I have in the past convinced local officials for the need of local opinion polls to gauge support for policies or new initiatives from the entire electorate rather than just the NIMBYs who show up for public meetings. Do officials follow opinion polls? No. But it will give them ammunition if the poll supports their position. If
the
poll doesn't support their position, then the recommendation was for an increased information campaign before taking action.

In the absence of public opinion polls, policy makers rely on some very unreliable sources for what their constituents want--people who show for public meetings, letter-writers and donors.

> -----Original Message-----
> From:     Susan Losh [SMTP:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu]
> Sent:     Thursday, May 31, 2001 8:54 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject:  Re: FYI: Polling and policy setting competition
>
> Well, the issue is whether the public has "thought through" the issues, including the tradeoffs involved, so as to give "informed input" to policy makers.
>
> It's not a bad idea on the face of it.
>
> However, one has to wonder just how well-informed many *policy makers* are (my all-time favorite is the adoption of the "whole language" approach to reading by many school boards, despite the lack of research evidence that showed whether it even worked as well as phonics, let alone better) not to mention how suspicious I am of the "tradeoffs" engaged in by many policy makers.
>
> Susan
>
> At 05:36 PM 5/31/2001 -0700, you wrote:
> >And why, may I ask, should only the opinions of those who are "well-informed" (by whose definition) count? A bit elitist, I would say. Reminds me a bit of the "old South" and barriers to African-American voting.
> >
> >Jennifer Franz
> >JD Franz Research, Inc.
> >
> >Mark David Richards wrote:
> >
> >> CBSNews.com coverage of same essay, with comments from CATO's John SAMPLES
> >> ...
> >>
> >> Opinion Polls Not Reliable for Policymakers, Study Says
> >> By Lawrence Morahan
> >> CNSNews.com Senior Staff Writer
> >> May 30, 2001
> >>
> >> (CNSNews.com) - Polling is an inherently flawed practice that fails to measure the real interests of respondents and offers no informed guidance to
"Public opinion polling measures the wishes and preferences of respondents, neither of which reflect the costs or risks associated with a policy," said Robert Weissberg, a professor of political science at the University of Illinois, in a study entitled "Why Policymakers Should Ignore Public Opinion Polls."

Polls routinely fail to ensure that respondents understand the policy area or are in possession of information on all possible consequences from a given choice. "Modern polling can give us back only what citizens know the moment the phone rings," Weissberg said.

In the interests of time and money, pollsters tend not to screen out people with deficient knowledge or provide that knowledge to the respondents. This frugality results in "a pervasive dumbing down of the entire enterprise," where "hugely complex issues become catch phrases," Weissberg said.

Weissberg criticized what he called "the high priests of public opinion" who insist their polls convey legitimate advice about policies and political strategies.

John Samples, director of the Cato Center for Representative Government, which sponsored the study, said the paper was "a kind of attempt to say, 'don't make that much out of opinion polls.'"

The study calls into question what is accepted to be true, Samples said. "If you read the newspaper and watch television, you see it's assumed that public opinion polls should dominate and drive policy. But this paper shows polls are not a good guide to policy or politics. "We just assume it's democratic and the right way to go. And there are a lot of reasons to think it isn't," he said.

Elected officials also are driven by the need for reelection, which is the ultimate public opinion poll.

The administration of former President Clinton was completely driven by opinion polls, Samples said. "They ran the whole presidency on opinion polls, then," he said.
The full text of Robert Weissberg's essay "Why Policymakers Should Ignore Public Opinion Polls" can be found at:


Herbst's main argument is that most people in government and the news media already follow Weissberg's advice. The impact of public opinion on policy is almost always mediated by legislators who are much more knowledgeable about the real tradeoffs involved in any policy decision.

Ed Freeland

Mark David Richards wrote:

> The Washington Times
> > Inside the Beltway
> > by John McCaslin
> > SHUN THE POLLSTER
> > We suspected it all along: Polling is an inherently flawed enterprise that fails to measure the real interests of respondents and offers no informed guidance to policy-making.
> > So says the highly respected Cato Institute in Washington, which points out-as every American is aware ad nauseam—that for almost every public policy issue there is an opinion poll commissioned that supposedly determines what the public wants, with the unspoken directive that policy-makers should follow the will of the people.
In "Why Policymakers Should Ignore Public Opinion Polls," author Robert Weissberg, a professor of political science at the University of Illinois, argues that public opinion polling measures the wishes and preferences of respondents, neither of which reflects the costs or risks associated with a policy. As a result, polls are useless to policy-makers who must pay attention to tradeoffs among values, second-best possibilities and unexpected risks.

Says Mr. Weissberg: "Policy-makers should simply ignore the polls and focus on their own judgment."

I suspect few believe policy-makers should ignore their own judgment, but policy-makers who ignore too many expressions of public opinion should look for appointed jobs rather than elected ones...

Mark David RICHARDS, Sociologist
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008
202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com

Susan Carol Losh, PhD
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
visit the site at: http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm
The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453
Yes, elected representatives are SUPPOSED to know more about the details of public policy than the public at large, although they may well be susceptible to influences other than considerations of the greater public good (to put it mildly).

No, public opinion surveys are not meant to be "referenda" on detailed policy, nor would I personally be particularly comfortable with a system, say, of computerized "voting" by the public on every matter coming before Congress, which is precisely why I don't think polls should be referenda, since the the best they could do is estimate what the public would do in such a situation (without the incentive of knowing that their "votes" would count). This also, undoubtedly has a lot to do with the
fact
that "governing by the polls" is not endorsed by the public itself.

But, the general reaction of the public IS newsworthy, and important to know in itself and as part of assessing whether "education" is necessary, or how the political climate might be changed. They also provide about the only reliable means of tracing public opinion and its changes as (for instance, the Clinton health care plan shifted from a focus on whether its goals were popular to whether it would likely meet those goals.)

Further, as we all know, opinion can change and projections by people of what their reaction WOULD can be notoriously malleable. Note the many times during the Clinton impeachment controversy when the results of polls suggested "what has come out so far doesn't warrant impeachment and removal, but if "X" turns out to be true that is a different story", only later to find that when "X" did turn out to be true, the threshold was moved. (And pundits can be just as wrong as what the public's future reaction will be -- recall Sam Donaldson's comment when the Lewinsky story first started to break that the Clinton presidency would be measured in days if the allegations turned out to be substantially true. Indeed, the public turned out to be more "forgiving" ultimately than Clinton's own private polling showed when he decided he had no option but to hang tough in his denials.

All that said, those writing survey questions whose results will be widely disseminated should remember the importance of going beyond "yes/no" referenda-type questions to those trying to measure the general values and perceptions the public brings to the debate. That, it seems, not only is the "legitimate" concern of elected officials as they make up their minds, but would also help better to understand the process of opinion formation and change. Properly conducted and interpreted, surveys can provide important information to policymakers not easily available from any other source, and the public opinion community should not shrink from offering it to them as well as other audiences. G. Donald Ferree, Jr. Associate Director for Public Opinion Research University of Wisconsin Survey Center 1800
Three points are relevant to this discussion. First, the vast majority of PO polls are at the local or state level. These polls mostly ask relevant questions on relevant topics that are important to local and state constituencies and policy makers. While I am not sure that I agree with Weissberg's analysis for national polls, the reality is that local officials will seize upon this type of story, which focuses on national polls, to debunk state and local polls. Thanks Prof Weissberg! You've done us all a big service! Remind me not to order your text book on Public Opinion next semester.

Second, what really bores me about this story is that this debate (in one form or another) has been going on among political scientists and sociologists for years. Berelson et al, and Converse et al noted in the 1950s and 1960s that the public did not have coherent ideological belief systems and were not all that knowledgeable about politics and government. While I have not read Prof. Weissberg's analysis to fully grasp his argument, at first glance, there appears to be nothing new that we did not already know. Which leads me to ask: Haven't we walked this path before?
Haven't we come to grips with the idea that while the winds of public opinion may blow from different directions at different times of the day, they certainly do blow and thus, are worth measuring (and if I'm a politician, worth using to assess and shape policy appeals).

Third, this story has an implicit ideological bias. This smells like yet another critique of polling that is really just a stab at the Clinton Administration's use of polls. While the Clinton's use of polls represents an abuse, this does not mean that the whole enterprise should be also labeled as such. It reminds me of the liberals' attacks in the mid-1970s on the Nixon Administration's polling practices. As you might recall, Nixon pollsters were widely criticized for the artifact of the "silent majority."

In my humble opinion, the most damaging critique of polling is B. Ginsberg's critique in the Captive Public. If you have not read it, please do so. It certainly helps to keep me honest about what I do and more importantly, how I do it.

Joe Aistrup

"Kay, Ward

(NIAAA)"

To:  "'aapornet@usc.edu'

<aapornet@usc.edu> <wkay@mail.ni h.gov>

Subject:  RE: FYI: Polling and policy setting competition

Sent by:

owner-aaporne

t@usc.edu

06/01/2001
08:31 AM

Please respond to
I have in the past convinced local officials for the need of local opinion
polls to
gauge support for policies or new initiatives from the entire electorate
rather than
just the NIMBYs who show up for public meetings. Do officials follow opinion
polls?
No. But it will give them ammunition if the poll supports their position. If
the
poll doesn't support their position, then the recommendation was for an
increased
information campaign before taking action.

In the absence of public opinion polls, policy makers rely on some very
unreliable
sources for what their constituents want--people who show for public
meetings,
letter-writers and donors.

> -----Original Message-----
> From:         Susan Losh [SMTP:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu]
> Sent:         Thursday, May 31, 2001 8:54 PM
> To:           aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject:           Re: FYI:  Polling and policy setting competition
>
> Well, the issue is whether the public has "thought through" the
> issues, including the tradeoffs involved, so as to give "informed
> input" to
> policy
> makers.
> It's not a bad idea on the face of it.
> However, one has to wonder just how well-informed many *policy makers* are
> (my all-time favorite is the adoption of the "whole language" approach
> to reading by many school boards, despite the lack of research
> evidence that showed whether it even worked as well as phonics, let
> alone better) not
> to
> mention how suspicious I am of the "tradeoffs" engaged in by many
> policy makers.
>
> Susan
>
> At 05:36 PM 5/31/2001 -0700, you wrote:
> >And why, may I ask, should only the opinions of those who are
"well-informed"
>(by whose definition) count? A bit elitist, I would say. Reminds me
>of
>the "old South" and barriers to African-American voting.
>
>Jennifer Franz
>JD Franz Research, Inc.
>
>Mark David Richards wrote:
>
>CBSNews.com coverage of same essay, with comments from CATO's John
>SAMPLES
>> ...
>>
>> Opinion Polls Not Reliable for Policymakers, Study Says
>> By Lawrence Morahan
>> CNSNews.com Senior Staff Writer
>> May 30, 2001
>>
>> (CNSNews.com) - Polling is an inherently flawed practice that fails
>> to measure the real interests of respondents and offers no informed
>> guidance to
>> policymaking, a new study says.
>> "Public opinion polling measures the wishes and preferences of
>> respondents,
>> neither of which reflect the costs or risks associated with a
>> policy,"
>> said
>> Robert Weissberg, a professor of political science at the
>> University
>> of
>> Illinois, in a study entitled "Why Policymakers Should Ignore
>> Public
>> Opinion
>> Polls."
>> Polls routinely fail to ensure that respondents understand the
>> policy
>> area
>> or are in possession of information on all possible consequences
>> from
>> a
>> given choice.
>> "Modern polling can give us back only what citizens know the moment
>> the
>> phone rings," Weissberg said.
>> In the interests of time and money, pollsters tend not to screen
>> out
>> people
>> with deficient knowledge or provide that knowledge to the
>> respondents. This frugality results in "a pervasive dumbing down of
>> the entire enterprise," where "hugey complex issues become catch
>> phrases,"
>> Weissberg
>> said.
>> Weissberg criticized what he called "the high priests of public
>opinion" who
insist their polls convey legitimate advice about policies and political strategies.

John Samples, director of the Cato Center for Representative Government, which sponsored the study, said the paper was "a kind of attempt to say, 'don't make that much out of opinion polls.'" The study calls into question what is accepted to be true, Samples said. "If you read the newspaper and watch television, you see it's assumed that public opinion polls should dominate and drive policy. But this paper shows polls are not a good guide to policy or politics.

"We just assume it's democratic and the right way to go. And there are a lot of reasons to think it isn't," he said. Elected officials also are driven by the need for reelection, which is the ultimate public opinion poll. The administration of former President Clinton was completely driven by opinion polls, Samples said. "They ran the whole presidency on opinion polls," he said.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]  On Behalf Of Edward Freeland
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2001 10:01 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: FYI: Polling and policy setting competition

File: efreelan.vcf >> The full text of Robert Weissberg's essay "Why Policymakers Should Ignore Public Opinion Polls" can be found at:


Herbst's main argument is that most people in government and the news media already follow Weissberg's advice. The impact of public opinion on policy is almost always mediated by legislators who are much more
knowledgeable about the real tradeoffs involved in any policy decision.

Ed Freeland

Mark David Richards wrote:

> > > The Washington Times
> > >
> > > Inside the Beltway
> > > by John McCaslin
> > >
> > > SHUN THE POLLSTER
> > >
> > > We suspected it all along: Polling is an inherently flawed enterprise that fails to measure the real interests of respondents and offers no informed guidance to policy-making.
> > >
> > > So says the highly respected Cato Institute in Washington, which points out-as every American is aware ad nauseam-that for almost every public policy issue there is an opinion poll commissioned that supposedly determines what the public wants, with the unspoken directive that policy-makers should follow the will of the people.
> > >
> > > In "Why Policymakers Should Ignore Public Opinion Polls," author Robert Weissberg, a professor of political science at the University of Illinois, argues that public opinion polling measures the wishes and preferences of respondents, neither of which reflects the costs or risks associated with a policy. As a result, polls are useless to policy-makers who must pay attention to tradeoffs among values, second-best possibilities and unexpected risks.
> > >
> > > Says Mr. Weissberg: "Policy-makers should simply ignore the polls and focus on their own judgment."
> > >
> > > I suspect few believe policy-makers should ignore their own
judgment,
> but
> >> > policy-makers who ignore too many expressions of public opinion
> should
> >> best
> >> > look for appointed jobs rather than elected ones...
> >> >
> >> > Mark David RICHARDS, Sociologist
> >> > Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
> >> > 2610 Woodley Place NW
> >> > Washington, District of Columbia 20008
> >> > 202/ 347-8822
> >> > 202/ 347-8825 FAX
> >> > mark@bisconti.com
> >> >
> >> ---
> --
> Name: winmail.dat
> winmail.dat Type:
> application/x-unknown-content-type-dat_auto_file
> Encoding: base64
> Susan Carol Losh, PhD
> slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
> visit the site at: http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm
> The Department of Educational Research
> 307L Stone Building
> Florida State University
> Tallahassee FL 32306-4453
> 850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
> Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
> FAX 850-644-8776
> From mwolford@hers.com Fri Jun 1 09:05:45 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA07952 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Jun 2001 09:05:45 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from mail.his.com (root@herndon10.his.com [209.67.207.13])
The Center on Policy Attitudes did a poll in 1999 asking people what they thought about the issue of polls and policy making which may be of interest to people regarding this issue. Also of course, there are excellent books by Page and Shapiro (The Rational Public) and Jacobs and Shapiro (Politicians Don't Pander) examining the data behind the myths of constantly shifting public opinion and politicians who supposedly shape policy based on polling.

Below is the COPA report online

http://www.policyattitudes.org/ems.htm

--

Monica ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Monica Wolford mwolford@hers.com
Program on International Policy Attitudes www.pipa.org
A joint program of Center on Policy Attitudes www.policyattitudes.org and the Center
for Int'l & Security Studies at U Maryland 1779 Massachusetts Ave NW #510
Washington, DC 20036

--------------C819C0421C97B1D270EEE7C0
Content-Type: text/html; charset=utf-8;
name="ems.htm"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline;
filename="ems.htm"
Content-Base: "http://www.policyattitudes.org/ems.htm"
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

An abundance of polling data shows that the majority of Americans is quite dissatisfied with the American government. While this dissatisfaction has moderated a bit of late, it is still historically very high. Given that the US economy is sustaining an unprecedented boom, that the US prevailed in the Cold War, and that there are no longer any serious threats to American security, one might expect Americans to show higher levels of satisfaction. Nonetheless, as has been widely noted, less than a third of Americans say that they "trust the government in Washington to do what is right"—most of the time—as compared to the 1960s, when three-quarters felt this way. Disenchantment with government has also contributed to declining voter turnout.

This dynamic raises fundamental questions. Why are Americans so dissatisfied with the government? Do they perceive that the government is not doing what is best for the interests of the public? Do they think that the government is not doing what the public wants? If so, what do they perceive as driving government decisions? What do they see as the antidote to the present situation?

Another recent issue that highlighted public dissatisfaction with the government was the impeachment of the President. With the exception of the final Senate vote against impeachment, virtually every step taken by Congress was opposed by a strong majority of Americans, and provoked widespread annoyance.

This brought to the surface fundamental questions about how the government should make decisions. Throughout the impeachment process numerous members of Congress asserted that their constituents wanted their member
to vote according to his or her sense of what is right, not to follow the polls. But is this true? How much do Americans think elected officials should pay attention to majority opinion? What do they think about polls? Do Americans believe that there is some wisdom in public opinion, or do they perceive it as being too emotional, volatile and uninformed to offer a basis for decisionmaking? </font></p><p><font face="Century Gothic">Americans complain about how politicians are partisan and parochial. But do Americans really want elected officials to set aside their party agenda in favor of majority opinion? Do they really want elected officials to set aside the interests of their district in favor of the national interest? </font></p><p><font face="Century Gothic">To find how Americans feel about all of these issues, the Center on Policy Attitudes conducted an in-depth study that included: </font></p><p><font face="Century Gothic">a review of existing polling data going back several decades; focus groups in Albuquerque, New Mexico; Baltimore, Maryland; and Roanoke, Virginia; a nationwide poll of a random sample of 1,204 respondents (margin of error 3-4%) conducted January 26-31, 1999 (results were weighted to be demographically representative). </font></p><p><font face="Century Gothic">The study also included an analysis of public attitudes on the specific case of the impeachment process, which is presented in Appendix A. A demographic analysis can be found in Appendix B, and the complete questionnaire and results of the COPA poll in Appendix C. Appendix D provides an explanation of how the poll was conducted. </font></p><p><font face="Century Gothic">Findings</font></p><p><font size="5" face="Century Gothic">1</font><font face="Century Gothic"> The public's dissatisfaction with the US government is largely due to the perception that elected officials, acting in their self-interest, give priority to special interests and partisan agendas, over the interests of the public as a whole. Most Americans feel that they are marginalized from the decisionmaking process, that elected officials neither pay attention to nor understand the public, and that most of the decisions the government makes are not the decisions that the majority of Americans would make. (go to </font><a href="ems2.htm#1"><font face="Century Gothic">section 1</font></a><font face="Century Gothic">)</font></p><p><font size="5" face="Century Gothic">2</font><font face="Century Gothic"> To better serve the interests of the whole public, an overwhelming majority feels the majority public should have much more influence over government decisions. A strong majority
expresses confidence in the public’s judgment, and says it would give more credence to the decisions of a random sample of Americans informed on all sides of an issue than to the decisions of Congress. (go to section 2)

When elected officials make decisions, a strong majority feels that the views of the majority of the public should have more influence than the views of the official. At the same time, most Americans do feel that elected officials have an important role to play: that elected officials should not simply follow ill-informed majority opinion, but try to determine what the majority would favor if it had more complete information; and that elected officials should consult their own sense of what is right and, ideally, find policies that integrate their values as well as those of the majority. (go to section 3)

A strong majority feels that policymakers should pay close attention to polls when making public policy, even though many are uncertain about their accuracy. Consistent with this position, a majority thinks that policymakers should be more influenced by the views of the general majority than by the vocal public that actively calls or writes their representatives. (go to section 4)

The majority feels that members of Congress should make a conscious effort to look beyond the parochial interests of their district so as to find consensus and make decisions that are best for the nation as a whole. They reject the view that if members simply pursue the interests of their own district, the political system will be self-correcting and produce policies that serve the best interest of all. (go to section 5)

Majority support exists for increasing the influence of the majority, even though the public as a whole underestimates the competence of the majority to make judgments on public policy. (go to section 6)
An overwhelming majority believes that if the public gained more influence, this would counteract a perceived trend toward wealth concentrating in fewer hands, concurrent with the perceived increase in the influence of the wealthy. (go to section 7)

Though the public is quite critical of how the government in aggregate represents them, Americans are less apt to be so critical of their own representative. This may help explain why the public continues to reelect incumbents while still expressing such dissatisfaction with Congress. Apparently the public does not see the problem as lying in the individual member as much as with the political system. (go to section 8)
Joe,

Can you give us a fuller reference on the Ginsberg piece? Maybe even a url for the lazy among us?

Thanks!

Susan

> In my humble opinion, the most damaging critique of polling is B. 
> Ginsberg’s critique in the Captive Public. If you have not read it, 
> please do so. It certainly helps to keep me honest about what I do and 
> more importantly, how I do it. 
> 
> Joe Aistrup 
> 
> Susan Carol Losh, PhD 
> slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at: 
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

The Department of Educational Research 
307L Stone Building 
Florida State University 
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453 

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available) 
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592 
FAX 850-644-8776
The issue of whose opinion should be counted is not a trivial one, and I would be interested in others' reactions.

Gallup used to ask a screener question on an issue that would determine how much people had heard about the issue. Those people who said "nothing at all" would NOT be asked the subsequent attitude question. However, now -- mostly in recognition of the sentiment expressed by Jennifer Franz (below), that everyone's opinion counts -- we ask the "how much have you heard" question, but then go ahead and ask everyone their view of the issue, even those who had not heard of it before we mentioned it in the poll. For example, although many people may have not heard of, say, RU-486, we can still ask, "Would you favor or opposed the distribution of RU-486, the abortion pill, in the United States?" There are big differences in attitudes between those who had previously heard of it and those who first learned of it in the poll.

On other issues, from China's membership in the World Trade Organization to U.S. participation in environmental treaties, we tend to ask everyone what their views are -- even though we know that many people have not thought of such issues until
we raised them in the survey. (Naturally, anyone can volunteer "don't know" and it will be recorded.)

This method ensures that everyone's "vote" counts, but is that the "relevant" audience for policy makers and our political leaders? It may be, if the issue is an important one in an election, but then perhaps we should interview only "likely voters," as John Zogby routinely does, or perhaps only "registered voters" as Fox News Poll and the NBC/WSJ Poll do. Or, because of Democracy's notion that everyone's view should count, we can continue to ask opinions of everyone, regardless of previous knowledge.

Of course, we can do ALL of these in more extensive analytical pieces, but in practice it is usually just one number that gets the coverage. So, does it make sense, perhaps, to identify an "attentive public" instead of the general public (or registered voters, or likely voters) as the base for the major number we report?

Here are four possible options:
Report "public opinion" based on --

1. All adults
2. Attentive public (mostly self-defined, such as following issue "a great deal" or "moderate" amount) 3. Registered voters (self-defined as "registered to vote")
4. Likely voters (defined by polling organization)

Which is the "best" reporting base if only one number is presented?

David W. Moore
The Gallup Organization
47 Hulfish Street
Princeton, NJ 08542
(609) 924-9600
david_moore@gallup.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Franz [mailto:jdfranz@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2001 8:36 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: FYI: Polling and policy setting competition
And why, may I ask, should only the opinions of those who are "well-informed" (by whose definition) count? A bit elitist, I would say. Reminds me a bit of the "old South" and barriers to African-American voting.

Jennifer Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.
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Can anyone tell me where to find "Quality of life" surveys for citizens. More specifically, what topics are included in the definition of the quality of life such as government, economic development, education, health care, environment, housing, and cultural/social?

Thanks,
Terrie
>From rusciano@rider.edu Fri Jun  1 09:59:33 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])

Frank Rusciano

Susan Losh wrote:

> Joe,
> > Can you give us a fuller reference on the Ginsberg piece? Maybe even a
> > url for the lazy among us?
> >
> > Thanks!
> >
> > Susan
> >
> > >In my humble opinion, the most damaging critique of polling is B.
> > >Ginsberg's critique in the Captive Public. If you have not read it,
> > >please do so. It certainly helps to keep me honest about what I do
> > >and more importantly, how I do it.
> > >
> > >Joe Aistrup
> > >
> > >Susan Carol Losh, PhD

Barbara Burrell

Barbara Burrell
Interim Director
Public Opinion Laboratory
Northern Illinois University
Very good points—maybe a survey of policy-makers and reporters is in order! Reporters can usually only deal with one number for a story. However, if one starts narrowing or selecting too much, I have to wonder. All U.S. adults to me represent potential participants in the political process, including voting. I haven't seen huge differences between all adults and registered voters on most issues (?). However, I suspect that from a Congressional or Executive point-of-view at the federal level, many like to see registered voters, as well as political party distinctions (and the opinions of people who voted for/against them specifically). Likely voters seem mainly relevant to election time. People participate in many ways unrelated to voting—they join special and public interest groups, for example! So the degree of interest or personal relevance of the issue is important. Looking at issues as public schools... how many people actually vote for School Board members? Very low... yet, many people exert pressure in other ways, sometimes quite forcefully!
(Most people probably consider themselves citizens, not subjects!) As far as attentiveness measures go, recall the Yankelovich "mushiness" index ... a serious of questions (informed, interested, affects you personally, how much issue is discussed with family and friends) is used to determine opinion "mushiness." The issue of potentially creating opinions from "no opinion" is always important to examine ... I've noticed that some organizations who interview apparently push harder for an answer than others, so some have slightly lower "don't knows." Questions can be designed to deal with this, samples can be split, etc. Regardless, one can ask for opinions and learn an awful lot about where people are and how they are likely to respond conceptually, recognizing that opinions may change as people get involved and learn more, or some group launches a massive advertising or PR campaign to influence opinions, as in elections. How many people vote in elections without having adequate information about candidates? In a 2000 Pew study, 47% said they sometimes vote for candidates without really knowing enough about them. I haven't heard too many people arguing for abolishing elections (yet!). In the 1970s, there was a backlash against the proliferation of "the best and brightest," and "expert opinions" in policy-making through agencies outside of the electoral process. When some policies reached an individual's home town, the "unattentive" public found them offensive. (Not to mention urban riots.) At that time, the federal bureaucracies created mechanisms to mediate ... public involvement requirements (at minimum-public hearings), NEPA, etc. I believe the Forest Service led the way on many public involvement techniques. Jim Fishkin's "Deliberative Poll" is a contemporary approach to combining polling and public involvement. Some today feel that small groups can effectively use a process to stop projects on which there is majoritarian support ("the silent majority" who are not involved), so I suppose there is a bit of a backlash. But, Americans EXPECT to be respected and have their opinions heard—whether they know anything about
an issue or not (incidentally, as a generalization, I've noticed that women are quicker to admit they don't but should know something when men will say they know when their answers show they have no idea-yet they can be very persuasive!). One can use polling data to show Americans are ignorant on just about everything. But, it is hard to deny that once people take an interest in an issue and examine the competing opinions and tradeoffs, they make judgments that on average I would trust a lot more than leaving it to the best and brightest only. Gallup has asked the following question since 1995: "Do you think the federal government has become so large and powerful that is poses an immediate threat to the rights and freedoms of ordinary citizens, or don't you think so?" In April 1995, 39% said the federal government posed an immediate threat; 58% said no. In Feb. 1996, 52% said the federal government posed an immediate threat; 43% said no. In May 2001, 52% felt threatened, 46% did not.

Mark Richards

-----Original Message-----
From:       owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]  On Behalf Of David_Moore@gallup.com
Sent: Friday, June 01, 2001 12:36 PM
To:   aapornet@usc.edu
Subject:    RE: FYI:  Polling and policy setting competition

The issue of whose opinion should be counted is not a trivial one, and I would be interested in others' reactions.

Gallup used to asked a screener question on an issue that would determine how much people had heard about the issue. Those people who said "nothing at all" would NOT be asked the subsequent attitude question. However, now -- mostly in recognition of the sentiment expressed by Jennifer Franz (below), that everyone's opinion counts -- we ask the "how much have you heard" question, but then go ahead and ask everyone their view of the issue, even those who had not heard of it before we mentioned it in the poll. For example, although many people may have not heard of, say, RU-486, we can still ask, "Would you favor or opposed the distribution
of RU-486, the abortion pill, in the United States?" There are big differences in attitudes between those who had previously heard of it and those who first learned of it in the poll.

On other issues, from China's membership in the World Trade Organization to U.S. participation in environmental treaties, we tend to ask everyone what their views are -- even though we know that many people have not thought of such issues until we raised them in the survey. (Naturally, anyone can volunteer "don't know" and it will be recorded.)

This method ensures that everyone's "vote" counts, but is that the "relevant" audience for policy makers and our political leaders? It may be, if the issue is an important one in an election, but then perhaps we should interview only "likely voters," as John Zogby routinely does, or perhaps only "registered voters" as Fox News Poll and the NBC/WSJ Poll do. Or, because of Democracy's notion that everyone's view should count, we can continue to ask opinions of everyone, regardless of previous knowledge.

Of course, we can do ALL of these in more extensive analytical pieces, but in practice it is usually just one number that gets the coverage. So, does it make sense, perhaps, to identify an "attentive public" instead of the general public (or registered voters, or likely voters) as the base for the major number we report?

Here are four possible options:
Report "public opinion" based on --

1. All adults
2. Attentive public (mostly self-defined, such as following issue "a great deal" or "moderate" amount)
3. Registered voters (self-defined as "registered to vote")
4. Likely voters (defined by polling organization)

Which is the "best" reporting base if only one number is presented?

David W. Moore
The Gallup Organization
47 Hufish Street
Princeton, NJ 08542
(609) 924-9600
david_moore@gallup.com
And why, may I ask, should only the opinions of those who are "well-informed" (by whose definition) count? A bit elitist, I would say. Reminds me a bit of the "old South" and barriers to African-American voting.

Jennifer Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.

We don't have an electronic version, but I'd be happy to drop a copy in the mail to anyone who'd like one. Just e-mail me your postal address.

Tom Silver
editor@pollingreport.com
THE POLLING REPORT
P.O. Box 42580
Washington, DC  20015
www.PollingReport.com
202 237-2000 voice
202 237-2001 fax

----- Original Message ----- 
> Joe,
> 
> Can you give us a fuller reference on the Ginsberg piece? Maybe even a url for the lazy among us?
> 
> Thanks!
> 
> Susan
> 
> >In my humble opinion, the most damaging critique of polling is B. 
> >Ginsberg's critique in the Captive Public. If you have not read it, please
> >do so. It certainly helps to keep me honest about what I do and more
> >importantly, how I do it.
> >
> >Joe Aistrup
> >
> >Susan Carol Losh, PhD
> >slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
>

>From hjsmith@unm.edu Fri Jun 1 14:22:09 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/us) with ESMTP
id OAA21044 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Jun 2001 14:22:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from linux06.unm.edu (IDENT:gmailr@linux06.unm.edu [129.24.15.38])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us) with SMTP
The UNM Institute for Public Policy at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, NM, is taking applications for the position of Research Scientist III. This is a fully funded, permanent position in the Institute. The Institute is part of the UNM Department of Political Science.

The successful candidate will have responsibilities for (1) oversight of operations and development of the the UNM Survey Research Center (which is part of the Institute), and (2) obtaining and managing funded survey research projects. For a full description of the position, and application procedures, click on the link below.

http://www.unm.edu/~hrnet/jobs/m30460.htm

For a description of the Institute for Public Policy and the UNM Survey Research Center, click on the link below:

http://www.unm.edu/~instpp

--

Hank C. Jenkins-Smith
Director, UNM Institute for Public Policy
Professor, UNM Department of Political Science
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
Phone: 505-277-1099
Fax: 505-277-3115
Email: hjsmith@unm.edu
I am trying to find out what will happen if I ask Groupwise to return an "out of town" message to the listserv. I tried to restrict the returns to addressees that were not "aapornet" but the software seems to read the incoming address from the sender rather than from the listserv. Can anyone help?

(fran)
Fran Featherston
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC 20548
202.512.4946
featherstonf@gao.gov
At 05:24 PM 6/1/01 -0400, Fran A Featherston wrote:
> I am trying to find out what will happen if I ask Groupwise to return
> an
> "out of town" message to the listserv. I tried to restrict the returns to
> addressees that were not "aapornet" but the software seems to read the
> incoming address from the sender rather than from the listserv. Can
> anyone help?

I am not familiar with the details of Groupwise, but since this issue comes
up regularly, a more general answer may be useful for other people as well.
I assume that nobody really wants to send those messages to everybody on
the list.

Good e-mail programs do not sent such "out of town" messages in response to
messages coming from an e-mail list. They can detect these messages by
looking for the "Precedence: bulk" entry which well run lists like AAPORNET
put in the "extended header" of outgoing messages (some e-mail clients like
Eudora allow you to see this extended header; in Eudora you click the "bla,
bla" icon). So, with a good e-mail program (server) you don't have to do
anything.

As there are quite a few non-conforming e-mail programs around, the list
server administrator may do some filtering in addition. In case of
AAPORNET, there are several filters in effect. For example, when I tried to
post about these annoying "out of office" messages some time ago and put
the string "out of office" in the subject field, the message was not
distributed, but sent to James Beniger, as the "list owner", instead, who
just threw it out with the whole bunch of bounced messages he gets as the
list owner. So, if the "vacation" feature of your e-mail server let's you
determine what gets in the subject field (though it may not give you this
option) put "out of office" in the subject field and the automated response
will go no further than to JB who will surely not distribute it to everyone
on the list.

Finally, while most of the "vacation" or "out of town" messages are created
on your local mail server, there is also the option to set something like
this up on your own station. Better e-mail clients (like Eudora) let you
filter e-mail on your own station and you can then decide who gets an "out
of town" message and who does not. However, for this to work, you need to
let your station running while you are away (which may be a
security/privacy issue if you share office space with others) and setting
up such filtered response on your own station requires a somewhat higher
level of computer literacy.

When in doubt, ask your local system guys about the "vacation" feature of
the e-mail software you are using at your institution or company. Chances
are it is set up properly and you don't have to worry about it. M.

M. Manfred <http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>Kuechler,
Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

>From mkshares@mcs.net Sat Jun  2 09:05:52 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA29777 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 2 Jun 2001 09:05:52 -
0700
(PDT)
Received: from bnfep01.boone.winstar.net (bnfep01w.boone.winstar.net
[63.140.240.51]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA03026 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 2 Jun 2001 09:05:52 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mcs.net ([205.253.224.250]) by bnfep01.boone.winstar.net
   with ESMTP id <20010602160551.HXHW450.bnfep01@mcs.net>
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 2 Jun 2001 12:05:51 -0400
Message-ID: <3B18C85B.C7998194@mcs.net>
Date: Sat, 02 Jun 2001 11:05:02 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: FYI: Polling and policy setting competition
References: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000DE1CEFE40721489B@exchng7.gallup.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"
   x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree that every vote does count and that the opinions of those more aware
of an
issue are particularly relevant. I would add that the number who know "a lot"
or
"some" about an issue is not necessarily a constant - depending on the issue.
Their
numbers may grow as an issue becomes fully aired so informed opinion also
gives us a
clue about what future opinion may be.

Nick

David_Moore@gallup.com wrote:

> The issue of whose opinion should be counted is not a trivial one, and
> I would be interested in others' reactions.
>
Gallup used to ask a screener question on an issue that would determine how much people had heard about the issue. Those people who said "nothing at all" would NOT be asked the subsequent attitude question. However, now -- mostly in recognition of the sentiment expressed by Jennifer Franz (below), that everyone's opinion counts -- we ask the "how much have you heard" question, but then go ahead and ask everyone their view of the issue, even those who had not heard of it before we mentioned it in the poll. For example, although many people may have not heard of, say, RU-486, we can still ask, "Would you favor or opposed the distribution of RU-486, the abortion pill, in the United States?" There are big differences in attitudes between those who had previously heard of it and those who first learned of it in the poll.

On other issues, from China's membership in the World Trade Organization to U.S. participation in environmental treaties, we tend to ask everyone what their views are -- even though we know that many people have not thought of such issues until we raised them in the survey. (Naturally, anyone can volunteer "don't know" and it will be recorded.)

This method ensures that everyone's "vote" counts, but is that the "relevant" audience for policy makers and our political leaders? It may be, if the issue is an important one in an election, but then perhaps we should interview only "likely voters," as John Zogby routinely does, or perhaps only "registered voters" as Fox News Poll and the NBC/WSJ Poll do. Or, because of Democracy's notion that everyone's view should count, we can continue to ask opinions of everyone, regardless of previous knowledge.

Of course, we can do ALL of these in more extensive analytical pieces, but in practice it is usually just one number that gets the coverage. So, does it make sense, perhaps, to identify an "attentive public" instead of the general public (or registered voters, or likely voters) as the base for the major number we report?

Here are four possible options:

1. All adults
2. Attentive public (mostly self-defined, such as following issue "a great deal" or "moderate" amount) 3. Registered voters (self-defined as "registered to vote") 4. Likely voters (defined by polling organization)

Which is the "best" reporting base if only one number is presented?
And why, may I ask, should only the opinions of those who are "well-informed" (by whose definition) count? A bit elitist, I would say. Reminds me a bit of the "old South" and barriers to African-American voting.

Jennifer Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
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ADDING UP THE COSTS OF CYBERDEMOCRACY

By ALEXANDER STILLE

As Cass Sunstein, a professor of law at the University of Chicago, saw himself being skewered on various Web sites discussing his recent book, "Republic.com," he had the odd satisfaction of watching some of the book's themes unfold before his eyes. On the conservative Web site "FreeRepublic.com," the discussion began
by referring relatively mildly to Mr. Sunstein's book about the political consequences of the Internet as "thinly veiled liberal." But as the discussion picked up steam, the rhetoric of the respondents, who insisted that they had not and would not read the book itself, became more heated. Eventually, they were referring to Mr. Sunstein as "a nazi" and a "pointy headed socialist windbag."

The discussion illustrated the phenomenon that Mr. Sunstein and various social scientists have called "group polarization" in which like-minded people in an isolated group reinforce one another's views, which then harden into more extreme positions. Even one of his critics on the site acknowledged the shift. "Amazingly enough," he wrote, "it looks like Sunstein has polarized this group into unanimous agreement about him." An expletive followed.

To Mr. Sunstein, such polarization is just one of the negative political effects of the Internet, which allows people to filter out unwanted information, tailor their own news and congregate at specialized Web sites that closely reflect their own views. A "shared culture," which results partly from exposure to a wide range of opinion, is important for a functioning democracy, he argues. But as the role of newspapers and television news diminishes, he wrote, "and the customization of our communications universe increases, society is in danger of fragmenting, shared communities in danger of dissolving."

This pessimistic assessment is a sign of just how sharply scholarly thinking about the Web has shifted. In its first years, the Internet was seen euphorically as one of history's greatest engines of democracy, a kind of national town hall meeting in which everyone got to speak. As an early guru of cyberspace, Dave Clark of M.I.T., put it in 1992: "We reject kings, presidents and voting. We believe in: rough consensus and running code."

Now, with the examples of business and government control offered by the explosion
of Web commerce, the merger of America Online and Time-Warner, the Microsoft antitrust case and the litigation over Napster, that is no longer the case.

Andrew Shapiro, a guest lecturer at Yale Law School and the author of "The Control Revolution," said that the early euphoria over cyberspace had been replaced "by a kind of 'technorealism,' a second generation of Internet books" that are much more critical.

An example is the 1999 book "Code" by Lawrence Lessig, a law professor at Stanford University, who argues that the enormous amount of personal information people reveal when they shop online, browse Web sites or call up information offers extraordinary opportunities for both governments and businesses to control their lives. "Left to itself," he wrote, "cyberspace will become a perfect tool of control."

Mr. Sunstein's assessment is somewhat different from Mr. Lessig's, though still negative. "His is closer to Orwell's '1984'; mine is more like 'Brave New World,'" Mr. Sunstein explained. If to Mr. Lessig he danger is government or corporate control, to Mr. Sunstein it is a world of seemingly infinite choice, where citizens are transformed into consumers and a common political life is eroded.

Both agree, however, that society must begin to make more conscious choices about what it wants the Internet to be. Mr. Lessig's main point in "Code" is that the Internet does not have a "nature." The world we think of as "cyberspace," he said, is an environment created by the architecture of the computer code that gave birth to the World Wide Web.

Mr. Lessig's point is that because the Internet is based on "open source" computer protocols that allow anyone to tap into it, it has a specific character that can be, and is, modified all the time. Internet providers can write software to allow users maximum privacy or to track and restrict their movements to an extraordinary degree. The software engineers, as Percy Bysshe Shelley said of poets, are the unacknowledged legislators of our time. We must, Mr. Lessig said, acknowledge this reality and try to shape it.
"We can build, or architect, or code cyberspace to protect values that we believe are fundamental, or we can build, or architect, or code cyberspace to allow those values to disappear," he writes.

Mr. Shapiro describes himself as more optimistic than Mr. Lessig or Mr. Sunstein. "I came to see more potential in the Internet empowering individuals, but we are all 'technorealists' in that we see personalization and social fragmentation as features of the Net."

Other legal scholars agree that fragmentation and polarization have increased with the Internet, but they do not necessarily see it as a problem. "I do not mourn the demise of the domination of the main outlets of news and information," said Peter Huber, a conservative legal scholar who is a fellow at the Manhattan Institute and the author of "Law and Disorder in Cyberspace: Abolish the F.C.C. and Let Common Law Rule the Telecosm." "It's true that the oracles of traditional authority, The New York Times, the network news and the universities have lost power. Just look at the declining market share of the major TV networks. But whether you regard that as good or bad depends on where you sit."

That doesn't mean he dismisses claims that new technology causes social fragmentation; he just feels that the individual empowerment of the Internet is well worth the price. "The Soviet Union had a 'shared culture' and one source of information, 'Pravda,'" he said. "I think it's impossible to judge what is the exact point at which you have the right mix of diversity and common culture."

Mr. Sunstein said he was not talking about limiting diversity but rather the insular way that most sites were structured. For example, he said, most political Web sites have links only to other like-minded sites. Although he stops short of calling for government intervention, he says, "We might want to consider the possibility of ways of requiring or encouraging sites to link to opposing viewpoints."

Until the early 1980's, the Federal Communications Commission required broadcasters to provide equal time to opposing viewpoints, a policy eliminated during the Reagan
administration. When critics of Mr. Sunstein's book pointed out that his own site at the University of Chicago offered no such links, he responded by including the Web addresses of two well-known conservative colleagues.

What some political Web sites are already trying to do is figure out ways to encourage more intelligent deliberation rather than simply name-calling and insults.

"We are trying to design sites so that they promote diversity as well as a sense of community," said Scott Reents, the president of two political Web sites called E-ThePeople and Quorum.org that recently merged.

The software design of the sites, Mr. Reents said in support of Mr. Lessig's point, can shape discussion in important ways. For example, at Quorum.org readers are asked to give a thumbs up or thumbs down to a particular posting; that item's placement is determined by reader reaction. (The site tries to prevent people using multiple identities from voting more than once by requiring visitors to register.)

On other sites, a group of regular users rank the value of contributions, and the rankings then determines their place on the "bulletin board." How well that works, however, is an open question. When Mr. Sunstein tried to intervene in a discussion of his own book on a techie Web site called slashdot.org, his contribution was given a very low ranking. "I think maybe they didn't believe I was the author of the book," he said.

James Fishkin, a political scientist at the University of Texas, said that such efforts at Web democracy follow the model of debate in ancient Sparta called the Shout. "The idea of the Shout is that the candidate that got the loudest applause or shout would win," he said. "Unless we make special efforts to implement more ambitious democratic possibilities, the Internet, left to its own devices, is going to give us an impoverished form of democracy in the form of the Shout."

Mr. Fishkin is trying to follow the example of ancient Athens, whose assemblies consisted of several hundred citizens who, after being chosen by lot, would deliberate and vote. He has developed a technique called "deliberative polling" and
would like to bring the idea to the Internet. "The idea is this," he said. "What would public opinion be like if people were motivated to behave more like ideal citizens, if they had access to a wealth of information and to competing arguments on a given issue?"

Over the last decade Mr. Fishkin has collected a random group of several hundred people and given them carefully prepared briefing documents on both sides of a given issue. Participants question panels of experts and discuss the issues in smaller groups with trained moderators so that no single person is allowed to dominate discussion. After their deliberation, they are then surveyed privately as in any opinion poll, but their views now reflect, it is hoped, careful deliberation. Texas actually used the method to help determine its energy policy, holding a series of deliberative polls between 1996 and 1998. "Because of it, there are now windmills all over the state of Texas," Mr. Fishkin says.

Mr. Fishkin is hoping to use the Internet to conduct "deliberative polling" on a much larger basis. To Mr. Lessig, deliberative polling is one of the few hopeful developments when it comes the democracy and the Web. "If Jim can transfer to cyberspace what he has done in real space, I think the Internet could be very different," he said.

Yet some view efforts to tame the Internet as doomed to failure. "I think it's a waste of time," said Mr. Huber. "All this talk about 'links' and so forth is interesting intellectually, but by the time you try to implement it the technology will be 10 years ahead. When online video becomes as accessible as e-mail, the whole game will change again. And if you think there is fragmentation now, you ain't seen nothing yet."

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/06/02/technology/02INTE.html
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******
Position Opening: Operations Manager

the polling company(TM), a full service market research, public affairs and political consulting firm headquartered in Washington DC is seeking to fill the position of Operations Manager.

Job Description: The Operations Manager will be responsible for organizing all office activity, responding to focus group facility bids; coordination of focus groups, both on and off site including recruitment; construction and management of database; marketing the facility; maintenance of the website; some proposal development and report writing and all other related activities. Position is temporary, but can lead to full-time after a trial period.

Qualifications: Applicants should have 3-5 years experience in a market or political research environment, and be able to manage several tasks at the same time. Must have extensive knowledge of MS Word, Access and Excel and Internet applications, be able to construct, organize and manage database; coordinate focus groups, both on and off site; and market the facility in different venues; and maintain website. Strong writing skills are necessary, and statistical knowledge is a plus. Candidate must have Bachelor's degree, and higher education a plus. Salary commensurate with experience.
Please send resumes and references to Colleen McCulloch at cmcculloch@pollingcompany.com or fax them to (202)467-6551. For more information about the polling company(TM), please access our website at www.pollingcompany.com

Do You Yahoo!?
Get personalized email addresses from Yahoo! Mail - only $35 a year! http://personal.mail.yahoo.com/

From: Unovic@aol.com

Subject: Final Reminder: 6/14 BASE meeting AT BERKELEY

To: aapornet@usc.edu, SRMSNET@umdd.umd.edu

Apologies for multiple postings.

LAST CHANCE: (if you haven't already) PLEASE RSVP by Wednesday, June 6th!

Dear colleagues:

Enjoy a lunch with your peers, and a presentation of highlights from research papers presented at the 2001 AAPOR Annual conference held in Montreal last month.

We will meet Thursday, June 14th at noon on the UC Berkeley campus (see details below).

This will be an opportunity for survey research practitioners to interact and discuss important issues that we face in our professional lives. The Montreal conference set another record for attendance: a testimony to the intense research effort that is going on in our field.

Here are the specifics:

DATE: Thursday, June 14th, 2001

TIME: Noon
PLACE: Faculty Club, U.C. Berkeley

MEAL: Sit-down lunch. The menu consists of salad, rolls, Asian vegetables, basmati rice, chicken, dessert. IF you prefer TO SUBSTITUTE TOFU FOR CHICKEN, please let us know. Beverages: ice tea and coffee.

AGENDA:
11:45 AM-12:15 PM: Registration
12:15-1:30 PM: Lunch
1:30-4:30 PM: Presentations and discussion
4:30-5 PM: Open discussion with presenters and colleagues

Presentations:
*** Methodological issues in survey research, Victoria Albright, Vice-president & Research Director, Field Research Corporation;
*** Cognitive issues in survey research & instrument design, Donna Eisenhower, Director of Survey Operations/Senior Research Scientist, Survey Research Center, U.C. Berkeley;
*** Sensitive topics in survey research, Liberty Greene, Research Associate, Kaiser Family Foundation;
*** Interviewer effects in face-to-face and telephone interviewing, Robert Lee, Consultant;
*** Developments and issues in web-based surveys, Dominic Lusinchi, Consultant, Far West Research.

COST: $30 (cash -preferred- or check) will be collected at the door to defray the cost of room rental and food.

DIRECTIONS/PARKING:
-- A map of the campus and directions to get there are available at http://www.berkeley.edu/map/ . The Faculty Club is located in the C-5 quadrant on the campus map.
-- Parking information is available at http://www.berkeley.edu/visitors/parking.html . "S" parking lots on the campus map are open to the general public.
-- If you use BART: the station to get off is Downtown Berkeley on Shattuck. From there walk up Bancroft to the campus. For Bay Area transit information go to http://www.transitinfo.org/ . Intercampus shuttles (UCSF, UC Davis, Mills College) are also available, for more information go to http://public-safety.berkeley.edu/trip/intercampus.html .
-- ALLOW extra time for parking in order to be on time.

PLEASE RSVP BY Wednesday JUNE 6!

Remember that if you would like a VEGETARIAN LUNCH, please let us know when you reply. THANK YOU.

******************************************************************************
*  
**  
*************
This email was sent on behalf of BASE - Bay Area SurvEy researchers/statisticians.

BASE creates a forum for social science and survey researchers in the Bay
Area to meet and share experiences, raise questions about methodology, and participate in discussions of interest to our profession.

Contact Dominic Lusinchi at unovic@aol.com for more information about meeting dates.
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>From rmaullin@fmma.org Tue Jun  5 13:45:35 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA17497 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 5 Jun 2001 13:45:35 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from webserver.fmma.com (mail.fmma.org [4.3.157.35])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA12268 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Tue, 5 Jun 2001 13:45:36 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by WEBSERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <Q0A88H7N>; Tue, 5 Jun 2001 13:42:19 -0700
Message-ID: <F0D37B169259D311A1B40060082080FE25407A@WEBSERVER>
From: Richard <rmaullin@fmma.org>
To: "AAPORNET@USC.EDU" <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>
Subject: E-mail list
Date: Tue, 5 Jun 2001 13:42:18 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

After normally being deluged by AAPOR correspondence on a daily basis, I now have had none over the last two days. Has my name been knocked of the e-mail list inadvertently?

Richard Maullin

richard@fmma.com
rmaullin@fmma.org

>From jmitchell@elementusa.com Tue Jun  5 13:46:16 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA17808 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 5 Jun 2001 13:46:16 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from elementnt02.elementusa.com (elementnt02.elementusa.com [209.10.54.228])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA12941 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 5 Jun 2001 13:46:16 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by ELEMENTNT02 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
    id <L5P7GCD7>; Tue, 5 Jun 2001 16:46:15 -0400
Message-ID: <714D7E686BC9D311BB2000508B8BFE5EC2DFBF@ELEMENTNT02>
It's called Summer, I believe!

> John Mitchell
>
> element
> The leading provider of youth data and insight
>
> 73 Spring Street, Suite 205
> New York, NY 10012
> P: 212-925-3800
> F: 212-925-9090
> jmitchell@elementusa.com
>
> www.elementcentral.com
>

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard [mailto:rmaullin@fmma.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2001 4:42 PM
To: 'AAPORNET@USC.EDU'
Subject: E-mail list

After normally being deluged by AAPOR correspondence on a daily basis, I now have had none over the last two days. Has my name been knocked of the e-mail list inadvertently?

Richard Maullin
richard@fmma.com
rmaullin@fmma.org

-----Original Message-----
From: John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: E-mail list
Date: Tue, 5 Jun 2001 16:46:14 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
After normally being deluged by AAPOR correspondence on a daily basis, I now have had none over the last two days. Has my name been knocked of the e-mail list inadvertently?

Richard Maullin

richard@fmma.com
rmaullin@fmma.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Cooney, Brendan  [mailto:brendan.cooney@strategyone.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2001 1:50 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: E-mail list

Makes complete sense

-----Original Message-----
From: "Cooney, Brendan" <brendan.cooney@strategyone.net>
To: '"aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: E-mail list
Date: Tue, 5 Jun 2001 15:49:51 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

Post-Memorial Memorandum Moratorium

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard [mailto:rmaullin@fmma.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2001 4:42 PM
To: 'AAPORNET@USC.EDU'
Subject: E-mail list

After normally being deluged by AAPOR correspondence on a daily basis, I now have had none over the last two days. Has my name been knocked of the e-mail list inadvertently?

Richard Maullin

richard@fmma.com
rmaullin@fmma.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard [mailto:rmaullin@fmma.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2001 13:51:27 2001
To: 'AAPORNET@USC.EDU'
Subject: RE: E-mail list
Date: Tue, 5 Jun 2001 13:48:08 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
After normally being deluged by AAPOR correspondence on a daily basis, I now have had none over the last two days. Has my name been knocked off the e-mail list inadvertently?

Richard Maullin

richard@fmma.com
rmallin@fmma.org

Dear Colleagues:

Could those of you who do RDD, share the question sequences you use on telephone usage? I will compile and share with the LIST.

Of particular interest are questions about computer (email/Internet) usage of the telephone lines that households have. For example,

(1) Dedicated computer lines (which always ring busy?) but for which you can still leave a message?
(2) Capturing for lines with multiple usage how much of the time they get used for plain old telephone service?

Mixed use of line and cell phones is another issue I would like to hear about, if possible. Finally, respondent confusions that you have observed because of the growing variety of local telephone service options and names.

Thanks in advance,

Fritz Scheuren
Urban Institute

>From 71501.716@compuserve.com Wed Jun 6 06:30:30 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA07883 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 06:30:29 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from spdmgaaf.compuserve.com (ds-img-6.compuserve.com [149.174.206.139])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA13229 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 06:30:29 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from mailgate@localhost)
    by spdmgaaf.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.9) id JAA00829
    for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 09:29:59 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Wed, 6 Jun 2001 09:13:26 -0400
From: Margaret Roller <71501.716@compuserve.com>
Subject: Census 2000 Budget
Sender: Margaret Roller <71501.716@compuserve.com>
To: "INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-ID: <200106060929_MC2-D4F4-5F3A@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset=us-ascii
    Content-Disposition: inline

Can anyone tell me offhand what the Census 2000 research budget was? An approximate range? Thanks.

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com
804.758.3236

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Jun 6 08:18:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA18485 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 08:18:58 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA02394 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 08:18:57 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
This Washington Post - ABC News poll was conducted by telephone May 31-June 3, 2001, among a random national sample of 1004 adults. The results have a 3 point error margin. Fieldwork by TNS Intersearch of Horsham, Pa.

*= less than 0.5 percent

1. Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve NET</th>
<th>Approve Strongly</th>
<th>Approve Somewhat</th>
<th>Disapprove NET</th>
<th>Disapprove Strongly</th>
<th>Disapprove Somewhat</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/01</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/01</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Bush is handling...?

Summary Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The economy</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. International affairs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Environmental issues</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The issue of tax cuts</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Education</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The energy situation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Patients' rights in the</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health care system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Social Security</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trend:
### a. The economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/01</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. International affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/01</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c. Environmental issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/01</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### d. The issue of tax cuts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### e. Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### f. The energy situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/13/01</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### g. Patients' rights in the health care system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### h. Social Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Do you think the country should go in the direction Bush wants to lead it, go in the direction the Democrats in Congress want to lead it, or what? Where Bush wants, Where Democrats want, Other direction (vol.), Neither (vol.), No difference (vol.), No opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Other direction (vol.)</th>
<th>Neither (vol.)</th>
<th>No difference (vol.)</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare to: Where Clinton, Where Republicans, Other direction, Neither difference, No opinion.
wants       want  (vol.)   (vol.)   (vol.)   opin.
3/14/99*    47     29       6         7       4       7
1/23/96     51     28       3         8       4       6
1/23/96 WATCH 59     25       3         6       4       3
1/24/95     38     39       5         6       5       6
1/24/95 WATCH 43     34       7         6       5       4

* 3/14/99 and previous: "Do you think the country should go in the
direction Clinton wants to lead it, go in the direction the Republicans in Congress?"

4. Who do you trust to do a better job handling... -- Bush or the Democrats in Congress?

6/3/01
Summary Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bush (vol.)</th>
<th>Dems (vol.)</th>
<th>Both (vol.)</th>
<th>Neither (vol.)</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The economy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. International affairs</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Environmental issues</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The issue of tax cuts</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Education</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The energy situation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Patients' rights in the health care system</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Social Security</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. On another subject, which political party do you think is more open to the ideas of people who are political moderates - the Democrats or the Republicans?

Democrats       Republicans   Both   Neither   No opin.
6/3/01          57            32      2        6       4

6. As you may know, control of the U.S. Senate is about to switch from the Republicans to the Democrats. On balance, do you think the Democrats' taking control of the Senate is a good thing or a bad thing for the country, or doesn't it make much difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>No diff.</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare to: No diff. No
7/17/95*

**"As you probably know, control of Congress switched from the Democrats to the Republicans this year. On balance, do you think that's been a good thing or a bad thing for the country?"**

7. In the last four months do you think Bush has tried mainly (to push his own agenda in Congress), or tried mainly (to compromise with the Democrats in Congress)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Push own agenda</th>
<th>Compromise with Democrats</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In the future, do you think Bush SHOULD try mainly (to push his own agenda in Congress), or try mainly (to compromise with the Democrats in Congress)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Push own agenda</th>
<th>Compromise with Democrats</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you think Bush's views on most issues are too liberal for you, too conservative for you, or just about right?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Too liberal</th>
<th>Too conservative</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/00 RV</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23/00 RV</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23/00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6/00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Some people say the federal government should set limits on the price of electricity to prevent price gouging by suppliers. Others say price caps would not solve energy shortages and may discourage the development of new supplies.
What's your opinion - do you support or oppose federal limits on the price of electricity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. To address the country's energy needs, would you support or oppose action by the federal government to......? Do you support/oppose that strongly, or not strongly?

6/3/01

Summary Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Not Strongly</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not Strongly</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Build more nuclear power plants</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develop more solar and wind power</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Increase oil and gas drilling</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Increase coal mining</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Encourage more energy conservation by businesses and industries</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Encourage more energy conservation by consumers like yourself</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Require car manufacturers to improve the fuel-efficiency of vehicles sold in this country</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gas only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Not Strongly</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not Strongly</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h. Build more power plants that burn oil, coal or natural gas</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Of the ones you support, which one should be the federal government's highest priority?

6/3/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest priority</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build more nuclear power plants</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop more solar and wind power</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase oil and gas drilling</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase coal mining</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage more energy conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by businesses and industries</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage more energy conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by consumers like yourself</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require car manufacturers to improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the fuel-efficiency of vehicles sold</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build more power plants that burn oil,</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coal or natural gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Do you think the United States is heading into an energy crisis, or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Do you think the United States is in an energy crisis now, or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. As you may know, Congress has approved a tax cut of nearly one-point-four trillion dollars over the next 10 years. Do you think this tax cut will mainly benefit lower income people, middle income people, upper income people, or all people about equally?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>All equally</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/99**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/81***</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Do you think the tax cut Bush has proposed would mainly benefit...?*

**8/99: As you may know, the Republicans in Congress have called for a billion dollar tax cut over the next 10 years. Who do you think would benefit most from such a tax cut: poor and lower income people, middle income people, upper income people, or do you think all people would benefit pretty much equally?**

***4/81 and previous: Reagan called for a 30 percent federal income tax reduction for all taxpayers over the next three years. Who do you think would benefit most from such a tax cut: poor and lower income people, middle income people, upper income people, or do you think all people would benefit pretty much equally?***

16. In general, do you think this tax cut will be good for the economy, bad for the economy, or won't it make much difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>No difference</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. What would have been your own preference - (to have this tax cut), or (to have the federal government spend more on domestic programs such as education, health care and Social Security)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tax cut</th>
<th>Spend more</th>
<th>Neither (vol.)</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. The tax cut will bring most Americans a refund check for 300 to 600 dollars this summer. If you get a tax refund check for 300 to 600 dollars, what do you think you'll do with it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bills/Debts</th>
<th>Save/Invest</th>
<th>Spend &amp; save</th>
<th>Give away</th>
<th>Not Eligible</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. On another subject, do you think Congress should make it easier for
patients in managed care to sue health plans that deny or delay medical treatment, or do you think this would increase the cost of health care too much?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should make easier</th>
<th>Increase cost too much</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Who do you think would do a better job regulating health plans: (the federal government) or (individual state governments)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal gov't 27</th>
<th>State gov't (vol.) 65</th>
<th>Neither (vol.) 4</th>
<th>difference (vol.) 1</th>
<th>No opinion 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. As you may know, the President is in charge of nominating judges to serve in the federal court system. Do you think the federal judges nominated by Bush will be (too conservative), (too liberal) or about right?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too cons. 30</th>
<th>Too lib. 12</th>
<th>About 52</th>
<th>No Right 6</th>
<th>opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. (IF "TOO CONSERVATIVE" OR "TOO LIBERAL") Is that something that bothers you a lot, or not that much?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too conserv. Not at all 53</th>
<th>Too conserv. much (vol.) 43</th>
<th>Too lib. Not at all 4</th>
<th>Too lib. much (vol.) 0</th>
<th>No opinion 35</th>
<th>No opinion 55</th>
<th>No opinion 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Do you have a favorable or unfavorable impression of Bush as a person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorable 61</th>
<th>Unfavorable 34</th>
<th>No opinion 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/15/01*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/00</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/00</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/00</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10/1/00 RV 37 58 5
9/6/00 RV 35 62 3
8/20/00 RV 35 61 3
8/10/00 RV 34 62 4
1/26/00 34 61 5
12/15/99 RV 32 65 3
12/15/99 36 62 2
9/2/99 38 59 3
3/14/99 30 67 4
3/4/99 40 54 6
12/15/98 41 56 3
11/1/98 LV 37 60 3
11/1/98 42 54 4

*1/15/01 and previous: "Bill Clinton"

***END***
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR VNS EXIT POLL OPERATION

Voter News Service, LLC (VNS) recently issued a request for proposals to conduct its 2002 and 2004 exit poll operation. VNS is managed by ABC News, The Associated Press, CBS News, CNN, FOX News, and NBC News. VNS collects, tabulates, and disseminates vote returns, exit poll data, and projections of presidential primaries and national and statewide election contests. On Election Day, this information is distributed to the six member organizations and to other subscribing news organizations.

VNS is presently investigating the cost-effectiveness of contracting with a survey research company to coordinate part or all of its exit poll operation. The two major functions of the VNS exit poll operation are:

1) recruiting, training and equipping an Election Day field staff, and
2) managing a call center to input and process exit poll results. VNS is seeking proposals from companies with a high-quality field staff as well as experience conducting large-scale field surveys.

If interested in obtaining a copy of the rfp, please respond directly to Kathy Dykeman (kathy.dykeman@vnsusa.org) as soon as possible. Please include your company's name and description in your email. Also, VNS will be holding a bidder's conference on Wednesday, June 13, 2001 for companies interested in submitting a proposal.

CONTACT

Kathy Dykeman
Voter News Service Exit Poll Operations Manager
225 West 34th Street, Suite 310
New York, NY 10122
Phone: 800.330.8683
VM: 212.947.3477
Fax: 212.947.7756

---
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REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR VNS EXIT POLL OPERATION

Voter News Service, LLC (VNS) recently issued a request for proposals to conduct its 2002 and 2004 exit poll operation. VNS is managed by ABC News, The Associated Press, CBS, FOX News, and NBC News. VNS collects, tabulates, and disseminates vote returns, exit poll data, and projections of presidential primaries and national and statewide election contests. On Election Day, this information is distributed to the six member organizations and to other subscribing news organizations.

VNS is presently investigating the cost-effectiveness of contracting with a survey research company to coordinate part or all of its exit poll operation. The two major functions of the VNS exit poll operation are: 1) recruiting, training and equipping a Election Day field staff, and 2) managing a call center to input and process exit poll results.

VNS is seeking proposals from companies with a high-quality field staff as well as experience conducting large-scale surveys.

If interested in obtaining a copy of the rfp, please respond directly to Kathy Dykeman: kathy.dykeman@vnsusa.org as soon as possible.
possible. Please include your company's name and description in your email. Also, VNS will be holding a bidder's conference on Wednesday, June 20, 2001 for companies interested in submitting a proposal.

CONTACT:

Kathy Dykeman
Voter News Service
Exit Poll Operations Manager
225 West 34th Street, Suite 310
New York, NY 10122
Phone: 800.330.8683
VM: 212.947.3477
Fax: 212.947.7756
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>From 71501.716@compuserve.com Wed Jun 6 12:20:15 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id MAA12719 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 12:20:14 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from spdmgaaf.compuserve.com (ds-img-6.compuserve.com [149.174.206.139]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id MAA6136 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 12:20:10 -0700 (PDT)
Received: (from mailgate=localhost) by spdmgaaf.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.9) id PAA205000
Haste can make waste. In my earlier message concerning the Census budget I failed to mention that my area of interest is specifically in the field operations directed at increasing rate of return. That is, what is the approximate amount the Census spent in 2000 to gain response --- including the prelim letter, the questionnaire mailing, follow-up mailings/contacts, promotional and advertising efforts, etc.?

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com
804.758.3236

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Wed Jun  6 14:29:32 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA26171 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 14:29:31 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from c001.snv.cp.net (c001-h000.c001.snv.cp.net [209.228.32.114])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id OAA20000 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 14:29:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (cpmta 524 invoked from network); 6 Jun 2001 14:28:56 -0700
Received: from mxusw5x71.chesco.com (HELO default) (209.195.228.71)
    by smtp.jpmurphy.com (209.228.32.114) with SMTP; 6 Jun 2001 14:28:56 -0700
Message-ID: <007201c0eeef8$8def8720$47e4c3d1@default>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: "CASRO" <casro@casro.org>, "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: CASRO 6th Annual Technology Conference - June 21-22, 2001 - New York City
Date: Wed, 6 Jun 2001 17:27:54 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
"The CASRO membership has recently added language to its existing Code of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research to specifically address Internet research. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited email to recruit respondents for surveys."

How would the above be any different from what is routinely done in RDD telephone surveys? Or telephone surveys using "listed" samples? Or many mail surveys? Is this an attempt to restrict legitimacy to survey companies choosing to invest in building their own prerecruited panels of e-mail addressees?

Does "recruit respondents for surveys" mean invite them to opt in to sample frames (for possible later contact), or mean request that they complete a specific questionnaire that is attached to the message?

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

-----Original Message-----
From: CASRO <casro@casro.org>
To: casro@casro.org <casro@casro.org>
Date: Tuesday, June 05, 2001 4:32 PM
Subject: CASRO 6th Annual Technology Conference - June 21-22, 2001 - New York City

> The CASRO 6th Annual Technology Conference will be held June 21-22 at the Millennium Conference Center in New York City, and will focus on Internet/online research. This highly-rated conference targets senior information systems professionals, senior management and senior researchers at research companies and features two days of presentations by technology leaders and experts, as well as vendor exhibitors highlighting the latest in research-related technology.
>
> One of the sessions featured is "Strategies for Inference for Internet Sampling" with leading experts and practitioners, an expanded session based on the very popular session held last year. In last year's sampling session, a substantial portion of the presentations and discussion were dedicated to descriptions of sampling mechanisms used in Internet surveys. The part of the discussion dealing with inference issues focused largely on the non-probability aspect of most Internet survey samples.
>
> In this year's session, Peter Milla (Harris Interactive Inc.) and the Technology Committee direct the panel's attention to inference methods and practices in Internet sample surveys. In particular, it is hoped that participants will learn more about the opportunities for, obstacles to and experience with "model-based" inference methods that do not require probability sample designs.
The panel will also discuss the Internet research standards adopted by the CASRO membership. The CASRO membership has recently added language to its existing Code of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research to specifically address Internet research. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited email to recruit respondents for surveys. A brief overview of the Internet Standards will be presented at the outset of the session. Panelists will be invited to comment on the Internet Research Standards in their presentations.

Register today via the CASRO website at www.casro.org. We look forward to seeing you in New York City this month.

Council of American Survey Research Organizations
3 Upper Devon
Port Jefferson, NY 11777
Phone: (631) 928-6954
Fax: (631) 928-6041
Email: casro@casro.org
Website: www.casro.org

From simonetta@artsci.com Wed Jun 6 15:11:27 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA29316 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 15:11:27 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA21997 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 15:11:27 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
    id <MMT2K31V>; Wed, 6 Jun 2001 17:58:21 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F316D1AE@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: CASRO 6th Annual Technology Conference - June 21-22, 2001 - New York City
Date: Wed, 6 Jun 2001 17:58:20 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

James P. Murphy, Ph.D. said;
> "The CASRO membership has recently added language to its existing Code
of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research to specifically address Internet research. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited email to recruit respondents for surveys."

How would the above be any different from what is routinely done in RDD telephone surveys? Or telephone surveys using "listed" samples? Or many mail surveys?

There is no real difference between unsolicited telephone calls or mail surveys and unsolicited email recruiting to participate in surveys _except_ for the norms and mores that surround these methods of contact. There is a strong norm against unsolicited bulk email largely because of the economics of SPAM. When phone surveys started up there was no such norm against unsolicited contact (though the growing intrusion of tele-marketing seems to be creating a groundswell against this form of contact as well).

Those who send unsolicited email are frequently reported to their provider (it is against the Terms of Service of most Internet Service Providers) and often lose their accounts. Some types of unsolicited bulk email are even illegal in some states (Virginia, California, Washington).

In addition, as for RDD there is no correspondent method in email - there is (to the best of my knowledge) no way to determine what email address are in use and there is no counterpart to the telephone number in the email address world. It is possible to determine which domains (artsci.com, for example) are in use but there is no way to determine the number of individuals at a domain and what the corresponding addresses are.

Here is part of the CASRO CODE OF STANDARDS AND ETHICS FOR SURVEY RESEARCH that refers to Internet Research. http://www.casro.org/casro.htm

3. Internet Research

a. The unique characteristics of internet research require specific notice that the principle of respondent privacy applies to this new technology and data collection methodology. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited emails to recruit respondents.
(1) Research organizations are required to verify that individuals contacted for research by email have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact for research. Such agreement can be assumed when ALL of the following conditions exist:

a. A substantive pre-existing relationship exists between the individuals contacted and the research organization, the client or the list owners contracting the research (the latter being so identified);

b. Individuals have a reasonable expectation, based on the pre-existing relationship, that they may be contacted for research;

c. Individuals are offered the choice to be removed from future email contact in each invitation; and,

d. The invitation list excludes all individuals who have previously taken the appropriate and timely steps to request the list owner to remove them.

(2) Research organizations are prohibited from using any subterfuge in obtaining email addresses of potential respondents, such as collecting email addresses from public domains, using technologies or techniques to collect email addresses without individuals' awareness, and collecting email addresses under the guise of some other activity.

(3) Research organizations are prohibited from using false or misleading return email addresses when recruiting respondents over the Internet.

(4) When receiving email lists from clients or list owners, research organizations are required to have the client or list provider verify that individuals listed have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact, as defined, in (1) above.

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

>From Reg_Baker@marketstrategies.com Thu Jun  7 03:42:07 2001
Thanks to Leo for a thorough discussion of the SPAM issue below. Let me address one other issue raised in the original post.

The CASRO Internet Committee that developed the guidelines (I was a member) was careful not to "restrict legitimacy to survey companies choosing to invest in building their own prerecruited panels of e-mail addressees?" Use of third-party sample providers (of which there are many) is clearly permitted as long as those providers develop and maintain their lists within the guidelines. As a practical matter this means that in addition to meeting "opt-in" requirements the list owner must originate the survey request which is, of course, quite different from how we work with purchased lists for telephone and mail surveys.

Reg Baker
www.ms-interactive.com
James P. Murphy, Ph.D. said;
> "The CASRO membership has recently added language to its existing Code
> of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research to specifically address
> Internet research. The general principle of this section of the Code
> is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited email
> to recruit respondents for surveys."
>
> How would the above be any different from what is routinely done in
> RDD telephone surveys? Or telephone surveys using "listed" samples?
> Or many mail surveys?

There is no real difference between unsolicited telephone calls or mail
surveys and
unsolicited email recruiting to participate in surveys _except_ for the norms
and
mores that surround these methods of contact. There is a strong norm against
unsolicited bulk email largely because of the economics of SPAM. When phone
surveys
started up there was no such norm against unsolicited contact (though the
growing
intrusion of tele-marketing seems to be creating a groundswell against this
Those who send unsolicited email are frequently reported to their provider (it is against the Terms of Service of most Internet Service Providers) and often lose their accounts. Some types of unsolicited bulk email are even illegal in some states (Virginia, California, Washington).

In addition, as for RDD there is no correspondent method in email - there is (to the best of my knowledge) no way to determine what email address are in use and there is no counterpart to the telephone number in the email address world. It is possible to determine which domains (artsci.com, for example) are in use but there is no way to determine the number of individuals at a domain and what the corresponding addresses are.

Here is part of the CASRO CODE OF STANDARDS AND ETHICS FOR SURVEY RESEARCH that refers to Internet Research. http://www.casro.org/casro.htm

3. Internet Research

a. The unique characteristics of internet research require specific notice that the principle of respondent privacy applies to this new technology and data collection methodology. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited emails to recruit respondents for surveys.

(1) Research organizations are required to verify that individuals contacted for research by email have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact for research. Such agreement can be assumed when ALL of the following conditions exist:

a. A substantive pre-existing relationship exists between the individuals contacted and the research organization, the client or the list owners contracting the research (the latter being so identified);

b. Individuals have a reasonable expectation, based on the pre-existing relationship,
that they may be contacted for research;

c. Individuals are offered the choice to be removed from future email contact in each invitation; and,

d. The invitation list excludes all individuals who have previously taken the appropriate and timely steps to request the list owner to remove them.

(2) Research organizations are prohibited from using any subterfuge in obtaining email addresses of potential respondents, such as collecting email addresses from public domains, using technologies or techniques to collect email addresses without individuals' awareness, and collecting email addresses under the guise of some other activity.

(3) Research organizations are prohibited from using false or misleading return email addresses when recruiting respondents over the Internet.

(4) When receiving email lists from clients or list owners, research organizations are required to have the client or list provider verify that individuals listed have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact, as defined, in (1) above.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com
The first problem here is the idea of a "Code of Standards and Ethics" of any kind.

Standards and ethics are acutely different: Nice people live by ethical and moral codes; nice people do not necessarily know anything about scientific or technical standards. Conversely, good researchers--intending to conduct the best possible research they can--might well adhere to the most rigid scientific and technical standards; this is no guarantee, however, that they are either ethical or nice.

Would we really wish to live in a society in which questions of ethics and morality are routinely confounded with scientific and technical standards? Judging by the thankfully few historical examples we have of such societies, I don't think so (isn't this why we academics allow humanities professors to sit on human subjects committees?). Those who agree might wish to draft separate codes for survey standards and for survey ethics. Just the work of separating out the two could prove to be a worthwhile exercise, especially in relatively small and closely-knit organizations.

As for spamming the Net, I don't see this as a matter of either ethics or standards, but rather a simple matter of rational self-interest. Those of us who wish to use the Net to save time and money and also to improve and sustain our own research, over the course of our careers, have a profound self-interest in assuring that the Net does not degenerate into a channel of mass advertising and marketing by unfamiliar agents of questionable repute. Certainly no group holds this self-interest more strongly than do survey researchers.
It follows that survey researchers will want publicly to support anti-spam campaigns--even researchers who might wish to send out unsolicited mail to recruit respondents now and then.

It would be rude here to raise the question of what sampling frames might be used to assure random or otherwise representative samples using unsolicited emailings, and so I won't.

-- Jim

*******

On Wed, 6 Jun 2001, James P. Murphy wrote:

> "The CASRO membership has recently added language to its existing Code of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research to specifically address Internet research. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited email to recruit respondents for surveys."
>
> How would the above be any different from what is routinely done in RDD telephone surveys? Or telephone surveys using "listed" samples? Or many mail surveys? Is this an attempt to restrict legitimacy to survey companies choosing to invest in building their own prerecruited panels of e-mail addressees?
>
> Does "recruit respondents for surveys" mean invite them to opt in to sample frames (for possible later contact), or mean request that they complete a specific questionnaire that is attached to the message?
>
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
Job Announcement - please share with appropriate candidates

Senior Project Director

United Jewish Communities is sponsoring the National Jewish Population Survey 2000. This will be the definitive study of American Jewry for the coming decade. A national probability sample of 4,500 Jews and 4,500 non-Jews is being interviewed. Data will soon be available in a public use data set.

UJC seeks a researcher to participate in the analysis, report writing and presentation of the NJPS 2000 data. This individual will be involved in communicating with academics, advisory committees and Jewish organizations. S/he may also be involved in other surveys and projects of benefit to the Jewish Federation system.

Qualifications are
* A graduate degree, preferably Ph.D. or ABD in sociology or other social science.
* Strong capabilities in research methodology, data analysis and multivariate statistical modeling
* Knowledge of SPSS, Microsoft Office and Internet.
* Excellent oral, writing and interpersonal skills.
* Substantial knowledge about Jewish religion, culture and community in the U.S.
* Conceptual thinker, able to integrate data and theory.

This person must be a detailed oriented self-starter who can thrive in a teamwork environment and manage under pressure of deadlines. Pluses are program evaluation background and fluency in Hebrew.

This position is based on a funded program. Appointment for two years and, contingent on funding, an extension is possible. Employment beyond the duration of the program cannot be guaranteed.

Send resume and salary requirements by:
Email: Jim.schwartz@ujc.org or
Fax: (212) 284-6805
Please, no telephone calls.

Jim Schwartz, Ph.D.
Research Director
I was recently approached by a client asking the following question:

"We are in a position where we need to justify the cost of focus groups and user testing (e.g. for a web site) to our senior management. Do you have any information on the ROI on focus groups and user testing? Any data, quotes, web sites or reports would be useful, particularly for the I.T. industry and/or for web sites."

Would anyone know of any references or information that might speak to this question?

Please send any replies either to AAPORNET or to me directly.

Thanks, in advance.

Keith Neuman, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President
Decima Research Inc.
Ottawa, Ontario
613-230-2013
email: kneuman@decima.ca
WASHINGTON JUNK E-MAIL LAW UPHELD, SPAMMER TO STAND TRIAL

By Brian Krebs, Newsbytes

WASHINGTON, D.C., U.S.A.

The Washington Supreme Court today upheld a 1998 state law aimed at curbing the use of unsolicited commercial e-mail, or "spam."

Today's unanimous decision allows the state's attorney general to proceed with a pending lawsuit against Jason Heckel, a 26-year-old Oregon man accused of spamming millions of users in order to drum up sales of his book, which -- among other things -- teaches people how to use spam for profit.

Washington Attorney General Christine Gregoire said she was pleased that the Supreme Court issued such a strong endorsement of the state's new anti-spam law.

"Consumers and businesses pay a heavy price in money and lost time because of those who use the Internet to distribute deceptive commercial mailings to people who never asked for them," Gregoire said.
The state law prohibits the sending of commercial e-mail that contains misleading information in its subject line or uses a bogus return address or third-party domain name return address without permission. Lawsuits brought by the state under the Consumer Protection Act can seek up to $2,000 per violation, while consumers and Internet service providers (ISPs) can sue for $500 and $1,000 per violation, respectively.

The lawsuit alleges Hackel and his company "Natural Instincts" sent junk e-mails with the message, "Did I get the right e-mail address?" in the header to entice recipients into opening and reading the missive. The suit also accuses Hackel of using fake return address to keep people from responding.

King County Superior Court Judge Palmer Robinson dismissed the case last year, arguing that the new law violated the Commerce Clause of the Constitution. That decades old Supreme Court ruling that held individual states could not pass laws that effectively regulate interstate commerce.

In upholding the law, the state Supreme Court found that "... the only burden the Act places on spammers is the requirement of truthfulness, a requirement that does not burden commerce at all but actually 'facilitates it by eliminating fraud and deception.'"

The case will now be remanded to the Superior Court for trial.

Hackel's attorney Dale L. Crandall emphasized that today's decision was not about the guilt or innocence of his client, but instead symbolizes the struggle between state and federal government over the extent of the Commerce Clause. As such, Crandall said he expects that the US Supreme Court to be the ultimate arbiter of the law's constitutionality.

"That ruling will supersede any state court ruling," Crandall said. "In the meantime, we are going to proceed on the assumption that this is the case that the United States Supreme Court will decide to review, and that our argument is the
correct one."

Scott Hazen Mueller, chairman of the Coalition Against Unsolicited Commercial E-Mail (CAUCE), applauded the ruling, but said the interstate nature of spam ensures that the problem will continue as long as Congress delays passage of federal anti-spam laws.

"Until we have strong federal legislation giving consumers and Internet providers the legal tools with which to defend themselves, it is only through the actions of local and state law enforcement that spammers will be convinced to stop their fraudulent and abusive practices."

The House of Representatives is considering two separate bills to curb the use of unsolicited commercial e-mail. While one of the measures, co-sponsored by Rep. Heather Wilson, R-N.M., passed the House by an overwhelming margin of 427-1 last year, the bill this year enjoys far less support and has drawn fire from financial services companies, who claim the legislation would outlaw legitimate communications between companies and their customers.

As written, the Wilson bill would have provided a private right of action to allow consumers and Internet service providers to recoup the financial costs incurred from spam. That language was stripped from the bill in House Judiciary Committee markup last month, however, and the Senate is considering a similarly pared-down measure.

The Supreme Court's decision is at: http://www.courts.wa.gov/opinions/opindisp.cfm?docid=694168MAJ.


(C) 2001 The Washington Post Company
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STATE OF WASHINGTON, )
OWENS, J. -- The State of Washington filed suit against Oregon resident Jason Heckel, alleging that his transmissions of electronic mail (e-mail) to Washington residents violated Washington's commercial electronic mail act, chapter 19.190 RCW (the Act). On cross-motions for summary judgment, the trial court dismissed the State's suit against Heckel, concluding that the Act violated the dormant Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution. This court granted the State's request for direct review. We hold that the Act does not unduly burden interstate commerce. We reverse the trial court's dismissal of the State's suit, vacate the order on attorney fees, and remand this matter for trial.

FACTS

As early as February 1996, defendant Jason Heckel, an Oregon resident doing business as Natural Instincts, began sending unsolicited commercial e-mail (UCE), or 'spam,' over the Internet. In 1997, Heckel developed a 46-page on-line booklet entitled 'How to Profit from the Internet.' The booklet described how to set up an on-line promotional business, acquire free e-mail accounts, and obtain software for sending bulk e-mail. From June 1998, Heckel marketed the booklet by sending between 100,000 and 1,000,000 UCE messages per week. To acquire the large volume of e-mail addresses, Heckel used the Extractor Pro software program, which harvests e-mail addresses from various on-line sources and enables a spammer to direct a bulk-mail message to those addresses by entering a simple command. The Extractor Pro program requires the spammer to enter a return e-mail address, a subject line, and the text of the message to be sent. The text of Heckel's UCE was a lengthy sales pitch that included testimonials from
satisfied purchasers and culminated in an order form that the recipient could download and print. The order form included the Salem, Oregon, mailing address for Natural Instincts. Charging $39.95 for the booklet, Heckel made 30 to 50 sales per month.

In June 1998, the Consumer Protection Division of the Washington State Attorney General's Office received complaints from Washington recipients of Heckel's UCE messages. The complaints alleged that Heckel's messages contained misleading subject lines and false transmission paths.4 Responding to the June complaints, David Hill, an inspector from the Consumer Protection Division, sent Heckel a letter advising him of the existence of the Act. The Act provides that anyone sending a commercial e-mail message from a computer located in Washington or to an e-mail address held by a Washington resident may not use a third-party's domain name without permission,5 misrepresent or disguise in any other way the message's point of origin or transmission path, or use a misleading subject line.6 RCW 19.190.030 makes a violation of the Act a per se violation of the Consumer Protection Act, chapter 19.86 RCW (CPA).

Responding to Hill's letter, Heckel telephoned Hill on or around June 25, 1998. According to Hill, he discussed with Heckel the provisions of the Act and the procedures bulk e-mailers can follow to identify e-mail addressees who are Washington residents. Nevertheless, the Attorney General's Office continued to receive consumer complaints alleging that Heckel's bulk e-mailings from Natural Instincts appeared to contain misleading subject lines, false or unusable return e-mail addresses, and false or misleading transmission paths. Between June and September 1998, the Consumer Protection Division of the Attorney General's Office documented 20 complaints from 17 recipients of Heckel's UCE messages. On October 22, 1998, the State filed suit against Heckel, stating three causes of action. First, the State alleged that Heckel had violated RCW 19.190.020(1)(b) and, in turn, the CPA, by using false or misleading information in the subject line of his UCE messages. Heckel used one of two subject lines to introduce his solicitations: 'Did I get the right e-mail address?' and 'For your review--HANDS OFF!'
Papers (CP) at 6, 92, 113. In the State's view, the first subject line falsely suggested that an acquaintance of the recipient was trying to make contact, while the second subject line invited the misperception that the message contained classified information for the particular recipient's review. As its second cause of action, the State alleged that Heckel had violated RCW 19.190.020(1)(a), and thus the CPA, by misrepresenting information defining the transmission paths of his UCE messages. Heckel routed his spam through at least a dozen different domain names without receiving permission to do so from the registered owners of those names. For example, of the 20 complaints the Attorney General's Office received concerning Heckel's spam, 9 of the messages showed '13.com' as the initial ISP to transmit his spam. CP at 44, 113.

The 13.com domain name, however, was registered as early as November 1995 to another individual, from whom Heckel had not sought or received permission to use the registered name. In fact, because the owner of 13.com had not yet even activated that domain name, no messages could have been sent or received through 13.com. Additionally, the State alleged that Heckel had violated the CPA by failing to provide a valid return e-mail address to which bulk-mail recipients could respond. When Heckel created his spam with the Extractor Pro software, he used at least a dozen different return e-mail addresses with the domain name 'juno.com' (Heckel used the Juno accounts in part because they were free). CP at 88-89.

None of the Juno e-mail accounts was readily identifiable as belonging to Heckel; the user names that he registered generally consisted of a name or a name plus a number (e.g., 'marlin1374,' 'cindyt5667,' 'howardwesley13,' 'johnjacobson1374,' and 'sjtowns'). CP at 88-89. During August and September 1998, Heckel's Juno addresses were canceled within two days of his sending out a bulk e-mail message on the account. According to Heckel, when Juno canceled one e-mail account, he would simply open a new one and send out another bulk mailing. Because Heckel's accounts were canceled so rapidly, recipients who attempted to reply were unsuccessful. The State thus contended that Heckel's practice of cycling through e-mail addresses ensured that those addresses were useless to the recipients of his UCE messages.
During the months that Heckel was sending out bulk e-mail solicitations on the Juno accounts, he maintained a personal e-mail account from which he sent no spam, but that e-mail address was not included in any of his spam messages. The State asserted that Heckel's use of such ephemeral e-mail addresses in his UCE amounted to a deceptive practice in violation of RCW 19.86.020. The State sought a permanent injunction and, pursuant to RCW 19.86.140 and .080 of the CPA, requested civil penalties, as well as costs and a reasonable attorney fee. In early 2000, the parties cross-moved for summary judgment. On March 10, 2000, the trial court entered an order granting Heckel's motion and denying the State's cross motion. The court found that the Act violated the Commerce Clause (U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3) and was 'unduly restrictive and burdensome.' CP at 175. The order permitted Heckel to 'present a cost bill for recovery of his costs and statutory attorneys fees.' CP at 175. Heckel then moved the court for a fee award of $49,897.50. Denying Heckel's request for fees under RCW 19.86.080 of the CPA, the court limited Heckel's award to statutory costs under RCW 4.84.030.

Challenging the trial court's finding that the Act violated the Commerce Clause, the State sought this court's direct review. Heckel cross-appealed, seeking reversal of the trial court's denial of his attorney fee request under the CPA. We granted direct review.

ISSUE

Does the Act, which prohibits misrepresentation in the subject line or transmission path of any commercial e-mail message sent to Washington residents or from a Washington computer, unconstitutionally burden interstate commerce?

ANALYSIS

Standard of Review. The State seeks review of the trial court's decision on summary judgment that the Act violated the dormant Commerce Clause. This court reviews de novo a trial court's grant of summary judgment and views all facts in the
light most favorable to the party challenging the summary dismissal. Lybbert v. Grant County, 141 Wn.2d 29, 34, 1 P.3d 1124 (2000). A legislative act is presumptively constitutional, 'and the party challenging it bears the burden of proving it unconstitutional beyond a reasonable doubt.' State v. Brayman, 110 Wn.2d 183, 193, 751 P.2d 294 (1988); see also Frach v. Schoettler, 46 Wn.2d 281, 280 P.2d 1038, cert. denied, 350 U.S. 838 (1955). A party meets the standard 'if argument and research show that there is no reasonable doubt that the statute violates the constitution.' Amalgamated Transit Union Local 587 v. State, 142 Wn.2d 183, 205, 11 P.3d 762 (2000) (citing Belas v. Kiga, 135 Wn.2d 913, 920, 959 P.2d 1037 (1998)).

Heckel's Challenge under the Commerce Clause. The Commerce Clause grants Congress the 'power . . . (t)o regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.' U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3. Implicit in this affirmative grant is the negative or 'dormant' Commerce Clause--the principle that the states impermissibly intrude on this federal power when they enact laws that unduly burden interstate commerce. See Franks & Son, Inc. v. State, 136 Wn.2d 737, 747, 966 P.2d 1232 (1998). Analysis of a state law under the dormant Commerce Clause generally follows a two-step process. We first determine whether the state law openly discriminates against interstate commerce in favor of intrastate economic interests. If the law is facially neutral, applying impartially to in-state and out-of-state businesses, the analysis moves to the second step, a balancing of the local benefits against the interstate burdens:

Where the statute regulates evenhandedly to effectuate a legitimate local public interest, and its effects on interstate commerce are only incidental, it will be upheld unless the burden imposed on such commerce is clearly excessive in relation to the putative local benefits. If a legitimate local purpose is found, then the question becomes one of degree. And the extent of the burden that will be tolerated will of course depend on the nature of the local interest involved, and on whether
it could be promoted as well with a lesser impact on interstate activities.

Id. at 754 (quoting Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc., 397 U.S. 137, 142, 90 S. Ct. 844, 25 L. Ed. 2d 174 (1970)).

The Act is not facially discriminatory. The Act applies evenhandedly to in-state and out-of-state spammers: 'No person' may transmit the proscribed commercial e-mail messages 'from a computer located in Washington or to an electronic mail address that the sender knows, or has reason to know, is held by a Washington resident.' RCW 19.190.020(1) (emphasis added). Thus, just as the statute applied to Heckel, an Oregon resident, it is enforceable against a Washington business engaging in the same practices.

Because we conclude that the Act's local benefits surpass any alleged burden on interstate commerce, the statute likewise survives the Pike balancing test. The Act protects the interests of three groups--ISPs, actual owners of forged domain names, and e-mail users. The problems that spam causes have been discussed in prior cases and legislative hearings. A federal district court described the harms a mass e-mailer caused ISP CompuServe:

In the present case, any value CompuServe realizes from its computer equipment is wholly derived from the extent to which that equipment can serve its subscriber base. . . . (H)andling the enormous volume of mass mailings that CompuServe receives places a tremendous burden on its equipment. Defendants' more recent practice of evading CompuServe's filters by disguising the origin of their messages commandeers even more computer resources because CompuServe's computers are forced to store undeliverable e-mail messages and labor in vain to return the messages to an address that does not exist. To the extent that defendants' multitudinous electronic mailings demand the disk space and drain the processing power of plaintiff's computer equipment, those resources are not available to serve CompuServe subscribers. Therefore, the value of that equipment to CompuServe is diminished even though it is not physically damaged by defendants' conduct.

(granting preliminary injunction against bulk e-mailer on theory of trespass to chattels); see also Am. Online, Inc. v. IMS, 24 F. Supp. 2d 548, 550 (E.D. Va. 1998) ('relying on the reasoning of CompuServe' and finding that bulk e-mailer 'injured AOL's business goodwill and diminished the value of its possessory interest in its computer network'). To handle the increased e-mail traffic attributable to deceptive spam, ISPs must invest in more computer equipment.8 Operational costs likewise increase as ISPs hire more customer service representatives to field spam complaints and more system administrators to detect accounts being used to send spam.9 Along with ISPs, the owners of impermissibly used domain names and e-mail addresses suffer economic harm. For example, the registered owner of 'localhost.com' alleged that his computer system was shut down for three days by 7,000 responses to a bulk-mail message in which the spammer had forged the e-mail address 'nobody@localhost.com' into his spam's header. Seidl v. Greentree Mortgage Co., 30 F. Supp. 2d 1292, 1297-98 (D. Colo. 1998); see also Spamming: The E-Mail You Want to Can: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection of the Comm. on Commerce, 106th Cong. 9 (1999) (statement of Rep. Gary G. Miller) (attached as App. 4, Br. of Amicus WAISP); 146 Cong. Rec. H6373 (daily ed. July 18, 2000) (statement of Rep. Miller), available at http://thomas.loc.gov/home/cl06query.html (recounting similar experience of California constituent).

Deceptive spam harms individual Internet users as well. When a spammer distorts the point of origin or transmission path of the message, e-mail recipients cannot promptly and effectively respond to the message (and thereby opt out of future mailings); their efforts to respond take time, cause frustration, and compound the problems that ISPs face in delivering and storing the bulk messages. And the use of false or misleading subject lines further hampers an individual's ability to use computer time most efficiently. When spammers use subject lines 'such as 'Hi There!',' 'Information Request,' and 'Your Business Records,' it becomes 'virtually impossible' to distinguish spam from legitimate personal or business
Individuals who do not have flat-rate plans for Internet access but pay instead by the minute or hour are harmed more directly, but all Internet users (along with their ISPs) bear the cost of deceptive spam. This cost-shifting from deceptive spammers to businesses and e-mail users—has been likened to sending junk mail with postage due or making telemarketing calls to someone's pay-per-minute cellular phone. In a case involving the analogous practice of junk faxing (sending unsolicited faxes that contain advertisements), the Ninth Circuit acknowledged 'the government's substantial interest in preventing the shifting of advertising costs to consumers.'

Destination Ventures, Ltd. v. F.C.C., 46 F.3d 54, 56 (9th Cir. 1995) (holding that the Telephone Consumer Protection Act's (47 U.S.C. sec. 227) limitations on commercial speech did not violate the First Amendment). We thus recognize that the Act serves the 'legitimate local purpose' of banning the cost-shifting inherent in the sending of deceptive spam.

Under the Pike balancing test, '[i]f a legitimate local purpose is found, then the question becomes one of degree.' 397 U.S. at 142. In the present case, the trial court questioned whether the Act's requirement of truthfulness (in the subject lines and header information) would redress the costs associated with bulk e-mailings. As legal commentators have observed, however, 'the truthfulness requirements (such as the requirement not to misrepresent the message's Internet origin) make spamming unattractive to the many fraudulent spammers, thereby reducing the volume of spam.'

Jack L. Goldsmith & Alan O. Sykes, The Internet and the Dormant Commerce Clause, 110 Yale L.J. 785, 819 (2001). Calling 'simply wrong' the trial court's view 'that truthful identification in the subject header would do little to relieve the annoyance of spam,' the commentators assert that 'this identification alone would allow many people to delete the message without opening it (which takes time) and perhaps being offended by the content.' Id. The Act's truthfulness requirements thus appear to advance the Act's aim of protecting ISPs and consumers from the problems associated with commercial bulk e-mail.

To be weighed against the Act's local benefits, the only burden the Act
places on spammers is the requirement of truthfulness, a requirement that does not burden commerce at all but actually 'facilitates it by eliminating fraud and deception.' Id. Spammers must use an accurate, nonmisleading subject line, and they must not manipulate the transmission path to disguise the origin of their commercial messages. While spammers incur no costs in complying with the Act, they do incur costs for noncompliance, because they must take steps to introduce forged information into the header of their message. In finding the Act 'unduly burdensome,' CP at 175, the trial court apparently focused not on what spammers must do to comply with the Act but on what they must do if they choose to use deceptive subject lines or to falsify elements in the transmission path. To initiate deceptive spam without violating the Act, a spammer must weed out Washington residents by contacting the registrant of the domain name contained in the recipient's e-mail address. This focus on the burden of noncompliance is contrary to the approach in the Pike balancing test, where the United States Supreme Court assessed the cost of compliance with a challenged statute. Indeed, the trial court could have appropriately considered the filtering requirement a burden only if Washington's statute had banned outright the sending of UCE messages to Washington residents. We therefore conclude that Heckel has failed to prove that 'the burden imposed on . . . commerce (by the Act) is clearly excessive in relation to the putative local benefits.' Id. at 142 (emphasis added).

Drawing on two 'unsettled and poorly understood' aspects of the dormant Commerce Clause analysis, Heckel contended that the Act (1) created inconsistency among the states and (2) regulated conduct occurring wholly outside of Washington. The inconsistent-regulations test and the extraterritoriality analysis are appropriately regarded as facets of the Pike balancing test. The Act survives both inquiries. At present, 17 other states have passed legislation regulating electronic solicitations. The truthfulness requirements of the Act do not conflict with any of the requirements in the other states' statutes, and it is inconceivable that any state would ever pass a law requiring spammers to use misleading subject lines or transmission paths. Some states' statutes do include additional requirements; for
example, some statutes require spammers to provide contact information (for opt-out purposes) or to introduce subject lines with such labels as 'ADV' or 'ADV-ADLT.'

But because such statutes 'merely create additional, but not irreconcilable, obligations,' they 'are not considered to be 'inconsistent' for purposes of the dormant Commerce Clause analysis. Instructional Sys., Inc. v. Computer Curriculum Corp., 35 F.3d 813, 826 (3d Cir. 1994). The inquiry under the dormant Commerce Clause is not whether the states have enacted different anti-spam statutes but whether those differences create compliance costs that are 'clearly excessive in relation to the putative local benefits.' Pike, 397 U.S. at 142. We do not believe that the differences between the Act and the anti-spam laws of other states impose extraordinary costs on businesses deploying spam.17

Nor does the Act violate the extraterritoriality principle in the dormant Commerce Clause analysis. Here, there is no 'sweeping extraterritorial effect' that would outweigh the local benefits of the Act. Edgar v. MITE Corp., 457 U.S. 624, 642, 102 S. Ct. 2629, 73 L. Ed. 2d 269 (1982). Heckel offers the hypothetical of a Washington resident who downloads and reads the deceptive spam while in Portland or Denver. He contends that the dormant Commerce Clause is offended because the Act would regulate the recipient's conduct while out of state. However, the Act does not burden interstate commerce by regulating when or where recipients may open the proscribed UCE messages. Rather, the Act addresses the conduct of spammers in targeting Washington consumers. Moreover, the hypothetical mistakenly presumes that the Act must be construed to apply to Washington residents when they are out of state, a construction that creates a jurisdictional question not at issue in this case.

In sum, we reject the trial court's conclusion that the Act violates the dormant Commerce Clause. Although the trial court found particularly persuasive American Libraries Association v. Pataki, 969 F. Supp. 160 (S.D.N.Y. 1997), that decision--the first to apply the dormant Commerce Clause to a state law on Internet use--is distinguishable in a key respect.18 At issue in American Libraries was a New York statute that made it a crime to use a computer to distribute harmful, sexually
explicit content to minors. The statute applied not just to initiation of e-mail messages but to all Internet activity, including the creation of websites. Thus, under the New York statute, a website creator in California could inadvertently violate the law simply because the site could be viewed in New York. Concerned with the statute's 'chilling effect,' id. at 179, the court observed that, if an artist 'were located in California and wanted to display his work to a prospective purchaser in Oregon, he could not employ his virtual [Internet] studio to do so without risking prosecution under the New York law.'

Id. at 174. In contrast to the New York statute, which could reach all content posted on the Internet and therefore subject individuals to liability based on unintended access, the Act reaches only those deceptive UCE messages directed to a Washington resident or initiated from a computer located in Washington; in other words, the Act does not impose liability for messages that are merely routed through Washington or that are read by a Washington resident who was not the actual addressee.

CONCLUSION

The Act limits the harm that deceptive commercial e-mail causes Washington businesses and citizens. The Act prohibits e-mail solicitors from using misleading information in the subject line or transmission path of any commercial e-mail message sent to Washington residents or from a computer located in Washington. We find that the local benefits of the Act outweigh any conceivable burdens the Act places on those sending commercial e-mail messages. Consequently, we hold that the Act does not violate the dormant Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution. We reverse the trial court and remand the matter for trial. The trial court's order on attorney fees is vacated.

WE CONCUR:

1 'Commercial electronic mail message' means an electronic mail message sent for the purpose of promoting real property, goods, or services for sale or
lease.'  RCW 19.190.010(2).  The term 'spam' refers broadly to unsolicited bulk e-mail (or 'junk' e-mail'), which 'can be either commercial (such as an advertisement) or noncommercial (such as a joke or chain letter).'  Sabra-Anne Kelin, State Regulation of Unsolicited Commercial E-Mail, 16 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 435, 436 & n.10 (2001). Use of the term 'spam' as Internet jargon for this seemingly ubiquitous junk e-mail arose out of a skit by the British comedy troupe Monty Python, in which a waitress can offer a patron no single menu item that does not include spam: 'Well, there's spam, egg, sausage and spam. That's not got much spam in it.' 2 Graham Chapman et al., The Complete Monty Python's Flying Circus: All the Words 27 (Pantheon Books 1989); see also Kadow's Internet Dictionary, at http://www.msg.net/kadow/answers/s.html (last visited May 7, 2001). Hormel Foods Corporation, which debuted its SPAMI luncheon meat in 1937, has dropped any defensiveness about this use of the term and now celebrates its product with a website (www.spam.com). See Hormel Objects to Cyber Promotions' Use of 'SPAM' Mark, 4 No. 1 Andrews Intell. Prop. Litig. Rep. 19 (1997); Laurie J. Flynn, Gracious Concession on Internet 'Spam,' N.Y. Times, Aug. 17, 1998, at D3. Because the term has been widely adopted by Internet users, legislators, and legal commentators, we use the term herein, along with its useful derivatives 'spammer' and 'spamming.'

2 ''Electronic mail address' means a destination, commonly expressed as a string of characters, to which electronic mail may be sent or delivered.'  RCW 19.190.010(3).

3 The subject line, similar to the 'RE' line of a letter or memorandum, is generally displayed (at least in part) alongside the sender's name in the recipient's e-mail inbox.

4 Each e-mail message, which is simply a computer data file, contains so-called 'header' information in the 'To,' 'From,' and 'Received' fields. When an e-mail message is transmitted from one e-mail address to another, the message generally passes through at least four computers: from the sender's computer, the message travels to the mail server computer of the sender's Internet Service Provider (ISP); that computer delivers the message to the mail server computer of the
recipient's
ISP, where it remains until the recipient retrieves it onto his or her own computer.

Every computer on the Internet has a unique numerical address (an Internet Protocol or IP address), which is associated with a more readily recognizable domain name (such as 'mysite.com'). As the e-mail message travels from sender to recipient, each computer transmitting the message attaches identifying data to the 'Received' field in the header. The information serves as a kind of electronic postmark for the handling of the message. See Clerk's Papers (CP) at 130-34. It is possible for a sender to alter (or 'spoof') the header information by misidentifying either the computer from which the message originated or other computers along the transmission path. See Kelin, supra note 1, at 445.

5 See RCW 19.190.010(6) (defining 'Internet domain name').

6 '(1) No person may initiate the transmission, conspire with another to initiate the transmission, or assist the transmission, of a commercial electronic mail message from a computer located in Washington or to an electronic mail address that the sender knows, or has reason to know, is held by a Washington resident that:

'(a) Uses a third party's internet domain name without permission of the third party, or otherwise misrepresents or obscures any information in identifying the point of origin or the transmission path of a commercial electronic mail message; or

'(b) Contains false or misleading information in the subject line.

'(2) For purposes of this section, a person knows that the intended recipient of a commercial electronic mail message is a Washington resident if that information is available, upon request, from the registrant of the Internet domain name contained in the recipient's electronic mail address.' RCW 19.190.020.

7 The experience of 1 of the 17 complainants to the Attorney General's Office is illustrative. Nancy Smith received Heckel's spam on September 1, 1998; the message was sent from a Juno account with the user name 'apollo1113,' and the subject line
read 'For your review--HANDS OFF.' CP at 140. On or about September 1, 1998, Smith sent a copy of the Natural Instincts order form with a check for $39.95 by U.S. Mail to the Salem, Oregon, address provided on the order form. Hearing nothing for some weeks, Smith sent a message by return e-mail on September 30, 1998, but within a minute she received a return e-mail from Juno stating that the attempt had failed due to termination of the account. Unable to find any information about Natural Instincts on the Internet, Smith contacted her bank and learned that the check had cleared two weeks earlier. Smith then contacted the Attorney General's Office. CP at 140-41, 149-50.

8 ‘[W]hen Internet users attempt to reply to deceptive spam that has a fraudulent return address or domain name, one e-mail message (and the ISP[‘]s related computer log entry) instantly becomes three separate e-mail messages (and additional computer log entries) because: (1) the ISP server that is the victim of the fraudulent return address or domain name sends an error message back to the Internet user and their ISP announcing that the return path was invalid, (2) a message is sent to the server administrator requesting an investigation of the return address for potential problems, and (3) a message is sent to the server log in case the ISP wishes to track down the problem later. With bulk spam, these messages snowball to clog ISP resources, and ISPs have little choice but to purchase additional equipment at a significant cost.’ Br. of Amicus Washington Association of Internet Service Providers (WAISP) at 11-12.

9 See Br. of Amicus WAISP at 12-13; see also Spamming: The E-Mail You Want to Can: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection of the Comm. on Commerce, 106th Cong. 41-42 (1999) (statement of Michael Russina, Director of Systems Operations, SBC Internet Services) (attached as App. 4, Br. of Amicus WAISP).


12 'This generally involves paying a bulk re-mailing service to forge e-mail headers and send out the spammer's message, or at least running additional software programs to alter the e-mail messages' address and domain name information.' Br. of Amicus WAISP at 8.


15 See Goldsmith & Sykes, supra note 14, at 808 (concluding that 'inconsistent-regulations cases, like extraterritoriality cases, should be viewed as just another variant of balancing analysis'); see also William Lee Biddle, State Regulation of the Internet: Where Does the Balance of Federalist Power Lie? 37 Cal. W. L. Rev. 161, 167 (2000) (suggesting that '{t}he burden placed on interstate commerce through inconsistent local regulation is more appropriately placed as part of the Pike balancing test, rather than its own, separate line of inquiry').


17 As the State notes, '(p)resently, mail and phone solicitors are
expected to abide by different states' telemarketing laws and other consumer protection laws. E-mail solicitors should not be excused from the burden of complying with a state's law simply because of the ease of sending bulk e-mail solicitations in relation to other forms of commercial solicitation.' CP at 53.

18 See CP at 216. At least 10 other cases have distinguished American Libraries.
See, e.g., Hatch v. Super. Ct., 80 Cal. App. 4th 170, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 453 (2000);
People v. Hsu, 82 Cal. App. 4th 976, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 184 (2000); Ford Motor Co. v.

http://www.courts.wa.gov/opinions/opindisp.cfm?docid=694168MAJ
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
(C) 2001 The Washington Post Company
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>From mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu Sat Jun  9 09:27:25 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA18642 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 9 Jun 2001 09:27:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from harrier.mail.pas.earthlink.net (harrier.mail.pas.earthlink.net
[207.217.121.12])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA03028 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 9 Jun 2001 09:27:24 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mike (cpe-24-221-59-115.az.sprintbbd.net [24.221.59.115])
    by harrier.mail.pas.earthlink.net (EL-8_9_3_3/8.9.3) with SMTP id
    JAA17459
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 9 Jun 2001 09:27:25 -0700 (PDT)
Reply-To: <mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>
From: "Michael O'Neil" <mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Hard evidence of the usefulness of market research
Date: Sat, 9 Jun 2001 09:28:06 -0700
Message-ID: <NEBBKEFNCLONIIEECEAPGEHECHAA.mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
In-Reply-To: <A199185464CED211BC9800805FC7D18F01059B590XCHNG1>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
This question reminds me of a discussion I once had with Warren Miller. He said: "Ask them what it will cost them to be wrong."

Michael O'Neill
www.oneilresearch.com

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Keith Neuman
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2001 11:13 AM
To: 'AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU'
Subject: Hard evidence of the usefulness of market research

I was recently approached by a client asking the following question:

"We are in a position where we need to justify the cost of focus groups and user testing (e.g. for a web site) to our senior management. Do you have any information on the ROI on focus groups and user testing? Any data, quotes, web sites or reports would be useful, particularly for the I.T. industry and/or for web sites."

Would anyone know of any references or information that might speak to this question?

Please send any replies either to AAPORNET or to me directly.

Thanks, in advance.

Keith Neuman, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President
Decima Research Inc.
Ottawa, Ontario
613-230-2013
e-mail: kneuman@decima.ca

>From vector@sympatico.ca Mon Jun 11 09:42:50 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA27814 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Jun 2001 09:42:50
    0700
    (PDT)
Received: from tomts6-srv.bellnexxia.net (tomts6.bellnexxia.net
[209.226.175.26])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA24351 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Jun 2001 09:42:41 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from i7slu9 ([64.228.110.155]) by tomts6-srv.bellnexxia.net
    (InterMail vM.4.01.03.16 201-229-121-116-20010115) with SMTP
AAPOR members may find this commentary interesting.

Jun. 10, 02:00 EDT

Democracy in danger of indifference

Richard Gwyn
HOME AND AWAY

A CAMBRIDGE University law professor, Philip Allott, has come up with a description of the contemporary British political scene - by extension of the state of politics in most industrial democracies, most definitely including Canada's - that is at one and the same time exceedingly deft and thoroughly depressing.

According to Allott, British politics, as manifest by this week's election there, is undergoing a process of "Weimarization." His reference is to Germany's Weimar Republic, established after World War I as that country's first attempt at parliamentary democracy. This system was never accepted by the German people and eventually was swept into oblivion by Adolf Hitler.

Allott doesn't mean that he expects some demagogic dictator to emerge
in Britain or anywhere else. He means instead that the Brits, and the people of a good many other western democracies, are treating their parliamentary politics pretty much as the Germans once treated their Weimar Republic. With cynicism. With indifference. With non-involvement. With a turning inward by individuals towards themselves, away from the collective and the community.

"We may be witnessing a silent revolution ... to a new kind of society, a post-democratic society," writes Allott.

And he asks whether the kind of liberal democracies that we all were and were so proud of having achieved, "can survive the attrition of the old middle-class virtues of public service, of public morality and creative thrift, and the universalizing of the old aristocratic vices of shameless social exploitation (and) the pursuit of instant gratification."

Aside from a certain moralizing, that strikes me as by far and away the most interesting comment of the many made about the British election.

The least interesting aspect of this election, surely, was that Tony Blair's New Labour won a smashing, second majority victory and that William Hague's Conservatives suffered massive rejection, forcing Hague's instant resignation.

This is an exceptional performance by Blair. He's very much - in the manner of Bill Clinton - a master of today's feel-good, I-feel-your-pain, type of political leadership. He can mint sound bites effortlessly, like "the people's princess" right after Diana's death. He can wrap up his policies in pleasing packages, like The Third Way. He's nice looking, well spoken, bright but not threatening, not too hot, and eager.

In fact, though, Blair's victory was predictable. Jean Chrétien did as well last November, on his third time around. Clinton, no matter the scandals that plagued him, won re-election as easily in 1996.

Common to all three leaders was the strength of the economy and the weakness of the opposition.

It's why the opposition should be so weak in so many countries that's really
interesting. It's because voters aren't interested in changing the government and they aren't interested in politics itself. All they require of those in office is modest competence, and a large amount of luck - the luck, that is, to be in office when the economy happens to be booming. The shift of power from the national to the = global, and from governments to corporations, is an important subsidiary factor. So is the fact that people now look less and less to Parliament = to protect their rights than to the Charter of Rights and to the courts.

The consequence is disengagement, indifference and entrenched cynicism, some of this last self-protective because being cynical justifies not being involved.

The consequence of all of this in turn is that voters don't vote. In Britain, the turnout dropped to a century-long low of 60 per cent. In some constituencies, the turnout was an incredible 30 per cent.

A democracy in which fewer and fewer people vote (fewer than 50 per cent in the U.S. last November) and fewer and fewer of those who do vote care much about the result (that, pretty much, is why George W. Bush beat Al Gore), is undergoing Weimarization. Hence Allott's phrase, "post-democracy."

Barring a depression or a war, it's hard to see how things will change. The defining elements of parliamentary democracy - that politics matters; that those we elect will represent us and make decisions on our behalf - have simply lost their substance.

Their replacements, suggests Allott, may be "spiritual ideas, philosophical ideas, political ideas, strange ideas." That is to say, the personal, in different forms. (By "political ideas" I assume Allott had in mind non-conventional political ideas, like anti-globalization).

We're still a democracy all right. Public opinion most certainly matters. But we are less and less a parliamentary, representative democracy. That long line of political evolution all the way back to the Magna Carta is hollowing-out and regressing. Allott's right. We are witnessing a silent
revolution.

Richard Gwyn's column appears on Wednesday and Sunday. He can be reached at gwynR@sympatico.ca
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HOME AND AWAY
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This is an exceptional performance by Blair. He's very much in the manner of Bill Clinton - a master of today's feel-good, I-feel-your-pain, type of political leadership. He can mint sound bites effortlessly, like "the people's princess" right after Diana's death. He can wrap up his policies in pleasing packages, like The Third Way. He's nice looking, well spoken, bright but not threatening, not too hot, and eager.

In fact, though, Blair's victory was predictable. Jean Chrétien did as well last November, on his third time around. Clinton, no matter
the scandals that plagued him, won re-election as easily in 1996. Common to all three leaders was the strength of the economy and the weakness of the opposition. It's why the opposition should be so weak in so many countries that's really interesting. It's because voters aren't interested in changing the government and they aren't interested in politics itself. All they require of those in office is modest competence, and a large amount of luck - the luck, that is, to be in office when the economy is booming. The shift of power from the national to the global, and from governments to corporations, is an important subsidiary factor. So is the fact that people now look less and less to Parliament to protect their rights than to the Charter of Rights and to the courts. The consequence is disengagement, indifference and entrenched cynicism, some of this last self-protective because being cynical justifies not being involved. The consequence of all of this in turn is that voters don't vote. In Britain, the turnout dropped to a century-long low of 60 per cent. In some constituencies, the turnout was an incredible 30 per cent. A democracy in which fewer and fewer people vote (fewer than 50 per cent in the U.S. last November) and fewer and fewer of those who do vote care much about the result (that, pretty much, is why George W. = Bush beat Al Gore), is undergoing Weimarization. Hence Allott's phrase, "post-democracy." Barring a depression or a war, it's hard to see how things will change. The defining elements of parliamentary democracy - that politics matters; that those we elect will represent us and make decisions on our behalf - have simply lost their substance. Their replacements, suggests Allott, may be "spiritual ideas, philosophical ideas, political ideas, strange ideas." That is to say, the personal, in different forms. (By "political ideas" I assume = Allott had in mind non-conventional political ideas, like anti-globalization). We're still a democracy all right. Public opinion most =
certainly still matters. But we are less and less a parliamentary, representative democracy. That long line of political evolution all the way back to the Magna Carta is hollowing-out and regressing. Allott's right. We are witnessing a silent revolution.

Richard Gwyn's column appears on Wednesday and Sunday. He can be reached at gwynR@sympatico.ca
Please feel free to pass this on to interested parties:

Position Opening: Research Analyst

the polling company(TM), a full service market research, public affairs and political consulting firm headquartered in Washington DC is looking to expand its current operation with a Research Analyst.

Job Description: A Research Analyst will be responsible for working at all stages of a project, including proposal development, survey design,
questionnaire construction, data analysis and report writing and client contact for quantitative and qualitative research.

Qualifications: Applicants should have 1-3 years experience in a political, marketing, public affairs, or public opinion research, be able to manage several tasks at the same time, and willing to work in a small group environment. Must have extensive knowledge of SPSS, MS Word, Access and Excel and Internet applications, and capable of overseeing and executing all stages of a research project. Candidate must be willing to work in a fast-paced office. Strong writing skills and statistical knowledge are necessary. Candidate must have Bachelor's degree, and higher education a plus. Salary and benefits commensurate with experience.

Please send resumes and references to Colleen McCulloch at cmcculloch@pollingcompany.com or fax them to (202)467-6551. For more information about the polling company(TM), please access our website at www.pollingcompany.com
Women and the High-Tech Industry in the US

According to a recent report from Roper Starch Worldwide, sponsored by Deloitte & Touche, 70% of US "professionals" believe that the technology-driven "new economy" benefits women. Roper defines "professionals" as America Online (AOL) subscribers who work full-time and have internet access, at the very least, at work. Roper found that 78% associate the high-tech industry with a "strong economy."

The company surveyed 1,000 female and 500 male professionals and reported that 96%
are very or somewhat confident that they can keep up with new technology, but
slightly more women than men report that they are very confident:

However, only 43% of respondents believe that women receive equal pay for equal
work in the high-tech industry. Additionally, less than one-half are convinced that
men and women have an equal chance of advancing to leadership positions in the
industry.

A vast majority (69%) of professionals believe that there are too few female
leaders in the high-tech industry.

Is the media to blame for leader recognition? 98% of respondents are aware of Bill
Gates, but only 12% recognize Carly Fiorina and 11% are familiar with Heidi Miller.

Need to learn more about how many men and women are online, not only in the US, but
also worldwide? Then check out eMarketer's eDemographics Report.

www.emarketer.com/estatnews/estats/edemographics/20010612_roper.html

Get 2001 eMarketer, Inc.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Nielsen/NetRatings

Top 25 Web Properties

Week end of June 03, 2001, U.S.
at Home

The reported Internet usage estimates are based on a sample of households that have access to the Internet and use the following platforms: Windows 95/98/NT, and MacOS 8 or higher. The Nielsen//NetRatings Internet universe is defined as all members (2 years of age or older) of U.S. households which currently have access to the Internet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Unique Audience</th>
<th>Time Reach %</th>
<th>per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>AOL Time Warner</td>
<td>38,859,260</td>
<td>50.24</td>
<td>0: 15: 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Yahoo!</td>
<td>31,970,457</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>0: 27: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>28,417,075</td>
<td>36.74</td>
<td>0: 23: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>10,002,599</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>0: 04: 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Lycos Network</td>
<td>9,370,673</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>0: 08: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Excite@Home</td>
<td>8,863,550</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>0: 14: 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>eBay</td>
<td>7,306,995</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>0: 42: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Walt Disney Internet Group</td>
<td>6,272,129</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>0: 37: 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>About The Human Internet</td>
<td>6,159,958</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>0: 06: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>5,200,041</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>0: 09: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Google</td>
<td>5,113,869</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>0: 06: 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>eUniverse Network</td>
<td>5,101,674</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>0: 08: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>CNET Networks</td>
<td>4,586,161</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>0: 07: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>InfoSpace</td>
<td>4,518,424</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>0: 04: 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>NBC Internet</td>
<td>3,879,891</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0: 07: 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Ask Jeeves</td>
<td>3,740,010</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0: 05: 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>GoTo.com</td>
<td>3,656,725</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0: 02: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Napster</td>
<td>3,526,648</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0: 05: 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>3,259,394</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0: 09: 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Will AAPOR join this coalition?

>From June 4, 2001 COSSA Washington Update

Among the slew of amendments proposed for H.R.1, the President's education bill that reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is an amendment sponsored Rep Todd Tiahrt (R-KS) that passed the House by voice vote on May 23. Dubbed the "Parental Freedom of Information" the measure could end school-based...
survey research as we know it.

The language requires prior written consent from a parent before a minor can participate in federally-funded research in school. In practice, written consent is difficult to obtain, not because of parental disapproval of the research but due to a lack of involvement or time on their part. Research demonstrates that such restraints severely compromise both the sample size and the validity of the study.

The problem is not with written consent per se, but that the amendment imposes written consent as "the single and only method of obtaining informed parental consent," according to Felice Levine, Executive Officer of the American Sociological Association. "It is a 'one size fits all' solution that disregards what might be the best ethical practices in different circumstances and also ignores human subjects procedures already in place for assessing the adequacy of consent processes in school-based research."

The amendment also denies funds under any applicable program to any educational agency that effectively prevents parents from inspecting a broad array of surveys, analyses, evaluations, and curriculum. Researchers object that allowing parents to view research instruments before they are administered can compromise the data they collect. The amendment covers a broad range of research topics, including political affiliations, mental and psychological problems, illegal, anti-social, or high-risk behavior, income and others.

Current law, as defined by the Grassley Amendment to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994, is similar in nature but has been interpreted to apply only to research sponsored by the Department of Education. The Tiahrt amendment, however, would apply to all federal agencies.

This expanded reach would involve research sponsored by Health and Human Services (including the National Institutes of Health), which accounts for a large portion of school-based research and includes studies important to the health and well-being of children. The Monitoring the Future Project, for example, examines changes in public opinion on alcohol and drug use, as well as a variety of other issues like
government and politics, gender roles, and environmental protection.

The issue also arose several years ago when a coalition of organizations concerned about research (which included COSSA) effectively averted a similar bill from becoming law (see Update, November 13, 1995 and April 29 and June 24, 1996). The recent re-emergence of this issue caught many by surprise as it was not preceded by hearings.

The ESEA bill, to which the Tiahrt amendment was attached, passed the House by 384-45 on May 23. No companion amendment has appeared yet in the Senate, which has not completed work on ESEA, but is expected to soon. Organizations concerned that this measure will become law have once again joined forces, this time as the Coalition to Save School-Based Research of which COSSA is a part.

Carolyn S. White, PhD
University of Illinois

>From cswhite@uiuc.edu Tue Jun 12 17:22:51 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
      id RAA22636 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Jun 2001 17:22:51 -0700
    0700 (PDT)
Received: from ux6.cso.uiuc.edu (root@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu [128.174.5.9])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
      id RAA27660 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Jun 2001 17:22:49 -0700
      (PDT)
Received: from dialup (everglades-89.slip.uiuc.edu [130.126.29.89])
    by ux6.cso.uiuc.edu (8.11.0/8.11.0) with SMTP id f5D0Mgu27107
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Jun 2001 19:22:43 -0500 (CDT)
Message-ID: <002401c0f39e$789a89f0$591d7e82@cso.uiuc.edu>
Reply-To: "Carolyn S White" <cswhite@uiuc.edu>
From: "Carolyn S White" <cswhite@uiuc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: NBAC Calls for a single federal policy to protect human research participants
Date: Tue, 12 Jun 2001 19:19:09 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
      charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
In its key conclusion that the federal oversight system should protect the rights and welfare of human research participants, regardless of whether the research is publicly or privately sponsored, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC) recommended that there be a unified, comprehensive federal policy embodied in a single set of regulations and guidance. The commission further highlighted the fact that there is not a single federal entity with the authority to develop federal policy for all research involving human participants.

Accordingly, the Commission's recently released recommendations call for legislation creating a single, independent federal office, the National Office for Human Research Oversight (NORHO), to lead and coordinate the research oversight system. "This office should be responsible for policy development, regulatory reform, research review and monitoring, research ethics education, and enforcement."

In a year-long discussion of research oversight issues, the Commission examined the effectiveness of the oversight system, paying particular attention to the "Common Rule," a set of regulations followed by 17 agencies of the federal government.

NBAC released its recommendations during its 48th meeting on May 15, 2001. The recommendations, available on the Commission's website (www.bioethics.gov), will be incorporated into the Commission's upcoming report, Ethical and Policy Issues in Research Involving Human Participants. The report, requested by the White House in October, 1999, is expected to be available later this summer.

In addition to changes at the national level, NBAC's recommendations also address:
- The review of research
- The informed consent process
- Protecting privacy and confidentiality
- Developing a research agenda for research ethics
- The need for Education
- Certification and Accreditation
- Ensuring Compliance
- Managing conflicts of interests
- Institutional review board membership
Monitoring ongoing research
Central or lead institutional review boards
Study of research-related injury compensation issues, and
The need for resources

NBAC, established in October, 1995, was created to advise the National
Science
and
Technology Council and other appropriate government entities regarding
bioethical
issues arising from research on human biology and behavior. This is the
Commission's
fifth report.
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COSSA Washington Update June 4, 2001

Group Launches Human Subjects Protection Accrediting Agency

At a Capitol Hill press conference on May 23, seven research and university
organizations, including COSSA, launched the Association for the
Accreditation
of
Human Research Protection Programs (AAHRPP). Joining the Consortium in this
effort are
the Association of American Medical Colleges, the Association of American
Universities, the Federation of American Societies of Experimental Biology, the
National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the National

With the human research participants protection system under scrutiny from many
different groups, one issue that has gained attention is the desire to accredit these
systems and the Institutional Review Boards that are their backbones (see Update,
February 26, 2001 and NBAC story)

AAHRPP hopes to provide increased credibility through voluntary assessments and
accreditation. Working with human protection entities, it will provide guidelines for
successful implementation of best practices for protecting participants in research.
The new group is currently reviewing standards for the accreditation and is searching
for an executive director.
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I think aapor should sign on to this, and send a letter to the relevant Senate
staffers laying out our objections to the amendment.
Will AAPOR join this coalition?

>From June 4, 2001 COSSA Washington Update

Among the slew of amendments proposed for H.R.1, the President's education bill that reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is an amendment sponsored Rep Todd Tiahrt (R-KS) that passed the House by voice vote on May 23. Dubbed the "Parental Freedom of Information" the measure could end school-based survey research as we know it.

The language requires prior written consent from a parent before a minor can participate in federally-funded research in school. In practice, written consent is difficult to obtain, not because of parental disapproval of the research but due to a lack of involvement or time on their part. Research demonstrates that such restraints severely compromise both the sample size and the validity of the study.

The problem is not with written consent per se, but that the amendment imposes written consent as "the single and only method of obtaining informed parental consent," according to Felice Levine, Executive Officer of the American Sociological Association. "It is a 'one size fits all' solution that disregards what might be the best ethical practices in different circumstances and also ignores human subjects procedures already in place for assessing the adequacy of consent processes in school-based research."

The amendment also denies funds under any applicable program to any educational agency that effectively prevents parents from inspecting a broad array of surveys, analyses, evaluations, and curriculum. Researchers object that allowing parents to view research instruments before they are administered can compromise the data they collect. The amendment covers a broad range of research topics, including political affiliations, mental and psychological problems, illegal, anti-social, or high-risk
behavior, income and others.

Current law, as defined by the Grassley Amendment to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994, is similar in nature but has been interpreted to apply only to research sponsored by the Department of Education. The Tiahrt amendment, however, would apply to all federal agencies.

This expanded reach would involve research sponsored by Health and Human Services (including the National Institutes of Health), which accounts for a large portion of school-based research and includes studies important to the health and well-being of children. The Monitoring the Future Project, for example, examines changes in public opinion on alcohol and drug use, as well as a variety of other issues like government and politics, gender roles, and environmental protection.

The issue also arose several years ago when a coalition of organizations concerned about research (which included COSSA) effectively averted a similar bill from becoming law (see Update, November 13, 1995 and April 29 and June 24, 1996). The recent re-emergence of this issue caught many by surprise as it was not preceded by hearings.

The ESEA bill, to which the Tiahrt amendment was attached, passed the House by 384-45 on May 23. No companion amendment has appeared yet in the Senate, which has not completed work on ESEA, but is expected to soon. Organizations concerned that this measure will become law have once again joined forces, this time as the Coalition to Save School-Based Research of which COSSA is a part.

Carolyn S. White, PhD
University of Illinois
The University of Cincinnati Institute for Policy Research has the following open position.

Please respond to the address below by mail only.

Thank you.

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

Junior Research Associate

The Institute for Policy Research (IPR) is seeking an experienced professional who will assist with the ongoing survey research projects conducted by the IPR. Responsibilities include assisting with multiple IPR projects including data editing and coding, library searches, as well as detailed project record keeping and associated tasks. Responsibilities also include proofing/editing reports and creating charts/graphs. Additionally, some evening and weekend hours are required to assist in various off-campus projects, such as focus groups. (Salary will be commensurate with experience and qualifications).

Minimum Qualifications:

- Demonstrated experience with graphics software (e.g. PowerPoint, Harvard Graphics)
- Demonstrated experience with statistical analysis and statistical software (e.g. SAS and/or SPSS)
- Demonstrated experience in data management and spreadsheet software (e.g. Access, Excel)
- Responsible for the daily operation of multiple research projects
- Ability to collaborate with teams of researchers
- Strong oral and written communications skills
- Strong organizational skills
- Strong interpersonal skills

Preferred Qualifications:
I was wondering if folks had experience with alternatives to double data entry. Also, are folks using alternatives to double data entry?

I know of the following four alternatives, but have not used any of them.

1. Random sample (Specify a random sampling frequency for selection of records to be double data entered.)

2. Continuous sampling plan

3. Method analogous to continuous sampling plan
Perform visual inspection (report form vs. data entry) of i successive records
If an error is found in a record, start over with step (a)
Once no errors are found in i successive records, randomly sample a fraction f of data records for visual inspection If an error is found in the random sample, return to step (a); otherwise continue to take a random sample for visual inspection

Parameters that need to be specified:
clearing interval, i
sampling frequency, f

Advantages:
Tables already developed that will give i and f, given the actual and desired error rate Given the error rate from single data entry and time needed to perform visual inspection of a record, can quantify the following measures: Average outgoing quality (AOG) Average fraction inspected (AFI) Average number of records inspected (ARI) Average time to perform visual record verification checks (ATQA) Percent gain in average quality (PGAQ) Can tailor i and f to the type of form * data need for primary analyses would have a higher clearing interval and sampling frequency

Disadvantages:
Method is set up for visual inspection - paper shows less time is involved than with double data entry of every record (Table 3)

4. Adaptive data entry algorithm

Basic algorithm:
Estimate mean number of errors per form from a set of entered forms Calculate 1-e-@ where @ is the mean number of errors (probability of error is binomial and can be approximated by Poisson distribution) Draw a random uniform variate, if it is less than 1-e-@ then double data enter the next form count the number of errors, x update @ that includes the value x (if random uniform variate is not less then 1-e-@ then do not double data enter the next form) Go to step(c) and repeat for the next form
The "adaptive" data entry algorithm, referred to as ADDER (Adaptive Double Data EntRy) includes the following enhancements: probability of re-entering the next form depends on the error rate (err) of the most recent re-entered forms (n=NMRRE), can set a minimum probability (Pmin) of re-entering the next form, and can set a maximum probability (Pmax) beyond which the next form will definitely be re-entered. Given the number of forms (n) that are re-entered for a baseline error rate, the probability that the next form will be re-entered (Pn) is determined as follows:

If n ≤ NMRRE then Pn=1
If n > NMRRE then
    If [1-e-(err/NMRRE)] ≤ Pmin then Pn=Pmin
    If Pmax > [1-e-(err/NMRRE)] > Pmin then Pn= [1-e-(err/NMRRE)]
    If [1-e-(err/NMRRE)] ≥ Pmax then Pn=1

Advantages:
Random sampling adapts to the accuracy of data entry at each point in time. If data entry is poor, more forms will be re-entered while fewer forms will be re-entered if data entry is very good. Compared to simple random sampling, ADDER increased data quality

Disadvantages
Logistically difficult to implement
ADDER may result in too many forms not being re-entered * this problem can be alleviated by setting a maximum number of consecutive forms that are not re-entered, after which re-entry of the next form must be done

Thanks for any feedback!

Ellen

Ellen Gordon, Ph.D.
Director, Survey Program
Center for Health Studies
(206) 442-4041
(206) 287-2871 (FAX)
gordon.e@ghc.org
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Carolyn and Eleanor,

I'm not clear on several aspects of this issue:

We parents certainly do not expect to sign off on everything done in the classrooms of our children. Instead, we trust in the professional competence and good intentions of our schools' administrators, teachers and staff.

This seems to me to imply that we parents would therefore trust the same professionals to decide whether the administration of a particular survey to our children is in their own best interest, and not harmful to them, and also that it is a legitimate use of valuable classroom time (even if only a few minutes).

For a parent to think otherwise would be to wish to micromanage the local schools and school system. I can't think of any of the many parents of local school children whom I know who would have any desire to do this.

If we entrust the schools with the physical health, safety and well-being of our own precious children for 30-some hours of most weeks, certainly we can trust these same schools to decide when surveys of our children are both acceptable and appropriate uses of their school time, and also when they are not.

Moreover, whenever we object to any school activity to which our children have been subjected, we can go--often walk, in fact--to our local school to lodge our complaints in person. Should our questions not be satisfied, we are free to solicit the objections of other parents and--if we find a sufficient number in
agreement--to organize a formal protest to our local school board, the members of which are usually elected to fixed terms.

This local autonomy of American education, in which we citizens have traditionally taken considerable pride--especially since the federal integration of the schools--has instinctively led us to suspect that, for example, all of the problems of France result from its rigid centralization of the entire national school system in Paris--right down to textbooks, classes, meeting times and daily assignments.

In our American context, by contrast, it is difficult to understand why Congress would want to mess with the autonomy of local school officials to decide what are and are not worthwhile classroom activities for local students, from preschool through high school--surveys included.

As a parent, I would--without any hesitation--prefer to have decisions about surveys made by administrators and teachers in the local schools. When I find they have made questionable decisions, I can stop them on the street to complain. If they don't listen, I can appeal to the local school board. If it doesn't listen, we parents can organize to defeat the errant members in the next election. And if that doesn't work, I would at least be satisfied that my own views do not square with those of my community.

I don't feel that I have anything like this control over Congress, nor any of these satisfactions--does any citizen? Do any of you?

So, one thing I don't understand is why Congressional control of the curricula and other student activities of local schools is even constitutional. What business is it of Congress to attempt to fix problems which--while certainly real--are already in the hands of those most able to fix them, and who are in turn surrounded by the people most motivated to make certain that they are fixed?

Unfortunately, I think we all understand why members of Congress would vote for such legislation (hint: it's not always with the well-being of our children foremost
As for those of us parents who value privacy, for both ourselves and our families, the best protection does not depend on Congress: We can simply instruct our children not to participate in any surveys at school, or at least not without discussing them with us first. If they are asked to do so, they are to decline politely. If they are asked again, they are to explain that they must have the permission of their parents (it need not be written permission, by the way—in our household we suspect that ideas such as this are harbored only by lawyers).

Well, that's the way this issue looks to me. What don't I understand—what am I overlooking or missing—that makes this appear so complicated? I ask you all to help me out on this.

-- Jim

******

On Wed, 13 Jun 2001, Eleanor Singer wrote:

> I think aapor should sign on to this, and send a letter to the relevant Senate staffers laying out our objections to the amendment.
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Carolyn S White [mailto:cswhite@uiuc.edu]
> Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2001 8:14 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Parental Freedom of Information
> > Will AAPOR join this coalition?
> > >From June 4, 2001 COSSA Washington Update
> > Among the slew of amendments proposed for H.R.1, the President's education bill that reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is an amendment sponsored Rep Todd Tiahrt (R-KS) that passed the House by voice vote on May 23. Dubbed the "Parental Freedom of Information" the measure could end school-based survey research as we know it.
> > The language requires prior written consent from a parent before a minor can participate in federally-funded research in school. In practice, written consent is difficult to obtain, not because of parental disapproval of the research but due to a lack of involvement or time on their part. Research demonstrates that
such restraints severely compromise both the sample size and the validity of the study.

The problem is not with written consent per se, but that the amendment imposes written consent as "the single and only method of obtaining informed parental consent," according to Felice Levine, Executive Officer of the American Sociological Association. "It is a 'one size fits all' solution that disregards what might be the best ethical practices in different circumstances and also ignores human subjects procedures already in place for assessing the adequacy of consent processes in school-based research."

The amendment also denies funds under any applicable program to any educational agency that effectively prevents parents from inspecting a broad array of surveys, analyses, evaluations, and curriculum. Researchers object that allowing parents to view research instruments before they are administered can compromise the data they collect. The amendment covers a broad range of research topics, including political affiliations, mental and psychological problems, illegal, anti-social, or high-risk behavior, income and others.

Current law, as defined by the Grassley Amendment to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994, is similar in nature but has been interpreted to apply only to research sponsored by the Department of Education. The Tiahrt amendment, however, would apply to all federal agencies.

This expanded reach would involve research sponsored by Health and Human Services (including the National Institutes of Health), which accounts for a large portion of school-based research and includes studies important to the health and well-being of children. The Monitoring the Future Project, for example, examines changes in public opinion on alcohol and drug use, as well as a variety of other issues like government and politics, gender roles, and environmental protection.

The issue also arose several years ago when a coalition of organizations concerned about research (which included COSSA) effectively averted a similar bill from becoming law (see Update, November 13, 1995 and April 29 and June 24, 1996). The recent re-emergence of this issue caught many by surprise as it was not preceded by hearings.

The ESEA bill, to which the Tiahrt amendment was attached, passed the House by 384-45 on May 23. No companion amendment has appeared yet in the Senate, which has not completed work on ESEA, but is expected to soon. Organizations concerned
that this measure will become law have once again joined forces, this time
as
the Coalition to Save School-Based Research of which COSSA is a part.
>
Carolyn S. White, PhD
University of Illinois
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** Reply Requested When Convenient **

We are using Teleform for most of our mail surveys. After receiving the =
forms back
from our respondents (about 3800 forms), we would have to wait = four to five
months
to have the forms double entered. With Teleform, they = are scanned
immediately,
shaving 2 to 3 months off of the period between = data collection and
analysis. The
upfront cost is somewhat high (~$14k = including a duplex scanner), but may
be
worth
it if you have a lot of = forms or are doing this often.

Craig S. Gordon
Research Associate
Applied Research Center
Georgia State University
I was wondering if folks had experience with alternatives to double data entry. Also, are folks using alternatives to double data entry?

I know of the following four alternatives, but have not used any of them:

1. Random sample (Specify a random sampling frequency for selection of records to be double data entered.)

2. Continuous sampling plan

3. Method analogous to continuous sampling plan


Basic method:
Perform visual inspection (report form vs. data entry) of i successive records. If an error is found in a record, start over with step (a) Once no errors are found in i successive records, randomly sample a = fraction f of data records for visual inspection. If an error is found in the random sample, return to step (a); otherwise, continue to take a random sample for visual inspection.

Parameters that need to be specified:
clearing interval, i
sampling frequency, f

Advantages:
Tables already developed that will give i and f, given the actual and desired error rate. Given the error rate from single data entry and time needed to perform visual inspection of a record, can quantify the following measures:

- Average outgoing quality (AOG)
- Average fraction inspected (AFI)
- Average number of records inspected (ARI)
- Average time to perform visual record verification checks (ATQA)
- Percent gain in average quality (PGAQ)

Can tailor i and f to the type of form * data need for primary analyses = would have a higher clearing interval and sampling frequency.

Disadvantages:
Method is set up for visual inspection - paper shows less time is involved =
than with double data entry of every record (Table 3)=20

4. Adaptive data entry algorithm=20

Basic algorithm:=20
Estimate mean number of errors per form from a set of entered forms=20
Calculate 1-e-@ where @ is the mean number of errors (probability of error = is binomial and can be approximated by Poisson distribution)=20 Draw a random uniform variate, if it is less than 1-e-@ then=20 double data enter the next form=20 count the number of errors, x=20 update @ that includes the value x=20 (if random uniform variate is not less then 1-e-@ then do not double data = enter the next form)=20 Go to step(c) and repeat for the next form=20

The "adaptive" data entry algorithm, referred to as ADDER (Adaptive Double = Data Entry) includes the following enhancements: probability of re-entering the next form depends on the error rate (err) of the most recent = re-entered forms (n=3DNMRRE), can set a minimum probability (Pmin) of re-entering the next form, and can set a maximum probability (Pmax) beyond which the next form will definitely be re-entered. Given the number of = forms (n) that are re-entered for a baseline error rate, the probability = that the next form will be re-entered (Pn) is determined as follows:=20

If n NMRRE then Pn=3D1=20
If n > NMRRE then=20
If [1-e-(err/NMMMRE)] Pmin then Pn=3DPmin=20
If Pmax > [1-e-(err/NMMMRE)] > Pmin then Pn=3D [1-e-(err/NMMMRE)]=20 If [1-e-(err/NMMMRE)] Pmax then Pn=3D1=20

Advantages:=20
Random sampling adapts to the accuracy of data entry at each point in = time. If data entry is poor, more forms will be re-entered while fewer = forms will be re-entered if data entry is very good.=20 Compared to simple random sampling, ADDER increased data quality=20

Disadvantages=20
Logistically difficult to implement
ADDER may result in too many forms not being re-entered * this problem can be alleviated by setting a maximum number of consecutive forms that are not re-entered, after which re-entry of the next form must be done

Thanks for any feedback!

Ellen

Ellen Gordon, Ph.D.
Director, Survey Program
Center for Health Studies
(206) 442-4041
(206) 287-2871 (FAX)
gordon.e@ghc.org

Craig S.
Gordon
Research Associate
Applied Research Center
Georgia State University
1030 Urban Life Building
Atlanta, GA 30329
gordon.e@ghc.org 06/13/01 11:59AM

I was wondering if folks had experience with alternatives to double data entry. Also, are folks using alternatives to double data entry? I know of the following four alternatives, but have not used any of them. Random sample (Specify a random sampling frequency for selection of records to be double data entered.)

Continuous sampling plan
Method analogous to continuous
sampling plan Reference: King DW, Lashley R. = A=20 quantifiable alternative to
<BR>Perform visual inspection (report = form vs. data entry) of i successive
records <BR>If an error is found in a record, start over with step (a)
<BR>Once no errors are found in i successive records, randomly sample a fraction f of data records for visual inspection <BR>If an error is found in the random sample, return to step (a); otherwise continue to take a random sample for visual inspection <BR>Parameters that need to be specified: clearing interval, i sampling frequency, f <BR>Advantages: Tables already developed that will give i and f, given the actual and desired error rate <BR>Given the error rate from single data entry and time needed to perform visual inspection of a record, can quantify the following measures: Average outgoing quality (AOG) Average fraction inspected (AFI) Average number of records inspected (ARI) Average time to perform visual record verification checks (ATQA) Percent gain in quality (PGAQ) Can tailor i and f to the type of form * data need for primary analyses would have a higher clearing interval and sampling frequency <BR>Disadvantages: Method is set up for visual inspection - paper shows less time is involved than with double data entry of every record (Table = 3) <BR>4. Adaptive data entry algorithm Reference: Kleinman K. Adaptive double data entry: a probabilistic tool for choosing which forms to reenter. Control Clin Trials 2001;22:2-12. <BR>Basic algorithm: Estimate mean number of errors per form from a set of entered forms Calculate 1-e-@ where @ is the mean number of errors (probability of error is binomial and can be approximated by Poisson distribution) Draw a random uniform variate, if it is less than 1-e-@ then double data enter the next form count the number of errors, x update @ that includes the value x (if random uniform variate is not less then 1-e-@ then do not double data enter the next form) Go to step(c) and repeat for the next form The "adaptive" data entry
algorithm, referred to as ADDER (Adaptive Double Data EntRy) includes the following enhancements: probability of re-entering the next form depends on the error rate (err) of the most recent re-entered forms (n=3DNMRRE), can set a minimum probability (Pmin) of re-entering the next form, and can set a maximum probability (Pmax) beyond which the next form will definitely be re-entered.

Given the number of forms (n) that are re-entered for a baseline error rate, the probability that the next form will be re-entered (Pn) is determined as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{If } n \leq \text{NMRRE} \text{ then } P_n &= 1 \\
\text{If } n > \text{NMRRE} \text{ then } &\begin{cases} \\
\text{If } \left[1 - e^{-\left(\frac{\text{err}}{\text{NMRRE}}\right)}\right] \geq P_{\text{min}} \text{ then } P_n = P_{\text{min}} \\
\text{If } P_{\text{max}} > \left[1 - e^{-\left(\frac{\text{err}}{\text{NMMMRE}}\right)}\right] > P_{\text{min}} \text{ then } P_n = \left[1 - e^{-\left(\frac{\text{err}}{\text{NMMMRE}}\right)}\right] \\
\text{If } \left[1 - e^{-\left(\frac{\text{err}}{\text{NMMMRE}}\right)}\right] < P_{\text{max}} \text{ then } P_n = 1
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

Advantages:

- Random sampling adapts to the accuracy of data entry at each point in time.
- If data entry is poor, more forms will be re-entered while fewer forms will be re-entered if data entry is very good.

Disadvantages

- Logistically difficult to implement
- ADDER may result in too many forms not being re-entered

* = this problem can be alleviated by setting a maximum number of consecutive forms that are not re-entered, after which re-entry of the next form must be done.

---

Ellen Gordon, Ph.D.  
Director, Survey Program  
Center for Health Studies  
(206) 442-4041  
(206) 287-2871 (FAX)  
<a href="mailto:gordon.e@ghc.org">gordon.e@ghc.org</a>
I disagree. AAPOR should not join the effort to oppose this legislation.
The COSSA press release is a gross exaggeration of the potential consequences of the Tiahrt amendment to HR1 (5/23/2001). The amendment as proposed does two things: (1) it extends the requirements in the Buckley amendment to cover school curriculum materials as well as student records. This means that any school receiving federal funds (i.e., all public schools) cannot deny access by parents to materials used in schools for instruction. Nothing terribly controversial there.

Second, the Tiahrt amendment extends the requirements of the Grassley amendment to cover all federally sponsored research, not just research sponsored by the US Dept. of Education. Excuse me, did Grassley (which was passed in 1994) shut down all school-based research at the Dept. of Education? I don't think so. It merely requires researchers to obtain active consent from a parent before asking questions on any of the following topics: political affiliation; mental or psychological problems potentially embarrassing to the student or his/her family; sexual behavior and attitudes; illegal, anti-social, self-incriminating and demeaning behavior; critical appraisals of other individuals with whom the student has close family relationships; legally recognized privileged relationships (e.g., lawyers,
physicians, psychologists, ministers); income, other than that required by law
to
determine eligibility for a program; religious affiliation or belief. Most
researchers who conduct school-based surveys with children already know that
you need
to avoid asking questions on these 8 topics if (1) you want your IRB to
approve your
study with passive consent only, and (2) you don't want to encounter
objections from
school principals.

The requirement of active written consent does mean a study cannot be done at
all.
It means that conducting the study is just going to cost more money because a
greater
effort is needed to get enough parents to agree to let their children
participate.
Thus, opposition to active consent as a requirement for school-based surveys on
sensitive topics boils down to "Hey, it's going to cost us more money to
conduct our
research in an ethical and responsible manner."

As for COSSA's statement "Research demonstrates that such restraints severely
compromise both the sample size and the validity of the study." This is
nonsense.
Where is this research? The only published research on this topic I can find
comes
to exactly the opposite conclusion. The article is entitled "The Impact of
Consent
Policy on Estimates from a School-based Drug Use Survey" by Clyde Dent, Steve
Sussman, and Alan Stacy (Evaluation Review, 21 (6): 698-712. The abstract is
as
follows:

"The authors examine differences between mean, variance, and correlation
parameter
estimates derived from a full school-based sample and subsamples restricted
by
the
provision of parental consent. A total of 1,607 students at 21 continuation
high
schools and 1,192 students at 3 traditional high schools completed a survey
containing variables related to socio-demographics, drug use, mental health, and
violence. The employment of a researcher-initiated home telephone call
procedure
substantially increased the parental response rate over a student-/school-
assisted
consent method. The subsamples restricted by the written consent criterion
showed
some small biases in estimates of sociodemographic variables but little or no
biases
on measures related to mental health, drug use, or violence measures. The
augmentation of the written consent samples with verbally consented students
reduced
observed biases."

Ed Freeland

Eleanor Singer wrote:

> I think AAPOR should sign on to this, and send a letter to the
> relevant Senate staffers laying out our objections to the amendment.
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Carolyn S White [mailto:cswhite@uiuc.edu]
> Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2001 8:14 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Parental Freedom of Information
> 
> Will AAPOR join this coalition?
>
> -------------------1E2A01329ECB9F9ACDB3A336
Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii; name="efreelan.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: Card for Ed Freeland
Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="efreelan.vcf"

begin:vcard
n:Freeland;Edward
tel;fax:609-258-0549
tel;work:609-258-1854
x-mozilla-html:FALSE
org:Princeton University;Survey Research Center
adr:;;169 Nassau Street;Princeton;NJ;08542-7007;
version:2.1
e-mail;internet:efreelan@princeton.edu
title:Associate Director
fn:Edward Freeland
end:vcard

-------------------1E2A01329ECB9F9ACDB3A336--

>From eveland.6@osu.edu Wed Jun 13 11:02:56 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA08221 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 11:02:56 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mail5.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail5.uts.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.214.34])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA09089 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 11:02:57 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from faculty26.osu.edu (com5.sbs.ohio-state.edu [128.146.105.5])
by mail5.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id OAA17532;
Wed, 13 Jun 2001 14:02:52 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <5.0.2.1.10.20010613135848.025212d0@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: eveland.6@pop.service.ohio-state.edu
Regarding the email from Ed Freeland...

One study I have suggests that requiring active consent does in fact produce biases in student self-reports of anti-social behaviors, and this study is somewhat more valid as it compares passive vs. active consent, not just degrees of active consent. The cite is:


The last sentence of this abstract states, "The bias shown on significant dependent variables may adversely effect the generalizability of results of studies of adolescent drug usage that depend upon positive parental consent."

Maybe there are other studies out there that have found similar problems with active consent???

William "Chip" Eveland

<snip>

As for COSSA's statement "Research demonstrates that such restraints severely compromise both the sample size and the validity of the study." This is nonsense. Where is this research? The only published research on this topic I can find comes to exactly the opposite conclusion. The article is entitled "The Impact of Consent Policy on Estimates from a School-based Drug Use Survey" by Clyde Dent, Steve Sussman, and Alan Stacy (Evaluation Review, 21 (6): 698-712. The abstract is as follows:

"The authors examine differences between mean, variance, and correlation parameter estimates derived from a full school-based sample and subsamples restricted by the provision of parental consent. A total of 1,607 students at 21 continuation high schools and 1,192 students at 3 traditional high schools completed a survey containing variables related to socio-demographics, drug use, mental health, and violence. The employment of a researcher-initiated home telephone call procedure substantially increased the parental response rate over a student-/school-assisted consent method. The subsamples restricted by the written consent criterion showed some small biases in estimates of sociodemographic variables but little or no biases on measures related to mental health, drug use, or violence measures. The augmentation of the written consent with verbally consented students reduced observed biases."

Ed Freeland
Eleanor Singer wrote:

> I think AAPOR should sign on to this, and send a letter to the relevant Senate staffers laying out our objections to the amendment.

-----Original Message-----
From: Carolyn S White [mailto:cswhite@uiuc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2001 8:14 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Parental Freedom of Information

Will AAPOR join this coalition?

William "Chip" Eveland
Assistant Professor
School of Journalism & Communication
The Ohio State University

3139 Derby Hall
154 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-247-6004
Fax: 614-292-2055
Email: eveland.6@osu.edu

>From jkoch@tiac.net Wed Jun 13 12:10:04 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA25881 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 12:10:03 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from relay21.smtp.psi.net (relay21.smtp.psi.net [38.8.22.2])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA09900 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 12:09:58 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ip244.bedford3.ma.pub-ip.psi.net ([38.32.11.244]
    helo=tiac.net)
    by relay21.smtp.psi.net with esmtp (Exim 3.13 #3)
    id 15AG1S-0003JU-00
    for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 15:09:47 -0400
Message-ID: <3B27BADA.427F7DBE@tiac.net>
Date: Wed, 13 Jun 2001 15:11:23 -0400
From: John Kochevar <jkoch@tiac.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Double Data Entry
References: <sb272b74.033@ROC403.ghc.org>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
I understand that some of the current optical scanning systems get error rate down to about one percent. I imagine you will hear from several suppliers.

Years ago I worked on several projects where we checked the error rate of double entry. I dimly remember the error rate was about 0.4 percent or 0.5 percent.

I was always insistent on double entry, but have learned that key entry is usually the smallest contributor to error in any large survey project. For example, a study reported in the Harvard Business Review several years ago found that approximately ten percent of all numbers (that could be checked) in spreadsheets and presentations and the like, were in error. (This is about the same rate of error as misspelling of names and incorrect facts in daily newspapers.)

In our own operations we found less than ten percent error in first drafts of our presentations, but it usually took four different passes to get the error below one percent. We found 10 percent error rates in spot checks of what our clients did with our reports and data.

Optical scanning may not be quite as good as double entry, but you can save considerable time and money by using optical scanning. If your goal is to improve the quality of your ultimate results, use the savings for more and better proof reading of drafts and final reports.

John Kochevar

Ellen Gordon wrote:

> I was wondering if folks had experience with alternatives to double data entry. Also, are folks using alternatives to double data entry?
> I know of the following four alternatives, but have not used any of them.
> 1. Random sample (Specify a random sampling frequency for selection of records to be double data entered.)
> 2. Continuous sampling plan
> 3. Method analogous to continuous sampling plan
> Reference: King DW, Lashley R. A quantifiable alternative to double data entry. Control Clin Trials 2000;21:94-102. Basic method: Perform visual inspection (report form vs. data entry) of i successive records If an error is found in a record, start over with step (a) Once no errors are found in i successive records, randomly sample a fraction f
of data records for visual inspection. If an error is found in the random sample, return to step (a); otherwise continue to take a random sample for visual inspection.

Parameters that need to be specified:
- clearing interval, i
- sampling frequency, f

Advantages:
- Tables already developed that will give i and f, given the actual and desired error rate. Given the error rate from single data entry and time needed to perform visual inspection of a record, can quantify the following measures: Average outgoing quality (AOG), Average fraction inspected (AFI), Average number of records inspected (ARI), Average time to perform visual record verification checks (ATQA). Percent gain in average quality (PGAQ). Can tailor i and f to the type of form and data need for primary analyses would have a higher clearing interval and sampling frequency.

Disadvantages:
- Method is set up for visual inspection - paper shows less time is involved than with double data entry of every record (Table 3).

4. Adaptive data entry algorithm


Basic algorithm:
- Estimate mean number of errors per form from a set of entered forms.
- Calculate 1-e^-@ where @ is the mean number of errors (probability of error is binomial and can be approximated by Poisson distribution).
- Draw a random uniform variate, if it is less than 1-e^-@ then double data enter the next form and count the number of errors, x. Update @ that includes the value x (if random uniform variate is not less than 1-e^-@ then do not double data enter the next form). Go to step (c) and repeat for the next form.

The "adaptive" data entry algorithm, referred to as ADDER (Adaptive Double Data EntRy) includes the following enhancements: probability of re-entering the next form depends on the error rate (err) of the most recent re-entered forms (n=NMRRE), can set a minimum probability (Pmin) of re-entering the next form, and can set a maximum probability (Pmax) beyond which the next form will definitely be re-entered. Given the number of forms (n) that are re-entered for a baseline error rate, the probability that the next form will be re-entered (Pn) is determined as follows:

If n ≤ NMRRE then Pn=1
If n > NMRRE then
- If [1-e-(err/NMRRE)] < Pmin then Pn=Pmin
- If Pmax > [1-e-(err/NMRRE)] > Pmin then Pn = [1-e-(err/NMMRE)]
- If [1-e-(err/NMMRE)] < Pmax then Pn=1

Advantages:
- Random sampling adapts to the accuracy of data entry at each point in time. If data entry is poor, more forms will be re-entered while fewer
forms will be re-entered if data entry is very good. Compared to
simple random sampling, ADDER increased data quality

Disadvantages
Logistically difficult to implement
ADDER may result in too many forms not being re-entered * this problem
can be alleviated by setting a maximum number of consecutive forms
that are not re-entered, after which re-entry of the next form must be
done

Thanks for any feedback!

Ellen

Ellen Gordon, Ph.D.
Director, Survey Program
Center for Health Studies
(206) 442-4041
(206) 287-2871 (FAX)
gordon.e@ghc.org

From mark@bisconti.com Wed Jun 13 14:45:41 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA02125 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 14:45:40
    0700 (PDT)
Received: from janus.hosting4u.net (janus.hosting4u.net [209.15.2.37])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id OAA28815 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 14:45:41 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: (qmail 22446 invoked from network); 13 Jun 2001 21:45:38 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
    by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 13 Jun 2001 21:45:38 -0000
Received: from mark ([138.88.85.238]) by bisconti.com ; Wed, 13 Jun 2001
    16:45:29 -0500
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Birth of the Nation: The First Federal Congress 1789-1791
Date: Wed, 13 Jun 2001 17:43:00 -0400
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLCCIIBIELCDEAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
    boundary="="
    X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLCCIIBIELCDEAA.mark@bisconti.com>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-------=_NextPart_000_002E_01C0F430.4A549A80
Content-Type: text/plain;
This might be of interest to some. It is a wonderful documentary collection. I wonder what the public confidence rating of the First Federal Congress was two centuries ago ... ?! mark

Birth of the Nation: The First Federal Congress 1789-1791

On-line exhibit:  http://www.gwu.edu/~ffcp/exhibit/index.html
<http://www.gwu.edu/~ffcp/exhibit/index.html>

About the First Federal Congress Project:
http://www.gwu.edu/~ffcp/aboutffcp.html
<http://www.gwu.edu/~ffcp/aboutffcp.html>

"The First Federal Congress Project, a chartered University Research Center and affiliated with the Department of History <http://www.gwu.edu/~history/> at the George Washington University, has a dual mission: collecting, researching, editing and publishing the universally acclaimed and well reviewed Documentary History of the First Federal Congress, 1789-1791 <http://www.gwu.edu/~ffcp/publications.html> , and serving as a research center on the most important and productive Congress in U.S. history. The Johns Hopkins University Press <http://www.press.jhu.edu/> has published fourteen volumes of the records of this Congress and the editing of five volumes of the correspondence to and from the members and other related materials has begun." ... 

Also note:


A 0.5% error rate is horrendously high—equivalent to typing about 10 errors in a single-spaced page. A reasonably good data-entry operator should have an error rate under .01%.

It is my personal experience, derived from cleaning thousands of studies over more than 30 years, that questionnaire design is the biggest contributor to data entry error. Double data entrycatches mostly random errors or errors specific to an individual data entry operator and is less effective at catching errors stemming from questionnaire design, if only because the second operator is much more likely to repeat the same error as the first.

At some past AAPOR conference (Buck Hills vintage, I believe), I had a
conversation
with someone from RAND who had done some experiments on error bands resulting from
data entry problems and who confirmed this observation.

Jan Werner

John Kochevar wrote:

> I understand that some of the current optical scanning systems get
> error rate down to about one percent. I imagine you will hear from
> several suppliers.
> 
> Years ago I worked on several projects where we checked the error rate
> of double entry. I dimly remember the error rate was about 0.4
> percent or 0.5 percent.
> 
> I was always insistent on double entry, but have learned that key
> entry is usually the smallest contributor to error in any large survey
> project. For example, a study reported in the Harvard Business
> Review several years ago found that approximately ten percent of all
> numbers (that could be checked) in spread sheets and presentations and
> the like, were in error. (This is about the same rate of error as
> misspelling of names and incorrect facts in daily newspapers.)
> 
> In our own operations we found less than ten percent error in first
> drafts of our presentations, but it usually took four different passes
> to get the error below one percent. We found 10 percent error rates in
> spot checks of what our clients did with our reports and data.
> 
> Optical scanning may not be quite as good as double entry, but you can
> save considerable time and money by using optical scanning. If your
> goal is to improve the quality of your ultimate results, use the
> savings for more and better proof reading of drafts and final reports.
> 
> John Kochevar
>

Ellen Gordon wrote:

> I was wondering if folks had experience with alternatives to double
> data entry. Also, are folks using alternatives to double data
> entry?
> 
> I know of the following four alternatives, but have not used any of
> them.
> 
> 1. Random sample (Specify a random sampling frequency for selection
>      of records to be double data entered.)
> 
> 2. Continuous sampling plan
> 
> 3. Method analogous to continuous sampling plan
> 
> Reference: King DW, Lashley R. A quantifiable alternative to double
> 
> Perform visual inspection (report form vs. data entry) of i
> successive records If an error is found in a record, start over with
Step (a) Once no errors are found in $i$ successive records, randomly sample a fraction $f$ of data records for visual inspection. If an error is found in the random sample, return to step (a); otherwise continue to take a random sample for visual inspection.

Parameters that need to be specified:
- clearing interval, $i$
- sampling frequency, $f$

Advantages:
- Tables already developed that will give $i$ and $f$, given the actual and desired error rate. Given the error rate from single data entry and time needed to perform visual inspection of a record, can quantify the following measures: Average outgoing quality (AOG) (ARI) Average number of records inspected (ATQA) Percent gain in average quality (PGAQ) Can tailor $i$ and $f$ to the type of form. Data need for primary analyses would have a higher clearing interval and sampling frequency.

Disadvantages:
- Method is set up for visual inspection - paper shows less time is involved than with double data entry of every record (Table 3).

4. Adaptive data entry algorithm

Basic algorithm:
- Estimate mean number of errors per form from a set of entered forms.
- Calculate $1-e^{-\theta}$ where $\theta$ is the mean number of errors (probability of error is binomial and can be approximated by Poisson distribution).
- Draw a random uniform variate, if it is less than $1-e^{-\theta}$ then double data enter the next form.
- Count the number of errors, $x$. Update $\theta$ that includes the value $x$. If random uniform variate is not less then $1-e^{-\theta}$ then do not double data enter the next form. Go to step (c) and repeat for the next form.

The "adaptive" data entry algorithm, referred to as ADDER (Adaptive Double Data EntRy) includes the following enhancements: probability of re-entering the next form depends on the error rate (err) of the most recent re-entered forms ($n=NMRRE$), can set a minimum probability (Pmin) of re-entering the next form, and can set a maximum probability (Pmax) beyond which the next form will definitely be re-entered. Given the number of forms ($n$) that are re-entered for a baseline error rate, the probability that the next form will be re-entered (Pn) is determined as follows:

If $n \leq NMRRE$ then $Pn=1$
If $n > NMRRE$ then
  If $[1-e-(err/NMRRE)] \leq Pmin$ then $Pn=Pmin$
  If $Pmax > [1-e-(err/NMRRE)] > Pmin$ then $Pn= [1-e-(err/NMRRE)]$
  If $[1-e-(err/NMRRE)] \geq Pmax$ then $Pn=1$

Advantages:
Random sampling adapts to the accuracy of data entry at each point.
Can anyone guide me to a source that compares the "average presidential approval" based on all polls for presidents over the past several decades. I have seen
this information but my memory is not as good as it once was.

Many thanks.
Kurt

Kurt Lang, Prof. emeritus
Dept. of Sociology
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3340
Home Address:
1249 20th Ave. E.
Seattle, WA 98112-3530
Tel. (206) 325-4569
FAX (at UW) 206-543-2516

>From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Wed Jun 13 18:11:01 2001
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id SAA29954 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 18:11:00
(PDT)
Received: from mail-lat.latimes.com ([64.175.184.208])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id SAA25625 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 18:11:01 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from pegasus.latimes.com (pegasus.latimes.com [144.142.45.201])
    by mail-lat.latimes.com (Switch-2.1.0/Switch-2.1.0) with ESMTP id
    f5ElAnZ04252
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 18:10:50 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from vireo.latimes.com (vireo.latimes.com [172.24.18.37])
    by pegasus.latimes.com (Pro-8.9.3/Pro-8.9.3) with ESMTP id SAA08742
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 18:10:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by vireo.latimes.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    id <M6F9WJL9>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 18:10:29 -0700
Message-ID: <4F7708BE1C18204A908F0E11EAA743EB197091@GOOSE>
From: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Presidential Approval
Date: Wed, 13 Jun 2001 18:09:20 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Try Gallup. They have a book called, Presidential Approval, A Sourcebook, by George C. Edwards III with Alec M. Gallup. However the book only goes to 1988, but I'm sure they have updates.

Susan Pinkus

-----Original Message-----
From: Kurt Lang [SMTP:lang@u.washington.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2001 5:26 PM
To: AAPOR mbrship  
Subject: Presidential Approval

Can anyone guide me to a source that compares the "average presidential approval" based on all polls for presidents over the past several decades.  
I have seen this information but my memory is not as good as it once was.

Many thanks.  
Kurt

Kurt Lang, Prof. emeritus  
Dept. of Sociology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195-3340  
Home Address:  
1249 20th Ave. E.  
Seattle, WA 98112-3530  
Tel. (206) 325-4569  
FAX (at UW) 206-543-2516

>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Wed Jun 13 18:36:35 2001  
Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id SAA04605 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Jun 2001 18:36:35 -0700 (PDT)

From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com  
Received: by exchng7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Message-ID: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE407E2B12D@exchng7.gallup.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Presidential Approval  
Date: Wed, 13 Jun 2001 20:35:45 -0500

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

------=_NextPart_000_01C0F472.54B76C90
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

The attached Excel document includes the Gallup presidential approval ratings published in the book Susan refers to, plus includes Truman, G.H.W. Bush and Clinton.  
Individual ratings as well as quarterly, yearly and term averages are included in
this spreadsheet.

Lydia Saad
Senior Editor
The Gallup Poll
lydia_saad@gallup.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Pinkus, Susan [mailto:Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2001 9:09 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: Presidential Approval

Try Gallup. They have a book called, Presidential Approval, A Sourcebook, by George C. Edwards III with Alec M. Gallup. However the book only goes to 1988, but I'm sure they have updates.

Susan Pinkus

-----Original Message-----
From: Kurt Lang [SMTP:lang@u.washington.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2001 5:26 PM
To: AAPOR mbrship
Subject: Presidential Approval

Can anyone guide me to a source that compares the "average presidential approval" based on all polls for presidents over the past several decades.

I have seen this information but my memory is not as good as it once was.

Many thanks.
Kurt

Kurt Lang, Prof. emeritus
Dept. of Sociology
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3340
Home Address:
1249 20th Ave. E.
Seattle, WA 98112-3530
Tel. (206) 325-4569
FAX (at UW) 206-543-2516

------ = NextPart_000_01C0F472.54B76C90
Content-Type: application/vnd.ms-excel;
    name="Presidential Approval Statistics.xls"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Disposition: attachment;
    filename="Presidential Approval Statistics.xls"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAUgAAAAA

------ = NextPart_000_01C0F472.54B76C90
Content-Type: application/vnd.ms-excel;
    name="Presidential Approval Statistics.xls"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Disposition: attachment;
    filename="Presidential Approval Statistics.xls"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAUgAAAAA

------ = NextPart_000_01C0F472.54B76C90
Content-Type: application/vnd.ms-excel;
    name="Presidential Approval Statistics.xls"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Disposition: attachment;
    filename="Presidential Approval Statistics.xls"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAUgAAAAA

------ = NextPart_000_01C0F472.54B76C90
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One of the more interesting and lively sessions that I attended in Montreal was the Saturday afternoon roundtable by the standards committee. But it was wildly under-attended, and I thought I might share some of what happened for those who could not attend but have interest in this topic.

Also, many of the issues that were discussed were initially raised on AAPORnet in late April, with discussion deferred until the roundtable, so I thought it would be fair to bring it up again here.

First, I want to say that none of this is by any means critical of the standards committee. I think they've tackled a huge job and have accomplished much, and have been personally helpful to me in the past.

But response rates and such are a hot topic for lots of us. For some, it affects our bottom line, when we are contractually obligated to deliver certain levels of response, or if we have to compete against other organizations who calculate their rates differently.

Myself, I sometimes manage projects that are being fielded by more than one subcontractor, and I aim for uniformity wherever possible, so having a widely used, externally developed, commonly accepted system of disposition codes is very helpful to me.

So we talked a lot about disposition codes for RDD studies.

One issue that was stressed is that the requirement for disclosure is met by giving
the outcomes, the number of cases that were finalized as each disposition
code. As long as you tell folks how many
of each kind you have, then they can plug those numbers into whatever
formula they like. I think this is an important principle, and a
practice my team has always followed. It does allow for cross-system
comparisons as we transition into the AAPOR formulas but perhaps still
want to compare with rates from past years.

But the catch is making sure that disposition codes are standardized.
Of course what's being reported is final dispositions, but those start
with solid coding of the disposition of each phone call. The fact is, it can
be a fine line between a callback and refusal, especially
in a case of the "polite delayer" (which I mistakenly called "Southern
Women's Syndrome" a few years ago, only to find out that it happens to
researchers all over the globe).

Then Rob Daves told about how one of his vendors is using some
market-research software that isn't pre-loaded with AAPOR disposition codes,
and together they worked through an iterative process of
figuring out how to code certain kinds of cases, and to finalize
them based on a series of dispositions.

Well, I respect Rob greatly, but I can't imagine any one person
handling that kind of responsibility. (I don't even like having to code
open-ended
responses without a second coder coming
behind to double-check.)

Then we heard from a representative from Sawtooth WinCati, which has really
made a huge effort to implement the AAPOR disposition codes and formulas. The
representative who spoke admitted that they had come up with their final
disposition codes by just reading the green book and doing their best. (Afterward he
confirmed that they had not updated anything on the basis of the revised "blue" standard
definitions.)

Well, one of my subcontractors uses WinCati, and had always assured us (in public
meetings, even) that their dispo codes were "authentic AAPOR." I turned around to
glower at him, and he was stunned/apologetic/and a few other emotions.

I do think that the WinCati manual has a nice approach. There are
three columns, Disposition Code (which is the final disposition code),
Description and Rule.

So here's an example (which is going to be listed down 'cuz
I'm writing in ASCII, but in the manual it's in three columns):
Disposition Code: 2222
Description: Eligible; Ans. Mach. Message
Rule: Disposition of 2222 on at least one attempt and
dispositions of 2221, 2223, 3120, 3130, or 3140 on
all other attempts.

It's a nice way of seeing how the final disposition codes follow from each
phone
call.

Okay, so from what I can gather, the state of the art out there
is that various organizations are trying to implement the AAPOR codes, but
there is
some slight lack of standardization as to...

(1) exactly what final dispositions should be assigned after a certain
series
of
phone calls

(2) even how to code some phone calls

This is certainly an awkward place for the AAPOR standards
committee to sit. They clearly don't want to give so much detail
that we all feel our hands are tied to make decisions that are
best for our particular situations, or that would seem to endorse one product
or
company over another.

But at the same time, we have folks taking the name of AAPOR in
vain, sincerely attempting to apply the standard definitions, only
the fact is that two competent researchers may disagree on how to code a
series of
phone calls.

I guess if I was made queen of AAPOR for a day, this would be
my dream scenario of how to proceed:

First, I'd like us to gather all our ambiguous telephone calls, and
make an audio version of them. Most of us have access to PowerPoint that
talks, or
even an audio tape would suffice. I think that if
we're dealing with telephone conversations, we need to listen to
auditory versions, because it's too easy to insert tones and emotions
when reading a typed script.

Then, everyone should listen to these, and assign disposition codes for each
phone
call. We could perhaps discuss the ambiguous ones, and come up with a
consensus.

Then, once we know how to code all those phone calls, we could
use those to come up with "rules" for final dispositions, in an
approach similar to the WinCati manual.

And programs everywhere could program the final disposition codes,
following the rules.

And we could turn the original audio version of the phone calls into a training resource for our interviewers.

(Oh, darn, being queen for a day wouldn't be enough time to do it, huh?)

Anyway, I think that involving a lot of people who deal with these issues on the ground level every day is essential to making these standards more uniform and workable for all of us.

(There were some other cool things at the session as well, but I've rambled on long enough.)

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
Phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109  
UF Department of Health Services Administration  
Location/FedEx: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-016  
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

The Urban Institute is a non-profit, non-partisan public policy research organization whose objectives are to sharpen thinking about society's problems and efforts to solve them, improve government decisions and their implementation, and increase
citizens' awareness about important public choices. We are currently seeking to fill a position in our Assessing the New Federalism project.

Located in downtown Washington, DC, The Urban Institute is convenient to public transportation, shopping, restaurants and other amenities. We offer an environment which is informal, flexible and collegial. Our benefits include prepaid tuition assistance, generous retirement, annual leave and competitive salaries.

For more information on The Urban Institute and for a complete listing of job openings, please visit our website at http://www.urban.org.

*****

Job Title: Research Associate II

Job Number: Job #01057-ANF

Center: Executive Office Research-Assessing the New Federalism

Job Summary: Responsibilities include the management and oversight of several tasks associated with producing and preparing data files from a large-scale multi-year household survey. Will assist or take lead, depending on background, on all aspects of the data preparation process, including coding, data editing, imputations and creation of analytic files. Will coordinate project work assignments and monitor work flow between programmers, survey management staff, subcontractors and researchers.

Experience: Three years working with large data sets and experience related to working with complex survey data; methodologies, analyzing data for consistency and quality, data context/content knowledge. Experience working with large scale, hierarchical data sets. Some familiarity with survey data collection would be beneficial.

Status: Regular, Full-time

Education: MA Survey Methodology, Economics, Statistics, Mathematics, or related social science.

Reports To: Senior Research Associate

------------------------------------------------------------------
To apply:
send cover letter and resume to:
The Urban Institute
HR Dept. Job#, 01057-ANF
2100 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Fax-202-887-5189
Email-resumes@ui.urban.org
No phone calls please! Fax: (202) 887-5189 - Please limit transmissions to 6 pages!
We are able to accept resumes via e-mail at resumes@ui.urban.org. Send text only, no attachments please.
The Urban Institute is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

My experience with double entry is that very often it is not done correctly. In order for double entry to really work, two different people need to enter the data without consulting with each other or a common authority. The idea is that the chances that two independent data enterers would make the same key entry mistake or interpret the same "squiggle" (although they shouldn't be interpreting squiggles, that's for the investigator to do) in the same way are pretty remote. My experience is that these procedures are not followed, otherwise I would not see the mistakes I see (i.e., inconsistencies in data easily resolved by looking at the hardcopy and finding...
While we may be paying for 100% double entry (which is what I usually recommend), I don't believe they do 100% nor do I believe I get independent data entry. Moreover, most companies use a system in which the data are entered once and then the system checks the second data entry against the first interactively, i.e., the system beeps when data entry does not match template. "Corrections" are made on the spot, but the system keeps no record of mistakes or corrections and you end up with only a single data set. In fact, you cannot prove a second entry was ever made!

For any paper-and-pencil survey, be it interviewer or self-administered, what I recommend to people is you have the project director "edit" the questionnaires as they arrive (so they don't build up into a huge amount) by having them circle the responses that should be key entered. The "edit" is simply to make sure that there are no ambiguities about what should be punched. At the same time ambiguities and "marginal notes" can be handled by someone who knows what the rules are for handling such things. This sounds like a big investment in a large study, but if it is done on an ongoing basis it isn't too bad. Besides, the result should be reduced keypunch error, fewer cases to review after keypunch, reduced data cleaning time, and greater familiarity with the data set. I believe these are good things.

If you have low tolerance for error and you have the money, then 100% double entry on 100% of questionnaires is best. If you don't have the money, then I recommend 100% double entry on "key questions" where great precision is necessary. I have used samples before (double entry on every 5th record, 10th record, etc.) and my experience is Murphy's Law is highly applicable, i.e., double entry yields no error but the non-double entered questionnaires have big time errors. I think it is better to devote resources to having confidence in the cannot-be-wrong part of the data set.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu <mailto:lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu>
I was wondering if folks had experience with alternatives to double data entry. Also, are folks using alternatives to double data entry?

I know of the following four alternatives, but have not used any of them.

1. Random sample (Specify a random sampling frequency for selection of records to be double data entered.)

2. Continuous sampling plan

3. Method analogous to continuous sampling plan
   Reference: King DW, Lashley R. A quantifiable alternative to double data entry.
   Basic method:
   Perform visual inspection (report form vs. data entry) of i successive records
   If an error is found in a record, start over with step (a)
   Once no errors are found in i successive records, randomly sample a fraction f
   of data records for visual inspection
   If an error is found in the random sample, return to step (a); otherwise
   continue to take a random sample for visual inspection

   Parameters that need to be specified:
   clearing interval, i
   sampling frequency, f

Advantages:
Tables already developed that will give i and f, given the actual and desired error rate
Given the error rate from single data entry and time needed to perform visual inspection of a record, can quantify the following measures:
   Average outgoing quality (AOG)
   Average fraction inspected (AFI)
   Average number of records inspected (ARI)
   Average time to perform visual record verification checks (ATQA)
   Percent gain in average quality (PGAQ)
   Can tailor i and f to the type of form * data need for primary analyses would have a higher clearing interval and sampling frequency
Disadvantages:
Method is set up for visual inspection - paper shows less time is involved than with double data entry of every record (Table 3)

4. Adaptive data entry algorithm

Basic algorithm:
Estimate mean number of errors per form from a set of entered forms Calculate 1-e-@ where @ is the mean number of errors (probability of error is binomial and can be approximated by Poisson distribution)
Draw a random uniform variate, if it is less than 1-e-@ then double data enter the next form count the number of errors, x update @ that includes the value x (if random uniform variate is not less then 1-e-@ then do not double data enter the next form)
Go to step(c) and repeat for the next form

The "adaptive" data entry algorithm, referred to as ADDER (Adaptive Double EntRy) includes the following enhancements: probability of re-entering the next form depends on the error rate (err) of the most recent re-entered forms (n=NMRRE), can set a minimum probability (Pmin) of re-entering the next form, and can set a maximum probability (Pmax) beyond which the next form will definitely be re-entered. Given the number of forms (n) that are re-entered for a baseline error rate, the probability that the next form will be re-entered (Pn) is determined as follows:

If n \leq NMRRE then Pn=1
If n > NMRRE then
  If \left(1-e^{-\text{err}/NMRRE}\right) < Pmin then Pn=Pmin
  If Pmax > \left(1-e^{-\text{err}/NMRRE}\right) > Pmin then Pn= \left(1-e^{-\text{err}/NMRRE}\right)
  If \left(1-e^{-\text{err}/NMRRE}\right) \leq Pmax then Pn=1

Advantages:
Random sampling adapts to the accuracy of data entry at each point in time. If data entry is poor, more forms will be re-entered while fewer forms will be re-entered if data entry is very good.
Compared to simple random sampling, ADDER increased data quality

Disadvantages
Logistically difficult to implement
ADDER may result in too many forms not being re-entered * this problem
can be alleviated by setting a maximum number of consecutive forms that are not re-entered, after which re-entry of the next form must be done.

Thanks for any feedback!

Ellen

Ellen Gordon, Ph.D.
Director, Survey Program
Center for Health Studies
(206) 442-4041
(206) 287-2871 (FAX)
gordon.e@ghc.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Carolyn S White [mailto:cswhite@uiuc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2001 8:14 PM
Among the slew of amendments proposed for H.R.1, the President's education bill that reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is an amendment sponsored by Rep Todd Tiahrt (R-KS) that passed the House by voice vote on May 23. Dubbed the "Parental Freedom of Information" the measure could end school-based survey research as we know it.

The language requires prior written consent from a parent before a minor can participate in federally-funded research in school. In practice, written consent is difficult to obtain, not because of parental disapproval of the research but due to a lack of involvement or time on their part. Research demonstrates that such restraints severely compromise both the sample size and the validity of the study.

The problem is not with written consent per se, but that the amendment imposes written consent as "the single and only method of obtaining informed parental consent," according to Felice Levine, Executive Officer of the American Sociological Association. "It is a 'one size fits all' solution that disregards what might be the best ethical practices in different circumstances and also ignores human subjects procedures already in place for assessing the adequacy of consent processes in school-based research."

The amendment also denies funds under any applicable program to any educational agency that effectively prevents parents from inspecting a broad array of surveys, analyses, evaluations, and curriculum. Researchers object that allowing parents to view research instruments before they are administered can compromise the data they collect. The amendment covers a broad range of research topics, including political affiliations, mental and psychological problems, illegal, anti-social, or high-risk behavior, income and others.

Current law, as defined by the Grassley Amendment to the Goals 2000: Educate America
Act of 1994, is similar in nature but has been interpreted to apply only to research sponsored by the Department of Education. The Tiahrt amendment, however, would apply to all federal agencies.

This expanded reach would involve research sponsored by Health and Human Services (including the National Institutes of Health), which accounts for a large portion of school-based research and includes studies important to the health and well-being of children. The Monitoring the Future Project, for example, examines changes in public opinion on alcohol and drug use, as well as a variety of other issues like government and politics, gender roles, and environmental protection.

The issue also arose several years ago when a coalition of organizations concerned about research (which included COSSA) effectively averted a similar bill from becoming law (see Update, November 13, 1995 and April 29 and June 24, 1996). The recent re-emergence of this issue caught many by surprise as it was not preceded by hearings.

The ESEA bill, to which the Tiahrt amendment was attached, passed the House by 384-45 on May 23. No companion amendment has appeared yet in the Senate, which has not completed work on ESEA, but is expected to soon. Organizations concerned that this measure will become law have once again joined forces, this time as the Coalition to Save School-Based Research of which COSSA is a part.

Carolyn S. White, PhD
University of Illinois

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Jun 14 10:22:50 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id f5EHMno12928 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Jun 2001
10:22:49 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA16923 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Jun 2001 10:22:49 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA01158 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Jun 2001 10:22:47 -0700
We increasingly hear that English is rapidly becoming the single international language. From the list of 233 "new" words below, it would appear that--unless we spend a great deal of our time on the Net and Web, and talking with hip teenagers--we will soon not understand English at all.

-- Jim


JUNE 2001

Oxford English Dictionary News

The latest release of material on OED Online is the first to contain new entries from across the alphabet. Quarterly online publication provides an opportunity to publish new material more frequently than before, and to make available research on words and phrases which, as part of the main revision programme, would not be published for some years in their alphabetical sequence. Our aim in the new-words group is to apply the OED's historical approach to contemporary material. This first batch of 230 or so entries is designed to reflect both the diversity of the language we record, and the depth of our research. Many of the terms are quite familiar, but their origins and early history are sometimes surprising. They range from political hot potatoes such as GM foods, human BSE, and the postcode lottery, to cultural icons such as Bollywood, the mullet haircut, and Homer Simpson's doh!

The publication of new out-of-sequence entries allows the OED to catch up with the terminology of the Internet. The June OED Online update contains for the first time browsers, chat rooms, cookies, dotcoms, FAQs, and MP3 files, and of course,
the Internet itself. The list below shows the complete list of new words published this release.

Michael Proffitt, Principal Editor, New Words, OED

--------

A & E          duh!          nvCJD
Accident and Emergency dumb down          NVQ
adid jazz        E coli          off-message
alcopop          emoticon          on message
alternative energy          EU          pants
arsed          Euro          pay and display
asylum          European Monetary Union          pay cable
asylum seeker         European Union          pay channel
bad hair day          fair-trade          pay-per-view
Balti          FAQ          peace accord
big beat          feelgood factor          peace agreement
Bollywood          frequently-asked questions          peace dividend
Bosman          Friends of the Earth          peace initiative
boy band          full monty          peace process
Brit- (prefix)          functional food          peace settlement
Britpop          gangsta          peace treaty
browser          gangsta rap          performance-enhancing
B2B            gangsta rapper          phat
call centre          gangster rap          postcode lottery
care assistant          gangster rapper          PPV
care attendant          G8          quality time
caregiver          Generation X          retail park
caregiving          Generation Xer          retail therapy
care group          genetically engineered          road rage
care in the community          genetically modified          roid

care worker          genetic engineering          roid rage
casualty department          genetic modification          Scottish Vocational Qualification
cat flap          GM          search engine
CCTV          GMO          serial killer
channel surf            GNVQ          serial killing
channel surfer          Good Friday Agreement          serial marriage
channel surfing          Greek salad          serial monogamist
chat room          Group of Eight          serial monogamy
cheese          Gulf War Syndrome          shell suit
cheesy          home page          six-pack
Child Support Agency          homie          slacker
click          HTML          smiley
clubber          HTTP          smiley face
clubbing          human BSE          snail mail
.com          hyperlink          spam
control freak          hyperlinked          spammer
cookie          hypertext link          spamming
CSA            Hypertext Markup Language          special-needs
cybercafe          hypertext transfer protocol          student loan
cybercash          icon          superhighway
cybercrime          Income Support          surf (the net)
cybercriminal          information superhighway          surfer

Copyright (C) Oxford University Press 2001
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>From tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu Thu Jun 14 13:10:15 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id f5EKAFo04599 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Jun 2001
13:10:15 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
   id NAA04181 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Jun 2001 13:10:15 -0700
(PDT)
From: tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu
Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa28594;
14 Jun 2001 16:10 EDT
Pshaw! I see that neither SUGging nor FRUGing has yet made this list...  

Tom

On Thu, 14 Jun 2001 10:22:47 -0700 (PDT) James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu> wrote:

> We increasingly hear that English is rapidly becoming the single international language. From the list of 233 "new" words below, it would appear that--unless we spend a great deal of our time on the Net and Web, and talking with hip teenagers--we will soon not understand English at all.

> -- Jim

Copyright (C) Oxford University Press 2001


JUNE 2001

Oxford English Dictionary News

The latest release of material on OED Online is the first to contain new entries from across the alphabet. Quarterly online publication provides an opportunity to publish new material more frequently than before, and to make available research on words and phrases which, as part of the main revision programme, would not be published for some years in their alphabetical sequence. Our aim in the new-words group is to apply the OED's historical approach to contemporary material. This first batch of 230 or so entries is designed to reflect both the diversity of the language we record, and the depth of our research. Many of the terms are quite familiar, but their origins and early history are sometimes surprising. They range from political hot potatoes such as GM foods, human BSE, and the postcode lottery, to cultural icons such as Bollywood, the mullet haircut, and Homer Simpson's doh! The publication of new out-of-sequence entries allows the OED to catch up with the terminology of the Internet. The June
OED Online update contains for the first time browsers, chat rooms, cookies, dotcoms, FAQs, and MP3 files, and of course, the Internet itself. The list below shows the complete list of new words published this release.

Michael Proffitt, Principal Editor, New Words, OED

-----------

A & E               duh!                   nvCJD
Accident and Emergency dumb down      NVQ
acid jazz            E coli                  off-message
alcopop             emoticon               on message
alternative energy    EU                     pants
arsed                Euro                   pay and display
asylum               European Monetary Union pay cable
asylum seeker        European Union          pay channel
bad hair day         fair-trade             pay-per-view
Balti                FAQ                    peace accord
big beat             feelgood factor       peace agreement
Bollywood            frequently-asked questions peace dividend
Bosman               Friends of the Earth     peace initiative
boy band             full monty              peace process
Brit- (prefix)        functional food       peace settlement
Britpop              gangsta                 peace treaty
browser              gangsta rap            performance-enhancing
B2B                  gangsta rapper         phat
call centre           gangster rap          postcode lottery
care assistant       gangster rapper       PPV
care attendant        G8                      quality time
caregiver             Generation X          retail park
caregiving            Generation Xer        retail therapy
care group            genetically engineered road rage
care in the community genetically modified roid

care worker           genetic engineering    roid rage
casualty department   genetic modification  Scottish Vocational

---

cat flap               GM                     search engine
CCTV                  GMO                     serial killer
channel surf          GNVQ                   serial killing
channel surfer        Good Friday Agreement serial marriage
channel surfing       Greek salad             serial monogamist
chat room             Group of Eight         serial monogamy
cheese                Gulf War Syndrome     shell suit
cheesy                home page              six-pack
Child Support Agency  homie                  slacker
click                 HTML                    smiley
clubber               HTTP                   smiley face
clubbing              human                  snail mail
.com                  hyperlink               spam
control freak         hyperlinked            spammer
cookie                hypertext link         spamming
CSA                   Hypertext Markup Language special-needs
cybercafe             hypertext transfer protocol student loan
cybercash             icon                    superhighway
cybercrime            Income Support         surf (the net)
cybercriminal         information superhighway surfer
> cybercultural Internet surfing
> cyberculture Internet access provider SVQ
> Cyberia Internet Protocol third way
> cyberlaw Internet Relay Chat trailer trash
> cybermall Internet service provider trip-hop
> cybernaut internetwork 24-7
> cyberphobic internetworking urban folklore
> cyberphobia jungle urban legend
> cyberporn junglist urban myth
> cybersex Kosovan video diary
> cybershop Kosovar video on demand
> cybershopper lad WAP
> cybershopping ladette web
> cybersquatter leader of the opposition web-based
> cybersquatting lifestyle drug webcam
> cybersurfer millennium bug webcast
> cyberworld mobile phone webcasting
> dance music MPEG web-enabled
> deejay MP3 webliography
> deejaying mullet webmeister
> desert storm syndrome music video web publisher
> direct debit name and shame web publishing
> DJ naming and shaming webzine
> DJ-ing National Vocational wireless application
> dot net World Wide Web
> don! New Labour W3
> domain new lad WWW
> do dot new man year 2000
> dot com newsgroup Y2K
> do double-click new variant CJD zero tolerance
> drum and bass nutraceutical
> 
> -----
> ----
> *****

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (804) 243-5223
NEW POSTAL ADDRESS: CSR Main Number: (804) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (804) 243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu
Please submit research paper abstracts and/or proposals for the annual conference of the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research:

The Web of Opinion: Media, Measurement and Meaning

November 16-17, 2001

Radisson Hotel & Suites, Chicago

Public opinion research is rapidly evolving due to the Internet and other new technologies. Each development impacts the measurement and meaning of public opinion. MAPOR invites proposals addressing the conference theme, as well as any area related to public opinion methodology, theory, and analysis of data. MAPOR is a chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Research Papers
- Submissions must be abstracts no longer than two typed, double-spaced pages. No full-length papers will be reviewed.
- Please list the name(s) of the author(s) and affiliation on a separate page (for blind reviewing). Include your full mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address. Student submissions should be identified as such on the separate page. Indicate if you would prefer to present your paper in the poster session.
- Student authors are encouraged to participate in the MAPOR Fellow Student Paper Competition. (See web site for more details -- http://www.mapor.org

Panel Proposals
- Submit a written proposal (up to two double-spaced pages).
- Proposals should identify the topic, explain its importance, and list the potential panelists and their areas of expertise. Panels related to the conference theme are especially encouraged.

Deadline for Submission
All paper and panel proposals must be received by 8 p.m. EDT on June 30, 2001. Please send each submission ONLY ONCE, either by fax, mail or e-mail. Mail submissions should include four copies of the abstract. Submissions will be acknowledged by e-mail by July 7.

Send all submissions to:

Julie Andsager, MAPOR Conference Chair
Edward R. Murrow School of Communication
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-2520
FAX: 509.335.1555
Phone: 509.335.6149
E-mail: andsager@mail.wsu.edu

You will receive notification of the action on your proposal by August 15.

Douglas Blanks Hindman
Associate Professor, Department of Communication
321J Minard Hall
12th Avenue and Albrecht Drive
P.O. Box 5075
North Dakota State University
Fargo, ND 58105-5075
voice: (701) 231-7300
fax: (701) 231-7784
e-mail: db_hindman@ndsu.nodak.edu

From mark@bisconti.com Thu Jun 14 14:47:40 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5ELldol5784 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Jun 2001 14:47:39
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from janus.hosting4u.net (janus.hosting4u.net [209.15.2.37])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id OAA18944 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Jun 2001 14:47:40 -0700 (PDT)
Received: (gmail 7570 invoked from network); 14 Jun 2001 21:47:39 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
    by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 14 Jun 2001 21:47:39 -0000
Received: from mark ([138.88.85.238]) by bisconti.com ; Thu, 14 Jun 2001
16:47:27 -0500
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: America's Chronicles Historical Newspaper Project & American Memory@LoC
Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 17:44:58 -0400
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIIBGEMDDEAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
    boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0005_01C0F4F9.BAEEB7100"
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

The National Newspaper Association, EMC and Cold North Wind To Introduce America's Chronicles SM Historical Newspaper Project More Than 300 Years of American Life to be Digitized As Original Page Images

WASHINGTON - June 11, 2001 - More than 20,000 community newspapers, some long out of print, have recorded American life since the 17th century and two unique organizations have set the common goal of providing Internet access to this documentation of American heritage. The National Newspaper Association (NNA) and Cold North Wind Corporation signed a letter of intent today to create America's Chronicles SM, an online search engine that accesses the digital archives of America's community newspapers, beginning with the archives of the 3600 NNA member newspapers. The project could eventually result in 500,000,000 pages of original, historical content dating back to the 1600s and will be available online at www.americaschronicles.com. The site will be launched at the NNA's 116th Annual Convention and Trade Show in Milwaukee, September 12-15, with access to the first of many digital archives."

Also of interest-this collection is AMAZING (labyrinthine). Search for anything of interest and see what turns up...

AMERICAN MEMORY COLLECTION AT LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

American Memory is a gateway to rich primary source materials relating to the history and culture of the United States. The site offers more than 7 million digital items from more than 100 historical collections. http://memory.loc.gov
I'm searching for data on who the primary caregivers for children are; that
is, what proportion of children have the mother vs. the father vs. some non-parent as their primary caregiver. Ideally, this information would be available by State or County, but even national-level data would help. Ideally it would also distinguish caregiver by the age of the child.

This information doesn't seem to be part of the 2000 Census long form or available in the City/County Data Books, but I'm sure that some data must be available on this somewhere -- government statistics or polls or something...

Thanks for any suggestions.

William "Chip" Eveland

William "Chip" Eveland
Assistant Professor
School of Journalism & Communication
The Ohio State University

3139 Derby Hall
154 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-247-6004
Fax: 614-292-2055
Email: eveland.6@osu.edu
Check out the Early Childhood Education & School Readiness Component of the National Household Education Survey, National Center for Education Statistics
http://www.nces.ed.gov/nhes/

Michael P. Cohen
Bureau of Transportation Statistics
400 Seventh Street SW #3430
Washington DC 20590 USA
phone 202-366-9949 fax 202-366-3640

>>> "William P. Eveland, Jr." <eveland.6@osu.edu> 06/15/01 03:41PM >>>
I'm searching for data on who the primary caregivers for children are; that is, what proportion of children have the mother vs. the father vs. some non-parent as their primary caregiver. Ideally, this information would be available by State or County, but even national-level data would help. Ideally it would also distinguish caregiver by the age of the child.

This information doesn't seem to be part of the 2000 Census long form or available in the City/County Data Books, but I'm sure that some data must be available on this somewhere -- government statistics or polls or something...

Thanks for any suggestions.

William "Chip" Eveland

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Jun 17 14:31:29 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5HLVS013026 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 17 Jun 2001
14:31:28 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA15859 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 17 Jun 2001 14:31:29 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA11150 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 17 Jun 2001 14:31:29 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Sun, 17 Jun 2001 14:31:28 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Death Penalty Falls from Favor (Goodstein NYTimes)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0106171430270.10546-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
June 17, 2001

DEATH PENALTY FALLS FROM FAVOR
AS SOME LOSE CONFIDENCE IN ITS FAIRNESS

By LAURIE GOODSTEIN

After a decade in which there appeared to be an unshakable near consensus in favor of the death penalty, Americans say they are now rethinking and debating capital punishment as a moral issue the way they argue over abortion.

The debate came into sharp relief last week with an unlikely confluence of events: the execution of the Oklahoma city bomber, Timothy J. McVeigh, the protests during President Bush's European visit criticizing America's death penalty policy as a violation of human rights, the decision by the embassy bombing jury in New York against giving the death penalty for a convicted terrorist and the execution in Ohio on Thursday of a murderer who contended he had schizophrenia.

Interviews in six states this week reflect the poll numbers, which show that while there is still a majority in favor of the death penalty, the size of the majority is shrinking.

While many people cited the biblical command to take "an eye for an eye," and few objected to the execution of Mr. McVeigh, others said they had recently changed their minds after concluding that the death penalty was administered unfairly.

Some said that what persuaded them was the news that 13 prisoners on death row in Illinois were discovered to be innocent -- a revelation that led Gov. George Ryan, a Republican, to declare a statewide moratorium on the death penalty last year. Others said they were troubled by reports that the death penalty may be disproportionately imposed on blacks and Hispanics.
"I've slowly been changing my mind about the death penalty," said Fredrica Hicks, a mother of three who works in a Social Security office in Chicago, where the exonerations of prisoners in her state gave her pause. "What would happen if something went wrong and someone accused me of something and there was no way for me to prove my innocence, or evidence was lost and I was sitting on death row? If it has happened to someone else, it could happen to anyone. It could be me."

But Charlotte Stout, a retired nurse in Greenfield, Tenn., rebutted that, saying: "To me, that is the system working. If it hadn't been working, the innocent people wouldn't have been released."

Last year, Ms. Stout witnessed the execution of Robert Glen Coe, who had kidnapped, raped and killed her 8-year-old daughter, Cary Medlin, in 1979. Ms. Stout said that the death penalty was a morally and "biblically appropriate" punishment because it served the victims' families.

"When I walked out of that execution chamber that night, I felt like I had been given my life back," she said. "It could not bring Cary back, but it gave us our life back. Coe no longer had control of our lives through his legal maneuvers."

But in Portland, Ore., Ellis Martin, a 34-year-old sales associate for a specialty beer importer, said: "The justice system has been proven to be racist, a lot of people have been found innocent after being found guilty and there's just too much room for a flaw to use something so final as to kill someone."

The turning point in the national dialogue about the death penalty came last year with the moratorium in Illinois, said Austin Sarat, a professor of political science and law at Amherst College.

"Today to be raising questions about capital punishment is to be in the company of the pope, Governor Ryan, the Legislatures of Nebraska and New Hampshire, the columnist George Will, Pat Robertson and William Sessions, the former director of the F.B.I., all of whom have come out in favor of a moratorium, said Mr. Sarat, the author of "When the State Kills: Capital Punishment and the American Condition"
"Moratorium doesn't necessarily mean abolition," he continued, "but it's a far piece from where we were in the early 90's, when to be against the death penalty was to be considered outside the American mainstream."

The last time there was such passionate debate over the death penalty was in the 1970's. The Supreme Court called a stop to executions in 1972, but 38 states eventually passed new death penalty laws to comply with the court's decision. The executions began again in 1977 in Utah.

Polls show support for the death penalty has fallen since 1994, when about 80 percent of the public favored it. Recent polls have found about 65 percent in support, but the problem with polling on the death penalty is that outcomes vary with the way the question is asked. When respondents were asked whether murderers should get life in prison or the death penalty, the response in recent polls showed the public to be about evenly split.

Still, a majority of Americans continue to regard the death penalty as a fitting, even biblically mandated punishment for people who murder. Randy Voepel, the mayor of Santee, Calif., where a student opened fire in a high school in March, said: "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth is not about revenge. It's about a punishment that is commensurate with the offense. It's the old punishment-fits-the-crime belief."

In interviews, some people ridiculed Europeans, who have outlawed executions, as hypocrites for pointing fingers at Americans. Harold Christopher Bray, who installs fire sprinklers in Portland, Ore., said: "I think that its pretty humorous considering that France invented the guillotine and Spain had the Spanish inquisition and the Germans had the Holocaust. I think as a country, we've probably killed less than a lot of other countries. There's plenty of European countries that created a lot of death."

But Lang Dunbar, a job trainer for welfare recipients in Cleveland, said he was embarrassed to be a citizen of a country that still has the death penalty.
"It's awfully funny how George Bush and his crowd can hang a Ten Commandments on the wall -- it says not to kill -- but then they turn their back when they want to kill someone," he said.

Advocates of capital punishment once promoted it as a deterrent to crime, but experts said that despite falling crime rates, that argument has not proved convincing with the public, as indicated in the interviews.

"Go down to the police department and look at the police blotter and you'll be convinced it's not deterring anything," said Jerry Jones, an election worker in Chicago.

Contributing to the debate, religious groups have recently amplified their positions. The Southern Baptist Convention, the nation's largest Protestant denomination, passed a resolution last year supporting "fair and equitable use of capital punishment." Last week, Quakers, Reform Jews and Roman Catholic bishops denounced the execution of Mr. McVeigh.

But many of those interviewed said they neither knew nor cared about the stance of their denomination's leaders. Gloria Jiacalone, 75, a Catholic in Chicago who regularly attends Mass, said: "How the Cardinal reacts to the death penalty, I don't care. It's a personal thing. I think everybody has their own personal idea about this. The church or a pastor or anybody isn't going to tell me or anybody else how to think."

Professor Sarat said that in this "period of reconsideration," it was too early to project whether the change in public opinion would result in banning the death penalty, or merely reforming it.

"It may be," he said, "we end up with a 'mend it, don't end it' view, that we want capital punishment available for the worst of the worst, but we want to improve the process, or use it more sparingly."

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

******
June 15, 2001, Friday

ALL THINGS CONSIDERED (8:00 PM ET)

ANDY KOHUT DISCUSSES A RECENT PEW CENTER POLL REGARDING AMERICA SUPPORT OF A MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM AND PRESIDENT BUSH’S FOREIGN POLICY APPROVAL RATING

NOAH ADAMS

NOAH ADAMS, host:

On the issue of a missile system that would defend the United States, President Bush appears to have the support of the American people. A new poll by the Pew Research Center shows a 51 percent-to-38 percent margin in favor of a national missile defense system. Andy Kohut is the director of the Pew Center for the People and the Press.

Mr. Kohut, is that margin really all that significant? Wouldn't most people be
inclined to say the concept of protecting America from a rogue nuclear missile is a pretty good idea to think about?

Mr. ANDY KOHUT (Director, Pew Center for the People and the Press): Well, I think the default position is Americans say, 'Yes, protect us,' and a missile defense system seems to make sense to them. But there is some resilience in public opinion and in the polls. This is the third consecutive poll in which we've found a majority saying, 'This is a good idea.' In this survey, we tested opinion two ways. First, asking the question straight out. Then, we took the people through the pros and cons, and we got the same support for missile defense even after thinking through some of the issues that our respondents may have not been considering initially.

ADAMS: You say it's very expensive, people complain it could hurt relations with Russia and China, could, in fact, in the long run, be destabilizing--factors like those?

Mr. KOHUT: All of those things; it's too costly, it may not work. And what we found was that people were more familiar with the arguments against it--that's it's too costly, it may annoy Russia, it may annoy China--than they were about the arguments in favor of missile defense. But when we tested the importance of the reasons, pro and con, the reasons pro tested better, or got more receptivity, than the reasons against. The American public looks at costs and says, 'Hey, we afford it. This is the post-deficit era.' They look at the technological problems and they say, 'Hey, we'll work them out. This is the age of the Internet and the age of our technological marvel. Protect us.'

ADAMS: What about the--in terms of protecting the United States, what about the threat, the very conventional threat of terrorism, which has nothing to do with nuclear missiles coming across the borders, simply somebody driving up in a truck with a nuclear device?

Mr. KOHUT: Well, that's where the qualifications come in. By a margin of eight-to-one, the public is more worried about someone coming into the United States
with a weapon of mass destruction in a satchel than a missile attack from Iraq or one of the other rogue states.

And the other issue that the public is saying is they say they—if they had to choose, they'd rather be protected by treaties than be protected by a missile defense system. Now the question is not necessarily either/or. In the absence of either/or, they'll opt for the missile defense system, but they really want both.

ADAMS: And break it down for us in terms of party affiliation. What's the difference there?

Mr. KOHUT: Well, Republicans like the idea much more than Democrats. And conservative Republicans are in love with this idea. Seventy percent or more give strong, unwavering support among conservative Republicans.

ADAMS: As they have since President Reagan.

Mr. KOHUT: It's the international equivalent of welfare reform for conservative Republicans. This is what they really believe.

What we were—I was surprised by was that Democrats, even liberal Democrats, lean to this. There's more of a cohesive set of opinions for it than there is a cohesive set of opinions against it. The arguments against it really haven't gelled as much as the arguments for it.

ADAMS: In your poll, also, President Bush got pretty good marks for the way he's been handling the various China situations. What is his overall grade in dealing with foreign policy?

Mr. KOHUT: He gets a 56 percent approval rating in the Gallup Poll for handling foreign policy, which is pretty good; better than he gets for the economy. Certainly much better than the 40-odd percent he gets for handling the environment or dealing with the energy crisis. And so a president who—once again we have a president who is not known for foreign policy doing reasonably well on this. And you know, the notion that presidents get drawn into foreign policy may once again hold true, as
Bush seems to get a dividend from the American public in reaction to handling missiles and in reaction to handling China.

ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kohut.

Mr. KOHUT: You're welcome.

ADAMS: Andy Kohut, director of the Pew Center for the People and the Press, talking with us about a new poll conducted with the help of the Council on Foreign Relations.

http://www.npr.org/programs/atc/
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>From dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com Mon Jun 18 06:05:17 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5ID5Ho02409 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Jun 2001
06:05:17 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from kopl550145.db.smartrevenue.com (mail.smartrevenue.com [164.109.30.90])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA09325 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Jun 2001 06:05:15 -0700 (PDT)
Reply-To: <dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>
From: "Daniel B. Navarro" <dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Mystery shoppers in Kansas City
Date: Mon, 18 Jun 2001 09:02:23 -0400
Message-ID: <B0000084312@kopl550145.db.smartrevenue.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
In-Reply-To: <LPBBINMPOBMDDJCBNLJGGEAODBAA.dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>

Dear Aapornet,

Does anyone know of a field agency in the Kansas City area that specializes in
Mystery Shopping? We have a major fast food chain that has 35 stores in the KC area that would like mystery shoppers to test late night (after 10pm) drive thru. Mystery shoppers will visit each store 4 times over an 8 week period. After each visit, the shopper will log onto a website to take a survey. After taking the survey, a reward will be offered.

Many thanks,
Dan

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Daniel B. Navarro
Director, Project Management and Operations
SmartRevenue.com
Tel: 301-424-4146
Fax: 240-465-0572
Web: www.smartrevenue.com
I'm a newly independent researcher who will soon field a large statewide survey on tobacco use. The questionnaire combines health-risk measures (e.g. use-prevalence estimation) with public attitudes on tobacco-related policies. I'm wondering whether government health surveys (e.g., NHIS, BRFSS, CPS supplements, etc. etc.) have proposed or posted any formal or unofficial consensus on computing outcome rates, similar to the posting by AAPOR (http://www.aapor.org/ethics/stddef.html\#final). If not, do those of you who work on government surveys, especially health-related, have any reaction to the AAPOR approach?

Thank you in advance for any assistance you might be able to provide on this matter.

Arnold H. Levinson, PhD
Associate Scientist
Center for Research Methodology and Biometrics
AMC Cancer Research Center
(303) 239-3402
levinsona@amc.org
fax 239-3394

*******

>From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Mon Jun 18 07:05:50 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id f51E5oo08227 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Jun 2001
07:05:50
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from mtiwmhc28.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc28.worldnet.att.net
[204.127.131.36])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id HAA00505 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Jun 2001 07:05:51 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from oemcomputer ([12.85.10.71]) by mtiwmhc28.worldnet.att.net
   (InterMail vM.4.01.03.16 201-229-121-116-20010115) with SMTP
   id <20010618140229.TJPZ2093.mtiwmhc28.worldnet.att.net@oemcomputer>;
Mon, 18 Jun 2001 14:02:29 +0000
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.20010618090157.006c363c@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>
X-Sender: Jim-Wolf@postoffice.worldnet.att.net
Date: Mon, 18 Jun 2001 09:01:57 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu, AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net>
Subject: Re: Levinson, "Outcome rates, AAPOR cf. governments"
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0106180645390.12160-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
It's my experience that DHHS/SAMHSA (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Admin.) will accept outcome rates calculated using either AAPOR or CASRO approaches.
As always, if you're working on a federal grant/contract it would be best to check with your project officer.

At 06:47 AM 6/18/01 -0700, James Beniger wrote:
> ------------ Forwarded message ------------
> 
> Date: Mon, 18 Jun 2001 04:20:47 -0600
> From: Arnold Levinson <levinsona@AMC.ORG>
> Reply-To: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA
> <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>
> To: SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU
> Subject: Outcome rates, AAPOR cf. governments
> 
> Colleagues,
> 
> I'm a newly independent researcher who will soon field a large statewide survey on tobacco use. The questionnaire combines health-risk measures (e.g. use-prevalence estimation) with public attitudes on tobacco-related policies. I'm wondering whether government health surveys (e.g., NHIS, BRFSS, CPS supplements, etc. etc.) have proposed or posted any formal or unofficial consensus on computing outcome rates, similar to the posting by AAPOR (http://www.aapor.org/ethics/standdef.html#final). If not, do those of you who work on government surveys, especially health-related, have any reaction to the AAPOR approach?
> 
> Thank you in advance for any assistance you might be able to provide on this matter.
> 
> Arnold H. Levinson, PhD
> Associate Scientist
> Center for Research Methodology and Biometrics
> AMC Cancer Research Center
> (303) 239-3402
> levinsona@amc.org
> fax 239-3394
> 
> 
> *****
> 
> 
> =-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=
> Jim Wolf 
> Jim-Wolf@att.net
> >From rday@rdresearch.com Mon Jun 18 07:56:06 2001
> Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> id f5IEu6o15446 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Jun 2001 07:56:06 -0700 (PDT)
I recommend that you contact the CDC. They have been working on collecting data from youth regarding tobacco. Their Youth Tobacco Survey may be useful.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>; AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2001 9:01 AM

> It's my experience that DHHS/SAMHSA (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Admin.) will accept outcome rates calculated using either AAPOR or CASRO approaches. As always, if you're working on a federal grant/contract it would be best to check with your project officer.

> At 06:47 AM 6/18/01 -0700, James Beniger wrote:
> 
> > ---------- Forwarded message ---------- 
> >
> > > Date: Mon, 18 Jun 2001 04:20:47 -0600
> > > From: Arnold Levinson <levinsona@AMC.ORG>
> > > Reply-To: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>
> > > To: SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU
> > > Subject: Outcome rates, AAPOR cf. governments
> > >
> > > Colleagues,
> > >
> > > I'm a newly independent researcher who will soon field a large statewide survey on tobacco use. The questionnaire combines health-risk measures (e.g. use-prevalence estimation) with public
attitudes on tobacco-related policies. I'm wondering whether government health surveys (e.g., NHIS, BRFSS, CPS supplements, etc. etc.) have proposed or posted any formal or unofficial consensus on computing outcome rates, similar to the posting by AAPOR (http://www.aapor.org/ethics/ stddef.html#final). If not, do those of you who work on government surveys, especially health-related, have any reaction to the AAPOR approach?

Thank you in advance for any assistance you might be able to provide on this matter.

Arnold H. Levinson, PhD
Associate Scientist
Center for Research Methodology and Biometrics
AMC Cancer Research Center
(303) 239-3402
levinsona@amc.org
fax 239-3394

******

Jim Wolf
Jim-Wolf@att.net

---------- Forwarded message ----------
To clarify my original question (copied below):

I'm trying to choose among the various methods of computing outcome rates. Since my survey combines public opinion and health measures, one could argue that the standards of either or both research disciplines apply.

So I'm trying to find out whether, among government survey agencies and especially health-survey agencies, there might be common understandings about how much non-completion makes a case a "breakoff" vs. "partial completion," and whether agencies tend to include or exclude partial completions in the response-rate numerator. Thanks again for helping me consider this matter.

Arnold H. Levinson, PhD
Associate Scientist
Center for Research Methodology and Biometrics
AMC Cancer Research Center
(303) 239-3402
levinsona@amc.org
fax 239-3394

>Colleagues,
>I'm a newly independent researcher who will soon field a large statewide survey on tobacco use. The questionnaire combines health-risk measures (e.g. use-prevalence estimation) with public attitudes on tobacco-related policies. I'm wondering whether government health surveys (e.g., NHIS, BRFSS, CPS supplements, etc. etc.) have proposed or posted any formal or unofficial consensus on computing outcome rates, similar to the posting by AAPOR (http://www.aapor.org/ethics/stddef.html#final). If not, do those of you who work on government surveys, especially health-related, have any reaction to the AAPOR approach?

******

>From teresa.hottle@wright.edu Mon Jun 18 10:40:40 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id f5IHedo04216 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Jun 2001
10:40:39 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mailserv.wright.edu (mailserv.wright.edu [130.108.128.60])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
The following is taken from the 1998 BRFSS Summary Quality Control Report put out by the CDC:

"No definitive formula for response rate estimates exists. The three estimates that are used for BRFSS provide a combination of monitoring information that is useful for program management." Then they tell you that you can use CASRO, AAPOR or Waksberg response rate calculation. I know that in the past, some states require CASRO calculation rates when administering the BRFSS. But according to this manual I have, you can also use AAPOR which will tell you their rule on partial v. breakoff.

Terrie

James Beniger wrote:
>
> -------- Forwarded message --------
> 
> Date: Mon, 18 Jun 2001 11:11:26 -0600
> From: Arnold Levinson <levinsona@AMC.ORG>
> Reply-To: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA
> <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>
> To: SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU
> Subject: Re: Outcome rates, AAPOR cf. governments
> 
> To clarify my original question (copied below):
> 
>
I'm trying to choose among the various methods of computing outcome rates. Since my survey combines public opinion and health measures, one could argue that the standards of either or both research disciplines apply.

So I'm trying to find out whether, among government survey agencies and especially health-survey agencies, there might be common understandings about how much non-completion makes a case a "breakoff" vs. "partial completion," and whether agencies tend to include or exclude partial completions in the response-rate numerator. Thanks again for helping me consider this matter.

Arnold H. Levinson, PhD
Associate Scientist
Center for Research Methodology and Biometrics
AMC Cancer Research Center
(303) 239-3402
levinsona@amc.org
fax 239-3394

Colleagues,
I'm a newly independent researcher who will soon field a large statewide survey on tobacco use. The questionnaire combines health-risk measures (e.g., use-prevalence estimation) with public attitudes on tobacco-related policies. I'm wondering whether government health surveys (e.g., NHIS, BRFSS, CPS supplements, etc.) have proposed or posted any formal or unofficial consensus on computing outcome rates, similar to the posting by AAPOR (http://www.aapor.org/ethics/stddef.html#final). If not, do those of you who work on government surveys, especially health-related, have any reaction to the AAPOR approach?

********
This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

The following position is currently available at the University of Maryland School of Medicine in Baltimore, Maryland.

<<Research Analyst AAPORnet.doc>>

Thanks! Patricia
Patricia Commiskey, MA
Research Director - CATI Facility
Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research
University of Maryland School of Medicine
(410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702 pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu
From kwood@virginia.edu Mon Jun 18 11:34:13 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id f5IIYDo12352 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Jun 2001

-----=_NextPart_000_01C0F81F.49959BB0--
June 18, 2001

Position Announcements: Lead Research Analyst
Research Analyst

Center for Survey Research
University of Virginia

Growing academic survey research center seeks experienced research analysts for the two positions described below. Both positions require M.A. in social science as well as several years experience with project design and management, CATI programming, and data analysis in an academic survey research setting. The Lead Analyst position also requires substantial supervisory experience. Salary is commensurate with experience. Applications will be accepted until July 9. Please submit resume and letter of application to:

CSR Search Committee
Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service
P.O. Box 400206
Charlottesville, Virginia 22904

The University of Virginia is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer.

Job Description
Lead Research Analyst
(Research Assistant)
Center for Survey Research
1) Supervises part-time and student research assistants, assigning
tasks and monitoring quality of their work.
2) Coordinates with Associate Director and project staff to define analysis and programming needs for projects, set schedules, and ensure project research needs are met in a timely manner.
3) Trains part-time and student research assistants in CSR practices, procedures, and documentation conventions.
4) Contributes to written research reports, oral presentations, and CSR publications. Prepares written methods reports for projects as assigned.
5) Advises clients and project staff on research design and survey process issues.
6) Performs programming and analysis tasks using SPSS, WinCati, Excel, Access, and other software as appropriate. Some of these tasks are delegated to assistants under incumbent's supervision.
a) Programs questionnaires in Ci3.
b) Sets up telephone interview studies in WinCati.
c) Analyzes data using SPSS, and SAS as needed.
d) Sets up data bases in Access.
e) Processes, loads, and manages sample for use in WinCati or in mail-out surveys.
f) Prepares graphs and tables in Excel, Quattro, Word, and Wordperfect as appropriate.
g) Merges, modifies, and edits data files as needed for analysis or for use as sampling data bases.
7) Provides Level I computer support for CSR. Coordinates with Level II support as needed to ensure CSR's computer needs are met.

Job Description
Research Analyst
(Research Assistant)
Center for Survey Research

1) Performs programming and analysis tasks using SPSS, WinCati, Excel, Access, and other software as appropriate. Analyst duties to be assigned and monitored by the Lead Research Analyst.
a. Programs questionnaires in Ci3.
b. Sets up telephone interview studies in WinCati.
c. Sets up data bases in Access.
d. Processes, loads, and manages sample for use in WinCati or in mail-out surveys.
e. Merges, modifies, and edits data files as needed for analysis or for use as sampling data bases.
f. Prepares and labels SPSS data files for analysis and reporting.
g. Analyzes survey results data, including frequencies, crosstabulations, means tables, multivariate analyses, and tests of statistical significance.
h. Prepares graphs and tables in Excel, Quattro, Word, and Wordperfect as appropriate.
2) Acts as Project Coordinator for survey projects as assigned.
a. Prepares time lines for assigned projects.
b. Assists with budget preparation and budget revisions for assigned projects.
c. Maintains communication with client on survey progress.
d. Submits brief, written report on project progress each week to 
Associate Director, and reports on project progress, needs, and plans at 
weekly project scan meeting.
e. Maintains communication with project team using e-mail and team 
meetings as needed.
f. Monitors expenditures of effort by staff to ensure that projects stay within budget.
g. Coordinates with Associate Director regarding scheduling or 
resource problems affecting timely completion of assigned projects.
h. Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal 
Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.
3) Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and 
methodological reports as assigned
4) Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task 
teams as assigned.
5) Assists with Level I computing support tasks as assigned by Lead 
Research Analyst.
6) May occasionally be assigned to other tasks at the discretion of the Director.

Kate F. Wood
Associate Director
Center for Survey Research
University of Virginia

804-243-5224
804-243-5233 (fax)
Growing academic survey research center seeks experienced research analysts for the two positions described below. Both positions require M.A. in social science as well as several years experience with project design and management, CATI programming, and data analysis in an academic survey research setting. The lead Analyst position also requires substantial supervisory experience. Salary is commensurate with experience. Applications will be accepted until July 9.

Please submit resume and letter of application to:

CSR Search Committee
Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service
P.O. Box 400206
Charlottesville, Virginia 22904

The University of Virginia is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer.

Job Description

Lead Research Analyst (Research Assistant) Center for Survey Research

Supervises part-time and student research assistants, assigning tasks and monitoring quality of their work.
Coordinates with Associate Director and project staff to define analysis and programming needs for projects, set schedules, and ensure project research needs are met in a timely manner.<br>

Trains part-time and student research assistants in CSR practices, procedures, and documentation conventions.<br>

Contributes to written research reports, oral presentations, and CSR publications. Prepares written methods reports for projects as assigned.<br>

Advises clients and project staff on research design and survey process issues.<br>

Performs programming and analysis tasks using SPSS, WinCati, Excel, Access, and other software as appropriate. Some of these tasks are delegated to assistants under incumbents supervision.<br>

Programs questionnaires in Ci3.<br>

Sets up telephone interview studies in WinCati.<br>

Analyzes data using SPSS, and SAS as needed.<br>

Sets up data bases in Access.<br>

Processes, loads, and manages sample for use in WinCati or in mail-out surveys.<br>

Prepares graphs and tables in Excel, Quattro, Word, and Wordperfect as appropriate.<br>

Merges, modifies, and edits data files as needed for analysis or for use as sampling data bases.<br>

Provides Level I computer support for CSR. Coordinates with Level II support as needed to ensure CSRs computer needs are met.
<dl><dt>Job Description</dt><dd><h2>Research Analyst</h2><h3>(Research Assistant)</h3><h4>Center for Survey Research</h4></dd><dd><dl><dd>1) Performs programming and analysis tasks using SPSS, WinCati, Excel, Access, and other software as appropriate. Analyst duties to be assigned and monitored by the Lead Research Analyst.<dl><dd>a. Programs questionnaires in Ci3.</dd><dd>b. Sets up telephone interview studies in WinCathi.<dd>c. Sets up data bases in Access.<dd>d. Processes, loads, and manages sample for use in WinCACHI or in mail-out surveys.<dd>e. Merges, modifies, and edits data files as needed for analysis or for use as sampling data bases.<dd>f. Prepares and labels SPSS data files for analysis and reporting.<dd>g. Analyzes survey results data, including frequencies, crosstabulations, means tables, multivariate analyses, and tests of statistical significance.<dd>h. Prepares graphs and tables in Excel, Quattro, Word, and Wordperfect as appropriate.</dd></dl><dd>2) Acts as Project Coordinator for survey projects as assigned. Prepares time lines for assigned projects.</dd><dd>3) Assists with budget preparation and budget revisions for assigned projects.</dd></dl></dd></dl>
Maintains communication with client on survey progress.<br>
Submits brief, written report on project progress each week to Associate Director, and reports on project progress, needs, and plans at weekly project scan meeting.<br>
Maintains communication with project team using e-mail and team meetings as needed.<br>
Monitors expenditures of effort by staff to ensure that projects stay within budget.<br>
Coordinates with Associate Director regarding scheduling or resource problems affecting timely completion of assigned projects.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.<br>
Coordinates with Center Director, Associate Director or Principal Investigator of project regarding any issues affecting survey quality.<br>
Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.<br>
Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.

3) Assists with drafting and editing of project reports and methodological reports as assigned.

4) Attends general staff meetings and participates in management task teams as assigned.

5) Assists with Level I computing support tasks as assigned by Lead Research Analyst.

6) May occasionally be assigned to other tasks at the discretion of the Director.

Kate F. Wood  
Associate Director  
Center for Survey Research  
University of Virginia  
804-243-5224  
804-243-5233 (fax)
I forward this message to AAPORNET in the hope that at least a few AAPORNETters may not yet be familiar with the source, or at least not in this context, and find it useful in their own work.

-- Jim

*******

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Mon, 18 Jun 2001 13:43:06 -0400
From: Gene Shackman <gxs03@HEALTH.STATE.NY.US>
Reply-To: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>
To: SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU
Subject: outcome responses - BRFSS User's Guide

I had forwarded the request by Arnold Levinson to the Methods email list and got this reply.

---------------------- Forwarded by Gene Shackman/DON/CCH/OPH/DOH on 06/18/2001 01:40 PM -----------------------

Jennifer Haussler <jhaussler@VDH.STATE.VA.US>@linux08.UNM.EDU> on 06/18/2001 01:33:43 PM

Please respond to METHODS <METHODS@linux08.UNM.EDU>

Sent by: METHODS <METHODS@linux08.UNM.EDU>

To: METHODS@linux08.UNM.EDU
cc:
Subject: BRFSS User's Guide
Check out:
http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/brfss/usersguide.htm

I believe the user's guide will provide you with the information you're looking for.
If not, www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/brfss/ti-techinfo.htm
<http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/brfss/ti-techinfo.htm> will probably connect to the pertinent information.

Let me know if this is what you were looking for.

Jennifer

>>Mr. Levinson had written.....
Colleagues,
I'm a newly independent researcher

>From jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu Mon Jun 18 12:30:10 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id f51JU9o19320 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Jun 2001 12:30:09
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id MAA02984 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Jun 2001 12:30:09 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from PROUST (sph186-161.harvard.edu [134.174.186.161])
  by hsph.harvard.edu (8.10.2+Sun/8.10.2) with SMTP id f5IJTnp01353
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Jun 2001 15:29:49 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.1.20010618152245.00a2ba30@hsph.harvard.edu>
X-Sender: jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Mon, 18 Jun 2001 15:29:40 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "John T. Young" <jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu>
Subject: Re: Pew Poll on US Support of MDS & Bush Foreign Policy Approval (NPR)
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0106171456260.10546-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

this is a very interesting discussion between Noah Adams and Andy Kohut.

In a New York Times poll of 3.13.2001, people were asked, "From what you know, do you think that the United States currently has or does not have a missile defense system to protect against nuclear attacks?"

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not have</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wonder what proportion of the above 64% support a New Missle system?
On the issue of a missile system that would defend the United States, President Bush appears to have the support of the American people. A new poll by the Pew Research Center shows a 51 percent-to-38 percent margin in favor of a national missile defense system. Andy Kohut is the director of the Pew Center for the People and the Press.

Mr. Kohut, is that margin really all that significant? Wouldn't most people be inclined to say the concept of protecting America from a rogue nuclear missile is a pretty good idea to think about?

Mr. ANDY KOHUT (Director, Pew Center for the People and the Press): Well, I think the default position is Americans say, 'Yes, protect us,' and a missile defense system seems to make sense to them. But there is some resilience in public opinion and in the polls. This is the third consecutive poll in which we've found a majority saying, 'This is a good idea.' In this survey, we tested opinion two ways. First, asking the question straight out. Then, we took the people through the pros and the cons, and we got the same support for missile defense even after thinking through some of the issues that our respondents may have not been considering initially.

ADAMS: You say it's very expensive, people complain it could hurt relations with Russia and China, could, in fact, in the long run, be destabilizing--factors like those?

Mr. KOHUT: All of those things; it's too costly, it may not work. And what we found was that people were more familiar with the arguments against it--that's it's too costly, it may annoy Russia, it may annoy China--than they were about the arguments in favor of missile defense.
But when we tested the importance of the reasons, pro and con, the reasons pro tested better, or got more receptivity, than the reasons against. The American public looks at costs and says, 'Hey, we afford it. This is the post-deficit era.' They look at the technological problems and they say, 'Hey, we'll work them out. This is the age of the Internet and the age of our technological marvel. Protect us.'

ADAMS: What about the--in terms of protecting the United States, what about the threat, the very conventional threat of terrorism, which has nothing to do with nuclear missiles coming across the borders, simply somebody driving up in a truck with a nuclear device?

Mr. KOHUT: Well, that's where the qualifications come in. By a margin of eight-to-one, the public is more worried about someone coming into the United States with a weapon of mass destruction in a satchel than a missile attack from Iraq or one of the other rogue states.

And the other issue that the public is saying is they say they--if they had to choose, they'd rather be protected by treaties than be protected by a missile defense system. Now the question is not necessarily either/or. In the absence of either/or, they'll opt for the missile defense system, but they really want both.

ADAMS: And break it down for us in terms of party affiliation. What's the difference there?

Mr. KOHUT: Well, Republicans like the idea much more than Democrats. And conservative Republicans are in love with this idea. Seventy percent or more give strong, unwavering support among conservative Republicans.

ADAMS: As they have since President Reagan.

Mr. KOHUT: It's the international equivalent of welfare reform for conservative Republicans. This is what they really believe.

What we were--I was surprised by was that Democrats, even liberal Democrats, lean to this. There's more of a cohesive set of opinions for it than there is a cohesive set of opinions against it. The arguments against it really haven't gelled as much as the arguments for it.

ADAMS: In your poll, also, President Bush got pretty good marks for the way he's been handling the various China situations. What is his overall grade in dealing with foreign policy?

Mr. KOHUT: He gets a 56 percent approval rating in the Gallup Poll for handling foreign policy, which is pretty good; better than he gets for the economy. Certainly much better than the 40-odd percent he gets for handling the environment or dealing with the energy crisis. And so a president who--once again we have a president who is not known for foreign policy doing reasonably well on this. And you know, the notion that presidents get drawn into foreign policy may once again hold true, as Bush seems to get a dividend from the American public in reaction to handling missiles and in reaction to handling China.

ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kohut.
Mr. KOHUT: You're welcome.

ADAMS: Andy Kohut, director of the Pew Center for the People and the Press, talking with us about a new poll conducted with the help of the Council on Foreign Relations.

http://www.npr.org/programs/atc/

From ROBINSON@socy.umd.edu Tue Jun 19 16:06:10 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5JN6Ao01479 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Jun 2001 16:06:10 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mail.bsos.umd.edu (mail.bsos.umd.edu [129.2.168.57])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id QAA05959 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Jun 2001 16:06:10 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from gwiado-Message_Server by mail.bsos.umd.edu
    with Novell GroupWise; Tue, 19 Jun 2001 19:05:39 -0400
Message-Id: <sb2fa283.031@mail.bsos.umd.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.5.1
Date: Tue, 19 Jun 2001 19:05:32 -0400
From: "John Robinson" <ROBINSON@socy.umd.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: GSS 2000 Data Now Available for Analysis at University of Maryland Website
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id f5JN6Ao01480

GSS 2000 Data Now Available for Analysis at University of Maryland Website

Data from the year 2000 General Social Survey (GSS) are now publicly available at the University of Maryland website webuse.umd.edu. There they can be interactively statistically analyzed (but not downloaded) using SDA – the Internet software developed at the University of California at Berkeley's Computer Survey Methods group (and which won last year's AAPOR award for survey innovation.) The year 2000 GSS included a new Internet module that examined more than 150 aspects of
Internet use that can be correlated with the many attitude and behavioral questions regularly monitored by GSS. The Maryland website also contains an SDA tutorial intended to familiarize students and researchers with its many features and analytic capabilities.

Other Internet use data on the come from the monthly Pew Center studies of the Internet and everyday life. The government's NTIA "Digital Divide" surveys conducted by the Census Bureau, the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, trend studies conducted by the University of California at Santa Barbara and time-diary studies conducted at the University of Maryland. The Website also contains a large bibliography of published research on Internet impact and a series of profiles of typical Internet users.

The year 2000 GSS data is a main source of analytic interest for a group of 60 graduate students selected from around the country to attend a Graduate "WebShop" to being held at the College Park campus from June 10 to June 22 and at Berkeley from June 25 to June 29. At the WebShop, the students are hearing presentations from more than 40 Internet researchers about their research findings and theoretical perspectives about the Internet's impact on society.

A working paper, developed for the students at the WebShop, is available at the website that examines the relation of Internet use to various GSS socio-political attitudes, especially those related to political tolerance and diversity. Future working papers on the website will examine the relations of Internet use to various GSS measures of sociability and social topics.

Users of the GSS data are encouraged to share their findings and conclusions on the website and to suggest new questions for the GSS 2002 Internet module -- and the year 2001 re-interviews with GSS 2000 respondents (although space is very limited).

The website and WebShop are supported by a three-year grant from the National Science Foundation.
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It is an interesting discussion, and there are additional interesting results on the Pew Center's website.

However, this is an area where one suspects (and the NYTimes results seem to confirm) a vast public ignorance on the topic. Another finding that also seems to point to lack of knowledge is the relatively large number of people who want both treaties and a missile defense system. One suspects that many may be unaware that current treaties (the ABM) prohibit development of missile defense systems. It would be useful to have additional measures of the public's level of factual knowledge and understanding in this area (including their understanding of current treaties), to provide context for the results of the opinion measures.

"John T. Young"

<jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu> To: aapornet@usc.edu
this is a very interesting discussion between Noah Adams and Andy Kohut.

In a New York Times poll of 3.13.2001, people were asked, "From what you know, do you think that the United States currently has or does not have a missile defense system to protect against nuclear attacks?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has</th>
<th>64%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not have</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wonder what proportion of the above 64% support a New Missle system?

john young

At 02:57 PM 6/17/2001 -0700, you wrote:
> 
> 
> 
> 
> 
> > 
> > 
> > 
> > 
> > 
> > ________________________________
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> > (NPR)
NOAH ADAMS, host:

On the issue of a missile system that would defend the United States, President Bush appears to have the support of the American people. A new poll by the Pew Research Center shows a 51 percent-to-38 percent margin in favor of a national missile defense system. Andy Kohut is the director of the Pew Center for the People and the Press.

Mr. Kohut, is that margin really all that significant? Wouldn't most people be inclined to say the concept of protecting America from a rogue nuclear missile is a pretty good idea to think about?

Mr. ANDY KOHUT (Director, Pew Center for the People and the Press): Well, I think the default position is Americans say, 'Yes, protect us,' and a missile defense system seems to make sense to them. But there is some resilience in public opinion and in the polls. This is the third consecutive poll in which we've found a majority saying, 'This is a good idea.' In this survey, we tested opinion two ways. First, asking the question straight out. Then, we took the people through the pros and the cons, and we got the same support for missile defense even after thinking through some of the issues that our respondents may have not been considering initially.

ADAMS: You say it's very expensive, people complain it could hurt relations with Russia and China, could, in fact, in the long run, be destabilizing--factors like those?

Mr. KOHUT: All of those things; it's too costly, it may not work. And what we found was that people were more familiar with the arguments against it--that's it's too costly, it may annoy Russia, it may annoy China--than they were about the arguments in favor of missile defense. But when we tested the importance of the reasons, pro and con, the reasons pro tested better, or got more receptivity, than the reasons against. The American public looks at costs and says, 'Hey, we afford it. This is the post-deficit era.' They look at the technological problems and they say, 'Hey, we'll work them out. This is the age of the Internet and the age of our technological marvel. Protect us.'

ADAMS: What about the--in terms of protecting the United States, what about the threat, the very conventional threat of terrorism, which has nothing to do with nuclear missiles coming across the borders, simply
Mr. KOHUT: Well, that's where the qualifications come in. By a margin of eight-to-one, the public is more worried about someone coming into the United States with a weapon of mass destruction in a satchel than a missile attack from Iraq or one of the other rogue states.

And the other issue that the public is says is they say they--if they had to choose, they'd rather be protected by treaties than be protected by a missile defense system. Now the question is not necessarily either/or. In the absence of either/or, they'll opt for the missile defense system, but they really want both.

ADAMS: And break it down for us in terms of party affiliation. What's the difference there?

Mr. KOHUT: Well, Republicans like the idea much more than Democrats. And conservative Republicans are in love with this idea. Seventy percent or more give strong, unwavering support among conservative Republicans.

ADAMS: As they have since President Reagan.

Mr. KOHUT: It's the international equivalent of welfare reform for conservative Republicans. This is what they really believe.

What we were--I was surprised by was that Democrats, even liberal Democrats, lean to this. There's more of a cohesive set of opinions for it than there is a cohesive set of opinions against it. The arguments against it really haven't gelled as much as the arguments for it.

ADAMS: In your poll, also, President Bush got pretty good marks for the way he's been handling the various China situations. What is his overall grade in dealing with foreign policy?

Mr. KOHUT: He gets a 56 percent approval rating in the Gallup Poll for handling foreign policy, which is pretty good; better than he gets for the economy. Certainly much better than the 40-odd percent he gets for handling the environment or dealing with the energy crisis. And so a president who--once again we have a president who is not known for foreign policy doing reasonably well on this. And you know, the notion that presidents get drawn into foreign policy may once again hold true, as Bush seems to get a dividend from the American public in reaction to handling missiles and in reaction to handling China.

ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kohut.

Mr. KOHUT: You're welcome.

ADAMS: Andy Kohut, director of the Pew Center for the People and the Press, talking with us about a new poll conducted with the help of the Council on Foreign Relations.

http://www.npr.org/programs/atc/
One in five kids solicited for sex on Net
By Reuters
June 19, 2001, 9:30 p.m. PT
One in five U.S. teenagers who regularly log on to the Internet say they have received an unwanted sexual solicitation via the Web, according to a survey released Tuesday.

Nineteen percent of the 1,500 surveyed youths aged 10 to 17 reported getting solicited, presumably by adults. Solicitations were defined as requests to engage in sexual activities or sexual talk, or to give personal sexual information.

"In terms of risk, girls and older youth (14-17 years) were more likely to be solicited. Risk was higher for youth who were troubled. It was also higher for those who used the Internet more frequently, participated in chat rooms, engaged in
risky
behavior online, talked to strangers online, or used the Internet at
households other
than their own," wrote Kimberly Mitchell of the Crimes Against Children
Research
Center at the University of New Hampshire, in Durham.

One quarter of the children who were solicited for sex--some of whom were
subsequently approached in person or enticed on the telephone or by regular
mail--reported being extremely upset or afraid.

Neither parental oversight of children's online activities nor filtering or
blocking
technology had much impact on whether children were solicited, the study
found.

"Add Internet solicitation to the list of childhood perils about which
(authorities) should be knowledgeable and able to provide counsel to
families," said
the report, which was published in this week's issue of the Journal of the
American
Medical Association.

"At the same time, the concerns are not so alarming that they should by
themselves
encourage parents to bar children from accessing the Internet," it said.

Story Copyright © 2001 Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com
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Date: Wed, 20 Jun 2001 12:31:07 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: Pew Poll on US Support of MDS & Bush Foreign Policy Approval
One of the things that would be interesting is, first, what the results would be if the American people knew that there is no missile defense system at present that works, and that the tests have had an 80% failure rate under the best of conditions (i.e. when the individuals testing the system knew when, and from where, the other missile was being launched, and when the target had a homing device on it); and second, what the results are in foreign countries where the leaders are mixed in their reactions. Does anyone have any comparative data on this subject.

I believe it is a cultural characteristic of Americans that we believe our know how and inventiveness can solve any problem, even the most difficult ones-- that there is some technology lurking around the next corner that will provide the answer to such a thing as missile defense. That may, in fact, lie behind some of the answers respondents give regarding this program. Also, we have been treated to so many simulations on television and the Internet showing missiles being shot out of the air that many citizens no doubt believe such a system exists.

Frank Rusciano

elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov wrote:

> It is an interesting discussion, and there are additional interesting results on the Pew Center's website.
> However, this is an area where one suspects (and the NYTimes results seem to confirm) a vast public ignorance on the topic. Another finding that also seems to point to lack of knowledge is the relatively large number of people who want both treaties and a missile defense system. One suspects that many may be unaware that current treaties (the ABM) prohibit development of missile defense systems. It would be useful to have additional measures of the public's level of factual knowledge and understanding in this area (including their understanding of current treaties), to provide context for the results of the opinion measures.
this is a very interesting discussion between Noah Adams and Andy Kohut.

In a New York Times poll of 3.13.2001, people were asked, "From what you know, do you think that the United States currently has or does not have a missile defense system to protect against nuclear attacks?"

Has 64%
Does not have 21%
DK/NA 15%

I wonder what proportion of the above 64% support a New Missle system?

john young

At 02:57 PM 6/17/2001 -0700, you wrote:
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June 15, 2001, Friday

ANDY KOHUT DISCUSSES A RECENT PEW CENTER POLL REGARDING AMERICA SUPPORT OF A MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM AND PRESIDENT BUSH'S FOREIGN POLICY APPROVAL RATING
NOAH ADAMS, host:

On the issue of a missile system that would defend the United States, President Bush appears to have the support of the American people. A new poll by the Pew Research Center shows a 51 percent-to-38 percent margin in favor of a national missile defense system. Andy Kohut is the director of the Pew Center for the People and the Press.

Mr. Kohut, is that margin really all that significant? Wouldn't most people be inclined to say the concept of protecting America from a rogue nuclear missile is a pretty good idea to think about?

Andy Kohut (Director, Pew Center for the People and the Press):

Well, I think the default position is Americans say, 'Yes, protect us,' and a missile defense system seems to make sense to them. But there is some resilience in public opinion and in the polls. This is the third consecutive poll in which we've found a majority saying, 'This is a good idea.' In this survey, we tested opinion two ways. First, asking the question straight out. Then, we took the people through the pros and the cons, and we got the same support for missile defense even after thinking through some of the issues that our respondents may have not been considering initially.

ADAMS: You say it's very expensive, people complain it could hurt relations with Russia and China, could, in fact, in the long run, be destabilizing--factors like those?

Mr. Kohut: All of those things; it's too costly, it may not work.

And what we found was that people were more familiar with the arguments against it--that's it's too costly, it may annoy Russia, it may annoy China--than they were about the arguments in favor of missile defense. But when we tested the importance of the reasons, pro and con, the reasons pro tested better, or got more receptivity, than the reasons against. The American public looks at costs and says, 'Hey, we afford it. This is the post-deficit era.' They look at the technological problems and they say, 'Hey, we'll work them out. This is the age of the Internet and the age of our technological marvel. Protect us.'

ADAMS: What about the--in terms of protecting the United States, what about the threat, the very conventional threat of terrorism, which has nothing to do with nuclear missiles coming across the borders, simply somebody driving up in a truck with a nuclear device?

Mr. Kohut: Well, that's where the qualifications come in. By a margin of eight-to-one, the public is more worried about someone coming into the United States with a weapon of mass destruction in a satchel than a missile attack from Iraq or one of the other rogue states.

And the other issue that the public is says is they say they--if they had to choose, they'd rather be protected by treaties than be
protected by a missile defense system. Now the question is not
necessarily either/or. In the absence of either/or, they'll opt for
the missile defense system, but they really want both.

ADAMS: And break it down for us in terms of party affiliation.
What's the difference there?

Mr. KOHUT: Well, Republicans like the idea much more than Democrats.
And conservative Republicans are in love with this idea. Seventy
two percent or more give strong, unwavering support among conservative
Republicans.

ADAMS: As they have since President Reagan.

Mr. KOHUT: It's the international equivalent of welfare reform for
conservative Republicans. This is what they really believe.

What we were--I was surprised by was that Democrats, even liberal
Democrats, lean to this. There's more of a cohesive set of opinions
for it than there is a cohesive set of opinions against it. The
arguments against it really haven't gelled as much as the arguments
for it.

ADAMS: In your poll, also, President Bush got pretty good marks for
the way he's been handling the various China situations. What is his
overall grade in dealing with foreign policy?

Mr. KOHUT: He gets a 56 percent approval rating in the Gallup Poll
for handling foreign policy, which is pretty good; better than he
gets for the economy. Certainly much better than the 40-odd percent
he gets for handling the environment or dealing with the energy
crisis. And so a president who--once again we have a president who
is not known for foreign policy doing reasonably well on this. And
you know, the notion that presidents get drawn into foreign policy
may once again hold true, as Bush seems to get a dividend from the
American public in reaction to handling missiles and in reaction to
handling China.

ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Kohut.

Mr. KOHUT: You're welcome.

ADAMS: Andy Kohut, director of the Pew Center for the People and the
Press, talking with us about a new poll conducted with the help of
the Council on Foreign Relations.
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Dear AAPOR colleagues,

You'll recall that a week or so ago, Bob Weissberg's Cato Institute paper ignited a minor firestorm on our listserv. His jaundiced view of human nature has long been known to me, as we were in graduate school together. I've kept him apprised of our discussions, especially this last one about what the public knows about our nuclear missile defense. Here's his latest "salvo" below, which I share with you with his permission. Alice Robbin/IU

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Dear Alice:

I can't resist putting in my 2 cents into this discussion.

First point: Pollsters generally know almost zero about anything outside polling techniques. Just look at the technical education one receives in graduate school--endless courses on "methodology" with scant attention to substance. The upshot, then, is that questions are written by people unfamiliar with the topic at hand.

Second point: The US does currently enjoy a missile-based anti-missile defense system. It's called ICBM's and it is part of the MAD system--if they attack us, we nuke them. Bush wants a second form of anti-missile defense, one that would destroy incoming missiles before they caused damage. That the ICBM system has been in-place for at least four decades helps explain public beliefs in its existence.

Perhaps those who write questions should think first.

This point is examined at length in my public opinion book.

Best,
Bob
system. Its called ICBM's and it is part of the MAD system--if they attack us, we nuke them. Bush wants a second form of anti-missile defense, one that would destroy incoming missiles before they caused damage. That the ICBM system has been in-place for at least four decades helps explain public beliefs in its existence. Perhaps those who write questions should think first. This point is examined at length in my public opinion book. Best, Bob

---

I've been enlightened! I have been spending weeks and sometimes months reading and studying in my attempt to become informed BEFORE I craft instruments on topics about which I am not an expert -- and now I know that my colleagues aren't doing this! I wish I had known sooner... Thanks Bob (via Alice). I'll have much more time on my hands now.
Dear AAPOR colleagues, You'll recall that a week or so ago, Bob
Weissberg's Cato Institute paper ignited a minor firestorm on our
listserv. His jaundiced view of human nature has long been known to
me, as we were in graduate school together. I've kept him apprised of
our discussions, especially this last one about what the public knows
about our nuclear missile defense. Here's his latest "salvo" below,
which I share with you with his permission. Alice Robbin/IU

> Dear Alice:
>
> I can't resist putting in my 2 cents into this discussion.
>
> First point: Pollsters generally know almost zero about anything
outside polling techniques. Just look at the technical education one receives in
graduate school--endless courses on "methodology" with scant attention to
substance. The upshot, then, is that questions are written by people
unfamiliar with the topic at hand.
>
> Second point: The US does currently enjoy a missile-based anti-missile
defense system. It's called ICBM's and it is part of the MAD
system--if they attack us, we nuke them. Bush wants a second form of
anti-missile defense, one that would destroy incoming missiles before
they caused damage. That the ICBM system has been in-place for at
least four decades helps explain public beliefs in its existence.
>
> Perhaps those who write questions should think first.
>
> This point is examined at length in my public opinion book.
>
> Best,
> Bob
>
>

****************************
Mary E. Losch, Ph.D.
One in five kids solicited for sex on Net
By Reuters
June 19, 2001, 9:30 p.m. PT

One in five U.S. teenagers who regularly log on to the Internet say they have received an unwanted sexual solicitation via the Web, according to a survey released Tuesday.

Nineteen percent of the 1,500 surveyed youths aged 10 to 17 reported getting solicited, presumably by adults. Solicitations were defined as requests to
engage in
sexual activities or sexual talk, or to give personal sexual information.

"In terms of risk, girls and older youth (14-17 years) were more likely to be solicited. Risk was higher for youth who were troubled. It was also higher for those who used the Internet more frequently, participated in chat rooms, engaged in risky behavior online, talked to strangers online, or used the Internet at households other than their own," wrote Kimberly Mitchell of the Crimes Against Children Research Center at the University of New Hampshire, in Durham.

One quarter of the children who were solicited for sex--some of whom were subsequently approached in person or enticed on the telephone or by regular mail--reported being extremely upset or afraid.

Neither parental oversight of children's online activities nor filtering or blocking technology had much impact on whether children were solicited, the study found.

"Add Internet solicitation to the list of childhood perils about which (authorities) should be knowledgeable and able to provide counsel to families," said the report, which was published in this week's issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

"At the same time, the concerns are not so alarming that they should by themselves encourage parents to bar children from accessing the Internet," it said.

Story Copyright © 2001 Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com
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I don't think I care for Bob's tone (whoever Bob is) so I don't think I'll be picking up his book on public opinion anytime soon.

His comment does point to an interesting ambiguity of the term "missile defense system", though. According to a summary from a report sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, the ABM treaty limits "antiballistic missile systems," or systems designed to defend against strategic ballistic missiles. It says, "The ABM Treaty thus enshrined as strategic doctrine the principle of deterrence through threat of retaliation. Since neither side (Soviet Union or the U.S.) was free to deploy unlimited defenses against the strategic ballistic missiles of the other, each nation sought to deter any outright attack by the other through its ability to threaten overwhelming retaliation against an attack with its own nuclear-armed strategic ballistic missiles." So respondents might reasonably interpret "missile defense system" as including the ICBMs, since they were designed to deter attacks, or not, since they were not a missile defense system in the narrower, prohibited sense.

I do wonder how the respondents in the NYTimes survey (or the Pew survey) were interpreting the references to missile defense system in these surveys.
Polks,

What follows is just-now-breaking news about a classic struggle among four social, political and cultural forces:

(1) Two sovereign nations (the United States and France)

(2) A portal website, online host to more than 400 hate groups, but itself hosted by an Alaska-based ISP, and thereby protected by the First Amendment

(3) Various human rights and anti-racism groups (including the Simon Wiesenthal Center) which have filed suit against 13 French Internet service providers that refuse to block access to the U.S.-based hate site (sale of any item likely to incite racism or anti-Semitism is illegal in France)

(4) The 13 French ISPs, which represent many of the leading corporations of France, including France Telecom, Bouygues Telecom, and AOL France (all of which have refused demands to block access to--or filter content from--the U.S.-based hate portal); most of the 13 also have considerable influence within the government of France (see #1 above)

I bother AAPORNET with this in order to recall that the American development of scientific public opinion research began--especially at Columbia University--with the study anti-Semitism, racism, hate speech, and their influences on opinions and behavior--in the work of Paul Lazarsfeld (AAPOR's 3rd president) and one of his early graduate students, Charlie Glock (AAPOR's 17th president), who passed along the word to his own students, who included me, while I was a doctoral student in sociology at Berkeley, and employed at Berkeley's Survey Research Center.
All of this is merely background for my own question of our list: Does anyone besides me regret that survey research no longer seems relevant--for no good reason, as far as I can see--in deciding timeless but important societal problems like the one I've outline above--problems only exacerbated by the recent proliferation of the Internet and Web? If you agree, I encourage you to speak up here on AAPORNET.

My own hunch is that entirely new policy conflicts, problems and questions like the ones I outline above are not going to disappear any time soon, and that research firms which begin time series in such areas will have an audience for successive waves through at least the next few decades of global diffusion of the Internet and Web--and will also be appreciated for such efforts for many more decades after that.

-- Jim

---------

ABSTRACT:

"As a French citizen, I know I have no chance before an American court, which will put the right to freedom of speech ahead of any concerns about seeing the world's biggest democracy turn into an off-shore center for Internet hate," says Marc Knobel, a Paris-based researcher with the Simon Wiesenthal Center and vice-president of the International League Against Racism and Anti-Semitism, LICRA. Knobel now seeks to force French ISPs to block access to a site protected in the United States under the First Amendment. "We are hoping that a French court will take a different view toward the reception of illegal, hate-inspiring messages here in France, and act against the ISPs that are helping these messages to proliferate," Knobel says. He describes the site in question, the portal Front 14 <www.front14.org>, hosted by the Alaska-based ISP General Communication Inc., as "an unprecedented development in the history of the Internet: the birth of the first multi-service hate portal." His court filing cites Front 14's index, which notes that the portal offers "free web-hosting and e-mail exclusively to racialists," as "an alternative to proud White men and women ... for our White interests only." The sale of Nazi memorabilia, as well as any other item likely to incite racism or anti-Semitism, is illegal in France.

-- Jim

Wednesday, June 20, 2001

News - Free Speech:

E-Commerce Law Daily - French Human Rights Group Sues ISPs

French Human Rights Group Sues ISPs
Over Failure to Censor U.S.-Based Hate Site
PARIS-- A French anti-racism group filed suit June 15 against 13 Internet service providers that have refused to block access to a U.S.-based portal site which acts as an online host to more than 400 hate groups (Action Internationale pour la Justice v. Societe GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS INC (GCI) and 14 others, T.G.I. Paris, docket number unavailable, 6/14/01).

The case will pit the anti-racism group International Action for Justice (AIPJ) against some of the leading lights of French industry, including France Telecom, Bouygues Telecom, and AOL France, all of which have refused demands that their ISPs block access or filter content from the U.S.-based hate portal www.front14.org.

Alaska-based ISP General Communication Inc., which hosts the Front 14 site, is listed as a defendant in the French group's complaint, as is the French Association of Internet Access Providers (AFA), which has represented the French ISPs in their collective dealings with the AIPJ.

The AIPJ's effort to force French ISPs to block access to the hate site resembles a landmark legal battle in 2000 that pitted several anti-racism sites against Internet giant Yahoo! over the auction of Nazi memorabilia.

In the Yahoo! case, anti-racism campaigners convinced French courts to order Yahoo! to prevent French Internet users from accessing auction areas of a U.S.-based site where Nazi memorabilia is sold. The sale of such memorabilia, as well as any other item likely to incite racism or anti-Semitism, is illegal in France.

In the Front 14 case, the anti-racism campaigners--led by Marc Knobel, a Paris-based researcher with the Simon Wiesenthal Center and vice-president of the International League Against Racism and Anti-Semitism, LICRA, a main plaintiff in the Yahoo! case--are seeking to force the French ISPs to block access to a site protected in the United States under the First Amendment.

"As a French citizen, I know I have no chance before an American court, which will put the right to freedom of speech ahead of any concerns about seeing the world's biggest democracy turn into an off-shore center for Internet hate," Knobel told BNA June 19.

"We are hoping that a French court will take a different view toward the reception of illegal, hate-inspiring messages here in France, and act against the ISPs that are helping these messages to proliferate," Knobel said.

Calls Front 14 'Multi-Service Hate Portal'
The complaint lodged with the Paris High Court describes Front 14 as "an unprecedented development in history of the Internet: the birth of the first multi-service hate portal."

AIPJ's court filing cites Front 14's index, which notes that the portal offers "free web-hosting and e-mail exclusively to racialists," as "an alternative to proud White men and women ... for our White interests only."

Front 14's wide-ranging services offer—including 10 MB of Web space, Web-based e-mail accounts, counters, guestbooks, message boards, polls and free advertising--has attracted more than 420 hate groups worldwide, including many that are prohibited from Internet communications in Europe, operating under names such as Angry Aryans, Benevolent Racialists, Jew Watch, and White Warrior.

Having failed to convince the French ISPs to cut access, AIPJ calls on the court to instantly force them to do so.

**ISPs Respond**

Speaking for the ISPs, which represent nearly 90 percent of all French Internet users, AFA responded in a June 12 press release that blocking access to sites was nearly impossible on technical grounds and in any event not the role of access providers.

"Access providers definitely have an important role to play, but it is not one of controlling ... the comings and goings of citizens on the Internet, nor of the information that they exchange. This role of oversight belongs solely to the state," the AFA said.

A recently proposed bill--the Law on the Information Society ("Loi sur la Societe de l'Information" LSI)—will help French officials to carry out this role of Internet content control. The text, presented June 13 in the French Cabinet and scheduled for parliamentary debate this fall, will authorize judges to take "all necessary measures" to limit damages caused by online content.

Recognizing that the Information Society Law is still in the incubation process, the French anti-racism groups are calling on the Paris High Court to take immediate action against the French ISPs.

They note that Switzerland's three leading ISPs—Swisscom, Sunrise-Diax, and TiscaliNet—all agreed to block access to Front 14 after being alerted to the site's existence by an association linking families of Holocaust survivors, and have reported no technical problems in making the decision stick.

Oral arguments before TGI Judge Jean-Jacques Gomez—who also ruled in the Yahoo! case—are scheduled for June 29 in Paris.


A response from the French Association of Internet Access Providers
LES COMMUNIQUES DE PRESSE

Contrôler ou limiter l'accès Internet des citoyens est une prérogative qui appartient aux seuls pouvoirs publics.

Depuis 1997, l'AFA a eu réfléchir et discuter d'une question cruciale :
les fournisseurs d'accès peuvent-ils empêcher les citoyens connectés à Internet d'accéder à des sites qui seraient éventuellement offensants ou illicites ?

Des solutions de contrôle existent : les parents peuvent par exemple contrôler l'accès de leurs enfants des contenus qui sont sur Internet avec des logiciels de filtrage installés sur l'ordinateur familial.

Ces solutions ne sont pas applicables au fournisseur d'accès notamment parce que les abonnés sont des personnes responsables, qui ont le droit fondamental d'exercer leur libre arbitre dans le cadre de la libre circulation de l'information.

De fait, le fournisseur d'accès peut se comparer au gestionnaire d'une autoroute : il assure le bon fonctionnement de son infrastructure au plan technique, mais son pouvoir d'intervention sur ses utilisateurs est limité à la fourniture d'un service conforme. Sur l'autoroute par exemple, seuls les représentants des pouvoirs...
publics
(police, gendarmerie, douanes) peuvent surveiller le trafic afin de constater les infractions, demander aux automobilistes leur destination finale, le cas échéant les immobiliser, les verbaliser.

A l'heure le contrôle de l'accès Internet devient un sujet de débat public (l'avant-projet de loi sur la Société de l'Information aborde cette question), l'AFA réaffirme pour sa part son attachement à ce que l'Internet français bénéfice du même régime de libertés publiques que celui qui régit notre vie quotidienne et les moyens de communication en général.

Les principes actuels sont les suivants :

*Tous les citoyens bénéficient en France d'un principe de libre arbitre et de liberté de circulation ;

*Le pouvoir de prédire et de constater les événuels abus de ces libertés appartient au premier chef aux pouvoirs publics. À cette fin, ils assurent eux-mêmes directement la surveillance et le contrôle des citoyens ;

*L'autorité judiciaire applique la loi pour sanctionner les abus qui sont portés à sa connaissance et qu'elle estime avérés.

Dans ce cadre, le rôle des fournisseurs d'accès est de participer au travail de la justice en répondant aux acquisitions judiciaires. Ce travail essentiel, qui permet d'identifier et de poursuivre les responsables d'abus, est accompli par les fournisseurs d'accès membres de l'AFA dans un souci de déontologie collective.

Les fournisseurs d'accès ont un rôle certes important, mais ce n'est pas celui de contrôler ni de limiter de leur propre chef les allées et venues sur Internet de tous les citoyens ni les informations qu'ils échangent. Ce rôle de contrôle appartient aux seuls pouvoirs publics.
I gather that "Bob" is Robert Weissberg of the University of Illinois, and wonder if his comment refers to one of the works in progress he lists on his "expert" page at the Heartland Institute:

Voracious Appetites: Public Opinion and Big Government." An analysis of how American public opinion is manufactured to show a nearly insatiable appetite for greater government spending.

or perhaps:

"The Eunuchs of Analysis." A book-length treatment of why the behavioral revolution has drifted into political irrelevance and unintelligibility.

The descriptions are presumably his own.
Of course, what a respondent knows about a topic, or how she or he understands a question, is of critical importance in the interpretation of public opinion surveys, but Bob's response really doesn't address that issue. He has apparently made up his mind that the nuclear defense ICBMs constitute a "missile-based anti-missile defense system" and therefore the public must believe as he does.

Stronger arguments could be made, e.g., confusion with the Patriot missiles used against Iraqi SCUD missiles during the Gulf War, or simply the fact, shown by numerous experiments, that respondents frequently assume that something exists simply because they are being asked about it. These have, alas, the serious drawback of interfering with ideological preconceptions.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov wrote:
>
> I don't think I care for Bob's tone (whoever Bob is) so I don't think I'll be picking up his book on public opinion anytime soon.
>
> His comment does point to an interesting ambiguity of the term "missile defense system", though. According to a summary from a report sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, the ABM treaty limits "antiballistic missile systems," or systems designed to defend against strategic ballistic missiles. It says, "The ABM Treaty thus enshrined as strategic doctrine the principle of deterrence through threat of retaliation. Since neither side (Soviet Union or the U.S.) was free to deploy unlimited defenses against the strategic ballistic missiles of the other, each nation sought to deter any outright attack by the other through its ability to threaten overwhelming retaliation against an attack with its own nuclear-armed strategic ballistic missiles." So respondents might reasonably interpret "missile defense system" as including the ICBMs, since they were designed to deter attacks, or not, since they were not a missile defense system in the narrower, prohibited sense.
>
> I do wonder how the respondents in the NYTimes survey (or the Pew survey) were interpreting the references to missile defense system in these surveys. From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Wed Jun 20 14:22:48 2001
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Do we really need to put quotes around "expert?" What purpose does that serve other than adding acrimony? A glance at the page shows full professor at University of Illinois and numerous books and articles, including one in POQ.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Wednesday, June 20, 2001 4:49 PM
Subject: Re: FYI: Re: Pew Poll on US Support of MDS & Bush Foreign Policy Approval (NPR) (fwd)

>I gather that "Bob" is Robert Weissberg of the University of Illinois, and wonder if his comment refers to one of the works in progress he lists on his "expert" page at the Heartland Institute:
>
   Voracious Appetites: Public Opinion and Big Government."
   An analysis of how American public opinion is manufactured to show a nearly insatiable appetite for greater government spending.
>
   or perhaps:
>
   "The Eunuchs of Analysis." A book-length treatment of why the behavioral revolution has drifted into political irrelevance and unintelligibility.
>
The descriptions are presumably his own.

>Of course, what a respondent knows about a topic, or how she or he
understands a question, is of critical importance in the interpretation of public opinion surveys, but Bob's response really doesn't address that issue. He has apparently made up his mind that the nuclear defense ICBMs constitute a "missile-based anti-missile defense system" and therefore the public must believe as he does.

Stronger arguments could be made, e.g., confusion with the Patriot missiles used against Iraqi SCUD missiles during the Gulf War, or simply the fact, shown by numerous experiments, that respondents frequently assume that something exists simply because they are being asked about it. These have, alas, the serious drawback of interfering with ideological preconceptions.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov wrote:

I don't think I care for Bob's tone (whoever Bob is) so I don't think I'll be picking up his book on public opinion anytime soon.

His comment does point to an interesting ambiguity of the term "missile defense system", though. According to a summary from a report sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, the ABM treaty limits "antiballistic missile systems," or systems designed to defend against strategic ballistic missiles. It says, "The ABM Treaty thus enshrined as strategic doctrine the principle of deterrence through threat of retaliation. Since neither side (Soviet Union or the U.S.) was free to deploy unlimited defenses against the strategic ballistic missiles of the other, each nation sought to deter any outright attack by the other through its ability to threaten overwhelming retaliation against an attack with its own nuclear-armed strategic ballistic missiles." So respondents might reasonably interpret "missile defense system" as including the ICBMs, since they were designed to deter attacks, or not, since they were not a missile defense system in the narrower, prohibited sense.

I do wonder how the respondents in the NYTimes survey (or the Pew survey) were interpreting the references to missile defense system in these surveys.
Jan, I do think your point is well-taken; however, I do believe that Weissberg's argument is exactly the one you make. Murray Edelman (not "our" Murray, but the "other"), in his just released _Politics of Misinformation_ (Cambridge U Press, 2001), has a chapter on "Public Opinion" that also warrants reading for its pessimistic portrayal. (He was an important scholar of political communication, who would never have been identified with the right-wing.) I'll just quote a bit from the beginning of the chapter. (The beginning echoes what Jim just wrote.)

"The concept of public opinion is central to political discussion, to political action, and to virtually all ideas about the meaning of democracy and the meaning of political oppression and tyranny. Social change varies crucially both with what particular groups believe about public issues and with what the public perceives as change. Yet 'public opinion' is an exceptionally ambiguous and volatile term and idea. And it is readily subject to mistaken beliefs about its current or past content...Because there is no one 'public' but rather many different ones that change constantly, this multiplicity of perceptions of public opinion is inevitable. Nor is there any objective way to ascertain what public opinion is for any group of people or to define it accurately. Social scientists often rely on survey research
to do
so, and journalists conduct and cite polls of opinion. But the conclusions of
surveys and polls depend crucially on what questions are asked and what news events
respondents have in mind when they answer...Clearly, public opinion is a social
construction, not an observable entity. 'Public Opinion' is a construction: of governments, of the media, and of everyday conversation influenced
by governments and the media. It is accepted and treated as though it were an
objective reality to be discovered by polling or otherwise taking account of expressed beliefs and assumed beliefs about public policy. But it reflects and echoes
the claims of officials and of reports in the media respecting developments or
alleged developments in the news. Dramatic news reports and interpretations of
events and nonevents are routinely deployed to evoke concern, anger, relief, and
beliefs in general, and these are then labeled 'public opinion'...Opinions about
public policy do not spring immaculately or automatically into people's minds; they
are always placed there by the interpretations of those who can most consistently get
their claims and manufactured cues publicized widely...Claims about opinion as
well as the publicizing of poll results assert or imply that an 'opinion' is a clear,
unambiguous belief. But it never is. Opinions regarding controversial issues are
always ambiguous..., and they are often inconsistent or mutually contradictory...
(pp. 52-53, 55).

Cheers.

On Wed, 20 Jun 2001, Jan Werner wrote:
> Of course, what a respondent knows about a topic, or how she or he
> understands a question, is of critical importance in the
> interpretation of public opinion surveys, but Bob's response really
> doesn't address that issue. He has apparently made up his mind that
> the nuclear defense ICBMs consitute a "missile-based anti-missile
> defense system" and therefore the public must believe as he does.
> Stronger arguments could be made, e.g., confusion with the Patriot
> missiles used against Iraqi SCUD missiles during the Gulf War, or
> simply the fact, shown by numerous experiments, that respondents
> frequently assume that something exists simply because they are being
> asked about it. These have, alas, the serious drawback of interfering
> with ideological preconceptions.
FSU's Holocaust Institute is this week so I decided to pay Front14 a visit.

What does one say about a site that advertises itself as "Online hate at its best"?
When I looked at sites such as "WhitePower" music, I began to wonder if the entire endeavor was a very sick joke. But unfortunately it is not.

So I will pass this one along as another "resource" to our 37 teachers who instruct from middle school to college in residence this week, so that they will "know the enemy."

Does a Baumhammer get fueled from these sites, and gain the courage to claim innocent victims that he would not gain from his everyday acquaintances (who would mostly shrink in horror from his plans)? Do alienated teenagers find support and "the answers" here that they do not find elsewhere?

Don't know, but at least thanks to Jim to bringing this one to my attention.

Susan
Susan Carol Losh, PhD
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Posters in post offices for the last few months have said the "one in five children" has been sexually solicited on the net. But even a cursory review of the report shows
that that ratio was only for regular users within a specific age group - two important qualifiers lost in the post office poster and similar hype. At least the Reuters story is carefully worded.

- Ellis

> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf
> Of Leo Simonetta
> Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2001 9:01 AM
> To: Aapornet (E-mail)
> Subject: Survey Results: One in five kids solicited for sex on Net
> 
> One in five kids solicited for sex on Net
> By Reuters
> June 19, 2001, 9:30 p.m. PT
> One in five U.S. teenagers who regularly log on to the Internet say
> they have received an unwanted sexual solicitation via the Web,
> according to a survey released Tuesday.
> Nineteen percent of the 1,500 surveyed youths aged 10 to 17 reported
> getting solicited, presumably by adults. Solicitations were defined as
> requests to engage in sexual activities or sexual talk, or to give
> personal sexual information.
> "In terms of risk, girls and older youth (14-17 years) were more
> likely to be solicited. Risk was higher for youth who were troubled.
> It was also higher for those who used the Internet more frequently,
> participated in chat rooms, engaged in risky behavior online, talked
> to strangers online, or used
> the Internet at households other than their own," wrote Kimberly
> Mitchell of
> the Crimes Against Children Research Center at the University of New
> Hampshire, in Durham.
> One quarter of the children who were solicited for sex--some of whom
> were subsequently approached in person or enticed on the telephone or
> by regular mail--reported being extremely upset or afraid.
> Neither parental oversight of children's online activities nor
> filtering or blocking technology had much impact on whether children
> were solicited, the
> study found.
> "Add Internet solicitation to the list of childhood perils about which
> (authorities) should be knowledgeable and able to provide counsel to
> families," said the report, which was published in this week's issue
> of the Journal of the American Medical Association.
> "At the same time, the concerns are not so alarming that they should
> by themselves encourage parents to bar children from accessing the
> Internet," it said.
Despite his first overseas trip as president and the passage of his sweeping measure to cut taxes, President Bush's standing as a leader on both domestic and foreign fronts has diminished considerably, the latest New York Times/CBS News Poll shows.

Far from giving him a political lift, Mr. Bush's European tour, though it
drew largely upbeat news coverage, did not appear to help him in the eyes of the public. More than half of Americans say they are uneasy about Mr. Bush's ability to tackle an international crisis, and more people than not say he is not respected by other world leaders.

In addition, Mr. Bush's personal appeal -- one of his most potent qualities in last year's election -- has dipped to its lowest point since April 2000, after he was lashed by Senator John McCain of Arizona in the early Republican primaries.

And, by widening margins, people say they are less trusting that Mr. Bush will keep his word.

The poll found that a majority of Americans seem disenchanted by what they view as Mr. Bush's inattention to matters they care most about. And there is a substantial gap between his stand and theirs on many of those issues, including the patients' bill of rights, education, energy, the environment, raising the minimum wage, prescription drugs and judicial appointments.

Sooner or later, the sheen fades from new presidents, but this poll was discouraging for Mr. Bush because on nearly every critical measure tested, he has shown no improvement in recent months -- and often has lost ground.

Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which stands at 53 percent, is down seven points from March. His standing is similar to President Bill Clinton's at this point in his tenure. But, unlike Mr. Bush, Mr. Clinton's first months were marked by far more stinging legislative setbacks and political turbulence. Still, as Mr. Clinton showed, Mr. Bush clearly has time to reverse his fortunes.

The nationwide telephone poll of 1,050 adults was conducted June 14-18 during various stages of Mr. Bush's foreign trip. Its margin of sampling error was plus or minus three percentage points.

There are similarities between Mr. Bush's predicament and that of his father. As is the case today, when the elder George Bush was president, Americans said the country was veering dangerously off on the wrong
track -- and there was a widespread feeling that he was not focusing on issues of import to most Americans.

"He scares me and I'm uneasy about his approach to foreign policy," Jim Carabanas, 57, an independent who was a poll respondent, said in a follow-up interview yesterday. Mr. Carabanas, a painting contractor from Austintown, Ohio, added, "It's going to take some time until he gets the experience he needs."

"He's surrounded by advisers, but he has the last say," Mr. Carabanas said. "I'm hopeful that somewhere down the line he will be different. Clinton wasn't perfect either when he started, but he found his way."

Bill Willis, 55, a Republican who manages an automobile dealership in Paxton, Ill., was more satisfied. "So far I'm pleased," Mr. Willis said, "I'm glad I voted for him. I like his character and his honesty. He had a decent track record of bringing about reasonable leadership. He's not one who likes confrontation."

Another Republican, Betty Thomas, 62, a retired stenographer from Buffalo, said, "His personality -- doesn't inspire a lot of confidence."

"He really hasn't taken life too seriously," Ms. Thomas said, "and I don't think he's taken the presidency seriously either. He doesn't seem to have a lot to say that is specific. I don't think he's going to do much for prescription drug plans or helping the elderly. He seems to be most attentive to big business and, in particular, the big oil companies."

Indeed, on energy and the environment, as well as on foreign affairs, Mr. Bush's ratings are well below 50 percent. His handling of foreign policy is approved by 47 percent of the public; his stewardship of the environment is approved by 39 percent -- a substantial decline from a month ago. And his handling of the nation's energy problems is approved by 33 percent.

Respondents were suspicious of the administration's energy priorities because of links between the oil industry and Mr. Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney. Nearly two-thirds of Americans, including a plurality of Republicans, say that Mr. Bush and Mr. Cheney are too beholden to oil companies, and that they are more likely to
formulate policies that favor the industry.

"I'm very concerned about the environment and I think he's favoring energy production over the environment," said Marjorie Green, 54, a Republican who is a retired lawyer in Satellite Beach, Fla. "I think he's very much influenced by big oil."

A majority of respondents are skeptical that there actually is an energy shortage. More than 6 of 10 said Americans were being told there was a problem to give oil companies an excuse to charge more money.

By nearly two to one, respondents said they favored protecting the environment over producing energy. They said that Mr. Bush takes the opposite view, making energy production his priority.

Seventy-two percent of those surveyed said it was necessary to take immediate steps to counter the effects of global warming. While the administration has rejected the Kyoto accord on global warming, more than half the public said that the United States should abide by the agreement, even if it meant that China and India would not have to follow the same standards.

There was a wide perception that the Bush administration favors the rich over the middle class and poor, with 57 percent saying the administration's policies favor the rich, 8 percent saying they favor the middle class, 2 percent saying they favor the poor, and 27 percent saying the administration equally addresses the interests of all groups.

Mr. Bush is also seen as less caring about the average person than he was three months ago. And his difficulties with black Americans -- who voted overwhelmingly for Al Gore, Mr. Bush's Democratic rival -- seemed to have deepened. Eighteen percent of respondents said Mr. Bush cares a lot about the needs and problems of black people, down from 30 percent three months ago when Mr. Bush was making high-profile overtures to African-Americans.

The commanding hold Mr. Bush once had on the public's trust has diminished. Forty-nine percent say Mr. Bush can be trusted to keep his word; 40 percent
say he cannot. When he took office nearly six months ago, 56 percent said Mr. Bush could be trusted to keep his word, and 33 percent said he could not.

More people are questioning Mr. Bush's leadership skills. Fifty-four percent of respondents say Mr. Bush has strong qualities of leadership, down from 59 percent in February and from 68 percent in October 1999, when he was governor of Texas.

Apart from the discomfort about Mr. Bush himself, the public's anxiety about the future of Social Security is as high now as at any time in the 10 previous readings taken over the last 20 years by the Times and CBS News. The respondents said Mr. Bush's tax cut of $1.35 trillion over 10 years would not have much effect on the economy -- and that the money could have been put to better use in programs like Social Security and Medicare. (The tax cut has been approved, but people have yet to receive their rebate checks.)

"He needs to be more specific on how he intends to protect Social Security and Medicare," said Gary Levi, 60 a truck driver from Denver who is an independent. "I haven't heard enough about his plan."

The president's difficulties may have tarnished how people perceive Republicans. Forty-six percent hold a favorable view of the party, which is similar to the party's standing in the wake of the contentious impeachment hearings. By contrast, 56 percent hold a favorable view of the Democratic Party. Three months ago, 54 percent viewed the Republican Party favorably.

On a host of issues, in fact, the respondents' views are closer to those espoused by Democrats than those of Mr. Bush and other Republicans. Three-quarters of those surveyed want Medicare to include provisions for prescription drugs, even if that means an increase in premiums for Medicare patients. Nearly two-thirds said the program should be available to all Medicare recipients, not just those with low incomes.

Seven in 10 respondents favor a patients' bill of rights, even if it means
higher costs for participating in health care plans. More than 5 in 10 favor a law guaranteeing people the right to sue their health plan for denying coverage. That figure drops to 5 in 10 when respondents are asked to consider that the right to sue might result in increased costs.

More than half the public favors raising the minimum wage to $6.65 an hour over three years from the current $5.15. Another 3 in 10 favor raising the minimum wage to $6.15 instead. Only 1 in 10 favors keeping the minimum wage at its current level.

Although Americans favor mandatory testing of students in public schools, they oppose it if the scores are used to decide how federal money for education is allocated. Both the House and Senate have passed education bills requiring testing.

Given the closely divided Congress, and the recent change of the Senate to Democratic hands after the defection of James M. Jeffords of Vermont from the Republican Party, a majority of Americans are bracing for more partisan bickering. Even so, they say they expect Mr. Bush and Democrats to seek compromises. Whatever the outcome, the public says Mr. Bush has more influence over the nation's direction than the Democrats in Congress.

Despite the publicity about Mr. Bush sometimes working banker's hours, 53 percent of respondents say he is working hard enough, while 38 percent said he should be working harder.

Asked the same question about President Ronald Reagan in early 1982, 58 percent said he was working hard enough and 35 percent said he should be working harder.

As often happens with vice presidents, Mr. Cheney, who had an unusually high profile at the start of the administration, seems to have receded. Fifty-nine percent have no opinion of Mr. Cheney, compared with 49 percent in a CBS poll two months ago, while 27 percent view him favorably, and 14 percent view him unfavorably.
While Mr. Bush has plenty of time to win over the public, some people do not want to give him the benefit of the doubt. "I didn't trust him when he was governor of Texas," said Shirley Autrey, 55, an independent who is a retired mill worker from Rome, N.Y. "I don't think he wanted to be president in the first place. I think he got roped into it."

Joyce Bruegteman, 29, a Republican who is an administrative assistant in Sparta, Wis., was more encouraging. "I feel he is a Christian man struggling to lead his country the best way he can with his Christianity. I'm behind him for that. I know it can't be easy."

June 21, 2001

HOW THE POLL WAS CONDUCTED

The latest New York Times/CBS News Poll is based on telephone interviews conducted June 14 through June 18 with 1,050 adults throughout the United States.

The sample of telephone exchanges called was randomly selected by a computer from a complete list of more than 42,000 active residential exchanges across the country.

Within each exchange, random digits were added to form a complete telephone number, thus permitting access to both listed and unlisted numbers. Within each household, one adult was designated by a random procedure to be the respondent for the survey.

The results have been weighted to take account of household size and number of telephone lines into the residence and to adjust for variations in the sample relating to geographic region, sex, race, age, marital status and education.

In theory, in 19 cases out of 20, the results based on such samples will differ by no more than three percentage points in either direction from what would have been obtained by seeking out all American adults.

For smaller subgroups the margin of sampling error is larger.

In addition to sampling error, the practical difficulties of conducting any survey of public opinion may introduce other sources of error into the poll. Variations in the wording and order of questions, for example, may lead to somewhat different results.
A technical note unrelated to the contents of this survey:

The NYT print edition carries this article as the front page lead, using one of the best graphical representation of the poll results I have seen. The graphs use 10x10 squares, providing 100 cells that are color coded using contrasting, but relatively subdued, colors to represent the responses.

I personally feel that this provides more immediate visual information with far greater precision than the typical bar or pie charts.

My praise must be tempered somewhat by the fact that last two charts use a somewhat inconsistent assignment of color and visual groupings compared with the first five, thus diluting the intuitive graphical impact.

Unfortunately, the online article omits the graphs. If you do not have access to a copy of the print edition, the visuals can be seen in miniature by viewing the front page image.

Jan Werner
June 21, 2001

BUSH LOSES FAVOR, POLL SAYS, DESPITE TAX CUT AND TRIP

By RICHARD L. BERKE and JANET ELDER

Despite his first overseas trip as president and the passage of his sweeping measure to cut taxes, President Bush's standing as a leader on both domestic and foreign fronts has diminished considerably, the latest New York Times/CBS News Poll shows.

Far from giving him a political lift, Mr. Bush's European tour, though it drew largely upbeat news coverage, did not appear to help him in the eyes of the public. More than half of Americans say they are uneasy about Mr. Bush's ability to tackle an international crisis, and more people than not say he is not respected by other world leaders.

In addition, Mr. Bush's personal appeal -- one of his most potent qualities in last year's election -- has dipped to its lowest point since April 2000, after he was lashed by Senator John McCain of Arizona in the early Republican primaries.

And, by widening margins, people say they are less trusting that Mr. Bush will keep his word.

The poll found that a majority of Americans seem disenchanted by what they view as Mr. Bush's inattention to matters they care most about. And there is a substantial gap between his stand and theirs on many of those issues, including the patients' bill of rights, education, energy, the environment, raising the minimum wage, prescription drugs and judicial appointments.

Sooner or later, the sheen fades from new presidents, but this poll was discouraging for Mr. Bush because on nearly every critical measure tested, he has shown no improvement in recent months -- and often has lost ground.

Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which stands at 53 percent, is down seven points from March. His standing is similar to President Bill Clinton's at this point in his tenure. But, unlike Mr. Bush, Mr. Clinton's first months were marked by far more stinging legislative setbacks and political turbulence. Still, as Mr. Clinton showed, Mr. Bush clearly has time to reverse his fortunes.

The nationwide telephone poll of 1,050 adults was conducted June 14-18 during various stages of Mr. Bush's foreign trip. Its margin of sampling error was plus or minus three percentage points.
There are similarities between Mr. Bush's predicament and that of his father. As is the case today, when the elder George Bush was president, Americans said the country was veering dangerously off on the wrong track -- and there was a widespread feeling that he was not focusing on issues of import to most Americans.

"He scares me and I'm uneasy about his approach to foreign policy," Jim Carabanas, 57, an independent who was a poll respondent, said in a follow-up interview yesterday. Mr. Carabanas, a painting contractor from Austintown, Ohio, added, "It's going to take some time until he gets the experience he needs."

"He's surrounded by advisers, but he has the last say," Mr. Carabanas said. "I'm hopeful that somewhere down the line he will be different. Clinton wasn't perfect either when he started, but he found his way."

Bill Willis, 55, a Republican who manages an automobile dealership in Paxton, Ill., was more satisfied. "So far I'm pleased," Mr. Willis said, "I'm glad I voted for him. I like his character and his honesty. He had a decent track record of bringing about reasonable leadership. He's not one who likes confrontation."

Another Republican, Betty Thomas, 62, a retired stenographer from Buffalo, said, "His personality -- doesn't inspire a lot of confidence."

"He really hasn't taken life too seriously," Ms. Thomas said, "and I don't think he's taken the presidency seriously either. He doesn't seem to have a lot to say that is specific. I don't think he's going to do much for prescription drug plans or helping the elderly. He seems to be most attentive to big business and, in particular, the big oil companies."

Indeed, on energy and the environment, as well as on foreign affairs, Mr. Bush's ratings are well below 50 percent. His handling of foreign policy is approved by 47 percent of the public; his stewardship of the environment is approved by 39 percent -- a substantial decline from a month ago. And his handling of the nation's energy problems is approved by 33 percent.

Respondents were suspicious of the administration's energy priorities because of links between the oil industry and Mr. Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney. Nearly two-thirds of Americans, including a plurality of Republicans, say that Mr. Bush and Mr. Cheney are too beholden to oil companies, and that they are more likely to formulate policies that favor the industry.

"I'm very concerned about the environment and I think he's favoring energy production over the environment," said Marjorie Green, 54, a Republican who is a retired lawyer in Satellite Beach, Fla. "I think he's very much influenced by big oil."

A majority of respondents are skeptical that there actually is an energy shortage. More than 6 of 10 said Americans were being told there was a problem to give oil companies an excuse to charge more money.
By nearly two to one, respondents said they favored protecting the environment over producing energy. They said that Mr. Bush takes the opposite view, making energy production his priority.

Seventy-two percent of those surveyed said it was necessary to take immediate steps to counter the effects of global warming. While the administration has rejected the Kyoto accord on global warming, more than half the public said that the United States should abide by the agreement, even if it meant that China and India would not have to follow the same standards.

There was a wide perception that the Bush administration favors the rich over the middle class and poor, with 57 percent saying the administration's policies favor the rich, 8 percent saying they favor the middle class, 2 percent saying they favor the poor, and 27 percent saying the administration equally addresses the interests of all groups.

Mr. Bush is also seen as less caring about the average person than he was three months ago. And his difficulties with black Americans -- who voted overwhelmingly for Al Gore, Mr. Bush's Democratic rival -- seemed to have deepened. Eighteen percent of respondents said Mr. Bush cares a lot about the needs and problems of black people, down from 30 percent three months ago when Mr. Bush was making high-profile overtures to African-Americans.

The commanding hold Mr. Bush once had on the public's trust has diminished. Forty-nine percent say Mr. Bush can be trusted to keep his word; 40 percent say he cannot. When he took office nearly six months ago, 56 percent said Mr. Bush could be trusted to keep his word, and 33 percent said he could not.

More people are questioning Mr. Bush's leadership skills. Fifty-four percent of respondents say Mr. Bush has strong qualities of leadership, down from 59 percent in February and from 68 percent in October 1999, when he was governor of Texas.

Apart from the discomfort about Mr. Bush himself, the public's anxiety about the future of Social Security is as high now as at any time in the 10 previous readings taken over the last 20 years by the Times and CBS News. The respondents said Mr. Bush's tax cut of $1.35 trillion over 10 years would not have much effect on the economy -- and that the money could have been put to better use in programs like Social Security and Medicare. (The tax cut has been approved, but people have yet to receive their rebate checks.)

"He needs to be more specific on how he intends to protect Social Security and Medicare," said Gary Levi, 60 a truck driver from Denver who is an independent. "I haven't heard enough about his plan."

The president's difficulties may have tarnished how people perceive Republicans. Forty-six percent hold a favorable view of the party, which is similar to the party's standing in the wake of the contentious impeachment hearings. By contrast, 56 percent hold a favorable view of the Democratic Party. Three months ago, 54 percent viewed the Republican Party favorably.
> On a host of issues, in fact, the respondents' views are closer to
> those espoused by Democrats than those of Mr. Bush and other
> Republicans. Three-quarters of those surveyed want Medicare to
> include provisions for prescription drugs, even if that means an
> increase in premiums for Medicare patients. Nearly two-thirds said
> the program should be available to all Medicare recipients, not just
> those with low incomes.
>
> Seven in 10 respondents favor a patients' bill of rights, even if it
> means higher costs for participating in health care plans. More than 5
> in 10 favor a law guaranteeing people the right to sue their health
> plan for denying coverage. That figure drops to 5 in 10 when
> respondents are asked to consider that the right to sue might result
> in increased costs.
>
> More than half the public favors raising the minimum wage to $6.65 an
> hour over three years from the current $5.15. Another 3 in 10 favor
> raising the minimum wage to $6.15 instead. Only 1 in 10 favors keeping
> the minimum wage at its current level.
>
> Although Americans favor mandatory testing of students in public
> schools, they oppose it if the scores are used to decide how federal
> money for education is allocated. Both the House and Senate have
> passed education bills requiring testing.
>
> Given the closely divided Congress, and the recent change of the
> Senate to Democratic hands after the defection of James M. Jeffords
> of Vermont from the Republican Party, a majority of Americans are
> bracing for more partisan bickering. Even so, they say they expect
> Mr. Bush and Democrats to seek compromises. Whatever the outcome, the
> public says Mr. Bush has more influence over the nation's direction
> than the Democrats in Congress.
>
> Despite the publicity about Mr. Bush sometimes working banker's
> hours, 53 percent of respondents say he is working hard enough, while
> 38 percent said he should be working harder.
>
> Asked the same question about President Ronald Reagan in early 1982,
> 58 percent said he was working hard enough and 35 percent said he
> should be working harder.
>
> As often happens with vice presidents, Mr. Cheney, who had an
> unusually high profile at the start of the administration, seems to
> have receded. Fifty-nine percent have no opinion of Mr. Cheney,
> compared with 49 percent in a CBS poll two months ago, while 27
> percent view him favorably, and 14 percent view him unfavorably.
>
> While Mr. Bush has plenty of time to win over the public, some people
> do not want to give him the benefit of the doubt. "I didn't trust him
> when he was governor of Texas," said Shirley Autrey, 55, an
> independent who is a retired mill worker from Rome, N.Y. "I don't
> think he wanted to be president in the first place. I think he got
> roped into it."
>
> Joyce Bruegteman, 29, a Republican who is an administrative assistant
> in Sparta, Wis., was more encouraging. "I feel he is a Christian man
> struggling to lead his country the best way he can with his
Folks,

Shortly after (11 seconds) posting today's New York Times lead story on some poll about a guy named Bush, I received a message from someone whose name I shall not release (initials KAF) pointing out (in a graciously loving way, under the circumstances, believe me) that I had erred in calling said poll "NYT Poll" in my header, even though the first paragraph of the Times story clearly states that it is "the latest New York Times/ CBS News Poll"—CBS, of course, being the single greatest news gathering operation ever to grace our planet (though tied for first with the New York Times, certainly).

Before noticing KAF's message, as my luck would have it, I made this same mistake a second time, in my posting of "How the Poll Was Conducted," a brief report which begins with the words "The latest New York Times/CBS News
Poll..., "--in complete ignorance that I had already been notified of my first most terrible mistake by KAF.

What have I learned from this most unfortunate incident? That I will never, ever again compose any posting to AAPORNET before 7 am, local time, and not before I am well into my second mug of coffee.

That pledge made to you all, let me here publicly apologize to KAF personally, and to beg KAF's forgiveness (note how deftly I avoid revealing KAF's gender--to protect the confidentiality of h** response, in our venerable AAPOR tradition). I hereby promise never, ever again to award the New York Times with sole credit for what we all know has long been a joint effort with CBS News.

I also beg you all, on my knees, not to drag me up on some AAPOR poll reporting standards violation--at least not this very morning, while the full-color photo (immediately below the CBS News/NYT Poll lead story, on the front page of the National print edition of the Times, which lands in our driveway every morning--daily and Sunday--that it doesn't land on our roof) of Lori Berenson, age 31, and headed off to 20 years in a Peruvian prison, still sits so vividly in my mind.

I've traveled extensively throughout Peru, and I've read the AAPOR standards more than once--please, please don't drag me through all this again, during my summer vacation yet!

At your mercy, I remain, groveling..... -- Jim

**Confidential** (Please!) PS to KAF: I hope this doesn't mean that you people now intend to go with the news story on that unfortunate incident in Fort Lauderdale. I've got a lot more documentation on Buck Hill Falls than you might ever imagine, I'm just reminding you--something to keep in mind.
Dr. Beniger:
Many years ago I was advised never to post anything after 1 am or before 6 am (or that cup of coffee).
Whenever I've broken that rule I've regretted it. It's just too easy to hit that 'send' button I guess! Leora Lawton, Ph.D. Director of Research Informative, Inc.
2000 Sierra Point Parkway, Suite 310
Brisbane, CA 94005
v: 650 534-1080; f: 650 534-1020
m: 650 303-4072
www.informative.com

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2001 8:44 AM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Apologies--Mea Culpa

Folks,

Shortly after (11 seconds) posting today's New York Times lead story on some poll about a guy named Bush, I received a message from someone whose name I shall not release (initials KAF) pointing out (in a graciously loving way, under the circumstances, believe me) that I had erred in calling said poll "NYT Poll"
in my header, even though the first paragraph of the Times story clearly states that it is "the latest New York Times/ CBS News Poll"--CBS, of course, being the single greatest news gathering operation ever to grace our planet (though tied for first with the New York Times, certainly).

Before noticing KAF's message, as my luck would have it, I made this same mistake a second time, in my posting of "How the Poll Was Conducted," a brief report which begins with the words "The latest New York Times/CBS News Poll...,"--in complete ignorance that I had already been notified of my first most terrible mistake by KAF.

What have I learned from this most unfortunate incident? That I will never, ever again compose any posting to AAPORNET before 7 am, local time, and not before I am well into my second mug of coffee.

That pledge made to you all, let me here publicly apologize to KAF personally, and to beg KAF's forgiveness (note how deftly I avoid revealing KAF's gender--to protect the confidentiality of h** response, in our venerable AAPOR tradition). I hereby promise never, ever again to award the New York Times with sole credit for what we all know has long been a joint effort with CBS News.

I also beg you all, on my knees, not to drag me up on some AAPOR poll reporting standards violation--at least not this very morning, while the full-color photo (immediately below the CBS News/NYT Poll lead story, on the front page of the National print edition of the Times, which lands in our driveway every morning--daily and Sunday--that it doesn't land on our roof) of Lori Berenson, age 31, and headed off to 20 years in a Peruvian prison, still sits so vividly in my mind.

I've traveled extensively throughout Peru, and I've read the AAPOR standards more than once--please, please don't drag me through all this again, during my summer vacation yet!
At your mercy, I remain, groveling.....

-- Jim

**Confidential** (Please!) PS to KAF: I hope this doesn't mean that you people now intend to go with the news story on that unfortunate incident in Fort Lauderdale. I've got a lot more documentation on Buck Hill Falls than you might ever imagine, I'm just reminding you--something to keep in mind.
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As I am interested in more effective means of graphically presenting data, I was also interested in the front page graphs to which Jan Werner referred. I think this is an appropriate topic for AAPORNet.

He noted that "My praise must be tempered somewhat by the fact that last two charts use a somewhat inconsistent assignment of color and visual groupings compared with the first five, thus diluting the intuitive graphical impact."

I would apply this criticism more generally to these graphs. Has anybody been able to discern, from the graphs themselves, the rule for coloring a square one or another
color or none? I thought at first that the rule was color from the top left until reaching the bottom, then begin again at the top, continuing until the number of colored squares corresponds to the percentages; then begin at the top of the next available column with the other color.

But that is not the rule. See "the environment," for example. And colors can occupy the same columns. See "more important."

I am sure that the colors are not being applied arbitrarily, but I question whether the graphs do give the correct visual impression. A criterion for doing so would seem to be that people can figure out why a square is colored one way or another. I, at least, cannot. But with a pie chart, the concept of area is readily grasped.

I also question whether it is useful to show the grid lines. The human mind tends to attach meaning to such lines. There is meaning in the squares but only as a counting mechanism, a function which the squares could serve while invisible.

Also, I am a bit concerned about how DK, NA, and NR are being shown in these graphs. I presume they are the white boxes, but what is the rule for displaying them? Some graphs show rather large proportions of such responses, such as "foreign policy." Note that the white boxes tend towards the bottom and a bit towards the right -- but not always. What effect does this have on perception?

I know there is a history behind the development of graphs such as these, with people striving to overcome the known limitations of pie charts and bar graphs. But the only thing that I find attractive about these graphs is the subtle color -- much better than the glaring ones we usually use in pie charts.

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

Please note change of e-mail address:

Richard C. ROCKWELL
Executive Director, The Roper Center & Institute for Social Inquiry
Professor of Sociology
341 Mansfield Road, U-164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA
V +1 860 486-4440
It looks like an algorithm was written to simultaneously maximize the approximation to squareness or rectangularity of all three positions (Approve, Disapprove, No Opinion) -- even if it means crossing lines that seem like they shouldn't be crossed.

I agree that this is somewhat confusing. But I also agree that they are stunning in visual impact and clarity of a sort. They convey relative quantification and partitioning so effectively. One sees the totality immediately, something that is difficult with bar charts, at least. And they are much more discrete than pie charts. A hallmark of the digital age. I bet they will become a standard.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard C. Rockwell <richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Thursday, June 21, 2001 4:05 PM
Subject: Graphs in today's NYT

>As I am interested in more effective means of graphically presenting
data, I was also interested in the front page graphs to which Jan Werner referred. I think this is an appropriate topic for AAPORNet.

He noted that "My praise must be tempered somewhat by the fact that last two charts use a somewhat inconsistant assignment of color and visual groupings compared with the first five, thus diluting the intuitive graphical impact."

I would apply this criticism more generally to these graphs. Has anybody been able to discern, from the graphs themselves, the rule for coloring a square one or another color or none? I thought at first that the rule was color from the top left until reaching the bottom, then begin again at the top, continuing until the number of colored squares corresponds to the percentages; then begin at the top of the next available column with the other color.

But that is not the rule. See "the environment," for example. And colors can occupy the same columns. See "more important."

I am sure that the colors are not being applied arbitrarily, but I question whether the graphs do give the correct visual impression. A criterion for doing so would seem to be that people can figure out why a square is colored one way or another. I, at least, cannot. But with a pie chart, the concept of area is readily grasped.

I also question whether it is useful to show the grid lines. The human mind tends to attach meaning to such lines. There is meaning in the squares but only as a counting mechanism, a function which the squares could serve while invisible.

Also, I am a bit concerned about how DK, NA, and NR are being shown in these graphs. I presume they are the white boxes, but what is the rule for displaying them? Some graphs show rather large proportions of such responses, such as "foreign policy." Note that the white boxes tend towards the bottom and a bit towards the right -- but not always. What effect does this have on perception?

I know there is a history behind the development of graphs such as these, with people striving to overcome the known limitations of pie charts and bar graphs. But the only thing that I find attractive about these graphs is the subtle color -- much better than the glaring ones we usually use in pie charts.

Please note change of e-mail address:

Richard C. ROCKWELL
Executive Director, The Roper Center & Institute for Social Inquiry
Professor of Sociology
341 Mansfield Road, U-164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA
V +1 860 486-4440
F +1 860 486-6308
richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu
I don't want to start an argument that gets more attention than it deserves, but I find myself is strong disagreement with your opinions re: (1) "pollsters (who) generally know almost zero about anything outside polling...", and (2) "..."courses on 'methodology' with scant attention to substance...". The first point I find to be non-factual. The second I find to be the primary strength of empirical social science research.

I am a pollster, broadly defined, and number many pollsters among my friends, acquaintances, and colleagues. In general I find pollsters to be: (1) the most broadly educated people I know, from a wide variety of disciplines, and tending toward multidisciplinary approaches to most problems; (2) quick to absorb complex material, because they live lifetimes being forced to absorb diverse content in short periods of time; (3) in possession of very broad knowledge of information sources (human, print, and electronic) because they are called upon more often than other professionals to
research topics of interest to clients and publics; and (4) perhaps the people best equipped to evaluate the ability of a four-item survey to do justice to a very complex topic -- because they are so often attacked for having done so. In general, if I had to find someone who could help me deal quickly and effectively with a complicated problem on a very small budget -- give me a pollster every time. A university professor is going to kill my project with minutia masquerading as meaning. Oops, my bias is showing.

On the issue of graduate school training, my own training and that of most pollsters I know was unusually broad, but I am not certain that is the rule. Still, I'll side with Hubert Blalock (See the Introduction to Applied Multivariate Analysis and Experimental Designs, 1975) and opine that graduate students in the social sciences should study ONLY methods. The issues of measurement and design are the difficult part of science and graduate students tend to have the time and patience to master them. After grad school there is little time for serious training in fundamentals. I go further than Blalock. There is no content area in social sciences today that cannot be fully mastered in six months. There is little if any content that cannot be meaningfully absorbed in six weeks. And there are darn few content areas that cannot be satisfactorily understood in six days. Moreover, the business of business (or administration, communications, education, etc.), is such that you are permitted to take the time to learn content. Why waste a student's time on such pursuits? The people who come out of universities with a very solid background in research design, measurement skills, and analytical systems/techniques are more valuable in the short run (and the long, I think), than those who have their social science theory down pat.

I realize that last point was not your major emphasis, but I often take the time to point out this viewpoint when someone seems to be denigrating comprehensive training in methods.

As for facts in polling, you can use them as you wish. The answer to the question
"Should we have an MDS?" is a good, solid, meaningful set of data. The answer to the question "If you knew that the US does presently enjoy a missile-based anti-missile defense system -- it's called ICBM's and it is part of the MAD system--if they attack us, we nuke them. Bush wants a second form of anti-missile defense, one that would destroy incoming missiles before they caused damage, would you support Bush's MDS program?-- can also produce a good, solid, meaningful dataset. It would answer a DIFFERENT question and, I assume, would be applied to different form of analysis.

I have found myself in serious disagreement with the interpretation of my polling findings by the popular press. I have found, however, that establishing a relationship with reporters tends to be the best way to handle that issue. The Fourth Estate rules.

Thank you for sharing your opinion, and for reading mine.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Alice Robbin
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2001 6:56 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: FYI: Re: Pew Poll on US Support of MDS & Bush Foreign Policy Approval (NPR) (fwd)

Dear Alice:

I can't resist putting in my 2 cents into this discussion.

First point: Pollsters generally know almost zero about anything outside polling techniques. Just look at the technical education one receives in graduate school--endless courses on "methodology" with scant attention to substance. The upshot, then, is that questions are written by people unfamiliar with the topic at hand.

Second point: The US does presently enjoy a missile-based anti-missile defense system. Its called ICBM's and it is part of the MAD system--if they attack us, we nuke them. Bush wants a second form of anti-missile defense, one that would
destroy incoming missiles before they caused damage. That the ICBM system has been in-place for at least four decades helps explain public beliefs in its existence.

Perhaps those who write questions should think first.

This point is examined at length in my public opinion book.

Best,
Bob
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called upon more often than other professionals to research topics of interest
to clients and publics; and (4) perhaps the people best equipped to evaluate the
ability of a four-item survey to do justice to a very complex topic -- because
they are so often attacked for having done so.&nbsp; In general, if I had to
find someone who could help me deal quickly and effectively with a complicated
problem on a very small budget --&nbsp; give me a pollster every time.&nbsp; A
university professor is going to kill my project with minutia masquerading as meaning.&nbsp; Oops, my bias is showing.</DIV> <DIV><FONT color=#0000ff face=Arial size=2><SPAN class=610153501-21062001></SPAN></FONT><BR>On the issue of graduate school training, my own training and that of most pollsters I know was unusually broad, but I am not certain that is the rule.&nbsp; Still, I'll side with Hubert Blalock (See the Introduction to Applied Multivariate Analysis and Experimental Designs, 1975) and opine that graduate students in the social sciences should study ONLY methods.&nbsp; The issues of measurement and design are the difficult part of science and graduate students tend to have the time and patience to master them.&nbsp; After grad school there is little time for serious training in fundamentals.&nbsp; I go further than Blalock.&nbsp; There is no content area in social sciences today that cannot be fully mastered in six months.&nbsp; There is little if any content that cannot be meaningfully absorbed in six weeks.&nbsp; And there are darn few content areas that cannot be satisfactorily understood in six days.&nbsp; Moreover, the business of business (or administration, communications, education, etc.), is such that you are permitted to take the time to learn content.&nbsp; Why waste a student's time on such pursuits?&nbsp; The people who come out of universities with a very solid background in research design, measurement skills, and analytical systems/techniques are more valuable in the short run (and the long, I think), than those who have their social science theory down pat.</DIV> <DIV><FONT color=#0000ff face=Arial size=2><SPAN class=610153501-21062001></SPAN></FONT><BR>I realize that last point was not your major emphasis, but I often take the time to point out this viewpoint when someone seems to be denigrating comprehensive training in methods. </DIV> <DIV><FONT color=#0000ff face=Arial size=2><SPAN class=610153501-21062001></SPAN></FONT><BR>As for facts in polling, you can use them as you wish.&nbsp; The answer to the
"Should we have an MDS?" is a good, solid, meaningful set of data. The answer to the question "If you knew that the US does <I>presently </I>enjoy a missile-based anti-missile defense system --&nbsp;it's called ICBM's and it is part of the MAD system--if they attack us, we nuke them. Bush wants a <I>second </I>form of anti-missile defense, one that would destroy incoming missiles before they caused damage, would you support Bush's MDS program?-- can also produce a good, solid, meaningful dataset. It would answer a DIFFERENT question and, I assume, would be applied to different form of analysis.

I have found myself in serious disagreement with the interpretation of my polling findings by the popular press. I have found, however, that establishing a relationship with reporters tends to be the best way to handle that issue. The Fourth Estate rules.

Thank you for sharing your opinion, and for reading mine.

Dear Alice:

I can't resist putting in my 2 cents into this discussion. First point: Pollisters generally know almost zero about anything outside polling techniques. Just look at the technical education one receives in graduate school--endless courses on "methodology" with scant attention to substance. The upshot, then, is that questions are written by people unfamiliar with the topic at hand.

Second point: The US does <I>presently </I>enjoy a missile-based anti-missile defense system. Its called ICBM's and it is part of the MAD system--if they attack us, we nuke them. Bush wants a <I>second </I>form of anti-missile defense, one that would destroy incoming missiles before they caused damage. That the ICBM system has been in-place for at least four decades helps explain public beliefs in its existence.

Perhaps those who write questions should think first. This point is examined at length in my public opinion book.
I feel compelled to make a comment regarding the statement that the U.S. already has a missile defense system. ICBMs are no more a missile defense system than a handgun is a bullet defense system. Rather, the MAD strategy is based on the idea of offensive reaction to an attack by a foreign power; again, to extend the analogy, it is the equivalent of two or more individuals holding guns on each other, with each having the capacity to shoot back if one or more shoots first.

I mention this not as a support for a missile defense system, but rather to note that SDI (in whatever form one chooses) and MAD are based upon two different strategies. Equating the two, especially for the American public, creates a false impression, and makes it virtually impossible to explain how SDI may disrupt the MAD strategy.
Frank Rusciano

Second point: The US does presently enjoy a missile-based anti-missile defense system. Its called ICBM's and it is part of the MAD system--if they attack us, we nuke them. Bush wants a second form of anti-missile defense, one that would destroy incoming missiles before they caused damage. That the ICBM system has been in-place for at least four decades helps explain public beliefs in its existence.

Perhaps those who write questions should think first.

This point is examined at length in my public opinion book.

Best,

Bob

--Boundary_(ID_5X7i43YCukFRyrtBpJkTg)
anti-missile defense, one that would destroy incoming missiles before they caused damage. That the ICBM system has been in-place for at least four decades helps explain public beliefs in its existence. Perhaps those who write questions should think first. This point is examined at length in my public opinion book. Best, Bob

--Boundary_ID_5X7i43YCulKFryrtBpJkTg--

--Boundary_ID_5X7i43YCulKFryrtBpJkTg--
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Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5M3CUJ27360 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Jun 2001
20:12:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtppsv0.isis.unc.edu (smtppsv0.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id UAA22465 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Jun 2001 20:12:31 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from login4.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.101])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id XAA24894;
    Thu, 21 Jun 2001 23:12:29 -0400 (EDT)
Received: (from pmeyer@localhost)
    by login4.isis.unc.edu (AIX4.3/8.9.3/8.9.3) id XAA51670;
    Thu, 21 Jun 2001 23:12:29 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Thu, 21 Jun 2001 23:12:29 -0400 (EDT)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
    X-Sender: pmeyer@login4.isis.unc.edu
    To: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
    cc: aapornet@usc.edu
    Subject: Grid v. pie
In-Reply-To: <3B32131F.AD60F3F4@jwdp.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0106212259350.50212-100000@login4.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I like the grid, but I'm not sure why. One obvious advantage is that you can count the little squares to verify that the graphic fits the published numbers. I actually did that, whereas I have never whipped out a protractor to check the proportions in a NY Times pie chart. Both have the advantage (over a bar chart) of showing the whole sample within the boundaries of the picture. And the grid probably makes it easier to tell the difference between, say, 46 and 44. If there is an algorithm for deciding which squares to shade, I'd like to know what it is.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
>From rmaullin@fmma.org Thu Jun 21 20:12:53 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5M3CqJ27366 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Jun 2001
20:12:53 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from webserver.fmma.com (mail.fmma.org [4.3.157.35])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id UAA22591 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Jun 2001 20:12:51 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by WEBSERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <N2PH8D40>; Thu, 21 Jun 2001 20:09:19 -0700
Message-ID: <F0D37B169259D311A1B40060082080FE25411C@WEBSERVER>
From: Richard <rmaullin@fmma.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Thu, 21 Jun 2001 20:09:12 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Dannenmiller gets my vote.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jim Dannemiller [mailto:JDannemiller@smshawaii.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2001 2:08 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'

I don't want to start an argument that gets more attention than it deserves, but I find myself is strong disagreement with your opinions re: (1) "pollsters (who) generally know almost zero about anything outside polling...", and (2) "..."courses on 'methodology' with scant attention to substance...". The first point I find to be non-factual. The second I find to be the primary strength of empirical social science research.

I am a pollster, broadly defined, and number many pollsters among my friends, acquaintances, and colleagues. In general I find pollsters to be: (1) the most broadly educated people I know, from a wide variety of disciplines, and tending toward multidisciplinary approaches to most problems; (2) quick to absorb complex material, because they live lifetimes being forced to absorb diverse content in short periods of time; (3) in possession of very broad knowledge of
information sources (human, print, and electronic) because they are called upon more often than other professionals to research topics of interest to clients and publics; and (4) perhaps the people best equipped to evaluate the ability of a four-item survey to do justice to a very complex topic -- because they are so often attacked for having done so. In general, if I had to find someone who could help me deal quickly and effectively with a complicated problem on a very small budget -- give me a pollster every time. A university professor is going to kill my project with minutia masquerading as meaning. Oops, my bias is showing.

On the issue of graduate school training, my own training and that of most pollsters I know was unusually broad, but I am not certain that is the rule. Still, I'll side with Hubert Blalock (See the Introduction to Applied Multivariate Analysis and Experimental Designs, 1975) and opine that graduate students in the social sciences should study ONLY methods. The issues of measurement and design are the difficult part of science and graduate students tend to have the time and patience to master them. After grad school there is little time for serious training in fundamentals. I go further than Blalock. There is no content area in social sciences today that cannot be fully mastered in six months. There is little if any content that cannot be meaningfully absorbed in six weeks. And there are darn few content areas that cannot be satisfactorily understood in six days. Moreover, the business of business (or administration, communications, education, etc.), is such that you are permitted to take the time to learn content. Why waste a student's time on such pursuits? The people who come out of universities with a very solid background in research design, measurement skills, and analytical systems/techniques are more valuable in the short run (and the long, I think), than those who have their social science theory down pat.

I realize that last point was not your major emphasis, but I often take the time to point out this viewpoint when someone seems to be denigrating comprehensive training
As for facts in polling, you can use them as you wish. The answer to the question "Should we have an MDS?" is a good, solid, meaningful set of data. The answer to the question "If you knew that the US does presently enjoy a missile-based anti-missile defense system -- it's called ICBM's and it is part of the MAD system--if they attack us, we nuke them. Bush wants a second form of anti-missile defense, one that would destroy incoming missiles before they caused damage, would you support Bush's MDS program?-- can also produce a good, solid, meaningful dataset. It would answer a DIFFERENT question and, I assume, would be applied to different form of analysis.

I have found myself in serious disagreement with the interpretation of my polling findings by the popular press. I have found, however, that establishing a relationship with reporters tends to be the best way to handle that issue. The Fourth Estate rules.

Thank you for sharing your opinion, and for reading mine.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Alice Robbin
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2001 6:56 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: FYI: Re: Pew Poll on US Support of MDS & Bush Foreign Policy Approval (NPR) (fwd)

Dear Alice:

I can't resist putting in my 2 cents into this discussion.

First point: Pollsters generally know almost zero about anything outside polling techniques. Just look at the technical education one receives in graduate school--endless courses on "methodology" with scant attention to substance. The upshot, then, is that questions are written by people unfamiliar with the topic at hand.

Second point: The US does presently enjoy a missile-based anti-missile defense
system. Its called ICBM's and it is part of the MAD system--if they attack us, we nuke them. Bush wants a second form of anti-missile defense, one that would destroy incoming missiles before they caused damage. That the ICBM system has been in-place for at least four decades helps explain public beliefs in its existence.

Perhaps those who write questions should think first.

This point is examined at length in my public opinion book.

Best,
Bob

The grid clearly has several advantages over the pie. The square shape is a more efficient use of space on the page and the lines improve precision. Additionally, the bolded median lines used here enhance the immediate visual transfer of information by making the four quadrants stand out at a glance. The use of neutral shades is also good, because it reduces the subliminal effect of the darker color dominating the lighter color.
Where the NYT erred is in the inconsistent distribution of the unit squares within the grid. Counting the seven charts from the top right, the first four are consistent in distributing the colors with respect to both median lines, the fifth and sixth are visually inconsistent in that they do not fill the top quadrants before spreading down, but spread horizontally across the upper quadrants.

What seems to be happening is an attempt to square the circle by preserving some of the pie chart's amorphous visual impact, even when this conflicts with the additional information content provided by the grid lines.

Since we do not know how these grids were created, we do not know whether the fill patterns were created by software using a pre-determined algorithm, or manually by a graphic artist.

Perhaps Janet Elder or Mike Kagay could enlighten their fellow AAPOR members on the genesis of these charts.

Jan Werner

Philip Meyer wrote:
>
> I like the grid, but I'm not sure why. One obvious advantage is that you can count the little squares to verify that the graphic fits the published numbers. I actually did that, whereas I have never whipped out a protractor to check the proportions in a NY Times pie chart. Both have the advantage (over a bar chart) of showing the whole sample within the boundaries of the picture. And the grid probably makes it easier to tell the difference between, say, 46 and 44. If there is an algorithm for deciding which squares to shade, I'd like to know what it is.
>
> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
> CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
> University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
> Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

--
From ande271@attglobal.net Fri Jun 22 05:30:05 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5MCU4J13293 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Jun 2001 05:30:04 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from prserv.net (out4.prserv.net [32.97.166.34])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id FAA15912 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Jun 2001 05:30:05 -0700
One more thing: For a non-researcher, it may be more difficult to perceive that there is no "significant" difference between a grid with, say, 45 blue squares and 47 blue ones. Particularly if the configuration of squares by color is radically different in two different grids. Pie charts may tend to overemphasize large differences but at least small ones tend to be unnoticeable.

Philip Meyer wrote:

> I like the grid, but I'm not sure why. One obvious advantage is that you can count the little squares to verify that the graphic fits the published numbers. I actually did that, whereas I have never whipped out a protractor to check the proportions in a NY Times pie chart. Both have the advantage (over a bar chart) of showing the whole sample within the boundaries of the picture. And the grid probably makes it easier to tell the difference between, say, 46 and 44. If there is an algorithm for deciding which squares to shade, I'd like to know what it is.
> 
> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  Voice: 919 962-4085
> CB 3365 Carroll Hall  Fax: 919 962-1549
> University of North Carolina  Cell: 919 906-3425
> Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365  http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
> 
> From richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu Fri Jun 22 07:03:54 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f5ME3sJ15738 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Jun 2001
07:03:54 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ropercenter.uconn.edu (mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu [137.99.36.157])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id HAA13667 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Jun 2001 07:03:54 -0700
I may have figured out why the NYT grid-graph needs to retain the grid lines, rather than being invisible as I suggested yesterday. The answer relates to how the eye interprets the graphs.

In a pie chart, what counts is relative area -- the size of one slice relative to another. But the human eye also sees absolute area, which changes as you increase or decrease the size of the pie. When comparing two or more pie charts, they really need to be the same size, or the human eye may be tricked into interpreting absolute rather than relative area.

That problem will not arise with grid-graphs that retain their grid lines, for area is not a part of the presentation. Instead, the presentation turns on how many squares, out of 100 squares, are populated by one color and how many by another. Comparisons across graphs of different sizes would likely be more accurate. This consideration would arise when comparing data from two or more organizations, for example.

This may be a fairly considerable advantage of these grid-graphs. Comparisons across graphs are often very informative.

I do think there was an error in the algorithm for populating the squares that led to some strange results. It may also account for the odd way in which DK responses were handled.

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

Please note change of e-mail address:
In response to many inquiries, listed below is the site of the AAPOR 2002 Conference (a joint AAPOR/WAPOR year)

May 16-19, 2002
The TradeWinds Resort
St. Pete Beach, Florida
800.808.9833

Advance Room Registration deadline: April 15, 2002

Conference Program Chair:
Richard Kulka
Research Triangle Institute
P.O. Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194
Greetings and all best wishes.

In response to a query, I can report that Charles Blow, the editor of news graphics at The Times, devised the "grid" format for our NYT/CBS News Poll results yesterday as a substitute for what would in the past have been pie charts.

I have passed along to him the seven sets of comments posted to AAPORNET so far.

Thanks for your comments.

Cheers, - Mike
Is this grid viewable online at all? Or did one need to get the paper. The discussion has been fascinating. But a visual would be much more enlightening. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
QUOTE OF THE WEEK
"If the aborigine drafted an IQ test, all of Western civilization would presumably flunk it." -Stanley Marion Garn (anthropologist)

PUBLIC OPINION ON THE FEDERAL EDUCATION BILL
The Senate last week passed a sweeping new education bill that promises dramatic changes in the way in which the federal government is involved in the nation's education system. The American public generally welcomes such legislation. Education has been at the top of the list of priorities for Congress and the president in numerous polls conducted during the past year. The new education bill will include an increased emphasis on mandatory standardized testing, which the public favors, but will not include a voucher program, a concept about which the public is still ambivalent. http://www.gallup.com/Poll/releases/pr010618.asp

COMMUNITY-BASED EFFORTS TO IMPROVE STUDENT HEALTH STATEWIDE
Two local education funds are working across communities to build statewide comprehensive school health programs that include HIV prevention education. Find contact information and links to resources for adolescent health services. http://www.publiceducation.org/health/resources/

STRONG PARTNERSHIPS KEY TO PUBLIC SCHOOL SUCCESS
In order for public education to be successful and for students to achieve at high levels, a strong partnership must be forged between schools, parents, teachers and the community. Panelists at a recent dialogue on public schools hosted by the Los Angeles Educational Partnership (LAEP) examined various themes ranging from limited school choice, to better teacher recruitment and universal preschool. Panelists agreed that it will take government and individuals working together to "fix" the many complex problems facing public schools, such as equal access, low test scores and under-qualified teachers. LAEP, a local education fund, works with educators, business leaders and communities to improve education. http://www.laep.org/01_19_01/boardretreat2.html

EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS: STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS
More is accomplished together than alone. Recognition of this reality is prompting many school reform groups to form new partnerships and alliances. This downloadable brief identifies key components or conditions that contribute to partnership success. The components fall into the following areas: shared mission, goals, and objectives; organizational structure and governance; leadership; communication; budget, resources, and external funding; culture as it relates to both collaboration and professional development; and evaluation. http://www.wested.org/cs/wew/view/rs/508

MEMPHIS ENDS USE OF EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOL REFORMS
The American Association of School Administrators named Gerry House superintendent of the year in 1999. House was hailed by her peers as a visionary, in part for insisting that all 165 schools in her Memphis school district implement a comprehensive reform model. Recently, however, House's successor, Superintendent Johnnie Watson, announced that he was abandoning all 18 of the reform models that were put into place in the district's schools in the 1990s. According to an internal study conducted by the district, only three of the 18 whole-school designs raised student achievement in Memphis. Teachers complained to district researchers that the models were not appropriate for students who needed more time on the basics, and also took too much time and required too much paperwork. http://www.gomemphis.com/newca/062001/20reform.htm
BECOMING A CREATIVE LEADER
Innovation is a form of change. For the most part our culture welcomes change, but people proposing it do, as you might expect, run into barriers. As our society has become more complex, we find important segments of it becoming larger, more structured, more bureaucratic, less nimble, and less hospitable to creative people.
Learn strategies for leaders to use in setting an example for openness and imagination and acceptance.

FIX THE FLAWS IN SCHOOL REFORM
School reform will come to nothing unless real money is put behind rebuilding failing schools and closing the achievement gap between white students and the minority children. What children's advocates fear most of all is that Congress will pass a reform bill that promises a lot but fails to appropriate the necessary funds later on. That would be a missed opportunity and a tragedy for millions of children.
http://www.nytimes.com/2001/06/16/opinion/16SAT2.html

DEVELOPING A STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY STRATEGY "Think it Through" covers what it takes to design & fund an effective communications technology strategy, including planning, audience development, message shaping, and evaluation and funding. http://www.benton.org/Practice/Toolkit/thinkthru.html

TOOLS FOR ACCOUNTABILITY
The Annenberg Institute has just released a new tool that provides an in-depth introduction to using surveys as part of an ongoing school-improvement program. Seven school-tested survey instruments are available with advice on how to use them. The tools can help gauge the progress local schools are making to improve student achievement. http://www.annenberginstitute.org/accountability/toolbox/

GRANT AND FUNDING INFORMATION

"NFL Charities"
NFL Charities is a nonprofit organized founded by member clubs of the National Football League. Awards are granted for youth education, recreation, and physical fitness. http://www.nfl.com

"Sol Hirsch Education Fund Grants"
The National Weather Associations' Sol Hirsch Education Fund supplies grants of $500 to K-12 educators to help improve the teaching of meteorology.
"The Pentair Foundation"
The Pentair Foundation awards education grants that are aimed at projects that can support the use of alternative education methods and instruction that recognize and support the individual needs and skill levels of students. http://www.pentair.com/ci/ci_pf.htm

"Reach-a-Star Foundation"
The Reach-a-Star Foundation awards Educational Project grants for programs that take an innovative and creative approach to students' learning experience. http://www.reachastar.org

"National Science Foundation"
The National Science Foundation provides grants that support highly innovative and replicable projects for Internet network connections and high performance connections in research institutions. http://www.nsf.gov

"eSchool News School Funding Center"
Information on up-to-the-minute grant programs, funding sources, and technology funding. http://www.eschoolnews.org/funding

"Philanthropy News Digest-K-12 Funding Opportunities"
K-12 Funding opportunities with links to grantseeking for teachers, learning technology, and more. http://fdncenter.org/pnd/20000328/funding.html

"Information on U.S. Department of Education Initiatives"
Among a wealth of other information, the ED site provides comprehensive information on applying for grants and listings of current funding opportunities. http://www.ed.gov/funding.html

"SchoolGrants"
A collection of resources and tips to help K-12 educators apply for and obtain special grants for a variety of projects. http://www.schoolgrants.org

QUOTE OF THE WEEK
"If the aborigine drafted an IQ test, all of Western civilization would presumably flunk it." -Stanley Marion Garn (anthropologist)

The PEN NewsBlast is a free weekly e-mail newsletter featuring school reform and school fundraising resources. The PEN NewsBlast is the property of the Public Education Network, a national association of 62 local education funds working
to improve public school quality in low-income communities nationwide.

There are currently 22,551 subscribers to the PEN NewsBlast. Please forward this e-mail to anyone who enjoys free updates on education news and grant alerts.

To subscribe or unsubscribe, visit: http://www.PublicEducation.org/news/signup.htm

If you would like an article or news about your local education fund, public school, or school reform organization featured in the next exciting issue of PEN Weekly NewsBlast, send a note to HSchaffer@PublicEducation.org

Andrew Smith is a regular contributor to the PEN Weekly NewsBlast.

--------

Howie Schaffer
Managing Editor
Public Education Network
601 13th Street, NW #900N
Washington, DC 20005
202-628-7460
202-628-1893 fax
www.PublicEducation.org
Fello 'netters:
I am working on a funded research project with a UVA researcher in which we want to contact assistant professors in 75 selected colleges and universities. Can anyone suggest an efficient way to obtain a list of names, phones, and e-mails for assistant professors? We may or may not choose selected departments within universities.

We have tried having research assistants "just go on the web" and found this not to be very efficient. Are good commercial lists available?

Please reply to me and I'll gladly summarize for the list.

Tom

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

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Sat Jun 23 10:37:04 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
id f5NHb4J27416 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 23 Jun 2001
10:37:04 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtp5ve.mailsrvcs.net (smtp5vepub.gte.net [206.46.170.26])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA03442 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 23 Jun 2001 10:37:05 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (client-151-203-161-114.wma.adsl.bellatlantic.net
[151.203.161.114])
by smtp5ve.mailsrvcs.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id RAA1973341
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 23 Jun 2001 17:36:28 GMT
Message-ID: <3B34D3DE.34E7D80C@jwdp.com>
Date: Sat, 23 Jun 2001 13:37:34 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: NY Times Grid Chart Image
References: <b0.16526f3b.2864f082@aol.com>
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="---------
CB3954A2D4EA418998E5D2C7"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format. ------
CB3954A2D4EA418998E5D2C7
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The graphics appeared only in the print version of the Times, although they could be
seen in reduced format in the front page image on the Times site the day they were published.

For those who did not see them, here is a JPEG scan of the graphics as they appeared on the front page of the print edition of the Times.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

JAnnSelzer@aol.com wrote:

> Is this grid viewable online at all? Or did one need to get the paper. The discussion has been fascinating. But a visual would be much more enlightening. JAS

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

--
/J9/gAIV0FORx4C/+AAEPgsUYAAEBAJAYA1gAA/9sAQwAbExQFBEbFxBxYHhbwICChKygI
JShROj0wQmBVZWRVb1b1zGwpXHNdBYW1hCEoe6utq2eAvMm6p2zQkuk/9sAQwEcHh4oIyOhOytOpG5dqbkSKpKSpKSPkKSPkKSpKSpKSKpKSKpKSpKSKpK
P5KSpKSp/8AAEgQDAIAcAwhEAA1RAQMFAREB8AAAEFAQBEAQEBAAAABBBBBBBBшибEMBQYH
CACKK/I/EALUAQAIBwkMCMBFQQEAAABQFCEAwAEEQUSITFBBmHNRQciRQygZhCCNCscEV
UthwJDNicoIChXyYGBkaJSYnKckqNDU2Nzq50kNERU2HSEIKUI1RVV1dYVpZGVMm22hpan0o
DzX3e3Hi6G4ShoeiyQ5v5i1peYmZqio61lpgeoqagys751tre4ubcrW8TFxsfIyrSc090V
1tfFy2dhr4upk5ebn6onq8flz9P929/j5+e/V888BAAMAQAEEBAEQEAAEAEBBBBBBBBB
CACKK/I/EALUAQAIBAgEaWhFQBQQAAAECDwABAgMBAgMB排出YMQSYQVEXYETIJKCBCKCaGwqkJ
Ml1wFbJwYQWoJDTdfhjEgGBkajicKSo1Jnc407dPiDREVGR0hJS1UNVZVXWF1aY2RZmdaoWp
zhHV2d3h5eOdKhIWgh4iJipK1JW15i2mqKjpKwmp6ipqMrKztLW2t7i5usLDxMXGx8jJyTLT
1NXW19j22ulj5OXm5+jp6vLz9P9X29/j5+/v/AAWDAQAACEQMRA8A1S0gB30hpcYB61hICXT9
aRyoHizAB+FACPgAQAJAJ65pdwbB7etACr1JGaQCTQAnG36medqK72i8WwSaaXqRj7tQAAS
9/hRKhJoAFyMn0ad3jJoACPlAU04JoJQMzzQAnhm69KUBt3tQAE816Ug/vA0AYhEyeaBjt
wTQApUgCg10QCMUDEI560wOsRSjD4waACASASmg AzgaN1pcDGAcUwA5yABQcFsY6UABGtK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 Triangle Institute (RTI) is looking for an experienced Site Manager to oversee our telephone operations center in Greenville, NC.

RTI is a leading nonprofit survey research organization headquartered in Research Triangle Park, NC, with offices in Washington, D.C., Rockville, MD, Chicago, IL, and Atlanta, GA.

Function and Scope: Develop all aspects of the telephone unit operations. Manage the staffing levels, personnel training, overhead budgets, and inter/intra-office correspondence of the local office. Must track and have a working knowledge of all projects operating at the site.

Minimum Qualifications:

-----------------------
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Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
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Research Triangle Institute (RTI) is looking for an experienced Site Manager to oversee our telephone operations center in Greenville, NC.

RTI is a leading nonprofit survey research organization headquartered in Research Triangle Park, NC, with offices in Washington, D.C., Rockville, MD, Chicago, IL, and Atlanta, GA.

Function and Scope: Develop all aspects of the telephone unit operations. Manage the staffing levels, personnel training, overhead budgets, and inter/intra-office correspondence of the local office. Must track and have a working knowledge of all projects operating at the site.

Minimum Qualifications:
5+ years of experience in telephone data collection operations
outstanding leadership skills
strong writing and oral communications, interpersonal, word
processing, organizing, and computer spreadsheet skills

Responsibilities of the Site Manager include:

- managing the operations and activities conducted at RTI's
  Greenville, NC telephone research center
- working with project directors, survey operations specialists, and
  CAI programming staff on the successful implementation of telephone data
  collection projects
- managing telephone center budgets for the facility
- coordinating and monitoring interviewer hiring, training, and
  quality programs
- monitoring attendance and time reporting accuracy of all employees
- managing the staffing and other direct cost invoicing process
- ensuring the smooth and proper functioning of the center, including
  coordination with outside vendors or service providers

RTI offers competitive salary and excellent benefits. To apply for the Site
Manager position, please use job reference number 30823 and apply at our web-site at
www.rti.org or E-mail your resume to jobs@rti.org. Or, mail your resume and
cover letter to Research Triangle Institute, Office of Human Resources, P.O. Box
12194, RTP, NC 27709-2194. We are committed to diversity in the workplace.

Michael W. Link, Ph.D.
Director, Telephone Survey Department

Survey Research Division
Research Triangle Institute
PO Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Office: (919)990-8462
Fax: (919)541-1261
E-mail: Link@rti.org
Http://www.rti.org
JDannemiller@smshawaii.com wrote:

[Some amazing stuff, including...]

I am a pollster, broadly defined, and number many pollsters among my
friends, acquaintances, and colleagues. In general I find pollsters to
be:

(1) the most broadly educated people I know, from a wide variety of
disciplines, and tending toward multidisciplinary approaches to most
problems;

This is certainly my experience. I know very few people in the biz who
have graduated from programs in survey research, which are relatively
recent developments, aren't they? Most of us have degrees in other
things. And the diversity of those "other things" is one of the joys of
AAPOR meetings. (Come to think of it, even the joint program grads I know
are pretty well-rounded people...)

Has anyone done a study of the AAPOR membership to quantify this
diversity? Normally I disdain such navel-gazing, but at times like this
it might be nice to actually have some figures.

This exchange reminded me of my job interview for my current position,
which is in health services research. My boss said that he was very
surprised to have gotten an application from a journalism major. I
couldn't figure out why, since they had advertised for someone with a
graduate
degree
in a social science. And there are lots of great survey researchers
affiliated with
J schools. While I was at a survey lab at a college of communication, I had
been the
field director for
BRFSS and worked on an early HIV study.

But his doctorate is in Sociology, and that's what he was comfortable with.
It was
really interesting over the next few months to see him learn that I had taken very rigorous classes, and have very solid training in research methodology. Additionally, I can crank out reams of words on demand when a report is needed.

I also think of my husband and medical doctors. My husband is a research biologist (one of the top people in the world in fire ants). As a biologist, he sees himself as having superior knowledge to that of mere MDs. At one point, he declared, "Medicine is art, not science." (Thank goodness this was not to my specialist's face.) Well, maybe he does have superior knowledge when it comes to overall understanding of physiology, etc., but getting me well via drugs or surgery is something else again.

And by golly, pollsters have that same get-it-done, roll-up-your-sleeves attitude. We are used to deadlines and having to earn our own keep, and delivering.

I also think that many of us share a curiosity about anything new. We love having a license to ask questions. And this makes us good researchers when it comes to learning about an issue before tackling a new project.

> I have found myself in serious disagreement with the interpretation of my polling findings by the popular press. I have found, however, that establishing a relationship with reporters tends to be the best way to handle that issue. The Fourth Estate rules.

Actually, headline writers rule :( I can't tell you how many times I have carefully crafted an editorial only to have the meaning twisted by a headline. And then the letters to the editor coming pouring in, reacting to the headline rather than the article. Most people don't realize there is such a disconnect, and that the writer has no say at all in the headline...

Colleen
(who is writing this to avoid coding the 200 place-of-work items that remain before bedtime)

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, UF Department of Health Services Administration
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
Phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-016
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Jun 24 08:48:06 2001
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Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
Scientific sampling under attack by non-random sampling methods for bestseller lists--what next?

-- Jim

Friday, June 22 10:41 A.M.

Putting the Times Bestseller List to the Test:

A Hard-Numbered Look at the Only Rankings Anyone Cares About

Fact is, nobody really tracks how many copies of a book are sold, though BookScan is coming closer, raising questions about the paper's venerable system for sampling bookstores to come up with rankings. An Inside examination.

by Sara Nelson

Landing your book on the New York Times bestsellers list is the goal of just about every publisher with just about every book. A ranking there not only suggests that a book has sold well, it also more or less ensures that a book will begin to sell even better.

But the Times does not include actual sales figures in its listings, and sometimes the strict order in which books are ranked would appear to be deceiving. In many
cases, the difference in sales among the books seems to be very small. In still other cases, a lower-ranked book arguably sold more copies than one listed above it, reflecting the inherent difficulties of working from a sampling. (The New York Times will indicate with an asterisk when a book's sales numbers are "barely distinguishable" from another's, but a spokesman for the paper declined to specify what constitutes barely distinguishable.)

Take sales for the week ending June 9, which are the rankings that will appear in the June 24 issue of the paper. Tom Brokaw's An Album of Memories appears at No. 3 on the nonfiction list. According to data from BookScan, which currently records sales at Barnes and Noble and B. Dalton stores and at barnesandnoble.com, Brokaw's book sold 3,003 for the week (although the site calls it the week ending June 10). But, oddly, the books right behind Brokaw's -- George Carlin's Napalm & Silly Putty and Yogi Berra's When You Come to a Fork in the Road, Take It -- show much higher BookScan numbers, 5,725 and 5,854, respectively.

(BookScan numbers are considered to represent roughly 20 percent of the total number of trade books sold in the nation, though not intended to be a sample. And while there clearly is a big disconnect between how BookScan and the Times evaluated sales for Brokaw's book, the two do agree about Carlin and Berra -- the Times puts an asterisk to indicate how close sales for the two are.)

On the fiction list, Iris Johansen's Bantam title, Final Target, is No. 3 and, according to BookScan, has sold 3,571 copies. The No. 4 title, On the Street Where you Live, by Mary Higgins Clark (Simon & Schuster) shows 3,543 in sales. (This time, there was no asterisk from the Times.)

As a general rule, and surely during the week ending June 9, the biggest sales drop-off comes between the top bestsellers and the others filling out the list. Simon & Schuster's stellar John Adams, for example, is No. 1 on the nonfiction list, and sold 13,147 for the week, according to BookScan. Hampton Sides's Ghost Soldiers, in second place, sold fewer than that number of copies, 5,605. Likewise, on the fiction list, Sue Grafton's P Is for Peril, from Marian Wood/Putnam, tops the chart, and was tracked selling 20,653 copies.
last week. John Sandford's Chosen Prey, at No. 2 on the Times list, sold 4,193, a mere 25 percent of Grafton's title.

While other sectors of the media -- whether music, television or magazines - brim with detailed sales figures, book publishing has proved resistant. The Times, for example, relies on reports from" almost 4,000 bookstores plus wholesalers serving 50,000 other retailers (gift shops, department stores, newsstands, supermarkets)," which are "statistically weighted to represent all such outlets nationwide," according to the boilerplate that regularly accompanies the list.

John Wright, assistant to the Bestsellers editor at the Times, elaborates on the weighting system by saying it is based on" area, size of store and population of that area." If a small store in one area sells one copy, for example, the listmakers might assume that a store 5 times bigger in the same general area sells 5 copies. (Bestseller Editor Deborah Hofmann was on vacation and thus unavailable for comment.)

Furthermore, the Times compiles its list with a methodology that has hardly changed in its 35-year history. The biggest change is probably the addition of some online retailers, says Wright, who begins receiving reams of data on Sunday night, crunches the numbers and by Tuesday comes up with seven complete lists -- hardcover fiction, nonfiction and advice, paperback fiction, nonfiction and advice and the newly created Children's category.

But as the Times itself reported on Monday that BookScan is closer to becoming a universal tracker. It soon will add data from the Borders group and is beginning to collect numbers from Costco, Target "and several smaller chains and independent stores." (BookScan currently charges publishers for access to its database, which it has provided to Inside.com for its reporting on the industry.)

According to Wright, executives from the Times and BookScan, which is owned by the Dutch publisher VNU, discussed the paper's potential use of the
as-of-then-unlaunched database three or four years ago, but nothing happened.
"We might get involved" in further talks now that BookScan is up and running, he said.

Clearly the push by BookScan to collect comprehensive records of book sales will change the nature and the perception of all bestseller lists, especially if the company manages to collect sales figures from thousands of independent booksellers. In the face of hard numbers from BookScan, the Times's proprietary weight-and-balance system could well lose some of its cachet. At the moment, however, it is still the Times list that triggers bonus clauses in writers' contracts. And at some chain stores (including, until recently Barnes and Noble, which began applying discounts to its own bestsellers, not the Times's), being listed in the newspaper of record guaranteed substantial consumer discounts, which translated into increased sales.

As things stand today, the clout of the New York Times is so great that hundreds of publishing executives pay in the neighborhood of $500 a year to have the Best Sellers lists faxed to them 10 days before the publication date of the Book Review that contains them. Should the list lose its pull, the Old Gray Lady could also lose some cash.

http://www.inside.com/jcs/Story?article_id=33360&pod_id=8

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright (C) 2001 Powerful Media, Inc. -- Inside.com
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

*****
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The Division of Science Resource Studies at NSF has the following positions for survey statisticians.

http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?C20010189

http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?e20010199

William Safire has once again joined the White House spin team trying to kill the polling messenger.

Let NYTimes.com Come to You
ASHINGTON - To the question "How's your wife?" the comedian Henny Youngman would reply "compared to who?" He should have said with whom, of course, but the political point is valid: between campaigns, those polled tend to judge incumbents in a vacuum. We will put that right today.

Much was made of a New York Times/CBS News poll showing a four-point dip in Bush the Younger's job approval ratings over the past month. However, the Gallup poll showed virtually no change in that period, and the most recent Zogby survey showed a bump upward for Bush.

The lesson: put not your faith in pollsters, especially when they offer their interviewees no alternative. Instead, measure your opinion of the president against those who may be running against him in a few short years. Here is the early-morning line handicapped by one right-wing tout:

Tom Daschle (4-1), sure to command regular national TV coverage as Senate majority leader. An amiable partisan who is always on message and regularly on the record, he is attractive to Democratic nominating constituencies. Drawbacks: South Dakota is uncoastal, and his Senate power carries the risk of chronic oppositionitis or too-frequent compromise, as well as suffocation in legislative detail.

Joe Biden (5-1), new chairman of Foreign Relations, which guarantees serious exposure at times of global tension; quick mind, has been on the track before
Richard Gephardt (15-1), knows too much about too many issues; needs speakership in 2002 to be taken seriously, at which point he'd have to be a crazy gambler to run. Ever-lengthening long shot.

John Edwards (9-1), good-looking, hyperarticulate trial lawyer from North Carolina, frequently mentioned by future-wavers. Will be closely associated with likely H.M.O. lawsuits. Adept in debate, though light on gravitas; needs to avoid appearance of slickness. Shows too much early media foot, but his fund-raisers can belly up to the plaintiff bar.

John Kerry (4-1), Massachusetts New Democrat with good financing, multilateralist impulses and a passion for preventing drilling in pristine Arctic wastes. Studious and serious. Must overcome perpetually worried look and will have to advertise heavily coming out of the starting gate to show he's "not that Kerrey."

Pat Leahy (6-1), Vermont chairman of Judiciary who will become nationally known at storm center of Supreme Court confirmations. Comes across on TV as soft-spoken but hardheaded; was loyal and effective Clinton defender. Starts far off pace and on the outside but could close unexpectedly in stretch.

Joe Lieberman (5-1), now a familiar face with few negatives who would deliver centrist and faith-based voters. Will attract new attention overseeing Government Operations when scandals bloom, and is well positioned with his "new prosperity" in case of recession. Problem: has pledged not to compete with Al Gore for nomination. If Gore issues a Coolidge statement ("I do not choose to run"), lower Lieberman odds to 3-1.

Chris Dodd (4-1), combination of heart and head appeals to old Clintonites, Catholic, can run knowledgably in domestic or international turf. Workhorse rather than show horse, partisan but not unreasonable, experienced on TV, his time may be coming. As with Leahy, you read it in this tip sheet first.
Russell Feingold (8-1), youthful, idealistic, courage of his convictions (he eschewed soft money and yet won in Wisconsin). Needs identification with issue other than campaign finance reform. If backed by an off-reservation McCain, could offer delegates capture of the center.

Al Gore (2-1), wise to lie low for first Bush year, his course will become clear if he decides to campaign widely for Congressional Democrats next year. Sly slogan: "Re-elect Gore in Two Thousand Four." Overweight or trim; dismissed as an old face by resentful party strategists or supported quietly by soccer moms in primary states; helped or hindered by distance from Clinton - it's Al against the field.

Now you're ready for the Henny pollster's call: "How's your candidate?" Do you prefer Bush - or one of the above?


Visit NYTimes.com for complete access to the most authoritative news coverage on the Web, updated throughout the day.

Become a member today! It's free!


HOW TO ADVERTISE

For information on advertising in e-mail newsletters or other creative advertising opportunities with The New York Times on the Web, please contact Alyson Racer at alyson@nytimes.com or visit our online media kit at http://www.nytimes.com/adinfo

For general information about NYTimes.com, write to help@nytimes.com.

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

>From mkshares@mcs.net Mon Jun 25 07:22:58 2001
I believe the more significant finding on Bush is the increase in *disapproval* across all polls - particularly despite his success on tax cuts. See below.

http://www.pollingreport.com/BushJob.htm

mitofsky@mindspring.com wrote:

> This article from NYTimes.com
> has been sent to you by mitofsky@mindspring.com.
> >
> > William Safire has once again joined the White House spin team trying
> > to kill the polling messenger.
> >>
> > /---------------- advertisement -----------------------\
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> Let NYTimes.com Come to You
> >>
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> CIRCUITS plugs you into the latest on
ASHINGTON - To the question "How's your wife?" the comedian Henny Youngman would reply "compared to who?" He should have said with whom, of course, but the political point is valid: between campaigns, those polled tend to judge incumbents in a vacuum. We will put that right today.

Much was made of a New York Times/CBS News poll showing a four-point dip in Bush the Younger's job approval ratings over the past month. However, the Gallup poll showed virtually no change in that period, and the most recent Zogby survey showed a bump upward for Bush.

The lesson: put not your faith in pollsters, especially when they offer their interviewees no alternative. Instead, measure your opinion of the president against those who may be running against him in a few short years. Here is the early-morning line handicapped by one right-wing tout:

Tom Daschle (4-1), sure to command regular national TV coverage as Senate majority leader. An amiable partisan who is always on message and regularly on the record, he is attractive to Democratic nominating constituencies. Drawbacks: South Dakota is uncoastal, and his Senate power carries the risk of chronic oppositionitis or too-frequent compromise, as well as suffocation in legislative detail.

Joe Biden (5-1), new chairman of Foreign Relations, which guarantees serious exposure at times of global tension; quick mind, has been on the track before and will plagiarize nothing. Needs identification with a domestic issue; nobly shies from muddy track.

Richard Gephardt (15-1), knows too much about too many issues; needs speakership in 2002 to be taken seriously, at which point he'd have to be a crazy gambler to run. Ever-lengthening long shot.

John Edwards (9-1), good-looking, hyperarticulate trial lawyer from North Carolina, frequently mentioned by future-wavers. Will be closely associated with likely H.M.O. lawsuits. Adept in debate, though light on gravitas; needs to avoid appearance of slickness. Shows too much early media foot, but his fund-raisers can belly up to the plaintiff bar.

John Kerry (4-1), Massachusetts New Democrat with good financing, multilateralist impulses and a passion for preventing drilling in pristine Arctic wastes. Studious and serious. Must overcome
perpetually worried look and will have to advertise heavily coming out of the starting gate to show he's "not that Kerrey."

Pat Leahy (6-1), Vermont chairman of Judiciary who will become nationally known at storm center of Supreme Court confirmations. Comes across on TV as soft-spoken but hardheaded; was loyal and effective Clinton defender. Starts far off pace and on the outside but could close unexpectedly in stretch.

Joe Lieberman (5-1), now a familiar face with few negatives who would deliver centrist and faith-based voters. Will attract new attention overseeing Government Operations when scandals bloom, and is well positioned with his "new prosperity" in case of recession. Problem: has pledged not to compete with Al Gore for nomination. If Gore issues a Coolidge statement ("I do not choose to run"), lower Lieberman odds to 3-1.

Chris Dodd (4-1), combination of heart and head appeals to old Clintonites, Catholic, can run knowledgably in domestic or international turf. Workhorse rather than show horse, partisan but not unreasonable, experienced on TV, his time may be coming. As with Leahy, you read it in this tip sheet first.

Russell Feingold (8-1), youthful, idealistic, courage of his convictions (he eschewed soft money and yet won in Wisconsin). Needs identification with issue other than campaign finance reform. If backed by an off-reservation McCain, could offer delegates capture of the center.

Al Gore (2-1), wise to lie low for first Bush year, his course will become clear if he decides to campaign widely for Congressional Democrats next year. Sly slogan: "Re-elect Gore in Two Thousand Four." Overweight or trim; dismissed as an old face by resentful party strategists or supported quietly by soccer moms in primary states; helped or hindered by distance from Clinton - it's Al against the field.

Now you're ready for the Henny pollster's call: "How's your candidate?" Do you prefer Bush - or one of the above?
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I believe the more significant finding on Bush is the increase in *disapproval* across all polls - particularly despite his success on tax cuts. See below.

William Safire has once again joined the White House spin team trying to kill the polling messenger.
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The Henny Poll
ESSAY
By WILLIAM SAFIRE

ASHINGTON - To the question "How's your wife?" the comedian Henny Youngman would reply "compared to who?" He should have said with whom, of course, but the political point is valid: between campaigns, those polled tend to judge
incumbents in a vacuum. We will put that right today. Much was made of a New York Times/CBS News poll showing a four-point dip in Bush the Younger's job approval ratings over the past month. However, the Gallup poll showed virtually no change in that period, and the most recent Zogby survey showed a bump upward for Bush. The lesson: put not your faith in pollsters, especially when they offer their interviewees no alternative. Instead, measure your opinion of the president against those who may be running against him in a few short years. Here is the early-morning line handicapped by one right-wing tout: Tom Daschle (4-1), sure to command regular national TV coverage as Senate majority leader. An amiable partisan who is always on message and regularly on the record, he is attractive to Democratic nominating constituencies. Drawbacks: South Dakota is uncoastal, and his Senate power carries the risk of chronic oppositionitis or too-frequent compromise, as well as suffocation in legislative detail. Joe Biden (5-1), new chairman of Foreign Relations, which guarantees serious exposure at times of global tension; quick mind, has been on the track before and will plagiarize nothing. Needs identification with a domestic issue; nobly shies from muddy track. Richard Gephardt (15-1), knows too much about too many issues; needs speakership in 2002 to be taken seriously, at which point he'd have to be a crazy gambler to run. Ever-lengthening long shot. John Edwards (9-1), good-looking, hyperarticulate trial lawyer from North Carolina, frequently mentioned by future-wavers. Will be closely associated with likely H.M.O. lawsuits. Adept in debate, though light on gravitas; needs to avoid appearance of slickness. Shows too much early media foot, but his fund-raisers can belly up to the plaintiff bar. John Kerry (4-1), Massachusetts New Democrat with good financing, multilateralist impulses and a passion for preventing drilling in pristine Arctic wastes. Studious and serious. Must overcome perpetually worried look and will have to advertise heavily coming out of the starting gate to show he's "not that Kerrey." Pat Leahy (6-1), Vermont chairman of Judiciary who will become nationally known at storm center of Supreme Court
confirmations. Comes across on TV as soft-spoken but hardheaded; was loyal and effective Clinton defender. Starts far off pace and on the outside but could close unexpectedly in stretch. Joe Lieberman (5-1), now a familiar face with few negatives who would deliver centrist and faith-based voters. Will attract new attention overseeing Government Operations when scandals bloom, and is well positioned with his "new prosperity" in case of recession. Problem: has pledged not to compete with Al Gore for nomination. If Gore issues a Coolidge statement ("I do not choose to run"), lower Lieberman odds to 3-1. Chris Dodd (4-1), combination of heart and head appeals to old Clintonites, Catholic, can run knowledgably in domestic or international turf. Workhorse rather than show horse, partisan but not unreasonable, experienced on TV, his time may be coming. As with Leahy, you read it in this tip sheet first. Russell Feingold (8-1), youthful, idealistic, courage of his convictions (he eschewed soft money and yet won in Wisconsin). Needs identification with issue other than campaign finance reform. If backed by an off-reservation McCain, could offer delegates capture of the center. Al Gore (2-1), wise to lie low for first Bush year, his course will become clear if he decides to campaign widely for Congressional Democrats next year. Sly slogan: "Re-elect Gore in Two Thousand Four." Overweight or trim; dismissed as an old face by resentful party strategists or supported quietly by soccer moms in primary states; helped or hindered by distance from Clinton - it's Al against the field. Now you're ready for the Henny pollster's call: "How's your candidate?" Do you prefer Bush - or one of the above? Visit NYTimes.com for complete access to the most authoritative news coverage on the Web,
Is there some archive of the discussion around the NYT grid chart? Foolishly, I did not keep copies of these interesting messages.
I post this to AAPORNET on behalf of Pam Shoemaker, as you can read below. Please send all replies directly to Pam—at her email address above and twice below—and *NOT* to AAPORNET nor to me, personally.

Thank you for your consideration and help. -- Jim

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Mon, 25 Jun 2001 10:51:28 -0400
From: Pamela J. Shoemaker <snowshoe@syr.edu>
To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Subject: Best political reporters

James,

If you think it is appropriate, would you please put on AAPORNET the following:
Who are the best political reporters in the US? Send names of broadcast or print reporters, editors or producers to Pam Shoemaker, <snowshoe@syr.edu> Newhouse School of Public Communications, Syracuse University. We are looking for someone to fill an endowed chair in political reporting. Thanks.

Many thanks,
Pam
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Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5PJXUJJ19525 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Jun 2001
12:33:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from gull.mail.pas.earthlink.net (gull.mail.pas.earthlink.net[207.217.121.85])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA18638 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Jun 2001 12:33:26 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from oemcomputer (washdc3-ar2-185-156.washdc3.dsl.gtei.net[4.3.185.156])
    by gull.mail.pas.earthlink.net (EL-8_9_3_3/8.9.3) with SMTP id MAA06548
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Jun 2001 12:33:20 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <004901c0fdae$4a2eece0$9cb90304@oemcomputer>
Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.A41.4.21LI.0.106212259350.50212-100000@login4.isis.unc.edu>
<3B3331D8.885C0153@jwdp.com>
Subject: Re: Grid v. pie
Date: Mon, 25 Jun 2001 15:36:38 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4522.1200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4522.1200

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Jan Werner" <jwerner@jwdp.com>
To: "Philip Meyer" <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
Cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2001 7:54 AM
Subject: Re: Grid v. pie
The grid clearly has several advantages over the pie. The square shape is a more efficient use of space on the page and the lines improve precision. Additionally, the bolded median lines used here enhance the immediate visual transfer of information by making the four quadrants stand out at a glance. The use of neutral shades is also good, because it reduces the subliminal effect of the darker color dominating the lighter color.

Where the NYT erred is in the inconsistent distribution of the unit squares within the grid. Counting the seven charts from the top right, the first four are consistent in distributing the colors with respect to both median lines, the fifth and sixth are visually inconsistent in that they do not fill the top quadrants before spreading down, but spread horizontally across the upper quadrants.

What seems to be happening is an attempt to square the circle by preserving some of the pie chart's amorphous visual impact, even when this conflicts with the additional information content provided by the grid lines.

Since we do not know how these grids were created, we do not know whether the fill patterns were created by software using a pre-determined algorithm, or manually by a graphic artist.

Perhaps Janet Elder or Mike Kagay could enlighten their fellow AAPOR members on the genesis of these charts.

Jan Werner

Philip Meyer wrote:

I like the grid, but I'm not sure why. One obvious advantage is that you can count the little squares to verify that the graphic fits the published numbers. I actually did that, whereas I have never whipped out a protractor to check the proportions in a NY Times pie chart. Both have the advantage (over a bar chart) of showing the whole sample within the boundaries of the picture. And the grid probably makes it easier to tell the difference between, say, 46 and 44. If there is an algorithm for deciding which squares to shade, I'd like to know what it is.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall  Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina  Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365  http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Jun 26 11:52:29 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f5QiOqTJ01039 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Jun 2001 11:52:29 -0700 (PDT)
Is anyone at Census at liberty to shed any light on this story?

-- Jim
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Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
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June 26, 2001

CRITICS WANT CENSUS DATA MADE PUBLIC

By ERIC SCHMITT

WASHINGTON, June 25 -- Three months after the Census Bureau decided against adjusting the 2000 population tally for the purposes of drawing Congressional and other legislative districts, civil rights groups, big-city mayors and Congressional Democrats are accusing the agency of suppressing data that formed the basis of the bureau's decision.

The dispute between the Census Bureau and a number of Democrats and Democratic-leaning groups is part of a fight over what population counts will be used to allocate federal aid and redraw Congressional and other legislative districts.

The bureau's acting director, William G. Barron Jr., has said the agency will recommend by this fall whether to use statistically adjusted data in allocating
federal aid based on population. About $185 billion a year was distributed based on population counts from the 1990 census.

But critics are demanding that census officials immediately release the adjusted data for areas as small as city blocks for all 50 states. Though critics like Congressional Democrats and big-city mayors say the adjusted data should be released in the name of accuracy, the adjusted counts could also help fuel court challenges to Congressional redistricting efforts in most states.

As was the case in 1990, the adjusted numbers for the 2000 census were produced by a survey conducted by the Census Bureau after the traditional head count was completed. In both 1990 and last year, the survey pointed out the extent to which the census missed millions of people, mainly racial minorities and renters, and double-counted others, mainly whites and homeowners.

Some critics say the Census Bureau is reluctant to release the findings of last year's survey because they would provide a measure of the extent of the errors in last year's census and call into question the March decision made by census officials not to recommend that the census figures be adjusted.

But Mr. Barron has said that releasing the results before the agency verifies the data's reliability would be "inappropriate and irresponsible." He added that the bureau might eventually disclose the data.

At a meeting of the United States Conference of Mayors in Detroit over the weekend, Mayor Dannel P. Malloy of Stamford, Conn., one of the fastest-growing cities in New England, pressed his colleagues to approve a resolution calling for the release of the adjusted data.

"We do have freedom of information in this country," said Mr. Malloy, who is a Democrat.

The California State Finance Department said this month that it would not wait any longer, and factored the estimated 500,000 people missed in the 2000 head count into the annual population estimates it uses to distribute state tax dollars.

There is even a whiff of presidential politics in the brewing fight, as Senator
John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat who is considering a bid for the White House in 2004, is calling for hearings to examine the propriety of an effort by the Census Bureau to require a joint Presidential-Congressional oversight committee to sign confidentiality forms before receiving new data.

The Democratic chairman of the Congressional monitoring board, Gilbert F. Casellas, called the census's nondisclosure plan "capricious and political in nature."

Census officials acknowledge they missed at least 6.4 million people last year and counted at least 3.1 million twice but insist that the 2000 census was the most accurate ever.

Unadjusted figures tend to favor Republicans in the drawing of Congressional and other legislative districts, political analysts of both parties say, because statistically adjusting population counts would probably add more people to customarily Democratic neighborhoods.

For that reason, most Republicans do not want any adjusted numbers released while the redistricting is under way. At the same time, Census Bureau demographers say they do not want their professional reputations dragged through the mud.

"We don't really want to release data that we don't have confidence in," said John H. Thompson, director of the 2000 census, who justified the confidentiality form as a way to prevent the spread of "misleading data."

Some 50 House Democrats angrily disagreed last week, arguing in a letter, circulated by Representative Carolyn B. Maloney of New York to two Senate committees, now controlled by Democrats, that leaving millions of Americans uncounted raises "serious questions about whether or not all of our citizens will have an equal voice in government."

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
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This report in today's Los Angeles Times draws of survey and polling data and interviews contributed by a number of different AAPOR members.

-- Jim
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Bush Enters Era of Limits as Agenda Hits Resistance

By JANET HOOK, RONALD BROWNSTEIN, Times Staff Writers

WASHINGTON--After months of dominating Washington with his tax cut, budget and education policies, President Bush is getting a crash course in the constraints on his agenda and the limits of his public support.

Congress is charting its own course on issues ranging from health to the environment to disaster aid, steering debate away from Bush's priorities--and in some cases openly defying his wishes.

The president is losing his grip on the agenda in part because Democrats now control the Senate--where they've put onto the legislative fast track a patients' bill of rights measure much broader than Bush prefers. But even members of
his party
in the House, where the GOP still holds the majority, are starting to follow a path
that reflects their home-state and political needs—which do not always coincide
with Bush's.

House Republicans, for instance, are preparing a managed health care bill that
goes farther than Bush wants. They are passing a series of appropriation bills that
overspend Bush's budget, bulking up on such parochial projects as subsidies for
apple growers. And Bush's faith-based initiative, which House leaders had hoped to
pass this week, is struggling amidst unanticipated resistance from the right.

Bush's problems were highlighted by a series of House votes last week
rejecting key elements of his energy and environmental plan—as well as a
wave of congressional pressure that compelled the administration to accept
electricity price caps more stringent than it had earlier preferred.

A Precarious Balancing Act

This flurry of resistance hasn't shifted control of Washington's agenda
to Democrats, who are still struggling to fit their policy priorities into the austere
budget blueprint Bush pushed into law in the spring. But the sudden succession of
reversals and roadblocks the White House has encountered underscores how precariously power remains divided in Washington—and how narrowly political allegiance remains split in the country. Indeed, recent polls suggest America is about as evenly split over the Bush presidency as it was in last year's razor-thin presidential race.

"It's just like October and November," said one Bush political advisor.
"Fundamentally, because the electorate is so polarized, the ability to build consensus . . . and keep [legislative] things moving is very difficult and almost impossible."

Neither side has the power to ram its priorities into law, presenting both
with basic decisions about how much they should compromise with their adversaries.
The progress of the patients' bill of rights has been emblematic: Although it has
become clear that Bush will have to accept broader legal rights for patients if he wants to sign a bill into law, Democrats acknowledge they will have to include more legal protections for employers than they had wanted.

"If anyone says, 'It's my way or the highway,' no way is going to win," said Sen. John B. Breaux (D-La.).

Although Bush hasn't suffered the sharp decline in approval ratings that marked President Clinton's first chaotic months, neither has he mobilized a commanding level of support that would give him decisive leverage over wavering lawmakers. Three national surveys released last week showed Bush's approval rating hovering at a modest 50% to 55%; in two of the polls, Bush's disapproval rating had increased since earlier this spring.

Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press--an independent polling firm whose survey put Bush's approval at 50% last week--said Bush appears to have been hurt by anxiety about the economy and the energy situation, and a sense among some Americans that he has proved more conservative in office than advertised as a candidate. "He has lost a little bit of the middle," Kohut said.

The surveys suggest Bush has done little to narrow the partisan chasm that defined November's election. In the polls, he drew virtually unanimous approval from Republicans while attracting favorable ratings from at most only one-third of Democrats--a figure lower than voters from the opposition party traditionally provide a new president.

The response to a query in a recent Gallup/CNN/USA Today poll drove home the continuing split. Asked if they agree with Bush on the issues that mattered most to them, 49% of Americans (including 90% of Republicans) said yes, 47% (including nearly 80% of Democrats and a slight majority of independents) said no.

White House advisors believe the coolness of rank-and-file Democrats to Bush has made it easier for congressional Democrats to oppose his ideas and pursue
confrontational approach on their own priorities.

As a result, after months of playing offense on Capitol Hill, the White House is resigned to a summer of defense.

The battles already are joined. The Democratic Senate's insistence on moving the patients' bill of rights measure has forced the hand of House GOP leaders, who had been slow to move the bill. Now, those leaders have joined the effort to find a compromise that would give patients broader power to sue their HMOs than Bush has supported. Democrats promise next to force Bush to respond to such proposals as a new prescription drug benefit for Medicare or an increase in the minimum wage.

GOP Conservatives Resist President

But Bush's problems do not just come from emboldened Democrats. He has been increasingly challenged by members of his own party.

Tensions between Bush and Republicans on Capitol Hill have been growing as Congress has turned to the annual appropriation bills. Earlier this year, Republicans paid great deference to Bush by passing a broad budget blueprint that reflected his priorities, including a limit on the growth of federal discretionary spending at 4%. Now that Congress is filling in the spending details, lawmakers are chafing at that collar.

The House later this week will consider an energy and water spending bill that would provide $1.2 billion more than Bush wants. The House also will debate an agriculture bill that includes a $150-million subsidy for apple growers, despite vigorous administration opposition. Last week, House Republicans ignored White House pleas and slashed spending for the Federal Emergency Management Agency to pay for projects Bush did not request.

The setbacks for the White House on energy and the environment came amid new polls showing that Americans continue to prize environmental protection over
energy production--and continue to believe Bush reverses that priority. Against that backdrop, dozens of House Republicans deserted Bush last week and voted against his proposals to expand oil and gas exploration off the Florida coast and on national monument grounds and to relax regulation of hard-rock mining. The GOP defections came mostly among moderates from the Northeast and Midwest, where Bush's stances on energy and the environment are especially controversial.

It has been conservatives who have bridled at other Bush plans. His faith-based initiative has been slowed partly because conservatives fear that strengthened partnerships with government will dilute the moral dimension of religious charities. And on education reform, one of the greatest hurdles to concluding the legislation is concern among conservatives that it centralizes too much power in Washington.

The common theme in all these challenges is that, with power so fractured in Washington, even small groups of dissenters have enormous leverage to block initiatives--either from the White House or Senate Democrats. The critical question ahead is whether that dynamic produces a stalemate on issues such as the patients' bill of rights and prescription drug coverage--or forces compromise. Neither side seems to have entirely settled on its answer.

"Nobody knows exactly how to work any of this," said Charles O. Jones, a political scientist at the University of Wisconsin at Madison.
Pollsters dismiss survey giving low marks to Bush

Donald Lambro
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A CBS News-New York Times survey showing declining public support for President Bush, his abilities and his agenda is being criticized by pollsters who say its methodology is tilted toward Democrats and gives an inaccurate reading of public opinion.

The national opinion survey, which the New York Times made the lead story on its front page on Thursday, presented an overwhelmingly dismal picture of the public's
perception of the president, his leadership and his policies so far.

Some pollsters found many of its findings surprising and in some cases wildly out of sync with their own numbers. Critics said the poll didn't limit respondents to likely voters but questioned adults in general, which tends to give a distorted picture of public opinion.

"When I look at the Times' polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats and it took me a long time to figure out why," said John Zogby, an independent campaign pollster whose numbers were among the most accurate of the 2000 presidential election.

"They poll only adults, and all adults include larger percentages of minorities or poorer voters and voters even in the $25,000-to-$50,000 income range, all of which lean to the Democratic side," Mr. Zogby said. "When you screen for voters, you screen out a substantial percentage of Democratic-leaning individuals who do not vote.

"I think it is an inaccurate reading. It doesn't tell me anything," he said.

"So many of their numbers were so bad, while his job approval rating was not bad, 53 percent, that it just did not translate, which kind of raises questions were they getting a false reading," said Republican pollster Ed Goeas, president of the Tarrance Group.

"As you go from likely voters to adults, you are moving to an increasingly less-engaged individual, which means you are getting a false read," Mr. Goeas said. He also noted that the survey was taken on a weekend, "when you get a type of voter that is more liberal and more disconnected. It's a questionable sampling."

"Using just adults in a poll can skew the results. Usually the bigger universe of just adult voters favors the Democrats while the smaller universe of likely voters favors the Republicans," said Republican pollster John McLaughlin.

That appears to be the chief reason why the Times' poll turned out so negatively for Mr. Bush. While his job approval rating was at a 53 percent majority, with 34 percent disapproving, most of the other numbers were worse: 47 percent approved of his foreign policy; 39 percent approved of his environmental policies; and 33 percent approved of his energy policies.
In its other findings, 49 percent said he can be trusted to keep his word as president, and 57 percent said his policies favor the rich.

Michael Kagay, polling director for the New York Times, denied that his survey sample was tilted to get a desired result, saying he used traditional survey techniques followed by many other pollsters.

"During a presidential election year, we often concentrate on registered voters, and in the fall we concentrate on likely voters. In non-election years, we concentrate on just adults," Mr. Kagay said yesterday.

"There's no tilting going on. That's a tradition that George Gallup established in 1935, and most polls have followed that same tradition," he said. "If you limit your sampling to likely voters all the time, you disenfranchise about 50 percent of the people."

Mr. Zogby said that overall "there isn't very much good news public opinionwise for Bush. I honestly believe he has squandered a number of opportunities in the first five months."

"Where my numbers are at real variance with [the CBS-Times poll] is when I see some of the job approval numbers," he said.

"They have Bush's favorable-unfavorable at 37-29. My polls get a favorable-unfavorable rating of 60-30. Not only is that a huge difference, but in the Times poll, 33 percent don't even have an opinion," he said.

Mr. Zogby found some of the other unusually low numbers to be "strange." For example, Vice President Richard B. Cheney received a 27-14 percent favorable-unfavorable score. "How can 59 percent not have an opinion on Cheney?" he asked.

Mr. Zogby was reluctant to comment on the CBS-Times methodology, but he made it clear that he did not think polling adults accurately measures how the country views its president.

"I think on matters of politics and policy we really ought to see the options of likely voters as opposed to all adults. The likely voters are what give us the true read because they are the ones who go out and vote and are the ones to compare apples to apples," he said.
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A CBS News-New York Times survey showing declining public support for President Bush, his abilities and his agenda is being criticized by pollsters who say its methodology is tilted toward Democrats and gives an inaccurate reading of
public opinion.<br> The national opinion survey, which the New<br> York Times made the lead story on its front page on Thursday, presented an<br> overwhelmingly dismal picture of the public's perception of the president, his<br> leadership and his policies so far.<br> Some pollsters found many of its findings surprising and in some cases wildly out of sync with their own numbers. Critics said the poll didn't limit respondents to likely voters but questioned adults in general, which tends to give a distorted picture of public opinion. When I look at the Times' polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats and it took me a long time to figure out why, said John Zogby, an independent campaign pollster whose numbers were among the most accurate of the 2000 presidential election. They poll only adults, and all adults include larger percentages of minorities or poorer voters and voters even in the $25,000-to-$50,000 income range, all of which lean to the Democratic side, Mr. Zogby said. When you screen for voters, you screen out a substantial percentage of Democratic-leaning individuals who do not vote. I think it is an inaccurate reading. It doesn't tell me anything, he said. So many of their numbers were so bad, while his job approval rating was not bad, 53 percent, that it just did not translate, which kind of raises questions were they getting a false reading, said Republican pollster Ed Goeas, president of the Tarrance Group. As you go from likely voters to adults, you are moving to an increasingly less-engaged individual, which means you are getting a false read, Mr. Goeas said. He also noted that the survey was taken on a weekend, when you get a type of voter that is more liberal and more disconnected. It's a questionable sampling. Using just adults in a poll can skew the results. Usually the bigger universe of just adult voters favors the Democrats while the smaller universe of likely voters favors the Republicans, said
Republican pollster John McLaughlin. That appears to be the chief reason why the Times' poll turned out so negatively for Mr. Bush. While his job approval rating was at a 53 percent majority, with 34 percent disapproving, most of the other numbers were worse: 47 percent approved of his foreign policy; 39 percent approved of his environmental policies; and 33 percent approved of his energy policies. In its other findings, 49 percent said he can be trusted to keep his word as president, and 57 percent said his policies favor the rich.

Michael Kagay, polling director for the New York Times, denied that his survey sample was tilted to get a desired result, saying he used traditional survey techniques followed by many other pollsters.

During a presidential election year, we often concentrate on registered voters, and in the fall we concentrate on likely voters. In non-election years, we concentrate on just adults, Mr. Kagay said yesterday.

There's no tilting going on. That's a tradition that George Gallup established in 1935, and most polls have followed that same tradition, he said. If you limit your sampling to likely voters all the time, you disenfranchise about 50 percent of the people.

Mr. Zogby said that overall there isn't very much good news public opinionwise for Bush. I honestly believe he has squandered a number of opportunities in the first five months. Where my numbers are at real variance with the CBS-Times poll is when I see some of the job approval numbers, he said.

They have Bush's favorable-unfavorable at 37-29. My polls get a favorable-unfavorable rating of 60-30. Not only is that a huge difference, but in the Times poll, 33 percent don't even have an opinion, he said.

Mr. Zogby found some of the other unusually low numbers to be strange. For example, Vice President Richard B. Cheney received a 27-14 percent favorable-unfavorable score. How can 59 percent not have an opinion on Cheney? he asked.
methodology, but he made it clear that he did not think polling adults accurately measures how the country views its president.<br>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;I think on matters of politics and policy we really ought to see the options of likely voters as opposed to all adults. The likely voters are what give us the true read because they are the ones who go out and vote and are the ones to compare apples to apples," he said.<o:p></o:p></p>

Copyright © 2001 News World Communications, Inc. All rights reserved.</p>
Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist

Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.

2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008

202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 = FAX
mark@bisconti.com
It's a stupid argument that they are trying to make.

John Mitchell
element
The leading provider of youth data and insight
73 Spring Street, Suite 205
New York, NY 10012
P: 212-925-3800
F: 212-925-9090
jmitchell@elementusa.com
www.elementcentral.com
Note discussion of whom should be counted in polling – all adults versus likely voters. Mark

///

The Washington Times
<http://www.washtimes.com> www.washtimes.com

Pollsters dismiss survey giving low marks to Bush

Donald Lambro
THE WASHINGTON TIMES
Published 6/26/01

A CBS News-New York Times survey showing declining public support for President Bush, his abilities and his agenda is being criticized by pollsters who say its methodology is tilted toward Democrats and gives an inaccurate reading of public opinion.

The national opinion survey, which the New York Times made the lead story on its front page on Thursday, presented an overwhelmingly dismal picture of the public's perception of the president, his leadership and his policies so far.

Some pollsters found many of its findings surprising and in some cases wildly out of sync with their own numbers. Critics said the poll didn't limit respondents to likely voters but questioned adults in general, which tends to give a distorted picture of public opinion.

"When I look at the Times' polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats and it took me a long time to figure out why," said John Zogby, an independent campaign pollster whose numbers were among the most accurate of the 2000 presidential election.

"They poll only adults, and all adults include larger percentages of minorities or poorer voters and voters even in the $25,000-to-$50,000 income range, all of which lean to the Democratic side," Mr. Zogby said. "When you screen for voters, you screen out a substantial percentage of Democratic-leaning individuals who do not
vote.

"I think it is an inaccurate reading. It doesn't tell me anything," he said.

"So many of their numbers were so bad, while his job approval rating was not bad, 53 percent, that it just did not translate, which kind of raises questions were they getting a false reading," said Republican pollster Ed Goeas, president of the Tarrance Group.

"As you go from likely voters to adults, you are moving to an increasingly less-engaged individual, which means you are getting a false read," Mr. Goeas said.

He also noted that the survey was taken on a weekend, "when you get a type of voter that is more liberal and more disconnected. It's a questionable sampling."

"Using just adults in a poll can skew the results. Usually the bigger universe of just adult voters favors the Democrats while the smaller universe of likely voters favors the Republicans," said Republican pollster John McLaughlin.

That appears to be the chief reason why the Times' poll turned out so negatively for Mr. Bush. While his job approval rating was at a 53 percent majority, with 34 percent disapproving, most of the other numbers were worse: 47 percent approved of his foreign policy; 39 percent approved of his environmental policies; and 33 percent approved of his energy policies.

In its other findings, 49 percent said he can be trusted to keep his word as president, and 57 percent said his policies favor the rich.

Michael Kagay, polling director for the New York Times, denied that his survey sample was tilted to get a desired result, saying he used traditional survey techniques followed by many other pollsters.

"During a presidential election year, we often concentrate on registered voters, and in the fall we concentrate on likely voters. In non-election years, we concentrate on just adults," Mr. Kagay said yesterday.

"There's no tilting going on. That's a tradition that George Gallup established in 1935, and most polls have followed that same tradition," he said. "If you limit your sampling to likely voters all the time, you disenfranchise about 50 percent of the people."

Mr. Zogby said that overall "there isn't very much good news public opinionwise for Bush. I honestly believe he has squandered a number of opportunities in the first five months."

"Where my numbers are at real variance with [the CBS-Times poll] is when
I see some of the job approval numbers," he said. "They have Bush's favorable-unfavorable at 37-29. My polls get a favorable-unfavorable rating of 60-30. Not only is that a huge difference, but in the Times poll, 33 percent don't even have an opinion," he said.

Mr. Zogby found some of the other unusually low numbers to be "strange." For example, Vice President Richard B. Cheney received a 27-14 percent favorable-unfavorable score. "How can 59 percent not have an opinion on Cheney?" he asked.

Mr. Zogby was reluctant to comment on the CBS-Times methodology, but he made it clear that he did not think polling adults accurately measures how the country views its president. "I think on matters of politics and policy we really ought to see the options of likely voters as opposed to all adults. The likely voters are what give us the true read because they are the ones who go out and vote and are the ones to compare apples to apples," he said.
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-----Original Message-----
From: Mark David Richards [mailto:mark@bisconti.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2001 9:05 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Pollsters dismiss survey giving low marks to Bush

Note discussion of whom should be counted in polling -- all adults versus likely voters.

The Washington Times

http://www.washtimes.com
A CBS News-New York Times survey showing declining public support for President Bush, his abilities and his agenda is being criticized by pollsters who say its methodology is tilted toward Democrats and gives an inaccurate reading of public opinion.

The national opinion survey, which the New York Times made the lead story on its front page on Thursday, presented an overwhelmingly dismal picture of the public's perception of the president, his leadership and his policies so far. Some pollsters found many of its findings surprising and in some cases wildly out of sync with their own numbers. Critics said the poll didn't limit respondents to likely voters but questioned adults in general, which tends to give a distorted picture of public opinion.

"When I look at the Times' polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats and it took me a long time to figure out why," said John Zogby, an independent campaign pollster whose numbers were among the most accurate of the 2000 presidential election. They poll only adults, and all adults include larger percentages of minorities or poorer voters and...
voters=20
even in the $25,000-to-$50,000 income range, all of which lean to the =

Democratic side," Mr. Zogby said. "When you screen for voters, you = screen
out=20
a substantial percentage of Democratic-leaning individuals who do not =
vote.<BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;"I think it is an inaccurate =
reading ,=20
It doesn't tell me anything," he =
said.<BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;"So=20
many of their numbers were so bad, while his job approval rating was not =
bad,=20
53 percent, that it just did not translate, which kind of raises =
questions=20
were they getting a false reading," said Republican pollster Ed = Goeas,=20
president of the Tarrance Group.<BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;"As = you
go=20
from likely voters to adults, you are moving to an increasingly = less-
engaged=20
individual, which means you are getting a false read," Mr. Goeas = said. He
also=20
noted that the survey was taken on a weekend, "when you get a type of =
voter=20
that is more liberal and more disconnected. It's a questionable=20
sampling."<BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;"Using just adults in a = poll
=20
skew the results. Usually the bigger universe of just adult voters = favors
the=20
Democrats while the smaller universe of likely voters favors the =
Republicans,"=20
said Republican pollster John=20
McLaughlin.<BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;That appears to be the =
chief=20
reason why the Times' poll turned out so negatively for Mr. Bush. = While
his=20
job approval rating was at a 53 percent majority, with 34 percent=20
disapproving, most of the other numbers were worse: 47 percent = approved
of
his=20
foreign policy; 39 percent approved of his environmental policies; = and
33=20
percent approved of his energy =
policies.<BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;In other findings, 49 percent said he can be trusted to keep his = word
as=20
president, and 57 percent said his policies favor the=20
rich.<BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;Michael Kagay, polling = director for
the=20
New York Times, denied that his survey sample was tilted to get a =
desired=20
result, saying he used traditional survey techniques followed by many =
other=20
pollsters.<BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;"During a presidential =
election=20
year, we often concentrate on registered voters, and in the fall we=20
concentrate on likely voters. In non-election years, we concentrate = on just=20
adults," Mr. Kagay said =
yesterday.<BR>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;"There's=20
no tilting going on. That's a tradition that George Gallup = established in=20
1935, and most polls have followed that same tradition," he said. "If = you=20
limit your sampling to likely voters all the time, you disenfranchise = about 50=20
percent of the people."&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;Mr. Zogby = said that=20
overall "there isn't very much good news public opinionwise for Bush. = I=20
honestly believe he has squandered a number of opportunities in the = first five=20
months."&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;"Where my numbers are at = real=20
variance with [the CBS-Times poll] is when I see some of the job = approval=20
numbers," he said.&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;"They have Bush's = favorable-unfavorable at 37-29. My polls get a favorable-unfavorable = rating of=20
60-30. Not only is that a huge difference, but in the Times poll, 33 = percent=20
don't even have an opinion," he = said.&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;Mr. Zogby found some of the other unusually low numbers to be "strange." = For=20
example, Vice President Richard B. Cheney received a 27-14 percent=20
favorable-unfavorable score. "How can 59 percent not have an opinion = on=20
Cheney?" he asked.&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;Mr. Zogby was = reluctant to=20
comment on the CBS-Times methodology, but he made it clear that he = did not=20
think polling adults accurately measures how the country views its=20
president.&lt;BR&gt;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&amp;nbsp;"I think on matters of = politics=20
and policy we really ought to see the options of likely voters as = opposed to=20
all adults. The likely voters are what give us the true read because = they are=20
the ones who go out and vote and are the ones to compare apples to = apples," he=20
said.&lt;p&gt;&lt;/p&gt;&lt;p style=3D"MARGIN: 0in 0in 0pt"&gt;&lt;font face=3D"Book Antiqua" =
color=3Dbblack size=3D3&gt;&lt;span style=3D"FONT-SIZE: 12pt; FONT-FAMILY: 'Book = Antiqua'"&gt;&lt;![endif]&gt;&lt;![if = !supportEmptyParas]&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;&lt;/p&gt;
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But I suspect that perhaps my opinion doesn't count for Mr. Zogby or the Washington Times?
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Pollsters dismiss survey giving low marks to Bush

Donald Lambro
THE WASHINGTON TIMES
Published 6/26/01
A CBS News-New York Times survey showing declining public support for President Bush, his abilities and his agenda is being criticized by pollsters who say its methodology is tilted toward Democrats and gives an inaccurate reading of public opinion.

The national opinion survey, which the New York Times made the lead story on its front page on Thursday, presented an overwhelmingly dismal picture of the public's perception of the president, his leadership and his policies so far.

Some pollsters found many of its findings surprising and in some cases wildly out of sync with their own numbers. Critics said the poll didn't limit respondents to likely voters but questioned adults in general, which tends to give a distorted picture of public opinion.

"When I look at the Times' polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats and it took me a long time to figure out why," said John Zogby, an independent campaign pollster whose numbers were among the most accurate of the 2000 presidential election.

"They poll only adults, and all adults include larger percentages of minorities or poorer voters and voters even in the $25,000-to-$50,000 income range, all of which lean to the Democratic side," Mr. Zogby said. "When you screen for voters, you screen out a substantial percentage of Democratic-leaning individuals who do not vote.

"I think it is an inaccurate reading. It doesn't tell me anything," he said.

"So many of their numbers were so bad, while his job approval rating was not bad, 53 percent, that it just did not translate, which kind of raises questions were they getting a false reading," said Republican pollster Ed Goeas, president of the Tarrance Group.

"As you go from likely voters to adults, you are moving to an increasingly less-engaged individual, which means you are getting a false read," Mr. Goeas said.

He also noted that the survey was taken on a weekend, "when you get a type of voter that is more liberal and more disconnected. It's a questionable sampling."

"Using just adults in a poll can skew the results. Usually the bigger
universe
of just adult voters favors the Democrats while the smaller universe of
likely
voters
favors the Republicans," said Republican pollster John McLaughlin.

That appears to be the chief reason why the Times' poll turned out so
negatively
for Mr. Bush. While his job approval rating was at a 53 percent majority,
with
34
percent disapproving, most of the other numbers were
worse: 47 percent approved of his foreign policy; 39 percent approved of his
environmental policies; and 33 percent approved of his energy policies.

In its other findings, 49 percent said he can be trusted to keep his
word
as
president, and 57 percent said his policies favor the rich.

Michael Kagay, polling director for the New York Times, denied that his
survey
sample was tilted to get a desired result, saying he used traditional survey
techniques followed by many other pollsters.

"During a presidential election year, we often concentrate on registered
voters,
and in the fall we concentrate on likely voters. In non-election years, we
concentrate on just adults," Mr. Kagay said yesterday.

"There's no tilting going on. That's a tradition that George Gallup
established
in 1935, and most polls have followed that same tradition," he said. "If you
limit
your sampling to likely voters all the time, you disenfranchise about 50
percent of
the people."

Mr. Zogby said that overall "there isn't very much good news public
opinionwise
for Bush. I honestly believe he has squandered a number of opportunities in
the first
five months."

"Where my numbers are at real variance with [the CBS-Times poll] is when
I see
some of the job approval numbers," he said.

"They have Bush's favorable-unfavorable at 37-29. My polls get a
favorable-unfavorable rating of 60-30. Not only is that a huge difference,
but
in the
Times poll, 33 percent don't even have an opinion," he said.

Mr. Zogby found some of the other unusually low numbers to be "strange."

For example, Vice President Richard B. Cheney received a 27-14 percent
favorable-unfavorable score. "How can 59 percent not have an opinion on
Cheney?" he
asked.

Mr. Zogby was reluctant to comment on the CBS-Times methodology, but he
made it
clear that he did not think polling adults accurately measures how the
country
views
its president.
"I think on matters of politics and policy we really ought to see the options of likely voters as opposed to all adults. The likely voters are what give us the true read because they are the ones who go out and vote and are the ones to compare apples to apples," he said.
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Pollsters dismiss survey giving low marks to Bush

Donald Lambro
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Published 6/26/01

A CBS News-New York Times survey showing declining public support for President Bush, his abilities and his agenda is being criticized by pollsters who say its methodology is tilted toward Democrats and gives an inaccurate reading of public opinion.

CBS News-New York Times survey showing declining public support for President Bush, his abilities and his agenda is being criticized by pollsters who say its methodology is tilted toward Democrats and gives an inaccurate reading of public opinion.
findings surprising and in some cases wildly out of sync with their own numbers. Critics said the poll didn't limit respondents to likely voters but questioned adults in general, which tends to give a distorted picture of public opinion. "When I look at the Times' polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats and it took me a long time to figure out why," said John Zogby, an independent campaign pollster whose numbers were among the most accurate of the 2000 presidential election. "They poll only adults, and all adults include larger percentages of minorities or poorer voters and voters even in the $25,000-to-$50,000 income range, all of which lean to the Democratic side," Mr. Zogby said. "When you screen for voters, you screen out a substantial percentage of Democratic-leaning individuals who do not vote. I think it is an inaccurate reading. It doesn't tell me anything," he said. "So many of their numbers were so bad, while his job approval rating was not bad, 53 percent, that it just did not translate, which kind of raises questions were they getting a false reading," said Republican pollster Ed Goeas, president of the Tarrance Group. "As you go from likely voters to adults, you are moving to an increasingly less-engaged individual, which means you are getting a false read," Mr. Goeas said. He also noted that the survey was taken on a weekend, "when you get a type of voter that is more liberal and more disconnected. It's a questionable sampling." "Using just adults in a poll can skew the results. Usually the bigger universe of just adult voters favors the Democrats while the smaller universe of likely voters favors the Republicans," said Republican pollster John McLaughlin. That appears to be the chief reason why the Times' poll turned out so negatively for Mr. Bush. While his
job approval rating was at a 53 percent majority, with 34 percent disapproving, most of the other numbers were worse: 47 percent approved of his foreign policy; 39 percent approved of his environmental policies; and 33 percent approved of his energy policies. In its other findings, said he can be trusted to keep his word as president, and 57 percent said his policies favor the rich.

In its other findings, 49 percent said he can be trusted to keep his word as president, and 57 percent said his policies favor the rich. Michael Kagay, polling director for the New York Times, denied that his survey sample was tilted to get a desired result, saying he used traditional survey techniques followed by many other pollsters. "During a presidential election year, we often concentrate on registered voters, and in the fall we concentrate on likely voters. In non-election years, we concentrate on just adults," Mr. Kagay said yesterday.

"There's no tilting going on. That's a tradition that George Gallup established in 1935, and most polls have followed that same tradition," he said. "If you limit your sampling to likely voters all the time, you disenfranchise about 50 percent of the people." Mr. Kagay said that overall, "there isn't very much good news public opinionwise for Bush. I honestly believe he has squandered a number of opportunities in the first five months." "Where my numbers are at real variance with [the CBS-Times poll] is when I see some of the job approval numbers," he said. "They have Bush's favorable-unfavorable at 37-29. My polls get a favorable-unfavorable rating of 60-30. Not only is that a huge difference, but in the Times poll, 33 percent don't even have an opinion," he said. Mr. Zogby found some of the unusually low numbers to be "strange." For example, Vice President Richard B. Cheney received a 27-14 percent favorable-unfavorable score. "How can 59 percent not have an opinion on Cheney?" asked. Mr. Zogby was reluctant to =
on the CBS-Times methodology, but he made it clear that he did not think polling adults accurately measures how the country views its president. "I think on matters of politics and policy we really ought to see the options of likely voters as opposed to all adults. The likely voters are what give us the true read because they are the ones who go out and vote and are the ones to compare apples to apples," he said.
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The premise on which the Washington Times article is based seems to me, at least, be to be thin and rather flaky, to say the least. Their implicit argument is that if a respondent is not a likely voter, then his or her opinions and attitudes don't count and should just be dismissed. Why pay attention to a citizen who doesn't vote? Forget the notion that he or she just might vote next time around and that maybe it's valid to take a measure of all the people, not just some. The logic supporting their attempt to dismiss and discredit this particular opinion poll is almost laughable. But then, considering the source, should we be surprised?

Dick Halpern
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> Pollsters dismiss survey giving low marks to Bush

>
A CBS News-New York Times survey showing declining public support for President Bush, his abilities and his agenda is being criticized by pollsters who say its methodology is tilted toward Democrats and gives an inaccurate reading of public opinion.

The national opinion survey, which the New York Times made the lead story on its front page on Thursday, presented an overwhelmingly dismal picture of the public's perception of the president, his leadership and his policies so far.

Some pollsters found many of its findings surprising and in some cases wildly out of sync with their own numbers. Critics said the poll didn't limit respondents to likely voters but questioned adults in general, which tends to give a distorted picture of public opinion.

"When I look at the Times' polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats and it took me a long time to figure out why," said John Zogby, an independent campaign pollster whose numbers were among the most accurate of the 2000 presidential election.

"They poll only adults, and all adults include larger percentages of minorities or poorer voters and voters even in the $25,000-to-$50,000 income range, all of which lean to the Democratic side," Mr. Zogby said.

"When you screen for voters, you screen out a substantial percentage of Democratic-leaning individuals who do not vote. "I think it is an inaccurate reading. It doesn't tell me anything," he said.

"So many of their numbers were so bad, while his job approval rating was not bad, 53 percent, that it just did not translate, which kind of raises questions were they getting a false reading," said Republican pollster Ed Goeas, president of the Tarrance Group.

"As you go from likely voters to adults, you are moving to an increasingly less-engaged individual, which means you are getting a false read," Mr. Goeas said. He also noted that the survey was taken on a weekend, "when you get a type of voter that is more liberal and more disconnected. It's a questionable sampling."

"Using just adults in a poll can skew the results. Usually the bigger universe of just adult voters favors the Democrats while the smaller universe of likely voters favors the Republicans," said...
Republican pollster John McLaughlin.

That appears to be the chief reason why the Times' poll turned out so negatively for Mr. Bush. While his job approval rating was at a 53 percent majority, with 34 percent disapproving, most of the other numbers were worse: 47 percent approved of his foreign policy; 39 percent approved of his environmental policies; and 33 percent approved of his energy policies.

In its other findings, 49 percent said he can be trusted to keep his word as president, and 57 percent said his policies favor the rich.

Michael Kagay, polling director for the New York Times, denied that his survey sample was tilted to get a desired result, saying he used traditional survey techniques followed by many other pollsters.

"During a presidential election year, we often concentrate on registered voters, and in the fall we concentrate on likely voters. In non-election years, we concentrate on just adults," Mr. Kagay said yesterday.

"There's no tilting going on. That's a tradition that George Gallup established in 1935, and most polls have followed that same tradition," he said. "If you limit your sampling to likely voters all the time, you disenfranchise about 50 percent of the people."

Mr. Zogby said that overall "there isn't very much good news opinionwise for Bush. I honestly believe he has squandered a number of opportunities in the first five months."

"Where my numbers are at real variance with [the CBS-Times poll] is when I see some of the job approval numbers," he said.

"They have Bush's favorable-unfavorable at 37-29. My polls get a favorable-unfavorable rating of 60-30. Not only is that a huge difference, but in the Times poll, 33 percent don't even have an opinion," he said.

Mr. Zogby found some of the other unusually low numbers to be "strange." For example, Vice President Richard B. Cheney received a 27-14 percent favorable-unfavorable score. "How can 59 percent not have an opinion on Cheney?" he asked.

Mr. Zogby was reluctant to comment on the CBS-Times methodology, but he made it clear that he did not think polling adults accurately measures how the country views its president.

"I think on matters of politics and policy we really ought to see the options of likely voters as opposed to all adults. The
The premise on which the Washington Times article is based seems to me, at least, be to be thin and rather flaky, to say the least. Their implicit argument is that if a respondent is not a likely voter, then his or her opinions and attitudes don't count and should just be dismissed. Why pay attention to a citizen who doesn't vote? Forget the notion that he or she just might vote next time around and that maybe it's valid to take a measure of all the people, not just some. The logic supporting their attempt to dismiss and discredit this particular opinion poll is almost laughable. But then, considering the source, should we be surprised?
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<dd>A CBS News-New York Times survey showing declining public support for President Bush, his abilities and his
agenda is being criticized by pollsters who say its methodology is tilted toward Democrats and gives an inaccurate reading of public opinion. The national opinion survey, which the New York Times made the lead story on its front page on Thursday, presented an overwhelmingly dismal picture of the public's perception of the president, his leadership and his policies so far. Some pollsters found many of its findings surprising and in some cases wildly out of sync with their own numbers. Critics said the poll didn't limit respondents to likely voters but questioned adults in general, which tends to give a distorted picture of public opinion. When I look at the Times' polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats and it took me a long time to figure out why, said John Zogby, an independent campaign pollster whose numbers were among the most accurate of the 2000 presidential election. They poll only adults, and all adults include larger percentages of minorities or poorer voters and voters even in the $25,000-to-$50,000 income range, all of which lean to the Democratic side, Mr. Zogby said. When you screen for voters, you screen out a substantial percentage of Democratic-leaning individuals who do not vote. I think it is an inaccurate reading. It doesn't tell me anything, he said. So many of their numbers were so bad, while his job approval rating was not bad, 53 percent, that it just did not translate, which kind of raises questions were they getting a false reading, said Republican pollster Ed Goeas, president of the Tarrance Group. As you go from likely voters to adults, you are moving to an increasingly less-engaged individual, which means you are getting a false read, Mr. Goeas said. He also noted that the survey was taken on a weekend, when you get a type of voter that is more liberal and more disconnected. It's a questionable sampling. Using just adults in a poll can skew the results. Usually the bigger universe of just adult voters favors the Democrats while the smaller universe of likely
voters favors the Republicans," said Republican pollster John McLaughlin. That appears to be the chief reason why the Times' poll turned out so negatively for Mr. Bush. While his job approval rating was at a 53 percent majority, with 34 percent disapproving, most of the other numbers were worse: 47 percent approved of his foreign policy; 39 percent approved of his environmental policies; and 33 percent approved of his energy policies. In its other findings, 49 percent said he can be trusted to keep his word as president, and 57 percent said his policies favor the rich.

Michael Kagay, polling director for the New York Times, denied that his survey sample was tilted to get a desired result, saying he used traditional survey techniques followed by many other pollsters. "During a presidential election year, we often concentrate on registered voters, and in the fall we concentrate on likely voters. In non-election years, we concentrate on just adults," Mr. Kagay said yesterday.

"There's no tilting going on. That's a tradition established in 1935, and most polls have followed that same tradition," he said. "If you limit your sampling to likely voters all the time, you disenfranchise about 50 percent of the people." Mr. Zogby said that overall "there isn't very much good news public opinionwise for Bush. I honestly believe he has squandered a number of opportunities in the first five months." Where my numbers are at real variance with [the CBS-Times poll] is when I see some of the job approval numbers," he said. Their have Bush's favorable-unfavorable at 37-29. My polls get a favorable-unfavorable rating of 60-30. Not only is that a huge difference, but in the Times poll, 33 percent don't even have an opinion," he said.

Mr. Zogby found some of the other unusually low numbers to be "strange." For example, Vice President Richard B. Cheney received a 27-14 percent favorable-unfavorable score. "How can 59 percent not have an opinion on Cheney?" he asked. Mr. Zogby was reluctant to comment on the CBS-Times methodology, but he made it clear that he did not think polling adults accurately measures how the country views its
Linda,

Thanks for getting the study weighted with 2000 data. Would it be possible to get the total number of calls we made, the dispositions for calls, and...
the various cooperation and contact rates? We will be publicly reporting figures on July 1, and I would like us to compile with the AAPOR guideline for disclosure. Please let me know if this will be a problem.

Would it be possible for you to instruct Shasha Gao on how to create population estimates like the ones you did for the KIdCare study (I think the project number was 817)? I recall you saying that it was a pretty straightforward procedure. The question we are sure to get is how may people are represented in various categories--i.e., like the number of people without insurance who have incomes between 100-185% of the poverty level might be 25,000-27,000, etc.

Thanks much,
Dianne

The irony here is that many individuals criticized the Clinton White House for supposedly always following the polls. Now many of these same people (see Safire's earlier column also) are stating that polls don't matter unless they reveal something about who is likely to win an election three years away.
I would like to add a cautionary note to all of this crystal ball gazing. I recall hearing a speaker from the American Enterprise Institute in 1991 saying that there was no one out there who could possibly beat George Bush (Sr.) in 1992; at that point, the only declared candidate was Paul Tsongas, and according to the speaker "you know what happened to the last Greek Massachusetts liberal who went up against Bush." A governor named Bill Clinton was hardly on the radar at that point; most people remembered him, if at all, as the person who gave a long-winded nominating speech in a disastrous debut at the 1988 Democratic convention. What a difference a few months made...

Finally, if polling is going to have any relevance to democracy, it would have to report the responses of all citizens. According to Zogby's argument, including non-voters who are dissatisfied with the administration skews the results. He does not ask what the implications of his own statement are-- for instance, what does it say for the republic if you have a significant portion of individuals who are dissatisfied and do not vote? Can you be assured that they will not express this dissatisfaction in some other way? Or, more optimistically, doesn't that indicate an opportunity for an individual who can address the reasons for their dissatisfaction in the next election? After all, non-voting is not a demographic characteristic like ethnicity, it is a choice-- and as such, can be changed at the citizen's whim.

Frank Rusciano

Mark David Richards wrote:
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I am not necessarily disagreeing with Frank below. But whatever happened to the concept that job approval is a measure which is independent from future electoral success? It's an absolute measure. It can't be strength relative to potential opponents.

Job approval is a means of monitoring an incumbent's success while in office years out from election day when attempting to identify likely voters would be foolish. The only meaningful base is the total electorate or adult population.

I do think the stories should have given some weight to the much greater shift in disapproval. This is from an earlier message:

"I believe the more significant finding on Bush is the increase in disapproval across all polls. See below."

http://www.pollingreport.com/BushJob.htm

Nick
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Finally, if polling is going to have any relevance to democracy, it
would have to report the responses of all citizens. According to
Zogby's argument, including non-voters who are dissatisfied with the
administration skews the results. He does not ask what the
implications of his own statement are-- for instance, what does it say
for the republic if you have a significant portion of individuals who
are dissatisfied and do not vote? Can you be assured that they will
not express this dissatisfaction in some other way? Or, more
optimistically, doesn't that indicate an opportunity for an individual
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To quote Dennis Miller, "I don't mean to go on a rant here..." I'll keep it short:

Saying that voters are the only people whose opinions count seems to me only a step away from saying that landowners (and white male landowners, at that) are the only people worthy of voting in the first place. Last time I checked, the President presides over a government for the people, not a government for the voters.

-----Original Message-----
From: Mark David Richards [mailto:mark@bisconti.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2001 9:05 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Pollsters dismiss survey giving low marks to Bush

Note discussion of whom should be counted in polling - all adults versus likely voters. Mark

///

The Washington Times
<http://www.washtimes.com> www.washtimes.com

Pollsters dismiss survey giving low marks to Bush

Donald Lambro
THE WASHINGTON TIMES
Published 6/26/01

A CBS News-New York Times survey showing declining public support for President Bush, his abilities and his agenda is being criticized by pollsters who say its methodology is tilted toward Democrats and gives an inaccurate reading of public opinion.

The national opinion survey, which the New York Times made the lead story on its front page on Thursday, presented an overwhelmingly dismal picture of the public's perception of the president, his leadership and his policies so far.

Some pollsters found many of its findings surprising and in some cases wildly out of sync with their own numbers. Critics said the poll didn't limit respondents to
likely voters but questioned adults in general, which tends to give a distorted picture of public opinion.

"When I look at the Times' polls, they are generally tilted toward the Democrats and it took me a long time to figure out why," said John Zogby, an independent campaign pollster whose numbers were among the most accurate of the 2000 presidential election.

"They poll only adults, and all adults include larger percentages of minorities or poorer voters and voters even in the $25,000-to-$50,000 income range, all of which lean to the Democratic side," Mr. Zogby said. "When you screen for voters, you screen out a substantial percentage of Democratic-leaning individuals who do not vote.

"I think it is an inaccurate reading. It doesn't tell me anything," he said.

"So many of their numbers were so bad, while his job approval rating was not bad, 53 percent, that it just did not translate, which kind of raises questions were they getting a false reading," said Republican pollster Ed Goeas, president of the Tarrance Group.

"As you go from likely voters to adults, you are moving to an increasingly less-engaged individual, which means you are getting a false read," Mr. Goeas said. He also noted that the survey was taken on a weekend, "when you get a type of voter that is more liberal and more disconnected. It's a questionable sampling."

"Using just adults in a poll can skew the results. Usually the bigger universe of just adult voters favors the Democrats while the smaller universe of likely voters favors the Republicans," said Republican pollster John McLaughlin.

That appears to be the chief reason why the Times' poll turned out so negatively for Mr. Bush. While his job approval rating was at a 53 percent majority, with 34 percent disapproving, most of the other numbers were worse: 47 percent approved of his foreign policy; 39 percent approved of his environmental policies; and 33 percent approved of his energy policies.

In its other findings, 49 percent said he can be trusted to keep his word as president, and 57 percent said his policies favor the rich.

Michael Kagay, polling director for the New York Times, denied that his survey sample was tilted to get a desired result, saying he used traditional survey
techniques followed by many other pollsters.

"During a presidential election year, we often concentrate on registered voters, and in the fall we concentrate on likely voters. In non-election years, we concentrate on just adults," Mr. Kagay said yesterday.

"There's no tilting going on. That's a tradition that George Gallup established in 1935, and most polls have followed that same tradition," he said. "If you limit your sampling to likely voters all the time, you disenfranchise about 50 percent of the people."

Mr. Zogby said that overall "there isn't very much good news public opinionwise for Bush. I honestly believe he has squandered a number of opportunities in the first five months."

"Where my numbers are at real variance with [the CBS-Times poll] is when I see some of the job approval numbers," he said.

"They have Bush's favorable-unfavorable at 37-29. My polls get a favorable-unfavorable rating of 60-30. Not only is that a huge difference, but in the Times poll, 33 percent don't even have an opinion," he said.

Mr. Zogby found some of the other unusually low numbers to be "strange." For example, Vice President Richard B. Cheney received a 27-14 percent favorable-unfavorable score. "How can 59 percent not have an opinion on Cheney?" he asked.

Mr. Zogby was reluctant to comment on the CBS-Times methodology, but he made it clear that he did not think polling adults accurately measures how the country views its president.

"I think on matters of politics and policy we really ought to see the options of likely voters as opposed to all adults. The likely voters are what give us the true read because they are the ones who go out and vote and are the ones to compare apples to apples," he said.
To quote Dennis Miller, "I don't mean to go on a rant here... I'll keep it short:

Saying that voters are the only people whose opinions count seems to me only a step away from saying that landowners (and white male landowners, at that) are the only people worthy of voting in the first place. Last time I checked, the President presides over a government for the people, not a government for the voters.
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Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008
202/347-8822 202/347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com
Thank you Brendan!

Do I have this right? Lemme see here:

We only poll likely voters.

Who have incomes over $50,000.

We only poll "engaged individuals" (who pass the bowling ball test).

We only poll people who hang around their telephones on weekdays.

Now I know for sure this isn't a mass public.

It's certainly not a general public.

I don't know who these folks are or whom they represent (except that they are less likely to be Democrats).

Why not make it easy? Have a filter at the beginning on political party identification. Eliminate everyone who is not Republican (except for election polls) and be done with it.

Susan

Mark, have your comments will get back to you; thanks. SCL

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.

(850) 644-8778 Voice Mail Available

(850) 644-8776 FAX

Department of Educational Research

Florida State University
In research on the PRC, I have just stumbled upon what might be the all-time saddest poll--not poll question, but *poll* (see below). And it comes out of the Henry Luce tradition at Time Inc., of all places.

Certainly I'm no expert on item construction, but don't at least some of you think that respondents ought to be presented with a few more response categories--"Undecided," for example?

-- Jim
I'm sure Bill (I governed by the poll) Clinton would answer:

"That depends on what your definition of 'ever' is"
In research on the PRC, I have just stumbled upon what might be the all-time saddest poll—not poll question, but *poll* (see below). And it comes out of the Henry Luce tradition at Time Inc., of all places.

Certainly I'm no expert on item construction, but don't at least some of you think that respondents ought to be presented with a few more response categories--"Undecided," for example?

-- Jim

http://www.time.com/time/asia/features/sex/

Have you ever had sex?

Yes

No

Navigate to the next story by voting

http://www.time.com/time/asia/features/sex/

*******
In the discussion of the dip in President Bush's approval ratings and the increase in his disapproval ratings, as measured by the recent New York Times / CBS News poll, there has been little reference to the trends in such polls in other administrations.

Some may be interested in examining the Presidential approval/disapproval ratings on the Roper Center Web site. Go to http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/ Click "Online access to data" and then click "Presidential job performance." The resulting screen provides the ratings data on G.W. Bush (#43) that have been the subject of this discussion. You can select a specific polling organization and get data for Clinton as well from multiple polling organizations. The page also lets you choose Gallup poll results among 11 Presidents -- all who have been in the office since the advent of polling in the U.S.

We are going to identify the Bush's better. You can tell which one is being rated from the dates of the polls, but the initials will make it clearer.

The increase in disapproval ratings in the first months appears to be fairly consistent across many administrations. In Gallup polls, Clinton, for example, went from 37% disapprove before the inauguration and 20% right after it to 50% disapprove by June 18-21 and hovered around that number until August. (This was not his peak disapproval rating, however.)

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

Please note change of e-mail address:

Richard C. ROCKWELL
Executive Director, The Roper Center & Institute for Social Inquiry
Professor of Sociology
341 Mansfield Road, U-164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA
V +1 860 486-4440
F +1 860 486-6308
Q: What is a cost-effective way to learn about the attitudes and perceptions of Illinois residents?

A: THE ILLINOIS POLL

If the costs of a custom-designed survey have prohibited you from collecting information you could use on the attitudes, perceptions, and/or behaviors of Illinois residents, THE ILLINOIS POLL gives you the opportunity to obtain those data at a lower cost. The Survey Research Laboratory, a unit of the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago, has over 35 years experience in survey research and methodology. You can take advantage of that experience by participating in THE ILLINOIS POLL, an annual, statewide, omnibus telephone survey. The next ILLINOIS POLL will be conducted in Fall 2001.

How does THE ILLINOIS POLL work?

You can submit already-prepared questions for inclusion in THE ILLINOIS POLL or work with SRL staff to design your questions. Your questions are combined with those from other participants to be administered all at once. The cost is lower because the expenses of conducting the poll are shared by all participants.

A minimum of 600 interviews will be completed. This allows statistically reliable estimates for the state population as a whole. All interviewing is done in accordance with the most advanced survey techniques.
The cost per closed-ended question is $1,200. Open-ended questions are more expensive and are priced individually. Included in the cost of individual question preparation is advice on question wording, formatting, and order; a pretest of the question(s); and any subsequent revisions that are required.

As part of THE ILLINOIS POLL, demographic information will be gathered and shared with all participants [a listing of demographic questions included can be found on our web site, noted below]. In addition each of your questions will be cross-tabulated with each demographic characteristic and you will receive computer-generated frequencies for the survey results of your questions.

When the survey is complete, you will receive an ASCII data file that will allow you to do your own data analysis; a codebook documenting the coding of each of your questions and the demographic questions; and a complete methodological report detailing both technical and quality-control procedures for the entire survey.

For more information about THE ILLINOIS POLL, visit THE ILLINOIS POLL Web page at http://www.srl.uic.edu/illinoispoll.htm, or send an e-mail to poll@srl.uic.edu.
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Q: What is a cost-effective way to learn about the attitudes and perceptions of Illinois residents?

A: THE ILLINOIS POLL

If the costs of a custom-designed survey have prohibited you from collecting information you could use on the attitudes, perceptions, and/or behaviors of Illinois residents, THE ILLINOIS POLL gives you the opportunity to obtain those data at a lower cost. The Survey Research Laboratory, a unit of the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago, has over 35 years experience in survey research and methodology. You can take advantage of that experience by participating in THE ILLINOIS POLL, an annual, statewide, omnibus telephone survey. The next ILLINOIS POLL will be conducted in Fall 2001.

How does THE ILLINOIS POLL work?

You can submit already-prepared questions for inclusion in THE ILLINOIS POLL or work with SRL staff to design your questions. Your questions are combined with those from other participants to be administered all at once. The cost is lower because the expenses of conducting the poll are shared by all participants.

A minimum of 600 interviews will be completed. This allows statistically reliable estimates for the state population as a whole. All interviewing is done in accordance with the most advanced survey techniques.

The cost per closed-ended question is $1,200. Open-ended questions are more expensive and are priced individually. Included in the cost of individual question preparation is advice on question wording, formatting, and order; a pretest of the question(s); and any subsequent revisions that are required.

As part of THE ILLINOIS POLL, demographic information will be gathered and
shared
with all participants (a listing of demographic questions included can be
found on
our web site, noted below]. In addition each of your questions will be
cross-tabulated with each demographic characteristic and you will receive
computer-generated frequencies for the survey results of your questions.

When the survey is complete, you will receive an ASCII data file that will
allow you
to do your own data analysis; a codebook documenting the coding of each of
your
questions and the demographic questions; and a complete methodological report
detailing both technical and quality-control procedures for the entire
survey.

For more information about THE ILLINOIS POLL, visit THE ILLINOIS POLL Web
page
at
http://www.srl.uic.edu/illinoispoll.htm, or send an e-mail to
poll@srl.uic.edu.

This report by Janny Scott appears as the lead story in the

Do the mounting complaints about the Census like those
described here simply mean that we are now in another
calendar year ending with "1"--or are there some more
unusual problems with the 2000 census?
Whatever the case, the story certainly serves to illustrate just how much we all depend on Census data.

-- Jim

June 27, 2001

ADJUSTED CENSUS QUESTION IS BLAMED FOR HISPANIC MISCOUNT

By JANNY SCOTT

The Census Bureau thought it had a new and improved way to count the many Hispanic groups in all their variety, but it appears to have backfired. As a result, New York City officials say, the bureau significantly underestimated the size of several groups, including Dominicans and Colombians.

The problem became apparent yesterday as the bureau began to release the first detailed data from the 2000 census on Latinos and Asians in New York. Large numbers of Latinos turned out to have failed to identify themselves as belonging to any specific Latino group.

Demographers for New York City say they believe that the problem can be traced largely to the rewording of a census question about Hispanic ethnicity. Bureau officials said the rewording is one possible explanation for a problem that poses problems for social scientists, city agencies and social service groups.

The total number of Hispanics of all kinds was put at 2,160,554, out of a city total of 8,008,278, in 2000.

"Boy, this has opened up a big can of worms," said Roberto Ramirez, a survey statistician with the Census Bureau. "Because this is sensitive stuff. People want their detail, but they don't understand how people report in the real world."

The census numbers released yesterday put the official count of Dominicans in the city at 406,806, nearly 150,000 below what city officials say figures on
immigration, births and deaths strongly suggest. The official number for the city's Colombian population dropped by more than 7,000 since 1990. The city had estimated that it would rise by 35,000.

Meanwhile, the number of Latinos counted as part of a generic "other Hispanic" category jumped to 401,108 in 2000 from 115,541 in 1990. City officials and others suspect that many Dominicans, Colombians, Ecuadoreans, Peruvians and others ended up in that group after failing to write in their specific group as asked on the questionnaire.

"It's pretty significant, I would say, if it really, truly is a mess-up," John Mollenkopf, director of the Center for Urban Research at the City University of New York Graduate Center, said yesterday. "Hispanics are the biggest category of immigrants to the United States, and we want to know all we can about the diversity and specifics of that population. So, if we've done something to give us less good information, that's too bad, really."

The problem does not affect the count of Puerto Ricans, Mexicans and Cubans. They are asked simply to check a box next to the name of their group, not to write in their group's name.

The numbers made public yesterday are just the latest in a series of data from the 2000 census being released in a three-year period. They include counts of all Latino and Asian groups, as well as of non-Hispanic blacks, whites and others, along with data on the makeup of their households, family sizes and ages in every census tract in the city.

The numbers shed new light on which groups are creating the marked increase in the average size of city households, which had declined for most of last century but increased since 1990 to near the national average. The new data show that the growth in household and family size in the city has been heavily among Asians and Hispanics.
and in heavily immigrant neighborhoods.

Non-Hispanic whites had the smallest average household size in the city, with an average of 2.1 people per household, compared with a statewide average for whites of 2.4. The average household size for blacks in the city was 2.7, also below the state average. Asian households averaged 3.1 people and Hispanic 3.5, both in the city and statewide.

The highest percentages of Hispanic family households made up of five or more people were in Queens, where one in four family households were that size. One in five Asian family households in Queens included five or more. Only 6 percent of all non-Hispanic white family households in New York City included that many people, and they were concentrated most heavily in Staten Island.

The highest percentages of people who described themselves as relatives and nonrelatives living with families were in the Bronx and Queens, often in immigrant neighborhoods where many families take in boarders and double up. Relatively few non-Hispanic whites put themselves in that category, but they were more likely than other groups to live in nonfamily households.

Non-Hispanic whites were also older than other groups, and older than whites living in the outer suburbs and upstate New York. The median age for white New York City women, for example, is 42.8. The median age for Hispanic women is 30.5; for Asian women, 33.8; and for black women, 34.2.

The question about the count of what are called Hispanic subgroups arose initially because of the gaps between the official numbers for Dominicans and Colombians and the Department of City Planning's estimates. That was in addition to the startling increase in the numbers in the "other Hispanic" category, which rose 247 percent.

"The number of Dominicans that the Census Bureau has reported for New York City is far too low," said Joseph J. Salvo, director of the population division of the Planning Department. "It's well below even the most conservative or minimal estimate that this department has produced. Similarly, other groups that had to report
Mr. Salvo traced the problem at least in part to the bureau's decision to change a single question on the census short form, intended to be filled out by everyone living in the country. That question concerned whether the person answering was "Spanish/Hispanic/Latino."

People answering could check one box if they were Puerto Rican, another if they were Cuban and a third if they were Mexican or Mexican-American. But if they belonged to another Hispanic group, they were to check a box for "other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino" and then write in the name of their specific group.

In 1990, the question included more detailed instructions: "Print one group, for example: Argentinian, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on." But the bureau decided in the 1990's to eliminate the examples after finding a suspiciously large increase in the number of people who named one of those six groups, as opposed to any others, Mr. Ramirez said.

The change may have caused some confusion, he said.

"Some, we suspect, might have viewed it as a multiple-choice question," he said. "When we asked, 'Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino, they might have thought, 'I'm Argentinian but, yeah, I'm Hispanic.' "

He added, "Some respondents may not have understood that they were supposed to give us a detailed origin."

Jorge del Pinal, assistant division chief for special population statistics at the bureau, said there were other possible explanations. Some Latinos may have simply chosen to identify with the greater group, Hispanic or Latino, instead of their specific national origin. Or, he said, younger Latinos born in the United States may have answered differently from Latinos born abroad.

But Moises Perez, executive director of Alianza Dominicana, the largest Dominican social service agency in New York City, said the problem was confusion, not choice.

"What a ridiculous thing," he said. "If you're illiterate, or you don't
write
Spanish appropriately, it was a confusing form."

Finally, Philip Kasinitz, a professor of sociology at Hunter College who specializes in urban sociology and immigration, said another possible explanation was that Dominicans and others have simply left the city. He said, "Anybody who thinks they understand what went on with these numbers right now is purely seat-of-the-pants guessing."

The failure of some Latinos to identify themselves with a specific group, and any underestimations that might result, could have implications beyond those for social scientists, who use the census to determine patterns of neighborhood change and to study differences among groups in income and education levels, employment and housing.

As for city agencies, Mr. Salvo said inaccurate numbers could affect programs aimed at serving Dominicans, the second-largest Hispanic group in New York, after Puerto Ricans. "One of the great things about the census is its ability to represent what's really there at the small-area level," he said. "What I'm worried about is we're starting off with less than what's there."

Others pointed to political ramifications.

"If Colombians are perceived to be a decreasing group over the long run, what political presence will they have when they speak to elected officials?" said Arturo Ignacio Sanchez, a professor of urban planning at the Pratt Institute Graduate School of Architecture and Planning.


---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

*****

>From lbourque@ucla.edu Wed Jun 27 17:35:00 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f5SOYxJ04985 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Jun 2001
17:34:59
I think you sent this to the wrong person.

At 08:39 AM 6/27/01 -0500, you wrote:
> Linda,
> Thanks for getting the study weighted with 2000 data. Would it be
> possible to get the total number of calls we made, the dispositions for
> calls, and
> the various cooperation and contact rates? We will be publicly reporting
> figures on July 1, and I would like us to compile with the AAPOR
> guideline for disclosure. Please let me know if this will be a problem.
> Would it be possible for you to instruct Shasha Gao on how to create
> population estimates like the ones you did for the KidCare study (I
> think the project number was 817)? I recall you saying that it was a
> pretty straightforward procedure. The question we are sure to get is
> how many people are represented in various categories--i.e., like the
> number of people without insurance who have incomes between 100-185% of
> the poverty level might be 25,000-27,000, etc.
> Thanks much,
> Dianne
>
> From dhalpern@bellsouth.net Wed Jun 27 19:25:54 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMT
    id f5S2PsJ09253 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Jun 2001
19:25:54
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from imf08bis.bellsouth.net (mail008.mail.bellsouth.net
[205.152.58.28])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMT
Thank you, Jim! It's obvious that the purpose of the Time Magazine site was to create a story about sex. A very steamy one, matter of fact. From what I can infer the the results of the Time's poll seem to represent only a self selected sample of Time Magazine readers who are intrigued by sex. An unusual, niche group who seem to reflect a cultural pattern distinct from our own. If you believe that....take a look at the site before commenting. And enjoy! And don't forget to vote!

At 12:55 PM 6/27/01, you wrote:

> In research on the PRC, I have just stumbled upon what
> might be the all-time saddest poll--not poll question,
> but *poll* (see below). And it comes out of the Henry
> Luce tradition at Time Inc., of all places.
>
> Certainly I'm no expert on item construction, but don't
> at least some of you think that respondents ought to
> be presented with a few more response categories--
> "Undecided," for example?
> -- Jim

> Have you ever had sex?
> Yes
> No
> Navigate to the next story by voting
Further to the sex survey conducted by TIME Asia, here are some of their other questions. In each case the reader must vote in order to download the associated article and the poll results. It would be easy to argue with the question wordings but I doubt that wouldn't be a very good use of your time. The poll maybe sad but I'd be surprised if it didn't generate incredible readership of TIME.

Do you think that monogamy is important?
Yes
No

How old were you when you had your first sexual encounter?
Below 13
13-15 16-17 18-20 20-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 40 or over

Do you think that premarital sex is acceptable?
Yes
No
Why do you have sex?
For pleasure
Out of duty
For conception
For lust
For love
For fun
My job
To improve social or financial status

Copyright © 2001 Time Inc. All rights reserved.
no. It's a notice of an omnibus survey being done by the University of Illinois at Chicago. Anyone interested in adding questions to the survey should follow the instructions in the email.

>>> Phillip Downs <pd@kerr-downs.com> 06/27/01 05:37pm

is this spam?

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
[mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Jennifer Parsons
Sent: Wednesday, June 27, 2001 6:14 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001

Q: What is a cost-effective way to learn about the attitudes and perceptions of Illinois residents?

A: THE ILLINOIS POLL

If the costs of a custom-designed survey have prohibited you from collecting information you could use on the attitudes, perceptions, and/or behaviors of Illinois residents, THE ILLINOIS POLL gives you the opportunity to obtain those data at a lower cost. The Survey Research Laboratory, a unit of the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago, has over 35 years
experience in survey research and methodology. You can take advantage of that experience by participating in THE ILLINOIS POLL, an annual, statewide, omnibus telephone survey. The next ILLINOIS POLL will be conducted in Fall 2001.

How does THE ILLINOIS POLL work?

You can submit already-prepared questions for inclusion in THE ILLINOIS POLL or work with SRL staff to design your questions. Your questions are combined with those from other participants to be administered all at once. The cost is lower because the expenses of conducting the poll are shared by all participants.

A minimum of 600 interviews will be completed. This allows statistically reliable estimates for the state population as a whole. All interviewing is done in accordance with the most advanced survey techniques.

The cost per closed-ended question is $1,200. Open-ended questions are more expensive and are priced individually. Included in the cost of individual question preparation is advice on question wording, formatting, and order; a pretest of the question(s); and any subsequent revisions that are required.

As part of THE ILLINOIS POLL, demographic information will be gathered and shared with all participants (a listing of demographic questions included can be found on our web site, noted below). In addition each of your questions will be cross-tabulated with each demographic characteristic and you will receive computer-generated frequencies for the survey results of your questions.

When the survey is complete, you will receive an ASCII data file that will allow you to do your own data analysis; a codebook documenting the coding of each of your questions and the demographic questions; and a complete methodological report detailing both technical and quality-control procedures for the entire survey.

For more information about THE ILLINOIS POLL, visit THE ILLINOIS POLL Web page at http://www.srl.uic.edu/illinoispoll.htm, or send an e-mail to poll@srl.uic.edu.
I'm afraid this reply gives short shrift to a valid question about what constitutes spam, and what kind of communication we want to encourage/discourage on aapornet.

This kind of unsolicited notice is extremely rare on aapornet, and I for one would like to keep it that way. The information may be very useful for researchers in need of Illinois based data, but a discussion-based listserv is probably not the best venue for distributing it. Perhaps AAPOR could consider adding an "Industry News" section to aapor.org where announcements like this could be posted for a small fee.

Lydia Saad

-----Original Message-----
From: Linda Owens [mailto:lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2001 8:59 AM
To: pd@kerr-downs.com; aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001 -Reply

no. It's a notice of an omnibus survey being done by the University of Illinois at Chicago. Anyone interested in adding questions to the survey should follow the instructions in the email.

>>> Phillip Downs <pd@kerr-downs.com> 06/27/01 05:37pm
>>> is this spam?

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
[mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Jennifer Parsons
Sent: Wednesday, June 27, 2001 6:14 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001

Q: What is a cost-effective way to learn about the attitudes and perceptions of Illinois residents?
If the costs of a custom-designed survey have prohibited you from collecting information you could use on the attitudes, perceptions, and/or behaviors of Illinois residents, THE ILLINOIS POLL gives you the opportunity to obtain those data at a lower cost. The Survey Research Laboratory, a unit of the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago, has over 35 years experience in survey research and methodology. You can take advantage of that experience by participating in THE ILLINOIS POLL, an annual, statewide, omnibus telephone survey. The next ILLINOIS POLL will be conducted in Fall 2001.

How does THE ILLINOIS POLL work?

You can submit already-prepared questions for inclusion in THE ILLINOIS POLL or work with SRL staff to design your questions. Your questions are combined with those from other participants to be administered all at once. The cost is lower because the expenses of conducting the poll are shared by all participants.

A minimum of 600 interviews will be completed. This allows statistically reliable estimates for the state population as a whole. All interviewing is done in accordance with the most advanced survey techniques.

The cost per closed-ended question is $1,200. Open-ended questions are more expensive and are priced individually. Included in the cost of individual question preparation is advice on question wording, formatting, and order; a pretest of the question(s); and any subsequent revisions that are required.

As part of THE ILLINOIS POLL, demographic information will be gathered and shared with all participants (a listing of demographic questions included can be found on our web site, noted below). In addition each of your questions will be cross-tabulated with each demographic characteristic and you will receive computer-generated frequencies for the survey results of your questions.

When the survey is complete, you will receive an ASCII data file that will allow you to do your own data analysis; a codebook documenting the coding of each of your questions and the demographic questions; and a complete methodological report detailing both technical and quality-control procedures for the entire survey.

For more information about THE ILLINOIS POLL, visit THE ILLINOIS POLL Web page at http://www.srl.uic.edu/illinoispoll.htm, or send an e-mail to poll@srl.uic.edu.
It's interesting that this is just coming up now. I have seen several announcements over the years of other omnibus surveys and have never seen those challenged as spam.

>>> <Lydia_Saad@gallup.com> 06/28/01 09:11am >>>
I'm afraid this reply gives short shrift to a valid question about what constitutes spam, and what kind of communication we want to encourage/discourage on aapornet.

This kind of unsolicited notice is extremely rare on aapornet, and I for one would like to keep it that way. The information may be very useful for researchers in need of Illinois based data, but a discussion-based listserv is probably not the best venue for distributing it. Perhaps AAPOR could consider adding an "Industry News" section to aapor.org where announcements like this could be posted for a small fee.

Lydia Saad

-----Original Message-----
From: Linda Owens [mailto:lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2001 8:59 AM
To: pd@kerr-downs.com; aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001 -Reply

no. It's a notice of an omnibus survey being done by the University of Illinois at Chicago. Anyone interested in adding questions to the survey should follow the instructions in the email.

>>> Phillip Downs <pd@kerr-downs.com> 06/27/01 05:37pm
>>> is this spam?
Q: What is a cost-effective way to learn about the attitudes and perceptions of Illinois residents?

A: THE ILLINOIS POLL

If the costs of a custom-designed survey have prohibited you from collecting information you could use on the attitudes, perceptions, and/or behaviors of Illinois residents, THE ILLINOIS POLL gives you the opportunity to obtain those data at a lower cost. The Survey Research Laboratory, a unit of the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago, has over 35 years experience in survey research and methodology. You can take advantage of that experience by participating in THE ILLINOIS POLL, an annual, statewide, omnibus telephone survey. The next ILLINOIS POLL will be conducted in Fall 2001.

How does THE ILLINOIS POLL work?

You can submit already-prepared questions for inclusion in THE ILLINOIS POLL or work with SRL staff to design your questions. Your questions are combined with those from other participants to be administered all at once. The cost is lower because the expenses of conducting the poll are shared by all participants.

A minimum of 600 interviews will be completed. This allows statistically reliable estimates for the state population as a whole. All interviewing is done in accordance with the most advanced survey techniques.

The cost per closed-ended question is $1,200. Open-ended questions are more expensive and are priced individually. Included in the cost of individual question preparation is advice on question wording, formatting, and order; a pretest of the question(s); and any subsequent revisions that are required.

As part of THE ILLINOIS POLL, demographic information will be gathered and shared with all participants (a listing of demographic questions included can be found on our web site, noted below). In addition each of your questions will be cross-tabulated with each demographic characteristic and you will receive computer-generated frequencies for the survey results of your questions.

When the survey is complete, you will receive an ASCII data file
that will allow you to do your own data analysis; a codebook documenting the coding of each of your questions and the demographic questions; and a complete methodological report detailing both technical and quality-control procedures for the entire survey.

For more information about THE ILLINOIS POLL, visit THE ILLINOIS POLL Web page at http://www.srl.uic.edu/illinoispoll.htm, or send an e-mail to poll@srl.uic.edu.

>From GStraw@aarp.org Thu Jun 28 07:46:20 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5SEkJJ27545 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Jun 2001 07:46:20
    -0700 (PDT)
Received: from gatekeeper.aarp.org (gatekeeper.aarp.org [204.254.118.1])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA11479 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Jun 2001 07:46:19 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: by gatekeeper.aarp.org; (8.8.8/1.3/10May95) id KAA13158; Thu, 28 Jun 2001 10:30:30 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from imc01dc.aarp.org ([170.109.3.86])
    by VMS.AARP.ORG (PMDF V5.1-10 #D4308)
    id <01K5APXC8NZ48ZDYKA@VMS.AARP.ORG> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu,
    28 Jun 2001 10:44:45 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from imc01dc.aarp.org ([170.109.3.86])
    by VMS.AARP.ORG (PMDF V5.1-10 #D4308)
    with ESMTP id <01K5APWT2OAY82DYUQ@VMS.AARP.ORG> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu,
Received: by imc01dc.aarp.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    id <NZ0B30C5>; Thu, 28 Jun 2001 10:43:24 -0400
Content-return: allowed
Date: Thu, 28 Jun 2001 10:43:20 -0400
From: "Straw, Gretchen" <GStraw@aarp.org>
Subject: RE: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001 -Reply
To: '"aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-id: <>EDC131491CBD411AE1200508BB01EFE01EC52F9@mbs02dc.aarp.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

As a regular reader of AAPORNET and as a state-level researcher, I have always found the information on state omnibus polls very useful. Given that these polls are often available only once or twice a year, it would be easy to miss seeing them if one had to regularly scan a website. On the other hand, the list serve gives us "just in time" information. And as always, the reader can delete unwanted messages. I guess one person's spam is another person's valuable information.
Gretchen Straw  
Associate Research Director  
AARP  
State Member Research Department

-----Original Message-----
From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com [mailto:Lydia_Saad@gallup.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2001 10:11 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001 -Reply

I'm afraid this reply gives short shrift to a valid question about what constitutes spam, and what kind of communication we want to encourage/discourage on aapornet.

This kind of unsolicited notice is extremely rare on aapornet, and I for one would like to keep it that way. The information may be very useful for researchers in need of Illinois based data, but a discussion-based listserv is probably not the best venue for distributing it. Perhaps AAPOR could consider adding an "Industry News" section to aapor.org where announcements like this could be posted for a small fee.

Lydia Saad

-----Original Message-----
From: Linda Owens [mailto:lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2001 8:59 AM
To: pd@kerr-downs.com; aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001 -Reply

no. It's a notice of an omnibus survey being done by the University of Illinois at Chicago. Anyone interested in adding questions to the survey should follow the instructions in the email.

>>> Phillip Downs <pd@kerr-downs.com> 06/27/01 05:37pm
>>> is this spam?

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
[mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Jennifer Parsons
Sent: Wednesday, June 27, 2001 6:14 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001

Q: What is a cost-effective way to learn about the attitudes and perceptions of Illinois residents?

A: THE ILLINOIS POLL

If the costs of a custom-designed survey have prohibited you from collecting information you could use on the attitudes,
perceptions, and/or behaviors of Illinois residents, THE ILLINOIS POLL gives you the opportunity to obtain those data at a lower cost. The Survey Research Laboratory, a unit of the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago, has over 35 years experience in survey research and methodology. You can take advantage of that experience by participating in THE ILLINOIS POLL, an annual, statewide, omnibus telephone survey. The next ILLINOIS POLL will be conducted in Fall 2001.

How does THE ILLINOIS POLL work?

You can submit already-prepared questions for inclusion in THE ILLINOIS POLL or work with SRL staff to design your questions. Your questions are combined with those from other participants to be administered all at once. The cost is lower because the expenses of conducting the poll are shared by all participants.

A minimum of 600 interviews will be completed. This allows statistically reliable estimates for the state population as a whole. All interviewing is done in accordance with the most advanced survey techniques.

The cost per closed-ended question is $1,200. Open-ended questions are more expensive and are priced individually. Included in the cost of individual question preparation is advice on question wording, formatting, and order; a pretest of the question(s); and any subsequent revisions that are required.

As part of THE ILLINOIS POLL, demographic information will be gathered and shared with all participants (a listing of demographic questions included can be found on our web site, noted below). In addition each of your questions will be cross-tabulated with each demographic characteristic and you will receive computer-generated frequencies for the survey results of your questions.

When the survey is complete, you will receive an ASCII data file that will allow you to do your own data analysis; a codebook documenting the coding of each of your questions and the demographic questions; and a complete methodological report detailing both technical and quality-control procedures for the entire survey.

For more information about THE ILLINOIS POLL, visit THE ILLINOIS POLL Web page at http://www.srl.uic.edu/illinoispoll.htm, or send an e-mail to poll@srl.uic.edu.

>From horner.43@osu.edu Thu Jun 28 08:24:19 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
I, too, have seen this kind of unsolicited notice on appornet before. I've also seen unsolicited job postings, unsolicited postings for conferences, and many unsolicited messages that were never intended for the list. So what? I assume someone on the list will be interested in the messages. Personally, I used the message about the Illinois Poll to make a comparison about my center's fee structure.

This is a closed list, and I've seen very few problems with it. The notion that someone wants to limit what I see on a listserv devoted to public opinion is sadly ironic.

Lew Horner
OSU Center for Survey Research

At 09:11 AM 6/28/2001 -0500, you wrote:
>I'm afraid this reply gives short shrift to a valid question about what constitutes spam, and what kind of communication we want to encourage/discourage on aapornet.
>
>This kind of unsolicited notice is extremely rare on aapornet, and I for one would like to keep it that way. The information may be very useful for researchers in need of Illinois based data, but a discussion-based listserv is probably not the best venue for distributing it. Perhaps AAPOR could consider adding an "Industry News" section to aapor.org where announcements like this could be posted for a small fee.
>
>Lydia Saad

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Thu Jun 28 08:40:54 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
I, too, have seen this kind of unsolicited notice on appornet before. I've also seen unsolicited job postings, unsolicited postings for conferences, and many unsolicited messages that were never intended for the list. I think it was a matter of style, not content, that may have tended to rub people the wrong way. If it had been a more scholarly, dry (boring) and straightforward announcement, it wouldn't have gotten so much attention.

But it was designed to get attention, and thus had some of the feel of a used-car commercial about it.

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195
Generally I find announcements of this kind useful because I like to know what is happening with state polls across the country.

What I would really like Jennifer and others to do, in fact, is list the topics after the poll is completed so I can see, for example, who else is working on public opinion and science, and who plays the lottery and how, across the country.

That's a help not spam. Again, you don't want it, hit the delete key. My husband's email is filled with spam and it sure doesn't look anything like the UIll posting (but some things I will not share).

Susan

At 11:40 AM 6/28/01 -0400, you wrote:

>>> horner.43@osu.edu 06/28/01 11:24AM >>>
>>> I, too, have seen this kind of unsolicited notice on appornet before. 
>>> I've 
>>> also 
>>> seen unsolicited job postings, unsolicited postings for conferences, 
>>> and 
>>> many unsolicited messages that were never intended for the list. 
>
Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
(850) 644-8778 Voice Mail Available
(850) 644-8776 FAX
Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4453
(904) 249-1683

Visit the site:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

>From vector@sympatico.ca Thu Jun 28 09:36:47 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5SGakJ07066 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Jun 2001
09:36:46
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from tomts14-srv.bellnexxia.net (tomts14.bellnexxia.net
[209.226.175.35])
I agree with Susan Losh. As researchers our clients expect us to know what services are available even if we're not providing them ourselves.

---

Marc Zwelling
Vector Research + Development Inc.
Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991

See what's new at Vector:
http://www.vectorresearch.com/

------ Original Message ------
From: "Susan Losh" <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2001 12:26 PM
Subject: RE: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001 -Reply

> Generally I find announcements of this kind useful because I like to know what is happening with state polls across the country.
> > What I would really like Jennifer and others to do, in fact, is list the topics after the poll is completed so I can see, for example, who else is working on public opinion and science, and who plays the lottery and how, across the country.
> > That's a help not spam. Again, you don't want it, hit the delete key. My husband's email is filled with spam and it sure doesn't look anything like the UIll posting (but some things I will not share).
> > Susan
> > At 11:40 AM 6/28/01 -0400, you wrote:
> >>>>> horner.43@osu.edu 06/28/01 11:24AM >>>
> >>I, too, have seen this kind of unsolicited notice on appornet before.
Susan and others:

If you are interested in what other surveys are being done around the country, you should check into the "Survey Research" newsletter, which is produced three times a year here at the Univ. of IL. It consists primarily of information on what surveys are being done (or have recently been done) by academic and not-for-profit survey organizations. Many of these 100+ organizations send us updates on their projects (including omnibus surveys), including topic(s), sponsor, funding, sample, method of data collection, schedule -- which would enable you to contact relevant places for additional information or to "compare notes."

Subscription information is included in the newsletter. Back issues can be found on our website -- www.srl.uic.edu

Diane O'Rourke
Generally I find announcements of this kind useful because I like to know what is happening with state polls across the country.

What I would really like Jennifer and others to do, in fact, is list the topics after the poll is completed so I can see, for example, who else is working on public opinion and science, and who plays the lottery and how, across the country.

That's a help not spam. Again, you don't want it, hit the delete key. My husband's email is filled with spam and it sure doesn't look anything like the UIll posting (but some things I will not share).

Susan

At 11:40 AM 6/28/01 -0400, you wrote:

> I, too, have seen this kind of unsolicited notice on appornet before.
> I've also
> seen unsolicited job postings, unsolicited postings for conferences, and
> many unsolicited messages that were never intended for the list.

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
(850) 644-8778 Voice Mail Available
(850) 644-8776 FAX
Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4453
(904) 249-1683

Visit the site: http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm
Aapornetters,

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

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

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

Aapornetters,

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

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

H. Stuart Elway
Elway Research, Inc.
206/264-1500
NEW E-MAIL: hstuart@elwayresearch.com
Website: www.elwayresearch.com
What about contact with physicians?

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

-----Original Message-----
From: H. Stuart Elway <hstuart@elwayresearch.com>
To: 'AAPORNET' <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Thursday, June 28, 2001 1:14 PM
Subject: Non-medical determinants of health

Aapornetters,

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

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

H. Stuart Elway
Folks,

I wish to log into this exchange with my strong support for the views of Jennifer Parsons, Linda Owens, Gretchen Straw, and Lew Horner, with also a respectful nod to Lydia Saad’s general point that each message considered for our list ought to posted with this concern: Every email arriving at the AAPORNET server just now will go out to 1004 addresses (I say "addresses" rather than "members" because a few of us are subscribed at more than one address).

To begin with the Phil Downs question, "Is this spam?".....

In one important sense of "spam," *every* message posted to AAPORNET--or to any other Internet list, for that matter--is precisely a spam: Each of our postings is, in effect, a mass mailing to 1004 addresses, indiscriminately, many of these messages to be received by people unknown to the poster, and many of no interest whatsoever to those who receive them--thus, spam.

This makes AAPORNET little different from, say, reading a daily newspaper, for which we voluntarily pay our good money, despite knowing that most days we will have no interest whatsoever in perhaps 95 percent of its content. This makes every large-circulation newspaper itself a spam, of a kind, in that we must subscribe to it all or nothing, tolerate stories we care absolutely nothing about, and waste our valuable time and energy sorting through to find the stories we want.
And so our list's problem really comes down to one of not wasting the
time and energies of our colleagues and friends more than is absolutely
necessary, given the limitations of our communications technology—much
like those of the daily newspaper. Unlike newspapers, however, AAPORNET
is offered free of charge: The server and its maintenance cost AAPOR
nothing, and no one posting anything to our list has ever submitted a
bill for the creative content. In short, we are a socialist commune—with
annual dues.

That said, the best remedy for receipt of unwanted messages is simply
to delete them unopened, which requires roughly as much time as it takes
the second hand on my quartz wristwatch to jump from any one little dot
to the next one—moving clockwise, of course.

Just as newspapers have for centuries employed the headline to enable
each reader to skip over the countless stories of little or no interest,
members of Internet lists like our own must rely on the headers
attached to each message by its sender.

And even that comparison to newspapers does not explain why most of us
willingly tune in to television and radio newscasts, where stories come
in a steady stream, often with no more warning than a few "headlines"
at the broadcast's beginning, if we manage to catch it. (If I might
speak personally here, this certainly does not bother me for CBS News
programming, in which I do cherish every last well-crafted word, I
somehow feel compelled to say).

As a model example of what an excellent header ought to look like, I
could hardly do better than to congratulate Jennifer Parsons on the
very one she did in fact use: "Announcing Illinois Poll 2001"

If you opened her message without knowing rather definitively—in
advance—what it was about, I think you ought to go off to a quiet
corner somewhere, and confront the horrible possibility that you may
not be as clever as you think you are.

Me, I personally appreciate most messages posted to AAPORNET, simply
because I like to keep up on what you all are thinking, doing, and
up to next. Sometimes this inspires new ideas, sometimes this
informs me about things I did not know, and am happy to learn, and
sometimes I simply like to hear from people I happen to know, to
admire, and even to like (some I dare say I might actually love).
Just scanning down the list of my new messages received—showing only
date, sender's name, message size, and header—gives me much welcome
information: Who's still alive, who hasn't posted for a time and has
been sorely missed, who's finally back from that vacation, who's got
a new interest, who's still stuck in the same rut, who's got happy
news to report...

If you do not have time in your professional life to delete a few
unwanted messages after scanning a few words in their headers, then
I think you might want to go off to a quiet corner somewhere and
confront the horrible possibility that you might not live long
enough to meet your own grandchildren (I am being deadly serious
here). If you already have grandchildren, my congratulations—
believe me.
In short (something I rarely am, as you know), I must give Jennifer Parsons an A-plus on her header--headers being extremely important to the continued success of our list, I hope I have convinced you--and wish to thank her for posting a message likely to be of at least some passing interest to many AAPOR members (if you wish to judge the writing style of our messages here, I encourage you to join a lit-crit list, which would be punishment enough, no matter what your sins). If any message posted to our list doesn't happen to be of any interest to you yourself, personally, all I can say is, how was any one of us to know this in advance? And what might we have done about it if we had known--ask you to unsubscribe for a few minutes while we post our message?

If you happened to fail "taking turns," "sharing" and "cooperation" in preschool, however, all is forgiven--it's undoubtedly not your own fault. As for me, I've now got not only preschool but also kindergarten behind me, and am steaming straight ahead toward first grade.

-- Jim

*******

>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Thu Jun 28 18:23:39 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5T1NcJ24992 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Jun 2001
18:23:38 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from exchng7.gallup.com (exchng7.gallup.com [198.175.140.71])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id SAA01318 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Jun 2001 18:23:37 -0700
    (PDT)
From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com
Received: by exchng7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    id <MYKC1MYY>; Thu, 28 Jun 2001 20:23:07 -0500
Message-ID: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE407E2B1CF@exchng7.gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001 -Reply
Date: Thu, 28 Jun 2001 20:23:07 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Goodness,

Interesting that this hit such a nerve. My motives have been assailed, my views have been described as sadly ironic and now I'm likened to a preschooler.

I'll just close this day by explaining that I thought Philip Downs raised a valid question by asking "is this spam?" and I thought I'd generate some discussion about our standards for what is acceptable vs. not acceptable on aapornet in this regard. My training as Publications and Information Committee Chair conditioned me to pay closer attention to issues surrounding
the service (like the great debate over the default "reply" address), and motivated me to get the ball rolling on a discussion.

It's always been a "publication" of, by and for aapornetters (well mostly "by" Jim, but hopefully he'll cut me a break on that). As such we've always made our own rules based on the best interests of the group and interest of the members.

In that spirit, many people have responded today in support of the Illinois Poll type of announcement saying they benefit from industry ads like this as a way to learn about services or see what other organizations are doing. That's a great answer.

Some have responded saying, if you don't like it you can be a big boy or girl and "hit the delete" button. I don't think that's a great answer. It's not a standard for anything. One could say the same of email frugging, sugging and kiddie porn. A great subject line may help, but not much.

aapornet at it's best is direct communication among individuals. Gretchen Straw might write and ask, can anyone recommend a good omnibus survey in Illinois? And Linda Owens will reply, "Have I got a poll for you!" Then Diane O'Rourke would chime in with information about her great newsletter which has a whole list of available omnibus surveys. In the process, we all had the chance to learn something, even if haphazardly.

I don't even mind learning haphazardly about the Illinois Poll through an unsolicited mailing. I just don't prefer to get a whole lot of these on aapornet, and as I said, fortunately they are rare. (Note I did not say that we never get them.) I do think we get them at a low enough frequency that it's tolerable.

That still doesn't answer the question "Is it spam?" From the responses today, the answer is, "maybe it is, but so what?"

Yours,

Lydia Saad

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2001 2:50 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: RE: Announcing Illinois Poll 2001 -Reply

Folks,

I wish to log into this exchange with my strong support for the views of Jennifer Parsons, Linda Owens, Gretchen Straw, and Lew Horner, with also a respectful nod to Lydia Saad's general point that each message considered for our list ought to posted with this concern: Every email arriving at the AAPORNET server just now will go out to 1004 addresses (I say "addresses" rather than "members" because a few of us are subscribed at more than one address).
To begin with the Phil Downs question, "Is this spam?

In one important sense of "spam," *every* message posted to AAPORNET--or to any other Internet list, for that matter--is precisely a spam: Each of our postings is, in effect, a mass mailing to 1004 addresses, indiscriminately, many of these messages to be received by people unknown to the poster, and many of no interest whatsoever to those who receive them--thus, spam.

This makes AAPORNET little different from, say, reading a daily newspaper, for which we voluntarily pay our good money, despite knowing that most days we will have no interest whatsoever in perhaps 95 percent of its content. This makes every large-circulation newspaper itself a spam, of a kind, in that we must subscribe to it all or nothing, tolerate stories we care absolutely nothing about, and waste our valuable time and energy sorting through to find the stories we want.

And so our list's problem really comes down to one of not wasting the time and energies of our colleagues and friends more than is absolutely necessary, given the limitations of our communications technology--much like those of the daily newspaper. Unlike newspapers, however, AAPORNET is offered free of charge: The server and its maintenance cost AAPOR nothing, and no one posting anything to our list has ever submitted a bill for the creative content. In short, we are a socialist commune--with annual dues.

That said, the best remedy for receipt of unwanted messages is simply to delete them unopened, which requires roughly as much time as it takes the second hand on my quartz wristwatch to jump from any one little dot to the next one--moving clockwise, of course.

Just as newspapers have for centuries employed the headline to enable each reader to skip over the countless stories of little or no interest, members of Internet lists like our own must rely on the headers attached to each message by its sender.

And even that comparison to newspapers does not explain why most of us willingly tune in to television and radio newscasts, where stories come in a steady stream, often with no more warning than a few "headlines" at the broadcast's beginning, if we manage to catch it. (If I might speak personally here, this certainly does not bother me for CBS News programming, in which I do cherish every last well-crafted word, I somehow feel compelled to say).

As a model example of what an excellent header ought to look like, I could hardly do better than to congratulate Jennifer Parsons on the very one she did in fact use: "Announcing Illinois Poll 2001"

If you opened her message without knowing rather definitively--in advance--what it was about, I think you ought to go off to a quiet corner somewhere, and confront the horrible possibility that you may not be as clever as you think you are.

Me, I personally appreciate most messages posted to AAPORNET, simply because I like to keep up on what you all are thinking, doing, and up to next. Sometimes this inspires new ideas, sometimes this informs me about things I did not know, and am happy to learn, and
sometimes I simply like to hear from people I happen to know, to admire, and even to like (some I dare say I might actually love). Just scanning down the list of my new messages received--showing only date, sender's name, message size, and header--gives me much welcome information: Who's still alive, who hasn't posted for a time and has been sorely missed, who's finally back from that vacation, who's got a new interest, who's still stuck in the same rut, who's got happy news to report...

If you do not have time in your professional life to delete a few unwanted messages after scanning a few words in their headers, then I think you might want to go off to a quiet corner somewhere and confront the horrible possibility that you might not live long enough to meet your own grandchildren (I am being deadly serious here). If you already have grandchildren, my congratulations--believe me.

In short (something I rarely am, as you know), I must give Jennifer Parsons an A-plus on her header--headers being extremely important to the continued success of our list, I hope I have convinced you--and wish to thank her for posting a message likely to be of at least some passing interest to many AAPOR members (if you wish to judge the writing style of our messages here, I encourage you to join a lit-crit list, which would be punishment enough, no matter what your sins). If any message posted to our list doesn't happen to be of any interest to you yourself, personally, all I can say is, how was any one of us to know this in advance? And what might we have done about it if we had known--ask you to unsubscribe for a few minutes while we post our message?

If you happened to fail "taking turns," "sharing" and "cooperation" in preschool, however, all is forgiven--it's undoubtedly not your own fault. As for me, I've now got not only preschool but also kindergarten behind me, and am steaming straight ahead toward first grade.

-- Jim

******

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jun 29 07:33:28 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f5TEXSJ10845 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 07:33:28 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id HAA29297 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 07:33:29 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f5TEXT612317 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 07:33:29 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 07:33:28 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers
Study Reveals 52 Percent of People Over 55 Feel Web is More Important Than Newspapers

Research Suggests Newspaper Web Sites Lose Readership Battle

NEWTONVILLE, Mass.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--June 27, 2001--A new primary research study conducted by Content Intelligence reveals that the population that uses newspapers most--those aged 55 and older--say the Internet is a more important medium to them than newspapers in a direct comparison by a conclusive margin of 52 to 37 percent. This is one of the original findings featured in the comprehensive study, ``Newspapers in a Web-Driven Society,'' which highlights the results of a Web-based survey of more than 1,400 respondents. The six-section report examines the role newspapers play for readers in a digital media landscape and explores what changes may be looming ahead as Web use becomes faster and easier to use and more commonplace.

>From simonetta@artsci.com Fri Jun 29 07:33:35 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5TEXYJ10864 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001
07:33:34 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA29324 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 07:33:35 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
    id N6PMJN7J; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 10:19:58 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F316D26E8@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: More Americans think the First Amendment goes too far
Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 10:19:57 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
Americans Polled on First Amendment

"The number of Americans who think the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution goes too far in the rights it guarantees has doubled to four in 10 over the past year, says a new poll on the amendment that protects freedom of speech."

"Paulson said researchers at the University of Connecticut suggested the concern about too much freedom is particularly strong among those who think there should be a law to prevent news organizations from predicting election winners before polls are closed. Four of five people said news organizations should not be allowed to project winners until polls close."


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

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

>From aubinp@EM.AGR.CA Fri Jun 29 07:38:13 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTMP
   id f5TEcDJ11876 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001
   07:38:13 -0700 (PDT)
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from gw.agr.ca (gw.agr.ca [192.197.71.131])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP
   id HAA02029 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 07:38:13 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from [192.197.71.135] (agrgate2.agr.ca [192.197.71.135])
   by gw.agr.ca (8.11.3/8.11.3) with SMTP id f5TEcru07597
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 10:38:53 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from agrin1.agr.ca by [192.197.71.135]
   via smtpd (for agrout1.agr.ca [192.197.71.131]) with SMTP; 29 Jun 2001
   14:37:10 UT
Received: from ncrxem6.agr.ca (ncrxem6.agr.ca [142.61.34.109])
   by agrin1.agr.ca (8.9.3/8.8.4) with SMTP
   id KAA25072 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 10:35:52 -0400
   (EDT)
Received: FROM EM.AGR.CA BY ncrxem6.agr.ca ; Fri Jun 29 10:38:43 2001 -0400
Received: from AGCAN-Message_Server by EM.AGR.CA
   with Novell GroupWise; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 10:39:12 -0400
Message-Id: <sb3c5ad0.055@EM.AGR.CA>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 10:37:37 -0400
From: "Pierre Aubin" <aubinp@EM.AGR.CA>
Sender: Postmaster@EM.AGR.CA
Reply-To: aubinp@EM.AGR.CA
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline
Je serai à l'extérieur du bureau jusqu'au lundi 9 juillet, date à laquelle je lirai votre message.

Si vous avez besoin d'une réponse immédiate, veuillez s'il vous plaît contacter Marc McCarthy au (613) 759-7392 (Ottawa) ou Claude Perreault au (514) 283-3815 poste 485 (Montréal).

I will be outside of the office until Monday July 9, 2001, at which date I will read your message.

If you need immediate assistance, please contact Marc McCarthy at (613) 759-7392 (Ottawa) or Claude Perreault at (514) 283-3815 ext. 485 (Montreal).

Merci ! / Thanks !

I assume this is distributed to AAPORNETters as an instructive example of
how easy it is to draw unjustified conclusions when we ignore a survey's limitations. Before we sound the death knell for newspapers, we might want to see the results of something other than a "Web-based survey."

James Beniger
<beniger@rcf.usc.edu>          To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
vs.                                           cc:
Sent by:     Subject: New Research: Internet

owner-aaporne@usc.edu Newspapers

06/29/01
10:33 AM
Please respond to aapornet

-------- Forwarded message --------
Date: Thu, 28 Jun 2001 23:14:37 -0700
From: radman <resist@best.com>
To: triumph-of-content-l@usc.edu
Subject: Study: Web wins older newspaper subscribers

http://biz.yahoo.com/bw/010627/2242.html

Wednesday June 27, 9:11 am Eastern Time
Press Release
Study Reveals 52 Percent of People Over 55 Feel Web is More Important Than Newspapers

Research Suggests Newspaper Web Sites Lose Readership Battle

NEWTONVILLE, Mass.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--June 27, 2001--A new primary research study conducted by Content Intelligence reveals that the population that uses newspapers most--those aged 55 and older--say the Internet is a more important medium to them than newspapers in a direct comparison by a conclusive margin of 52 to 37 percent. This is one of the original findings featured in the comprehensive study, "Newspapers in a Web-Driven Society," which highlights the results of a Web-based survey of more than 1,400 respondents. The six-section report examines the role newspapers play for readers in a digital media landscape and explores what changes may be looming ahead as Web use becomes faster and easier to use and more commonplace.

I fear that this press release may be misleading. If these findings are based upon a "web-based survey," then it would seem to me that the headline ought to read "52 Percent of WEB-USERS (not "People") Over 55 Feel Web is More Important Than Newspapers." Since not everyone over 55 uses the web, I think it may be premature to announce the death of newspapers.
There may also be some questions worth raising about the specific question wording, the sequencing of this question among others, and how the answers should be interpreted. What are respondents actually trying to tell us when they say that "the Internet is a more important medium to them than newspapers"? What would respondents say if they were asked a follow-up question: "In what way(s)?" Maybe there are also some ways in which newspapers are still more important to them than the Internet. I would be careful about generalizing too fast from this finding.

Larry McGill

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Friday, June 29, 2001 10:35 AM
Subject: New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers

> >
> >----------- Forwarded message -----------
> >Date: Thu, 28 Jun 2001 23:14:37 -0700
> >From: radman <resist@best.com>
> >To: triumph-of-content-l@usc.edu
> >Subject: Study: Web wins older newspaper subscribers
> >
> >
> >http://biz.yahoo.com/bw/010627/2242.html
> >
> >Wednesday June 27, 9:11 am Eastern Time
> >
> >Press Release
> >
> >Study Reveals 52 Percent of People Over 55 Feel Web is More Important Than Newspapers
> >
> >Research Suggests Newspaper Web Sites Lose Readership Battle
> >
> >NEWTONVILLE, Mass.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--June 27, 2001--A new primary research study conducted by Content Intelligence reveals that the population that uses newspapers most—those aged 55 and older—say the Internet is a more important medium to them than newspapers in a direct comparison by a conclusive margin of 52 to 37 percent. This is one of the original findings featured in the comprehensive study, "Newspapers in a Web-Driven Society," which highlights the results of a Web-based survey of more than 1,400 respondents. The six-section report examines the role newspapers play for readers in a digital media landscape and explores what changes may be looming ahead as Web use becomes faster and easier to use and more commonplace.
> >
> >
> >From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Fri Jun 29 08:16:37 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
Also, and potentially more important to methodologists, is a recent study done at Univ. of Maryland reporting that internet users -- even after controlling for basic demographics -- differ from non-users in attitudes on social issues. While one report implied that these were 1997 data and that the findings could be attributed to an early adopter phenomenon, the working paper says the data are from the 2000 GSS.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry McGill <ltmcgill@home.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Friday, June 29, 2001 11:05 AM
Subject: Re: New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers

>I fear that this press release may be misleading. If these findings are
>based upon a "web-based survey," then it would seem to me that the headline
>ought to read "52 Percent of WEB-USERS (not "People") Over 55 Feel Web is
>More Important Than Newspapers." Since not everyone over 55 uses the web, I
>think it may be premature to announce the death of newspapers.
>
>There may also be some questions worth raising about the specific question
>wording, the sequencing of this question among others, and how the answers
>should be interpreted. What are respondents actually trying to tell us when
>they say that "the Internet is a more important medium to them than
>newspapers"? What would respondents say if they were asked a follow-up
> question: "In what way(s)?" Maybe there are also some ways in which newspapers are still more important to them than the Internet. I would be careful about generalizing too fast from this finding.

> Larry McGill

>-----Original Message-----
>From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
>To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
>Date: Friday, June 29, 2001 10:35 AM
>Subject: New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers

>
>

>-------------- Forwarded message --------------
>Date: Thu, 28 Jun 2001 23:14:37 -0700
>From: radman <resist@best.com>
>To: triumph-of-content-l@usc.edu
>Subject: Study: Web wins older newspaper subscribers

>http://biz.yahoo.com/bw/010627/2242.html

>Wednesday June 27, 9:11 am Eastern Time

>Press Release

>Study Reveals 52 Percent of People Over 55 Feel Web is More Important Than Newspapers

>Research Suggests Newspaper Web Sites Lose Readership Battle

>NEWTONVILLE, Mass.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--June 27, 2001--A new primary research study conducted by Content Intelligence reveals that the population that uses newspapers most--those aged 55 and older--say the Internet is a more important medium to them than newspapers in a direct comparison by a conclusive margin of 52 to 37 percent. This is one of the original findings featured in the comprehensive study, `Newspapers in a Web-Driven Society,' which highlights the results of a Web-based survey of more than 1,400 respondents. The six-section report examines the role newspapers play for readers in a digital media landscape and explores what changes may be looming ahead as Web use becomes faster and easier to use and more commonplace.

>From GStraw@aarp.org Fri Jun 29 08:21:22 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f5TFLLJ15955 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 08:21:21
It’s instructive to note that the August 2000 CPS found that only 20% of those age 55+ say they use the Internet regularly.

Gretchen Straw
Associate Research Director
State Member Research
AARP

-----Original Message-----
From:       James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2001 10:33 AM
To:   AAPORNET
Subject:    New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Thu, 28 Jun 2001 23:14:37 -0700
From: radman <resist@best.com>
To: triumph-of-content-l@usc.edu
Subject: Study: Web wins older newspaper subscribers

http://biz.yahoo.com/bw/010627/2242.html

Wednesday June 27, 9:11 am Eastern Time

Press Release

Study Reveals 52 Percent of People Over 55 Feel Web is More Important Than...
Newspapers

Research Suggests Newspaper Web Sites Lose Readership Battle

NEWTONVILLE, Mass.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--June 27, 2001--A new primary research study conducted by Content Intelligence reveals that the population that uses newspapers most--those aged 55 and older--say the Internet is a more important medium to them than newspapers in a direct comparison by a conclusive margin of 52 to 37 percent. This is one of the original findings featured in the comprehensive study, "Newspapers in a Web-Driven Society," which highlights the results of a Web-based survey of more than 1,400 respondents. The six-section report examines the role newspapers play for readers in a digital media landscape and explores what changes may be looming ahead as Web use becomes faster and easier to use and more commonplace.

And to take the inquiry one step further, we don't even know from the press release whether this web-based survey was in any way a probability sample of some defined population, or one of the less formal, SLOP surveys so common on the 'net. If it was the latter, the respondents would tend to be the most web-addicted of the elder web-users.

Anyone know the methods used by Content Intelligence?

Tom

On Fri, 29 Jun 2001 07:33:28 -0700 (PDT) James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu> wrote:

> 
> > 
> > -------- Forwarded message --------
Press Release

Study Reveals 52 Percent of People Over 55 Feel Web is More Important Than Newspapers

NEWTONVILLE, Mass.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--June 27, 2001--A new primary research study conducted by Content Intelligence reveals that the population that uses newspapers most--those aged 55 and older--say the Internet is a more important medium to them than newspapers in a direct comparison by a conclusive margin of 52 to 37 percent. This is one of the original findings featured in the comprehensive study, "Newspapers in a Web-Driven Society," which highlights the results of a Web-based survey of more than 1,400 respondents. The six-section report examines the role newspapers play for readers in a digital media landscape and explores what changes may be looming ahead as Web use becomes faster and easier to use and more commonplace.

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

From: Jack_Ludwig@gallup.com Fri Jun 29 08:29:36 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f5TFTaJ17409 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 08:29:36 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by exchng7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) id IAA00308 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 08:29:37 -0700 (PDT)
From: Jack_Ludwig@gallup.com
Received: by exchng7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) id <MYKC136F>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 10:29:05 -0500
Message-ID: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE408516275@exchng7.gallup.com> To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers
Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 10:29:04 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
And it is widely known that those over the age of 50 are significantly less likely to use the internet--compounding the mode-related coverage limitation that several people have already pointed out. It is noteworthy in this connection, however, that the U.S. Dep't of Commerce's excellent report "Falling Through the Net: Toward digital Inclusion" instructs us that internet use by this age segment is growing at a faster rate than any other.

Jack Ludwig
The Gallup Organization

-----Original Message-----
From: James P. Murphy [mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com]
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2001 11:16 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers

Also, and potentially more important to methodologists, is a recent study done at Univ. of Maryland reporting that internet users -- even after controlling for basic demographics -- differ from non-users in attitudes on social issues. While one report implied that these were 1997 data and that the findings could be attributed to an early adopter phenomenon, the working paper says the data are from the 2000 GSS.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry McGill <ltmcgill@home.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Friday, June 29, 2001 11:05 AM
Subject: Re: New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers

>I fear that this press release may be misleading. If these findings are
>based upon a "web-based survey," then it would seem to me that the headline
>ought to read "52 Percent of WEB-USERS (not "People") Over 55 Feel Web is
>More Important Than Newspapers." Since not everyone over 55 uses the web, I
>think it may be premature to announce the death of newspapers.
>
>There may also be some questions worth raising about the specific question
>wording, the sequencing of this question among others, and how the answers
>should be interpreted. What are respondents actually trying to tell us when
>they say that "the Internet is a more important medium to them than
>newspapers"? What would respondents say if they were asked a follow-up
>question: "In what way(s)?" Maybe there are also some ways in which
>newspapers are still more important to them than the Internet. I would be
>careful about generalizing too fast from this finding.
>
>Larry McGill
>
Study Reveals 52 Percent of People Over 55 Feel Web is More Important Than Newspapers

Research Suggests Newspaper Web Sites Lose Readership Battle

NEWTONVILLE, Mass.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--June 27, 2001--A new primary research study conducted by Content Intelligence reveals that the population that uses newspapers most--those aged 55 and older--say the Internet is a more important medium to them than newspapers in a direct comparison by a conclusive margin of 52 to 37 percent. This is one of the original findings featured in the comprehensive study, `Newspapers in a Web-Driven Society,'

which highlights the results of a Web-based survey of more than 1,400 respondents. The six-section report examines the role newspapers play for readers in a digital media landscape and explores what changes may be looming ahead as Web use becomes faster and easier to use and more commonplace.
Content Intelligence Methodology

The Content Intelligence General Internet User Survey, featured in the Primary Numbers section of the May, 2001 issue, is an online study conducted between April 5 and 10, 2001 with a sample of 1,112 adult Internet users 18 years of age or above, and drawn from the SurveySpot panel of Survey Sampling, Inc. To maximize the response rate, survey participants were offered an incentive - an opportunity to win one $250 award and one of five $50 awards.

In theory, with a randomly selected sample of this size, one could say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling and other random effects is 3 percentage points in either direction from what would have been obtained if the entire Internet using population had been surveyed. The sample for this survey is not a random sample. While individuals were randomly selected from the database of Survey Sampling, they had previously chosen to join the panel.

Using a panel as the sampling frame enhanced the efficiency of the study. It, however, might introduce unknown bias into the findings. To compensate for any such bias and to generalize the results to the entire Internet using population, the data were weighted by sex, education and income. The demographic weighting parameters were derived from the sample data provided by Survey Sampling, and the most recently available Current Population Survey of the U.S. Census Bureau (March 2000).

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

> -----Original Message-----
> From: tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu [mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu]
> Sent: Friday, June 29, 2001 11:37 AM
> To: AAPORnet List server
> Subject: New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers
>
> And to take the inquiry one step further, we don't even know
> from the press
> release whether this web-based survey was in any way a
> probability sample
> of some defined population, or one of the less formal, SLOP
> surveys so
> common on the 'net. If it was the latter, the respondents
> would tend to be
> the most web-addicted of the elder web-users.
Anyone know the methods used by Content Intelligence?

Tom

On Fri, 29 Jun 2001 07:33:28 -0700 (PDT) James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu> wrote:

> > > > > > ----------- Forwarded message -----------
> > > > > > Date: Thu, 28 Jun 2001 23:14:37 -0700
> > > > > > From: radman <resist@best.com>
> > > > > > To: triumph-of-content-l@usc.edu
> > > > > > Subject: Study: Web wins older newspaper subscribers
> > > > > > http://biz.yahoo.com/bw/010627/2242.html
> > > > > > Wednesday June 27, 9:11 am Eastern Time
> > > > > > Press Release
> > > > > > Study Reveals 52 Percent of People Over 55 Feel Web is More Important Than Newspapers
> > > > > > Research Suggests Newspaper Web Sites Lose Readership Battle
> > > > > > NEWTONVILLE, Mass.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--June 27, 2001--A new primary research study conducted by Content Intelligence reveals that the population that uses newspapers most--those aged 55 and older--say the Internet is a more important medium to them than newspapers in a direct comparison by a conclusive margin of 52 to 37 percent. This is one of the original findings featured in the comprehensive study, "Newspapers in a Web-Driven Society," which highlights the results of a Web-based survey of more than 1,400 respondents. The six-section report examines the role newspapers play for readers in a digital media landscape and explores what changes may be looming ahead as Web use becomes faster and easier to use and more commonplace.
> > > > > > Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434) 243-5223
> > > > > > NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
> > > > > > Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
> > > > > > University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
> > > > > > P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
> > > > > > Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu
> > > > From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jun 29 08:39:03 2001
> > Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
Reply to Larry McGill:

I'm with you on this, Larry. And your point applies to an increasing number of surveys conducted via Internet and Web, a criticism I myself have made more than once here on AAPORNET, and at our annual conferences. Here's the Website description of the Content Intelligence methodology--please tell us all what you think of it more specifically.

I posted the summary to AAPORNET largely because it presented a timely echo of my sustained metaphor of yesterday--the newspaper as a direct analogue for how I think we ought to view and use Internet lists like our own here.

-- Jim

P.S. For those who missed it, or would like to read it again, Larry's criticism follows the statement immediately below.

Methodology

The Content Intelligence General Internet User Survey, featured in the Primary Numbers section of the May, 2001 issue, is an online study conducted between April 5 and 10, 2001 with a sample of 1,112 adult
Internet users 18 years of age or above, and drawn from the SurveySpot panel of Survey Sampling, Inc. To maximize the response rate, survey participants were offered an incentive -- an opportunity to win one $250 award and one of five $50 awards.

In theory, with a randomly selected sample of this size, one could say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling and other random effects is 3 percentage points in either direction from what would have been obtained if the entire Internet using population had been surveyed. The sample for this survey is not a random sample. While individuals were randomly selected from the database of Survey Sampling, they had previously chosen to join the panel.

Using a panel as the sampling frame enhanced the efficiency of the study. It, however, might introduce unknown bias into the findings. To compensate for any such bias and to generalize the results to the entire Internet using population, the data were weighted by sex, education and income. The demographic weighting parameters were derived from the sample data provided by Survey Sampling, and the most recently available Current Population Survey of the U.S. Census Bureau (March 2000).

http://www.contentintelligence.com/General/Links.asp

Copyright (C) 2001 Lyra Research, Inc. All rights reserved.

*****

On Fri, 29 Jun 2001, Larry McGill wrote:

> I fear that this press release may be misleading. If these findings are
> based upon a "web-based survey," then it would seem to me that the headline
> ought to read "52 Percent of WEB-Usuarios (not "People") Over 55 Feel Web is
> More Important Than Newspapers." Since not everyone over 55 uses the web, I
> think it may be premature to announce the death of newspapers.
> 
> There may also be some questions worth raising about the specific question
> wording, the sequencing of this question among others, and how the answers
> should be interpreted. What are respondents actually trying to tell us when
> they say that "the Internet is a more important medium to them than
> newspapers"? What would respondents say if they were asked a follow-up
> question: "In what way(s)?" Maybe there are also some ways in which
> newspapers are still more important to them than the Internet. I would be
> careful about generalizing too fast from this finding.
> 
> Larry McGill
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
> To: AAPORNETH <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Date: Friday, June 29, 2001 10:35 AM
> Subject: New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers
> 
>
Study Reveals 52 Percent of People Over 55 Feel Web is More Important Than Newspapers

Research Suggests Newspaper Web Sites Lose Readership Battle

NEWTONVILLE, Mass.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--June 27, 2001--A new primary research study conducted by Content Intelligence reveals that the population that uses newspapers most--those aged 55 and older--say the Internet is a more important medium to them than newspapers in a direct comparison by a conclusive margin of 52 to 37 percent. This is one of the original findings featured in the comprehensive study, 'Newspapers in a Web-Driven Society,' which highlights the results of a Web-based survey of more than 1,400 respondents. The six-section report examines the role newspapers play for readers in a digital media landscape and explores what changes may be looming ahead as Web use becomes faster and easier to use and more commonplace.

*****

From mkuechle@hunter.cuny.edu Fri Jun 29 09:07:47 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f5TG71J28505 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001
09:07:47 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (shiva.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.96])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA27477 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 09:07:44 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from kathman.hunter.cuny.edu (ads1-151-202-23-5.nyc.ads1.bellatlantic.net
[151.202.23.5])
    by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA00357
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 12:13:53 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20010629121008.00a10690@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 12:07:24 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Re: New Research: Internet vs. Newspapers
At 10:55 AM 6/29/2001 -0400, jeffrey.c.moore@census.gov wrote:

> I assume this is distributed to AAPORNETters as an instructive example of
> how easy it is to draw unjustified conclusions when we ignore a survey's
> limitations. Before we sound the death knell for newspapers, we might want
> to see the results of something other than a "Web-based survey." ......

Take a look at the "methodology" for these monthly surveys (conducted by a
=20
company with a commercial interest in the topic) currently available at
http://www.contentintelligence.com/General/Links.asp
(but an an "asp" page the contents can change quickly), emphasis is mine.=20
You may also have to "register" first before you can get to this specific=20
page:
> Methodology
>
> The Content Intelligence General Internet User Survey, featured in=
=20
> the Primary Numbers section of the May, 2001
> issue, is an online study conducted between April 5 and 10, 2001=
=20
> with a sample of 1,112 adult Internet users 18
> years of age or above, and drawn from the SurveySpot panel of=20
> Survey Sampling, Inc. To maximize the response
> rate, survey participants were offered an incentive =96 an=20
> opportunity to win one $250 award and one of five $50
> awards.
>
> In theory, with a randomly selected sample of this size, one could=
=20
> say with 95% confidence that the error
> attributable to sampling and other random effects is 3 percentage=
=20
> points in either direction from what would have
> been obtained if the entire Internet using population had been=20
> surveyed. The sample for this survey is not a
> random sample. While individuals were randomly selected from the=20
> database of Survey Sampling, they had
> previously chosen to join the panel.
>
> Using a panel as the sampling frame enhanced the efficiency of the=20
> study. It, however, might introduce unknown
> bias into the findings. To compensate for any such bias and to=20
> generalize the results to the entire Internet using
> population, the data were weighted by sex, education and income.=20
> The demographic weighting parameters were
derived from the sample data provided by Survey Sampling, and the most recently available Current Population Survey of the U.S. Census Bureau (March 2000).

While the KN (Knowledge Networks) and HI (Harris Interactive) web surveys also use some form of panel recruitment and ex-post weighting of the data, even the best such "web survey methodology" will lead to seriously biased results if the topic is web use (or any aspect thereof) itself and no kind of weighting can compensate for this bias. And it does not take a degree in statistics to realize this.

Which brings me to a larger point: the increasing tendency on part on some list members to "share" their newspaper readings with the rest of us without any attempt to either corroborate the findings or otherwise make a genuine contribution to a professional discussion of an issue. In my view, there is a distinctive difference between a "chat group" and a "professional discussion group" (so this is NOT an argument to institute a "moderator"). While both types have distinctive advantages and disadvantages, AAPORNET has become too much of the "chat group" type where people peddle their products, vent their political views, and don't seem to spend much time and/or effort in composing their posts. M.

Manfred Kuechler
Hunter College

At 10:55 AM 6/29/2001 -0400, jeffrey.c.moore@census.gov wrote:

I assume this is distributed to AAPORNETters as an instructive example of how easy it is to draw unjustified conclusions when we ignore a survey's limitations. Before we sound the death knell for newspapers, we might want to see the results of something other than a "Web-based survey." .......
Methodology

The Content Intelligence General Internet User Survey, featured in the Primary Numbers section of the May, 2001 issue, is an online study conducted between April 5 and 10, 2001 with a sample of 1,112 adult Internet users 18 years of age or above, and drawn from the SurveySpot panel of Survey Sampling, Inc. To maximize the response rate, survey participants were offered an incentive — an opportunity to win one $250 award and one of five $50 awards. In theory, with a randomly selected sample of this size, one could say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling and other random effects is 3 percentage points in either direction from what would have been obtained if the entire Internet using population had been surveyed. The sample for this survey is not a random sample. While individuals were randomly selected from the database of Survey Sampling, they had previously chosen to join the panel.

Using a panel as the sampling frame enhanced the efficiency of the study. It, however, might introduce unknown bias into the findings. To compensate for any such bias and to generalize the results to the entire Internet using population, the data were weighted by sex, education and income. The demographic weighting parameters were derived from the sample data provided by Survey Sampling, and the most recently available Current Population Survey of the U.S. Census Bureau (March 2000).

While the KN (Knowledge Networks) and HI (Harris Interactive) web surveys also use some form of panel recruitment and ex-post weighting of the data, even the best such web survey methodology will lead to seriously biased results if the topic is web use (or any aspect thereof) itself and no kind of weighting can compensate for this bias. And it does not take a degree in statistics to realize this.

Which brings me to a larger point: the increasing tendency on part on some list members to "share" their newspaper readings with the rest of us without any attempt to either corroborate the findings or otherwise make a genuine contribution to a professional discussion of an issue. In my view, there is a distinctive difference between a chat group and a professional discussion group (so this is NOT an argument to institute a moderator). While both types have distinctive advantages and disadvantages, AAPORNET has become too...
much of the "chat group" type where people peddle their products, vent their political views, and don't seem to spend much time and/or effort in composing their posts. M.<br> <x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep>

Manfred
<a href="http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html">Kuechler</a><br>
<a>Hunter College</a></html>

--=====================_1538341==_.ALT--

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Jun 29 09:45:29 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f5TGlSJJ04897 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001
   09:45:28 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA24785 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 09:45:26 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f5TGlRE00476 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001 09:45:27 -0700
   (PDT)
Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 09:45:27 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Protest Planned (2nd Annual) Against Ads Targeting Children
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0106290906490.8567-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Because I know that many AAPORNETers work in the mass media (CBS News, for example), and with advertisers and in market research, I post the following—which just landed among my email—as a possibly useful heads up. The credentials of the organizers are more impressive than I would have guessed, I must say, but it's the "second annual" such protest, which might make it no surprise.

I suppose it's now obvious that I've somehow been placed on the wrong mailing list. Although I do have two young children whom I do dearly love, and I don't appreciate many of the ads they see, I've also grown rather fond of the First Amendment (Leo Simonetta, take note), which I expect will appeal to my daughters as well. And The First applies equally to both commercial advertising and to the planned protest—suggesting that the two sides ought to have much ground in common.

Freedom of expression is very rarely very pretty—precisely its value, don't you think?

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Hello Colleagues,

The following flier (below) announces an important event I am helping to organize, the Second Annual Protest Against the Golden Marble Awards.

All the best,
Diane Levin

Diane Levin, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Wheelock College
200 The Riverway
Boston, MA 02215
617-879-2167
617-876-7795 (Fax)

MARKETING TO CHILDREN: A CALL TO ACTION
Protest the Golden Marble awards
Say "NO" to the corporate takeover of childhood!

HOLD THE DATE
September 10, 2001
Outside the Grand Hyatt Hotel, New York City
(42nd Street between Lexington and Park)

The fourth annual Golden Marble awards, a celebration of "excellence" in children's advertising, will take place in New York City on September 10th at the Grand Hyatt Hotel. The awards take place during an annual industry conference titled "Advertising and Promoting to Kids."

It is time for people who care about children to take a stand against their exploitation as a consumer group. The Golden Marble awards celebrate artistry without questioning the ethics of marketing to children. They reward advertisers' effective campaigns regardless of how the products, or the marketing messages, affect the well-being of children and families.

We represent a coalition of health care professionals, parents, educators and advocates who are alarmed about the recent escalation of corporate marketing directed at children. Children influence $500 billion in spending per year. As a result, they are bombarded with commercials for products, including violent toys and junk food.

* Children consume almost 40 hours of media a week and see 20,000 commercials a year on television alone.

* Corporations spend more than $12 billion a year marketing to children, well over 20 times the amount spent 10 years ago.

* Over the past ten years, childhood obesity has become a major public health problem. The fast food industry is the biggest advertiser on TV.
* Forty percent of fifth grade girls report dieting. Discontent about body image correlates to how often girls read fashion magazines.

* The most frequently advertised and best-selling toys are linked to media.

* Children play less creatively with media-linked toys.

* The United States regulates advertising to children less than most other democratic nations.

JOIN US AND BRING YOUR COLLEAGUES AND FRIENDS!

For more information check our website:
http://www.jbcc.harvard.edu/media/marketing_to_children.htm

or contact:

Susan Linn, EdD
617-232-8390 x2328
Susan_Linn@JBCC.Harvard.edu

Diane Levin, PhD
617-879-2167
DLevin@Wheelock.edu

Allen D. Kanner, PhD
510-526-8613
ADKanner@aol.com

Andrew Hagelshaw
510-268-1100
andy@commercialfree.org

Alvin F. Poussaint, MD
617-232-8390 x2303
Alvin_Poussaint@JBCC.Harvard.edu

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

*****
Jim

Between this and yesterday's forthright response to the 'spam' complaint, =
my admiration for you grows and grows. Man after my own heart. Keep up =
the great job.
Hello Colleagues,

The following flier (below) announces an important event I am helping to organize, the Second Annual Protest Against the Golden Marble Awards.

All the best,
Diane Levin

Diane Levin, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Wheelock College
200 The Riverway
Boston, MA 02215
617-879-2167
617-876-7795 (Fax)

MARKETING TO CHILDREN: A CALL TO ACTION
Protest the Golden Marble awards
Say "NO" to the corporate takeover of childhood!

HOLD THE DATE
September 10, 2001
Outside the Grand Hyatt Hotel, New York City
(42nd Street between Lexington and Park)

The fourth annual Golden Marble awards, a celebration of "excellence" in children's advertising, will take place in New York City on September 10th at the Grand Hyatt Hotel. The awards take place during an annual industry conference titled "Advertising and Promoting to Kids."

It is time for people who care about children to take a stand against their exploitation as a consumer group. The Golden Marble awards celebrate artistry without questioning the ethics of marketing to children. They reward advertisers' effective campaigns regardless of how the products, or the marketing messages, affect the well-being of children and families.

We represent a coalition of health care professionals, parents, educators and advocates who are alarmed about the recent escalation of corporate marketing directed at children. Children influence $500 billion in spending per year. As a result, they are bombarded with commercials for products, including violent toys and junk food.

* Children consume almost 40 hours of media a week and see 20,000 commercials a year on television alone.

* Corporations spend more than $12 billion a year marketing to children, well over 20 times the amount spent 10 years ago.

* Over the past ten years, childhood obesity has become a major public health problem. The fast food industry is the biggest advertiser on TV.

* Forty percent of fifth grade girls report dieting. Discontent about body image correlates to how often girls read fashion magazines.

* The most frequently advertised and best-selling toys are linked to media.

* Children play less creatively with media-linked toys.

* The United States regulates advertising to children less than most other democratic nations.

JOIN US AND BRING YOUR COLLEAGUES AND FRIENDS!

For more information check our website: http://www.jbcc.harvard.edu/media/marketing_to_children.htm

or contact:

Susan Linn, EdD
617-232-8390 x2328
Susan_Linn@JBCC.Harvard.edu

Diane Levin, PhD
617-879-2167
DLevin@Wheelock.edu

Allen D. Kanner, PhD
510-526-8613
ADKanner@aol.com

Andrew Hagelshaw
510-268-1100
andy@commercialfree.org

Alvin F. Poussaint, MD
617-232-8390 x2303
Alvin_Poussaint@JBCC.Harvard.edu

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

******
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I know that many AAPORNETers work in the mass media (CBS News, for example), and with advertisers and in market research, I post the following—which just landed among my email—as a possibly useful heads up. The credentials of the organizers are more impressive than I would have guessed, I must say, but it's the "second annual" such protest, which might make it no surprise. I suppose it's now obvious that I've somehow been placed on the wrong mailing list. Although I do have two young children whom I dearly love, and I don't appreciate many of the ads they see, I've also grown rather fond of the First Amendment (Leo Simonetta, take note), which I expect will appeal to my daughters as well. And The First applies equally to both commercial advertising and to the planned protest—suggesting that the two sides ought to have much ground in common. Freedom of expression is very rarely very pretty—precisely its value, don't you think?

--

Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Hello Colleagues,

The following flier (below) announces an important event I am helping to organize, the Second Annual Protest Against the Golden Marble Awards. All the best, Diane Levin

Diane Levin, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Wheelock College
200 The Riverway
Boston, MA 02215
617-879-2167
617-876-7795 (Fax)

MARKETING TO CHILDREN: A CALL TO ACTION
Protest the Golden Marble awards Say "NO" to the corporate takeover of childhood!

THE DATE: September 10, 2001
Outside the Grand Hyatt Hotel, New York

City (42nd Street between Lexington and Park)

The fourth annual Golden Marble awards, a celebration of "excellence" in children's advertising, will take place in New York City on September 10th at the Grand Hyatt Hotel. The awards take place during an annual industry conference titled "Advertising and Promoting to Kids." It is time for people who care about children to take a stand against their exploitation as a consumer group. The Golden Marble awards celebrate artistry without questioning the ethics of marketing to children. They reward advertisers' effective campaign
regardless of how the products, or the marketing messages, affect the well-being of children and families. We represent a coalition of health care professionals, parents, educators and advocates who are alarmed about the recent escalation of corporate marketing directed at children. Children influence $500 billion in spending per year. As a result, they are bombarded with commercials for products, including violent toys and junk food. Children consume almost 40 hours of media a week and see 20,000 commercials a year on television alone. Corporations spend more than $12 billion a year marketing to children, we over 20 times the amount spent 10 years ago. Over the past ten years, childhood obesity has become a major public health problem. The fast food industry is the biggest advertiser on TV. Forty percent of fifth grade girls report dieting. Discontent about body image correlates to how often girls read fashion magazines. The most frequently advertised and best-selling toys are linked to media. Children play less creatively with media-linked toys. The United States regulates advertising to children less than most other democratic nations. JOIN US AND BRING YOUR COLLEAGUES AND FRIENDS! For more information check our website:
We have been asked to include 16- and 17-year-olds in a telephone survey about transportation issues. Do we need to be concerned about parental permission?

Jennifer D. Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.
We currently execute a continuous origin/destination study for the Delaware Department of Transportation and eventually had to exclude the group because parental permission was required. The problem seems to be the concern that parents have that we could be gathering O&D info for dubious purposes.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Franz [mailto:jdfranz@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2001 1:30 PM
We have been asked to include 16- and 17-year-olds in a telephone survey about transportation issues. Do we need to be concerned about parental permission?

Jennifer D. Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.

Doris Northrup
CODA, Inc.

If you are doing the survey for the Federal Government and you need to get OMB approval, I think you will definitely need to face that issue.

Doris Northrup
CODA, Inc.
Does anyone have experience with trying to get parental permission for surveys of drug and alcohol use with this same age group? If so, what percentage of parents were willing to give permission?

>>> Ratledge, Edward <ratledge@UDel.Edu> 06/29/01 12:52pm
>>>  
We currently execute a continuous origin/destination study for the Delaware Department of Transportation and eventually had to exclude the group because parental permission was required. The problem seems to be the concern that parents have that we could be gathering O&D info for dubious purposes.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Franz [mailto:jdfranz@earthlink.net]  
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2001 1:30 PM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Parental Permission

We have been asked to include 16- and 17-year-olds in a telephone survey about transportation issues. Do we need to be concerned about parental permission?

Jennifer D. Franz  
JD Franz Research, Inc.
According to federal guidelines, children are a "protected class" and you should have parental consent and the kid's assent. For the Federal Guidelines that universities and I think OMB follow, go here:

http://www.med.umich.edu/irbmed/FederalDocuments/hhs/HHS45CFR46.html
In a statewide phone survey of Kentucky adolescents (12-17) in 1998-99 we had 94% of parents/guardians give verbal permission for our interviewers to talk to their kids.

At 12:54 PM 6/29/01 -0500, Linda Owens wrote:
> Does anyone have experience with trying to get parental
> permission for surveys of drug and alcohol use with this same
> age group? If so, what percentage of parents were willing to give
> permission?
Folks,

For those who haven't already discovered it (I might well be the last one on the list), Google now has up and running a new image search tool, "Google Image Search.BETA". Although the name itself does not inspire confidence, I'll admit, this does work reasonably well already. It's at:

http://images.google.com/

Consider yourself warned.....

AAPORNETters under age 18: You are *required* to click to place "Mature content filter is On" in the upper righthand corner of the search screen.

AAPORNETters over age 18: You may/may not wish to click to place "Mature content filter is Off" in the upper righthand corner of the search screen, depending on the particular word or words you are searching.

Those over age 18 *only* might wish to click the "Mature content filter button" back and forth--between "On" and "Off"--to see what we would lose under strict censorship of media content by images alone, completely out of context. Such research will require that you figure out productive words to search for on Google Image Search, however, and this I feel confident that anyone who has ever been to an AAPOR conference will be able to handle instinctively (no email queries of me, please).

Although Google Image Search is not about to make me abandon AltaVista's "Image Search"--with its "Family Filter is off/on" in the upper righthand corner--at:

http://www.altavista.com/sites/search/simage ,

considering the massive database which Google has at its disposal, Google Image Search might soon be the site to visit first, for those of us in a hurry.

Now let's see who can be first to use this new image search tool to dredge up some photos from past AAPOR conferences--now there's a frightening thought, don't you agree? Might this be the beginning of our own Brave New World--with everyman his own global private snoop?

-- Jim

*******
Colleagues,

AAPOR's Standard Definitions Committee seeks your help.

More than a score of suggestions to improve the next edition of the Standard Definitions booklet came out of the roundtable session and hallway conversations at the Montreal conference. The passion of those comments suggested to the AAPOR Standard Definitions committee that one of the highest priorities was to have the committee provide guidance to help researchers determine final disposition of individual cases in an RDD sample where a number of potentially conflicting temporary case code dispositions exist.

We understand that many practitioners already have developed protocols, guidelines and other methods for developing final dispositions. As a starting point for our task, we'd like to incorporate your thinking, wisdom and professional guidance, and ask that if you can, please send to me any of the following you can share from your organization:

1. The protocols, decision rules or guidelines that you use for determining final call attempt dispositions from multiple-contact cases where there are conflicting temporary outcomes.

2. The list of temporary codes you use during the fieldwork period.
We're interested in receiving material that applies to any of the three modes currently in SD (RDD phone surveys, mail surveys, in-person HH surveys).

Please send them to me by Aug. 1, either via USPS or e-mail, and not to the list in general.

Committee members will use them to begin working on the next edition of Standard Definitions. (We have other goals for the next edition, too, but this is a way you can help with this particular task.)

Thanks in advance for your contribution. Have a good summer.

All best wishes...

Rob Daves, chair
Tom Smith
Paul Lavrakas
AAPOR Standard Definitions Committee

USPS Address:
Rob Daves
Director of Strategic & News Research
Star Tribune
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN 55488 USA
e-mail:
daves@startribune.com
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   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f5TJOpJ02322 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Jun 2001
12:24:51 -0700 (PDT)
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   by asu.edu (PMDF V6.0-24 #47347) with ESMTP id <0GFP00J6WHT046@asu.edu> for
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Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2001 12:22:09 -0700
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@asu.edu>
Subject: RE: Parental Permission
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
The Office for Human Research Protections at Health and Human Services (the former Office for Protection from Research Risks) is at:
http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/

There are many useful links from that page. From the "Educational Materials" link there is a "Tutorial Module for Assurances." Investigators at Federalwide Assurance or Multiple Project Assurance sites must complete this training module (on-line course) to submit proposals to their IRB's. The module is free and accessible to anyone; it does a good job of covering the basics of informed consent.

The IRB guidebook is also available at this site. Special protections for children and minors are addressed at:
http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/irb/irb_chapter6.htm#g4

And if you want all the detail, the full text of Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46, "PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS" is at:
http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm

Shap Wolf
Arizona State University SRL
shap.wolf@asu.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Franz [mailto:jdfranz@earthlink.net]
Sent: 29 June 2001 10:30 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Parental Permission

We have been asked to include 16- and 17-year-olds in a telephone survey about transportation issues. Do we need to be concerned about parental permission?

Jennifer D. Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.
The Office for Human Research Protections at Health and Human Services (the former Office for Protection from Research Risks) is at:

http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/

There are many useful links from that page. From the "Educational Materials" link there is a "Tutorial Module for Assurances." Investigators at Federalwide Assurance or Multiple Project Assurance sites must complete this training module (on-line course) to submit proposals to their IRB's. The module is free and accessible to anyone; it does a good job of covering the basics of informed consent.

The IRB guidebook is also available at this site. Special protections for children and minors are addressed at:

http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/irb/irb_chapter6.htm#g4

And if you want all the detail, the full text of Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46, "PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS" is at:

http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm

Shap Wolf

Arizona State University SRL

shap.wolf@asu.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Franz [mailto:jdfranz@earthlink.net]
Sent: 29 June 2001 10:30 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Parental Permission

We have been asked to include 16- and 17-year-olds in a telephone survey about transportation issues. Do we need to be
concerned about parental permission?

Jennifer D. Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.

I am looking for advice on specifics for a face-to-face survey. Our client would like us to do a door-to-door survey. Eligibility is 55 years or older and they must consider themselves Jewish. We will have to conduct survey in July/August -- is this pro or con. Do we use male and female interviewers, etc. Anotherwords, if we use male interviewers will this frighten most elderly and cause them not to open the door. Any information would be helpful.

Thanks,
Terrie
Here's good news: A consummate outsider--Inside.com--has come to the defense of the CBS News/New York Times Poll. You can see for yourself, immediately below.....

-- Jim

P.S. For KAF's eyes only, please: See, even seasoned Internet journalists can leave world-class TV network news operations out of their headlines, even while including that name in the first sentence of their story. And no, I didn't doctor the headline here in any way--see the Website if you don't believe me. If I *had* doctored it, my own headline would have been:

Zogby, Wall Street Journal, NBC Rescue Rival CBS Poll

Didn't I tell you that a brief visit to the Inside.com offices might do the trick--I can only assume that you took my advice, and that the story below is the result. Didn't have time to remind them about the headline, hey? If it didn't matter that much to you then, can you possibly forgive me now, after all this time?

-- jb

Copyright (C) 2001 Powerful Media, Inc. -- Inside.com

CRITICIZED NEW YORK TIMES POLL LOOKS BETTER THESE DAYS
Over the past several days, conservative New York Times columnist William Safire has been taking whacks at his paper over a Times/CBS poll showing weakening support for President Bush. On Meet the Press over the weekend, Safire called the poll results "a non-story. I would not have played it that big." Zogby International's polls, Safire said, were probably more accurate. In Monday's paper, he took another swing at his paper's coverage, pointing out that a "recent Zogby survey shows a bump upward for Bush."

Yesterday, however, Zogby released a poll under the headline, "Majority voters at odds with Bush over major issues." And today, The Wall Street Journal/NBC poll had Bush falling to a "tepid" 50 percent approval rating, the lowest presidential approval rating in more than five years. So does Safire still think readers should ignore his paper's polls? We'll just have to wait and see: "Mr. Safire is writing right now," his assistant said, "and I think he wants to save his comments for his column."

-- Seth Mnookin

http://www.inside.com
Kathy: PLEASE grant Jim public forgiveness for his unforgivable gaffe. PLEASE!

Bob Steen
Vice President
Fleishman-Hillard Research
200 North Broadway
St. Louis, MO 63102

Phone: 314 982 1752
Fax: 314 982 9105
steenb@fleishman.com

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2001 4:10 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Good News Indeed!

Here's good news: A consummate outsider--Inside.com--has come to the defense of the CBS News/New York Times Poll. You can see for yourself, immediately below.....

-- Jim

P.S. For KAF's eyes only, please: See, even seasoned Internet journalists can leave world-class TV network news operations out of their headlines, even while including that name in the first sentence of their story. And no, I didn't doctor the headline here in any way--see the Website if you don't believe me. If I *had* doctored it, my own headline would have been:

Zogby, Wall Street Journal, NBC Rescue Rival CBS Poll

Didn't I tell you that a brief visit to the Inside.com offices might do the trick--I can only assume that you took my advice, and that the story below is the result. Didn't have time to remind them about the headline, hey? If it didn't matter that much to you then, can you possibly forgive me now, after all this time?

-- jb

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright (C) 2001 Powerful Media, Inc. -- Inside.com

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
CRITICIZED NEW YORK TIMES POLL LOOKS BETTER THESE DAYS

Thursday, June 28 04:50 p.m.

Over the past several days, conservative New York Times columnist William Safire has been taking whacks at his paper over a Times/CBS poll showing weakening support for President Bush. On Meet the Press over the weekend, Safire called the poll results "a non-story. I would not have played it that big." Zogby International's polls, Safire said, were probably more accurate. In Monday's paper, he took another swing at his paper's coverage, pointing out that a "recent Zogby survey shows a bump upward for Bush."

Yesterday, however, Zogby released a poll under the headline, "Majority voters at odds with Bush over major issues." And today, The Wall Street Journal/NBC poll had Bush falling to a "tepid" 50 percent approval rating, the lowest presidential approval rating in more than five years. So does Safire still think readers should ignore his paper's polls? We'll just have to wait and see: "Mr. Safire is writing right now," his assistant said, "and I think he wants to save his comments for his column."

-- Seth Mnookin

http://www.inside.com

------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright (C) 2001 Powerful Media, Inc. -- Inside.com

------------------------------------------------------------------------
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu>
Subject: Re: New to Google: Image Search Tool
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

Also try http://www.ditto.com/ - it bills itself as the "leading visual search engine."

Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

At 12:12 PM -0700 6/29/01, James Beniger wrote:
> Folks,
> For those who haven't already discovered it (I might well be the last one on the list), Google now has up and running a new image search tool, "Google Image Search.BETA". Although the name itself does not inspire confidence, I'll admit, this does work reasonably well already. It's at:
> http://images.google.com/

---

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/06/30/obituaries/30SEWE.html

June 30, 2001

WILLIAM SEWELL, 91, SOCIOLOGIST FAMED

FOR STUDY OF WISCONSINITES, IS DEAD
By JENNIFER CHIU

Dr. William H. Sewell, a sociologist who guided a study that looked at the underpinnings of success by following more than 10,000 people over 40 years, died on Sunday in Madison, Wis., where he lived. He was 91.

Colleagues credit Dr. Sewell, a member of the National Academy of Sciences, with helping to elevate the status of sociology.

"From the very beginning he was a major force in the development of the discipline," said Dr. Robert M. Hauser, a professor at the University of Wisconsin and a collaborator in the study.

The study grew from a survey authorized by the State Legislature, which wanted to measure the adequacy of the public university system, and financed a four-page questionnaire that was given to all 30,000 students who graduated from high school in Wisconsin in 1957. The survey contained questions about family background and educational and occupational aspirations.

After the data had been compiled, the forms lay forgotten in a basement until Dr. Sewell found them in the early 1960's. That was the start of Dr. Sewell's biggest project, the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study.

Working with his colleagues at the university, Dr. Sewell arranged for further contact with a random sample of the original respondents and some of their siblings, or more than 10,000 people. Based on follow-up surveys and interviews, the study contains data on the participants' socioeconomic backgrounds, education and careers, and links those factors to their success later in life.

A person's family and social origins greatly affect ambitions, Dr. Sewell found, and those factors correlate strongly with schooling and later accomplishments. The study has spawned many inquiries into the relationship between background and achievement.

William Hamilton Sewell II was born on Nov. 27, 1909, in Perrinton, Mich. He received his bachelor's and master's degrees in sociology at Michigan State University and a Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota.

He has been president of the American Sociological Association and the Rural Sociological Society and chairman of the National Commission on Research. He was also the University of Wisconsin's chancellor, from 1967 to 1968.

He is survived by his wife, Elizabeth; a daughter, Mary Sewell Cooper, of LaVeta, Colo.; two sons, William H. III of Chicago and Robert G. of Metuchen, N.J.; five grandchildren; and a great-grandchild.

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/06/30/obituaries/30SEWE.html

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
My firm conducts The Iowa Poll for The Des Moines Register and part of our responsibility is to check numbers in stories and graphics. I'm looking for any source you might know that details conventions for presenting graphics. Like a pie chart starting at 12.00. And, ranking the data (if categorical) with the largest slice starting at 12.00. My company has our own standards, from years of preparing our own graphics and studying others. But, it might be helpful to have a standard style book on this. I've not found one so far that addresses some very basic issues of graphic presentation of data. The USA Today pie charts are notorious for seemingly random arrangements of wedges, and I recall watching with horror Ross Perot's graphics. Ideas, anyone?

JAS

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

JAS

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

--part1_7c.17e83eba.286f65e2_boundary--
Edward Tufte has written three excellent books on the questions of information display. They aren't handbooks in the sense of "if presenting X use chart Y," instead they are explorations of how we perceive information and what effects different methods have on perception. He does a great job debunking "chart junk." Tufte was the plenary speaker at the 1984 AAPOR conference, and I've enjoyed reading his work ever since.

The three texts are all beautifully illustrated and printed:


An interview with Tufte (professor emeritus at Yale) is at:
http://www.ercb.com/feature/feature.0008.2.html, it has links to some images from his books.

His own web site is at: http://www.edwardtufte.com. Be sure and look at Minard's anti-war poster showing Napoleon's invasion of Russia. Tufte calls it the best statistical graphic ever drawn; I certainly agree.

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

Also-

SAS has a new title "Visualizing Categorical Data" by Michael Friendly, (December 2000) SAS Publishing; ISBN: 1580256600. This shows how to take advantage of the power of SAS Graph. A lot of it is oriented to exploratory data analysis. I've also found this text to be very useful.

Shap Wolf
Arizona State University SRL
shap.wolf@asu.edu
(do I need a disclaimer? I'm just an avid Tufte fan; no kickbacks involved!)

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2001 10:27 AM
(snip)
>From shap.wolf@asu.edu Sat Jun 30 12:02:53 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f5UJ2qJ23704 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 30 Jun 2001
12:02:52
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from post2.inre.asu.edu (post2.inre.asu.edu [129.219.110.73])

I forgot to include the link to Michael Friendly's web site in my previous note:
http://hotspur.psych.yorku.ca/SCS/Gallery/
many examples of good and bad graphics, as well as links to his work and other data visualization and statistical graphics sites.

shap
Edward Tufte has written three excellent books on the questions of information display. They aren't handbooks in the sense of "if presenting X use chart Y," instead they are explorations of how we perceive information and what effects different methods have on perception. He does a great job debunking "chart junk." Tufte was the plenary speaker at the 1984 AAPOR conference, and I've enjoyed reading his work ever since.

The three texts are all beautifully illustrated and printed:

The Visual Display of Quantitative Information, 2nd edition (May 2001)


An interview with Tufte (professor emeritus at Yale) is at:
http://www.ercb.com/feature/feature.0008.2.html, it has links to some images from his books.

His own web site is at: http://www.edwardtufte.com. Be sure and look at Minard's anti-war poster showing Napoleon's invasion of Russia. Tufte calls it the best statistical graphic ever drawn; I certainly agree.

Also-

SAS has a new title "Visualizing Categorical Data" by Michael Friendly, (December 2000) SAS Publishing; ISBN: 1580256600. This shows how to take advantage of the power of SAS Graph. A lot of it is oriented to exploratory data analysis. I've also found this text to be very useful.

Shap Wolf
Arizona State University SRL
shap.wolf@asu.edu
(do I need a disclaimer? I'm just an avid Tufte fan; no kickbacks involved!)

-----Original Message-----
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2001 10:27 AM
(snip)