu Jun  3 07:18:05 1999
Received: from rti26.rti.org (rti26.rti.org [152.5.128.111])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA19996 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Jun 1999 07:18:00 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by rti26.rti.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <M12M2PPA>; Thu, 3 Jun 1999 10:17:24 -0400
Message-ID: <89FDB122A0E0D2118D2E0090273FA8C501F7A2@rti26.rti.org>
From: "Singer, Ruth Toby" <singer@rti.org>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Letter to the Editor
Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 10:17:24 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
For those interested, my Letter to the Editor regarding Huffington's column appeared in today's (6/3/99) Chicago Sun-Times:

"I was appalled by Ms. Huffington's column ["Going to War Over Polling," May 26] in which she advocates hanging up on pollsters because it would "protect democracy." Enabling citizens to express their opinions on issues affecting this country can only enhance democracy, not harm it. Polls enable policy makers to know what the public thinks. For Huffington to be against polls makes her seem elitist and undemocratic. Moreover, it is irresponsible to encourage citizens to hang up on all pollsters regardless of the purpose for which they are calling. The government performs important surveys on health care, education, crime, and work force issues, to name a few, that enables it to identify problems affecting Americans and how best to address them. The less people respond to these surveys, the less informed we are as a nation about critical issues. I encourage all citizens to respond to polls and surveys -- and to feel fortunate and proud to do so."

Toby Singer
Research Triangle Institute
203 North Wabash Avenue, Suite 1220
Chicago, IL 60601   E-Mail: singer@rti.org
Tel: (312) 456-5247  Fax: (312) 456-5250
Good response, Toby!

---------------------
> Mike Weeks
> Survey Research Division Telephone: (919)
> 541-6026
> Research Triangle Institute FAX: (919) 541-1261
> P.O. Box 12194 Internet: mfw@rti.org
> Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194 Website:
> http://www.rti.org/units/shsp.cfm
> 
>
For those interested, my Letter to the Editor regarding Huffington's column appeared in today's (6/3/99) Chicago Sun-Times:

"I was appalled by Ms. Huffington's column ["Going to War Over Polling," May 26] in which she advocates hanging up on pollsters because it would "protect democracy." Enabling citizens to express their opinions on issues affecting this country can only enhance democracy, not harm it. Polls enable policy makers to know what the public thinks. For Huffington to be against polls makes her seem elitist and undemocratic. Moreover, it is irresponsible to encourage citizens to hang up on all pollsters regardless of the purpose for which they are calling. The government performs important surveys on health care, education, crime, and work force issues, to name a few, that enables it to identify problems affecting Americans and how best to address them. The less people respond to these surveys, the less informed we are as a nation about critical issues. I encourage all citizens to respond to polls and surveys -- and to feel fortunate and proud to do so."

Toby Singer
Research Triangle Institute
Donald Lambro (chief political correspondent of The Washington Times, =
syndicated columnist) in "Direction signals powered by polls" writes = today
that White House pollster Mark Penn and many other pollsters are = telling
Clinton that "Americans are losing faith in his ability to achieve the goals he set forth when he began the bombing on March 24. That they want to stop the bombing and a negotiated settlement to the conflict." -20

A Pew Research Center report and a CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll is cited. "Nothing engages Bill Clinton's mind more than polls showing what he is doing is not popular with the American people. And that is why he has begun moving toward negotiation with Belgrade while keeping up his bravado that the bombing runs are working and will go on until Slobodan Milosevic capitulates to NATO's demands that he withdraw his troops from Kosovo."

Lambro acknowledges that popular opinion isn't the only factor—there's his own party and Al Gore. Conclusion: "This is why, one way or another, Mr. Clinton's war will be history before the end of the summer."

Remember the "Your mother wears combat boots" insult? An adult version could be "Your leader follows the polls."

Mark Richards

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Thu Jun 3 08:17:20 1999
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA06406 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Jun 1999 08:17:18 -0700
(PDT)
From: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu
Received: by psg.ucsf.EDU with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
  id <LXA9DFXK>; Thu, 3 Jun 1999 08:19:29 -0700
Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A2136F64AC@psg.ucsf.EDU>
Mr. Lambro appears to ignore two rather significant facts. First, there was never any great movement in public opinion towards action against the Serbs. Those decisions were definitely top-down, i.e., the White House decided, not the public. How many questions was Clinton asked at the beginning about this isn't very popular, what if it isn't over in a week, what if military lives are lost, civilian lives?

Second, by all reports the "negotiated peace" is Serbian agreement to the NATO specifications perhaps with some face-saving façade thrown over the top. The same "negotiated peace" was possible after day 1 of bombing if the Serbs had given in to NATO demands. The plan was to bomb until they agree to demands and withdraw, then put in a peace-keeping ground force, start rebuilding, get the refugees back in with some degree of autonomy. What evidence does Lambro have that this has changed or is changing? I suspect none.

In my opinion, Lambro has taken a poll here and a fact there and spliced them together into a half truth that fits his own opinion, the current m.o. of most columnists these days.
Donald Lambro (chief political correspondent of The Washington Times, syndicated columnist) in "Direction signals powered by polls" writes today that White House pollster Mark Penn and many other pollsters are telling Clinton that "Americans are losing faith in his ability to achieve the goals he set forth when he began the bombing on March 24. That they want to stop the bombing and a negotiated settlement to the conflict." 

A Pew Research Center report and a CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll is cited. "Nothing engages Bill Clinton's mind more than polls showing what he is doing is not popular with the American people. And that is why he has begun moving toward negotiation with Belgrade while keeping up his bravado that the bombing runs are working and will go on until Slobodan Milosevic capitulates to NATO's demands that he withdraw his troops from Kosovo." Lambro acknowledges that popular opinion isn't the only factor—there's his own party and Al Gore. Conclusion: "This is why, one way or another, Mr. Clinton's war will be history before the end of the summer."

Remember the "Your mother wears combat boots" insult? An adult
version could be "Your leader follows the polls."

Mark Richards

>From cwiese@unlinfo.unl.edu Thu Jun 3 16:42:45 1999
Received: from unlinfo3.unl.edu (unlinfo3.unl.edu [129.93.1.18])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id QAA11706 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Jun 1999 16:42:44 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from unlinfo2.unl.edu (unlinfo2.unl.edu [129.93.1.21])
    by unlinfo.unlinfo3.unl.edu (8.9.2/8.8.7) with ESMTP id SAA03888;
    Thu, 3 Jun 1999 18:26:52 -0500 (CDT)
Received: (from cwiese@localhost)
    by unlinfo2.unl.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) id SAA06261;
    Thu, 3 Jun 1999 18:36:55 -0500 (CDT)
From: cheryl wiese <cwiese@unlinfo.unl.edu>
Message-Id: <199906032336.SAA06261@unlinfo2.unl.edu>
Subject: Job opportunity
To: Field-dir@indiana.edu, aapornet@usc.edu, soc@unlinfo.unl.edu
Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 18:36:55 -0500 (CDT)
Cc: cwiese@unlinfo2.unl.edu (cheryl wiese),
    djohnson@unlinfo2.unl.edu (david johnson),
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL20]
Content-Type: text

Study Manager - (2+ year position) - University of Nebraska-Lincoln
    Bureau of Sociological Research
Function as the study manager of a large telephone research project
measuring alcohol and substance use among youth and adults in Nebraska for the Bureau of Sociological Research. Manager will develop training materials and supervise and train a staff of 12 to 50 telephone interviewers; and monitor the progress of the study. Bachelor's in social science or related field plus three years relevant experience, preferably in survey research, required. Master's preferred. Excellent organizational and communication skills necessary. Supervisory/study management experience preferred. Manager will have experience with data management and analysis and a wide variety of computer software (including SPSS or similar program, spreadsheets, and word processors). Position is funded through July, 2001. Salary: $27,274 annually plus excellent benefits.

Position is funded through July, 2001.

To apply, submit cover letter, resume, and three references postmarked by *June 18* to:

Cheryl Wiese  
Bureau of Sociological Research  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
729 Oldfather Hall  
Lincoln, NE 68588-0325  
cwiese@unl.edu
Toby Singer's letter is excellent...clear, concise and to the point! Good going Toby.

Dick Halpern

At 10:17 AM 6/3/99, you wrote:

>For those interested, my Letter to the Editor regarding Huffington's column appeared in today's (6/3/99) Chicago Sun-Times:
"I was appalled by Ms. Huffington's column ["Going to War Over Polling," May 26] in which she advocates hanging up on pollsters because it would "protect democracy." Enabling citizens to express their opinions on issues affecting this country can only enhance democracy, not harm it. Polls enable policy makers to know what the public thinks. For Huffington to be against polls makes her seem elitist and undemocratic. Moreover, it is irresponsible to encourage citizens to hang up on all pollsters regardless of the purpose for which they are calling. The government performs important surveys on health care, education, crime, and work force issues, to name a few, that enables it to identify problems affecting Americans and how best to address them. The less people respond to these surveys, the less informed we are as a nation about critical issues. I encourage all citizens to respond to polls and surveys -- and to feel fortunate and proud to do so."

Toby Singer
Research Triangle Institute
203 North Wabash Avenue, Suite 1220
Chicago, IL 60601  E-Mail: singer@rti.org
Tel: (312) 456-5247  Fax: (312) 456-5250

=Toby Singer's letter is excellent...clear, concise and to the==_27609484=_ALT=._ALT

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

<html>
<font size=3>Toby Singer's letter is excellent...clear, concise and to the
point! Good going Toby.<br>

Dick Halpern

At 10:17 AM 6/3/99, you wrote:<br>

For those interested, my Letter to the Editor regarding Huffington's column appeared in today's (6/3/99) Chicago Sun-Times:<br>

I was appalled by Ms. Huffington’s column ["Going to War Over Polling," May 26] in which she advocates hanging up on pollsters because it would protect democracy. Enabling citizens to express their opinions on issues affecting this country can only enhance democracy, not harm it. Polls enable policy makers to know what the public thinks. For Huffington to be against polls makes her seem elitist and undemocratic. Moreover, it is irresponsible to encourage citizens to hang up on all pollsters regardless of the purpose for which they are calling. The government performs important surveys on health care, education, crime, and work force issues, to name a few, that enables it to identify problems affecting Americans and how best to address them. The less people respond to these surveys, the less informed we are as a nation about critical issues. I encourage all citizens to respond to polls and surveys -- and to feel fortunate and proud to do so.

Toby Singer

Research Triangle Institute

203 North Wabash Avenue, Suite 1220

Chicago, IL 60601

E-Mail: singer@rti.org

Tel: (312) 456-5247

Fax: (312) 456-5250

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Fri Jun 4 14:49:39 1999
Polling Ends War? Not really.

It is true that Clinton pays close attention to the polls but to say that his foreign policy is dictated by the findings is a bit much. Unless I am mistaken, the Washington Times has always been less than enthusiastic about Clinton...so we have to remember who is saying what to whom and why...and not take it too seriously.
At 10:32 AM 6/3/99, you wrote:

>Donald Lambro (chief political correspondent of The Washington Times, syndicated columnist) in "Direction signals powered by polls" writes today that White House pollster Mark Penn and many other pollsters are telling Clinton that "Americans are losing faith in his ability to achieve the goals he set forth when he began the bombing on March 24. That they want to stop the bombing and a negotiated settlement to the conflict."

>A Pew Research Center report and a CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll is cited. "Nothing engages Bill Clinton's mind more than polls showing what he is doing is not popular with the American people. And that is why he has begun moving toward negotiation with Belgrade while keeping up his bravado that the bombing runs are working and will go on until Slobodan Milosevic capitulates to NATO's demands that he withdraw his troops from Kosovo." Lambro acknowledges that popular opinion isn't the only factor-there's his own party and Al Gore. Conclusion: "This is why, one way or another, Mr. Clinton's war will be history before the end of the summer."

>Remember the "Your mother wears combat boots" insult? An adult version could be "Your leader follows the polls."

>Mark Richards
Polling Ends War? Not really.

It is true that Clinton pays close attention to the polls but to say that his foreign policy is dictated by the findings is a bit much. Unless I am mistaken, the Washington Times has always been less than enthusiastic about Clinton...so we have to remember who is saying what to whom and why...and not take it too seriously.

Dick Halpern

At 10:32 AM 6/3/99, you wrote:

Donald Lambro (chief political correspondent of The Washington Times, syndicated columnist) in "Direction signals powered by polls" writes today that White House pollster Mark Penn and many other pollsters are telling Clinton that "Americans are losing faith in his ability to achieve the goals he set forth when he began the bombing on March 24. That they want to stop the bombing and a negotiated settlement to the conflict." Lambro acknowledges that popular opinion isn't the only factor—there's his own party and Al Gore. Conclusion: This is why, one way or another, Mr. Clinton's war will be history before the end of the summer.

Remember the "Your mother wears combat boots" insult? An adult version could be "Your leader..."
Follows the polls."<br>Mark Richards<br></font></blockquote></html>

--

==_6033270==_ALT--

--From KathrynC@socialresearch.com Fri Jun  4 17:25:27 1999
Received: from mail.isp.net (psion.isp.net [216.38.129.30])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA10042 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Jun 1999 17:25:25 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from researchnt.socialresearch.com (mail.socialresearch.com [208.128.218.194])
by mail.isp.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id RAA53600
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Jun 1999 17:26:43 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <199906050026.RAA53600@mail.isp.net>
Received: by mail.socialresearch.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
id <K39J5D50>; Fri, 4 Jun 1999 17:14:49 -0700
From: Kathy Cirksena <KathrynC@socialresearch.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Summary of suggestions on 'surveying children'
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 17:22:34 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
Content-Type: text/plain

Below is a compilation of recommendations, offers of assistance, referrals and citations I received in response to my query on surveying children.

Many thanks to those of you who took the time to respond!
Marilyn Sandler, president, Creative Research International in Toronto, has a lot of experience in this area. 416-250-8500.

We just published the results of a survey of n=550 HHs in which we surveyed one parent and one teen (age 12-17). If you think I could be of help, please feel free to contact me at the numbers below. Rob Daves Director of Polling & News Research

Star Tribune v: 612-673-7278
425 Portland Av. S. f: 612-673-4359
Minneapolis MN 55488 e: daves@startribune.com

Try Child Trends, Inc., in Washington, DC, and Diane Colasanto at Princeton Survey Research. They did the National Commission on Children survey "Speaking of Kids" about eight years ago, which covered lots of topics, including quite sensitive ones. I've polled children (LA Times Poll) between the ages of 12 and 17 and before I spoke to the children I spoke to the parents to get permission.

The surveys I've conducted are usually first asked of parents and then ask them if we cld speak to the child and explain what the poll is about. We have had excellent results, hardly any refusals. Good luck.

I also know that Sameer Abraham has done work with children (301)309-9439.

Susan Pinkus
To respond to your AAPORnet posting, I would recommend contacting the Kaiser Family Foundation for their polls on children and the entertainment media. As I recall, they have done at least one or two surveys (written in association with Princeton Survey Research Associates) that sampled children in the age group you are looking for. Also, if memory serves, their most recent kids poll was a joint project with Sports Illustrated, where they asked children about sports role models.

Contact Nina Kjellson (nkjellson@kff.org) for more information. I have some questionnaires used to obtain radio listening information from children 6-11. Do you want me to send them to you? Also I have some information regarding interviewing children from the ARF Children's research council. Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com See the following:

"Children as respondents: Methods for improving data quality"
by Jacqueline Scott (Jackie Scott)
pages 331-350 in Survey Measurement and Process Quality,
edited by Lyberg, Biemer, Collins, et al
published in 1997 by John Wiley & Sons

What about contacting research units of school systems that administer various questionnaires (not achievement tests per se) to children in grades 3-6 or so (the approximate grade range)? [You might find out which school systems these are from the Association of State School Officers, I think is their name, or by contacting the National Center for Educational Statistics, part of the Dept of Education.] How about contacting Educational Testing
Service in Princeton, NJ or various test publishers that develop attitude
toward school and self-esteem instruments for elementary school children?

Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.
Research Services Manager
Communication Sciences Group/
Survey Methods Group
140 Second Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 495-6692 ext. 269

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Sat Jun 5 08:02:30 1999
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id IAA20313 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 5 Jun 1999 08:02:29 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from garnet2.acns.fsu.edu (garnet2-fi.acns.fsu.edu
[128.186.197.3])
   by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA41612
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 5 Jun 1999 11:02:27 -0400
Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial221.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.32.221])
   by garnet2.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA43200
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 5 Jun 1999 11:02:25 -0400
Date: Sat, 5 Jun 1999 11:02:25 -0400
Message-Id: <199906051502.LAA43200@garnet2.acns.fsu.edu>
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Summary of suggestions on 'surveying children': thank you!

This is NOT an accidental "hit the reply" message!

Kathryn, I want to thank you for sharing your compilation with us. Although this is not currently my research area, one never knows about future opportunities and I will keep your list on file. I applaud your collegiality.

Susan

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh, PhD.
Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-644-1753 Office
     850-644-6416 Sociology Office
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208

>From jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu Sat Jun  5 13:28:27 1999
Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA23540 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 5 Jun 1999 13:28:26 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (sph76-224.harvard.edu [128.103.76.224])
    by hsph.harvard.edu (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id QAA10260
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 5 Jun 1999 16:28:16 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <375987AD.93255028@hsph.harvard.edu>
Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 16:25:17 -0400
From: "john t. young" <jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.05 [en] (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Summary of suggestions on 'surveying children': thank you!
References: <199906051502.LAA4320@garnet2.acns.fsu.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

i agree totally with susan's comments. Kathryn, thanks for sharing the compilation.

john young
harvard opinion research program

Susan Losh wrote:
> This is NOT an accidental "hit the reply" message!
> 
> Kathryn, I want to thank you for sharing your compilation with us.
> Although this is not currently my research area, one never knows about
> future opportunities and I will keep your list on file. I applaud your
> collegiality.
> 
> Susan
> 
> If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.
> 
> Susan Losh, PhD.
> Department of Sociology
> Florida State University
> Tallahassee FL 32306-2270
> 
> PHONE 850-644-1753 Office
> 850-644-6416 Sociology Office
> 
> slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
> FAX 850-644-6208

>From blanka@worldnet.att.net Sun Jun 6 11:17:55 1999
Received: from mtiwmhc04.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc04.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.39])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
Dear colleague(s).

Please set your screen size to wrap around at 72 (or whatever the magic words are) so your words don't run on straight to New Jersey (from where I sit).

I thank you for your cooperation.

Blanka Eckstein
This message is intended for those AAPORites (AAPORians?) who attended our 1999 Annual Conference and stayed at the TradeWinds Resort (all others, feel free to hit the delete key now).
"VIDEO CHECK-OUT" CONTEST WINNER:

As announced at the conference, if you used the video check out option on your hotel room's television set to check out of the hotel prior to 12 noon, Sunday, you were automatically entered into a drawing for a free future weekend stay at the TradeWinds.

The TradeWinds Resort has notified me that the winner of the "AAPOR video checkout" contest is Ms. Angie Kewalramani.

Congratulations, Angie!

(Angie, the hotel should have already sent you a letter about your prize. Please let me know if they did not.)

Dawn Von Thurn

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

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Mon Jun 7 06:39:50 1999
A powerful, succinct and relevant editorial from today's NY Times re the Census issue:

June 7, 1999

A Much Bigger Census Bill

The Census Bureau says it will cost $1.7 billion in addition to the $2.9 billion already requested to comply with a Supreme Court ruling that prohibits the use of statistical sampling for apportioning Congressional seats among the states. The new money is needed to pay
for 400,000 more census takers. Yet this expense may not improve on census accuracy or solve the political problems of the Republican Party, which opposes sampling.

The 1990 Census missed 8.4 million people and double counted 4.4 million, with most of the undercount occurring in poor, urban and minority communities. The factors that hindered accuracy in 1990 -- growing immigrant populations, increased mobility, irregular housing patterns -- have all become more pronounced in the past decade.

The Supreme Court decision allows sampling in determining population for other purposes, like redrawing state and Congressional legislative districts. If state legislatures were to use the more accurate, adjusted figures -- which the Census Bureau will also produce -- redistricting might well result in more Democratic districts. This is exactly what Republicans fear.

Republican lawmakers in several states have passed legislation to require the use of unadjusted census figures for redistricting. The politics may win out, but resisting scientific methods to reduce the undercount is undemocratic.

Dick Halpern
>From dkb@casro.org Mon Jun  7 08:01:28 1999
Received: from mail.saturn5.net (mail.saturn5.net [207.122.105.6])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA16358 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Jun 1999 08:01:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from diane ([207.122.105.201]) by mail.saturn5.net
    (Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-59533U600L2S100V35)
    with SMTP id net for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
    Mon, 7 Jun 1999 10:57:44 -0400
Message-ID: <002101beb0f6$d1ef0ae0$c9697acf@diane>
From: dkb@casro.org ((CASRO) Diane Bowers)
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: California Senate Bill 988
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 11:02:52 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
The following information from CMOR and CMOR's Government Affairs Director, Donna McElhinney, may clarify the California situation. Diane Bowers, President, CMOR Earlier this year, the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) learned of a restrictive do-not-call bill introduced in California. The bill, Senate Bill 988, would require researchers who "seek marketing information" to comply with state-compiled do-not-call lists.

CMOR has monitoring the bill since it introduction and, on behalf of the marketing and opinion research industry, contacted the sponsor to express our concerns regarding the implications of the bill. We spoke with several key staff members and presented model language and amendments to revise the bill to exempt research. We learned that the bill was introduced at the request of the Attorney General and that a number of sales-related organizations oppose the bill. We also elicited the assistance of our California lobbyist, Phil Dowd, to assist our efforts. CMOR will continue to monitor this bill and work to protect the interests of the marketing and opinion research community.

The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) is a non-profit trade association formed to protect the interests of the marketing research and opinion research industry. Our membership is nationwide and includes all segments of the research community - research companies, research clients as well as other research industry associations. Our mission is to protect the
value that marketing and opinion research presents to the public, government, media and society in general. We accomplish this by influencing legislation and regulations for the protection of the marketing and opinion research process, preventing passage of restrictive legislation while working to balance the need for information against the right of individual privacy and promoting internal research practices to encourage respondent cooperation and self regulation.

If you would like a copy of the bill or more information on CMOR's involvement, please contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs, Donna McElhinney, at (516) 928-6206 or via email at donna@cmor.org.

Donna McElhinney
Director of Government Affairs
Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR)
170 North Country Road, Suite 4
Port Jefferson, NY 11777
Phone: (516) 928-6206   Fax: (516) 928-6041
Email: donna@cmor.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Sullivan <sullivan@fsc-research.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 1999 1:09 PM
Subject: California Senate Bill 988

Members in the market research business might want to take a look at SB 988. This bill establishes a "no call" list for consumers in the State of California and bars telemarketers and legitimate market researchers alike
from calling them.

What is AAPOR's position on this bill? I, for one, believe that regulation of telemarketing activity is badly needed because of its obvious negative impact on legitimate survey activity. A bill allowing consumers to avoid receiving telemarketing calls and prohibiting faux surveying could make most of our jobs a lot easier. However, because the prohibitions and penalties in the bill will be applied to legitimate market research, I think AAPOR must oppose it. What we need here is some legislation that pulls the weeds in the industry not something that defoliates the forest instead.

Comments?

>From rday@mcs.net Mon Jun 7 10:21:33 1999
Received: from Mailbox.mcs.net (Mailbox.mcs.com [192.160.127.87])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id KAA27406 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Jun 1999 10:21:24 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from gopher (P57-Chi-Dial-5.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.57]) by
Mailbox.mcs.net (8.8.7/8.8.2) with SMTP id MAA27119 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Mon, 7 Jun 1999 12:21:18 -0500 (CDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990607121853.00708c30@popmail.mcs.net>
X-Sender: rday@popmail.mcs.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.2 (32)
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 12:21:18 -0500 (CDT)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
Subject: Re: California Senate Bill 988
In-Reply-To: <002101beb0f6$d1ef0ae0$c9697acf@diane>
At 11:02 AM 6/7/99 -0400, you wrote:

> The following information from CMOR and CMOR’s Government Affairs
> Director, Donna McElhinney, may clarify the California situation.
> Diane Bowers, President, CMOR Earlier this year, the Council for
> Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) learned of a restrictive
> do-not-call bill introduced in California. The bill, Senate Bill 988,
> would require researchers who "seek marketing information" to comply
> with state-compiled do-not-call lists.
> CMOR has monitoring the bill since it introduction and, on behalf of
> the marketing and opinion research industry, contacted the sponsor to
> express our concerns regarding the implications of the bill. We spoke
> with several key staff members and presented model language and
> amendments to revise the bill to exempt research. We learned that the
> bill was introduced at the request of the Attorney General and that a
> number of sales-related organizations oppose the bill. We also elicited
> the assistance of our California lobbyist, Phil Dowd, to assist our
> efforts. CMOR will continue to monitor this bill and work to protect
> the interests of the marketing and opinion research community.
> The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) is a non-profit
> trade association formed to protect the interests of the marketing
research and opinion research industry. Our membership is nationwide and includes all segments of the research community - research companies, research clients as well as other research industry associations. Our mission is to protect the value that marketing and opinion research presents to the public, government, media and society in general. We accomplish this by influencing legislation and regulations for the protection of the marketing and opinion research process, preventing passage of restrictive legislation while working to balance the need for information against the right of individual privacy and promoting internal research practices to encourage respondent cooperation and self regulation.

If you would like a copy of the bill or more information on CMOR's involvement, please contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs, Donna McElhinney, at (516) 928-6206 or via email at donna@cmor.org.

Donna McElhinney
Director of Government Affairs
Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR)
170 North Country Road, Suite 4
Port Jefferson, NY 11777
Phone: (516) 928-6206   Fax: (516) 928-6041
Email: donna@cmor.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Sullivan <sullivan@fsc-research.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 1999 1:09 PM
Subject: California Senate Bill 988

>
Members in the market research business might want to take a look at SB 988. This bill establishes a "no call" list for consumers in the State of California and bars telemarketers and legitimate market researchers alike from calling them.

What is AAPOR's position on this bill? I, for one, believe that regulation of telemarketing activity is badly needed because of its obvious negative impact on legitimate survey activity. A bill allowing consumers to avoid receiving telemarketing calls and prohibiting faux surveying could make most of our jobs a lot easier. However, because the prohibitions and penalties in the bill will be applied to legitimate market research, I think AAPOR must oppose it. What we need here is some legislation that pulls the weeds in the industry not something that defoliates the forest instead.

Comments?

From bosnjak@zuma-mannheim.de Mon Jun  7 10:33:50 1999
Received: from mail.zuma-mannheim.de (mail.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.12]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id KAA02186 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Jun 1999 10:33:38 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from zuma-mannheim.de (pc-bosnjak.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.25]) by mail.zuma-mannheim.de (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id TAA24543
Dear AAPORites,

I am sending this on behalf of the German Society for Online Research (D.G.O.F). Enclosed please find the Call for Papers to GOR '99 conference. It would be nice to see you there this fall.

Greetings from Mannheim,

Michael Bosnjak
ZUMA OnlineResearch

CALL FOR PAPERS

GOR '99
GERMAN ONLINE RESEARCH '99
This year’s GOR Conference in Nuremberg (the third of its kind) will be presenting an overview of the current progress in online research and its outlook for the future, with particular attention to empirical findings. We expect about 250 to 300 participants.

Topical emphasis at the GOR ’99 Conference will be placed upon: comparative analyses, evaluation studies and innovative developments in the following areas:

* Methods of Online Research
  - Data collection methods (surveys, online interviews, web experiments)
  - Methods of analysis (user tracking, content analyses)
  - Use of 3D in online surveys

* Online Panel Research
  - Interview panels, participant pools
  - Panel mortality, tools
* Quality Aspects in Internet-based Surveys
  - Sampling methods
  - Media coherent survey techniques
  - Evaluation of data quality
  - Pitfalls in Online Research
  - Ethical aspects

* CMC
  - Computer Mediated Communication (applications in business, perception of persons, trends in online media usage)

* Online-Marketing
  - Online communities, client clubs
  - Personalized communication and interaction

* Further fields of application and other aspects of Online Research
  - Communication and media research
  - Software ergonomics
  - Legal aspects / privacy

The main conference language is German. However, contributions in English are welcome!

An active contribution to the GOR Conference can either be a poster or an oral presentation. The best poster at GOR will be awarded with a cash prize.
Furthermore, GOR conference can also be used as a trade forum for introducing services and products (software) to GOR participants. The local organization team will be glad to inform of further details.

All submitted presentation proposals must be accompanied by abstracts. The proposals will be evaluated by the program committee.

Guidelines for the Registration of Contributions:

The contributions will be reviewed by the program committee (Wolfgang Bandilla, Bernard Batinic, Michael Bosnjak, Lorenz Graef, Ulf-Dietrich Reips, Andreas Werner).

Abstract Composition

1. Title of the submitted contribution
2. Type of contribution (talk or poster)
3. Author(s)
4. Primary author's contact address including postal address, telephone number, E-Mail, and URL
5. Key words about contribution (maximum of 4)
6. Abstract

Maximum length of abstract:

approximately one page with 65 characters per line

Please send abstracts to:
gor99@dgof.de

"Abstract" must be typed into the subject header. The aforementioned points 1 to 6 should be typed into the E-Mail body. Please use ASCII text only.

The abstracts can either be written in English or in German.

Deadline for Abstracts: June 30, 1999

Participants will be informed of approval or rejection by 16th July 1999.

Meanwhile, the interim schedule is available for viewing at the following URL:

http://www.dgof.de/gor99/index_en.html

To accompany the GOR, a preliminary proceedings volume of all contributions accepted as oral presentations is planned as a WWW version. All authors invited for talks should therefore hand in a written version of their contribution and include an abstract in the respective other language (between 3 and maximum 5 pages) by 1st October.

Registration

As of immediately, tickets can be registered at the following URL:

http://www.dgof.de/gor99/registration.html
Registration is compulsory for all participants (with or without contribution/talk).

Registration Fees

The registration fees include two lunches and drinks as well as the accompanying conference program. The prices are as follows:

- Non-Academic Participants: EUR 175 (ca. US$ 185)
- University Staff: EUR 95 (ca. US$ 100)
- Students: EUR 70 (ca. US$ 74)
- Active Participants: EUR 35 (ca. US$ 37)

The registration fees must be paid in full. In the case of foreign transactions: Any fees to be levied must be paid by the participant himself or herself.

Day passes will not be available at GOR '99.

Schedule

- 30th June 1999  Deadline for Proposals
- 16th July 1999  Notice of Approval/Refusal to Contributors
- 20th July 1999  Publication of the interim program
- 1st October 1999  Deadline for written contributions to the WWW conference volume
28th/29th October 1999 Conference in Nuremberg

Organization Committee

Wolfgang Bandilla     ZUMA Mannheim
Bernad Batinic        University of Erlangen-Nuernberg
Michael Bosnjak       ZUMA Mannheim
Lorenz Graef          AG VIRTUS Evaluation (VERA) Cologne
Klaus Moser           University of Erlangen-Nuernberg
Ulf-Dietrich Reips    Zurich University
Andreas Werner        screen media consulting Mannheim

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

Contact Address of Local Organization Committee

Mail  orga@dgof.de
      bernad.batinic@wiso.uni-erlangen.de
Tel.  ++49-911/5302-247
      ++49-911/5302-259 (Secretary's Office)
FAX  ++49-911/5302-243

University of Erlangen-Nuernberg
Faculty of Economic and Social Psychology
Atttn: GOR-99
Lange Gasse 20
90403 Nuernberg

-------------------------------
From SMarcy@NationalResearch.com
Mon Jun  7 13:11:44 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (root@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA07048 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Jun 1999 13:11:44 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from nrc7.nationalresearch.com (exchange.nationalresearch.com
[12.13.114.6] (may be forged))
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA06622 for <aapornet@rcf.usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Jun 1999 13:11:43 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by nrc7.nationalresearch.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2448.0)
    id <MCMRSZC8>; Mon, 7 Jun 1999 15:11:13 -0500
Message-ID:
<A1D26D98B20AD211A2A00060089F9C0A5B7CEB@nrc7.nationalresearch.com>
From: Sherry Marcy <SMarcy@NationalResearch.com>
To: "'aapornet@rcf.usc.edu" <aapornet@rcf.usc.edu>
Subject: Copyrighted questionnaires
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 15:10:55 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Does anyone out there know of a case where a questionnaire was copyrighted?
Where a researcher had to pay a copyright fee to use the questionnaire? If
so, what was the fee? And could you give me a general description of the
questionnaire (length, subject, anything else pertinent to the price)?
Thanks for the help in advance!

Sherry Marcy, M.P.H.
National Research Corporation
325 East Eisenhower Parkway
Suite 106
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108
Phone: 734/327-4111
Fax: 734/665-4104
Email: smarcy@nationalresearch.com
Perhaps "AAPORitions"?

Lance M. Pollack
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: dawn.von.thurn@us.pwcglobal.com
[SMTP:dawn.von.thurn@us.pwcglobal.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 06, 1999 10:12 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: 1999 AAPOR Conference - Video Check out Winner

This message is intended for those AAPORites (AAPORians?) who attended our
1999 Annual Conference and stayed at the TradeWinds Resort (all others,
feel free to hit the delete key now).
"VIDEO CHECK-OUT" CONTEST WINNER:

As announced at the conference, if you used the video check out option on your hotel room's television set to check out of the hotel prior to 12 noon, Sunday, you were automatically entered into a drawing for a free future weekend stay at the TradeWinds.

The TradeWinds Resort has notified me that the winner of the "AAPOR video checkout" contest is Ms. Angie Kewalramani.

Congratulations, Angie!

(Angie, the hotel should have already sent you a letter about your prize. Please let me know if they did not.)

Dawn Von Thurn

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

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If
you received
    this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any
    computer.

>From rday@mcs.net Mon Jun 7 13:30:09 1999
Received: from Mailbox.mcs.net (Mailbox.mcs.com [192.160.127.87])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA12985 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 7 Jun 1999 13:29:58 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from gopher (P29-Chi-Dial-7.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.157]) by
Mailbox.mcs.net (8.8.7/8.8.2) with SMTP id PAA12663 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Mon, 7 Jun 1999 15:29:53 -0500 (CDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990607152728.0070d40c@popmail.mcs.net>
X-Sender: rday@popmail.mcs.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.2 (32)
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 15:27:28 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
Subject: Re: Copyrighted questionnaires
In-Reply-To: <A1D26D98B20AD211A2A00060089F9C0A5B7CEB@nrc7.nationalresearch.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Peter miller was working on this. I suggest that you contact him
At 03:10 PM 6/7/99 -0500, you wrote:
>Does anyone out there know of a case where a questionnaire was
>copyrighted? Where a researcher had to pay a copyright fee to use the
>questionnaire? If so, what was the fee? And could you give me a
>general description of the questionnaire (length, subject, anything
>else pertinent to the price)? Thanks for the help in advance!
>
>Sherry Marcy, M.P.H.
>National Research Corporation
>325 East Eisenhower Parkway
>Suite 106
>Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108
>Phone: 734/327-4111
>Fax: 734/665-4104
>Email: smarcy@nationalresearch.com
>
>From rusciano@rider.edu Tue Jun  8 10:51:01 1999
>Received: from GENIUS.rider.edu (genius.rider.edu [192.107.45.5])
>       by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
>       id KAA29595 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Jun 1999 10:50:59 -0700
>(PDT)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29692)
id <01JC5RIQ0CV6O8Y6YVP@genius.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 8 Jun 1999 13:49:32 EDT
Received: from rider.edu (finearts138.rider.edu)
by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29692)
with ESMTP id <01JC5RIQ02UC8Y6YQ4@genius.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Tue, 08 Jun 1999 13:49:18 -0400 (EDT)
Dear Bob,

I wanted to write to you to let you know that I will be putting together an article on the past ten years of research on world opinion for the IJPOR; it basically will summarize the history, results, and ramifications of the research (with the obligatory notes about future directions for the study). I believe the plan is for it to come out about ten years after the first article.

I also wanted to ask you a question regarding a Fulbright application. When I spoke at LSE, I asked Chris Hill if it would be possible to visit there for a half or full year on a sabbatical; he said that it would be fine with him, but he didn't have the authority for invitations. I recall you said you were on the Board of Governors there, and was wondering if you might know who to contact for a possible invitation. I have attached my vitae if there are any questions there. I am not sure I would be applying in this cycle, but if so, the applications are due in August.
I unfortunately didn't make it to AAPOR this year, despite plans to do so.

I understand that the Tradewinds Resort was beautiful. I seem to only catch the convention when it is in uninteresting places.

All the best,

Frank Rusciano
Dear Bob,

I inadvertently hit the "send" icon before I attached my vitae. It is attached here. Sorry for the confusion.

Frank Rusciano

--Boundary__(ID_khv46bpkAgRWjN+wjjWcaw)
Content-type: application/msword
Content-disposition: inline
Content-transfer-encoding: BASE64
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AAANNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN NN
--Boundary_(ID_khv46bpkAgRWjN+wjjWcaw)--

>From mkshares@mcs.net Wed Jun  9 05:48:22 1999
Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id FAA03924 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Jun 1999 05:48:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P59-Chi-Dial-7.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.187]) by
Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id HAA23237 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Wed, 9 Jun 1999 07:48:17 -0500 (CDT)
Message-ID: <375E627C.C83546E5@mcs.net>
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 07:47:58 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Figures Don't Lie
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
This is a multipart message in MIME format.

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
    x-mac-creator="4D4F5355"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

http://www.pollingreport.com/9906NP.htm

Content-Type: text/html; charset=iso-8859-1;
    name="9906NP.htm"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
Content-Disposition: inline;
    filename="9906NP.htm"
Content-Base: "http://www.pollingreport.com/9906NP.htm"
    Content-Location: "http://www.pollingreport.com/9906NP.htm"

<html>

<head>
    <meta name="GENERATOR" content="Microsoft FrontPage 3.0">

<title>Figures Don't Lie</title>

</head>
Nick Panagakis, a member of the National Council on Public Polls, is president of Market Shares Corporation, a marketing and public opinion research firm headquartered in Mt. Prospect, Ill.
This article appeared in the June 7, 1999, edition of The Polling Report.

Arianna Huffington has very strong opinions about political polling. A recent column of hers titled "How To Rid Your House Of Annoying Pollsters" sums up the feelings she has been asserting for several years—that polls produce inaccurate readings of public sentiments, which in turn influence spineless elected officials, resulting in bad public policy.

Her solution is for the public to quit responding to poll interviews and for polling to be subjected to the same legislative restrictions placed on telemarketing sales calls.
In the column, which appeared in newspapers in late May,

Huffington warns her readers that polls "enable a habit that is hazardous to our political health." To demonstrate this hazard, she cites polls from early April showing a consensus of Americans favoring the use of allied ground troops in Kosovo; she then points to a decline in support to only 15% in a mid-May Zogby International poll. She says this reversal of support led to a policy change by the poll-driven Clinton Administration.

Indeed, several polls asking whether or not ground troops should be used in Kosovo were showing consensus support for troops in early April. They included a Zogby poll showing 55% responding "yes" to the same question. But according to the Zogby release Huffington cites, 50% answered affirmatively to this question in mid-May, not 15%, as Huffington says in her column.

It was a different Zogby question that showed 15% favoring ground troops. This question asked which one of three choices was preferred: ground troops, continued bombing, or a diplomatic solution. Other options were favored over
ground troops as a first choice, if offered. Moreover, the 15% favoring ground troops in May was down slightly from 17% in April when the same question was asked. </font></p>
<p><font face="Arial" size="2">This means use of ground troops was down only two points when offered as one of three choices, and down five points when it was the only choice—not down about 40 points, as Huffington suggests. </font></p>
<p><font face="Arial" size="2">In the April poll, continued bombing ranked first among the three options offered. In the mid-May poll, more respondents chose a diplomatic solution than bombing, which Zogby described as a "reversal of opinion." But Huffington takes this quote out of context and associates it with a decline in ground troop support instead. Columnists are entitled to their own opinions. But should they be entitled to their own facts? </font></p>
<p><font face="Arial" size="2">Yes Arianna, there is a hazard to using poll results in politics, but only when results are in the hands of someone unable to make valid analytical comparisons or someone who misinterprets results to advance a particular point of view. </font></p>
>From bickart@crab.rutgers.edu Wed Jun 9 07:04:57 1999

Received: from crab.rutgers.edu (crab.rutgers.edu [165.230.211.2])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA14610 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Jun 1999 07:04:56 -0700
Hi,

I'm posting this request for John Lynch. You can send your responses to John directly (jglynch@mail.duke.edu) or to me. If people are interested, I can post a summary of the responses to the list.

>I'm seeking references:
>
>a. Comparing omnibus panels to one-shot studies in the representativeness of the achieved samples. Relatedly, I'm interested in papers about how to maintain representativeness of an initially representative panel over time;
>
b. comparing omnibus panels to one-shot studies in non-sampling errors.

> Comparing web surveys with other techniques of data collection on response rates and non-sampling errors.

> Thanks very much for your help.

>----------------------

John Lynch                 Office Phone: 919-660-7766
Fuqua School of Business   Office Fax:   919-681-6244
Duke University            Home Fax:     919-477-5374
Box 90120 email: john.lynch@duke.edu
Durham,NC 27708-0120

Barbara Bickart
Assistant Professor of Marketing
Rutgers University
Camden, NJ 08102
(609) 225-6593 (Work)
(609) 225-6231 (Fax)
bickart@crab.rutgers.edu

>From mwolford@hers.com Wed Jun 9 07:57:15 1999
Received: from mail.his.com (root@mail.his.com [205.177.25.9])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA23088 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Jun 1999 07:57:14 -0700
(PDT)
Another practice that makes everyone look bad. The following article on an implicitly anonymous but not really confidential survey on shareholder satisfaction appears in the Washington Post today.

Enter
symbols<br>separated by a space:<br><input type="text" name="ticker" value="" size="14"><br><input type="image" name="getquotes" src="http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/business/images/getquotes_sm.gif" width="65" height="12" border="0" vspace="2"></input><br><A href="http://financial.washingtonpost.com/search.asp?query=1"><font size="-2" face="arial, helvetica" color="#333333">Look Up Symbols</font></A><br><A href="http://financial.washingtonpost.com/porfolio.asp"><font size="-2" face="arial, helvetica" color="#333333">Portfolio</font></A><br><IMG src="/wp-srv/globalnav/images/spacer.gif" width="114" height="2" border="0" alt="">

</table>

made possible by:<br><br>


border=0"></a>

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td bgcolor="#006633" align="center">
<font face="arial, helvetica" size="-2" color="#CCCCCC">Made Possible by:</font></td>
</tr>
</table>
</table>
<br clear="all"/></p></form>

<!--end elogic box-->

<!--NEW TABLE FOR BUY STOCKS ONLINE-->
<table width="124" border="0" cellpadding="4" cellspacing="0"
bgcolor="#006633">
<tr>
<td width="124" align="center">


<font size="-1" face="arial, helvetica" color="#333333">

<b>From The Post</b> </font>

<font size="-1">
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Robert O'Harrow Jr.<br>May 13: A New study on Web site privacy policies.<br>1998 Post series: "Privacy in the Digital Age". <br> <p> <font size="-1" face="arial, helvetica" color="#333333"> <b>Quotes, News And Data</b> </font> <br> <li type="square"> <br> <li type="square"> <a href="http://financial.washingtonpost.com/industry_list.asp?ticker=ge">GE</a> <br> <p>
GE Gives Investors Air of Anonymity
By all appearances, the survey was as anonymous as they come. It asked shareholders of GE Investments for thoughts about the company’s service, the quality of its products and ways to improve. There was no place to put a name. What the survey failed to mention to the 15,000 recipients -- most
of them employees of General Electric Co., the giant parent firm -- is that
officials would quickly find out who filled in the circles indicating
"Unacceptable," "Average" and "Outstanding." That's because the company
included a code on the return envelope that corresponded with information in
the company's shareholder database, allowing the company to surreptitiously
identify every respondent. A GE Investments official raved about the
technique in a letter to the printer that helped devise the method. "This
was, on the surface, a simple task requiring printing and collating various
pieces for each shareholder's use. However, the hard part came with our
request to be able to 'secretly' identify each respondent in the most
discreet way," said the letter to Harty Press Inc. of New Haven, Conn.
"I must especially compliment one of your employees. . . . Her suggestion
enabled us to secrete the code in a manner least likely to attract attention
from the respondents," the letter said. "She's terrific!"
Yesterday, however, the company said it would drop the practice after receiving a phone
call about it from The Washington Post. Such ploys have been used for
years by some market researchers, who pine for personal information about
consumers but know that respondents sometimes grow shy when they must
include their name on a survey. But the methods have become far smoother in
recent years, as computer technology makes it easier than ever before to
link coupons, surveys or other materials to databases of information about
individuals. The mechanism might be a bar code. It might be a cluster of
dots. In the case of GE Investments' survey last year, a company official
said, the identifying information was contained in series of numbers.
"Those sort of tricks are quite common in the survey industry," said Jason
Catlett, president of Junkbusters Corp., a private Web site that offers
consumer tips about privacy. "There's an assumption that reasonable people
have that because their name does not appear they're anonymous. . . . In any
survey, you should assume your response is not anonymous." GE Investments
is an money management arm of General Electric that oversees about $80 billion in assets for individual and institutional investors, said Tim Benedict, spokesman for the company. The survey went out last year to shareholders of the company's mutual funds, he said.<p> It was intended to help the company improve service and identify the particular concerns of individual investors, said Benedict, who noted that it did not say the answers would be confidential.<p>

The survey asked shareholders to opine on such things as whether their quarterly and annual fund statements were accurate, tax reports understandable and other services easy to use. The most probing questions focused on whether shareholders need current income or longer-term investments. It also asked them to describe the percentage of their investments managed by the company. Benedict said it was the first -- and last -- time the company used such a code. The company said yesterday that in future surveys it would tell shareholders that the information they provide will be identifiable. Officials from Harty Press declined to discuss the matter.<p>

"We basically didn't ask for the customer's name and address because we wanted to encourage a response," Benedict said, adding, "We wanted to know who was answering. . . . It was not to pull a fast one on our customers."

It's not likely that the GE employees who filled out the survey will believe that, according to an official at the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, a union that has members at the company. "I'm appalled, although I'm not surprised," said Betsy Potter, president of a local office in Erie, Pa. "It's not honest. If they wanted to know who filled out the survey, all they had to do is ask."<p> Evan Hendricks, a civil liberties activist and publisher of Privacy Times, agrees. Hendricks said he believes many companies try such ruses to get more information than many consumers are willing to give.<p> "It's typical. As long as it's secret
they get away with it," said Hendricks, who first obtained the GE Investments letter and will publish an account of it in his upcoming newsletter. "If it's such a great service, why can't they let the shareholders decide for themselves?"
From rusciano@rider.edu Wed Jun 9 08:35:11 1999
Received: from GENIUS.rider.edu (genius.rider.edu [192.107.45.5])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA01328 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Jun 1999 08:35:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29692)
id <01JC712R27CW8Y70WZ@genius.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 9 Jun 1999 11:33:35 EDT
Received: from rider.edu (finearts138.rider.edu)
    by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #29692)
    with ESMTP id <01JC712DYXP88Y6YCK@genius.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
    Wed, 09 Jun 1999 11:33:17 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 11:30:00 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: Vitae
To: KERWINJ1 <KERWINJ1@westat.com>, aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <375E8878.6EF4F61F@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.08 [en]C-NECCk (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
References: <0010D087.C21292@westat.com>
Dear fellow AAPORneters,

As KERWINJ1 below has noted, I did indeed send a personal message to all of AAPORNET. I now share the (extreme) embarrassment of those who have mistakenly done so before, and I apologize for wasting everyone's time. (The mistake occurred, of course, as I replied personally to someone who had posted to the NET). I will write 100 times "These machines will make our lives better..."

Sorry again to all,

Frank Rusciano

KERWINJ1 wrote:

> Do you realize you just sent your vitae to the hundreds of folks on AAPORnet???

> From jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU Wed Jun 9 09:10:55 1999
Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA10907 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Jun 1999 09:10:42 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])
   by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA23157
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Jun 1999 11:07:17 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
   with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 09 Jun 1999 10:52:47 -0500
The Survey Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois at Chicago is looking for an individual to manage its computer operations. Duties include overseeing the operation of a Novell local area network, and providing direction for technical staff in the development and implementation of hardware and software systems for survey applications. The position requires familiarity with installation, configuration and maintenance of personal computers, and a large variety of research, financial graphics and system software packages.

NT, TCP/IP, and web design and connectivity experience are desirable, as are trouble-shooting skills and knowledge of Microsoft Office products. Minimum requirements include a Bachelor's degree in computer science or a relevant social science (Masters degree is preferred) with at least five years previous experience in computer-based systems and local area networks including supervisory duties. Experience with computer-assisted telephone interviewing systems is a plus. For additional information regarding our organization, visit our web site at: www.srl.uic.edu. Salary range $55,000-$65,000.

For full consideration resumes must be received by June 14, 1999. Send a resume to: Dr. Timothy Johnson, Director; Survey Research Laboratory; University of Illinois at Chicago; 412 S. Peoria St. (M/C 336), Chicago, IL 60607. No phone calls please. The University of Illinois is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.
Did you fly on Delta Airlines to the AAPOR conference last month?

If you flew on Delta and did NOT already get an email from me thanking you,
please email me with the dates on which you traveled. Tickets acquired through government travel agents don't qualify, unfortunately.

AAPOR earns complimentary tickets from the airline if enough of our members buy tickets and give the airline AAPOR's conference number. This year we are just a few short of earning a ticket from Delta. These tickets are used for Council and conference operations travel, saving AAPOR's budget. (We did earn one ticket from USAir, our other 'official' airline this year.)

Thanks for your help. Email me at: shap.wolf@asu.edu

Shap Wolf
Associate Conference Operations Chair
Arizona State University
Survey Research Laboratory
shap.wolf@asu.edu
480-965-5032: voice -5077: fax

>From BGroves@survey.umd.edu Wed Jun 9 11:15:47 1999
Received: from survey.umd.edu (survey.umd.edu [129.2.169.4]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
   id LAA23480 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Wed, 9 Jun 1999 11:15:45 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from JPSM-Message_Server by survey.umd.edu
   with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 09 Jun 1999 14:14:05 -0400
Message-Id: <s75e76ad.077@survey.umd.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 14:13:55 -0400
From: "Bob Groves" <BGroves@survey.umd.edu>
To: <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>, <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>
Please forgive cross-listing:

We have learned that there are only 65 rooms left unreserved at the government rate for the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse, October 28-31, 1999, in Portland, Oregon.

Those government agency employees planning on attending the conference should make reservations soon by calling the Portland Hilton at (503) 499-4244 between the hours of 7am and 6pm Pacific Standard Time. Reservations at this rate cannot be made via the ICSN website.

For those wanting further information about the conference, access http://www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/
JOB OPENING FOR ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF L.A. TIMES POLL

The Los Angeles Times Poll is looking for someone to act as second in command in the polling unit. This person must have at least 5 to 7 years experience in the field of polling/marketing research, as well as good managerial skills. This person will help the director in questionnaire writing, working with reporters on the analysis, writing up poll alerts (poll releases) and conducting research, as well as working independently. Besides writing questionnaires, this person would have the creativity in thinking up different kinds of poll
subjects/themes that would be unique to the L.A.Times. This polling unit is known for their thematic type polls and this person should be able to come up with provocative and newsworthy subjects. Would also like this person to be familiar with CATI interviewing (the polling unit uses CfMC). When the director is away, this person would assume all department responsibilities. The polling unit has a full-time staff of seven and about 200 part-time interviewers.

He/She should have excellent knowledge in questionnaire design, sampling methodology, strong analytical skills and report writing. Also a plus, but not necessary, if this person has journalistic polling experience or journalism background. This person must have experience analyzing and understanding complex datasets on different issues. It would be highly desirable for this person to have a strong interest in politics (Times Poll does a lot of polling on national, state and local politics), current events and social trends or issues. The Poll is always interested in increasing response rates and any knowledge of response rate research (perhaps with experimental polling) is an added plus.

This person must be able to work well with all different kinds of people as this job deals with editors, reporters, pundits, politicians, readers to the Times, academicians, students and the general public. The analysis of data must be cohesive for all to understand. He/She must work extremely well under deadline pressure and not be afraid to work long hours, when necessary. There are times when weekend work is involved, especially during presidential election years.

Would be a plus for the candidate to have knowledge of SPSS and other
software packages (such as Excel, Access, Quark, Microsoft Word). This person would learn the Times Poll's own data and analysis package.

Must have at least a bachelor's degree.

All interested persons should send their resume to Susan Pinkus, Director of the Los Angeles Times Poll, Los Angeles Times, Times Mirror Square, L.A., California 90053, or fax resume to 213-237-2505, or e-mail spinkus@aol.com. No phone calls, please.
There is a new service for email list management that automates the subscription and unsubscribe function called Topica (http://www.topica.com). It has a handy little search function which turns up (among 6 other) the following when you search for public opinion.

>aapornet
>Nickname:aapornet
>Purpose: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR (American Association for Public Opinion Research).
>Owner: Owner
>To Join: Subscribe here
>Categories:
>   Humanities | Social Science | Demography

I haven't tried signing up for AAPORnet using their forms but I suspect that our listserv address might get a little but busier. It is possible to edit your list entry (or to remove it) so the listowner might want to pay them a visit.
For anyone who needs a good example of the outcomes of self-selected polling samples.
Recently the Modern Library published a list of the "100 best
English-language novels of the 20th century". Along with this list, based
on
"expert opinion," a poll of readers was conducted. The two lists are
displayed side-by-side on the Web. I do not know where, nor how, the reader
poll was conducted. According to the Web site I found
(www.randomhouse.com),
"The readers' poll for the best novels published in the English language
since 1900 opened on July 20, 1998 and closed on October 20, 1998, with
217,520 votes cast."

Strangely enough, of the ten such novels with the most votes from this
sample
of readers, four were authored by Ayn Rand and three by L. Ron Hubbard (the
founder of Scientology nee Dianetics). Who'd ever of thunk it? Needless to
say, this was quite at variance from the expert opinion list.

On the other hand, collecting data from a valid probability sample of
"American readers of novels" would pose some interesting conceptual and
methodological challenges. (And probably, considerably more expense than the
results would be worth to the sponsor.)

Ray Funkhouser

>From hse@elwaypoll.com Thu Jun 10 07:55:19 1999
AAPOR-ishmenters,

---

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

AAPOR-ishmenters,
Can anyone refer me to recent surveys on Affirmative Action -- either national or state? I have some from 1997: Gallup Polls, Public Agenda material on race relations, and a study by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.

Have you seen or done anything on this topic?

Thank you for any guidance.

Stuart Elway
The Elway Poll
Seattle WA
206/ 264-1500
We have been asked to develop items asking personnel about their leadership. Can anyone provide me with a lead to items covering the following types of attributes, for which at least some comparable data has been published. Note that we do not have time to arrange to use copyrighted items. Please
respond to me and I will post a summary of responses to the list.

The current draft of the items includes ratings of 3 levels of supervision (immediate supervisor, middle management, most senior leaders). On a 5-point scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," personnel are asked to rate the leaders at each level on:

Leaders at this level
... work hard to create an environment of trust and teamwork. ... inspire me to do the best job I can. ... are doing all they can to improve the quality of life available to employees and their families.
... treat employees fairly and equitably.
... provide complete, accurate, and reliable information.
... meet standards for character and ethical behavior.
... place high priority on maintaining a quality organization.

Timothy Elig
Defense Manpower Data Center
703.696.5858

>From jwerner@jwp.com Thu Jun 10 09:47:23 1999
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id JAA29615 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Jun 1999 09:47:17 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from jwp.com (plp58.vgernet.net [205.219.186.158])
   by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id MAA06596
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Jun 1999 12:54:29 -0400 (EDT)
Ray, you should know better!

This is the Arianna Huffington approach to analysis: pick a particularly egregious example, pretend that it is representative of whatever you want to beat up on, and run with it for all it's worth.

One can come up with dozens of examples of this kind of nonsense, but one can also cite many cases in social research where self-selected samples are properly used to obtain information not otherwise available.

And the results are not that strange, even if we don't know how many actual voters cast those 217,520 votes. I suspect (sadly), that a rigorous study of the reading preferences of the U.S. population would show a lot more support for Rand or Hubbard than for Joyce, Faulkner or Hemingway.

Jan Werner
RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

> For anyone who needs a good example of the outcomes of self-selected polling samples.

> Recently the Modern Library published a list of the "100 best English-language novels of the 20th century". Along with this list, based on "expert opinion," a poll of readers was conducted. The two lists are displayed side-by-side on the Web. I do not know where, nor how, the reader poll was conducted. According to the Web site I found (www.randomhouse.com), "The readers' poll for the best novels published in the English language since 1900 opened on July 20, 1998 and closed on October 20, 1998, with 217,520 votes cast."

> Strangely enough, of the ten such novels with the most votes from this sample of readers, four were authored by Ayn Rand and three by L. Ron Hubbard (the founder of Scientology nee Dianetics). Who'd ever of thunk it? Needless to say, this was quite at variance from the expert opinion list.

> On the other hand, collecting data from a valid probability sample of "American readers of novels" would pose some interesting conceptual and methodological challenges. (And probably, considerably more expense than the results would be worth to the sponsor.)

> Ray Funkhouser
Good morning colleagues,

What do you find is the most reliable and valid question wording for asking about income in a CATI interview? Do you have or know of any wording that works especially well for low income populations? Thanks in advance for your suggestions.

Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.
Research Services Manager
Communication Sciences Group/
Dear Stuart (and anyone else interested in obtaining survey data on any of a hundred or so subjects from a multitude of different sources going back 64 years and up to the present):

The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research is the largest archive of
polling data in the known universe. We are a non-profit, non-partisan organization at the University of Connecticut; and, although we don't give the stuff away for free, we think we're quite a bargain considering what we can provide.

I imagine I'm breaking some rule of internet etiquette with this shameless plug, but I thought y'all would like to know we're out here.
I'll be happy to assist Stuart or anyone else who'd like to contact our User Services department.

Best wishes,

Lisa Ferraro Parmelee, Ph.D.
Senior Research Analyst
The Roper Center

www.ropercenter.uconn.edu

(860)486-4440

At 07:53 AM 6/10/99 -0700, you wrote:

>>>>>
AAPOR-ishioners,

Can anyone refer me to recent surveys on Affirmative Action -- either national or state? I have some from 1997: Gallup Polls, Public Agenda material on race relations, and a study by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies. Have you seen or done anything on this topic? Thank you for any guidance.

Stuart Elway
The Elway Poll
Seattle WA
206/264-1500

From KTedin@UH.EDU Thu Jun 10 11:16:19 1999
Received: from Post-Office.UH.EDU (pmdf@NS3.UH.EDU [129.7.1.20]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA28777 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Jun 1999 11:16:02 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 13:10:08 -0500
From: Kent Tedin <KTedin@UH.EDU>
Subject: College Students Opinion
Does anyone know of a study more recent than 1995 which shows the political ideology (liberal - middle of the road - conservative) for a nationally representative sample of college students. I would like to update Table 5.5 in Erikson/Tedin, American Public Opinion with something more recent. I am, of course, aware of the Freshman data collected by the Institute for Higher Education at UCLA. But I would like data for Freshman through seniors. Many thanks. KTEDIN@UH.EDU
Kent, the same organization (Higher Education Research Institute) also surveys currently enrolled students and includes the same question on political ideology that they ask freshmen. The problem is relatively few schools participate in these surveys (at least compared to the freshman survey), so I’m not sure the results are a "nationally representative sample" of college students. But you might want to give them a call.

Kent Tedin wrote:

> Does anyone know of a study more recent than 1995 which shows the political ideology (liberal - middle of the road - conservative) for a nationally representative sample of college students. I would like to update Table 5.5 in Erikson/Tedin, American Public Opinion with something more recent. I am, of course, aware of the Freshman data collected by the Institute for Higher Education at UCLA. But I would like data for Freshman through seniors. Many thanks. KTEDIN@UH.EDU
begin: vcard
fn: Linda Suskie
n: Suskie; Linda
org: Millersville University
adr:dom: P.O. Box 1002; Millersville; PA; 17551;
email; internet: lsuskie@marauder.millersv.edu
title: Assistant to the President for Special Projects
tel; work: 717.872.3598
tel; fax: 717.872.3968
x-mozilla-cpt: ;1
x-mozilla-html: TRUE
version: 2.1
end: vcard

>From Mark@bisconti.com Thu Jun 10 11:33:37 1999
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA06403 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Jun 1999 11:33:31 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org (Content
The Roper Center provides a wonderful service in helping to identify secondary data. I've always found them very helpful. I encourage everyone to contribute their data to Roper Center on a regular basis so it is archived for historical analysis and can be used by those who work to synthesize data, understand the big picture.

On a related subject: Michael Traugott presented a paper entitled "The Invocation of Public Opinion in Congress" showing, as I recall, that in Congress, polling data is most frequently invoked by interest groups in hearings. I expect this because opinion data is one way to show public support (to those who claim to represent the public) for particular policy options. As you would expect, each interest group highlights data that support their views. Rarely have I seen data synthesized and put in
perspective. More often, select data from different groups comes across as competing or contradictory to those not trained to analyze it, and they say "well, it all depends on who pays to ask the questions or = what you ask," meaning you can find anything you want in "public = opinion," which (the Clinton impeachment showed...) is obviously not = quite accurate.

When Rosita Thomas worked for the Congressional Research Service (CRS), she synthesized everyone's data into topical reports (depending on what = was hot on the Hill). It was a great service, but I don't think CRS = does it any more. What other groups regularly take secondary data and = COMPREHENSIVELY report it all (without censoring the parts they don't = agree with) in non-academic/technical language that Hill staffers, etc. = will read? Mark Richards

-->
From rhickson@monmouth.com Thu Jun 10 18:13:27 1999
Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id SAA25046 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Jun 1999 18:13:22 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from rachel (r-ppp21.monmouth.com [209.191.24.53])
    by shell.monmouth.com (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id VAA24629
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Jun 1999 21:12:11 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <376063E1.1DCA@monmouth.com>
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 21:18:25 -0400
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
We are currently doing a large series of surveys for an evaluation of welfare reform in New Jersey (very low income population). I won't tell you what we're using, because I don't think it's working well! But I would recommend asking about monthly income only, not about annual income. It's our summative question on annual income that some respondents find very difficult.

Rachel Hickson
Here's what we have been using for a long time and it works very well for our varied purposes. The first item (d22, below) tries to get a discrete income number from the respondent. Item nonresponse is in the 20%-30% range to this. The followup (d22c) gets categorical data from the nonresponders to the first item, and about half who didn't answer the first answer the second. You can use the data from the second item to impute an answer to their first from the nonresponders and you can use the data from the first to create categorical data in the second for all who answered.

This is in CASES syntax:

Note. The d22a and d22b variables get the interviewer to verify the s/he meant to enter a very low or very high income to d22.

```cases
> d22<[$][define <r> <8888888>][define <u> <9999999>][bold]

Approximately what was your total household income from all sources, before taxes for 1998?

# OF TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME <0-8888887>

<r> REFUSED  [goto d22c]```
<u> UNCERTAIN  [goto d22c]

===>

>d22a<
[if d22 le <1000>]
[goto d22b]
[else]
[if d22 ge <500001> and d22 lt <8888888>]
[goto d22b]
[else]
[goto d23]
[endif][endif]

>d22b<[indirect]
[yellow]INTERVIEWER:  DO NOT READ THIS TO RESPONDENT.[n]  [bold]YOU HAVE ENTERED $[fill d22:] AS THE ANSWER TO THE LAST QUESTION.  IS THIS THE ANSWER YOU MEANT TO ENTER?

<1> YES[goto d23]
<2> NO [goto d22]

===>

>d22c<[bold]
Well, then, would you please tell me if it was...

[cyan](CONTINUE ON LADDER UNTIL "NO")[n][bold]
At 10:11 AM 6/10/99 -0700, you wrote:

>Good morning colleagues,

>What do you find is the most reliable and valid question wording for
>asking about income in a CATI interview? Do you have or know of any
>wording that works especially well for low income populations? Thanks
>in advance for your suggestions.

>

>Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.

>Research Services Manager

>Communication Sciences Group/

>Survey Methods Group
>140 Second Street, Suite 400
>San Francisco, CA 94105
>(415) 495-6692 ext. 269
>kathrync@socialresearch.com
>
>*

************* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *************

************* Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy & Management *************

************* Director, OSU Center for Survey Research *************

************* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences; Derby Hall, Room 3045 *************

************* 154 North Oval Mall, Ohio State University; Columbus OH 43210 *************

************* Voice: (614)-292-6672  Fax: (614)-292-6673  E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu *************

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

>From hochschi@wws.princeton.edu Fri Jun 11 08:12:41 1999

Received: from Princeton.EDU (outbound2.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA07567 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Jun 1999 08:12:39 -0700
The most recent compendium is in POQ a couple of years ago, the "Poll Trends" section, by Steeh and Krysan. Larry Bobo may have more recent data. Also cf. 1998 GSS. best, JH
AAPOR-ishioners,

Can anyone refer me to recent surveys on Affirmative Action -- either national or state? I have some from 1997: Gallup Polls, Public Agenda material on race relations, and a study by the Joint C

Have you seen or done anything on this topic? Thank you for any guidance. Stuart Elway

The Elway Poll
Seattle WA
206/ 264-1500

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

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

-----------------------------
On Fri, 11 Jun 1999, Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. wrote:

> Here's what we have been using for a long time and it works very well
> for our varied purposes. The first item (d22, below) trys to get a
> discrete income number from the respondent. Item nonresponse is in
> the 20%-30% range to this. The followup (d22c) gets categorical data
> from the nonresponders to the first item, and about half who didn't
> answer the first answer the second. You can use the data from the
> second item to impute an answer to ther first from the nonrespondenrs
> and you can use the data from the first to create categorical data in
> the second for all who answered.
>
> This is in CASES syntax:
>
> Note. The d22a and d22b variables get the interviewee to verify the
> s/he meant to enter a very low or very high income to d22.
>
> Approximately what was your total household income from all sources,
> before taxes for 1998?
>
> # OF TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME <0-8888887>
>
> <r> REFUSED     [goto d22c]
>
> <u> UNCERTAIN   [goto d22c]
>
> ===>

> >d22<a
> >[if d22 le <1000>]
> >[goto d22b]
> >[else]
> >[if d22 ge <500001> and d22 lt <8888888>]
> >[goto d22b]
> [else]
> [goto d23]
> [endif][endif]
>
> >d22b<[indirect]
> [yellow]INTERVIEWER: DO NOT READ THIS TO RESPONDENT.[n] [bold]YOU
> HAVE ENTERED $(fill d22;,) AS THE ANSWER TO THE LAST QUESTION. IS
> THIS THE ANSWER YOU MEANT TO ENTER?
>
> > <1> YES[goto d23]
> > <2> NO [goto d22]
> >
> ==>>
>
> >d22c<[bold]
> Well, then, would you please tell me if it was...
>
> > [cyan](CONTINUE ON LADDER UNTIL "NO")[n][bold]
> >
> > <0> more than $10,000? NO
> > <1> more than $20,000? NO
> > <2> more than $30,000? NO
> > <3> more than $40,000? NO
> > <4> more than $50,000? NO
> > <5> more than $60,000? NO
> > <6> more than $75,000? NO
> > <7> more than $100,000? NO
> > <8> more than $150,000? NO
> > <9> MORE THAN $150,000? YES
At 10:11 AM 6/10/99 -0700, you wrote:

> Good morning colleagues,
> What do you find is the most reliable and valid question wording for
> asking about income in a CATI interview? Do you have or know of any
> wording that works especially well for low income populations?
> Thanks in advance for your suggestions.
>
> Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.
> Research Services Manager
> Communication Sciences Group/
> Survey Methods Group
> 140 Second Street, Suite 400
> San Francisco, CA 94105
> (415) 495-6692 ext. 269
> kathrync@socialresearch.com

> Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.

* * *
I think Paul's approach is the right way to go, with a few minor exceptions. I've asked the categorical question first. More on that later. I've also started in the expected middle of the income distribution and worked up--"more than . . ."-- and down --"less than" --. This approach presents interviewers and respondents with fewer categories to deal with and should be programmable in current CATI systems. If you use two "middles" there still fewer categories are presented, and imputation should become somewhat more precise. After asking the categorical question, I would then ask: "Could you tell me to the nearest thousand?", or something like that. If I've done the arithmetic right, Paul's approach seems to have 10 to 15 percent nonresponse remaining. I still have marginals for some of my data, and in two nonindependent samples, the final nonresponse was 5 or 6 percent. All of the second was done by student interviewers, and the vast majority of
the first was done by professional interviewers. Of course, my data are ancient. Has anyone done research on categorical first vs. open first?

Joe Spaeth
spaeth@stat.orst.edu

>From mb@mori-usa.com Mon Jun 14 05:46:14 1999
Received: from dfw-ix3.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix3.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.3])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id FAA16668 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Jun 1999 05:46:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from smap@localhost)
    by dfw-ix3.ix.netcom.com (8.8.4/8.8.4)
    id HAA21215; Mon, 14 Jun 1999 07:45:34 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from pen-nj1-13.ix.netcom.com(205.184.179.45) by
dfw-ix3.ix.netcom.com via smap (V1.3)
    id rma021202; Mon Jun 14 07:45:07 1999
Message-ID: <004801beb663$f3f21a20$2db3b8cd@mbasanez.ix.netcom.com>
Reply-To: "Miguel Basanez" <mb@mori-usa.com>
From: "Miguel Basanez" <mb@mori-usa.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>, "Wapornet"
<wapornet@listserv.oit.unc.edu>
Subject: WAPOR in Paris - Hotel reservations
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 08:44:46 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="-----=_NextPart_000_0045_01BEB642.6CE07A20"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
Dear Colleagues,

WAPOR has pre-booked additional rooms for the Conference in Paris due to the high demand for the Conference. We regret if you were not able to find accommodation at the LUCIEN HOTEL, the Conference site. The additional pre-bookings have been made for the nights of Friday September 3 and Saturday September 4, 1999. The price range is from FF485 to FF1350. Make your own arrangements before July 10.

Reservation reference: Wapor conference

General conditions: Deadline-date for booking: July 10, 1999 / Beyond that date, only the bookings guaranteed through a credit-card will be maintained. Any further booking will be made according to availability / Cancellation: Between 48 and 7 days prior to date of arrival, the expenses of one night will be invoiced to the client / If cancellation is made less than 7 days to day of arrival or in case the client doesn’t show up at all, the total amount of the stay will be charged to the client.
HOTEL MERIDIEN ETOILE ****
81, Boulevard Gouvion Saint Cyr
75017 PARIS
Tel : + 33 (0) 1.40.68.34.34 / Fax : + 33 (0) 1.40.68.31.31 Price (without breakfast): 1.350 FF per night for a single or a double = room=20

HOTEL MERIDIEN MONTPARNAinnie ****
9, Rue du Commandant Mouchotte
75014 PARIS
Tel : + 33 (0) 1.44.36.44.36 / Fax : + 33 (0) 1.44.36.47.00 Price (without breakfast): 1.350 FF per night for a single or a double = room=20

HOTEL AROTEL***
74, Boulevard Edgar Quinet
75014 PARIS
Tel : + 33 (0) 1.43.35.46.66 / Fax : + 33 (0) 1.42.79.03.64 Price (without breakfast): Single room: 485 FF per room / Double room: = 524 FF per room=20

HOTEL GOLDEN TULIP CAYRE ****
4, Boulevard Raspail
75007 PARIS
Tel : 33 (0) 1.45.44.38.88 / Fax : + 33 (0) 1.45.44.98.13 / E-mail : =
cayre@copatel.com Price (breakfast included): Single room  1.250 FF per night / Double = room 1.350 FF per night=20

ATTENTION : IF YOU WISH TO BOOK AT THE GOLDEN TULIP CAYRE=20 HOTEL, PLEASE PRINT AND RETURN THE FILLED OUT FORM BELOW.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
= AB WAPOR Conference =
From September 3 to September 5 1999

GOLDEN TULIP CAYRE ****
04, Boulevard Raspail
75007 PARIS
Tel : + 33 (0) 1.45.44.38.88 / Fax : + 33 (0) 1.45.44.98.13

Stay from the ............to the ..........of September 1999

Name : =
...........................................................................................................

............

Type of rooms : Single / Double / Twin=20

Preferential price : Single room 1.250 FF / Double or twin-bed room = 1.350 FF
These are net prices per room and per night. VAT, Continental buffet breakfast, tax and service included.

Booking conditions :
In order to guarantee your reservation, please indicate details of your =
credit card :=20

Credit Card : =
...........................................................................................................

.........Exp. : ......./.........
Cancellations:

No penalties will be charged if the cancellation is made 48 hours prior to date of arrival. Beyond that deadline, one night will be charged to the customer.

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

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>
<META content=3D"text/html;charset=3Diso-8859-1" http-equiv=3D"Content-Type"><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">
<META content=3D"" name=3D"GENERATOR"> </HEAD> <BODY bgColor=3D"#ffffff">
  Dear Colleagues,
  WAPOR has pre-booked additional rooms for the Conference in Paris due to the high demand for the Conference. We regret if you were not able to find accommodation at the LUCIEN HOTEL, the Conference site. The additional pre-bookings have been made for the nights of Friday September 3 and Saturday September 4, 1999. The price range is from FF485 to FF1350. Make your own arrangements before July 10.
</DIV>
Reservation reference: Wapor conference

General conditions: Deadline-date for booking: July 10, 1999 / Beyond that date, only the bookings guaranteed through a credit-card will be maintained. Any further booking will be made according to availability / Cancellation: Between 48 and 7 days prior to date of arrival, the expenses of one night will be invoiced to the client / If cancellation is made less than 7 days to day of arrival or in case the client doesn't show up at all, the total amount will be charged to the client.

HOTEL MERIDIEN ETOILE ****
81, Boulevard Gouvion Saint = Cyr
75017 PARIS
Tel: + 33 (0) 1.40.68.34.34 / Fax: + 33 (0) 1.40.68.31.31
Price (without breakfast): 1.350 FF per night for a single or a double room

HOTEL MERIDIEN MONTPARNASSE ****
9, Rue du Commandant = Mouchotte
75014 PARIS
Tel: + 33 (0) 1.44.36.44.36 / Fax: + 33 (0) 1.44.36.47.00
Price (without breakfast): 1.350 FF per night for a single or a double room

HOTEL AROTEL***
74, Boulevard Edgar Quinet
75014 PARIS
Tel: + 33 (0) 1.43.35.46.66 / Fax: + 33 (0) 1.42.79.03.64
Price (without breakfast): Single room: 485 FF per room / Double room: 524 FF per room

HOTEL GOLDEN TULIP CAYRE ****
4, Boulevard Raspail
75007 PARIS
Tel: + 33 (0) 1.45.44.38.88 / Fax: + 33 (0) 1.45.44.98.13 / E-mail: cayre@copatel.com
Price (breakfast included): Single room: 1.250 FF per night / Double room: 1.350 FF per night

ATTENTION: IF YOU WISH TO BOOK AT THE GOLDEN TULIP CAYRE, PLEASE PRINT AND RETURN THE FILLED
WAPOR Conference
From September 3 to September 5 1999
GOLDEN TULIP CAYRE ****
04, Boulevard Raspail
75007 PARIS
Tel : + 33 (0) 1.45.44.38.88 / Fax : + 33 (0) 20 1.45.44.98.13

Stay from the ............to the ..........of September 1999

Name :

Type of rooms : Single / Double / Twin

Preferential price : Single room 1.250 FF / Double or twin-bed room= 1.350 FF
These are net prices per room and per night.

VAT, Continental buffet breakfast, tax and service included.

Booking conditions:

In order to guarantee your = reservation, please indicate details of your credit card:

Credit Card :

Name :

Signature :

Exp. :
Cancellations: No penalties will be charged if the cancellation is made 48 hours prior to date of arrival. Beyond that deadline, one night will be charged to the customer.
I am looking for information regarding how other organizations structure pay scales for telephone interviewers. Specifically, are interviewers who are fluent in a second language, particularly Spanish, compensated differently and by how much?

Anyone who is willing to share this information please contact me privately at roger.richardson@latimes.com

Thanks,

Roger Richardson
Los Angeles Times Poll

>From Smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com Mon Jun 14 17:05:11 1999
Received: from relay3.smtp.psi.net (relay3.smtp.psi.net [38.8.210.2])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id RAA17406 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Jun 1999 17:05:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [38.176.63.7] (helo=mail.icrsurvey.com)
  by relay3.smtp.psi.net with smtp (Exim 1.90 #1)
  for aapornet@usc.edu
  id 10tgj7-0005KN-00; Mon, 14 Jun 1999 20:05:17 -0400
Received: from media#u#dom-Message_Server by mail.icrsurvey.com
  with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 14 Jun 1999 20:10:30 -0400
Message-Id: <s76561b6.061@mail.icrsurvey.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 20:09:55 -0400
From: "Steve McFadden" <Smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com>
Sender: Postmaster@mail.icrsurvey.com
Reply-To: Smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com
I will be out of the office until 6/177, if you need immediate attention =
please contact Jennifer Roach at Jroach@mail.icrsurvey.com.
Elig, Tim W.,"DMDCEAST wrote:

> We have been asked to develop items asking personnel about their leadership. Can anyone provide me with a lead to items covering the following types of attributes, for which at least some comparable data has been published. Note that we do not have time to arrange to use copyrighted items. Please respond to me and I will post a summary of responses to the list.

> The current draft of the items includes ratings of 3 levels of supervision (immediate supervisor, middle management, most senior leaders). On a 5-point scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," personnel are asked to rate the leaders at each level on:

> Leaders at this level
> ... work hard to create an environment of trust and teamwork. ...
> ... inspire me to do the best job I can. ... are doing all they can to improve the quality of life available to employees and their families.
> ... treat employees fairly and equitably.
> ... provide complete, accurate, and reliable information.
> ... meet standards for character and ethical behavior.
> ... place high priority on maintaining a quality organization.

> Timothy Elig
> Defense Manpower Data Center
What should seem simple and straightforward is often not. Could it be that whether you ask about yearly vs monthly vs weekly income depends largely on the population you are addressing? Professional and corporate types, for example, typically think in terms of their yearly income whereas lower paid
personnel probably think in terms of monthly or weekly income. I suspect that some even think primarily in terms of hourly income. Ask an executive or a professional (even professors) about his monthly pay and my guess is that most would have to do a quick computation.....whereas others would have to do a reverse computation to get their yearly income. In all the years I was involved with global research for Coke we never had a problem...but maybe times have changed.

Dick Halpern

---

What should seem simple and straightforward is often not. Could it be that whether you ask about yearly vs monthly vs weekly income depends largely on the population you are addressing? Professional and corporate types, for example, typically think in terms of their yearly income whereas lower paid personnel probably think in terms of monthly or weekly income. I suspect that some even think primarily in terms of hourly income. Ask an executive or a professional (even professors) about his monthly pay and my guess is that most would have to do a quick computation.....whereas others would have to do a reverse computation to get their yearly income.&nbsp; In all the years I was involved with global research for Coke we never had a problem...but maybe times have changed.&lt;br&gt; &lt;br&gt; Dick Halpern&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/html&gt;

---

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Tue Jun 15 04:12:40 1999

Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu
As of 1996, at the Northwestern U. survey unit, we were starting regular interviewers at $8.50 per hour and starting those who did interviews in Spanish $10.50/hr. We never used the same bilingual interviewers to interview in both English and Spanish. They were trained to specialize in one language or the other on a survey.

We do not have experience/need for Spanish language interviewing here at OSU, at least so far. Thus I only have my NU experiences to report.
At 05:00 PM 6/14/99 -0700, you wrote:

>I am looking for information regarding how other organizations structure pay scales for telephone interviewers. Specifically, are interviewers who are fluent in a second language, particularly Spanish, compensated differently and by how much?

>Anyone who is willing to share this information please contact me privately at roger.richardson@latimes.com

>Thanks,

>Roger Richardson

>Los Angeles Times Poll

>Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
* Professor of Journalism & Communication
* Professor of Public Policy & Management
* Director, Center for Survey Research
* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University
* Derby Hall [Room 3045], 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210
* Voice: 614-292-3468 Fax: 614-292-6673 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu

>From featherstonf.rced@gao.gov Tue Jun 15 06:26:24 1999
This message is for those of you interested in the next chapter of the debacle at General Electric, where respondents were secretly tracked via a code in the return envelope. The Washington Post had a second article saying that the president of GE issued an apology for the episode via e-mail to all employees. He
reiterated that all employee surveys are anonymous and confidential. I guess he meant that was the policy and not the practice.

(fran)

Fran Featherston
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC 20548
E-mail: FEATHERSTONF.RCED@GAO.GOV
Phone: 202.512.4946

>From abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu Tue Jun 15 13:33:56 1999
Received: from cicero.src.uchicago.edu (cicero.src.uchicago.edu [128.135.232.3])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA24393 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Jun 1999 13:33:55 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from nittany.uchicago.edu (nittany.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.8])
   by cicero.src.uchicago.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id PAA00637
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Jun 1999 15:33:55 -0500 (CDT)
Received: (from abcgss1@localhost)
   by nittany.uchicago.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) id PAA06697
   for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 15 Jun 1999 15:33:54 -0500 (CDT)
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 15:33:54 -0500 (CDT)
From: "Tom_W. Smith" <abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu>
Message-Id: <19990615152033.PAA06697@nittany.uchicago.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu

Please reply to Dr. Chen, I'm only posting it for him.
Tom W. Smith

Dear Colleagues,

With the encouragement of Dr. John Eltinge, ASA-SRMS Program Chair-Elect, I am in the process of putting together a possible invited paper session on infrequent items in survey research for the Survey Research Methods Section of the 2000 Joint Statistical Meetings, to be held August 13-17, 2000 in Indianapolis, Indiana. I am very much interested in the issue, but now few experts in the field. I wonder if anyone would be interested in sharing his/her data and experience with us in the meeting, or know anyone who may have such data and be interested in presenting a paper or be a discussant in the JSM, please drop me a note with his/her name and email address or affiliation. Thank you very much for your early attention!

Tentative Title of the Session:
"Infrequent Items and Validity of Individual Questionnaires"

Abstract of the Session:

With more and more survey research being conducted in modern society, some of the survey respondents tend to develop negative or careless attitudes toward the surveyors or questionnaire itself. Researchers have developed some infrequent items addressing faking bad response tendencies so as to increase the validity of the survey. However, as an interdisciplinary field, we do not have enough documentation on how well these infrequent items work, what are the marginal distribution of these different items for different populations, whether and how the exclusion of the infrequent-item answerers will affect the representativeness of the sample, when we should exclude the case(s) with positive response to the infrequent items and when
we may keep them, what are the relations between response to the infrequent items and the reliability and validity of the survey, how we can develop some more effective tools to detect the careless respondents in future survey research. This special session will try to address these issues with empirical data, constructive ideas, and/or statistical methods.

Contact Information:

Kevin Chen, Ph.D. MPH
Department of Psychiatry
UMDNJ -- New Jersey Medical School
30 Bergen Street, ADMC 1419
Newark, NJ 07107
Tel: 973-972-7225
Fax: 973-972-8305
Email: chenke@umdnj.edu
AAPORNETters,

Do we glimpse here the future nature of scientific research and publishing, a misguided application of flashy new technologies, a useful tool with only modest applications, or what?

-- Jim

******

IVORY-TOWER OPEN SOURCE

Two Illinois scholars have created software that may open the door to online academic collaboration and debate. The software allows authors to post their papers to solicit outside reviews. Readers' suggestions will be displayed in pop-up windows within the paper's text, allowing authors to obtain feedback and other reviewers to read previously posted commentary. The texts and suggestions are stored on a server and edited using FileMaker Pro, which can be downloaded on the project Internet site. The software may change the publication of a text from a solitary event to a means of
interaction, facilitating interaction among academics that once was only present within published journals and scattered Internet bulletin boards. Co-creator Jim Levin, an educational psychology professor at the University of Illinois, sees the new interactive software as a method to raise new questions immediately, thus speeding the debate.

(Wired News 06/14/99)

News abstracts Copyright 1999, Information Inc., Bethesda, MD; Edupage Copyright 1999, EDUCAUSE, an international nonprofit association dedicated to transforming education through information technologies.
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Ivory-Tower Open Source
by Joe Ashbrook Nickell

Two researchers in Illinois have developed software that could bring the traditional method of scholarly peer review out of its ivory tower and down to earth with open source collaboration.

The Interactive Paper Project allows authors to post drafts of their writings -- from term papers to articles destined for publication in scholarly journals -- online. Readers can annotate suggested changes and their comments will appear online as pop-up windows within the paper's text.

"We see this as a way of opening up the writing process," said James Buell, a Ph.D. student in educational psychology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and co-creator of the project.
"Right now, reviewers look at papers in isolation and then an editor synthesizes the ideas put forward by the reviewers and the author into one text," said co-creator Jim Levin, an educational psychology professor at the University of Illinois. "A tool like this would help reviewers collaborate, expand on each other's points, [and] change their minds in a much more efficient and open way."

The texts and comments are stored on a server and edited using FileMaker Pro. Late last month, Buell and Levin placed a downloadable version of the FileMaker templates on the project Web site, allowing anyone to test their work -- and suggest changes.

According to one early user, the Interactive Paper Project offers a means to turn scattered discussions that once resided on Web bulletin boards or email lists into a coherent dialogue.

"The software is very simple, yet powerful," said Mark Gillingham, educational technology consultant for Gillingham hopes to use the software to facilitate online literary discussions among children, and believes that the software will both empower individual readers and help them work together.

"Unlike paper versions of text markup, many readers may comment with the knowledge of what others have already said," said Gillingham.

"This project really turns the notion of a publication away from a one-time dissemination and toward making the publication itself a medium of interaction," said Nicholas C. Burbules, a professor in the University of
Illinois’ Department of Educational Policy Studies and the editor of three scholarly journals.

Burbules has used the Interactive Paper Project software to foster discussion of policy and curriculum within his department, and hopes to use it as a means for readers to comment on articles in Education Review, an online journal he co-edits.

But Burbules believes that the software brings up difficult questions.

"The idea that there's a paper that gets published and finalized is the way that editors and publishers traditionally define their value," said Burbules.

"A process like this doesn't clearly need an intermediary like an editor. It's an interaction between author and reader directly. Thus it raises questions about the role of these intermediaries [who guide] readers through the mass of work available, acting as a filter."

Furthermore, Burbules noted, collaboration of this sort raises authorship issues.

"If a paper is never finished or finalized, what does it mean to be copyrighted? If the author only wrote 1 percent of the total body of the paper, who owns that?" he wonders.

For now, the Interactive Paper Project's creators believe that such concerns needn't stand in the way of testing the approach.
"Oftentimes you see debates in scholarly journals that are stretched out over years, where one paper appears in publication, and then three months later a paper in response, then another response, and so on," said Levin. "This could allow that discussion to occur instantaneously, and thus speed up the development of ideas."

Have a comment on this article? Send it.
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If Hemingway had had a tool like that, he might have been persuaded to use more commas. And some synonyms for "said." Thomas Wolfe would have been convinced to write shorter. Thomas Paine could have kept revising until The Crisis was over. And there would be an electronic trail showing who really wrote Shakespeare's plays.
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I’m passing along the following announcement at the request of Monroe Sirken, from the National Center for Health Statistics.
Paul Beatty
pbeatty@umich.edu

> Two Publications of the CASM II Seminar
>
> In June 1997, the National Center for Health Statistics and the National Science Foundation, with support of several Federal statistical agencies, sponsored the Second Advanced Research Seminar on the Cognitive Aspects of Survey Methodology (CASM II Seminar). The CASM II Seminar was attended by about 50 outstanding researchers and survey methodologists representing a broad range of scientific disciplines. The Seminar assessed the contributions of the CASM movement since its inception at the CASM I Seminar in June 1984 and sketched a roadmap for fostering interdisciplinary survey methods research into the twenty-first century. This is an announcement of the availability of two CASM II Seminar publications.

> A New Agenda for Interdisciplinary Survey Research Methods: Proceedings of the CASM II Seminar, edited by Monroe Sirken, Thomas Jabine, Gordon Willis, Elizabeth Martin, and Clyde Tucker was published March 1999 by the National Center of Health Statistics (NCHS). It is accessible in its entirety at the NCHS Web site
This publication summarizes the history of the CASM movement and reviews current needs and proposes future directions for interdisciplinary survey methods research. Its highlights include eight working group reports outlining research agendas that address critically important survey issues, abstracts of articles that were presented at 4 plenary sessions as well as rapporteur comments, and an edited transcript of oral history interviews with 17 pioneers of the CASM movement.

A New Agenda for Interdisciplinary Survey Research: Proceedings of the CASM II Seminar. 136 pp. 811 KB (This report can be viewed only with Adobe Acrobat 3.0.)

Cognition and Survey Research, edited by Monroe Sirken, Douglas Herrmann, Susan Schechter, Norbert Schwartz, Judith Tanur, and Roger Tourangeau was published in April 1999 by John Wiley and Sons (ISBN 0-471-24138-5) in its Probability and Statistics Series, Survey Methodology Section. This publication contains the
>22 articles that were commissioned for the CASM II Seminar. Leading survey researchers, cognitive psychologists, and other scientists from around the globe critically review the impact of CASM research since 1984 and discuss the important roles of computer science, statistics, and other scientific disciplines in a rapidly evolving field of interdisciplinary survey methods research.

>From dobson@usia.gov Thu Jun 17 08:39:42 1999
Received: from xgate.usia.gov (firewall-user@XGATE.USIA.GOV [198.67.64.2])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
   id IAA07157 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Jun 1999 08:39:40 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from Connect2 Message Router by xgate.usia.gov via Connect2-SMTP 4.34B; Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:47:35 -0400
Message-ID: <F258764701BD11C0@xgate.usia.gov>
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:33:09 -0400
From: "Dobson, Richard" <dobson@usia.gov>
Sender: "Dobson, Richard" <dobson@usia.gov>
To: aapornet@usc.edu (aapornet)
Cc: llach@usia.gov ("Llach, Nancy"), gombert@usia.gov ("Gombert, Dennis")
Subject: Job Opening: Latin America Opinion Research
X-SMF-Hop-Count: 2
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Connect2-SMTP 4.34B MHS/SMF to SMTP Gateway
UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY
MERIT PROMOTION VACANCY ANNOUNCEMENT

Announcement No.   HRC- 139-99
Opening Date:    06/17/99
Closing Date: 07/09/99

FIRST CONSIDERATION WILL BE GIVEN TO WELL-QUALIFIED DISPLACED APPLICANTS IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C. AREA

APPLICANTS SHOULD BE AMERICAN CITIZENS

POSITION TITLE, SERIES AND GRADE: Social Science Analyst, GS-101-9/11/12
Potential GS-13

SALARY RANGE:  $33,650 - $63,436

LOCATION:  R/AA - Office of Research, East Asia/Pacific/American Republics Branch

AREA OF CONSIDERATION:  All Qualified Applicants (USIA, State, status and non-status)
DUTIES: The incumbent initiates, plans and oversees public opinion research studies and analyzes relationships between public opinion and political, economic and social issues in Latin America and Asia (as Office work load requires). The work includes (1) keeping up with activities and developments in Latin America; (2) planning, writing questionnaires and overseeing public opinion surveys; and (3) reporting results from such polls and others acquired in the region by writing clear, concise, interpretative reports and memoranda for top level officials in the USG foreign policy community.

SCREEN OUT FACTOR (Attach a narrative statement addressing this factor).

Demonstrated experience in public opinion polling and analysis.

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS:

A. Degree: behavioral or social science; or related disciplines appropriate to the position.

B. Combination of education and experience - four years of appropriate experience, or a combination of education and experience which provides applicants with knowledge of one or more of the behavioral sciences equivalent to a major in the field. For grades 9/11/12, one year of specialized experience which is in or directly related to the line of work of the position to be filled and which has equipped the candidate with the specific knowledge, skills, and abilities to successfully perform the duties of the position. To be creditable, specialized
experience must have been at least equivalent to the next lower grade in
the normal line of progression for the occupation in the organization.

SPECIAL RATING FACTORS: (Relative Numerical Values Equate to a Total of
30 points) [ALL APPLICANTS ARE REQUIRED TO LIST AND WRITE A PARAGRAPH(S)
ADDRESSING EACH SPECIAL RATING FACTOR]

1. Knowledge of survey research methodology and quantitative data such
as acquired through graduate level studies and/or work experience. (8)
2. Ability to read and speak Spanish. (7)
3. Knowledge of U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America and Asia such
as acquired through graduate level studies. (5)
4. Skill in writing clearly and concisely in English. (5)
5. Skill in organizing and conducting studies of public opinion on
political, economic and social issues. (5)

ALL APPLICANTS WHO MEET EXPERIENCE/EDUCATION/TIME IN GRADE, ETC. WILL BE
CONSIDERED.

HOW TO APPLY: You have the option of submitting an SF-171, Application
for Federal Employment, an OF-612, Optional Application for Federal
Employment and its companion, the OF-306, Declaration for Federal
Employment, a resume, or any other format you choose, providing it
contains the information requested in forms OF-612 and OF-306. For a
detailed description of the information to include in a resume or other
written format, the flyer "Applying for a Federal Job", which explains
the steps of the employment process, is available in Federal Personnel
Offices.
PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS: To assure full consideration, USIA and status applicants must submit a copy of their most recent performance appraisal.

INTER-AGENCY CAREER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (ICTAP): Current and former displaced Federal employees in the same local commuting area who are well qualified must be selected for Federal positions before other candidates may be considered. Attach a copy of your RIF separation notice when applying for appropriate vacancies. To be determined well qualified to receive special selection priority for this position, you must meet all qualification and eligibility requirements, all screen out factors, all special rating factors, and be rated at the above average level or higher in each quality ranking factor.

CAREER/CAREER-CONDITIONAL/REINSTATEMENT ELIGIBLE: Non-USIA applicants with career or career-conditional status or reinstatement eligibility must submit a copy of their most recent Notification of Personnel Action (SF-50) showing tenure group and promotion potential (if any).

NON-STATUS APPLICANTS: Non-status applicants claiming eligibility for other special appointments such as handicapped or former Peace Corps/Vista Volunteers, must submit proof of eligibility, i.e. letter from Peace Corps or State Rehabilitation agency. Non-status candidates eligible for special appointment who wish to be considered under both special appointment and competitive procedures must submit two (2) complete applications. When only one (1) application is received it will be considered under competitive procedures (OPM certification) only.

STATUS APPLICANTS: Status candidates who wish to be considered under
both merit promotion and competitive procedures (OPM certification)) must submit two (2) complete applications. When only one (1) application is received it will be considered under the merit promotion program only. If a list of eligibles is requested from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), all non-status candidates who meet minimum requirements will be referred to OPM for rating, ranking and referral.

VETERANS PREFERENCE: Non-status applicants claiming veterans preference or eligibility for Veterans Readjustment Appointment must submit a copy of their DD-214 and, if disabled, an SF-15 with letter from the Department of Veterans Affairs. Veterans who are preference eligibles or who have been separated from the armed forces under honorable conditions after 3 years or more of continuous active service may apply.

The Defense Authorization Act of November 18, 1997, extended veterans' preference to persons who served on active duty during the Gulf War from August 1, 1990, through January 2, 1992. The law grants preference to persons otherwise eligible and who served on active duty during the period, regardless of where the person served or for how long. The law also authorizes the Secretary of each military department to award the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal for service in Bosnia during the period November 20, 1995, to a date to be determined. The award of the Medal is qualifying for veterans' preference. More information on veterans' preference is available in the VetGuide that may be found on the United States Office of Personnel Management web site at [www.opm.gov] or at Federal Personnel Offices.
PRE-EMPLOYMENT DRUG TESTING: Pre-employment drug testing is required for non-USIA applicants selected for positions requiring a Top Secret clearance.

RELOCATION EXPENSES: Relocation expenses will not be paid for persons selected for this position.

IDENTICAL VACANCIES: Identical vacancies arising after the closing date of this announcement may be filled from the same certificate prior to its expiration.

JOB SHARING: Job-sharing applicants [approximately 16-24 hours per week] will be accepted with or without a job-share partner. Job-share partners must be clearly indicated on application, or the applicants will be paired by the selecting official. If indicated on application, applicants may be considered for both job-share and full-time.

CONTENT OF APPLICATION: In addition to specific information requested in the vacancy announcement, following is what your resume or application must contain.

JOB INFORMATION

- Announcement number, and title and grade(s) of the job you are applying for.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

- Full name, mailing address (with zip code) and day and evening phone
numbers.

- Social Security Number
- Country of Citizenship (Most Federal jobs require United States citizenship)
- Veterans' preference
- Reinstatement eligibility (If requested, attach SF-50 proof of your career or career conditional status)
- Highest Federal civilian grade held (Also give job series and dates held.)

EDUCATION

- High School name, city and state, date of diploma or GED
- College or universities name, city and state, majors, type and year of any degrees received. Send a copy of your college transcript only if requested.

WORK EXPERIENCE

- Give the following information for your paid and nonpaid work experience related to the job you are applying for: Job Title; Duties and accomplishments; Employer's name and address; Supervisor's name and phone number; Starting and ending dates; Hours per week; Salary. Indicate if we may contact your current supervisor.

OTHER QUALIFICATIONS

- Job related training courses (title and year)
- Job related skills, for example, other languages, computer
software/hardware, tools, machinery, typing speed

_ Job related certificates and licenses (current only).
_ Job related honors, awards, and special accomplishments, for example, publications, memberships in professional or honor societies, leadership activities, public speaking, and performance awards (Give dates but do not send documents unless requested.)

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL RESULT IN ELIMINATION FROM CONSIDERATION.

WHERE TO APPLY: Submit a completed application and any additional documentation as instructed above under How to Apply to the Office of Human Resources, USIA, Room 518, 301 4th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20547.
Applications received after the closing date of this announcement will not be considered. [Postmarks are accepted.]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE JOB, PLEASE CONTACT KATHY BUTLER (202) 619-4659.

THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER.
Our company performs research on music. Over the years we have found that African Americans tend to give scores to music that are 30-40% higher on average than whites. We have always assumed that African Americans simply like music much more passionately than whites, and this explains the difference. Recently, however, someone mentioned to us that in many kinds of satisfaction or taste research, African Americans consistently give top box scores that are significantly higher than whites.

Does anyone have insights into this phenomenon? Is anyone aware of research that shows that African Americans are more generous with top box scores across all categories? Or conversely, that whites are less generous with top
box scores?

Please email me directly at robfarbman@aol.com with any information you might have.

Thanks.

Rob Farbman
Edison Media Research
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Call for Software Demonstrations

Deadline for Proposals: December 1, 1999

The Conference: A second International Conference on Establishment Surveys (ICES-II) will be held June 17 - 21, 2000 in Buffalo, New York at the Adam's Mark Hotel.

The Demonstrations: Since the first ICES was held in 1993, many new processing systems have been developed by statistical agencies or software organisations around the globe. The organising committee will set aside a room for demonstrating software used in establishment surveys. Demonstrations should target live processing of data with possible customisations for the interest of specific audiences, rather than inflexible slide shows or presentations. Proposed software packages should already be in use for one or more establishment surveys and should be designed to automate establishment survey processes, such as:

- Sample design and selection
- Data collection, capture and coding
- Record linkage and matching
- Editing and imputation
- Weighting, estimation, and tabulation
- Times series adjustment
- Disclosure analysis
- Survey data analysis
- Publication and data presentation
Schedule and Equipment: The demonstrations will take place during the regular conference sessions, on June 19-20. They will be split in four different groups, with a dedicated half day for each group. The organizing committee will provide the participants with telephone lines, tables and chairs. The participants will bring their laptops or desktop computers with their own software already set up.

How to send your proposal: A 200 word abstract must be submitted by December 1, 1999. A completed registration form and registration fee of $350 U.S. will be required later. The abstract will help evaluate the proposed software demonstration. It should include a description of the software package, potential applications in other survey organisations, and special equipment required for the demonstration. Registration forms, as well as detailed information can be obtained on our web site. Proposals and questions on the software demonstrations should be sent to Claude Poirier at poircla@statcan.ca or by calling (613) 951-1491.

Visit our web site at www.eia.doe.gov/ices2/index.html

__________________
David A. Binder | binddav@statcan.ca
Methodology Branch | az004@ncf.ca
11-A R.H. Coats Building | TEL: 1-613-951-0980 (Office)
Statistics Canada | 1-613-226-7292 (Home) =20
Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA K1A 0T6 | FAX: 1-613-951-1462
Call for Abstracts for Contributed Papers

Deadline for Abstracts: December 1, 1999

The Conference: A second International Conference on Establishment Surveys (ICES-II) will be held June 17 - 21, 2000 in Buffalo, New York at the Adam's
Mark Hotel. Since the first ICES was held in 1993, many new techniques have been implemented by practitioners around the globe. With the new millennium upon us, it is time for a forward look at methods for surveying businesses, farms, and institutions. ICES-II will contain invited and contributed paper sessions, short courses, and software demonstrations. The preliminary program can now be seen on our website. A hardcover, unedited volume of the invited papers—as well as CD-ROMs of the invited and contributed papers—will be produced after the conference.

Contributed Paper Sessions: At this time, we are soliciting abstracts for contributed papers. The focus of all papers must be on surveys of businesses, farms, or institutions—or issues related to their products. Special contributed paper sessions are also encouraged. These sessions are arranged in advance by an organizer, and include four speakers and a discussant. Potential topics include (among others) the following:

- Registers and frames --- classification, issues with multiple frames, updating for births and deaths
- Survey Design, Sampling, or Estimation --- survey coordination, small-area methods, outliers, pps sampling
- Data Collection or Processing --- electronic reporting, use of administrative records, respondent burden
- Dissemination --- web publishing, metadata, disclosure avoidance, public-use files, data warehousing
- Analysis of Economic Data --- effects of survey errors on indicators, seasonal adjustment, benchmarking
- Specific Sectors or Industries --- surveys of retail businesses, schools, farms, plants, hospitals, and jails
- Cross-Cutting Issues --- meta analysis, international comparisons, measurement errors and evaluation

How to Submit Abstracts and Register: An abstract of 200 words should be
submitted, accompanied by a completed registration form and registration fee of $350 U.S. Registration forms and more detailed information can be obtained on our website at www.eia.doe.gov/ices2/index.html. There you can also find the call for software demonstrations. General questions about the conference can be addressed to John G. Kovar at kovar@statcan.ca, or by calling (613) 951-8615. Questions about the contributed paper sessions should be addressed to Pat Cantwell at patrick.j.cantwell@ccmail.census.gov or by calling (301) 457-8105.

Visit our webpage at www.eia.doe.gov/ices2/index.html

__________________

David A. Binder | binddav@statcan.ca
Methodology Branch | az004@ncf.ca
11-A R.H. Coats Building | TEL: 1-613-951-0980 (Office)
Statistics Canada | 1-613-226-7292 (Home)
Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA K1A 0T6 | FAX: 1-613-951-1462
The Survey Research Unit (SRU) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill currently has an opening for Data Collection Director. The SRU is a growing operation conducting mail and telephone surveys ranging from population-based epidemiological studies to marketing and needs assessments in areas covering economic, health, social, medical, and environmental issues.
The Data Collection Director position requires a Bachelor's degree in Sociology, Economics, Psychology or related social science, including coursework in statistics, research methodology, computer science, and/or other coursework related to survey research and methodology, and one year of experience in gathering, editing, and analyzing data for social and economic research. (Coursework toward a Master's degree in an area related to survey research and methodology may be substituted for some or all of the experience.)

The major responsibilities of this position include preparing budgets for proposals, managing mail and telephone surveys from the planning stage to data cleaning and analysis, overseeing operations in our calling room (20 station CATI facility), serving as survey methods resource person for students and other staff working on methods projects, and suggesting methods experiments where possible.

UNC offers a competitive salary and excellent benefits.

Interested applicants may submit their resume or request additional information about the position by email to ashley_bowers@unc.edu, by fax (919-966-2221), or by mail to:

Survey Research Unit
Attn. Ashley Bowers
730 Airport Road, Suite 103
CB #2400, UNC-CH
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-2400
Interested applicants also must submit an application to the UNC Employment Department. An application can be downloaded from http://www.ais.unc.edu/hr/ or one can be requested by calling 919-962-2991.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is an equal opportunity employer.

The Survey Research Unit (SRU) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill currently has an opening for Data Collection Director. The SRU is a growing operation conducting mail and telephone surveys ranging from population-based epidemiological studies to marketing and needs assessments in areas covering economic, health, social, medical, and environmental issues. The Data Collection Director position requires a Bachelor’s degree in Sociology, Economics, Psychology or related social science, including coursework in statistics, research methodology, computer science, and one year of experience in gathering,
editing, and analyzing data for social and economic research. 

(Coursework toward a Master’s degree in an area related to survey research and methodology may be substituted for some or all of the experience.)</DIV><DIV>&nbsp;</DIV><DIV>The major responsibilities of this position include preparing budgets for proposals, managing mail and telephone surveys from the planning stage to data cleaning and analysis, overseeing operations in our calling room (20 station CATI facility), serving as survey methods resource person for students and other staff working on methods projects, and suggesting methods experiments where possible.</DIV>&nbsp;</DIV><DIV>UNC offers a competitive salary and excellent benefits. </DIV>&nbsp;</DIV><DIV>Interested applicants may submit their resume or request additional information about the position by email to ashley_bowers@unc.edu, by fax (919-966-2221), or by mail to: Survey Research Unit, Attn. Ashley Bowers, 730 Airport Road, Suite 103, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-2400. Interested applicants also must submit an application to the UNC Employment Department. An application can be downloaded from http://www.ais.unc.edu/hr/ or requested by calling 919-962-2991.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is an equal opportunity employer.
Please forward to anyone you think might be interested.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY
MERIT PROMOTION VACANCY ANNOUNCEMENT
Announcement No.   HRC- 133-99
Opening Date: 06/11/99
Closing Date: 07/09/99

FIRST CONSIDERATION WILL BE GIVEN TO WELL-QUALIFIED DISPLACED
APPLICANTS IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C. AREA

POSITION TITLE, SERIES AND GRADE: Social Science Analyst, GS-101-9/11/12
Potential GS-13

SALARY RANGE: $33,650 - $63,436

APPLICANTS MUST BE U.S. CITIZENS TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR HIRING.

LOCATION: R/RNA - Office of Research, Near East/South Asia/Africa Branch

AREA OF CONSIDERATION: All Qualified Applicants (USIA, State, status and non-status)

DUTIES: The incumbent initiates plans, executes, and reports results of public opinion polls and analyzes political, economic and cultural developments in the Middle East, with particular attention to the Arab countries and Israel. This involves: keeping up with activities and developments in the region; obtaining and analyzing results of opinion surveys; and writing clear, concise interpretative reports and memoranda for top-level officials in the USG foreign policy community that discuss the implications of public opinion and reach conclusions on the relevance of the pool results for U.S.
foreign policy.

SCREEN OUT FACTOR (Attach a narrative statement addressing this factor).

Graduate-level course work in or experience designing public opinion polls.

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS:

A. Degree: behavioral or social science; or related disciplines appropriate to the position.
B. Combination of education and experience - four years of appropriate experience, or a combination of education and experience which provides applicants with knowledge of one or more of the behavioral sciences equivalent to a major in the field.
For grades 9/11/12, one year of specialized experience which is in or directly related to the line of work of the position to be filled and which has equipped the candidate with the specific knowledge, skills, and abilities to successfully perform the duties of the position. To be creditable, specialized experience must have been at least equivalent to the next lower grade in the normal line of progression for the occupation in the organization.

SPECIAL RATING FACTORS: (Relative Numerical Values Equate to a Total of 30 points)

[ALL APPLICANTS ARE REQUIRED TO LIST AND WRITE A PARAGRAPH(S) ADDRESSING EACH SPECIAL RATING FACTOR]
1. Knowledge of survey research methodology and quantitative data analysis. (8)
2. Knowledge of the Middle East and U.S. foreign policy toward the region. (7)
3. Knowledge of Arabic and/or Hebrew. (7)
4. Skill in implementing public opinion surveys. (5)
5. Skill in writing clearly and concisely in English. (3)

ALL APPLICANTS WHO MEET EXPERIENCE/EDUCATION/TIME IN GRADE, ETC. WILL BE CONSIDERED.

HOW TO APPLY: You have the option of submitting an SF-171, Application for Federal Employment, an OF-612, Optional Application for Federal Employment and its companion, the OF-306, Declaration for Federal Employment, a resume, or any other format you choose, providing it contains the information requested in forms OF-612 and OF-306. For a detailed description of the information to include in a resume or other written format, the flyer "Applying for a Federal Job", which explains the steps of the employment process, is available in Federal Personnel Offices.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS: To assure full consideration, USIA and status applicants must submit a copy of their most recent performance appraisal.

INTER-Agency CAREER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (ICTAP): Current and former displaced Federal employees in the same local commuting area who are well qualified must be selected for Federal positions before other candidates may be considered. Attach a copy of your RIF separation
notice when applying for appropriate vacancies. To be determined well qualified to receive special selection priority for this position, you must meet all qualification and eligibility requirements, all screen out factors, all special rating factors, and be rated at the above average level or higher in each quality ranking factor.

CAREER/CAREER-CONDITIONAL/REINSTATEMENT ELIGIBLE: Non-USIA applicants with career or career-conditional status or reinstatement eligibility must submit a copy of their most recent Notification of Personnel Action (SF-50) showing tenure group and promotion potential (if any).

NON-STATUS APPLICANTS: Non-status applicants claiming eligibility for other special appointments such as handicapped or former Peace Corps/Vista Volunteers, must submit proof of eligibility, i.e. letter from Peace Corps or State Rehabilitation agency. Non-status candidates eligible for special appointment who wish to be considered under both special appointment and competitive procedures must submit two (2) complete applications. When only one (1) application is received it will be considered under competitive procedures (OPM certification) only.

STATUS APPLICANTS: Status candidates who wish to be considered under both merit promotion and competitive procedures (OPM certification)) must submit two (2) complete applications. When only one (1) application is received it will be considered under the merit promotion program only.

If a list of eligibles is requested from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), all non-status candidates who meet minimum requirements will be referred to OPM for rating, ranking and referral.
VETERANS PREFERENCE: Non-status applicants claiming veterans preference or eligibility for Veterans Readjustment Appointment must submit a copy of their DD-214 and, if disabled, an SF-15 with letter from the Department of Veterans Affairs. Veterans who are preference eligibles or who have been separated from the armed forces under honorable conditions after 3 years or more of continuous active service may apply.

The Defense Authorization Act of November 18, 1997, extended veterans' preference to persons who served on active duty during the Gulf War from August 1, 1990, through January 2, 1992. The law grants preference to persons otherwise eligible and who served on active duty during the period, regardless of where the person served or for how long. The law also authorizes the Secretary of each military department to award the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal for service in Bosnia during the period November 20, 1995, to a date to be determined. The award of the Medal is qualifying for veterans' preference. More information on veterans' preference is available in the VetGuide that may be found on the United States Office of Personnel Management web site at [www.opm.gov] or at Federal Personnel Offices.

PRE-EMPLOYMENT DRUG TESTING: Pre-employment drug testing is required for non-USIA applicants selected for positions requiring a Top Secret clearance.

RELOCATION EXPENSES: Relocation expenses will not be paid for persons selected for this position.

IDENTICAL VACANCIES: Identical vacancies arising after the closing date
of this announcement may be filled from the same certificate prior to its expiration.

JOB SHARING: Job-sharing applicants [approximately 16-24 hours per week] will be accepted with or without a job-share partner. Job-share partners must be clearly indicated on application, or the applicants will be paired by the selecting official. If indicated on application, applicants may be considered for both job-share and full-time.

CONTENT OF APPLICATION: In addition to specific information requested in the vacancy announcement, following is what your resume or application must contain.

JOB INFORMATION

- Announcement number, and title and grade(s) of the job you are applying for.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

- Full name, mailing address (with zip code) and day and evening phone numbers.
- Social Security Number
- Country of Citizenship (Most Federal jobs require United States citizenship)
- Veterans' preference
- Reinstatement eligibility (If requested, attach SF-50 proof of your career or career conditional status)
- Highest Federal civilian grade held (Also give job series and dates
EDUCATION

- High School name, city and state, date of diploma or GED
- College or universities name, city and state, majors, type and year of any degrees received. Send a copy of your college transcript only if requested.

WORK EXPERIENCE

- Give the following information for your paid and nonpaid work experience related to the job you are applying for: Job Title; Duties and accomplishments; Employer's name and address; Supervisor's name and phone number; Starting and ending dates; Hours per week; Salary.
- Indicate if we may contact your current supervisor.

OTHER QUALIFICATIONS

- Job related training courses (title and year)
- Job related skills, for example, other languages, computer software/hardware, tools, machinery, typing speed
- Job related certificates and licenses (current only).
- Job related honors, awards, and special accomplishments, for example, publications, memberships in professional or honor societies, leadership activities, public speaking, and performance awards (Give dates but do not send documents unless requested.)
INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL RESULT IN ELIMINATION FROM CONSIDERATION.

WHERE TO APPLY: Submit a completed application and any additional documentation as instructed above under How to Apply to the Office of Human Resources, USIA, Room 518, 301 4th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20547. Applications received after the closing date of this announcement will not be considered. [Postmarks are accepted.]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE JOB, PLEASE CONTACT KATHY BUTLER (202) 619-4659.

THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER.
Any suggestions on user friendly, yet flexible software that will produce report quality tables & graphs? We have the latest version of SPSS, but it's not up to the task.

Gary Siegel

Please reply to info@gsoresearch.com
To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Job opening at KRC Research & Consulting

Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 17:53:00 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

Content-Type: text/plain

Job Opening:

Opinion Research in Washington, D.C.

KRC Research & Consulting, a division of BSMG Worldwide, has an opening in its Washington, D.C., office for a mid-level opinion research analyst. KRC conducts quantitative, qualitative and on-line research for a wide range of corporate, government, and non-profit clients.

Qualified applicants will have experience with both quantitative and qualitative research used in a political, advocacy, or positioning context. Specific skills required include developing methodologies, writing questionnaires and focus group guides, supervising data collection, moderating focus groups, checking and cleaning data, analyzing data, and writing reports. Strong writing and project management skills are also required.

Please send resumes to Jennifer Sosin, KRC Research & Consulting, 1501 M Street NW, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20005, or fax to 202-659-8287. No phone calls, please.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Jun 19 17:52:41 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
Copyright 1999 Gannett Company, Inc.

USA TODAY

June 18, 1999, Friday, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: MONEY; Pg. 12B
NEW YORK--Women are powering commercial growth of the Internet, a report out Thursday says.

From July 1998 to April 1999, the number of women buying on line grew 80%, from 6 million to 10.5 million, the CommerceNet/Nielsen Media Research study found. The percentage of on-line buyers who are women grew from 29% to 38%.

"More women are purchasing on line," says Jerome Samson, director of technology and business strategy for Nielsen Media Research. "This is a very healthy trend for the stability of the e-commerce economy. Women are jumping aboard and using the Web much more than before."

The study found that total Internet users age 16 and older in the USA and Canada grew 16% from July to April to 92 million, while total on-line buyers jumped 40% to 28 million.

Increasingly, shoppers are also turning to the Web to gather information before buying products in stores, the study found. A total of 55 million people shopped that way, up 15% from the previous survey.
Other highlights:

* Of today's 92 million Internet users, 46% are women, vs. 43% in the previous two years.

* 41% of today's 55 million Internet shoppers -- people who browse on line but don't necessarily buy -- are women. The percentage had been 36%.

* Women were 53% of on-line apparel buyers, 45% for books, 38% for CDs and videos and 24% for computer hardware.

* Of the 28 million Web purchasers, 9 million bought once a month; a million bought once a week.

* Of all on-line buyers in the survey, 13% had made their first Web purchase in the preceding month.

The study is the latest in a series conducted by CommerceNet and Nielsen since 1995 and is based on phone surveys with 7,200 people in the USA and Canada.

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

Copyright 1999 Gannett Company, Inc.

USA TODAY

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

----
I recently had my car repaired at an auto dealership in my area. A few days later I received a letter from the dealership that included the following paragraph:

"You may receive a call or be mailed a survey from your car manufacturer."
We would greatly appreciate your completing the survey, giving us the highest satisfactory score on each question, and mailing it back to the manufacturer.

Has anyone conducted any research to determine the effect such letters have on customer responses? Are there any explicit AAPOR or CASRO policies that strongly urge disclosure about the use of such letters when the survey results are used by the manufacturer either internally, or for advertising purposes?

I'm not in the business of automobile dealer service satisfaction measurement, so I don't know if sending such letters is standard practice for that industry. But, as someone who measures customer satisfaction for a wide variety of other industries, I am appalled at the blatant attempt to manipulate the results of the survey. To me, the practice not only affects the results of the particular survey, but also erodes the credibility of survey research [like telemarketers conducting "surveys" to sell their products].

Jacquie Schriber, Ph.D
====================================================================
Market Probe, Inc. - PMB #635, 915-C W Foothill Blvd, Claremont, CA 91711-3356
Phone: 909.626.6172  Fax: 909.626.6072
====================================================================
What you have experienced happens frequently when customer satisfaction measurements are used to set economic incentives for sales or customer service staff. At least some auto manufacturers that I am aware of use customer satisfaction measurements as one of several parameters to set the prices dealerships are charged for new automobiles.

In general, the more money involved in the incentive, the higher the likelihood the recipient will try to game the measurement.
I recently had my car repaired at an auto dealership in my area. A few days later I received a letter from the dealership that included the following paragraph:

"You may receive a call or be mailed a survey from your car manufacturer. We would greatly appreciate your completing the survey, giving us the highest satisfactory score on each question, and mailing it back to the manufacturer."

Has anyone conducted any research to determine the effect such letters have on customer responses? Are there any explicit AAPOR or CASRO policies that strongly urge disclosure about the use of such letters when the survey results are used by the manufacturer either internally, or for advertising purposes?

I'm not in the business of automobile dealer service satisfaction measurement, so I don't know if sending such letters is standard practice for that industry. But, as someone who measures customer satisfaction for a wide variety of other industries, I am appalled at the blatant attempt to manipulate the results of the survey. To me,
the practice not only affects the results of the particular survey, but also erodes the credibility of survey research [like telemarketers conducting "surveys" to sell their products].

Jacquie Schriber, Ph.D

Market Probe, Inc. - PMB #635, 915-C W Foothill Blvd, Claremont, CA
91711-3356
Phone: 909.626.6172 Fax: 909.626.6072
Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc. (SRBI), a rapidly expanding market and opinion research firm, is seeking skilled and highly motivated analysts and project directors to join our research teams in public policy and market research. Candidates must thrive in a fast-paced and collaborative environment.

The following positions are available:

Senior Survey Methodologist: must have a strong academic background in both survey design and statistics. Responsible for project management and in-house consulting. Projects include large-scale public policy surveys. Requires 3-5 years experience. Position is in our NYC office.

Analysts: excellent verbal, analytic, client and presentation skills required. MBA, MA/MS or 3-5 years experience in commercial strategy research. Areas: banking/finance, telecommunications, media, technology, transportation, customer loyalty, brand equity. Position can be situated in any of the following offices: NYC, Ft. Myers, Florida, or West Long Branch, NJ.

Project Directors: detail-oriented team person, with heavy project management responsibility. BA/BS and/or 1-3 years of project experience. Position can be situated in any of the following offices: NYC, Ft. Myers, Florida, or West Long Branch, NJ.

ABOUT SRBI: SRBI is a leading market and opinion research firm. The company specializes in public opinion, public policy, telecommunications, media, health care, financial services, utilities, automotive and transportation research. The firm conducts large-scale policy evaluation and strategy surveys for government, foundations, and major corporations.

SRBI is an American affiliate of Global Market Research, an international consortium of research companies in 24 countries.

Salaries are highly competitive, with full benefits.

APPLICATIONS: Send resume and cover letter to: Katie Bisbee, Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc., 145 E. 32nd St., Suite 500, New York, NY 10016 or Email to: K.Bisbee@srbi.com. EOE.
Your concern is misplaced. This is not a customer satisfaction survey in the sense of a scientific survey, but a quality control monitoring program.

The manufacturer is collecting information on how satisfied customers are with their dealers in order to improve their service offerings by determining which ones should be rewarded for good service and which ones need remedial action.

Unfortunately, many people see these kinds of surveys only as a means to vent gripes and don't bother to respond if the experience was good. Your dealer is quite right to inform you that you might receive the survey and ask you to respond positively. The fact that they sent you such a message is a good sign in that it indicates that they are aware of, and reacting positively to this quality control program. They would be far less likely to do so if they expected that your response to the manufacturer
would be negative.

Jan Werner

Jacquelyn B Schriber wrote:

I recently had my car repaired at an auto dealership in my area. A few days later I received a letter from the dealership that included the following paragraph:

"You may receive a call or be mailed a survey from your car manufacturer. We would greatly appreciate your completing the survey, giving us the highest satisfactory score on each question, and mailing it back to the manufacturer."

Has anyone conducted any research to determine the effect such letters have on customer responses? Are there any explicit AAPOR or CASRO policies that strongly urge disclosure about the use of such letters when the survey results are used by the manufacturer either internally, or for advertising purposes?

I'm not in the business of automobile dealer service satisfaction measurement, so I don't know if sending such letters is standard practice for that industry. But, as someone who measures customer satisfaction for a wide variety of other industries, I am appalled at the blatant attempt to manipulate the results of the survey. To me, the practice not only affects the results of the particular survey,
but also erodes the credibility of survey research [like telemarketers conducting "surveys" to sell their products].

Jacquie Schriber, Ph.D

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

Market Probe, Inc. - PMB #635, 915-C W Foothill Blvd, Claremont, CA
91711-3356
Phone: 909.626.6172 Fax: 909.626.6072
================================================================================================

From rrands@cfmc.com Mon Jun 21 15:44:22 1999
Received: from mail.cfmc.com (main.cfmc.com [206.15.13.129])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA15490 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Jun 1999 15:43:58 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from Rands-W95.cfmc.com (rands-w95.cfmc.com [206.15.13.172])
    by mail.cfmc.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id PAA22305
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Jun 1999 15:42:27 -0700
Message-Id: <4.1.19990621153422.015329f0@cfmc.com>
X-Sender: rrands@cfmc.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 15:44:11 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Rands <rrands@cfmc.com>
Subject: Re: Customer Surveys
In-Reply-To: <376EA5DE.9E122007@jwp.com>
References: <19990620.111436.-249039.5.Market.Probe.LA@juno.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Jan Werner writes:
> Your concern is misplaced...
> The manufacturer is collecting information on how satisfied customers are with their dealers in order to improve their service offerings by determining which ones should be rewarded for good service and which ones need remedial action.

I suspect this is a bit too idealistic. What really is happening is that the manufacturers have a QA rating system and they award high scoring service depts. an official looking plaque that can be displayed in their lobby that states their quality record. More often than not, the rating is based on a lack of complaints, rather than a lot of positive responses.

> Your dealer is quite right to inform you that you might receive the survey and ask you to respond positively. The fact that they sent you such a message is a good sign in that it indicates that they are aware of, and reacting positively to this quality control program. They would be far less likely to do so if they expected that your response to the manufacturer would be negative.

In any case, the request is worded inappropriately. They should encourage a response to the survey with the hope that it will be positive, and suggest that if the response is less than positive, they should call the dealer's service department to complain.

Richard Rands
AAPORNETters,

Of the several interesting findings in this new Pathfinder Study just released by Arbitron NewMedia, perhaps the most surprising is that, while 38 percent of U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home, only a portion of these people--24 percent of U.S. consumers--report actual Web use at home. In other words, fewer than two out of every three
people who could use the Web at home actually do.

Any ideas about what might account for such results?

-- Jim

******

June 21, 1999, Monday

PC Home Ownership Doubles While Home Usage Stagnates,
Reveals Arbitron New Media Pathfinder Study:
Increased Home PC Access Does Not Result in Increased Use

NEW YORK--Despite a nearly doubling of home PC access in the last four years, the percentage of the U.S. population who actually use PCs has stagnated according to the latest Pathfinder Study just released from Arbitron NewMedia.

According to the study, computers have become as popular as many home appliances, with home penetration nearly doubling from 29 percent in 1995 to 54 percent in 1999. However, the percentage of people with access to a home PC who actually use it has fallen off from a high of 90 percent in 1995 to
53 percent today. High income consumers ($75K or more) report the highest incidence of PC use at home - 51 percent, a decline of 10 percent since 1997.

"This decline in actual usage is part of a trend we've been tracking for the last three years," said Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of research at Arbitron NewMedia. "Apparently, many consumers deal with PCs and other technologies all day at work. By the time they get home, many of these technology-weary users prefer to wind down and spend time with their families rather than interact with office-like PCs. To achieve sustained growth in home computer sales, manufacturers will have to design information appliances with more obvious, easy-access user benefits in mind. Clearly, ownership of a home PC does not equal usage."

The Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study also determined that the large majority of PC owners - 70 percent - subscribe to Internet services at home - a fourfold increase over the 16 percent access rate in 1995. But home web subscription does not guarantee home PC use. While nearly four out of every ten U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home (38 percent), only a portion of these people, 24 percent of U.S. consumers, report actual Web use at home.

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

The Pathfinder Study is an on-going comprehensive survey of consumer media behavior and new media preferences. The study examined American purchasing and user preferences of consumer technology. Results were based on extensive 1999 national telephone and mail surveys, which canvassed a total of 5,500 U.S. consumers, age 16-74. This survey comprises the first phase of the 1999 Pathfinder research.

Additional data will become available throughout 1999 and 2000. For information on the Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study, contact Arbitron NewMedia, 9705 Patuxent Woods Drive, Columbia, MD 21046; telephone (410) 312-8429.

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

Copyright 1999 Business Wire, Inc.

Business Wire

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

******

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Mon Jun 21 19:30:29 1999
Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
James Beniger wrote:

> Of the several interesting findings in this new Pathfinder Study just
> released by Arbitron NewMedia, perhaps the most surprising is that,
> while 38 percent of U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions
> at home, only a portion of these people--24 percent of U.S.
> consumers--report actual Web use at home. In other words, fewer than
> two out of every three people who could use the Web at home actually
> do.
>
> Any ideas about what might account for such results?
> -- Jim

IMHO I think how boring the WEB really is may have a lot to do with this. It
is fine for ordering books, or buying Beanie Babies, downloading pornography
and downloading MP3 music but it certainly does not have the production
value of movies, plays, TV shows, etc. Nor is it as engaging as good video
game like Doom or Duke Nukem.

There also is the problem of the World Wide Wait.

I doubt that this report will help with next 5 or 10 IPO's.

Before the WEB converges with other media, the bandwidth problem has go to
be solved!!!

Andy Beveridge
Andy Beveridge is right. When the bandwidth problem is solved we will see use of the Internet in a manner that is a bit difficult to imagine. In addition to bandwidth, however, many computer users don't find their software especially user friendly. They buy very fast computers with fast modems and then get lost with all the bells and whistles of the software. Just sending e mail for many is felt as a genuine accomplishment. Navigating the Internet...aside from the boring content of so many sites....can be exceptionally frustrating and provides an on-line lesson in humility and disappointment.

Dick Halpern

> -- Jim

>
> IMHO I think how boring the WEB really is may have a lot to do with
> this. It is fine for ordering books, or buying Beanie Babies,
> downloading pornography and downloading MP3 music but it certainly
> does not have the production value of movies, plays, TV shows, etc. Nor
> is
> it as engaging as good video game like Doom or Duke Nukem.
>
> There also is the problem of the World Wide Wait.
>
> I doubt that this report will help with next 5 or 10 IPO's.
>
> Before the WEB converges with other media, the bandwidth problem has go
> to be solved!!!
>
> Andy Beveridge

--=====================_30582127==_.ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>
<font size=3>Andy Beveridge&nbsp;is right. When the bandwidth problem is
solved we will see use of the Internet in a manner that is a bit difficult
to imagine. In addition to bandwidth, however,&nbsp;many computer users
don't find their software especially user friendly. They buy very fast
computers with fast modems and then get lost with all the bells and whistles
of the software. Just sending e mail for many is felt as a genuine
accomplishment. Navigating the Internet...aside from the boring content of
so many sites....can be exceptionally frustrating and provides an on-line
lesson in humility and disappointment.<br> <br> Dick Halpern<br> <br> IMHO I think how boring the WEB really is may have a lot to do with this.<br> It is fine for ordering books, or buying Beanie Babies, downloading pornography and downloading MP3 music but it certainly does not have the production value of movies, plays, TV shows, etc.<br> Nor is it as engaging as good video game like Doom or Duke Nukem.<br> There also is the problem of the World Wide Wait.<br> I doubt that this report will help with next 5 or 10 IPO's.<br> Before the WEB converges with other media, the bandwidth problem has go to be solved!!!<br> <br> Andy Beveridge

---=====================_30582127==_.ALT---

>From market.probe.la@juno.com Mon Jun 21 20:42:33 1999
Received: from m4.boston.juno.com (m4.boston.juno.com [205.231.101.198])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/uscd) with ESMTP
Hypothesis: The respondents are adults, but in many households, only the kids use the Internet???
On Mon, 21 Jun 1999 16:13:47 -0700 (PDT) James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu> writes:

> AAPORNETters,

> Of the several interesting findings in this new Pathfinder Study just released by Arbitron NewMedia, perhaps the most surprising is that, while 38 percent of U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home, only a portion of these people—24 percent of U.S. consumers—report actual Web use at home. In other words, fewer than two out of every three people who could use the Web at home actually do.

> Any ideas about what might account for such results?

> -- Jim

>********

>-----------------------------------------------------------------------

>                  Copyright   1999 Business Wire, Inc.

>-----------------------------------------------------------------------

> Business Wire

>-----------------------------------------------------------------------

>
PC Home Ownership Doubles While Home Usage Stagnates,

Reveals Arbitron New Media Pathfinder Study:
Increased Home PC Access Does Not Result in Increased Use

NEW YORK--Despite a nearly doubling of home PC access in the last four years, the percentage of the U.S. population who actually use PCs has stagnated according to the latest Pathfinder Study just released from Arbitron NewMedia.

According to the study, computers have become as popular as many home appliances, with home penetration nearly doubling from 29 percent in 1995 to 54 percent in 1999. However, the percentage of people with access to a home PC who actually use it has fallen off from a high of 90 percent in 1995 to 53 percent today. High income consumers ($75K or more) report the highest incidence of PC use at home - 51 percent, a decline of 10 percent since 1997.

"This decline in actual usage is part of a trend we've been tracking for
"the last three years," said Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of research at Arbitron NewMedia. "Apparently, many consumers deal with PCs and other technologies all day at work. By the time they get home, many of these technology-weary users prefer to wind down and spend time with their families rather than interact with office-like PCs. To achieve sustained growth in home computer sales, manufacturers will have to design information appliances with more obvious, easy-access user benefits in mind. Clearly, ownership of a home PC does not equal usage."

The Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study also determined that the large majority of PC owners - 70 percent - subscribe to Internet services at home - a fourfold increase over the 16 percent access rate in 1995. But home web subscription does not guarantee home PC use. While nearly four out of every ten U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home (38 percent), only a portion of these people, 24 percent of U.S. consumers, report actual Web use at home.

In other words, nearly all of the 29 percent of people who use their PCs at home also use the Web. But only two of every three people who could use the Web at home actually do. The lure of the Web is not sufficient to convert the one-third of home Internet subscribers who do not currently
use their PCs. The increase in home PC ownership is due, in large, to first-time PC purchasers.

Since 1997, the percentage of consumers who have more than one PC at home has remained relatively unchanged; there has only been a one-percent increase. Over the last two years, the largest gains in home PC purchases has been among low-to middle-income households as well as households with children.

The Pathfinder Study is an on-going comprehensive survey of consumer media behavior and new media preferences. The study examined American purchasing and user preferences of consumer technology. Results were based on extensive 1999 national telephone and mail surveys, which canvassed a total of 5,500 U.S. consumers, age 16-74. This survey comprises the first phase of the 1999 Pathfinder research.

Additional data will become available throughout 1999 and 2000. For information on the Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study, contact Arbitron NewMedia, 9705 Patuxent Woods Drive, Columbia, MD 21046; telephone (410) 312-8429.
From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Mon Jun 21 21:26:34 1999
Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id VAA01182 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Jun 1999 21:26:33 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (mxhyp2x32.chesco.com [209.195.202.160])
    by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id AAA12377
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Jun 1999 00:26:29 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <002901bebc6750805be00$a0cac3d1@default>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: PC Ownership Doubles While Home Use Stagnates
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 00:23:49 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Concerning the Pathfinder study --

As the proportion of households that have adopted an appliance grows (29% in 1995 to 54% in 1999), the proportion of adults having used the device recently will drop. There are many precedents for this. (Look in your closets!)

Anyhow, the arithmetic still implies growth in the number of adults using computers at home -- 0.29 x 0.90 = 26% (1995) vs. 0.54 x 0.53 = 29% (1999).

How is this characterized (news story) as "a decline in actual usage"?

The web/internet data seem to say: For every 24 adults who use the web from home, there are another 14 whose households contain computers that are connected to the internet -- but not used for web access by the respondent. (Maybe other household members use them for web/internet access; maybe the respondent pays for internet access just to use e-mail.)

These unexpected findings might evaporate if there were more evident distinctions between household and individual level data, and if "use" was defined. (Perhaps they are in the actual report.)

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
AAPORNETters,

Of the several interesting findings in this new Pathfinder Study just released by Arbitron NewMedia, perhaps the most surprising is that, while 38 percent of U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home, only a portion of these people--24 percent of U.S. consumers--report actual Web use at home. In other words, fewer than two out of every three people who could use the Web at home actually do.

Any ideas about what might account for such results?

-- Jim

******

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright   1999 Business Wire, Inc.
Business Wire
NEW YORK--Despite a nearly doubling of home PC access in the last four years, the percentage of the U.S. population who actually use PCs has stagnated according to the latest Pathfinder Study just released from Arbitron NewMedia.

According to the study, computers have become as popular as many home appliances, with home penetration nearly doubling from 29 percent in 1995 to 54 percent in 1999. However, the percentage of people with access to a home PC who actually use it has fallen off from a high of 90 percent in 1995 to 53 percent today. High income consumers ($75K or more) report the highest incidence of PC use at home - 51 percent, a decline of 10 percent since 1997.

"This decline in actual usage is part of a trend we've been tracking for the last three years," said Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of research at Arbitron NewMedia. "Apparently, many consumers deal with PCs and other technologies all day at work. By the time they get home, many of these technology-weary users prefer to wind down and spend time with their families rather than interact with office-like PCs. To achieve sustained
growth in home computer sales, manufacturers will have to design information appliances with more obvious, easy-access user benefits in mind. Clearly, ownership of a home PC does not equal usage."

The Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study also determined that the large majority of PC owners - 70 percent - subscribe to Internet services at home - a fourfold increase over the 16 percent access rate in 1995. But home web subscription does not guarantee home PC use. While nearly four out of every ten U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home (38 percent), only a portion of these people, 24 percent of U.S. consumers, report actual Web use at home.

In other words, nearly all of the 29 percent of people who use their PCs at home also use the Web. But only two of every three people who could use the Web at home actually do. The lure of the Web is not sufficient to convert the one-third of home Internet subscribers who do not currently use their PCs. The increase in home PC ownership is due, in large, to first-time PC purchasers.

Since 1997, the percentage of consumers who have more than one PC at home has remained relatively unchanged; there has only been a one-percent increase. Over the last two years, the largest gains in home PC purchases has been among low-to middle-income households as well as households with children.

The Pathfinder Study is an on-going comprehensive survey of consumer media behavior and new media preferences. The study examined American purchasing and user preferences of consumer technology. Results were based on extensive 1999 national telephone and mail surveys, which canvassed a total of 5,500
U.S. consumers, age 16-74. This survey comprises the first phase of the 1999 Pathfinder research.

Additional data will become available throughout 1999 and 2000. For information on the Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study, contact Arbitron NewMedia, 9705 Patuxent Woods Drive, Columbia, MD 21046; telephone (410) 312-8429.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright   1999 Business Wire, Inc.
            Business Wire
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

******

>From mcdonald@tw.timeinc.com Tue Jun 22 06:17:41 1999
Received: from gate.twi.com (gate.twi.com [207.25.35.3])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id GAA22844 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Jun 1999 06:17:40 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [168.161.2.130] by gate.twi.com
    via smtpd (for usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) with SMTP; 22 Jun 1999
13:17:39 UT
Received: from tw.timeinc.com by ecsmtpe.twi.com (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
    id JAA14003; Tue, 22 Jun 1999 09:13:32 -0400
Message-ID: <376F8D2B.156E2E61@tw.timeinc.com>
I haven't seen the new Pathfinder Study, but it would not surprise me to find that the "surprise" is really an artifact of the nature and structure of the question wording. A subscription to an ISP or online service is a household-level variable, while usage is an individual-level variable. Usage questions typically are asked within a fixed time-frame -- as in "Have you personally used the WWW from home within the past 7 days?". Feature the household where mom goes online occasionally, but the kids and husband are on more often. She could truthfully answer "yes" to the subscription question and "no" to the usage question, but in fact the access was not being wasted and the medium was not being "rejected" by the household. Moreover, any of these household members could have been accessing from work during the same time period, an event that would not be captured by the "at home usage" question of the interviewed individual.

If they have been rendered accurately here, the Arbitron results are at odds with several other well-done tracking surveys, including Yankelovich's CyberDialogue survey and the establishment survey for the MediaMetrix ratings service. These other surveys find that at home usage of the
Internet by adults in the past 30 days is in the vicinity of 34-38%. A segment of these at home users (estimated at between 10% and 15%) use the Internet almost exclusively for sending and retrieving e-mail. Depending on the exact wording of the Pathfinder usage question, such e-mail-only users may, or may not, have claimed Web usage.

It may be best not to theorize too grandly about the reasons for the "surprise" (bandwidth, boredom, etc.) until we see the details of the Pathfinder questions and sample.

Scott McDonald
Director of Research
Time Warner Inc.

James Beniger wrote:

> AAPORNETters,
> 
> Of the several interesting findings in this new Pathfinder Study just released by Arbitron NewMedia, perhaps the most surprising is that, while 38 percent of U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home, only a portion of these people--24 percent of U.S. consumers--report actual Web use at home. In other words, fewer than two out of every three people who could use the Web at home actually do.
> 
> Any ideas about what might account for such results?
NEW YORK--Despite a nearly doubling of home PC access in the last four years, the percentage of the U.S. population who actually use PCs has stagnated according to the latest Pathfinder Study just released from Arbitron NewMedia.

According to the study, computers have become as popular as many home appliances, with home penetration nearly doubling from 29 percent in 1995 to 54 percent in 1999. However, the percentage of people with access to a home PC who actually use it has fallen off from a high of 90 percent in 1995 to 53 percent today. High income consumers ($75K or more) report the highest incidence of PC use at home - 51 percent, a decline of 10 percent since 1997.
"This decline in actual usage is part of a trend we've been tracking for the last three years," said Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of research at Arbitron NewMedia. "Apparently, many consumers deal with PCs and other technologies all day at work. By the time they get home, many of these technology-weary users prefer to wind down and spend time with their families rather than interact with office-like PCs. To achieve sustained growth in home computer sales, manufacturers will have to design information appliances with more obvious, easy-access user benefits in mind. Clearly, ownership of a home PC does not equal usage."

The Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study also determined that the large majority of PC owners - 70 percent - subscribe to Internet services at home - a fourfold increase over the 16 percent access rate in 1995. But home web subscription does not guarantee home PC use. While nearly four out of every ten U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home (38 percent), only a portion of these people, 24 percent of U.S. consumers, report actual Web use at home.

In other words, nearly all of the 29 percent of people who use their PCs at home also use the Web. But only two of every three people who could use the Web at home actually do. The lure of the Web is not sufficient to convert the one-third of home Internet subscribers who do not currently use their PCs. The increase in home PC ownership is due, in large, to first-time PC purchasers.

Since 1997, the percentage of consumers who have more than one PC at home has remained relatively unchanged; there has only been a one-percent increase. Over the last two years, the largest gains in
home PC purchases has been among low-to middle-income households as well as households with children.

The Pathfinder Study is an on-going comprehensive survey of consumer media behavior and new media preferences. The study examined American purchasing and user preferences of consumer technology. Results were based on extensive 1999 national telephone and mail surveys, which canvassed a total of 5,500 U.S. consumers, age 16-74. This survey comprises the first phase of the 1999 Pathfinder research.

Additional data will become available throughout 1999 and 2000. For information on the Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study, contact Arbitron NewMedia, 9705 Patuxent Woods Drive, Columbia, MD 21046; telephone (410) 312-8429.

Copyright 1999 Business Wire, Inc.
Scott McDonald wrote:

> I haven't seen the new Pathfinder Study, but it would not surprise me
> to find that the "surprise" is really an artifact of the nature and
> structure of the question wording.

Can one imagine a TV survey, where 1/3 of those who have a TV in the household would report that they do not use the TV? I would be stunned!!!!!

> These other surveys find that at home usage of the Internet by
> adults in the past 30 days is in the vicinity of 34-38%. A segment of
these
> at home users (estimated at between 10% and 15%) use the Internet
> almost exclusively for sending and retrieving e-mail. Depending on
> the exact wording of the Pathfinder usage question, such e-mail-only
> users may, or may not, have claimed Web usage.

Compare this with what you would get from TV again!!

> It may be best not to theorize too grandly about the reasons for the
> "surprise" (bandwidth, boredom, etc.) until we see the details of the
> Pathfinder questions and sample.

The point that the Internet has yet to "take off" in terms of home
entertainment medium still remains. Whether it ever will is an
open question.

>
> Scott McDonald
> Director of Research
> Time Warner Inc.
>

Andy Beveridge

>From mkshares@mcs.net Tue Jun 22 07:06:38 1999
Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id HAA03700 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Jun 1999 07:06:19 -0700
I agree with the comments so far - including Jacquelyn's comment about kids. And as the spokesperson said - many people use a PC at work. The family PC at home may be there for use by others, especially if it is need of upgrading.

I also have 1999 Forrester research that almost exactly matches Arbitron's
PC and Internet household penetration figures.

Two questions remain: how did they define usage? Used yesterday? And did they exclude e-mail only users who do not surf the net? This group may not be useful to Arbitron given the objectives of their research.

dick halpern wrote:

> Andy Beveridge is right. When the bandwidth problem is solved we will see use of the Internet in a manner that is a bit difficult to imagine. In addition to bandwidth, however, many computer users don't find their software especially user friendly. They buy very fast computers with fast modems and then get lost with all the bells and whistles of the software. Just sending e mail for many is felt as a genuine accomplishment. Navigating the Internet...aside from the boring content of so many sites....can be exceptionally frustrating and provides an on-line lesson in humility and disappointment.

> Dick Halpern

>> IMHO I think how boring the WEB really is may have a lot to do with this. It is fine for ordering books, or buying Beanie Babies, downloading pornography and downloading MP3 music but it certainly does not have the production value of movies, plays, TV shows, etc.

>> Nor
I agree with the comments so far - including Jacquelyn’s comment about kids. And as the spokesperson said - many people use a PC at work. The family PC at home may be there for use by others, especially if it is need of upgrading. I also have 1999 Forrester research that almost exactly matches Arbitron’s PC and Internet household penetration figures. Two questions remain: how did they define usage? Used yesterday? And did they exclude e-mail only users who do not surf the net? This group may not be useful to Arbitron given the objectives of their research. dick halpern wrote: Andy Beveridge is right. When the bandwidth problem is solved we will see use of the Internet in a
manner that is a bit difficult to imagine. In addition to bandwidth, however, many computer users don't find their software especially user friendly. They buy very fast computers with fast modems and then get lost with all the bells and whistles of the software. Just sending e mail for many is felt as a genuine accomplishment. Navigating the Internet...aside from the boring content of so many sites....can be exceptionally frustrating and provides an on-line lesson in humility and disappointment.

Dick Halpern
<blockquote type=cite cite><font size=+0>-- Jim</font>
<br>
IMHO I think how boring the WEB really is may have a lot to do with this. It is fine for ordering books, or buying Beanie Babies, downloading pornography and downloading MP3 music but it certainly does not have the production value of movies, plays, TV shows, etc. Nor is it as engaging as good video game like Doom or Duke Nukem.

There also is the problem of the World Wide Wait.

I doubt that this report will help with next 5 or 10 IPO's.

Before the WEB converges with other media, the bandwidth problem has go to be solved!!!

Andy Beveridge</blockquote>
a few other theories:

1) Internet use at work is generally "free", use at home comes at a premium
2) many people are on line all the time at work, this is rare at home
3) For households without a dedicated line, use at home ties up phone line
   (and in most houses this is still preferred mode of real time communication)
4) Email is probably primary use and most households don't get volume of
   mail to justify checking every day
5) in the honeymoon phase one wanders around exploring all kinds of things and spending all kinds of money. In the later phases you know everything is out there if you have the time to look and the Internet becomes more of a huge library that you visit with a specific purpose or maybe just occasionally to browse around.

Karen Donelan
Harvard School of Public Health

James Beniger wrote:

> AAPORNETters,
> 
> Of the several interesting findings in this new Pathfinder Study just released by Arbitron NewMedia, perhaps the most surprising is that, while 38 percent of U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home, only a portion of these people--24 percent of U.S. consumers--report actual Web use at home. In other words, fewer than two out of every three people who could use the Web at home actually do.
> 
> Any ideas about what might account for such results?
> 
> -- Jim
> 
> ********
>
> Copyright 1999 Business Wire, Inc.
June 21, 1999, Monday

PC Home Ownership Doubles While Home Usage Stagnates, Reveals Arbitron New Media Pathfinder Study:
Increased Home PC Access Does Not Result in Increased Use

NEW YORK--Despite a nearly doubling of home PC access in the last four years, the percentage of the U.S. population who actually use PCs has stagnated according to the latest Pathfinder Study just released from Arbitron NewMedia.

According to the study, computers have become as popular as many home appliances, with home penetration nearly doubling from 29 percent in 1995 to 54 percent in 1999. However, the percentage of people with access to a home PC who actually use it has fallen off from a high of 90 percent in 1995 to 53 percent today. High income consumers ($75K or more) report the highest incidence of PC use at home - 51 percent, a decline of 10 percent since 1997.

"This decline in actual usage is part of a trend we've been tracking for the last three years," said Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of research at Arbitron NewMedia. "Apparently, many consumers deal with PCs and other technologies all day at work. By the time they get home, many of these technology-weary users prefer to wind down and spend time with their families rather than interact with office-like PCs.
achieve sustained growth in home computer sales, manufacturers will have to design information appliances with more obvious, easy-access user benefits in mind. Clearly, ownership of a home PC does not equal usage."

The Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study also determined that the large majority of PC owners - 70 percent - subscribe to Internet services at home - a fourfold increase over the 16 percent access rate in 1995. But home web subscription does not guarantee home PC use. While nearly four out of every ten U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home (38 percent), only a portion of these people, 24 percent of U.S. consumers, report actual Web use at home.

In other words, nearly all of the 29 percent of people who use their PCs at home also use the Web. But only two of every three people who could use the Web at home actually do. The lure of the Web is not sufficient to convert the one-third of home Internet subscribers who do not currently use their PCs. The increase in home PC ownership is due, in large, to first-time PC purchasers.

Since 1997, the percentage of consumers who have more than one PC at home has remained relatively unchanged; there has only been a one-percent increase. Over the last two years, the largest gains in home PC purchases has been among low-to middle-income households as well as households with children.

The Pathfinder Study is an on-going comprehensive survey of consumer media behavior and new media preferences. The study examined American purchasing and user preferences of consumer technology. Results were
based on extensive 1999 national telephone and mail surveys, which
canvassed a total of 5,500 U.S. consumers, age 16-74. This survey
comprises the first phase of the 1999 Pathfinder research.

Additional data will become available throughout 1999 and 2000. For
information on the Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study, contact
Arbitron NewMedia, 9705 Patuxent Woods Drive, Columbia, MD 21046;
telephone (410) 312-8429.

The text is copyrighted by Business Wire, Inc.
We have a self-completion questionnaire for the German part of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP). Sometimes the ISSP is fielded after the face-to-face ALLBUS (German GSS) with the same respondents. When this is the case, it is possible that someone who agrees to the face-to-face ALLBUS will not agree to a self-completion interview (ISSP). Self-completion is nonetheless what interviewers are required to bring in for the ISSP.

Naturally if someone has trouble writing or reading, and says they need to continue with face-to-face, getting the data this way can be seen as better than not getting them at all (they enrich ALLBUS data too). I have recorded mode since 1994. The problem is, using a fielding institute generally thought to be one of the best in Germany, I get one-third back as face-to-face and two-thirds as self-completion. This is also what I got back with other institutes. Discussions with institutes have so far led nowhere (brick wall). I have not found effects on substantive scores so far.
Nonetheless, I am required to deliver a one-mode N = 1,000 minimum to the archive. Next year I have a split and I definitely would like to avoid one third of each split coming in face-to-face. I talked to some ISSP members at the annual meeting in Madrid. They had far lower numbers of face-to-face in this situation. I suspect German results have less to do with the respondents than a series of institute-related factors. I want to discuss this again with institutes who may field the ISSP 2000. It would help to have information from more countries and studies. Please let me know what sort of numbers you get in this kind of situation, what the demographics details of these self-selecting face-to-face respondents are (or does it look more like interviewer selection or an indiscriminate combination of the two) and anything else you find relevant. Remember to send replies and comments to harkness@zuma-mannheim.de I will post the answers together in a single mail. Thanks, Janet Harkness

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Tue Jun 22 10:05:49 1999
Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.150])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA17384 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:05:48 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149])
    by makalu.hp.ufl.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id NAA04666
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Jun 1999 13:12:20 -0400
Message-Id: <1999906221712.NAA04666@makalu.hp.ufl.edu>
Received: from K2/SpoolDir by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44);
    22 Jun 99 13:05:54 -0500
On 22 Jun 99 at 9:28, Andrew A. Beveridge wrote:

> Scott McDonald wrote:
> >> I haven't seen the new Pathfinder Study, but it would not surprise
> >> me to find that the "surprise" is really an artifact of the nature
> >> and structure of the question wording.
> >>
> >
> > Can one imagine a TV survey, where 1/3 of those who have a TV in the
> > household would report that they do not use the TV? I would be
> > stunned!!!!!!

But what if the TV at home was a 9" black-and-white TV, while the TV you could use other places (at work after hours, for example) was a beautiful big-screen color display?

That's how it is for folks who get used to an ethernet connection, who can't stand the slow web waits of using a mere telephone line.

Although it might be worth it to keep the little black-and-white set
around just to catch the news (or e-mail, in this case.)

And actually, yes, I go for weeks at a time without watching TV, even though we have two in the house. So the question wording would have a profound influence.

> It may be best not to theorize too grandly about the reasons for the "surprise" (bandwidth, boredom, etc.) until we see the details of the Pathfinder questions and sample.

The point that the Internet has yet to "take off" in terms of home entertainment medium still remains. Whether it ever will is an open question.

I'm not sure I've ever thought of it as an "entertainment medium." But it's a great tool. I have my cookie recipes on a homepage so that my grown-up kids can download what they need whenever they want it, instead of making a long-distance phone call.

Ooh, now if there was a way to download the actual cookies so easily, that would really be something...

Colleen Kay Porter
Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu UF
From: RobFarbman@aol.com
Received: from RobFarbman@aol.com
by imo26.mx.aol.com (IMOv20.21) id 5BLLa03723 (14374) 
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Jun 1999 09:15:10 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <8515da21.24a237dd@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 09:15:09 EDT
Subject: Fwd: Question on Polling African Americans -Forwarded
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part1_8515da21.24a237dd_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214

--part1_8515da21.24a237dd_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

--part1_8515da21.24a237dd_boundary
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Rob,

As you noted, yes, there are several research findings that show that Black and Hispanic respondents are MORE likely to use the extreme ends of a response scale (and less acculturated Hispanics do this more than acculturated Hispanics). Certain cultures view extreme responses as more "sincere." Therefore, indeed you have a racial/ethnic variable intervening into your scale.

See for example:


"Yea-saying, nay-saying and going to extremes: Black-white differences in response styles" Bachman, JG and O'Malley, PM in Public Opinion Quarterly, 1984, 48, 491-509

Diane O'Rourke
Survey Research Laboratory
University of Illinois
217-333-7170

Received: from usc.edu (localhost [127.0.0.1])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
   id NAA16749; Thu, 17 Jun 1999 13:31:15 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA16511 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Jun 1999 13:30:39 -0700 (PDT)
(PDT)
Received: from RobFarbman@aol.com (8008)
   by imo12.mx.aol.com (IMOv20) id 5ZIVa10677
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Jun 1999 16:28:13 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <13ae1d0d.249ab45b@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 16:28:11 EDT
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
Our company performs research on music. Over the years we have found that African Americans tend to give scores to music that are 30-40% higher on average than whites. We have always assumed that African Americans simply like music much more passionately than whites, and this explains the difference. Recently, however, someone mentioned to us that in many kinds of satisfaction or taste research, African Americans consistently give top box scores that are significantly higher than whites.

Does anyone have insights into this phenomenon? Is anyone aware of research that shows that African Americans are more generous with top box scores across all categories? Or conversely, that whites are less generous with top box scores?

Please email me directly at robfarbman@aol.com with any information you might
have.

Thanks.

Rob Farbman
Edison Media Research
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As a sometime dabbler in applications of cognitive sciences to survey methodology (in my view, so far, so scant) I was struck by ready survey engineering implications I found in an item today on the ABC News web service: "Men's Health: Improving Your Memory." It included one principle
we found extremely productive that some call "domain-dependent learning," that is, recall occurs more readily and accurately to the extent that the recall environment is like the environment in which the relevant learning took place. While we can't follow an example in the ABC piece by asking a man being interviewed at home about an office job to put on a business suit, some efforts toward mise en scene in interviewing should be helpful.

There were two more sensational suggestions. William Cone is quoted on the periodic shifting between cerebral hemispheres so that matter learned when the right hemisphere is in its heightened state is recalled better when that hemisphere is also in the heightened state; and so, too, with the left hemisphere. He then adds the knowledge that breathing through one nostril heightens that side's brain activity. So if you can't recall where you put your car keys, try to recall it with your finger on (or in, if it suits you) the right nostril, and then if that doesn't work, try again after a bit while blocking the left one. For a survey, one would do the same screener successively with the right and then the right nostril blocked. (Of course, any plausible excuse for repeating a set of screen questions can be quite productive, as can any possible excuse one gives oneself for thinking anew on where one's car keys might be. Even more important would be any effect it had toward convincing the respondent of the importance the survey places on full and accurate recall.)

The second suggestion related to certain memory enhancing foods. Now if we could only get respondents to partake mightily of carrots, chick peas, kidney beans, chicken and tuna the day before the interview. OK, so now I've got you pinching both nostrils.

[A listserver problem delayed posting this by two days. I saw the cited ABC News feature on June 21.] Albert D. Biderman abider@american.edu
I read the questionnaire/results from the report "Expecting More Say: The American Public on Its Role in Government Decisionmaking" by Steven Kull and colleagues at the Center on Policy Attitudes (http://www.policyattitudes.org). Interesting study (especially for policy wonks).
A number of questions about the role of opinion polls may be of interest to AAPOR members.

I found it interesting that there was no difference in a split sample in which one part was asked "About what percentage of the time does Congress make decisions that are the same as the decisions that [YOU] would make?" and the other part was asked the same question in terms of [THE MAJORITY OF AMERICANS].

Also, a question (#32-34) which seems to refer to the Deliberative = "Poll" lends support to the idea that the DP method could increase legitimacy among the general public in controversial public policy decision-making (as a public involvement tool).

Glad COPA included full questionnaire and results-makes for easy reading when time is limited.

Mark Richards

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Wed Jun 23 15:12:31 1999
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id PAA22804 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Jun 1999 15:12:30 -0700 (PDT)
From: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu
Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
   id <N3ZHLW5G>; Wed, 23 Jun 1999 15:15:47 -0700
Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A2136F64F5@psg.ucsf.edu>
I am posting this request for a fellow scientist here at the University of California, San Francisco. Please direct your kind responses to Claire Brindis, DrPH at brindis@itsa.ucsf.edu.

We are hoping you may know of some literature looking at what people's perceptions are of the answer choices "always, sometimes, and never" in comparison to numerical choices-half the time, three-fourths of the time, etc. We are in the midst of working on the evaluation of an intervention program and have just begun to survey clients using the program. We included one question that was erroneously coded as never, 1/4 the time, =BD the time, =BE of the time, and always and we want to compare it to an identical
question that was used on the State Women's Health Survey but with the
options "always, sometimes, and never".

We are hoping that there might be some literature that enables us to
know how comparable "sometimes" would be to numerical choices, such as
someone who rates =BE of the time as either sometimes or who might rate this
as always. We thought that you would be the ones who would know if any
such literature exists. I would greatly appreciate it if you know of any such studies
as soon as possible as it has major implications for a cost-benefit study underway.

Thanks a lot for all your help.

Lance M. Pollack
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

From karl_feld@usa.net Wed Jun 23 15:36:32 1999
Received: from aw161.netaddress.usa.net (aw161.netaddress.usa.net [204.68.24.61])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id PAA29979 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Jun 1999 15:36:17 -0700 (PDT)
Received: (qmail 1754 invoked by uid 60001); 23 Jun 1999 22:35:01 -0000
Message-ID: <19990623223501.1753.qmail@aw161.netaddress.usa.net>
Does anyone have a recommendation on current literature discussing topic =
bias in introduction. I've found very little so far and would appreciate =

references!

Karl Feld
WWORC
SURVEY REVEALS CONSUMER CONCERN OVER E-COMMERCE SECURITY ISSUES

A recent report studying consumer confidence and acceptance in technologies indicates that consumers worry about privacy and security regarding e-commerce. The National Technology Readiness Survey, conducted by Rockbridge Associates, indicated that 58 percent of consumers do not consider any financial transaction online to be safe; 67 percent are not confident conducting business with a company that can only be reached online; 77 percent think it is unsafe to provide a credit card number over the computer; and 87 percent want e-commerce transactions confirmed in writing. The two-year survey polled 1,001 randomly-chosen households. (E-Commerce Times Online 06/21/99)

----------------------------------------------------------------
News abstracts Copyright 1999, Information Inc., Bethesda, MD. Edupage
Copyright 1999, EDUCAUSE, an international nonprofit association dedicated
to transforming education through information technologies.

While these findings are of interest I would like to see an analysis that looked at the views of those people they interviewed at the beginning of the study (two years ago) and those they interviewed at the end of the study. And, of course, I'd also like to see the actual questions and methodology.
I would suspect that opinions changed quite a bit over that two year span. Two years ago e-commerce was much more a coming idea (other than Amazon) compared to now when you can buy from Land's End, Eddie Bauer and Barnes and Noble on-line.

Two years is an eternity on the Internet.

--
Leo G. Simonetta http://www.artsci.com
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

-----Original Message-----
> From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
> Sent: Saturday, June 26, 1999 10:01 AM
> To: AAPORNET
> Subject: Rockbridge Survey on E-Commerce Security
>
> SURVEY REVEALS CONSUMER CONCERN OVER E-COMMERCE SECURITY ISSUES
>
> A recent report studying consumer confidence and acceptance in technologies indicates that consumers worry about privacy and security regarding e-commerce. The National Technology Readiness Survey, conducted by Rockbridge Associates, indicated that 58 percent of
> consumers do not consider any financial transaction online to be safe;
> 67 percent are not confident conducting business with a company that
> can only be reached online; 77 percent think it is unsafe to provide a
> credit card number over the computer; and 87 percent want e-commerce
> transactions confirmed in writing. The two-year survey polled 1,001
> randomly-chosen households. (E-Commerce Times Online 06/21/99)
> 
> News abstracts Copyright 1999, Information Inc., Bethesda, MD. Edupage
> Copyright 1999, EDUCAUSE, an international nonprofit association
> dedicated to transforming education through information technologies.

>From jpearson@stanford.edu Mon Jun 28 11:40:32 1999
Received: from smtp2.Stanford.EDU (smtp2.Stanford.EDU [171.64.14.23])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA00043 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Jun 1999 11:40:31 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ..stanford.edu (PC-Pearson-J.Stanford.EDU [36.188.0.94])
    by smtp2.Stanford.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3/L) with SMTP id LAA15563;
    Mon, 28 Jun 1999 11:40:28 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19990628113917.006a6104@jpearson.pobox.stanford.edu>
X-Sender: jpearson@jpearson.pobox.stanford.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 11:40:28 -0700
To: por@vance.irss.unc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@stanford.edu>
Subject: Stats software
In reply to Gary Siegel's question about stats software that produces high quality tables and graphs: I've been very happy with Statpac for the five years I've used it. Statpac is extremely easy to use for everything from descriptive stats to crosstabs and banners to regressions and other advanced analyses. It is especially easy to create and edit your survey format (variables, names, labels, etc) -- maybe because it seems to be made specifically for survey research instead of for other sorts of research data. They just came out with a Windows version that looks excellent and even easier to use. I demo'd it and am about to buy it. You have a fair amount of flexibility in setting the appearance of tables, and they look very good. I don't know how good the graphics are because I never use them. I always prefer to hand make my own graphs with Harvard Graphics. The guy who created Statpac does the customer support himself and has always been extremely responsive. I haven't had any problems with it, but the few questions I've had have all been answered quickly and thoroughly.

You can get info and download a demo at: http://www.statpac.com/

(I should note that I have no connection with Statpac other than being a very satisfied customer.)

If you make any inquiries about it, please mention my name. (Who knows when a brownie point might come in handy.)

Jerold Pearson
This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

----------DA559387F341D8F04180277B
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Some members of this forum who may wish to comment on this.

Headlines are showing that in May, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce, the national savings rate continued to decline, down to -1.4%. The implication here is that Americans are spending 1.4% more than they earned as income.

But National Income and Product Account data show declining rates of savings during economic boom periods - now time are so good that the rate is negative.

But the savings rate is calculated based on the difference between income and expenditures and includes assumed new liabilities as an outlay. One example: when times are good people buy homes. But unless you pay cash for a house, additional mortgage debt assumed is counted as an outlay. I also read that capital gains is not counted as income.

Questions: Is the above accurate? If so, why is the savings rate significant?

The link below will take you to the BEA site.

http://beadata.bea.doc.gov/

------------DA559387F341D8F04180277B
Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
BEA, an agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce, is the nation's economic accountant, preparing estimates that illuminate key national, international, and regional aspects of the U.S. economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Bureau-wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP and related data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry and wealth data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview of the U.S. economy**

**Catalog of products**

**Feedback**
Our <A href="bea/uguide.htm">Catalog of products</A> gives you another way to find and download data files. Descriptions of the <A href="bea/mp.htm">methodologies</A> used to prepare national, regional, and international estimates are available here.

Privacy policy for the BEA web site.

--------DA559387F341D8F04180277B--

>From mkshares@mcs.net Tue Jun 29 07:15:23 1999
Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id HAA23877 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 29 Jun 1999 07:15:22 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mcs.net (P32-Chi-Dial-6.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.96]) by
Correction: Capital gains.

>From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Tue Jun 29 07:48:00 1999
Received: from mtiwmhc04.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc04.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.39])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA00697 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 29 Jun 1999 07:48:00 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from default ([12.75.197.52]) by mtiwmhc04.worldnet.att.net
    (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134) with SMTP
    id <19990629144727.NKSM1417@default>;
    Tue, 29 Jun 1999 14:47:27 +0000
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19990629092310.006a49e8@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>
X-Sender: Jim-Wolf@postoffice.worldnet.att.net
I'm posting this for Kathy Trier <trier@ipfw.edu>.

> 
> Sorry for the cross listings: 

> 
> This is one you don't want to miss! 
> The New Millennium . . . Are You Ready? 

> 
> The Society for Applied Sociology 
> Presents its 17th Annual Meeting in Dallas, Texas 
> October 28-31, 1999 

> 
> The 1999 annual meeting of SAS is one you will not want to miss! It is 
> filled with: 

> 
> INNOVATION and CREATIVITY 

> 
> Conference Session Highlights 
> Annual meeting sessions will be held on Friday, October 29 and 
> Saturday, 
> October 30th. Traditional paper presentations, panel discussions, poster 
> sessions, demonstration sessions and free workshops are on the agenda. Here
is a sample of the sessions being presented this year:

From College to Career: Strategies for Success;
A Symbolic Interaction Perspective;
Applied Sociology in International Action-Based Projects; Teaching
Quantitative Skills: Basic Skills;
Using PKGD and Self-Designed Modules;
Organizational Interventions;
Educational Sociology: Building Coalitions Among University and High School Institutions;
Removing Barriers to Research on Rape and Domestic Violence;
Outcomes and Controversy: Public Relations to Education Reform;
Using Sociology to Target Local Health Risk-Reduction;
Research/Teaching Grant Information;
Performance Measures and CQI Process;
Expert Witness: Selling Sociology to the Courts

NEW features in the program:
Poster sessions -- Applied sociologists, community agencies and organizations, and applied sociology program showcase their work or innovative programs.
Technology demonstrations in the Tool Shed -- Technology vendors with the latest in computer applications, presentational materials, and hardware.
Professional Problem-solving Exercise -- professional applied sociologists will work with a selected client on a problem/case.
Student Problem-solving Exercise -- 1998 teams present their "case" and 1999 teams work on their "case."
Plenary session -- 2 plenary sessions: one follows the theme of Janus with
>a look back at the same time we look forward.

>Special Tool Kit sessions -- the how-to's of new and old techniques used in

>applied work.

>

>There is still time to submit your proposal! Submit on-line at

> http://www.appliedsoc.org or email trier@ipfw.edu

>

>Hotel Information

>

>The location of our annual meeting is the Doubletree Hotel at Lincoln Centre, located at 5410 LBJ Freeway in Dallas, Texas. The hotel is a recipient of the coveted AAA Four-Diamond Award for the ninth straight year.

>Single Occupancy $ 119  Junior Suite     $230

>Double Occupancy $ 119  One Bdrm St     $ 475

>Triple Occupancy $ 129  Two Bdrm St     $ 600

>Quad Occupancy $ 139

>These rates are subject to a 15% tax.

>

>Reservation requests must be made directly with the Doubletree Hotel by October 6, 1999. For reservations, call the hotel directly at 1-972-934-8400.

>

>

>Meeting Registration Form

>Name:______________________________________________

>Address:____________________________________________

>____________________________________________________
Registration fees include the following: Welcome Reception, Thursday, October 28 (cash bar) Continental breakfast, luncheon, and afternoon break, Friday, October 29 and Saturday, October 30 All one day registration fees include the luncheon plus scheduled coffee breaks for the day of registration. All registrations must be received no later than October 1.

Friday evening entertainment will be bus trip to Billy Bob’s in Ft. Worth; please note if you will plan to come and if you plan to dine there also. Bus fee is separate from dining, which is at your own cost.

I would like to register for the SAS annual meeting. The registration fees are as follows (check one):

Before July 1    After July 1
- q SAS or SPA member  $160     $175
- q Non-member           $190     $200
- q Student member       $75     $85
- q One day member       $90     $100
- q One day non-member   $110     $120
- q One day student non-member $60    $70

I want to ride by bus to Billy Bob’s on Friday night at $10.00 per
person

for bus trip. Dining is not included in price of registration or transportation. q Yes! q No

Fees: I would like to renew or pay my SAS dues in the amount of (check one and complete enclosed form):

q Regular member $ 65
q Student member 30
q Organization or department member 100
q International member 75

Total Amount Enclosed $___________________________

Send to: Society for Applied Sociology Center for Community Research

Development Baylor University P.O. Box 97131 Waco, TX 76798-7131 If you have questions about the registration materials, please call 254-710-3811 or e-mail info@appliedsoc.org.

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

Jim Wolf Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

From dhenwood@panix.com Tue Jun 29 09:58:34 1999

Received: from mail2.panix.com (mail2.panix.com [166.84.0.213])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
Nick Panagakis wrote:

>But the savings rate is calculated based on the difference between
>income and expenditures and includes assumed new liabilities as an
>outlay. One example: when times are good people buy homes. But unless
>you pay cash for a house, additional mortgage debt assumed is counted
>as an outlay. I also read that capital gains is not counted as income.
>
>Questions: Is the above accurate? If so, why is the savings rate
>significant?

Capital gains are not included as income. The reason is that under
the conventions of national income and product accounting, income
must be charged against production - e.g. wages are earned for work.

With capital gains, there's no product to correspond to the expenditure. The cash realized in a capital gain comes from someone else's current income - e.g., someone who buys the shares that you sell.

The savings rate is significant in that it shows that present consumption levels are being sustained by what economists call dissaving - drawing down existing savings or borrowing. This is the first U.S. business cycle expansion since WW II in which more than 100% of the growth in after-tax income has been consumed; the average was about 90% (the other 10% of income growth was presumably saved). You're right that the savings rate has been falling since the early 1980s. The U.S. has gotten away with this because of a tremendous inflow of foreign capital. Net U.S. foreign debt is almost $2 trillion, about half of it from the last 3-4 years. No one seems to care about this. It might be interesting for pollsters to ask some questions, in fact.

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
250 W 85 St
New York NY 10024-3217 USA
+1-212-874-4020 voice  +1-212-874-3137 fax
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>

>From rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu Tue Jun 29 13:30:35 1999
Received: from opinion (opinion.isi.uconn.edu [137.99.84.21])
I did a little analysis and found the results interesting. Many of you have probably seen something similar already but here it is. Gallup asked the following question in early June:

"Do you favor or oppose sending 7,000 US (United States) ground troops along with troops from other countries to serve as peacekeepers in Kosovo?"

Results by Party ID are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I thought hmmmm. Normally I think Republicans are more inclined to favor military action. Now looking at a question from the Desert Storm era, with a sitting President who is Republican...

Gallup also asked (August, 1990): "Do you approve or disapprove of the United States' decision to send U.S. troops to Saudi Arabia as a defense against Iraq?"

Once again results by Party ID are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It's common knowledge that there is a correlation between the presidential job approval rating and the economic condition of the country. It seems there may also be a correlation between Party ID and military action based on the Party of the sitting president.

Rob Persons

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

Rob Persons
The Roper Center
rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu
www.ropercenter.uconn.edu
What about military action and sex (that sounds unintentionally provocative)? Are men more in favor of it than women?

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
250 W 85 St
From: Albert Biderman <abider@earthlink.net>

Subject: Re: military action and PartyID

References: <3.0.32.19990629162207.007dd260@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>

Good to see posts on this topic. As I wrote here early during the Kosovo action, it was notably absent from AAPORNET discussions. Al Biderman
abidfer@american.edu

Rob Persons wrote:
I did a little analysis and found the results interesting. Many of you have probably seen something similar already but here it is.

Gallup asked the following question in early June:

"Do you favor or oppose sending 7,000 US (United States) ground troops along with troops from other countries to serve as peacekeepers in Kosovo?"

Results by Party ID are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I thought hmmmm. Normally I think Republicans are more inclined to favor military action. Now looking at a question from the Desert Storm era, with a sitting President who is Republican...

Gallup also asked (August, 1990): "Do you approve or disapprove of the United States' decision to send U.S. troops to Saudi Arabia as a defense against Iraq?"

Once again results by Party ID are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It's common knowledge that there is a correlation between the presidential job approval rating and the economic condition of the country. It seems there may also be a correlation between Party ID and military action based on the Party of the sitting president.

Rob Persons

******************************************************************************
Rob Persons
The Roper Center
rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu
www.ropercenter.uconn.edu
ph: (860) 486-4440
fax: (860) 486-6308
******************************************************************************

From ajsupple@students.wisc.edu Tue Jun 29 14:35:45 1999
Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA28826; Tue, 29 Jun 1999 14:35:44 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from [144.92.210.185] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu
    id QAA246944 (8.9.1/50); Tue, 29 Jun 1999 16:35:37 -0500
Message-Id: <199906292135.QAA246944@mail1.doit.wisc.edu>
X-Sender: ajsupple@students.wisc.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2
Or if you are inclined to accept the reasoning of William Saletan (in the July/August issue of Mother Jones), liberals (dems, theoretically) support military interventions when humanitarian interests are at stake (main purpose in Kosovo was to halt ethnic cleansing and atrocities) while conservatives favor intervention when national interests are at risk (i.e. oil).

At 04:22 PM 6/29/99 -0400, Rob Persons wrote:

> I did a little analysis and found the results interesting. Many of you
> have probably seen something similar already but here it is. Gallup
> asked the following question in early June:
> 
> "Do you favor or oppose sending 7,000 US (United States) ground troops
> along with troops from other countries to serve as peacekeepers in
> Kosovo?"
>
> Results by Party ID are:
> 
> Democrats  Republicans
> Favor  63%  43%
> Oppose  33%  55%
> I thought hmmm. Normally I think Republicans are more inclined to
> favor military action. Now looking at a question from the Desert Storm
> era, with a sitting President who is Republican...
> Gallup also asked (August, 1990): "Do you approve or disapprove of the
> United States' decision to send U.S. troops to Saudi Arabia as a
> defense against Iraq?"
> Once again results by Party ID are:
> Democrats  Republicans
> Approve  70%  87%
> Disapprove  25%  10%
> It's common knowledge that there is a correlation between the
> presidential job approval rating and the economic condition of the
> country. It seems there may also be a correlation between Party ID and
> military action based on the Party of the sitting president.
> Rob Persons
> **************************
> Rob Persons
> The Roper Center
>From Adam.Safir@arbitron.com Wed Jun 30 08:49:57 1999
Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id IAA03846 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 08:49:56 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id LAA16340; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 11:40:02
-0400 (EDT)
Received: from arbmdex.arbitron.com(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via
smap (4.1)
   id xma016309; Wed, 30 Jun 99 11:39:45 -0400
Received: by arbmdex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
   id <MV02L0AA>; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 11:43:56 -0400
Message-ID: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B3B156B0@arbmdex.arbitron.com>
From: "Safir, Adam" <Adam.Safir@arbitron.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: FW: PC Ownership Doubles While Home Use Stagnates
My apologies for backing up a couple of threads=

After the lively AAPORNET discussion regarding Arbitron's latest =
Pathfinder Study, I forwarded Jacquelyn Schriber's question concerning respondent = age over to Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of research at Arbitron = NewMedia (along with some of the other insightful hypotheses posted by = AAPORNETters). Roberta just got back to me after returning from vacation, and her = reply is attached below: =20

> -----Original Message-----
> From: McConochie, Roberta
> Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 1999 3:34 PM
> To: Safir, Adam
> Subject: RE: PC Ownership Doubles While Home Use Stagnates

> Hey Adam. Thanks for the feedback. This year, we added a special =
study
of children. We > talked w/ 400+ kids 8 - 15 after we interviewed a
selected adult (16-74). The write up=20
> of the kids' data will go out in July. Interesting & informative =
results
-- and I believe > of great interest to the AAPOR/academic communities. = I
did a review of recent lit and it > appears to me that there's a =
dearth of
probability-sample research on kids' media uses.
>FYI, the 3 reasons I see and infer for the drop in PC owners' home =
use
are:
>
> 1. daytime PC fatigue, given the escalation of PC-dependent office =
work
> 2. diminishing PC commitment especially among the newer owners =
(given
reduced price, and > lessened specific driving, compelling reasons =
for
need/use)
> 3. rising consumer expectations and diminishing patience -- given =
the
plethora of > always-on, easy access devices/services
>=20
> Also, FYI, kids home PC use does not "explain" the lack of increase =
in the
adult-home- > user population. That's an independent issue. Feel =
free
to share some or all of this > with the AAPOR people. I'd love to
continue the dialog.
>
> r
>=20
Original Message

From: Jacquelyn B Schriber [mailto:market.probe.la@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 9:16 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: market.probe.la@juno.com
Subject: Re: PC Ownership Doubles While Home Use Stagnates

Hypothesis: The respondents are adults, but in many households, only the kids use the Internet???

Jacquie

Market Probe, Inc. - PMB #635, 915-C W Foothill Blvd, Claremont, CA
91711-3356
Phone: 909.626.6172 Fax: 909.626.6072
AAPORNETters,

Of the several interesting findings in this new Pathfinder Study just released by Arbitron NewMedia, perhaps the most surprising is that, while 38 percent of U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home, only a portion of these people--24 percent of U.S. consumers--report actual Web use at home. In other words, fewer than two out of every three people who could use the Web at home actually do.

Any ideas about what might account for such results?

-- Jim

* * *
NEW YORK--Despite a nearly doubling of home PC access in the last four years, the percentage of the U.S. population who actually use PCs has stagnated according to the latest Pathfinder Study just released from Arbitron NewMedia.

According to the study, computers have become as popular
as many home appliances, with home penetration nearly doubling from 29% in 1995 to 54% in 1999. However, the percentage of people with access to a home PC who actually use it has fallen off from a high of 90% in 1995 to 53% today. High income consumers ($75K or more) report the highest incidence of PC use at home - 51%, a decline of 10% since 1997.

"This decline in actual usage is part of a trend we've been tracking for the last three years," said Dr. Roberta McConochie, director of research at Arbitron NewMedia. "Apparently, many consumers deal with PCs and other technologies all day at work. By the time they get home, many of these technology-weary users prefer to wind down and spend time with their families rather than interact with office-like PCs. To achieve sustained growth in home computer sales, manufacturers will have to"
design information appliances with more obvious, easy-access benefits in mind. Clearly, ownership of a home PC does not equal usage."

The Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study also determined that the large majority of PC owners - 70 percent - subscribe to Internet services at home - a fourfold increase over the 16 percent access rate in 1995.

But home web subscription does not guarantee home PC use. While nearly four out of every ten U.S. consumers currently report Web subscriptions at home (38 percent), only a portion of these people, 24 percent of U.S. consumers, report actual Web use at home.

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

The Pathfinder Study is an on-going comprehensive survey of consumer media behavior and new media preferences. The study examined American purchasing and user preferences of consumer technology. Results were based on extensive 1999 national telephone and mail surveys, which canvassed a total of 5,500 U.S. consumers, age 16-74. This survey
comprises the first phase of the 1999 Pathfinder research.

Additional data will become available throughout 1999 and 2000. For information on the Arbitron NewMedia Pathfinder Study, contact Arbitron NewMedia, 9705 Patuxent Woods Drive, Columbia, MD 21046; telephone (410) 312-8429.

Copyright © 1999 Business Wire, Inc.
I have a question regarding weighting procedures in survey sampling. I took a class in which the teacher explained that when weighting, "n" does not change. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Actual Pop. #</th>
<th>weight assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 women</td>
<td>40 women</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 men</td>
<td>60 men</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This makes sense. However, I need to understand how this differs from the following weighting procedure:

At work, we had a survey that used a 4 segment weighting procedure to weight and project survey returns to reflect the actual population. Please see
example below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unweighted Census Pop Weighting</th>
<th>HH return</th>
<th>#HH</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent Segment</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115,708</td>
<td>1345.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle segment</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>106,880</td>
<td>980.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89,910</td>
<td>956.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>490,529</td>
<td>1211.182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here after you use the weighting factor, "n" does change. Am I confusing two concepts or weighting procedures? Can someone please explain the difference?
The answer is this - n does NOT change if all you are doing is what is called balancing. Again going w/the example, you have a sample of 100, 50% male and 50% female. but we want 60% male and 40% female. We would apply a weight of 1.2 to each male and a weight of .8 to each female. Notice that the end sample still equals 100 - this is just because we balanced the data.

The next example that you talk about involves projecting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unweighted Census Pop Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent Segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, you want to take your sample and project it to a national sample so the end sample now equals that of the population. So =
I have a question regarding weighting procedures in survey sampling. I took a class in which the teacher explained that when weighting, "n" does not change. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Actual Pop. #</th>
<th>weight assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 women</td>
<td>40 women</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 men</td>
<td>60 men</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This makes sense. However, I need to understand how this differs from the following weighting procedure:

At work, we had a survey that used a 4 segment weighting procedure to weight and project survey returns to reflect the actual population. Please see
example below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>HH return</th>
<th>Pop</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn County</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115,708</td>
<td>1345.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent Segment</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>106,880</td>
<td>980.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle segment</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>89,910</td>
<td>956.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>490,529</td>
<td>1211.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here after you use the weighting factor, "n" does change. Am I confusing two concepts or weighting procedures? Can someone please explain the difference?

_________________________________________________________

Do You Yahoo!

Get your free @yahoo.com address at http://mail.yahoo.com=20
On Wed, 30 Jun 1999, Isabelle Spencer wrote:

> I have a question regarding weighting procedures in survey sampling.
> I took a class in which the teacher explained that when weighting, "n"
> does not change. For example:
>
> # of Survey Respondents   Actual Pop. #   weight assigned
> 50 women                   40 women   .8
> 50 men                     60 men    1.2
>
> This makes sense.

It does? I don't see how one gets 50 women to respondent out of an actual population of 40. Some respond twice?

At any rate, I find this use of "n" a very regrettable terminology. It is like using the Greek letter mu for a mean --- it's fine in formulas but I don't think it should be in text.

n or (ugh!) "unweighted n" is usually the sample size.

N or (ugh!) "weighted n" is usually the population size (or an estimate of
However, I need to understand how this differs from the following weighting procedure:

At work, we had a survey that used a 4 segment weighting procedure to weight and project survey returns to reflect the actual population. Please see example below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Unweighted HH return</th>
<th>Census Pop #HH</th>
<th>Weighting Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent Segment</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115,708</td>
<td>1345.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle segment</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>106,880</td>
<td>980.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89,910</td>
<td>956.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>490,529</td>
<td>1211.182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hereafter you use the weighting factor, "n" does change. Am I confusing two concepts or weighting procedures? Can someone please explain the difference?

"Unweighted HH return" is the number of respondents (sample size minus number of non-respondents). Sometimes this is called r. Then r = n - m where m is the number of non-respondents and n is the sample size.

"Census Pop #HH" is the population size (population of households). It might also be called N or (unfortunately) "weighted n" (or "weighted r"?). It is either known in advance (as I think it was in this case) or calculated, as you surmise, using the weights.
No, since "reversal" occurs among Republicans but not Democrats (I shall ignore Saletan's "liberal" and "conservative" labels), one might say that Republicans favor military force ONLY when national interests are at stake.
whereas Democrats are not so exclusive.

Regardless, all these "guesses" are just that. Some "why" questions are in order. Also, I would expect some generational effects as well. Those with a world view dominated by World War II may well have a more visceral response to the need for military action in the Balkans that cuts across party and ideological labels. That's speculation of course. Bottom line, the data presented are insufficient to support any of the interpretations.

Lance M. Pollack
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: andy supple [SMTP:ajsupple@students.wisc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 1999 8:17 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu; AAPORNET@usc.edu
Subject: Re: military action and PartyID

Or if you are inclined to accept the reasoning of William Saletan (in the July/August issue of Mother Jones), liberals (dems, theoretically) support militar interventions when humanitarian interests are at stake (main purpose in Kosovo was to halt ethnic cleansing and atrocities) while conservatives favor intervention when national interests are at risk (i.e. oil).
>I did a little analysis and found the results interesting. Many of you have probably seen something similar already but here it is. Gallup asked the following question in early June:
>
>"Do you favor or oppose sending 7,000 US (United States) ground troops along with troops from other countries to serve as peacekeepers in Kosovo?"
>
>Results by Party ID are:
>
>Democrats   Republicans
>
>Favor       63%       43%

>Oppose      33%       55%

>I thought hmmmm. Normally I think Republicans are more inclined to favor military action. Now looking at a question from the Desert Storm era, with a sitting President who is Republican...
United States’ decision to send U.S. troops to Saudi Arabia as a defense against Iraq?"

Once again results by Party ID are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It's common knowledge that there is a correlation between the presidential job approval rating and the economic condition of the country. It seems there may also be a correlation between Party ID and military action based on the Party of the sitting president.

Rob Persons

**************************
Rob Persons
The Roper Center
rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu
www.ropercenter.uconn.edu
ph: (860) 486-4440
fax:(860) 486-6308
**************************
Isabelle,

> andrew j supple
> university of wisconsin-madison
> 1430 linden drive madison wi 53711
> home 608.258.9248
> work 608.265.8584
> ajsupple@students.wisc.edu

>From ARCGTH@langate.gsu.edu Wed Jun 30 13:54:24 1999
Received: from sphinx.Gsu.EDU (root@sphinx.Gsu.EDU [131.96.1.22])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA01464 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 13:54:23 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from langate.gsu.edu (langate.Gsu.EDU [131.96.175.15])
   by sphinx.Gsu.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3-GSU-MOD-3) with SMTP id QAA20492
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 16:54:22 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from GSU-Message_Server by langate.gsu.edu
   with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 16:57:13 -0400
Message-Id: <s77a4c69.009@langate.gsu.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 16:57:01 -0400
From: "Gary T. Henry" <ARCGTH@langate.gsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Weighting Procedures Question
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

Isabelle,
The type of weights that you wish to use are called post-stratification weights. The reason that most people keep the n the same for weighted and unweighted analysis is that it does not change the calculation for standard errors and tests of significance, if you employed a simple random sample in the first place. If you did a stratified sample then you need to compute design based standard errors and perhaps probability weights. The weights that you want to use can be computed by computing the proportion of the total population represented by the group \((N_{group}/N_{population})\) and dividing that by the sample proportions for the group \((n_{group}/n_{population})\). Normally, we do this for age, gender and race, and in that case we use the three way crosstab proportions. If I read the columns correctly on my e-mail the first group represents \(.124\) or your sample and \(.144\) of your population, so the weight is \(1.16\). Using poststratification weights have some controversy associated with them but I think that many of us use them to correct for some obvious biases that exist. However, be aware that that poststratification is not a cure all for non-response problems. If non-response is much greater in one group than another the results are likely to be biased, but the extent is unknown. In this case, weighting is a partial correction. Gary Henry

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Wed Jun 30 14:37:45 1999
Received: from smtp4.mindspring.com (smtp4.mindspring.com [207.69.200.64]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA15024 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 14:37:44 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from default (user-2ive3k8.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.14.136]) by smtp4.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id RAA26228 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 17:37:41 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.1.19990630173230.00b89850@pop.mindspring.com>
> Using poststratification weights have some controversy associated with them
> but I think that many of us use them to correct for some obvious biases that
> exist. However, be aware that that poststratification is not a cure all for
> non-response problems. If non-response is much greater in one group than
> another the results are likely to be biased, but the extent is unknown. In
> this case, weighting is a partial correction.
> 
> Gary Henry

Post stratification weighting is not generally done to reduce bias. It is a means for reducing the sampling error. The sampling error will be reduced if the correlation between the weighting variable and the variable being estimated is +0.5 or better. If the correlation is less than this the sampling error will not be reduced. It may be increased. If the correlation is as large as +1.0 the sampling error will be zero. The use of post
stratification weighting for dealing with non-response may or may not reduce the bias of non-response, if there is any. This is a separate problem from the one of making an estimate with a lower sampling error. There is nothing controversial about the procedure if it is part of the sample design and not something decided post hoc.

warren mitofsky

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

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From ARCGTH@langate.gsu.edu Wed Jun 30 15:07:10 1999
Received: from sphinx.Gsu.EDU (root@sphinx.Gsu.EDU [131.96.1.22])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA23306 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 15:07:09 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from langate.gsu.edu (langate.Gsu.EDU [131.96.175.15])
    by sphinx.Gsu.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3-GSU-MOD-3) with SMTP id SAA28768
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 18:07:03 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from GSU-Message_Server by langate.gsu.edu
    with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 30 Jun 1999 18:07:27 -0400
Message-Id: <s77a5cdf.088@langate.gsu.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 18:07:21 -0400
From: "Gary T. Henry" <ARCGTH@langate.gsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Weighting Procedures Question

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

>>> Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com> 06/30 5:41 PM responded:
"Post stratification weighting is not generally done to reduce bias. It is =
a means for reducing the sampling error. The sampling error will be reduced
= if the correlation between the weighting variable and the variable being =
estimated is +0.5 or better. If the correlation is less than this the
sampling error = will not be reduced. It may be increased. If the
correlation is as large as =
+1.0 the
sampling error will be zero. The use of post stratification weighting for
dealing with non-response may or may not reduce the bias of non-response, =
if there is any. This is a separate problem from the one of making an =
estimate with a lower sampling error. There is nothing controversial about
the = procedure if it is part of the sample design and not something decided
post hoc." The difference in our comments has mainly to do with the role of
the = stratification at the time of design, I believe and perhaps
terminology. = Warren assumes that the stratification was done during
design and is = correct if that is the case. I made the assumption that
they were being = suggested as a post hoc procedure. If the strata were not
used in the design phase then I usually refer to = that as
poststratification weighting and is done for a number of issue but = mainly
differential nonresponse. If the weights are based on disproportionate stratified sampling, then they are probability weights, done for reduction in sampling error. Gary Henry