

=====  
Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700  
Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>  
Subject: May 1998 archive - one BIG message

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

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

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

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

Begin archive:

-----  
Archive aapornet, file log9805.  
Part 1/1, total size 581547 bytes:

----- Cut here -----  
>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Thu Apr 30 13:28:29 1998  
Received: from camel7.mindspring.com (camel7.mindspring.com [207.69.200.57])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id NAA13846 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 30 Apr 1998 13:28:27 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from default (user-381d0ii.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.130.82])  
by camel7.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA23950  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 30 Apr 1998 16:28:25 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <199804302028.QAA23950@camel7.mindspring.com>  
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0  
Date: Thu, 30 Apr 1998 16:28:57 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Warren J. Mitofsky" <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Re: Canvassing via Internet  
In-Reply-To: <2.2.32.19980430035532.006d17ac@pop.ben2.ucla.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Is it really that hard to hit the DELETE key?

warren mitofsky

>I expect that politicians will quickly start to misuse the concept and  
>turn off the electorate. I think e-mail users are more sensitive to  
>spamming than are snail mail receivers. Also, sophisticated servers  
>can be programed to turn off spammers, I understand. But mostly it  
>behooves all of us to immediately respond to junk mail and spamming  
>from politicians with immediate negative responses, donations to  
>opponents that we can stomach, and a promise not to vote for the spammer.  
> I do wonder if there are first amendment issues here. And I  
>appreciate that e-mail is a way of dealing with communications control  
>in authoritarian regimes. So it is not all that clear, but I for one am  
>highly irritated by spammers, no matter who they may be.  
>Hal Kassarjian  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>Hal Kassarjian  
>hkassarj@ucla.edu  
>Phone 1-818 784-5669  
>FAX 1-818 784-3325  
>

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

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

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Fri May 1 05:00:58 1998  
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.170])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id FAA10669 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 05:00:56 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)  
by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id IAA16340;  
Fri, 1 May 1998 08:01:08 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Fri, 1 May 1998 08:01:08 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Andrew Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
X-Sender: andy@troll  
To: "Warren J. Mitofsky" <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
cc: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Canvassing via Internet  
In-Reply-To: <199804302028.QAA23950@camel7.mindspring.com>  
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.96.980501074646.16320D-100000@troll>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear Warren:

You would not be so flip about this, if you ever had a computer blocked by

some junk e-mailers SPAM. We lost the use of one of our workstations for a couple of weeks, because it had not had its "spam hole" plugged.

We would come in in the morning and find the machine sending hundreds of thousands of pornographic, travel and get rich quick adds to AOL, etc.

As long as they have a valid header with a return ID, I don't consider it spam. Spam means that there is not valid header, but a faked one.

It is the equivalent of using someone else's bulk mail permit without paying.

In fact some of the bulk e-mailers have been forced to pay money damages to those whose computers they have "hijacked."

To tell if it is spam one simply tries a reply, and if the address that comes up is something like noone@nowhere.com or something else that is not related to who to respond to for the actual message then it is real SPAM.

For information on the problem go to <http://www.spam.abuse.net>

Here is a brief excerpt:

1.The free ride. E-mail spam is unique in that the receiver pays so much more for it than the sender does. For example, AOL has said that they were receiving 1.8 million spams from Cyber Promotions per day until they got a court injunction to stop it. Assuming that it takes the typical AOL user only 10 seconds to identify and discard a message, that's still 5,000 hours per day of connect time per day spent discarding their spam, just on AOL. By contrast, the spammer probably has a T1 line that costs him about \$100/day. No other kind of advertising costs the advertiser so little, and the recipient so much. The closest analogy I can think of would be auto-dialing junk phone calls to cellular users; you can imagine how favorably that might be received.

Andy

Andrew A. Beveridge	Home Office
209 Kissena Hall	50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology	Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY	Phone: 914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597	Fax: 914-337-8210
Phone: 718-997-2837	E-Mail: <a href="mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu">andy@troll.soc.qc.edu</a>
Fax: 718-997-2820	Website: <a href="http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps">http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps</a>

>From DLAMBERT@chilton.net Fri May 1 06:26:02 1998

Received: from [204.243.31.8] (GRUMPY.CHILTONCO.COM [204.243.31.8])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id GAA24280 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 06:26:00 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from smtpm.chilton.net by [204.243.31.8]  
via smtpd (for usc-e0.usc.edu [128.125.1.45]) with SMTP; 1 May  
1998 13:24:07 UT

Received: from Chilton\_Radnor-Message\_Server by chilton.net  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Tue, 28 Apr 1998 09:19:33 -0400

Message-Id: <s5459f25.078@chilton.net>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Fri, 01 May 1998 09:19:33 -0400

From: David Lambert <DLAMBERT@chilton.net>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Hiring - Research Manager

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain

Content-Disposition: inline

Chilton Research Services  
Attention: David B. Lambert, Ph.D.  
201 King of Prussia Road  
Radnor, PA 19087

Chilton Research Services, a leading provider of full service custom research and consulting located just outside Philadelphia in Radnor, PA, has a position available for a Research Manager. Please check the posting below:

Position: Research Manager.

Primary duties and responsibilities include directing project management in the successful completion of research studies, leading proposal preparation and developing project designs for established and new clients. Client contact and management skills as well as analytical report writing will be required.

Experience requirements: Requires familiarity with: the government proposal process, conducting government research projects, public opinion polling, and non-profit association research. Health Care research experience would be a real plus. Candidates must have at least five (5) years experience managing projects, preferably with at least one year supervising project directors.

Educational Requirements: M.A.

Specialized Skills, Knowledge, Abilities: Candidates must have skills in all aspects of survey management, including study design, sample control, questionnaire design, data processing and statistical analysis. They should also possess superb analytical and written communication skills.

Proposal and analytical report writing proficiency is required.

Preferred Field of Study/Specialty: Social Science

Please respond by mail to the address above or by email to  
dlambert@chilton.net Phone calls will not be considered.

>From rosepol@mailhost.tcs.tulane.edu Fri May 1 07:19:44 1998  
Received: from spnode01.tcs.tulane.edu (spnode01.tcs.tulane.edu  
[129.81.129.1])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id HAA07239 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 07:19:41 -0700  
(PDT)

From: rosepol@mailhost.tcs.tulane.edu

Received: from [129.81.50.11] (drose.pols.tulane.edu [129.81.50.11])

by spnode01.tcs.tulane.edu (8.8.5/8.8.4) with ESMTP

id JAA176294 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 09:19:38 -0500

Message-Id: <l03130300b16f836069c7@[129.81.50.11]>

In-Reply-To: <Pine.HPP.3.96.980430120942.8358B-100000@ruby.iupui.edu>

References: <2.2.32.19980430130405.00962848@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Fri, 1 May 1998 09:18:55 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: survey org id

I think the question of identifying your survey organization involves two types of issues. The first, focused on so far, concerns the rights of respondents. Do people have a right to know who they are talking to and who is paying for the survey? If so, can the identification be deferred until the end of the interview?

The second involves the validity of the survey. We know that identifications affect the behavior of respondents. That's why response rates jump with credentialling, race of interviewer impacts results, and sponsors suspect that responses depend on whom the caller is presumed to favor.

When I do nationwide tourism marketing surveys, I don't use the name of my firm, Bayou Research, because it correctly connotes Louisiana sponsorship. Interviewers provide the name of a dummy firm and, if asked, my name and phone number. When I do local political surveys, which are sometimes partly funded by Tulane University, I don't use the university's name to increase response rate if, as is at times the case, that might affect the content of responses, introduce distracting issues, or redound to the debit of the university.

Which is the more valid survey, the high response rate & high deference response one that goes with university sponsorship, the vanilla one produced by a neutral-sounding organization, or the one announced as being sponsored by the Newt Gingrich for President committee?

>From H0neill536@aol.com Fri May 1 07:52:28 1998  
Received: from imo30.mx.aol.com (imo30.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.74])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id HAA15977 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 07:52:26 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from H0neill536@aol.com  
by imo30.mx.aol.com (IM0v14.1) id 0LHAa02448  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 10:51:46 -0400 (EDT)  
From: H0neill536 <H0neill536@aol.com>  
Message-ID: <fc12db5b.3549e183@aol.com>  
Date: Fri, 1 May 1998 10:51:46 EDT  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Subject: just out of curiosity  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 51

In response to Bob Putnam's query, I have never heard of M&H Survey Research. I would be very, very suspicious of any survey call in which the interviewer refused to provide th name, address, and phone number of the research firm. This is simply unethical and I know of no reputable firm that would behave in

this manner. Harry O'Neill

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Fri May 1 08:16:46 1998  
Received: from camel14.mindspring.com (camel14.mindspring.com [207.69.200.64])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id IAA21320 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 08:16:44 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from default (user-38ld0p5.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.131.37])  
by camel14.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id LAA25671  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 11:16:41 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <199805011516.LAA25671@camel14.mindspring.com>  
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0  
Date: Fri, 01 May 1998 11:17:15 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Warren J. Mitofsky" <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Canvassing via Internet  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.96.980501074646.16320D-100000@troll>  
References: <199804302028.QAA23950@camel7.mindspring.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Andy,

Did you forget to divide your SPAM time estimates (below) by the number of AOL subscribers. I believe there are 11 million of them.

Furthermore, there was no indication that the e-mailed political messages being sent by politicians were SPAM. From what we were told the source was identified. I think it is flip to condemn political messages sent by e-mail just because they were unsolicited. You are not obligated to read their e-mail any more than you are to watch politicians on the free television time so many people are clamoring for, or to read the mail they send to your home.

warren

At 08:01 AM 5/1/98 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Warren:

>

>You would not be so flip about this, if you ever had a computer blocked  
>by some junk e-mailers SPAM. We lost the use of one of our  
>workstations for a couple of weeks, because it had not had its "spam  
>hole" plugged.

>

>We would come in in the morning and find the machine sending hundreds  
>of thousands of pornographic, travel and get rich quick adds to AOL,  
>etc.

>

>As long as they have a valid header with a return ID, I don't consider  
>it spam. Spam means that there is not valid header, but a faked one.

>

>It is the equivalent of using someone else's bulk mail permit without  
>paying.

>

>In fact some of the bulk e-mailers have been forced to pay money  
>damages to those whose computers they have "hijacked."

>

>To tell if it is spam one simply tries a reply, and if the address that  
>comes up is something like noone@nowhere.com or something else that is  
>not related to who to respond to for the actual message then it is real  
>SPAM.

>

>For information on the problem go to <http://www.spam.abuse.net>

>

>Here is a brief excerpt:

>

>1.The free ride. E-mail spam is unique in that the receiver pays so  
>much more for it than the sender does. For example,  
> AOL has said that they were receiving 1.8 million spams from Cyber  
>Promotions per day until they got a court injunction  
> to stop it. Assuming that it takes the typical AOL user only 10  
>seconds to identify and discard a message, that's still  
> 5,000 hours per day of connect time per day spent discarding their  
>spam, just on AOL. By contrast, the spammer  
> probably has a T1 line that costs him about \$100/day. No other  
>kind of advertising costs the advertiser so little, and the  
> recipient so much. The closest analogy I can think of would be

>auto-dialing junk phone calls to cellular users; you can  
> imagine how favorably that might be received.  
>  
>  
>Andy  
>  
>  
>Andrew A. Beveridge Home Office  
>209 Kissena Hall 50 Merriam Avenue  
>Department of Sociology Bronxville, NY 10708  
>Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237  
>Flushing, NY 11367-1597 Fax: 914-337-8210  
>Phone: 718-997-2837 E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu  
>Fax: 718-997-2820 Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps  
>

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

212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From rosepol@mailhost.tcs.tulane.edu Fri May 1 10:20:44 1998  
Received: from spnode01.tcs.tulane.edu (spnode01.tcs.tulane.edu  
[129.81.129.1])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id KAA21361 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 10:20:42 -0700

(PDT)

From: rosepol@mailhost.tcs.tulane.edu

Received: from [129.81.50.11] (drose.pols.tulane.edu [129.81.50.11])

by spnode01.tcs.tulane.edu (8.8.5/8.8.4) with ESMTP

id MAA152196 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 12:20:36 -0500

Message-Id: <l03130301b16fb47ff42a@[129.81.50.11]>

In-Reply-To: <l03130300b16f836069c7@[129.81.50.11]>

References: <Pine.HPP.3.96.980430120942.8358B-100000@ruby.iupui.edu>

<2.2.32.19980430130405.00962848@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Fri, 1 May 1998 12:19:52 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: survey org id

Ironically, my signature was inadvertently left off of my "survey org id"  
post. Apologies.

Douglas Rose  
Tulane University



>From murray.edelman@vnsusa.org Fri May 1 12:42:22 1998  
Received: from libra.vnsusa.com (libra.vnsusa.com [205.183.239.99] (may be forged))  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id MAA03609 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 12:42:19 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from mail.vnsusa.org by libra.vnsusa.com  
via smtpd (for usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) with SMTP; 1 May 1998 19:37:05 UT  
Received: by NTS\_1 with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)  
id <WJWANBC7>; Fri, 1 May 1998 14:47:43 -0400  
Message-ID: <017480CB593ED111B05D0060B0571CFE0827AD@NTS\_1>  
From: Murray Edelman <murray.edelman@vnsusa.org>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: CONFERENCE NOTES: Seinfeld, and more  
Date: Fri, 1 May 1998 14:47:40 -0400  
X-Priority: 3  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)  
Content-Type: text/plain

AAPORNETers,

Here are some items of interest concerning our coming conference:

1. SAMPLING POPULAR CULTURE: RERUN OF THE FINAL SEINFELD EPISODE

We have added this session for Thursday evening, (at approximately 11 PM). The actual broadcast conflicts with our plenary on "The Market Research Industry in 2010." Now you can participate in both.

We will have Jerry, George, Elaine, and Kramer on the big screen and we can also present and discuss their latest approval ratings.

2. A TASTE OF AAPOR '98

I want to call your attention to the coverage of our conference in the newsletter. Jo Holz did a fine job. I am particularly delighted with the results of our experiment. I asked the organizers of sessions to go beyond their session summary, which I had already requested for the conference program, and give us a "taste" of their session: why this meeting is important to them and what could happen there. These short descriptions should whet your appetite.

3. ALL PAPERS SHOULD BE DELIVERED TO CHAIRS AND DISCUSSANTS BY MAY 8th.

We have sent contact author information to the chairs and discussants of each session. They should have contacted all paper presenters by the early part of next week. The papers should be delivered to them (in some agreed

upon form) by Friday, May 8th.

If you are a contact author for a paper to be presented in a session and have not heard from your chair or discussant by this coming Wednesday, please let me know.

I am looking forward to seeing you in St. Louis,

Murray Edelman                   murray.edelman@vnsusa.org  
Conference Chair

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri May 1 15:43:27 1998  
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id PAA04010 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 15:43:25 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)  
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id PAA28783 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 15:43:25 -0700  
(PDT)

Date: Fri, 1 May 1998 15:43:25 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Remembering Betsy Morton  
Message-ID: <Pine.SV4.3.94.980501153154.9426C-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: MULTIPART/MIXED; BOUNDARY="====\_894084154==\_"  
Content-ID: <Pine.SV4.3.94.980501153154.9426D@almaak.usc.edu>

This message is in MIME format. The first part should be readable text, while the remaining parts are likely unreadable without MIME-aware tools. Send mail to mime@docserver.cac.washington.edu for more info.

-----\_894084154==\_  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=us-ascii  
Content-ID: <Pine.SV4.3.94.980501153154.9426E@almaak.usc.edu>

Date: Fri, 01 May 1998 13:59:48 -0700  
From: Merrill Shanks <jms@csm.berkeley.edu>  
Subject: Betsy Morton

To: Friends of the CSM Program  
From: Merrill Shanks  
Subject: Betsy Morton

As you may have already heard, Betsy Morton died of complications from her prolonged battle with lung cancer on April 24. Up to the final week or two, Betsy was determined to continue her work with the Census Bureau and several other organizations that work with the CSM Program. She resisted efforts to assist her when it became hard for her to move around, and she insisted she

would come back again from her most recent series of treatments. She wanted to be keep up to date and to contribute to our projects, up to the very end.

Betsy had strongly requested that we not tell anyone about the nature of her health-related problems, and we honored that request until last December. She didn't want cancer to interfere with her work or her professional relationships, and she pursued those goals with a determination and grace that will be remembered for a very long time.

Those who were privileged to work closely with Betsy knew that she was an extraordinarily positive yet private person, who brought great determination as well as skill to any project she joined. Since 1982, she taught several hundred survey professionals about computer-assisted surveys in CSM workshops, and she was the most sought after consultant in the country concerning computer-based instrumentation for complex surveys. Within the survey field, Betsy represented a unique combination of a traditional field director, instrument designer, instructor, documentation specialist, manager, and missionary for computer-assisted surveys. Without her, our work will continue, but in a very different way.

Many individuals have inquired about some way to remember Betsy and her many contributions. As in many other aspects of our activities, Betsy provided some guidance on this question, for she left a request that we have a party, instead of a traditional memorial service. To respect her request, while honoring her many contributions, the CSM Program and Betsy's family have organized a gathering of her many professional and personal friends, at 3:30, May 7, at the Bancroft Hotel, 2680 Bancroft Way, in Berkeley. For that occasion, we are compiling a book of pictures and statements about Betsy for her family.

Betsy's daughter, Tracy, has indicated that contributions in Betsy's memory may be sent to:

American Cancer Society  
1710 Webster Street, Suite 210  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(510) 893-7900

Please include a note with any contribution saying that it is being made in the name of Betsy Morton and ask that the Society notify Tracy Fontana, 5808 Estates Drive, Oakland, 94611. A donation to the American Cancer Society may also be made via telephone and with a credit card by calling: 1-800-227-2345.

I know we will be hearing from many of you concerning Betsy's contributions to our lives. I look forward to those contacts, and we will pass any messages on to Betsy's family and our staff.

\*\*\*\*\*

-----\_894084154==\_--  
>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Fri May 1 16:50:25 1998  
Received: from smtp3.erols.com (smtp3.erols.com [207.172.3.236])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id QAA19222 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 May 1998 16:50:22 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (207-172-197-186.s59.as1.whp.erols.com  
[207.172.197.186])  
by smtp3.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id TAA24698;  
Fri, 1 May 1998 19:50:17 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <354A5FB7.92D267D9@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
Date: Fri, 01 May 1998 19:50:15 -0400  
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; U)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Canvassing via Internet  
References: <199804302028.QAA23950@camel7.mindspring.com>  
<199805011516.LAA25671@camel14.mindspring.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

See responses below

Warren J. Mitofsky wrote:

>  
> Andy,  
> Did you forget to divide your SPAM time estimates (below) by the  
> number of AOL subscribers. I believe there are 11 million of them.

There are other spammers. Besides cyber promotions, which has now gone out of business.

Note the computations were not mine, but from <http://www.spam.abuse.net>

>  
> Furthermore, there was no indication that the e-mailed political  
> messages being sent by politicians were SPAM. From what we were told  
> the source was identified. I think it is flip to condemn political  
> messages sent by e-mail just because they were unsolicited. You are  
> not obligated to read their e-mail any more than you are to watch  
> politicians on the free television time so many people are clamoring  
> for, or to read the mail they send to your home.  
> warren  
>

But like unsolicited FAX'es you do help subsidize them. My bet is that they think it is a neat idea to send out 1 million almost free e-mails.

Andy

> A

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Sat May 2 11:38:22 1998  
Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu  
[128.146.214.33])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id LAA14330 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 2 May 1998 11:38:21 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu (ts20-3.homenet.ohio-state.edu  
[140.254.113.138])  
by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id OAA26427  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 2 May 1998 14:36:56 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Sat, 2 May 1998 14:36:56 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <199805021836.OAA26427@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu>  
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>  
Subject: Survey Research Ethics: A very personal observation

Some recent postings to AAPORnet sadly remind me how different my own thoughts on survey ethics and those of some others appear to be. And as you'll see below, this has really pushed a hot button for me...

To me, the consideration of whether or not a survey's validity might be lessened, for example, by honestly acknowledging information to respondents about the firm conducting, and/or the firm sponsoring the survey, is an issue I see little on which to "compromise." For example, the notion that one might use a "bogus" name for the group that does the work, or sponsors the work, is ethically unacceptable to me. If telling the truth about these matters lowers the validity of a survey, then so be it...

And for those of you who don't know me and simply see that I'm a professor at a university, let me assure you I'm no naive academic out of touch with the "real" world. Rather, I'm simply a person who has a very, very strong personal/professional code of ethics and I let that code determine what will and what not will be done in my research and the research my organization does. (More than 20 years ago I wrote something for myself explaining why one's "means" should justify the "ends" one achieves, and if those ends are less than what was hoped, then at least one has the self-respect that goes with using ethical means. In research this to me dictates not using unethical methods to achieve "more accurate" results.) My code acts as a "red flag" that goes up as soon as I hear about something that seems ethically inappropriate. That, for example, was why I took such a strong and inflexible stand a year ago when AAPORnetters were discussing whether or not it was OK for interviewers to use bogus names in survey introductions.

My own methods training in grad school, 25+ years ago, instilled in me the responsibility researchers have to "do no harm." To deal with threats to a study's validity, and if we can justify "creatively avoiding" giving out information that might lessen the validity of a study -- and I think this can be done --, then it is incumbent on us to at least "debrief" our respondents after the data are collected to correct the possible harm we've done by not being fully honest with them. How the debriefing, after a study ends, is operationalized can take many appropriate forms...

Why is this important -- i.e., why be concerned about "fooling" respondents by telling them something "small" that isn't true? To me even what may appear to many to be some "innocent" untruth (e.g., allowing interviewers to use a bogus name when speaking with respondents) flies directly in the face, both in principle and in practice, of our desire for our respondents to honestly answer our questions. To me it's hypocritical and unethical. If the survey enterprise is threatened by the prospect that respondents won't provide accurate information, then how can we take the "high road" in trying to convince the public about how important it is to participate honestly in good surveys if we won't always be honest with them???

On another "methods" list-serve that I read last fall, one on social science methods, I was saddened by a posting and subsequent discussion in which a professor explained that his methods class basically thought that everybody lies, so what's the harm if researchers do it too? That is, what's the harm if researchers use methods that "trick" subjects.

To me social research and its methods are the way we search for the best "truths" we can achieve (i.e., findings that are as reliable and valid as one's finite resources will allow). Thus, it strikes me as extremely ironic and sad that researchers who are striving for accurate ("truthful") findings sometimes appear not to be bothered by using "untruthful" methods and procedures to achieve those findings.

A final point: another aspect of my ethical code for good survey practice is the responsibility (both in principle and to the profession) that researchers have to ideally provide respondents with a "positive" experience when they are interviewed. To me, not being honest with respondents, including "innocent" lies, is inconsistent with this goal.

-----  
\* \* \* \* \*  
\* \*  
\*  
\* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.  
\*  
\* Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy & Management  
\*  
\* Director, OSU/SBS Survey Research Unit  
\*  
\* \* \* \* \*  
\* \*

\* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences; Derby Hall, Room 0126  
\*  
\* 154 North Oval Mall, Ohio State University; Columbus OH 43210  
\*  
\* Voice: (614)-292-6672 Fax: (614)-292-6673 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu  
\*  
\* \* \* \* \*  
\* \*

>From ande271@ibm.net Sun May 3 14:22:24 1998  
Received: from out5.ibm.net (out5.ibm.net [165.87.194.245])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id OAA13551 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 3 May 1998 14:22:21 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from default (slip-32-100-112-93.ny.us.ibm.net [32.100.112.93]) by  
out5.ibm.net (8.8.5/8.6.9) with SMTP id VAA74394 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;  
Sun, 3 May 1998 21:22:15 GMT  
Message-ID: <354D0A88.F9F@ibm.net>  
Date: Sun, 03 May 1998 17:23:36 -0700  
From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@ibm.net>  
Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: ethics and identity  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I applaud Professor Lavrakas' statement about ends not justifying means (I am paraphrasing roughly an eloquent statement - I apologize.)

There is, apparently, some controversy about revealing the identity of the sponsor of the study/research organization conducting it. My impression is that academic researchers believe in revealing the identity of the sponsor as a way of reassuring potential respondents that the study is unbiased and competently designed. This may hold some truth.

However, my guess is that those of us who conduct survey research for commercial, government, non-profit, or other non-academic sponsors do not visualize revealing the identity of our clients as a way of reassuring potential respondents. We reassure ourselves and any colleagues of the integrity of our work by revealing our methods. We believe that we can conduct valid, unbiased studies for clients who have a vested interest in the results of those studies.

Some academic researchers conduct their own data-gathering. If a commercial client were to do this, the results would immediately be suspect among AAPOR members, wouldn't it? Academic research is often funded by grants, which are awarded on the basis of proposals that specify objectives, link design to those objectives, and spell out methods of quality control in data

gathering and analysis.

Some non-academic research is also awarded to contractors after competitive bidding, including presentation of detailed proposals. Can bias creep in nevertheless? If so, is the potential respondent likely to be able to predict that it will? Do people feel that Campbell's (soup) is more likely to try to introduce bias into the studies it commissions than, say, Ford Motor?

Identifying the sponsor of the study probably does not contribute to a meaningful decision on the part of the potential respondent. Does identifying the agency conducting the study? Universities generally are held in high regard, as they are perceived to uphold standards of scientific objectivity and accuracy. Is this equally true of Harvard University and Podunk College? Similarly, the well-established market research company may claim a reputation for upholding standards. The less-well-known research organization does not have this advantage.

Can interviewers be supplied with statements about a study that will convince people that it is well-designed and conducted without revealing the name(s) of sponsor(s) (which in itself can be said to be unethical)? Would members of the public be reassured by statements such as "I am from [research organization]; we do not reveal the identity of our clients because that would be unethical. We do not reveal the identity of the people we interview, for the same reason. We design the studies we do to be objective, and we choose the people to be included in the study using systematic sampling methods. The results are reported honestly, no matter what those results are."

Such statements would add to "interview" length and therefore cost clients more. If they ensured higher response rates, surveys might actually be more cost-effective. But would they do that? And would clients be willing to pay the additional cost? How much more would it cost? Finally, would survey researchers be willing to compose such statements to include in cover letters for mail surveys and introductions to telephone interviews?

>From tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu Sun May 3 18:04:40 1998

Received: from mhub3.tc.umn.edu (0@mhub3.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.53])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id SAA23152 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 3 May 1998 18:04:39 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mhub1.tc.umn.edu by mhub3.tc.umn.edu; Sun, 3 May 98 20:04:24 -0500

Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub1.tc.umn.edu; Sun, 3 May 98 20:04:23 -0500

Received: from localhost by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Sun, 3 May 98 20:04:23 -0500

Date: Sun, 3 May 1998 20:04:23 -0500 (CDT)

From: Phil Tichenor <tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Survey Research Ethics: An endorsement

In-Reply-To: <199805021836.OAA26427@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu>



Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.96.980503195032.6892A-100000@maroon.tc.umn.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I would like to add a strong second to the statement by Paul Lavrakas on ethics in survey research. The need for absolute honesty and distaste for deception of any kind is as essential in opinion research as it is in journalism generally. The use of deceptions and untruths, big or small, can have only one outcome--the equating of opinion polling with all the shady operations known to humankind. We know from the census methods debate, however politicized that may be, that the arguments against sampling appeal to a great potential for popular distrust of surveys generally. If members of the survey research profession adhere to anything less than total honesty with their respondents, the logical outcome is a reinforcement of that distrust.

As others have pointed out, many research firms have a rather simple way of handling questions from respondents about who is conducting a particular study. A common procedure, in my experience, is to tell the respondent that this information will be withheld until the end of the interview, so as not to bias in any way the respondent's answers.

One should especially underscore Paul's fundamental question: If we are concerned about accurate information from respondents, how can we be less than fully honest and claim we are taking the high road?

Phil Tichenor

>From Irv Crespi@aol.com Sun May 3 18:25:20 1998  
Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.37])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id SAA26024 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 3 May 1998 18:25:19 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from Irv Crespi@aol.com  
by imo15.mx.aol.com (IM0v14.1) id 0DLKa25760  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 3 May 1998 21:24:35 +2000 (EDT)  
From: Irv Crespi <Irv Crespi@aol.com>  
Message-ID: <16202d05.354d18d4@aol.com>  
Date: Sun, 3 May 1998 21:24:35 EDT  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Subject: Re: Survey Research Ethics: An endorsement  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 18

The principle of not lying to respondents is as applicable to commercial research as it is to academic. I have elaborated on this in the current IJPOR. There are various strategies that can be adopted. One can, for

example, tell them that they will be informed in full at the end of the interview. But one should never lie.

Irving Crespi

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun May 3 18:39:58 1998  
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id SAA01255 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 3 May 1998 18:39:56 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)  
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id SAA03546 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 3 May 1998 18:39:56 -0700  
(PDT)

Date: Sun, 3 May 1998 18:39:56 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Call for Papers: Solidarity as "The Social"  
Message-ID: <Pine.SV4.3.94.980503183432.27160D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

From: texbart@merle.acns.nwu.edu  
Date: Sat, 2 May 1998 06:32:07 -0500  
Subject: Solidarity: "The Social" in Thought & Practice

CALL FOR PAPERS

Solidarity: "The Social" in Thought and Practice

Graduate Student History Conference  
New York University  
April 2-3, 1999

Graduate students in the History Department at New York University announce a conference on the theme of "solidarity" and invite graduate students in all fields and periods of history to submit abstracts for papers. We use "solidarity" to refer to social phenomena that have come to be called mass action, political mobilization, and coalition-building. Calling attention to "solidarity" addresses recent trends in the academy. Many intellectual and cultural historians argue that discourse, ideology, and narrativity ought to be privileged categories of social analysis. To what extent has this view challenged or supplanted an older view that society is to be studied as a realm of competing structures, contending classes and groups, and conflicts over material resources? We invite students to present historical work that showcases the various interpretive and methodological tools that historians bring to the study of "solidarity."

We encourage prospective panelists to submit abstracts of papers that address any of the four following questions:

FIRST, is the study of society an exercise in metaphysics, disguised as science, or is it a professionally anchored way of investigating and knowing the social world?

SECOND, if discourse constitutes the social, to what degree have competing discourses operated as agents of historical change and how have they been socially located?

THIRD, can a focus on mass action, political mobilization, and coalition-building be reconciled with the view that power exists diffusely and cannot be located in particular groups, classes, or institutions?

FOURTH, how have recent explorations into the social construction of identity promoted or undermined "solidarity" as a matter of practical politics?

While we are not soliciting panel proposals, we suggest that panel topics could include:

- Identity, Politics, and Social Change
- Individuality and Solidarity
- Resistance as Solidarity
- Has the Idea of the "Public Sphere" Fallen Flat?
- Academic Knowledge and Its Social Uses?
- The Problems of Collective Action
- Solidarity and the Discursive Construction of the Social
- The Reflexivity of Social Knowledge

Please submit proposals by OCTOBER 15, 1998. Proposals should include a one-page abstract and a curriculum vitae, and should be sent to the following address:

Graduate Student History Association  
"Solidarity" Conference  
Attn: Jane Rothstein and Louis Anthes  
New York University  
Department of History  
53 Washington Square South  
New York, NY 10012

For further information, contact:

Jane Rothstein  
jr231@is5.nyu.edu

Louis Anthes  
lqa9210@is2.nyu.edu

----- Forwarded Message Ends Here -----

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Mon May 4 04:14:23 1998  
Received: from imo21.mx.aol.com (imo21.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.65])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id EAA21846; Mon, 4 May 1998 04:14:22 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com  
by imo21.mx.aol.com (IMOV14.1) id 0JNOa02431;  
Mon, 4 May 1998 07:13:36 -0400 (EDT)  
From: MILTGOLD <MILTGOLD@aol.com>  
Message-ID: <de119a51.354da2e1@aol.com>  
Date: Mon, 4 May 1998 07:13:36 EDT  
To: owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Subject: Re: Re: Survey Research Ethics: An endorsement  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

In a message dated 5/3/98 9:26:08 PM, Irv Crespi@AOL.COM wrote:

<<The principle of not lying to respondents is as applicable to commercial research as it is to academic. I have elaborated on this in the current IJPOR. There are various strategies that can be adopted. One can, for example, tell them that they will be informed in full at the end of the interview. But one should never lie.>>

I fully agree, and am always reminded of the resume I sent some years to a large commercial firm, hoping to be contacted by them and join their firm. The mailing address specified a particular individual, "John Johnson" and I sent the resume, attention that person. After a month or so, I called the firm directly, and spoke to one person then a second, after the first person said they didn't know of such a person at the firm. The second person checked around, and then told me (perhaps they weren't supposed to)--- that was the code name used in the firm's newspaper ads to indicate that the envelope contained a resume or involved job-hunting, and to make those responding believe they were sending the resume to a real person. (!)

I felt cheated then and still do: that this was an inappropriate approach. I've never liked deception in survey research: if respondents are being asked to provide valid and full information, why can't the data collection organization asking for that--- do the same?

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.  
Research Statistician  
U. S. Dept. of Justice

>From Tucker\_C@BLS.GOV Mon May 4 05:58:29 1998

Received: from blsmail.bls.gov ([146.142.4.13])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id FAA05039 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 May 1998 05:58:27 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov ([146.142.42.8]) by mailgate.bls.gov  
(5.x/SMI-SVR4)  
id AA19887; Mon, 4 May 1998 08:55:59 -0400  
Received: by psbmailhub with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
id <J4DR1PM1>; Mon, 4 May 1998 08:58:23 -0400  
Message-Id: <8119A6330C0CD0119F9A00805F38C2096E25B2@psbmail2>  
From: Tucker\_C <Tucker\_C@BLS.GOV>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Survey Research Ethics: A very personal observation  
Date: Mon, 4 May 1998 08:59:15 -0400  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

As Standards Chair, I largely agree with Paul. I certainly agree that a survey organization should identify itself. I believe interviewers should only give their first names (for privacy reasons). Whether or not a sponsor should be identified depends upon the circumstances.

-----

From: Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. [SMTP:lavrakas.1@osu.edu]  
Sent: 02 May 1998 14:37  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Survey Research Ethics: A very personal observation

Some recent postings to AAPORnet sadly remind me how different my own thoughts on survey ethics and those of some others appear to be. And as you'll see below, this has really pushed a hot button for me...

To me, the consideration of whether or not a survey's validity might be lessened, for example, by honestly acknowledging information to respondents about the firm conducting, and/or the firm sponsoring the survey, is an issue I see little on which to "compromise." For example, the notion that one might use a "bogus" name for the group that does the work, or sponsors the work, is ethically unacceptable to me. If telling the truth about these matters lowers the validity of a survey, then so be it...

And for those of you who don't know me and simply see that I'm a professor at a university, let me assure you I'm no naive academic out of touch with the "real" world. Rather, I'm simply a person who has a very, very strong personal/professional code of ethics and I let that code determine what will and what not will be done in my research and the research my organization does. (More than 20 years ago I wrote something for myself explaining why one's "means" should justify the "ends" one achieves, and if those ends are

less than what was hoped, then at least one has the self-respect that goes with using ethical means. In research this to me dictates not using unethical methods to achieve "more accurate" results.) My code acts as a "red flag" that goes up as soon as I hear about something that seems ethically inappropriate. That, for example, was why I took such a strong and inflexible stand a year ago when AAPORnetters were discussing whether or not it was OK for interviewers to use bogus names in survey introductions.

My own methods training in grad school, 25+ years ago, instilled in me the responsibility researchers have to "do no harm." To deal with threats to a study's validity, and if we can justify "creatively avoiding" giving out information that might lessen the validity of a study -- and I think this can be done --, then it is incumbent on us to at least "debrief" our respondents after the data are collected to correct the possible harm we've done by not being fully honest with them. How the debriefing, after a study ends, is operationalized can take many appropriate forms...

Why is this important -- i.e., why be concerned about "fooling" respondents by telling them something "small" that isn't true? To me even what may appear to many to be some "innocent" untruth (e.g., allowing interviewers to use a bogus name when speaking with respondents) flies directly in the face, both in principle and in practice, of our desire for our respondents to honestly answer our questions. To me it's hypocritical and unethical. If the survey enterprise is threatened by the prospect that respondents won't provide accurate information, then how can we take the "high road" in trying to convince the public about how important it is to participate honestly in good surveys if we won't always be honest with them???

On another "methods" list-serve that I read last fall, one on social science methods, I was saddened by a posting and subsequent discussion in which a professor explained that his methods class basically thought that everybody lies, so what's the harm if researchers do it too? That is, what's the harm if researchers use methods that "trick" subjects.

To me social research and its methods are the way we search for the best "truths" we can achieve (i.e., findings that are as reliable and valid as one's finite resources will allow). Thus, it strikes me as extremely ironic and sad that researchers who are striving for accurate ("truthful") findings sometimes appear not to be bothered by using "untruthful" methods and procedures to achieve those findings.

A final point: another aspect of my ethical code for good survey practice is the responsibility (both in principle and to the profession) that researchers have to ideally provide respondents with a "positive" experience when they are interviewed. To me, not being honest with respondents, including "innocent" lies, is inconsistent with this goal.

-----  
\* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \*

\* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.  
\*  
\* Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy & Management  
\*  
\* Director, OSU/SBS Survey Research Unit  
\*

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \*

\* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences; Derby Hall, Room 0126  
\*  
\* 154 North Oval Mall, Ohio State University; Columbus OH 43210  
\*

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

>From dobson@usia.gov Mon May 4 07:55:06 1998  
Received: from xgate.usia.gov (firewall-user@XGATE.USIA.GOV [198.67.64.2])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id HAA25645 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 May 1998 07:55:01 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from Connect2 Message Router by xgate.usia.gov  
via Connect2-SMTP 4.32.03; Mon, 4 May 1998 10:54:38 -0400  
Message-ID: <F2C44D3501BD11A0@xgate.usia.gov>  
Date: Mon, 4 May 1998 10:47:05 -0400  
From: "Dobson, Richard" <dobson@usia.gov>  
Sender: "Dobson, Richard" <dobson@usia.gov>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Cc: llach@usia.gov ("Llach, Nancy"), gombert@usia.gov ("Gombert, Dennis")  
Subject: Job Opening: Public Opinion Research/Latin America  
X-SMF-Hop-Count: 2  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
X-Mailer: Connect2-SMTP 4.32.03 MHS/SMF to SMTP Gateway

Announcement No. HRC-152-98  
Opening Date: 05/01/98  
Closing Date: 06/01/98

POSITION TITLE, SERIES AND GRADE: Social Science Analyst, GS-101-9/11/12  
(pot to GS-13)

SALARY RANGE: \$32,457 - \$61,190

LOCATION: U.S Information Agency, R/AA - Office of Research, East Asia,  
Pacific & American Republics Branch in Washington D.C.

DUTIES: The incumbent initiates, plans, and oversees public opinion  
research studies in Latin

America, and analyzes relationships between public opinion and political, economic and social issues in the region. The work includes (1) keeping up with activities and developments in Latin America; (2) planning and overseeing public opinion surveys; and (3) reporting results from such polls and others acquired in the region by writing clear, concise, interpretative reports and memoranda for top-level officials in the USG foreign policy community.

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

Knowledge of public opinion polling and analysis.

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS:

A. U.S. citizenship.

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

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

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

[ALL APPLICANTS ARE REQUIRED TO ATTACH A NARRATIVE STATEMENT ADDRESSING EACH SPECIAL RATING FACTOR]

1. Ability to read and speak Spanish. (6)
2. Knowledge of survey research methodology and quantitative data such as acquired through graduate level studies and/or work experience. (6)
3. Knowledge of Latin America politics and economics, and U.S. foreign policy toward the region such as acquired through graduate level studies. (6)
4. Skill in writing clearly and concisely in English. (6)
5. Skill in organizing and conducting studies of public opinion on political, economic and social issues. (6)

HOW TO APPLY: You have the option of submitting an SF-171, Application



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

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

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

#### JOB INFORMATION

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

#### PERSONAL INFORMATION

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

\_ Social Security Number

\_ Country of Citizenship (Most Federal jobs require United States citizenship)

\_ Veterans' preference

\_ Reinstatement eligibility (If requested, attach SF-50 proof of your career or career conditional status)

\_ Highest Federal civilian grade held (Also give job series and dates held.)

#### EDUCATION

\_ High School name, city and state, date of diploma or GED

\_ College or universities name, city and state, majors, type and year of any degrees received.

Send a copy of your college transcript only if requested.

#### WORK EXPERIENCE

\_ Give the following information for your paid and nonpaid work experience related to the job you

are applying for: Job Title; Duties and accomplishments; Employer's name and address;

Supervisor's name and phone number; Starting and ending dates; Hours

per week; Salary.

\_ Indicate if we may contact your current supervisor.

#### OTHER QUALIFICATIONS

\_ Job related training courses (title and year)

\_ Job related skills, for example, other languages, computer software/hardware, tools, machinery, typing speed

\_ Job related certificates and licenses (current only).

\_ Job related honors, awards, and special accomplishments, for example, publications,

memberships in professional or honor societies, leadership activities, public speaking, and

performance awards (Give dates but do not send documents unless requested.)

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL RESULT IN ELIMINATION FROM CONSIDERATION.

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

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

THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER.

>From Dawn\_Von\_Thurn@notes.pw.com Mon May 4 08:27:17 1998  
Received: from willow.us.pw.com (pw20.pw9.com [208.141.52.243])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id IAA02109 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 May 1998 08:27:15 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: Dawn\_Von\_Thurn@notes.pw.com  
Received: by willow.us.pw.com; id LAA24434; Mon, 4 May 1998 11:30:07 -0400  
Received: from fern.us.pw.com(10.9.16.60) by willow via smap (4.1)  
id xma024344; Mon, 4 May 98 11:29:40 -0400  
Received: by fern.us.pw.com (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)  
id LAA25932; Mon, 4 May 1998 11:24:46 -0400  
Message-Id: <199805041524.LAA25932@fern.us.pw.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Date: Mon, 4 May 98 11:22:09 EDT  
Subject: recommedations for data entry firm in Boston

I'm posting this message on behalf of a co-worker. . .

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

I was wondering if anyone could recommend a quality data entry firm in the Boston area.

I need to send out some data to be key entered.

Please respond to me directly at [audrey\\_kindlon@notes.pw.com](mailto:audrey_kindlon@notes.pw.com)

Thank you very much

-Audrey

Audrey Kindlon  
Price Waterhouse LLP  
6500 Rock Spring Drive, Suite 500  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
(301) 897-4413  
(301) 897-4302 fax

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

>From [bgroves@survey.umd.edu](mailto:bgroves@survey.umd.edu) Mon May 4 08:44:30 1998  
Received: from [umailsrv2.umd.edu](mailto:umailsrv2.umd.edu) ([umailsrv2.umd.edu](mailto:umailsrv2.umd.edu) [128.8.10.76])  
by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id IAA06679 for <[AAPORNET@USC.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@USC.EDU)>; Mon, 4 May 1998 08:44:28 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from [survey.umd.edu](mailto:survey.umd.edu) ([survey.umd.edu](mailto:survey.umd.edu) [129.2.169.100])  
by [umailsrv2.umd.edu](mailto:umailsrv2.umd.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id KAA12752;  
Mon, 4 May 1998 10:46:15 -0400  
Received: from SURVEY/MAILQUEUE1 by [survey.umd.edu](mailto:survey.umd.edu) (Mercury 1.13);  
Mon, 4 May 98 9:45:44 +1100  
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by SURVEY (Mercury 1.13); Mon, 4 May 98 9:45:24  
+1100  
From: "Bob Groves" <[bgroves@survey.umd.edu](mailto:bgroves@survey.umd.edu)>  
To: [SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU](mailto:SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU), [AAPORNET@USC.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@USC.EDU)  
Date: Mon, 4 May 1998 09:45:22 EST  
Subject: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SURVEY NONRESPONSE 1999 - CALL FOR A  
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.54)  
Message-ID: <[25BC8466880@survey.umd.edu](mailto:25BC8466880@survey.umd.edu)>

1999 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SURVEY NONRESPONSE

In preparation for the November, 1999, meeting, the editorial committee of the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse (ICSN) is now accepting abstracts for monograph papers at the web site

WWW.BSOS.UMD.EDU/JPSM

Follow the blinking button on the first page to the ICSN web page. The web site will be the repository of all information on the conference.

Abstracts of 500 words can be submitted electronically using the web site.

Questions about the conference can be posed via the web page or to ICSN@SURVEY.UMD.EDU

>From Joe\_Catania@quickmail.ucsf.edu Mon May 4 09:09:49 1998  
Received: from itsb.ucsf.edu (itsb.ucsf.EDU [128.218.80.88])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id JAA13548 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 May 1998 09:09:45 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from quickmail.ucsf.edu (quickmail.ucsf.EDU [128.218.80.27]) by  
itsb.ucsf.edu (8.6.8/8.6.6) with SMTP id IAA20170 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;  
Mon, 4 May 1998 08:54:13 -0700  
Message-ID: <n1317849333.81989@quickmail.ucsf.edu>  
Date: 4 May 1998 09:06:43 -0700  
From: "Joe Catania" <Joe\_Catania@quickmail.ucsf.edu>  
Subject: Re: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SURVEY NONRESPONSE 1999 - CALL FOR  
A  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
X-Mailer: Mail\*Link SMTP-QM 4.1.0  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"; Name="Message Body"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

RE>INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SURVEY\* 5/4/98

please change address for Joe Catania; new jcatania@psg.ucsf.edu

Thanks

-----  
Date: 5/4/98 8:59 AM  
To: Joe Catania  
From: aapornet@usc.edu  
1999 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SURVEY NONRESPONSE

In preparation for the November, 1999, meeting, the editorial committee of the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse (ICSN) is now accepting abstracts for monograph papers at the web site

WWW.BSOS.UMD.EDU/JPSM

Follow the blinking button on the first page to the ICSN web page. The web site will be the repository of all information on the conference.

Abstracts of 500 words can be submitted electronically using the web site.

Questions about the conference can be posed via the web page or to ICSN@SURVEY.UMD.EDU

----- RFC822 Header Follows -----  
Received: by quickmail.ucsf.edu with ADMIN;4 May 1998 08:58:39 -0700  
Received: from usc.edu (localhost [127.0.0.1])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id IAA06777; Mon, 4 May 1998 08:44:42 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from umailsrv2.umd.edu (umailsrv2.umd.edu [128.8.10.76])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id IAA06679 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Mon, 4 May 1998 08:44:28 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from survey.umd.edu (survey.umd.edu [129.2.169.100])  
by umailsrv2.umd.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id KAA12752;  
Mon, 4 May 1998 10:46:15 -0400  
Received: from SURVEY/MAILQUEUE1 by survey.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);  
Mon, 4 May 98 9:45:44 +1100  
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by SURVEY (Mercury 1.13); Mon, 4 May 98 9:45:24 =  
+1100  
Message-Id: <25BC8466880@survey.umd.edu>  
Date: Mon, 4 May 1998 09:45:22 EST  
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu  
Precedence: bulk  
From: "Bob Groves" <bgroves@survey.umd.edu>  
To: SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU, AAPORNET@USC.EDU  
Subject: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SURVEY NONRESPONSE 1999 - CALL FOR A  
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.54)  
X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

>From caspar@rti.org Mon May 4 09:49:53 1998  
Received: from cscnts3.rti.org (cscnts3.rti.org [152.5.128.49])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id JAA23788 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 May 1998 09:49:50 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: by cscnts3.rti.org with Internet Mail Service (6.0.2102.0)  
id <J9XY72CM>; Mon, 4 May 1998 12:49:03 -0400  
Message-ID: <F7688A451B58CF11B8DA08002BE5A6C703814E87@cscnts3.rti.org>  
From: "Caspar, Rachel A." <caspar@rti.org>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "Pate, D. Kirk" <dkp@rti.org>  
Subject: Job openings at Research Triangle Institute  
Date: Mon, 4 May 1998 12:48:44 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (6.0.2102.0)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="ISO-8859-1"

> RTI is currently interviewing candidates for both Survey  
> Methodologists and Survey Directors. Descriptions of both positions  
> are included below.  
>  
> SURVEY METHODOLOGISTS  
> The Research Triangle Institute (RTI), a leading nonprofit survey  
> research organization with offices in Research Triangle Park, NC, and  
> the Washington, D.C., area, currently has career opportunities for  
> Survey Methodologists at all levels. The opportunities are within  
> RTI's Survey Research Methods Program (SMRP).  
>  
> Minimum qualifications for the entry-level positions are a Masters  
> degree in survey methodology, sociology, psychology, statistics or  
> other related field; course work in survey methods; and 1+ year of  
> post-degree experience in the design and implementation of surveys.  
> Senior-level positions require 5+ years of post-degree experience in  
> survey methods research. Strong oral and written communications  
> skills are required at all levels.  
>  
> SMRP is engaged in a variety of research projects that would interest  
> survey methodologists including:  
>     the comparison of audio computer assisted self-interviewing (ACASI)  
> data quality with PAPI data quality;  
>     the application of cognitive interview methods for improving  
> questionnaires;  
>     estimation of estimates of reliability and validity in the absence  
> of criterion measures;  
>     and methods for increasing the response rate and response quality  
> for surveys of establishments, especially mail surveys.  
> RTI senior staff - Rachel Caspar and Paul Mullin - will be available at  
> the AAPOR meetings to discuss our survey methodologist positions with you.  
> To learn about other openings in survey research at RTI, contact Kirk Pate  
> at the meetings or email him at [dkp@rti.org](mailto:dkp@rti.org).  
>  
> RTI offers excellent opportunities for career growth, competitive  
> salary and excellent benefits. To apply, applicants should send their  
resume to:  
> Dr. Paul Biemer  
> RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE  
> P.O. BOX 12194  
> RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-2194

> (E-MAIL: PPB@RTI.ORG; FAX: 919-541-1261)  
> To learn more about RTI,  
> please visit our Web Site at [www.rti.org](http://www.rti.org).  
> EOE/AA M/F/D/V  
>  
>  
> SURVEY DIRECTORS  
> The Research Triangle Institute, a leading nonprofit survey research  
> organization with offices in Research Triangle Park, NC, and the  
> Washington, D.C., area, currently has career opportunities for Survey  
> Directors and Senior Survey Directors.  
>  
> Experience needed in project management, survey design, survey  
> operations, proposal writing and costing, and marketing. Advanced  
> degree in a related field (e.g., Statistics, Sociology) preferred, with 5+  
> years  
> post-degree experience in a social science research environment.  
>  
> Responsibilities include managing day-to-day activities of ongoing  
> research studies. Activities include working with study collaborators  
> to develop, implement, and monitor research designs; overseeing data  
> collection operations (field or phone); documenting study procedures;  
> implementing quality control procedures; scheduling and delegating  
> study tasks, preparing and presenting research reports to clients.  
>  
> Successful candidates will have strong oral and written communications  
> skills. Project management skills, administrative abilities, ability  
> to work collaboratively on large project teams, and the ability to  
> manage and delegate multiple tasks are essential.  
>  
> At the AAPOR Conference, RTI's primary contact regarding Survey  
> Director career opportunities is Mr. Kirk Pate. Other RTI staff  
> attending AAPOR will also be available to confidentially discuss the  
> opportunities that we offer. Please contact Don Camburn, Katy Dowd, or  
> Mike Weeks.  
>  
> RTI offers excellent opportunities for career growth, competitive  
> salary and excellent benefits. To apply, applicants should send their  
> cover letter and resume to: MR. KIRK PATE  
> SENIOR SURVEY DIRECTOR  
> RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE  
> P.O. BOX 12194  
> RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-2194  
> (E-MAIL: DKP@RTI.ORG; FAX: 919-541-1261)  
> To learn more about RTI,  
> please visit our Web Site at [www.rti.org](http://www.rti.org).  
> EOE/AA M/F/D/V  
>  
>  
>

Rachel A. Caspar  
Survey Methodologist  
Research Triangle Institute  
541-6376  
P.O. Box 12194  
(919) 541-1261

Phone: (919)

Fax:

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194 Internet: caspar@rti.org

>From smeltz@usia.gov Tue May 5 06:08:06 1998

Received: from xgate.usia.gov (firewall-user@XGATE.USIA.GOV [198.67.64.2])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id GAA28368 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 5 May 1998 06:08:04 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from Connect2 Message Router by xgate.usia.gov  
via Connect2-SMTP 4.32.03; Tue, 5 May 1998 09:16:34 -0400

Message-ID: <EBFE4E3501BD11A0@xgate.usia.gov>

In-Reply-To: <E4FE4E3501BD11A0@xgate.usia.gov>

Date: Tue, 5 May 1998 9:06:33 -0400

From: "Smeltz, Dina" <smeltz@usia.gov>

Sender: "Smeltz, Dina" <smeltz@usia.gov>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SURVEY NONRESPONSE 1999 - CALL F

X-SMF-Hop-Count: 2

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: Connect2-SMTP 4.32.03 MHS/SMF to SMTP Gateway

I'm not going to aapor. His name is fang. he is so cute. i am a little worried though, he seems really scared of elvis.

>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Tue May 5 16:38:26 1998

Received: from csu-e.csuohio.edu (csu-e.csuohio.edu [137.148.49.12])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id QAA15042 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 5 May 1998 16:38:22 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from myhost.csuohio.edu (portc72.async.csuohio.edu  
[137.148.59.82]) by csu-e.csuohio.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP id TAA13526  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 5 May 1998 19:37:18 -0400

Date: Tue, 5 May 1998 19:37:18 -0400

Message-Id: <199805052337.TAA13526@csu-e.csuohio.edu>

X-Sender: s.kraus@bones.asic.csuohio.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Dr. Sidney Kraus" <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

Subject: On Affirmative Action

On another network, we've had an on-going discussion of Affirmative Action. I am posting this on aapornet because I think it is one of the clearest



statements I have read on the social policy that affects us all (as well as public opinion):

From: "Samuel L. Becker" <sam-becker@uiowa.edu>

It depends on the definition

Whether affirmative action institutionalizes racism, as Michael Roth asserts, depends on how one defines affirmative action and whether one is familiar with its history.

If we look at the history of AA and the reasons it was instituted, it seems to me that we must come to quite a different conclusion than he does. It was instituted because of the long history of racism and sexism in almost every profession and industry in the country, including higher education. For example, I recall one of my colleagues many years ago saying that we could not hire a woman in his area because that would make him very uncomfortable; he would find it difficult working with a woman colleague. Although he thought of himself as a liberal, and he was in many ways, given the norms of the time, he would have responded even more firmly if an African-American had risen to the top of our pool of candidates.

Women and minorities simply were not being given serious consideration for positions in most of our colleges and universities, let alone in our police departments, fire departments, construction trades, etc., etc., etc. Affirmative Action was started to try to ensure that we got women and minorities into the pool of candidates to be considered and that they received fair consideration. In addition, fair consideration meant that we needed to review our criteria of quality, to make sure that they were truly important for the position and did not just perpetuate our history of sexism and racism.

Those who object to Affirmative Action, I believe, are reacting in good part to that re-evaluation of what qualities are most important for these positions. (E.g., for college admissions or scholarships, the re-evaluation includes rethinking how much, if any, weight to give to College Board or ACT scores which are not highly correlated with college success.) They are also reacting to the distortion of Affirmative Action that has taken place in many institutions, exemplified by the demand that one MUST hire a woman or minority. I disagree with the imposition of quotas. On the other hand, I believe that some strong action needs to be taken when the faculty of an academic department, a communication studies department, for example, consistently ends its searches with the conclusion that they simply cannot find a woman or minority who is as good as the white male candidates available. That claim is difficult to believe, considering the proportion of new Ph.D.s in our field who are female and/or minority, and the contributions that many women and minorities have been making in our field.

One additional thought. If Affirmative Action has been so oppressive, why aren't there more women and minorities in our major departments today?

Sam

>From dfan@email.labmed.umn.edu Tue May 5 21:57:03 1998  
Received: from email.labmed.umn.edu (email.labmed.umn.edu [128.101.59.42])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id VAA09285 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 5 May 1998 21:57:01 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost (dfan@localhost)  
by email.labmed.umn.edu (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id XAA06693  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 5 May 1998 23:56:57 -0500 (CDT)  
Date: Tue, 5 May 1998 23:56:57 -0500 (CDT)  
From: David Fan <dfan@email.labmed.umn.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: On Affirmative Action  
In-Reply-To: <199805052337.TAA13526@csu-e.csuohio.edu>  
Message-ID: <Pine.SV4.3.95.980505235501.6316B-100000@email.labmed.umn.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I recall having read that women were included in affirmative action  
legislation by southern senators and/or representatives as a ploy to sink  
legislation designed to apply to race. Is my memory faulty?

-----  
David Fan  
Department of Genetics and Cell Biology  
University of Minnesota  
250 Bioscience Center  
1445 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, MN 55108-1095  
Phone: 612-624-4718 (work), 612-646-5266 (home)  
Fax: 612-624-4718

On Tue, 5 May 1998, Dr. Sidney Kraus wrote:

> On another network, we've had an on-going discussion of Affirmative  
> Action. I am posting this on aapornet because I think it is one of the  
> clearest statements I have read on the social policy that affects us  
> all (as well as public opinion):  
>  
> From: "Samuel L. Becker" <sam-becker@uiowa.edu>  
>  
> It depends on the definition  
>  
> Whether affirmative action institutionalizes racism, as Michael Roth  
> asserts, depends on how one defines affirmative action and whether one  
> is familiar with its history.  
>  
> If we look at the history of AA and the reasons it was instituted, it

> seems to me that we must come to quite a different conclusion than he  
> does. It was instituted because of the long history of racism and  
> sexism in almost every profession and industry in the country,  
> including higher education. For example, I recall one of my  
> colleagues many years ago saying that we could not hire a woman in his  
> area because that would make him very uncomfortable; he would find it  
> difficult working with a woman colleague. Although he thought of  
> himself as a liberal, and he was in many ways, given the norms of the  
> time, he would have responded even more firmly if an African-American  
> had risen to the top of our pool of candidates.

>  
> Women and minorities simply were not being given serious consideration  
> for positions in most of our colleges and universities, let alone in  
> our police departments, fire departments, construction trades, etc.,  
> etc., etc. Affirmative Action was started to try to ensure that we  
> got women and minorities into the pool of candidates to be considered  
> and that they received fair consideration. In addition, fair  
> consideration meant that we needed to review our criteria of quality,  
> to make sure that they were truly important for the position and did  
> not just perpetuate our history of sexism and racism.

>  
> Those who object to Affirmative Action, I believe, are reacting in  
> good part to that re-evaluation of what qualities are most important  
> for these positions. (E.g., for college admissions or scholarships,  
> the re-evaluation includes rethinking how much, if any, weight to give  
> to College Board or ACT scores which are not highly correlated with  
> college success.) They are also reacting to the distortion of  
> Affirmative Action that has taken place in many institutions,  
> exemplified by the demand that one MUST hire a woman or minority. I  
> disagree with the imposition of quotas. On the other hand, I believe  
> that some strong action needs to be taken when the faculty of an  
> academic department, a communication studies department, for example,  
> consistently ends its searches with the conclusion that they simply  
> cannot find a woman or minority who is as good as the white male  
> candidates available. That claim is difficult to believe, considering  
> the proportion of new Ph.D.s in our field who are female and/or  
> minority, and the contributions that many women and minorities have  
> been making in our field.

>  
> One additional thought. If Affirmative Action has been so oppressive,  
> why aren't there more women and minorities in our major departments  
> today?

>  
> Sam  
>  
>

>From Bnash@marketdecisions.com Wed May 6 10:58:57 1998  
Received: from mail.gwi.net (root@mail.gwi.net [204.120.68.142])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTTP

id KAA17598 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 10:58:51 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from NASH (pld15.gwi.net [204.248.133.78])  
by mail.gwi.net (8.8.5/8.8.7) with SMTP id NAA24995  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 13:58:34 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Wed, 6 May 1998 13:58:34 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <199805061758.NAA24995@mail.gwi.net>  
X-Sender: bnash@mail.biddeford.com (Unverified)  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Barbara Nash <Bnash@marketdecisions.com>  
Subject: Two requests

Fellow AAPOR members -

I hope you can help me with two requests:

1) Besides asking respondents to identify how others would rate them on a scale in terms of being liberal/conservative (on social issues, on economic issues) what other questions have been used for classifying respondents on a liberal-conservative dimension?

2) Has anybody out there done any research (or know of any research) with employees of nursing homes? Specifically, we are interested in learning about research done with CNAs and personal care attendants regarding workplace satisfaction.

Thanks!

Barbara Nash  
bnash@marketdecisions.com

>From tmg1p@server1.mail.virginia.edu Wed May 6 12:10:51 1998  
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id MAA12001 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 12:10:49 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from server1a.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa13989;  
6 May 98 15:10 EDT  
Received: from bootp-140-192.bootp.Virginia.EDU  
(bootp-140-192.bootp.Virginia.EDU [128.143.140.192]) by  
server1.mail.virginia.edu (8.8.5/8.6.6) with SMTP id PAA14576 for  
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 15:10:43 -0400 (EDT)  
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@server1.mail.virginia.edu>  
To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Call for Papers: Solidarity as "The Social"  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SV4.3.94.980503183432.27160D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Message-ID: <SIMEON.9805061542.E@bootp-140-192.bootp.Virginia.EDU>  
Date: Wed, 6 May 1998 15:10:42 -0400 (EDT)  
X-Mailer: Simeon for Windows Version 4.1.4 Build (40)  
X-Authentication: IMSP  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

I believe the organizers of the conference described below forgot to mention that there will be a reception on the evening before the conference to celebrate "The End of All Useful Forms of Thought." That would be on April Fools Day, 1999. I'm sure you'll all want to mark your calendars.

--tmg

On Sun, 3 May 1998 18:39:56 -0700 (PDT) James Beniger  
<beniger@almaak.usc.edu> wrote:

>  
>  
> From: texbart@merle.acns.nwu.edu  
> Date: Sat, 2 May 1998 06:32:07 -0500  
> Subject: Solidarity: "The Social" in Thought & Practice  
>  
> CALL FOR PAPERS  
>  
> Solidarity: "The Social" in Thought and Practice  
>  
> Graduate Student History Conference  
> New York University  
> April 2-3, 1999  
>  
> Graduate students in the History Department at New York University  
> announce a conference on the theme of "solidarity" and invite graduate  
> students in all fields and periods of history to submit abstracts for  
> papers. We use "solidarity" to refer to social phenomena that have  
> come to be called mass action, political mobilization, and  
> coalition-building. Calling attention to "solidarity" addresses recent  
> trends in the academy. Many intellectual and cultural historians argue  
> that discourse, ideology, and narrativity ought to be privileged  
> categories of social analysis. To what extent has this view  
> challenged or supplanted an older view that society is to be studied  
> as a realm of competing structures, contending classes and groups, and  
> conflicts over material resources? We invite students to present  
> historical work that showcases the various interpretive and  
> methodological tools that historians bring to the study of  
> "solidarity."  
>  
> We encourage prospective panelists to submit abstracts of papers that  
> address any of the four following questions:  
>  
> FIRST, is the study of society an exercise in metaphysics, disguised

> as science, or is it a professionally anchored way of investigating  
> and knowing the social world?  
>  
> SECOND, if discourse constitutes the social, to what degree have  
> competing discourses operated as agents of historical change and how  
> have they been socially located?  
>  
> THIRD, can a focus on mass action, political mobilization, and  
> coalition-building be reconciled with the view that power exists  
> diffusely and cannot be located in particular groups, classes, or  
> institutions?  
>  
> FOURTH, how have recent explorations into the social construction of  
> identity promoted or undermined "solidarity" as a matter of practical  
> politics?  
>  
> While we are not soliciting panel proposals, we suggest that panel  
> topics could include:  
>  
> -Identity, Politics, and Social Change  
> -Individuality and Solidarity  
> -Resistance as Solidarity  
> -Has the Idea of the "Public Sphere" Fallen Flat?  
> -Academic Knowledge and Its Social Uses?  
> -The Problems of Collective Action  
> -Solidarity and the Discursive Construction of the Social -The  
> Reflexivity of Social Knowledge  
>  
> Please submit proposals by OCTOBER 15, 1998. Proposals should include  
> a one-page abstract and a curriculum vitae, and should be sent to the  
> following address:  
>  
> Graduate Student History Association  
> "Solidarity" Conference  
> Attn: Jane Rothstein and Louis Anthes  
> New York University  
> Department of History  
> 53 Washington Square South  
> New York, NY 10012  
>  
> For further information, contact:  
>  
> Jane Rothstein  
> jr231@is5.nyu.edu  
>  
> Louis Anthes  
> lqa9210@is2.nyu.edu  
>  
> ----- Forwarded Message Ends Here -----  
>

>  
>  
>

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

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Wed May 6 12:41:22 1998  
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.10])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTTP  
id MAA23499 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 12:41:19 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (garnet1.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.2])  
by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.8.6/8.8.6) with ESMTTP id PAA16958  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 15:41:18 -0400  
Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (xyp08-07.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.174])  
by garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (8.8.6/8.8.6) with SMTP id PAA57076  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 15:41:16 -0400  
Date: Wed, 6 May 1998 15:41:16 -0400  
Message-Id: <199805061941.PAA57076@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>  
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu (Unverified)  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>  
Subject: Re: On Affirmative Action

No, that is it. Reps like Patsy Mink of Hawaii and Martha Griffith of Michigan (especially) were instrumental in seeing that it was taken seriously. Griffith later retired as Lt. Governor of Michigan.

Susan

At 11:56 PM 5/5/98 -0500, you wrote:

>I recall having read that women were included in affirmative action  
>legislation by southern senators and/or representatives as a ploy to  
>sink legislation designed to apply to race. Is my memory faulty?

>

>-----

>David Fan  
>Department of Genetics and Cell Biology  
>University of Minnesota  
>250 Bioscience Center  
>1445 Gortner Avenue  
>St. Paul, MN 55108-1095  
>Phone: 612-624-4718 (work), 612-646-5266 (home)

>Fax: 612-624-4718

>

>On Tue, 5 May 1998, Dr. Sidney Kraus wrote:

>

>> On another network, we've had an on-going discussion of Affirmative  
>> Action. I am posting this on aapornet because I think it is one of  
>> the clearest statements I have read on the social policy that affects  
>> us all (as well as public opinion):

>>

>> From: "Samuel L. Becker" <sam-becker@uiowa.edu>

>>

>> It depends on the definition

>>

>> Whether affirmative action institutionalizes racism, as Michael Roth  
>> asserts, depends on how one defines affirmative action and whether  
>> one is familiar with its history.

>>

>> If we look at the history of AA and the reasons it was instituted, it  
>> seems to me that we must come to quite a different conclusion than he  
>> does. It was instituted because of the long history of racism and  
>> sexism in almost every profession and industry in the country,  
>> including higher education. For example, I recall one of my  
>> colleagues many years ago saying that we could not hire a woman in  
>> his area because that would make him very uncomfortable; he would  
>> find it difficult working with a woman colleague. Although he  
>> thought of himself as a liberal, and he was in many ways, given the  
>> norms of the time, he would have responded even more firmly if an  
>> African-American had risen to the top of our pool of candidates.

>>

>> Women and minorities simply were not being given serious  
>> consideration for positions in most of our colleges and universities,  
>> let alone in our police departments, fire departments, construction  
>> trades, etc., etc., etc. Affirmative Action was started to try to  
>> ensure that we got women and minorities into the pool of candidates  
>> to be considered and that they received fair consideration. In  
>> addition, fair consideration meant that we needed to review our  
>> criteria of quality, to make sure that they were truly important for  
>> the position and did not just perpetuate our history of sexism and  
>> racism.

>>

>> Those who object to Affirmative Action, I believe, are reacting in  
>> good part to that re-evaluation of what qualities are most important  
>> for these positions. (E.g., for college admissions or scholarships,  
>> the re-evaluation includes rethinking how much, if any, weight to  
>> give to College Board or ACT scores which are not highly correlated  
>> with college success.) They are also reacting to the distortion of  
>> Affirmative Action that has taken place in many institutions,  
>> exemplified by the demand that one MUST hire a woman or minority. I  
>> disagree with the imposition of quotas. On the other hand, I believe  
>> that some strong action needs to be taken when the faculty of an



>> academic department, a communication studies department, for example,  
>> consistently ends its searches with the conclusion that they simply  
>> cannot find a woman or minority who is as good as the white male  
>> candidates available. That claim is difficult to believe,  
>> considering the proportion of new Ph.D.s in our field who are female  
>> and/or minority, and the contributions that many women and minorities  
>> have been making in our field.  
>>  
>> One additional thought. If Affirmative Action has been so  
>> oppressive, why aren't there more women and minorities in our major  
>> departments today?  
>>  
>> Sam  
>>  
>>  
>  
>

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

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

PHONE 850-644-1753  
FAX 850-644-6208

>From dfan@email.labmed.umn.edu Wed May 6 13:12:21 1998  
Received: from email.labmed.umn.edu (email.labmed.umn.edu [128.101.59.42])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id NAA05271 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 13:12:17 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost (dfan@localhost)  
by email.labmed.umn.edu (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA11032  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 15:12:03 -0500 (CDT)  
Date: Wed, 6 May 1998 15:12:02 -0500 (CDT)  
From: David Fan <dfan@email.labmed.umn.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: On Affirmative Action  
In-Reply-To: <199805061941.PAA57076@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>  
Message-ID: <Pine.SV4.3.95.980506150917.10785B-100000@email.labmed.umn.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Here are extracts of two notes sent to me personally:

The Southern strategy you are mentioning came about in the passage of the Civil Rights Bill in 1964. Southerners attached gender as a condition to Title VII, the employment section, in hopes of defeating the entire bill. The strategy backfired. Since the ammendment came on the floor of the House and the Senate chose not to refer the bill to committee, no hearings were held on the meaning of the issues associated with gender discrimination.

-----

It's a little faulty. Rep. Judge Smith (D-VA) intruduced "sex" into Title 9 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Smith, the chairman of the Rules Committee, was a strong opponent of Civil Rights and beleive that by expanding rights to women in the Act would make the act unpalatable to many. He miscalculated and Civil Rights was expanded to women (and men, in the rare instance that men are discriminated against). This, however, was a civil rights act intended to end discrimination. It was not affirmative action legislation, which did not come about until later in Johnson term and during the nixon administration.

-----

David Fan  
Department of Genetics and Cell Biology  
University of Minnesota  
250 Bioscience Center  
1445 Gortner Avenue  
St. Paul, MN 55108-1095  
Phone: 612-624-4718 (work), 612-646-5266 (home)  
Fax: 612-624-4718

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Wed May 6 14:46:13 1998  
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (shiva.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.96])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTTP  
id OAA26843 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 14:46:11 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from oemcomputer (175.new-york-01-02rs.ny.dial-access.att.net  
[12.78.192.175])  
by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7/08.30.97) with SMTP id RAA22927  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 May 1998 17:49:44 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <199805062149.RAA22927@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>  
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0  
Date: Wed, 06 May 1998 17:45:01 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>  
Subject: Standards for Web surveys

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

About 4 weeks ago (April 11), I complained about the practices of a well-known survey organization in connection to their launching of web surveys. In particular, I expressed my annoyance about a seemingly broken promise to make results available to participants.

On Monday (May 4) I received an apologetic e-mail message from the organization that the results are now available for viewing at their web site. According to the information provided there, over 12,000 people participated. But no information whatsoever was given about "how this survey was done" (remember the little boxes the NYT always uses?), no demographic breakdown whatsoever. Instead a rather eclectic sample of tables showing the responses to select questions. Some of the results indicate that the sample is severely biased. For example, only 8% think that President Clinton is doing an "excellent job", 33% think it is "pretty good", but 26% say it's "only fair" and 28% say it's "poor". Or: 38% had participated in an Internet survey before. Web people don't like Clinton -- despite all the hype about the information superhighway?

And sometimes even the math does not work out (like on Pg7.htm): "How much do you enjoy using the Internet?" 68% "a great deal", 30% "somewhat", and 20% "not very much".  $68+30+20=118$  !

Now the same institute (different division I suppose) has just published the results of a study about access to the Internet, claiming that there is no racial divide -- quite in contrast to the findings of a study at Vanderbilt (Hoffman/Novak) based on data collected by Nielsen which prompted VP Al Gore to call for additional research (and remedies). Available at:

<http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pubper/pdf/pp93b.pdf>

The "Public Perspective" publication is somewhat toned down compared to earlier press releases that claimed that if there ever was a racial divide it had closed over the last year. See for example:

[http://www.nua.ie/surveys/index.cgi?service=view\\_survey&survey\\_number=727&rel=no](http://www.nua.ie/surveys/index.cgi?service=view_survey&survey_number=727&rel=no)

(based on a MSNBC story that is no longer available at its original URL) Even the PubPer publication is very short on details about how the surveys were done. At least, we learn that these were telephone surveys, not web surveys :-)

But, how much shall we trust these data??

And coming back to the original question, what are the standards for web surveys, should there be any, is it the concern of AAPOR?

Manfred Kuechler

Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

695 Park Avenue, NY, NY 10021

Tel: 212-772-5588

Fax: as above, then select "3" from voice mail menu (\*\*NEW\*\* as of 7/21/97)

WWW: <http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

I am prepared to use PGP 5.5 (freeware) available from <http://www.nai.com> . Please send your public key if you are ready to protect the privacy of your e-mail, and I will send my public key in return -- which is also available from my web page. Note that the freeware version of PGP 5.5 does not handle (older) RSA keys.

>From abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu Thu May 7 05:20:19 1998

Received: from cholera.spc.uchicago.edu (root@cholera.spc.uchicago.edu [128.135.252.3])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id FAA24066 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 May 1998 05:20:17 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from nittany.uchicago.edu (abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.8]) by cholera.spc.uchicago.edu (8.6.9/8.6.4) with SMTP id HAA10386 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 May 1998 07:21:26 -0500

Received: by nittany.uchicago.edu (16.8/UofC3.0)

id AA28496; Thu, 7 May 98 07:20:11 -0500

Date: Thu, 7 May 98 07:20:11 -0500

From: "Tom\_W. Smith" <abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu>

Message-Id: <9805071220.AA28496@nittany.uchicago.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Lib con

The two most common ways on measuring liberal/conservative position are a) a self-ranking placement item and b) a scale of attitude items. Examples of both can be found on the General Social Survey at [www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss) tom w smith

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Thu May 7 05:35:11 1998

Received: from shell.monmouth.com (root@shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id FAA26223 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 May 1998 05:35:09 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (fh-ppp65.monmouth.com [205.164.221.97]) by shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id IAA02668 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 May 1998 08:32:52 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <3551AB3F.791F@monmouth.com>

Date: Thu, 07 May 1998 08:38:23 -0400

From: "Rachel A. Hickson" <rhickson@monmouth.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Lib con

References: <9805071220.AA28496@nittany.uchicago.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I believe the Harris polls also use some political philosophy/liberal-conservative/political persuasion questions. As well as voting behavior, etc.

Rachel Hickson

>From Tucker\_C@BLS.GOV Thu May 7 07:07:34 1998  
Received: from blsmail.bls.gov ([146.142.4.13])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id HAA08982 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 May 1998 07:07:32 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov ([146.142.42.8]) by mailgate.bls.gov  
(5.x/SMI-SVR4)  
id AA12632; Thu, 7 May 1998 10:04:28 -0400  
Received: by psbmailhub with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
id <KNQ4723L>; Thu, 7 May 1998 10:07:37 -0400  
Message-Id: <8119A6330CD0119F9A00805F38C20970FC15@psbmail2>  
From: Tucker\_C <Tucker\_C@BLS.GOV>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu, Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>  
Subject: RE: Standards for Web surveys  
Date: Thu, 7 May 1998 10:07:48 -0400  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
Content-Type: text/plain

The AAPOR Council has taken up the matter of survey research on the web and will have something to say in the near future.

-----  
From: Manfred Kuechler [SMTP:mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu]  
Sent: 06 May 1998 17:45  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Standards for Web surveys

About 4 weeks ago (April 11), I complained about the practices of a well-known survey organization in connection to their launching of web surveys. In particular, I expressed my annoyance about a seemingly broken promise to make results available to participants.

On Monday (May 4) I received an apologetic e-mail message from the organization that the results are now available for viewing at their web site. According to the information provided there, over 12,000 people participated. But no information whatsoever was given about "how this survey was done" (remember the little boxes the NYT always uses?), no demographic breakdown whatsoever. Instead a rather eclectic sample of tables showing the responses to select questions. Some of the results indicate that the sample is severely biased. For example, only 8% think that President Clinton is doing an "excellent job", 33% think it is "pretty good", but 26% say it's "only fair" and 28% say it's "poor". Or: 38% had participated in an Internet survey before. Web people don't like Clinton

--

despite all the hype about the information superhighway?

And sometimes even the math does not work out (like on Pg7.htm): "How much do you enjoy using the Internet?" 68% "a great deal", 30% "somewhat", and 20% "not very much".  $68+30+20=118$  !

Now the same institute (different division I suppose) has just published the results of a study about access to the Internet, claiming that there is no racial divide -- quite in contrast to the findings of a study at Vanderbilt (Hoffman/Novak) based on data collected by Nielsen which prompted VP Al Gore to call for additional research (and remedies). Available at:

<http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pubper/pdf/pp93b.pdf>

The "Public Perspective" publication is somewhat toned down compared to earlier press releases that claimed that if there ever was a racial divide it had closed over the last year. See for example:

[http://www.nua.ie/surveys/index.cgi?service=view\\_survey&survey\\_number=727&r](http://www.nua.ie/surveys/index.cgi?service=view_survey&survey_number=727&r)

el=no

(based on a MSNBC story that is no longer available at its original URL)

Even the PubPer publication is very short on details about how the surveys were done. At least, we learn that these were telephone surveys, not web surveys :-)

But, how much shall we trust these data??

And coming back to the original question, what are the standards for web surveys, should there be any, is it the concern of AAPOR?

Manfred Kuechler

Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

695 Park Avenue, NY, NY 10021

Tel: 212-772-5588

Fax: as above, then select "3" from voice mail menu (\*\*NEW\*\* as of 7/21/97)

WWW: <http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

I am prepared to use PGP 5.5 (freeware) available from <http://www.nai.com> . Please send your public key if you are ready to protect the privacy of your e-mail, and I will send my public key in return -- which is also available from my web page. Note that the freeware version of PGP 5.5 does not handle (older) RSA keys.

>From murray.edelman@vnsusa.org Thu May 7 17:10:48 1998

Received: from libra.vnsusa.com (libra.vnsusa.com [205.183.239.99] (may be forged))

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id RAA08688 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 May 1998 17:10:44 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mail.vnsusa.org by libra.vnsusa.com  
via smtpd (for usc.edu [128.125.19.136]) with SMTP; 8 May 1998  
00:06:04 UT

Received: by NTS\_1 with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)  
id <KNK20ZTV>; Thu, 7 May 1998 20:03:44 -0400

Message-ID: <017480CB593ED111B05D0060B0571CFE0827E6@NTS\_1>

From: Murray Edelman <murray.edelman@vnsusa.org>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: AAPOR: All discussants should have received the papers in their  
sessions

Date: Thu, 7 May 1998 20:03:43 -0400

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

Content-Type: text/plain

Conference Session Participants,

The deadline of May 8th is here. All discussants should have the papers in  
their sessions by the end of the day today.

Is the above just a fantasy of your totally exhausted Conference Chair ?

It probably is. But he sure has tried. The "Guidelines for Paper  
Presenters" clearly state that the chairs and discussants should receive  
their papers by May 8th. He has also sent a long letter and a list  
of paper presenters to everyone presenting a paper in a session at the  
conference and has urged them to contact their presenters immediately.

WHAT IF you are giving a paper and your chair or discussant has not  
contacted you ?

There are only six sessions with five papers. In these cases, there will  
not be a discussant and the chair may have elected to not get the papers in  
advance. If you are in one of these sessions and have not been contacted,  
don't be concerned. They are:

Friday 10:15 - Non-Response in Telephone Surveys

Friday 2:00 - Questionnaire Design Issues

Friday 3:45 - Measuring Perceptions of Self and Society

Saturday 10:15 - Cognitive Aspects of Survey Measurement

Saturday 2:15 - Political Attitudes and Values

Saturday 2:15 - Decreasing Nonresponse

If you are in a session that was organized in advanced, contact the  
organizer if you have any questions about their being a discussant.

If you are a paper presenter in any other session than the ones mentioned  
above AND you have not been contacted by either your chair or discussant,

please e-mail the Conference Chair immediately. He will track down the problem.

WHAT IF you will not be able to send your paper to the discussant on time?

You need to work this out with your chair and discussant. Most discussants will be willing to adapt somewhat to your needs. But please realize that by being very late, you are lessening the quality of your own feedback, taking away from the richness of the session, and making the discussants especially hard. But that won't happen this year, will it? :):)

Here's to a an exciting and stimulating conference next week. (That's not a fantasy!)

See you in St. Louis,

Murray Edelman, Conference Chair

```
>From hschuman@umich.edu Fri May 8 06:53:09 1998
Received: from berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.63.17])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA15483 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 06:53:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from qbert.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@qbert.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.63.94])
    by berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id
JAA06548
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 09:53:05 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)
    by qbert.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with SMTP id JAA00727
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 09:53:04 -0400 (EDT)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Fri, 8 May 1998 09:53:04 -0400 (EDT)
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
X-Sender: hschuman@qbert.rs.itd.umich.edu
To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Response effects
Message-ID:
<Pine.SOL.3.95.980508095009.18318D-100000@qbert.rs.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
```

The following from the internet magazine Slate may be of interest:

"A front-page LAT story and one inside at the NYT cover a sociological



finding coming out today in the journal Science. It's well known that people will under-report their questionable behavior when asked about it by an interviewer, but it has long been assumed that this problem was addressed by conducting surveys via paper and pencil questionnaires. However, by comparing paper-and-pencil surveys to those self-administered on a computer, the new study shows that's not true. Which means that many accepted paper-and-pencil surveys have rendered a distorted sense of how people behave. The Science study, for instance, purports to show that among 1,600 15-19-year-old males, those computer-queried were almost 4 times more likely than the paper-and-pencil group to report homosex, 5.5 times more likely to admit they were often or always drunk or high when having sex with women, and 14 times more likely to cop to sex with an intravenous drug user."

>From lockhadc@Maritz.com Fri May 8 07:10:59 1998  
Received: from gatekeeper.maritz.com (firewall-user@gatekeeper.maritz.com [207.239.118.4])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id HAA18917 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 07:10:57 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: by gatekeeper.maritz.com; id JAA17308; Fri, 8 May 1998 09:14:33 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from mifen-comm01.maritz.com(156.45.55.30) by gatekeeper.maritz.com via smap (3.2)

id xma016906; Fri, 8 May 98 09:14:02 -0500

Received: by mifen-comm01.maritz.com with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

id <KJ3FJ64R>; Fri, 8 May 1998 09:10:20 -0500

Message-ID:

<295401AFA48ED011B0D200805F31328501D2AFE9@mifen-comm07.maritz.com>

From: "Lockhart, Dan C." <lockhadc@Maritz.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Response effects

Date: Fri, 8 May 1998 09:10:07 -0500

X-Priority: 3

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

Dear AAPORNet:

Does anyone know how to reference an Internet site? I have the following reference. Does it look correct? How can it be improved?

Jupiter Communications (1997) <http://www.jup.com/>

\*\*\*\*\*

Best regards,

Dan :-)

\*\*\*\*\*

>From datapmc@uol.com.br Fri May 8 07:31:08 1998  
Received: from lacan.uol.com.br (smtp.uol.com.br [200.246.5.70])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id HAA23281 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 07:31:02 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from 33 (tclld146 [200.246.5.146])  
by lacan.uol.com.br (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id LAA05949  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 11:28:14 -0300 (EST)  
Message-ID: <3553089E.7AE0@uol.com.br>  
Date: Fri, 08 May 1998 11:29:02 -0200  
From: "Leandro L. Batista" <datapmc@uol.com.br>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02E [pt]-UOL (Win95; I)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Help on cluster analysis  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I am conducting cluster analysis using a dataset that needs to be weighted to represent the population, my question is:  
Should I use the weighted data to do the cluster analysis or the raw data?  
Thanks to any help on that.

Leandro Batista  
Datafolha Research Institute  
Sao Paulo, Brazil

>From wolfdn@indy.net Fri May 8 07:44:20 1998  
Received: from radiate.indy.net (radiate.indy.net [199.3.65.253])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id HAA26382 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 07:44:18 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from indy3.indy.net (root@indy3.indy.net [199.3.65.14])  
by radiate.indy.net (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id JAA01953  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 09:45:29 -0500 (EST)  
Received: from default (ip87-179.ts.indy.net [199.3.87.179])  
by indy3.indy.net (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id JAA01506  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 09:45:24 -0500 (EST)  
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19980508094524.006c2df0@pop.indy.net>  
X-Sender: wolfdn@pop.indy.net  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.1 (32)  
Date: Fri, 08 May 1998 09:45:24 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Jim Wolf <wolfdn@indy.net>  
Subject: RE: Response effects  
In-Reply-To: <295401AFA48ED011B0D200805F31328501D2AFE9@mifen-comm07.mari  
tz.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0

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

At 09:10 AM 5/8/98 -0500, Lockhart, Dan C. wrote:

>

>Does anyone know how to reference an Internet site? I have the  
>following reference. Does it look correct? How can it be improved?

>

> Jupiter Communications (1997) <http://www.jup.com/>

>

Very important question. I've seen similar references, but I prefer it when the citation includes an exact date. Most web sites are very dynamic. Having a month and day as well as year would help if the webmaster needed to be contacted.

=====

Jim Wolf [wolfden@indy.net](mailto:wolfden@indy.net)

>From [mohler@zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:mohler@zuma-mannheim.de) Fri May 8 07:57:09 1998

Received: from [noc.belwue.de](mailto:noc.belwue.de) ([noc.BelWue.DE](mailto:noc.BelWue.DE) [129.143.2.1])

by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id HAA28645 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Fri, 8 May 1998 07:57:01 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [mail.zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:mail.zuma-mannheim.de) ([mail.zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:mail.zuma-mannheim.de) [193.196.10.12])

by [noc.belwue.de](mailto:noc.belwue.de) (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id QAA20481

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Fri, 8 May 1998 16:56:21 +0200 (MET DST)

env-from ([mohler@zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:mohler@zuma-mannheim.de))

Received: from [zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:zuma-mannheim.de) ([pc-pm.zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:pc-pm.zuma-mannheim.de) [193.196.10.35])

by [mail.zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:mail.zuma-mannheim.de) (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id QAA09855

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Fri, 8 May 1998 16:55:00 +0200

Message-ID: <35539B1F.8DADC9E5@zuma-mannheim.de>

Date: Fri, 08 May 1998 16:54:07 -0700

From: "Peter Ph. Mohler" <[mohler@zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:mohler@zuma-mannheim.de)>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win16; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)

Subject: Re: Help on cluster analysis

References: <3553089E.7AE0@uol.com.br>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

first a question: what do you mean by "weighting to represent the population"? (adjusting age\*gender\*education\*.,.to an external distribution of a census or so (do you now how good the external data are?))? If so, are you sure your weighting "improves" your measurement? There are some instances where weighting may be worse than not. secondly a pragmatic answer, try it both ways

Peter

Leandro L. Batista wrote:

>

> I am conducting cluster analysis using a dataset that needs to be  
> weighted to represent the population, my question is: Should I use the  
> weighted data to do the cluster analysis or the raw data?  
> Thanks to any help on that.  
>  
> Leandro Batista  
> Datafolha Research Institute  
> Sao Paulo, Brazil  
>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Fri May 8 08:01:33 1998  
Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu (bones.asic.csuohio.edu  
[137.148.16.17])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id IAA29298 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 08:01:30 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from s.kraus.csuohio.edu (137.148.10.29) by mail.asic.csuohio.edu  
with SMTP (MailShare 1.0fc6); Fri, 8 May 1998 11:01:27 -0400  
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19980508110142.006ac644@bones.asic.csuohio.edu>  
X-Sender: s.kraus@bones.asic.csuohio.edu  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)  
Date: Fri, 08 May 1998 11:01:42 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Sidney Kraus <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR: All discussants should have received the papers  
in their sessions  
In-Reply-To: <017480CB593ED111B05D0060B0571CFE0827E6@NTS\_1>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Murray:

Thanks for the note. To date I have one abstract and one paper from  
"Pummeling" panel members I will plan to give some remarks on the topic.  
Best sid.

At 08:03 PM 5/7/98 -0400, you wrote:

>Conference Session Participants,  
>  
>The deadline of May 8th is here. All discussants should have the  
>papers in their sessions by the end of the day today.  
>  
>Is the above just a fantasy of your totally exhausted Conference Chair  
>?  
>  
>  
>It probably is. But he sure has tried. The "Guidelines for Paper  
>Presenters" clearly state that the chairs and discussants should receive  
>their papers by May 8th. He has also sent a long letter and a list  
>of paper presenters to everyone presenting a paper in a session at the  
>conference and has urged them to contact their presenters immediately.  
>

>WHAT IF you are giving a paper and your chair or discussant has not  
>contacted you ?

>

>There are only six sessions with five papers. In these cases, there  
>will not be a discussant and the chair may have elected to not get the  
>papers in advance. If you are in one of these sessions and have not  
>been contacted, don't be concerned. They are:

> Friday 10:15 - Non-Response in Telephone Surveys

> Friday 2:00 - Questionnaire Design Issues

> Friday 3:45 - Measuring Perceptions of Self and Society

> Saturday 10:15 - Cognitive Aspects of Survey Measurement

> Saturday 2:15 - Political Attitudes and Values

> Saturday 2:15 - Decreasing Nonresponse

>

>If you are in a session that was organized in advanced, contact the  
>organizer if you have any questions about their being a discussant.

>

>If you are a paper presenter in any other session than the ones  
>mentioned above AND you have not been contacted by either your chair or  
>discussant, please e-mail the Conference Chair immediately. He will  
>track down the problem.

>

>WHAT IF you will not be able to send your paper to the discussant on  
>time?

>

>You need to work this out with your chair and discussant. Most  
>discussants will be willing to adapt somewhat to your needs. But  
>please realize that by being very late, you are lessening the quality  
>of your own feedback, taking away from the richness of the session, and  
>making the discussants especially hard. But that won't happen this  
>year, will it? :):)

>

>Here's to a an exciting and stimulating conference next week. (That's  
>not a fantasy!)

>

>See you in St. Louis,

>

>Murray Edelman, Conference Chair

>

>

>

>

>

>

>From monson.6@osu.edu Fri May 8 08:07:18 1998

Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu  
[128.146.214.31])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id IAA00376 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 08:07:15 -0700  
(PDT)



by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.8.6/8.8.6) with ESMTTP id MAA14710  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 12:56:28 -0400  
Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (xyp08-11.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.178])  
by garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (8.8.6/8.8.6) with SMTP id MAA44900  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 12:56:27 -0400  
Date: Fri, 8 May 1998 12:56:27 -0400  
Message-Id: <199805081656.MAA44900@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>  
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu (Unverified)  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>  
Subject: Re: Response effects

Alas, with my experience working with students on computers, the PAPI surveys may be the accurate ones and the computer ones reflect typos, mistakenly hitting "enter" (no pun intended), the "alt" key or other snafus.

Susan

At 09:53 AM 5/8/98 -0400, you wrote:

>The following from the internet magazine Slate may be of interest:

>

>

>"A front-page LAT story and one inside at the NYT cover a sociological  
>finding coming out today in the journal Science. It's well known that  
>people will under-report their questionable behavior when asked about  
>it by an interviewer, but it has long been assumed that this problem  
>was addressed by conducting surveys via paper and pencil  
>questionnaires. However, by comparing paper-and-pencil surveys to those  
>self-administered on a computer, the new study shows that's not true.  
>Which means that many accepted paper-and-pencil surveys have rendered a  
>distorted sense of how people behave. The Science study, for instance,  
>purports to show that among 1,600 15-19-year-old males, those  
>computer-queried were almost 4 times more likely than the  
>paper-and-pencil group to report homosex, 5.5 times more likely to  
>admit they were often or always drunk or high when having sex with  
>women, and 14 times more likely to cop to sex with an intravenous drug  
>user."

>

>

>

>

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

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

PHONE 850-644-1753  
FAX 850-644-6208

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri May 8 11:10:19 1998  
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id LAA22735 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 11:10:17 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)  
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id LAA16617 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 11:10:17 -0700  
(PDT)  
Date: Fri, 8 May 1998 11:10:16 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Interviewing Youth Under 18  
Message-ID: <Pine.SV4.3.94.980508105821.23353D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

AAPORNETters: If you can be of any help, please reply directly to:

Kate Durocher <durocher@awis.org>  
Association for Women in Science  
1200 New York Ave., NW, Suite 650  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202.326.8940 Fax: 202.326.8960

Please do NOT reply to AAPORNET, unless, of course, you think your reply to  
be of general interest.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

Date: Fri, 08 May 1998 09:38:49 -0700  
From: Kate Durocher <durocher@awis.org>  
Subject: Interviewing Children Under 18

Hi,

I am desperately trying to determine the regulations/restriction of opinion



research polls on children under 18. Is there someone there I could speak with who might know the answer to this question -- or at least point me in the right direction? I looked for a telephone contact number on your webpage but was unable to find one.

Thanks,  
Kate Durocher  
--

Association for Women in Science  
1200 New York Ave., NW, Suite 650  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202.326.8940 Fax: 202.326.8960  
<http://www.awis.org>

"Dedicated to achieving equity and full participation for women in all areas of science and technology."

\*\*\*\*\*

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Fri May 8 11:45:45 1998  
Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id LAA00527 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 11:45:44 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from default (user-38ld1r5.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.135.101])  
by dewdrop2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id OAA20298  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 May 1998 14:45:31 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <199805081845.OAA20298@dewdrop2.mindspring.com>  
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1.329 (Beta)  
Date: Fri, 08 May 1998 14:46:11 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Warren J. Mitofsky" <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Re: Help on cluster analysis  
In-Reply-To: <35539B1F.8DADC9E5@zuma-mannheim.de>  
References: <3553089E.7AE0@uol.com.br>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
types="text/plain,text/html";  
boundary="====\_12227218==\_ .ALT"  
  
-----\_12227218==\_ .ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

- (1) If the weights reflect the probabilities of selection then you MUST weight, or you will introduce bias.
- (2) If the weights represent a ratio or regression or some other estimation

technique, then compute the sampling error with and without these weights and choose the method with the smaller sampling error, (but you still must include weights that reflect the probabilities of selection).

warren mitofsky

At 04:54 PM 5/8/98 -0700, you wrote:

>first a question: what do you mean by "weighting to represent the  
>population"? (adjusting age\*gender\*education\*.,.to an external  
>distribution of a census or so (do you now how good the external data  
>are?))? If so, are you sure your weighting "improves" your measurement?  
>There are some instances where weighting may be worse than not.  
>secondly a pragmatic answer, try it both ways

>Peter

>

>Leandro L. Batista wrote:

>>

>> I am conducting cluster analysis using a dataset that needs to be  
>> weighted to represent the population, my question is: Should I use  
>> the weighted data to do the cluster analysis or the raw data?  
>> Thanks to any help on that.

>>

>> Leandro Batista

>> Datafolha Research Institute

>> Sao Paulo, Brazil

>

Mitofsky International

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com

-----\_12227218==\_.ALT

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

<html><div>(1) If the weights reflect the probabilities of selection then you MUST weight, or you will introduce bias. </div>

<div>(2) If the weights represent a ratio or regression or some other estimation technique, then compute the sampling error with and without these weights and choose the method with the smaller sampling error, (but you still must include weights that reflect the probabilities of

selection).</div> <div> warren mitofsky</div> <br> <div>At 04:54 PM 5/8/98 -0700, you wrote:</div> <div>&gt;first a &nbsp; question: what do you mean by &quot;weighting to represent the</div> <div>&gt;population&quot;?

(adjusting age\*gender\*education\*.,.to an external</div>

<div>&gt;distribution of a census or so (do you now how good the external data</div> <div>&gt;are?))</div> <div>&gt;If so, are you sure your weighting

&quot;improves&quot; your measurement?</div> <div>&gt;There are some instances where weighting may be worse than not.</div> <div>&gt;secondly a pragmatic answer, try it both ways </div> <div>&gt;Peter</div>



>Dear AAPORNet:

>

>Does anyone know how to reference an Internet site? I have the  
>following reference. Does it look correct? How can it be improved?

>

> Jupiter Communications (1997) <http://www.jup.com/>

>

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>Best regards,

>

>Dan :-)

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>

\*\*\*\*\*

Hal Kassarjian

hkassarj@ucla.edu

Phone 1-818 784-5669

FAX 1-818 784-3325

>From Dawn\_Von\_Thurn@notes.pw.com Mon May 11 08:27:15 1998

Received: from willow.us.pw.com (pw20.pw9.com [208.141.52.243])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id IAA04021 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 May 1998 08:27:14 -0700

(PDT)

From: Dawn\_Von\_Thurn@notes.pw.com

Received: by willow.us.pw.com; id LAA28361; Mon, 11 May 1998 11:30:17 -0400

Received: from fern.us.pw.com(10.9.16.60) by willow via smap (4.1)

id xma028307; Mon, 11 May 98 11:30:13 -0400

Received: by fern.us.pw.com (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)

id LAA11828; Mon, 11 May 1998 11:25:10 -0400

Message-Id: <199805111525.LAA11828@fern.us.pw.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Mon, 11 May 98 09:11:49 EDT

Subject: AAPOR Conference - - Sunday Lunch

Since I have not yet seen this posted on AAPORNET, I am re-posting this message. Please forgive the duplicate posting.

----- Forwarded by Dawn Von Thurn/MCS/Price Waterhouse on  
05/11/98 09:12 AM -----

Dawn Von Thurn

05/08/98 05:29 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu@internet

cc:

Subject: AAPOR Conference - - Sunday Lunch

\*\*\*\*\*  
A MESSAGE FROM THE AAPOR CONFERENCE OPERATIONS COMMITTEE  
\*\*\*\*\*

The St. Louis Marriott has informed us that the Pavilion Restaurant, located on the hotel's lower level, can easily and quickly (e.g., lunch buffet) accommodate all of the AAPOR conference attendees who would like to eat lunch before departing the hotel on Sunday. Reservations are not required at this restaurant. The restaurant will also provide "to go" containers next to their lunch buffet for those needing to take lunch with them.

Given this news, AAPOR will NOT be offering a boxed lunch option for Sunday.

>From pbb5@cdc.gov Mon May 11 12:20:08 1998  
Received: from mailgate2.cdc.gov (mailgate2.cdc.gov [158.111.3.22])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTTP  
id MAA17642 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 May 1998 12:20:06 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from mcddc-us-ims.cdc.gov ([158.111.3.19])  
by mailgate2.cdc.gov (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id PAA11355  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 May 1998 15:19:35 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: by MDCDC-US-IMS with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
id <KNWFQXSX>; Mon, 11 May 1998 15:19:26 -0400  
Message-ID: <C79290593AB9D1118C9C0080D870032D4E8E9E@MDCDC-HVL-1>  
From: "Beatty, Paul C. (E)" <pbb5@cdc.gov>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: AAPOR Conference - - Purchase of additional meals  
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 15:19:25 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
Content-Type: text/plain

> \*\*\*\*\*  
> A MESSAGE FROM THE AAPOR CONFERENCE OPERATIONS COMMITTEE  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
>

This message is for AAPOR Conference attendees who wish to purchase additional meal tickets at this year's conference in St. Louis. As in the past, everyone staying at the conference hotel (the Marriott Pavillion Downtown) is required to purchase a standard room-plus-meals package. Those not staying in the hotel, or those who would like to purchase extra meals, will have several opportunities to do so.

The conference hotel will set up a booth near the AAPOR registration desk to sell meal tickets at the following times:

Thursday, May 14:	2 PM to 6 PM
Friday, May 15:	9 AM to 2 PM

On Thursday, tickets will be available for all conference meals. On Friday, you will ONLY be able to buy tickets for Saturday lunch, Saturday dinner, and Sunday breakfast.

Keep in mind that AAPOR is experimenting with a modified meal plan at this conference. Rather than holding the traditional 9 group meals, there will only be 6 group meals this year. All attendees will be "on their own" for Thursday dinner, Friday dinner, and Sunday lunch.

-Paul Beatty  
Conference Operations Committee

>From ghroberts@worldnet.att.net Mon May 11 12:34:35 1998  
Received: from mtigwc04.worldnet.att.net (mtigwc04.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.33])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id MAA21570 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 May 1998 12:34:30 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from hewlett-packard ([12.66.66.53]) by mtigwc04.worldnet.att.net (post.office MTA v2.0 0613 ) with ESMTP id AAA16304  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 May 1998 19:33:57 +0000  
From: "Glenn H. Roberts" <ghroberts@worldnet.att.net>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR Conference - - Sunday Lunch  
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 14:35:39 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Priority: 3  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1162  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Message-ID: <19980511193355.AAA16304@hewlett-packard>

Dear Ruth & Bill,

Will try to check your Marriott reservations but no guarantees. I sent my flower check and bill to Florence and she has received both checks, paid bill.. amounts were accurate. Tried to call Bill Troxel last night but only answering machine..wi