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

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

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

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

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

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9905.
Part 1/1, total size 342462 bytes:

------------------------------- Cut here -----------------------------
For those interested in the web sites of major presidential candidates (as of right now)

George W. Bush: www.georgewbush.com
Pat Buchanan: www.gopatgo2000.org
Al Gore: www.gore2000.org
For those interested in the web sites of major presidential candidates (as of right now):


John Kasich: <a href="http://www.k2k.org/" eudora="autourl">www.k2k.org</a>


Dan Quayle:
<a href="http://www.quayle.org/">www.quayle.org</a>

Bob Smith:

Alan Keyes:

--=====================_1440805==_.ALT--

>From Mherrmann@mail.icrsurvey.com Sun May 2 19:42:58 1999
Received: from relay3.smtp.psi.net (relay3.smtp.psi.net [38.8.210.2])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id TAA08450 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 May 1999 19:42:57 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [38.176.63.7] (helo=mail.icrsurvey.com)
   by relay3.smtp.psi.net with smtp (Exim 1.90 #1)
   for aapornet@usc.edu
   id 10e8h7-0002VC-00; Sun, 2 May 1999 22:42:57 -0400
Received: from media#u#dom-Message_Server by mail.icrsurvey.com
   with Novell_GroupWise; Sun, 02 May 1999 22:46:52 -0400
Message-Id: <s72cd5dc.057@mail.icrsurvey.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
This is an automatic reply from Melissa Herrmann.

I will be out of the office from May 3 through May 7, returning on May 10th. If you need immediate assistance, please contact Gregg Poryzees.

Thanks

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun May  2 22:44:22 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usd) with ESMTP
   id WAA11658 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 May 1999 22:44:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usd) with SMTP
   id WAA19852 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 May 1999 22:43:52 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Sun, 2 May 1999 22:43:52 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Lest we forget...

Bill Bradley: www.billbradley.com
Elizabeth Dole: www.dolein2000.org

And who can explain this:

.com sites               .org sites

Lamar Alexander          Pat Buchanan
Bill Bradley             Elizabeth Dole
George W. Bush           Al Gore
Steve Forbes             John Kasich
                        Alan Keyes
                        John McCain
                        Dan Quayle
                        Bob Smith

******
On Sun, 2 May 1999, dick halpern wrote:

> For those interested in the web sites of major presidential candidates
> (as of right now)
> 
> George W. Bush: www.georgewbush.com
> Pat Buchanan: www.gopatgo2000.org
> Al Gore: www.gore2000.org
> John Kasich: www.k2k.org
> Lamar Alexander: www.lamaralexander.com
> John McCain: www.mccainforpresident.org
> Dan Quayle: www.quayle.org
> Alan Keyes: www.keyes2000.org

******

>From langley@pop.uky.edu Mon May  3 06:34:55 1999
Received: from smtp.uky.edu (smtp.uky.edu [128.163.2.17])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA22623 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 May 1999 06:34:37 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from pop.uky.edu (pop.uky.edu [128.163.2.16])
    by smtp.uky.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id JAA27888
Please post the job opportunity listed below. I will be available at the annual AAPOR meeting to discuss the position with qualified candidates.

Thank You!

Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D.

Director

UK - Survey Research Center
The University of Kentucky Survey Research Center is seeking a talented, formally trained survey researcher to manage all field projects including a large four-year study which is currently under way. The Research Administration Coordinator works with a large degree of independence providing consultation on all stages of social science research design, questionnaire construction, sampling, data collection and analysis. The Research Coordinator also supervises all aspects of face-to-face interview field projects, including hiring, training, monitoring, and disciplining of interviewers. This is a 12-month professional staff position at the University with job security. Approximately 30% of the Research Coordinator's effort over the next four years will be devoted to the day-to-day management of the above-mentioned project. Occasional overnight travel may be required.

UK-SRC provides support to faculty engaged in funded research in a wide variety of substantive areas and designs and implements public policy and social impact assessment research for government agencies and clients in the
private and non-profit sector. The Center has a 14-station CATI Network and uses CAPI for conducting interviews in the field. For more information, visit our Web site at

www.rgs.uky.edu/src/srchome.htm

<underline>Qualifications</underline>

The Research Coordinator must have excellent oral and written communication skills, strong interpersonal skills, and the ability to work on multiple projects at once. Expertise with SAS and SPSS in PC and mainframe environments is preferred. Master's degree in the social sciences plus three years related experience is required; Ph.D. is preferred. Graduate-level training in survey research methods and quantitative analysis is also required.

To apply, please send letter of application, resume, three names of references, and minimum salary requirement to:

Job #SG17163, HR/Employment, 112 Scovell Hall, Lexington, KY 40506-0064.
FAX (606) 257-1736.
The University of Kentucky is an equal opportunity employer and encourages applications from minorities and women.

>From today's Washington Post:
Federal regulators are investigating a British company that began distributing an unsolicited gun-control survey to millions of fax machines in the United States the day after the shootings at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colo.

The survey asked recipients if they wanted more effective gun-control laws and requested that replies be faxed back to a 900 telephone number, which the fine print disclosed cost $2.95 a minute. Most of the fees charged for such a call go to the company receiving the fax, in this case 21st Century Fax Ltd. The survey claimed the results would be shared with politicians, lawmakers and interest groups.

The fax has led to consumer complaints made to the Federal Communications Commission and Federal Trade Commission, where regulators are studying whether the survey violates U.S. laws.

Dorothy Atwood, chief of the FCC common carrier bureau's enforcement division, said the agency was "concerned that potentially 3 million people out there have been exposed to this fax, which also seems to charge them if they call the number."
Atwood said the agency is looking into whether the fax violates the Telecommunications Consumer Protection Act, which prohibits unsolicited commercial faxes. Such electronic solicitations have become an increasing problem, with the number of written complaints filed to the FCC climbing from 300 in 1992 to 3,000 last year.

The FTC also is investigating whether the faxes violate its rules for 900 numbers, which require clear disclosure that consumers must pay for the phone calls, Attwood said. The FTC declined to confirm that an investigation is pending.

Reached by phone in London, Gordon Ritchie, director of 21st Century Fax, said the gun-control poll involved nothing illegal or improper. The FCC's rules on unsolicited faxes "only apply to faxes from the U.S.," Ritchie said.

"We're covered by European laws," he said. "In the U.S. you can have guns but not faxes. Here, we can't have guns, but we can have faxes."

Ritchie said his company was sending the survey "to every American fax number we've got, and we've got 3 million numbers."

The survey, which was first sent on April 21, the day after the Littleton shootings, so far has been sent to more than 150,000 machines, mostly on the East Coast. The company started sending it to Midwest and West Coast fax numbers this week.
For each reply faxed to the 900 number, 21st Century Fax will make about $1.50 to $1.75 per minute in revenue, Ritchie said. He also noted that replies can also be sent to a Manhattan mail drop; the address is in fine print at the bottom of the survey, about half the size of the 900 number prominently displayed in the middle of the fax.

Karen Mosbaek, a receptionist at a Bethesda political consulting firm, was the first to see the survey at her company when she reviewed the incoming faxes last week. Initially, it sounded great, she said.

"With all the stuff going on in Colorado, I was thinking more should be done," she said. So Mosbaek checked "yes" -- that there should be more effective gun-control laws -- and started to return the fax. Then she discovered that the fax number had a 900 area code and that she would be charged $2.95 a minute, with most of that fee going to the company receiving the fax.

"I was very angry," Mosbaek said. "It's pretty sad for someone to try to make money off a tragedy like this."

But Ritchie said the company has "had no one complain, out of the thousands and thousands of responses, that 'you're making money out of the death of these poor school kids.' " He said he expected a response rate of about 6 percent -- which would result in revenue of more than $250,000 for his company.
Ritchie said the gun-control survey was the first American poll for 21st Century Fax, which sends about 8 million faxes a month to machines in Britain and Germany. The faxes range from polls on such topics as whether England should stay in the European Union to all sorts of advice, such as how to lose weight or reduce stress. Last year, the fax services provided almost $6 million in revenue and $1.2 million in profit, he said.

Ritchie said the poll is scientifically sound because he is sending out so many surveys. Pollsters in the United States disputed that, noting that it is not a random sample of people -- that instead the participants are self-selected. Indeed, Ritchie -- who said he strongly favors tighter gun-control laws -- conceded he would halt the poll if it appeared a majority voted against gun control, though at the moment the faxes are running overwhelmingly in favor of gun-control laws.

Earlier this year, British regulators obtained a temporary injunction against Ritchie and other officers of a sister company, 20th Century Fax Ltd. charging it with sending deceptive and misleading information in its faxes advising people to lose weight through the "Yummy Yummy Diet."

Ritchie said the diet does work and he will challenge the injunction next month in court.

Staff writer Liz Leyden in New York contributed to this report.

(c) Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company
Market Research Analyst (Central New Jersey)

Edison Media Research, a small rapidly growing market research company is currently looking for an entry level Research Analyst. You will learn and assist in all aspects of our studies from questionnaire development through final presentation.

The ideal candidate should be a detail oriented, self-motivated recent college graduate with an interest in media & pop culture. Candidates should be comfortable with numbers and have PC experience. Ability to multi-task and willingness to work hard is a must.
Edison Media Research conducts survey research and provides strategic information to radio stations, television stations, newspapers, cable networks, record labels and other media organizations.


Please mail, fax or email resume to:

Rob Farbman
Edison Media Research
6 West Cliff Street
Somerville, NJ 08876
Fax: 908-707-4740
Robfarbman@aol.com

>From HHBASEHART@ssu.edu Wed May  5 08:30:57 1999
Received: from csin.ssu.edu ([131.118.47.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id IAA25549 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 May 1999 08:30:43 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ITS-Message_Server by csin.ssu.edu
    with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 05 May 1999 11:29:07 -0400
Message-Id: <s7302b83.071@csin.ssu.edu>
As co-director of a soon-to-be-established public affairs institute at Salisbury State University, Salisbury, Maryland, I am seeking advice on a number of questions associated with the creation of a public opinion research office within the institute. For example, what are the problems and opportunities with an opinion research office that would mainly conduct local and regional surveys and provide services to university departments/offices? What educational and work experience should we look for in a director of a new opinion research office? Where are ads placed to search for a director? Is there a place for student employees in such an office? What are the quality CATI systems? And many more.

I will attend the AAPOR conference in St. Petersburg, Florida, next week and if you have suggestions for me, I would appreciate talking with you for a few minutes. Or if you prefer, please e-mail me at HHBASEHART@SSU.EDU. My phone number is 410-543-6242. Thanks.
Harry,

It's really hard to know where to begin to answer your questions. I'm sure that several others like myself would be glad to chat with you at AAPOR. Plus, I suggest you attend the Thursday afternoon meeting of the academic-based survey organizations.

At 11:29 AM 5/5/99 -0400, you wrote:

>As co-director of a soon-to-be-established public affairs institute at Salisbury State University, Salisbury, Maryland, I am seeking advice on a
number of questions associated with the creation of a public opinion research office within the institute. For example, what are the problems and opportunities with an opinion research office that would mainly conduct local and regional surveys and provide services to university departments/offices? What educational and work experience should we look for in a director of a new opinion research office? Where are ads placed to search for a director? Is there a place for student employees in such an office? What are the quality CATI systems? And many more.

I will attend the AAPOR conference in St. Petersburg, Florida, next week and if you have suggestions for me, I would appreciate talking with you for a few minutes. Or if you prefer, please e-mail me at HHBASEHART@SSU.EDU. My phone number is 410-543-6242. Thanks.

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

>From Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU Wed May 5 09:39:47 1999
And now for the latest in online polling...

Mister Poll:

http://www.misterpoll.com/

Fred Solop, Director
Social Research Laboratory
PO Box 15301
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
(520) 523-3135 -- phone
(520) 523-6777 -- fax

>From M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com Wed May 5 10:01:01 1999

Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id KAA26844 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 May 1999 10:00:59 -0700
    (PDT)

Received: from SRBI_NEW_YORK-Message_Server by srbi.com
    with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 05 May 1999 12:56:53 -0400

Message-Id: <s7304015.065@srbi.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Wed, 05 May 1999 12:59:02 -0400

From: "MARK SCHULMAN " <M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Mister Poll

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

At least Mr. Poll discloses that his online polling is for "entertainment = purposes only." This puts Mr. Poll a step ahead of some other folks.

Mark Schulman

>>> Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU> 05/05/99 12:41PM >>>

And now for the latest in online polling...

Mister Poll:
http://www.misterpoll.com/=20
Fred Solop, Director
Social Research Laboratory
PO Box 15301
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ  86011
(520) 523-3135 -- phone
(520) 523-6777 -- fax

>From Mark@bisconti.com Wed May  5 10:20:24 1999
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA04357 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 May 1999 10:20:19 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org  (Content
Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000550635@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 05 May 1999 13:19:51 -0400
Received: from MARK-BRI ([10.2.0.181]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP
(Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)
    id JYDXFVXL; Wed, 5 May 1999 13:20:42 -0400
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
    id <01BE96F8.74823A20@mark-bri>; Wed, 5 May 1999 13:09:06 -0400
Message-Id: <01BE96F8.74823A20@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Phony Fax Poll
Date: Wed, 5 May 1999 13:09:05 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Maybe WAPOR/AAPOR should each issue a yearly Top-10 "PHONY," "SHAM," or == ??
POLL AWARD (along the lines of the misleading/false claims in == advertising
awards). Show phony results next to representative data. == Press
conference/news release would prompt a bunch of news and magazine ==
articles-a "fun" informational tool. Not sure about legal == implications...
Mark Richards
Objective:
Design and conduct research and strategic plans for the creation of targeted messages and communication campaigns for the benefit of advertising and public relations clients.

Work Experience:
1999 - September 1992
Sherrod/Knause Consulting
1600 W. Plum #20A
Fort Collins, CO 80521-3434
Planned and conducted research projects and communication campaigns while attending graduate school. Designed measurement instruments to evaluate the adoption of new behaviors and communication campaign effectiveness. Demonstrated how normative data can be used to guide the design of management actions and strategic messages. Addressed psychological and behavioral measurement issues before designing quantitative mail surveys to address research questions and determine audience segmentation strategy. Planned and conducted statistical analysis strategies using univariate and multivariate techniques in project reporting with the SPSS statistical analysis package. Planned and conducted Powerpoint presentations to explain
causal relationships and statistical findings to technical and lay audiences. Conducted elicitation studies regarding behaviors and intentions for using qualitative interviews and reporting methods.

September 1992 - November 1985
State of New Hampshire
Fish and Game Department
2 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03301
Program Planner III; Information & Education Division Chief; Public Information Officer

Planned, developed and implemented statewide communication campaigns and educational exhibits to address routine and controversial issues regarding natural resource issues. Managed budgets in excess of $450,000 and a professional staff varying from 7 to 12 people. Planned and supervised the production of over 200 agency publications such as brochures, curriculum guides, newspapers, etc. Created and managed advocacy newsletter.

Education:
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80521
Ph.D., Human Dimensions
Focus on statistical methods and techniques for survey research May 1999,
GPA: 3.66/ 4.0

Emerson College
Boston, MA 02116-1596
Master of Arts, Communication Studies- Marketing
Focus on integrated marketing techniques
June 1994, GPA: 3.7/4.0

Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, MI 48197
Bachelor of Science, Radio, TV and Film/Journalism
June 1982, GPA: 3.46/4.0

Other Training Courses:
1992 -- DBase, Franklin Pierce College, Rindge, New Hampshire
1992 -- Performance Management and Appraisal, Administrative Services, State of NH
1990 -- Understanding and Valuing Differences, Administrative Services,
State of NH 1990 -- Interaction Management, Administrative Services, State
of NH 1990 -- Personnel Appeals Workshop, Administrative Services, State of NH

Computer Skills:
Microsoft Word 97, 6.0
SPSS 8.3, 6.1
Powerpoint 4.0
Excel 5.0
Project Manager
WordPerfect 6.1
Windows 98, 95, 3.1

Memberships:
National Communication Association
Western Communication Association (pending)
Society for the Study of Psychological Issues
An idea prompted by Jan Werner's message re the phoney fax poll:

Suppose there was a web site or a listserv which regularly reported on the
inadequacies or misleading nature of polls such as these? Such a site could list an offending poll and point out it's lack of representativeness, its use of leading questions and the like. I know that some of you will raise questions about legal challenges to the information provided but I think that can be easily handled by sticking to high standards of evaluation such as those enunciated by AAPOR and WAPOR. The medical field does this all the time. The sampling issue along with question wording seem paramount.

My expectation is that most newspapers will tap into the information provided and include it on a regular basis as a service to their readers. An extra benefit would be the positive publicity for AAPOR along with a furtherance in understanding on the part of the public (and some journalists) about what constitutes valid, reliable survey research.

Make any sense?

Dick Halpern
representativeness, its use of leading questions and the like. I know that some of you will raise questions about legal challenges to the information provided but I think that can be easily handled by sticking to high standards of evaluation such as those enunciated by AAPOR and WAPOR. The medical field does this all the time. The sampling issue along with question wording seem paramount. My expectation is that most newspapers will tap into the information provided and include it on a regular basis as a service to their readers. An extra benefit would be the positive publicity for AAPOR along with a furtherance in understanding on the part of the public (and some journalists) about what constitutes valid, reliable survey research. Make any sense? Dick Halpern

--=-=-=-=-=--=_10413371==_._ALT--

>From surveys@wco.com Wed May 5 14:07:06 1999

Received: from smtp1.ncal.verio.com (smtp1.ncal.verio.com [204.247.247.82])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA08647 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 May 1999 14:07:01 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from compaq (as56-131.okldca.pacific.verio.net [207.20.234.131])
    by smtp1.ncal.verio.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id OAA20104
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 May 1999 14:06:59 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <009c01be973b$4f90b1e0$2ecbfea9@compaq>
From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <01BE96F8.74823A20@mark-bri>
Subject: Re: Phony Fax Poll
Date: Wed, 5 May 1999 13:47:35 -0700
> Maybe WAPOR/AAPOR should each issue a yearly Top-10 "PHONY," "SHAM,"
> or ??
POLL AWARD (along the lines of the misleading/false claims in advertising
awards). Show phony results next to representative data. Press
conference/news release would prompt a bunch of news and magazine articles-a
"fun" informational tool. Not sure about legal implications... Mark
Richards
>

Sounds like a great idea to me.

Hank Zucker
Creative Research Systems
makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
http://www.surveysystem.com hzucker@usa.net

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Thu May 6 08:16:38 1999
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA13763 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 May 1999 08:16:36 -0700
While I don't know anything about the possible legal ramifications of such an endeavor I do think that as an educational tool it would be very useful. I know that I have sent numerous reporters and others to the AAPOR site for information on 'push-polling' and the like and would love to be able to do the same for other sham polls.

--
Leo G. Simonetta http://www.artsci.com

Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

-----Original Message-----
From: dick halpern [mailto:rshalpern@mindspring.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 05, 1999 2:42 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Phony Fax Poll
An idea prompted by Jan Werner's message re the phoney fax poll:

Suppose there was a web site or a listserv which regularly reported on the inadequacies or misleading nature of polls such as these? Such a site could list an offending poll and point out it's lack of representativeness, its use of leading questions and the like. I know that some of you will raise questions about legal challenges to the information provided but I think that can be easily handled by sticking to high standards of evaluation such as those enunciated by AAPOR and WAPOR. The medical field does this all the time. The sampling issue along with question wording seem paramount.

My expectation is that most newspapers will tap into the information provided and include it on a regular basis as a service to their readers. An extra benefit would be the positive publicity for AAPOR along with a furtherance in understanding on the part of the public (and some journalists) about what constitutes valid, reliable survey research.

Make any sense?

Dick Halpern

>From thomas_s_mayer@ccMail.Census.GOV Fri May  7 07:28:11 1999
Received: from info.census.gov (info.census.gov [148.129.129.10])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA22375 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 May 1999 07:28:10 -0700 (PDT)
From: thomas_s_mayer@ccMail.Census.GOV
Does anyone know of any research that has been done to assess the effects of interviewer reward structures (e.g., pay, incentives, etc.) to improve interviewer performance, especially response rates?

If anyone else in interested in the same topic, let me know and I will be happy to share and/or discuss the information I receive.

Thanks,

Tom Mayer
Research Psychologist
U.S. Bureau of the Census
Thomas_S_Mayer@ccmail.census.gov

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Fri May 7 08:04:13 1999
Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.214.33])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA00414 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 May 1999 08:04:12 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from pjl1.sbs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.67])
    by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id LAA04148
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 May 1999 11:04:10 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19990507150425.00b8f5b0@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Fri, 07 May 1999 11:04:25 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: AAPOR papers to chairs and discussants

If you are presenting a paper at AAPOR '99 and have not done so already,
please send your paper to your session discussant and chair TODAY!!!

If you cannot do this, please have the courtesy to contact these people and
let them know WHEN you will do this.
Thanks.

Prof. Paul J. Lavrakas <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
1999 AAPOR Conference Committee Chair

>From ellins@temss2.isr.temple.edu Fri May  7 09:36:00 1999
Received: from temss2.isr.temple.edu (temss2.isr.temple.edu [155.247.33.10])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA23876 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 May 1999 09:35:59 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from ellins=localhost) by temss2.isr.temple.edu (8.7.4/8.7.3) id
MAA10645; Fri, 7 May 1999 12:43:17 -0400 (EDT)
From: Ellin Spector <ellins@temss2.isr.temple.edu>
Message-Id: <199905071643.MAA10645@temss2.isr.temple.edu>
Subject: Re: Interviewer incentives
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Fri, 7 May 1999 12:43:17 -0400 (EDT)
Cc: ellins@temss2.isr.temple.edu (Ellin Spector)
In-Reply-To: <9905079260.AA926087423@smtp-gw1.census.gov> from
"thomas_s_mayer@ccMail.Census.GOV" at May 7, 99 10:25:57 am
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL22]
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello Tom-
I'm very interested in this topic. Please share any information you receive. I'm sorry that I don't have any to offer you.

Thanks,

Ellin Spector
Institute for Survey Research
Temple University

Does anyone know of any research that has been done to assess the effects of interviewer reward structures (e.g., pay, incentives, etc.) to improve interviewer performance, especially response rates? If anyone else is interested in the same topic, let me know and I will be happy to share and/or discuss the information I receive.

Thanks,

Tom Mayer
Research Psychologist
U.S. Bureau of the Census
Thomas_S_Mayer@ccmail.census.gov
The New York Times is looking for a survey manager to work in the News Surveys department. This is a full-time contract position available immediately to oversee the interviewing operations for The New York Times and CBS News and assist the survey editors at The New York Times. The contract is for a year at a time at a competitive salary, but offers no health or other benefits.
Responsibilities include:

Management of the survey field operations including recruiting and scheduling interviewers and coordinating the field supervisory staff

Upkeep and control of all paperwork dealing with the interviewing staff, including payroll, productivity records and interviewer evaluations

Maintenance of computer and paper files for the News Surveys department

The polling department at The New York Times is a demanding environment with strict deadlines. Candidates should be highly motivated and flexible. He or she should be comfortable working with people and working with numbers. Computer literacy and working knowledge of at least one spreadsheet and word processing program are essential. An interest in politics and public affairs is a plus.

Applicants should send a letter with resume by mail, fax or e-mail to:

Marjorie Connelly
The New York Times
229 West 43rd Street
New York, New York 10036
connelly@nytimes.com
Fax: (212) 556-5816

I will be attending the AAPOR conference in St. Petersburg next week. Please feel free to contact me at the Tradewinds if you or someone you know might
be interested in this position.

>From steenb@fleishman.com Fri May  7 11:56:52 1999

Received: from mail.fleishman.com (mail.fleish.com [207.193.111.249])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA22213 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 May 1999 11:56:51 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from imcstlsrv02.fleishman.com (207.193.111.4 [207.193.111.4]) by
mail.fleishman.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service
Version 5.5.2448.0)
    id K31QZX1S; Fri, 7 May 1999 14:06:14 -0500

Received: by IMCSTLSRV02 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <KGNQ4M24>; Fri, 7 May 1999 13:55:40 -0500

Message-ID: <951B30EE47A7D2118D4000C9EA3573DC9322@STLEXGSRV01>

From: "Steen, Bob" <steenb@fleishman.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Job Opening at The New York Times Poll
Date: Fri, 7 May 1999 13:55:28 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

-----Original Message-----

From: Marjorie Connelly [mailto:connelly@nytimes.com]
Sent: Friday, May 07, 1999 9:46 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Job Opening at The New York Times Poll
The New York Times is looking for a survey manager to work in the News Surveys department. This is a full-time contract position available immediately to oversee the interviewing operations for The New York Times and CBS News and assist the survey editors at The New York Times. The contract is for a year at a time at a competitive salary, but offers no health or other benefits.

Responsibilities include:
- Management of the survey field operations including recruiting and scheduling interviewers and coordinating the field supervisory staff
- Upkeep and control of all paperwork dealing with the interviewing staff, including payroll, productivity records and interviewer evaluations
- Maintenance of computer and paper files for the News Surveys department

The polling department at The New York Times is a demanding environment with strict deadlines. Candidates should be highly motivated and flexible. He or she should be comfortable working with people and working with numbers. Computer literacy and working knowledge of at least one spreadsheet and word processing program are essential. An interest in politics and public affairs is a plus.

Applicants should send a letter with resume by mail, fax or e-mail to:

Marjorie Connelly
I will be attending the AAPOR conference in St. Petersburg next week. Please feel free to contact me at the Tradewinds if you or someone you know might be interested in this position.

>From GMooney@mathematica-mpr.com Fri May 7 14:16:14 1999
Received: from relay5.smtp.psi.net (relay5.smtp.psi.net [38.9.28.2])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA02072 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 May 1999 14:16:02 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from [38.233.146.17] (helo=mpr5.MATHINC)
    by relay5.smtp.psi.net with smtp (Exim 1.90 #1)
    for aapornet@usc.edu
    id 10fr UIL-0002Gj-00; Fri, 7 May 1999 17:13:23 -0400
Received: by mpr5.MATHINC with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63)
    id <01BE987C.87ACAD80@mpr5.MATHINC>; Fri, 7 May 1999 11:27:03 -0400
Message-ID: <c=US;a=_%p=MATHINC%l=MPR5-9905071526592-48154@mpr5.MATHINC>
From: Geraldine Mooney <GMooney@mathematica-mpr.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Position Openings at Mathematica Policy Research
Date: Fri, 7 May 1999 11:26:59 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (www.mathematica-mpr.com), a leading employee-owned survey research organization, has positions available in its Princeton, NJ and Washington, DC offices for survey researchers and survey specialists. Mathematica’s survey group is growing rapidly, and we are looking for survey professionals who want to work in a challenging and stimulating environment.

Applicants for the survey researcher positions must have:
>* Senior-level experience designing and directing complex survey research projects in support of public policy research studies.
>* At least five years of senior-level experience.
>* An advanced degree in the social sciences, statistics, or a related field,
>* or an equivalent combination of education and experience.
>* Extensive knowledge of survey research methods.
>* Strong management and business development skills.
>* Excellent written and oral communication skills.

The survey specialist positions require:
* An advanced degree.
* At least one year of relevant experience.
* Strong communication skills, solid analytic ability, and interest in managing surveys.

This is an opportunity to develop your survey research skills in an applied setting.
We offer a competitive salary and benefits package.

At the AAPOR Conference contact Geri Mooney or Anne Ciemnecki. Leave messages for Geri Mooney at 363-7421 (until 5 pm) and messages for Anne Ciemnecki at the conference hotel. Otherwise, contact:

> Esther Siach-Bar
> MPR
> P.O. Box 2393
> Princeton, NJ 08543
> 609-937-2767
> Fax: 609-799-0005
> E-mail: ESiach-Bar@mathematica-mpr.com
> Visit our website at www.mathematica-mpr.com
>

>From market.probe.la@juno.com Fri May  7 14:54:14 1999
Received: from m4.boston.juno.com (m4.boston.juno.com [205.231.101.198])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/uscd) with ESMTP
    id OAA13343 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 7 May 1999 14:54:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from market.probe.la@juno.com)
    by m4.boston.juno.com (queuemid) id D92Z62S5; Fri, 07 May 1999 17:52:57
EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: market.probe.la@juno.com
Date: Fri, 7 May 1999 14:45:38 -0700
Subject: Re: Phony Fax Poll
Message-ID: <19990507.145128.-258721.3.Market.Probe.LA@juno.com>
X-Mailer: Juno 2.0.11
Sounds like a great idea!

On Wed, 05 May 1999 14:42:02 -0400 dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com> writes:

> An idea prompted by Jan Werner's message re the phoney fax poll:
>
> Suppose there was a web site or a listserv which regularly reported on
> the
> inadequacies or misleading nature of polls such as these? Such a site
> could
> list an offending poll and point out it's lack of representativeness,
> its
> use of leading questions and the like. I know that some of you will
> raise
> questions about legal challenges to the information provided but I
> think
> that can be easily handled by sticking to high standards of evaluation
> such
as those enunciated by AAPOR and WAPOR. The medical field does this all the time. The sampling issue along with question wording seem paramount.

My expectation is that most newspapers will tap into the information provided and include it on a regular basis as a service to their readers.

An extra benefit would be the positive publicity for AAPOR along with a furtherance in understanding on the part of the public (and some journalists) about what constitutes valid, reliable survey research.

Make any sense?

Dick Halpern

From kagay@nytimes.com Sun May 9 10:35:22 1999
Received: from gatekeeper.nytimes.com (gatekeeper.nytimes.com [199.181.175.201]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id KAA10533 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 May 1999 10:35:20 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mailgate.nytimes.com (mailgate.nytimes.com [170.149.200.253]) by gatekeeper.nytimes.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id NAA20690; Sun, 9 May 1999 13:30:55 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from mail.nytimes.com ([170.149.211.68])
Greetings and all best wishes.

I am happy to announce the winners of the recent AAPOR elections:

Vice-President & President-Elect -- Murray Edelman

Associate Secretary-Treasurer -- Lawrence Bobo

Councillor-at-Large -- Don A. Dillman

Associate Conference Chair -- Peter V. Miller

Associate Standards Chair -- Janice Ballou

Associate Chair, Membership and
Chapter Relations -- Mickey Blum

Associate Chair, Publications and Information -- David Moore

Congratulations to all of the above !!

And our warm thanks to the other nominees who offered their service to the association.

Past President Jim Beniger chaired the nominations committee this year. Many thanks, Jim, to you and your committee for proposing such strong and attractive candidates for the Executive Council's consideration.

And kudos to all AAPORites who voted.

See you in St. Petersburg Beach!

Cheers, - Mike Kagay

>From wpeng@ccms.ntu.edu.tw Mon May 10 00:00:30 1999
Received: from ccms.ntu.edu.tw (root@ccms.ntu.edu.tw [140.112.2.3])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id AAA02259 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 May 1999 00:00:17 -0700
(PDT)
Has anyone ever conducted research on the effects of internet surveys? (e.g., validity, statistics, weaknesses and especially solutions, etc.)

If another person is interested in this topic, please let me know and I will be happy to share and/or discuss the information I receive.

Thank you so much!

Dennis Peng (wpeng@ccms.ntu.edu.tw)
Associate Professor
Does anyone know of any research that has been done to assess the effects of interviewer reward structures (e.g., pay, incentives, etc.) to improve interviewer performance, especially response rates?

If anyone else in interested in the same topic, let me know and I will be happy to share and/or discuss the information I receive.

Thanks,

Tom Mayer
Research Psychologist
U.S. Bureau of the Census
Thomas_S_Mayer@ccmail.census.gov
There have been a few articles in The Polling Report recently, 202-237-2000, P.O. Box 42580, Washington, DC 20015-2580. - Marc Zwelling/Vector Research + Development/http://www3.sympatico.ca/vector

Weng Jeng Peng wrote:

>  
> Does anyone know of any research that has been done to assess the
effects of internet survey (e.g., validity, statistics,
weaknesses and especially solutions, ..etc.)

If anyone else is interested in the same topic, let me know and I will be happy to share and/or discuss the information I receive.

Thank you so much!

Dennis Peng (wpeng@ccms.ntu.edu.tw)
Associate Professor
School of Journalism
Taiwan University

Subject: No subject given
Date: Fri, 07 May 1999 10:25:57 -0500
From: thomas_s_mayer@ccMail.Census.GOV
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Does anyone know of any research that has been done to assess the effects of interviewer reward structures (e.g., pay, incentives, etc.) to improve interviewer performance, especially response rates?

If anyone else is interested in the same topic, let me know and I
I hate to bother the whole list with this but . . .
There have been a few articles in The Polling Report recently, 202-237-2000, P.O. Box 42580, Washington, DC 20015-2580.

I think that I used to have their URL address but I seem to have mislaid it. Could anyone direct me to their site?

--
Leo G. Simonetta simonetta@artsci.com
Art & Science Group, http://www.artsci.com
190 W. Ostend St. #216
Baltimore MD 21230 (410) 962-1300 X 14

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon May 10 12:33:56 1999
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 MAA00539 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 May 1999 12:33:53 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id MAA28423 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 May 1999 12:33:23 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Mon, 10 May 1999 12:33:23 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: CORRECTION: Finding The Polling Report
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9905101230060.26709-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Leo usefully raises a general question. Whenever I have a proper name or other identifying phrase, sans URL, I merely place that name or phrase, inside of quotation marks when it is more than a single word, into a search engine.

When I put "Polling Report" into the search engine at hotbot.com, for example, I immediately received a hot link to the Polling Report home page. Clicking on this hot link immediately put me at the links for the articles Leo mentions.

Proceeding in this way is usually *faster*--often much faster--than actually having a site's URL; often it is faster even than having previously bookmarked the site (all one needs to do is remember "hotbot.com" or, for most recent browsers, "hotbot").

Try it and see what you think.

-- Jim

*****

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

Date: Mon, 10 May 1999 13:45:26 -0400
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: The Polling Report
I hate to bother the whole list with this but . . .

> There have been a few articles in The Polling Report recently,
> 202-237-2000, P.O. Box 42580, Washington, DC 20015-2580.

I think that I used to have their URL address but I seem to have mislaid it.
Could anyone direct me to their site?

--
Leo G. Simonetta  simonetta@artsci.com
Art & Science Group,  http://www.artsci.com
190 W. Ostend St. #216
Baltimore MD 21230  (410) 962-1300 X 14

> From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon May 10 12:37:04 1999
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 MAA02937 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 May 1999 12:37:02 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
      id MAA20262 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 May 1999 12:12:49 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Mon, 10 May 1999 12:12:49 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Finding The Polling Report
Leo usefully raises a general question. Whenever I have a proper name or other identifying phrase, sans URL, I merely place that name or phrase, inside of quotation marks when it is more than a single word, into a search engine.

When I put "Polling Report" into the search engine at infobot.com, for example, I immediately received a hot link to the Polling Report home page. Clicking on this hot link immediately put me at the links for the articles Leo mentions.

Proceeding in this way is usually *faster*--often much faster--than actually having a site's URL; often it is faster even than having previously bookmarked the site (all one needs to do is remember "infobot.com" or, for most recent browsers, "infobot").

Try it and see what you think.

-- Jim

******

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

Date: Mon, 10 May 1999 13:45:26 -0400
I hate to bother the whole list with this but . . . .

> There have been a few articles in The Polling Report recently,
> 202-237-2000, P.O. Box 42580, Washington, DC 20015-2580.

I think that I used to have their URL address but I seem to have mislaid it. Could anyone direct me to their site?

--
Leo G. Simonetta  simonetta@artsci.com
Art & Science Group,  http://www.artsci.com
190 W. Ostend St. #216
Baltimore MD 21230  (410) 962-1300 X 14

>From pbeaty@umich.edu Mon May 10 21:08:51 1999
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 VAA19613 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 May 1999 21:08:45 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from battlezone.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@battlezone.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.96])
   by berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id AAA11187; Tue, 11 May 1999 00:04:37 -0400 (EDT)
This message is for AAPOR Conference attendees who would like to purchase additional meal tickets. If you are staying at the Tradewinds in St. Pete's Beach, you automatically purchased a meal package along with your room. However, if you are staying elsewhere or would like additional meal tickets for any reason, please read the following.
Meal tickets will tentatively be for sale at the following times:

Thursday, 1-4 PM-- tickets for Friday, Saturday, and Sunday meals. Friday,
9-11 AM-- tickets for Friday dinner, and Saturday and
Sunday meals
Saturday, 9-11 AM-- tickets for Saturday dinner and Sunday meals only.

The meal tickets will be sold at a location to be announced at the
Tradewinds. Additional details and meal prices will be available when you
pick up your conference registration materials.

Note that you must buy tickets at least a *half-day prior* to the meals you
plan to attend. This is so that the Tradewinds has sufficient time to
prepare the required number of meals.

Thanks for your cooperation-- see you in Florida!

Paul Beatty
Associate Chair, Conference Operations Committee

>From pbeatty@umich.edu Mon May 10 21:16:09 1999
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 VAA21829 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 May 1999 21:16:07 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from battlezone.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@battlezone.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.63.96])
   by berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id
Several AAPOR members have inquired about getting their Sunday lunch "to go", as this is the final meal at the conference.

There will be a signup sheet at the AAPOR registration desk for anyone who
would prefer a box lunch on Sunday. This sheet will be posted only until noon on Friday-- so make sure you sign up early.

If you opt for the box lunch, you will be able to pick it up on Sunday morning at a place to be announced.

Paul Beatty
Associate Chair, Conference Operations Committee

>From tsilver@CapAccess.org Tue May 11 14:48:28 1999
Received: from cap1.CapAccess.org (tsilver@cap1.CapAccess.org [151.200.199.10])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id OAA19521 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 May 1999 14:48:26 -0700 (PDT)
Received: (from tsilver@localhost) by cap1.CapAccess.org (8.6.8/8.6.10) id RAA21763; Tue, 11 May 1999 17:50:33 -0400
Date: Tue, 11 May 1999 17:50:33 -0400 (EDT)
From: Tom Silver <tsilver@CapAccess.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: The Polling Report
In-Reply-To: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA9182232@AS_SERVER>
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91-FP.990511174740.20967A-100000@cap1.capaccess.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
The Polling Report URL is: www.pollingreport.com

On Mon, 10 May 1999, Leo Simonetta wrote:

> I hate to bother the whole list with this but . . . .

> > There have been a few articles in The Polling Report recently,
> > 202-237-2000, P.O. Box 42580, Washington, DC 20015-2580.
>
> I think that I used to have their URL address but I seem to have
>mislaid it. Could anyone direct me to their site? From cporter@afn.org

> Tue May 11 16:52:02 1999
Received: from freenet4.afn.org ([128.227.163.6])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id QAA20101 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 May 1999 16:52:01 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from freenet2.afn.org (cporter@freenet2.afn.org [128.227.163.4])
    by freenet4.afn.org (8.9.1a/8.9.1/1.1.2) with SMTP id TAA29778;
    Tue, 11 May 1999 19:54:31 -0400
Date: Tue, 11 May 1999 19:51:58 -0400 (EDT)
From: Colleen Kay Porter <cporter@afn.org>
To: Paul Beatty <pbeatty@umich.edu>
cc: aapornet@usc.edu, Jim Rausch <jrausch@twresort.com>
Subject: Re: Meal tickets at this year's AAPOR conference
In-Reply-To:
<Message-ID: <Pine.A32.3.95.990511194820.17161B-100000@freenet2.afn.org> MIME-Version: 1.0>
Is there any way to call/fax down and order them with a credit card number, so that the Tradewinds has their fair warning, but those of us who weren't planning on getting in until after 4 p.m. Thursday can still do Friday lunch?

Personally, I have to work Thursday morning and I'm sure a few others are in the same boat....

Thanks,

Colleen Kay Porter
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

On Tue, 11 May 1999, Paul Beatty wrote:

>
> *******************************
> * A MESSAGE FROM THE *
> * CONFERENCE OPERATIONS COMMITTEE *
> *******************************
>
> [...] Meal tickets will tentatively be for sale at the following times:
> Thursday, 1-4 PM-- tickets for Friday, Saturday, and Sunday meals.
> Friday, 9-11 AM-- tickets for Friday dinner, and Saturday and
Sunday meals
Saturday, 9-11 AM-- tickets for Saturday dinner and Sunday meals only.

[...] Note that you must buy tickets at least a *half-day prior* to the meals you plan to attend. This is so that the Tradewinds has sufficient time to prepare the required number of meals.

If you are renting a car at the Tampa airport for the AAPOR '99 conference
and haven’t driven to the Tradewinds Hotel, here’s some advice from my drive on this route this morning.

1. Follow I-275 SOUTH as you exit from the airport. You stay on this for most of the way to the hotel.

2. Once you cross the causeway from Tampa over to St. Petersburg don’t get off at any of the St. Petersburg exits, just keep heading south on 275.

3. About 28 miles after leaving the airport, exit 275 SOUTH at the St. Petes Beach exit (Pinellas Bayway) which takes you west across to St. Petes Beach. Here you have to pay a $.50 toll.

4. When you get to the Bight Pink Don Caesar, turn north/right on the local road and travel 1 1/2 miles to the Tradewinds (it’s on your left). The entrance to the Tradewinds is at the intersection of 55th and the road you are on. (If you are hungry as you drive north, stop at La Casa de Pane (about 1 mile after the Don on the right side with a red and green banner) and get the best focalize you’ve ever eaten.)

There is valet or self parking. The self-parking is easy. Either way your car will get very, very hot during the daytime...

All in all, the trip is about 30 miles and should take about 35-40 minutes if you drive the speed limit and it’s not rush hour.

Safe traveling to all!!!

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
Professor Paul J. Lavrakas, Chair
I thought it is interesting to note that on Friday morning our local public radio station here in the midwest (Wisconsin) will be discussing legislation banning telemarketing during the "dinner hour." Is this a hint of things to come?

Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

Ben Merens in for Tom Clark

*People are tired of racing to the phone with a mouthful of spaghetti only
to find a telemarketer at the other end of the line. That's why BEN MERENS' guest after six is working on legislation to help make the dinner hour free from unsolicited calls. Spencer Black, Democratic State Representative from Madison

>From JHall@mathematica-mpr.com Fri May 14 05:45:32 1999
Received: from mpr5.MATHINC (MPR5.mathinc.com [38.233.146.17])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id FAA16577 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 May 1999 05:45:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by mpr5.MATHINC with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63)
    id <01BE9DE6.3B97DE00@mpr5.MATHINC>; Fri, 14 May 1999 08:46:18 -0400
Message-ID: <c=US%a=_%p=MATHINC%l=MPR5-990514124616Z-15726@mpr5.MATHINC>
From: John Hall <JHall@mathematica-mpr.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: AAPORNET digest 1090
Date: Fri, 14 May 1999 08:46:16 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63

Calling during dinner hour is not only inconsiderate, but doing so probably hurts response rates. However, there's a definitional problem. Perhaps others have an answer to this, but I don't know what the so called dinner hour is. I think the bounds are somewhere between 5PM and 10 PM local time. I also suspect that there is a good deal of variation within households.

John
John Hall
Senior Sampling Statistician
Mathematica Policy Research
AAPORNERT Digest 1090

Topics covered in this issue include:

1) Make the dinner hour sacred
   by Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu>

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Fri May 14 05:52:29 1999
Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.214.33])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id FAA18160 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 May 1999 05:52:21 -0700
   (PDT)
Calling during "the dinner hour" really is not an issue at all for "good" survey organizations. These groups have interviewers who are trained to be sensitive to the possibility that people may be engaged with a meal and readily offer to schedule a call-back. Furthermore, since the "dinner hour" spans several hours, even when contacting "traditional" households, it is impractical to cut out calling during this extended period.

At 08:46 AM 5/14/99 -0400, you wrote:
> Calling during dinner hour is not only inconsiderate, but doing so
> probably hurts response rates. However, this is a definitional
> problem. Perhaps others have an answer to this, but I don't know what
> the so called dinner hour is. I think the bounds are somewhere between
> 5PM and 10 PM local time. I also suspect that there is a good deal of
> variation within households. John
>John Hall
>Senior Sampling Statistician
>Mathematica Policy Research
>P.O. Box 2393
>Princeton, NJ 08543
>phone (609) 275-2357
>fax (609) 799-0005
>email jhall@mathematica-mpr.com
>
>** Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
>*
>* Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy & Management
>*
>* Director, OSU Center for Survey Research
>*
>* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences; Derby Hall, Room 3045
>*
>* 154 North Oval Mall, Ohio State University; Columbus OH 43210
>*
>* Voice: (614)-292-6672    Fax: (614)-292-6673    E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu
>*
>From ratledge@UDel.Edu Fri May 14 06:38:53 1999
I concur. This has rarely been a problem over the years. The consequences to response rates of ruling out that period would be catastrophic to response rates and would create a more severe selection bias problem. Better to spend the time on training and scripts to handle the problem when an if it occurs. Given the rarity of the problem, I would suggest that "the dinner hour" and in fact even the concept of dinner has much more variance today than we suppose.

>-----Original Message-----
>From: Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. [SMTP:lavrakas.1@osu.edu]
Calling during "the dinner hour" really is not an issue at all for "good" survey organizations. These groups have interviewers who are trained to be sensitive to the possibility that people may be engaged with a meal and readily offer to schedule a call-back. Furthermore, since the "dinner hour" spans several hours, even when contacting "traditional" households, it is impractical to cut out calling during this extended period.

At 08:46 AM 5/14/99 -0400, you wrote:

"Calling during dinner hour is not only inconsiderate, but doing so probably hurts response rates. However, this is a definitional problem. Perhaps others have an answer to this, but I don't know what the so called dinner hour is. I think the bounds are somewhere between 5PM and 10 PM local time. I also suspect that there is a good deal of variation within households. John

John Hall
Senior Sampling Statistician
Mathematica Policy Research
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543
phone (609) 275-2357
fax (609) 799-0005
email jhall@mathematica-mpr.com
Besides the probability that such a ban is an unconstitutional restraint of trade and free speech (I'll leave that to the lawyers), it would be totally unenforceable at the state level. Calls made from out of state simply would not and could not be banned, and the truth of the matter is that the vast majority of calls are not in-state calls. Only in-state businesses would be hurt, hardly a brilliant strategy.

I suggest they get on the radio and television and suggest any of the following:

1) don't answer the phone at dinner time
2) disconnect the phone at dinner time
3) purchase an answering machine and let it do the work
4) tell any marketer to call at dinner that you refuse, take you off the call list, AND that the reason you refuse is solely because of the
timing of the call

The technology exists to regulate what calls get through to you and which ones you will answer. But in the end, the telephone is like any other device such as radio or television or even your computer, if you don't like what's on it turn it off.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Robert Godfrey [SMTP:rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 1999 10:01 PM
To:   aapornet@usc.edu
Subject:    Make the dinner hour sacred

I thought it is interesting to note that on Friday morning our local public
radio station here in the midwest (Wisconsin) will be discussing
legislation banning telemarketing during the "dinner hour." Is this a hint
of things to come?

Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

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

Ben Merens in for Tom Clark
*People are tired of racing to the phone with a mouthful of spaghetti only to find a telemarketer at the other end of the line. That's why BEN MERENS' guest after six is working on legislation to help make the dinner hour free from unsolicited calls.

Spencer Black, Democratic State Representative from Madison

>From sgoold@unm.edu Fri May 14 08:39:30 1999
Received: from kitsune.swcp.com (swcp.com [198.59.115.2])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA23295 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 May 1999 08:39:28 -0700
  (PDT)
Received: from [204.134.5.97] (dpm1-44.swcp.com [204.134.5.45]) by
  kitsune.swcp.com (8.8.8/1.2.3) with SMTP id JAA28306 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
  Fri, 14 May 1999 09:39:27 -0600 (MDT)
Message-Id: <v02130502b3619662d99e@[204.134.5.97]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Fri, 14 May 1999 10:00:48 +0100
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: sgoold@unm.edu (Scott Goold)
Subject: RE: Make the dinner hour sacred

In defense of survey researchers trying only to gather a representative sample, when's the dinner hour?

> Besides the probability that such a ban is an unconstitutional restraint of trade and free speech (I'll leave that to the lawyers), it would be totally unenforceable at the state level. Calls made from out of state simply would not and could not be banned, and the truth of the
mater is that the vast majority of calls are not in-state calls. Only
in-state businesses would be hurt, hardly a brilliant strategy.

I suggest they get on the radio and television and suggest any of the
following:

1) don't answer the phone at dinner time
2) disconnect the phone at dinner time
3) purchase an answering machine and let it do the work
4) tell any marketer to call at dinner that you refuse, take you
off the cal list, AND that the reason you refuse is solely because of
the timing of the call

The technology exists to regulate what calls get through to you and
which ones you will answer. But in the end, the telephone is like any
other device such as radio or television or even your computer, if you
don't like what's on it turn it off.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Robert Godfrey [SMTP:rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 1999 10:01 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Make the dinner hour sacred

I thought it is interesting to note that on Friday morning our local
radio station here in the midwest (Wisconsin) will be discussing legislation banning telemarketing during the "dinner hour." Is this a hint of things to come?

Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

Ben Merens in for Tom Clark
*People are tired of racing to the phone with a mouthful of spaghetti only to find a telemarketer at the other end of the line. That's why BEN MERENS' guest after six is working on legislation to help make the dinner hour free from unsolicited calls.

Spencer Black, Democratic State Representative from Madison

--=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-

Scott Goold, Ph.D.*
University of New Mexico
505.293.2504
Web page @ < www.unm.edu/~sgoold >

"I Can't Accept Not Trying"

--=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-
That sounds to me like a good survey research question. Anyone want to set up a design where we randomly call between 5 p.m. and 11 p.m. to ask if they are eating dinner when we call?
At 10:00 AM 5/14/99 +0100, you wrote:

> In defense of survey researchers trying only to gather a representative sample, when's the dinner hour?

>

\|//

(@ @)

=================================w==V==w==================================

Alan E. Bayer, Director e-mail: yogi@vt.edu

Center for Survey Research phone: (540)231-3676

207 W. Roanoke St. fax: (540)231-3678

Virginia Tech

Blacksburg, VA 24061-0543 USA


=================================w==V==w==================================

=================================w==V==w==================================

>From cporter@afn.org Sun May 16 16:22:10 1999

Received: from freenet4.afn.org (freenet4.afn.org [128.227.163.6])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id QAA29767 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 16 May 1999 16:22:09 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from freenet2.afn.org (cporter@freenet2.afn.org [128.227.163.4])
On Fri, 14 May 1999, Alan Bayer wrote:

> That sounds to me like a good survey research question. Anyone want
> to set up a design where we randomly call between 5 p.m. and 11 p.m.
> to ask if they are eating dinner when we call?

But be careful about the question wording, because some folks consider that evening meal to be "supper," with "dinner" being served around noon :)

Seriously, who eats dinner/supper at the same time every night anymore? Our family is so nuclear we radiate, but between play practice and driver's ed and late business meetings and early PTA meetings, we're lucky to eat at all, let alone the same "sacred hour" every night.

Colleen Kay Porter
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study
This evening's 60 Minutes presentation on war crimes in Kosovo, by Christianne Amanpour, raises a rather obvious question:

What polling is being done by what agencies in the refugee camps, asking carefully selected samples of respondents such questions as (a) what precipitated their departure, (b) whether they observed specific war crimes at first hand, (c) whether they had specific knowledge of damage and/or casualties from NATO bombing, (d) whether they have relatives in the KLA and (e) what their relationships with Serbians in Kosovo had been before
the Serbian onslaught that began this winter.

There are many more such questions. It seems that with the barrage of claims and counterclaims from both sides, all getting much attention in the media, professional survey research agencies have an unusual opportunity to get some unbiased data on the refugee experience.

Are such surveys being conducted? Are they accessible on the web?

Phil Tichenor
I am not sure about this particular sample, but I do know from a colleague who used to work for Radio Free Europe before the Berlin Wall fell that refugees used to be a source of information about closed societies. One can imagine, of course, the problems of reliability that these surveys encountered, but apparently the practice is not new.

Frank Rusciano
Political Science Dept.
Rider University

Phil Tichenor wrote:

> This evening’s 60 Minutes presentation on war crimes in Kosovo, by
> Christianne Amanpour, raises a rather obvious question:
> 
> What polling is being done by what agencies in the refugee camps,
> asking carefully selected samples of respondents such questions as (a)
> what precipitated their departure, (b) whether they observed specific
> war crimes at first hand, (c) whether they had specific knowledge of
> damage and/or casualties from NATO bombing, (d) whether they have
> relatives in the KLA and (e) what their relationships with Serbs in
Kosovo had been before the Serbian onslaught that began this winter.

There are many more such questions. It seems that with the barrage of claims and counterclaims from both sides, all getting much attention in the media, professional survey research agencies have an unusual opportunity to get some unbiased data on the refugee experience.

Are such surveys being conducted? Are they accessible on the web?

Phil Tichenor

>From rday@mcs.net Mon May 17 07:49:31 1999
Received: from Mailbox.mcs.net (Mailbox.mcs.com [192.160.127.87])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
       id HAA07993 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 May 1999 07:49:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from gopher (P33-Chi-Dial-9.pool.mcs.net [205.253.226.33]) by Mailbox.mcs.net (8.8.7/8.8.2) with SMTP id JAA16416 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
   Mon, 17 May 1999 09:49:24 -0500 (CDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990517094731.0074aa44@popmail.mcs.net>
X-Sender: rday@popmail.mcs.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.2 (32)
Date: Mon, 17 May 1999 09:47:31 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
Subject: Re: Make the dinner hour sacred
In-Reply-To: <v04011701b3615c8ea301@[128.104.49.222]>
References: <Pine.3.89.9904241339.D21732-0100000@unlinfo.unl.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
banning telemarketing from the dinner hour could be a good thing. The thing you should watch is the distinction between legitimate opinion and market research and telemarketing. That is the role of CMOR see their website. At 12:01 AM 5/14/99 -0500, you wrote:

>I thought it is interesting to note that on Friday morning our local public radio station here in the midwest (Wisconsin) will be discussing legislation banning telemarketing during the "dinner hour." Is this a hint of things to come?
>
>Robert Godfrey
>UW-Madison
>
>Ben Merens in for Tom Clark

>*People are tired of racing to the phone with a mouthful of spaghetti only to find a telemarketer at the other end of the line. That's why BEN MERENS' guest after six is working on legislation to help make the dinner hour free from unsolicited calls. Spencer Black, Democratic State Representative from Madison

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Mon May 17 08:21:57 1999
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.EDU [128.218.6.65])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
It is tempting to look at a ban on "evening meal" calling in a positive light (it's bad practice anyway, etc., etc.), but I think this is very dangerous ground for survey researchers. Remember, there are two parts of this proposal that need to be operationally defined. First, as has already been discussed fairly extensively, what exactly is the evening meal hour. This is probably too fuzzy to define, especially for a state legislature. Besides, if you set aside a certain hour, are you also compelling the people you are trying to protect to eat during that hour? The reasonable person would assume that most protectees will do no such thing. In which case, what's the point of the ban? If you set aside too much time you may end up practically banning evening calling.

The second thing to define is telemarketing. I'm afraid that the telephone public does not make this neat distinction between telemarketing and
legitimate marketing research. We have substantial minorities of potential respondents who refuse to participate in federally-funded academic research because they get too many solicitations (for their money AND for their time) over the telephone. Many keep asking what we are trying to sell, and apparently "nothing" is not a believable response. If telemarketing is defined narrowly, then I suspect the result will be many pitches preceded by a quick-and-dirty marketing survey. Maybe "many more" is a more accurate assessment. Circumventing the ban will cause people to clamor for a more wide-ranging definition of telemarketing and then we can really get into "deep do-do". Combine this with the problems of enforcing this against companies calling from outside the state or even the country (the lottery scams have been based in Canada), I think this has all the makings of a first class disaster.

I do not normally subscribe to "slippery slope" arguments, but I think this may well be a hint of trouble to come. Some things I think cannot be legislated and this is one of them. Regardless, I think AAPOR members should think long and hard about whether you want to be "on the record" endorsing this kind of proposal.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Day [SMTP:rday@mcs.net]
Sent: Monday, May 17, 1999 7:48 AM
To:   aapornet@usc.edu
Subject:  Re: Make the dinner hour sacred
banning telemarketing from the dinner hour could be a good thing. The thing you should watch is the distinction between legitimate opinion and market research and telemarketing. That is the role of CMOR see their website. At 12:01 AM 5/14/99 -0500, you wrote:

>I thought it is interesting to note that on Friday morning our local public radio station here in the midwest (Wisconsin) will be discussing legislation banning telemarketing during the "dinner hour." Is this a hint of things to come?

>Robert Godfrey

>UW-Madison

>Ben Merens in for Tom Clark

>*People are tired of racing to the phone with a mouthful of spaghetti only to find a telemarketer at the other end of the line. That's why BEN MERENS' guest after six is working on legislation to help make the dinner hour free from unsolicited calls.

>Spencer Black, Democratic State Representative from Madison

>
Date ................ Wednesday, 26 May 1999

Time ................ 4:00 p.m. sharp to 6:30 p.m. -- NOTE NEW TIME!

Place ............... CUNY Graduate Center/Room 1800
33 West 42nd Street (5th - 6th Ave.)

The AnswerTree: A Modern Look At Tree-Structured Classification
Tony Babinec, Director, Advanced Products Marketing at SPSS, Inc.

The AnswerTree is a new, powerful desktop program of four statistical
methods that provides tremendous analytical capability for discovering the value in your data. AnswerTree allows users to easily find respondent groups and segments, build profiles and identify critical factors that drive results.

In this workshop, Tony will review the basics of the AnswerTree software, including:

* Methods of tree-based classification (Chaid, CART, QUEST) with a conceptual road map for evaluating these and other alternatives.

* How AnswerTree can help you. An overview of current applications in business and academia and their potential benefits.

-- Specific applications that will be explored: survey research, data mining, medical risk assessment, customer profiling, and database marketing.

ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE PHONE RESERVATION ONLY.

So, reserve now! E-MAIL RONI ROSNER (RoniRosner@aol.com),
or call if you must (212/722-5333).

Return the form below with your cheque by Fri., 21 May. Pre-paid fees are on the return form below. Fees at the door are: $35 (members), $50 (nonmembers), $17 (student members), $25 (student nonmembers, HLMs). Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

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

I will attend the NYAAPOR afternoon workshop on Wed., 26 May 1999 with
_____ additional guests.

NAME: ________________________________

OFFICE PHONE: __________________________

HOME PHONE: ____________________________

AFFILIATION: ____________________________

GUEST'S NAME: __________________________

AFFILIATION: ____________________________

PREPAID FEES:

MEMBERS: $25 ___  NONMEMBERS: $40 ___  STUDENT
MEMBERS: $12 ___  STUDENT NONMEMBERS, HLMs: $20 ___

Send form and cheque payable to NYAAPOR by 21 May to:
Roni Rosner, 1235 Park Avenue, #7C, New York, New York 10128-1759

__________________________________________

SAVE THE DATE! TUES., 8 JUNE; NYAAPOR AWARDS EVE. MTG:

Kathy Frankovic, Morton David, Stuart Herman

>From mb@mori-usa.com Mon May 17 11:47:13 1999
Received: from dfw-ix12.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix12.ix.netcom.com
[206.214.98.12])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id LAA18224 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 May 1999 11:47:11 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from smap@localhost)
   by dfw-ix12.ix.netcom.com (8.8.4/8.8.4)
   id NAA29959 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 May 1999 13:46:10 -0500
(CDT)
Received: from pen-nj1-12.ix.netcom.com(205.184.179.44) by
Dear colleagues,

As I said on Saturday at the AAPOR banquet, the 1999 WAPOR Conference will be held in Paris over Labor Day weekend (Saturday 4 and Sunday 5 of September).

Please mark your calendars and drop a line to the WAPOR secretary (hjshealy@med.unc.edu) to know you are considering attending. In a few more days you will receive further details.
By the way, Continental Airlines and Air France crews will join us on the cruise (and reimburse their discounted fares), if WAPOR succeeds in getting the French government to sponsor it.

Au revoir. See you in Paris.

Dr. Miguel Basanez
WAPOR, President
Phone +1 (609) 818-1531
Fax +1 (609) 818-1529
e-mail: mb@mori-usa.com
Two years ago, we conducted two surveys, one nationally and the other in Georgia, asking respondents whether they should have the right to have their phone number removed from lists by telemarketers, charitable organizations, political pollsters or scientific survey researchers. A clear majority agreed that individuals should have that right, but they made a distinction between them with the largest agreement about telemarketers and least about the latter two categories. When asked would they pay $5 for such a service, only a minority indicated that they would and again the percentages declined as we moved down the list (in the order listed above). Interestingly, those most likely to exclude their numbers from scientific survey researchers also indicated they were least likely to participate in scientific surveys to begin with. The results were very similar in both the national and state surveys. We are presenting the results along with some estimates of bias that might occur in paper at the Nonresponse Conference in October. Legislation of this type is going to become more common. In Georgia, legitimate survey groups escaped being subject to these restrictions but more because of personal connections (not mine but other survey researchers) with some key legislators than the rationality of our arguments. Gary

Henry

>From surveys@wco.com Mon May 17 13:14:15 1999
> Some things I think cannot
> be legislated and this is one of them.

I agree with Lance on this one, but...

What can (and I think should) be legislated is that using the word "survey" in a sales call, or on the outside of a request for money, is a form of fraud. I would like to see AAPOR, CMOR and CASRO work to get such a law passed. For our long term health and survival we have to stop marketers from abusing what is left of the good name of the real opinion research industry. The only way to make this happen is to draw as sharp as possible
a distinction between research and sales in the public's minds. Each piece of mail people get saying "important survey" outside and "send money" inside hurts us. A truth-in-labeling law would help.

Hank Zucker
Creative Research Systems
makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
http://www.surveysystem.com hzucker@usa.net

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Monday, May 17, 1999 8:23 AM
Subject: RE: Make the dinner hour sacred

> It is tempting to look at a ban on "evening meal" calling in a
> positive light (it's bad practice anyway, etc., etc.), but I think
> this is very dangerous ground for survey researchers. Remember, there
> are two parts of this proposal that need to be operationally defined.
> First, as has already been discussed fairly extensively, what exactly
> is the evening meal hour. This is probably too fuzzy to define,
> especially for a state legislature. Besides, if you set aside a
> certain hour, are you also compelling the people you are trying to
> protect to eat during that hour? The reasonable person would assume
> that most protectees will do no such thing. In which case, what's the
> point of the ban? If you set aside too much time you may end up
practically banning evening calling.

The second thing to define is telemarketing. I'm afraid that the telephone public does not make this neat distinction between telemarketing and legitimate marketing research. We have substantial minorities of potential respondents who refuse to participate in federally-funded academic research because they get too many solicitations (for their money AND for their time) over the telephone. Many keep asking what we are trying to sell, and apparently "nothing" is not a believable response. If telemarketing is defined narrowly, then I suspect the result will be many pitches preceded by a quick-and-dirty marketing survey. Maybe "many more" is a more accurate assessment. Circumventing the ban will cause people to clamor for a more wide-ranging definition of telemarketing and then we can really get into "deep do-do". Combine this with the problems of enforcing this against companies calling from outside the state or even the country (the lottery scams have been based in Canada), I think this has all the makings of a first class disaster.

I do not normally subscribe to "slippery slope" arguments, but I think this may well be a hint of trouble to come. Some things I think cannot be legislated and this is one of them. Regardless, I think AAPOR members should think long and hard about whether you want to be "on the record" endorsing this kind of proposal.

Lance M. Pollack
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu
banning telemarketing from the dinner hour could be a good thing. The thing you should watch is the distinction between legitimate opinion and market research and telemarketing. That is the role of CMOR see their website. At 12:01 AM 5/14/99 -0500, you wrote:

> I thought it is interesting to note that on Friday morning our local public radio station here in the midwest (Wisconsin) will be discussing legislation banning telemarketing during the "dinner hour." Is this a hint of things to come?

> Robert Godfrey
> UW-Madison

> People are tired of racing to the phone with a mouthful of spaghetti
only to find a telemarketer at the other end of the line.

That's why BEN MERENS' guest after six is working on legislation to help make the dinner hour free from unsolicited calls.

Spencer Black, Democratic State Representative from Madison

From rhickson@monmouth.com Mon May 17 14:10:52 1999
Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA15246 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 May 1999 14:10:49 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from rachel (tr-ppp32.monmouth.com [209.191.24.64])
    by shell.monmouth.com (8.9.0/8.9.0) with SMTP id RAA00688
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 May 1999 17:09:55 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <374086DF.1129@monmouth.com>
Date: Mon, 17 May 1999 17:15:11 -0400
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Polling in Kosovo
References: <iss.189b.373f5f9c.4c0a3.1@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
A man arrived Sunday morning at the AAPOR conference (not wearing his name tag, and I don't know his name) having arrived from training Kosovars to interview those in the refugee camps.

Did anyone meet him Sunday who can elaborate?

Rachel Hickson

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon May 17 14:12:40 1999
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 OAA16457 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 May 1999 14:12:40 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id OAA16676 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 May 1999 14:12:10 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Mon, 17 May 1999 14:12:09 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: For Researchers, Good News and Bad
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9905171410080.7087-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
May 17, 1999

U.S. to Offer Search Service That Links Its Online Sites

By JERI CLAUISING

The Federal Government plans to put a World Wide Web service into operation Monday that is designed as a quick and easy way to find Government documents and resources online. But the service will not be free, stirring criticism that the Clinton Administration has forgotten its promise to make the Internet and Government data more accessible to everyone.

The new service, usgovsearch.com, will link together thousands of previously discrete Federal Web sites and provide cross-references for more than 3.8 million individual Government and military Web pages. For the first time, it will be possible to perform searches for topics as general as "missile technology" or "judicial branch" and compile results from any or all of
the discrete data bases.

The intended benefits include a new, easier way to search through the voluminous materials in the Commerce Department's National Technical Information Service, a trove that is generally considered one of the world's most valuable collections of scientific, engineering, technical and business reports.

Until now, individual Federal Web sites have been freely accessible. That will not change. But people reaching and using those sites via the new search service will need to pay a $30 monthly subscription fee or $15 for a one-day pass. And those amounts do not include any additional fees -- with or without the new service -- that the Government charges for some documents.

But Gary Bachula, Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology, defended the fees for use of usgovsearch.com as necessary to insure that the service pays for itself. "Govsearch is a breakthrough in the reinvention of government that Vice President Gore is continually trying to achieve," Bachula said.

As to criticism that the Government is charging new fees for access to documents that already
have been assembled at the taxpayers' expense, he noted that any material that is currently free on individual Web sites will continue to be so.

"People still have the choice to get the information without this service," Bachula said.

"But we believe a number of professionals, individuals, librarians, are going to find this to be invaluable. It helps you find what you need for a fee that's fair."

Still, some public advocacy groups, who contend that even many existing fees for Government documents are too high, say that the Administration's information policy is heading in the wrong direction.

"Does this mean Government is moving increasingly to a model of a pay service on the Internet for Government documents?" asked Gary Ruskin of the Congressional Accountability Project. The nonprofit group has been pushing to make court decisions and working drafts of Government documents like legislative amendments available more quickly and freely online so that the public can be more informed about the government process.

"You hear Clinton and Gore speechify until the
cows come home about the Internet," Ruskin said. "But they do almost nothing to harness the Internet to serve democracy and help ordinary citizens to carry out their civic responsibility."

Usgovsearch.com was developed by the Commerce Department's National Technical Information Service, or N.T.I.S., in partnership with a Cambridge, Mass., company, Northern Light Technology, which already operates a data base service that compiles 5,400 magazines, journals and news services. These Northern Light offerings will also be accessible through usgovsearch.com.

James Love, director of the Consumer Project on Technology, derided the new service as "corporate welfare," calling it a "typical example of all these problems in N.T.I.S. that have never been solved by the Clinton Administration."

During the Reagan Administration, the information service -- valued then and now as a crown-jewel information depository -- was revamped to become a self-financing resource. As a result, the agency charges fees for access to most of its research. Some materials are available for a nominal fee, like the "1998 Tax Products CD-ROM, IRS Publication 1796," for $13 plus a $5 handling
fee. But others, like the "Davis-Bacon Wage Determination Database" are priced at thousands of dollars.

In addition to reports, the agency offers resources like the World News Connection, an online news service that summarizes, in English, stories from local newspapers around the world and can cost $12,000 a year.

"This is a wonderful national treasure," Love said of the N.T.I.S. "But who gets access? Do you think students get access to this?"

Bachula, the Commerce Under Secretary, said the service was merely doing its federally mandated job and trying to make its services more valuable to those paying for them.

Susan Stearns, director of enterprise marketing for Northern Light, said the new service was intended to enable individuals and others to find more easily the information they need on the Internet and in Government data bases without having to hire a professional researcher.

"Traditionally, it has been very difficult to easily gain access to Government Web pages and information," Ms. Stearns said.
"It's not that it doesn't exist or is completely inaccessible, but because it's difficult to locate using traditional search engines," she said, adding that Government Web pages are usually not linked to other sites on the Web. "They're kind of hanging out there on their own."
It was Fritz Scheuren, I believe, who is now with the Urban Institute (but was doing this pro bono).

-----Original Message-----

From: Rachel Hickson [mailto:rhickson@monmouth.com]
Sent: Monday, May 17, 1999 5:15 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Polling in Kosovo

A man arrived Sunday morning at the AAPOR conference (not wearing his name tag, and I don't know his name) having arrived from training Kosovars to interview those in the refugee camps.

Did anyone meet him Sunday who can elaborate?

Rachel Hickson

>From rday@mcs.net Mon May 17 15:14:02 1999
Received: from Mailbox.mcs.net (Mailbox.mcs.com [192.160.127.87])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id PAA09031 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 May 1999 15:13:59 -0700
     (PDT)
Received: from gopher (P21-Chi-Dial-1.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.21]) by
Mailbox.mcs.net (8.8.7/8.8.2) with SMTP id RAA01092 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
   Mon, 17 May 1999 17:13:51 -0500 (CDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990517171159.007488bc@popmail.mcs.net>
X-Sender: rday@popmail.mcs.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.2 (32)
Date: Mon, 17 May 1999 17:11:59 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
Subject: Re: Make the dinner hour sacred
In-Reply-To: <00a001bea0a1$b068f580$b257fea9@compaq>
References: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A2136F6483@psg.ucsf.EDU>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
That is exactly what CMOR has been doing, very successfully.

Bringing AAPOR further into this process could only help.

At 01:11 PM 5/17/99 -0700, you wrote:

>> Some things I think cannot
>> be legislated and this is one of them.
>
>>I agree with Lance on this one, but...
>
>>What can (and I think should) be legislated is that using the word
>>"survey" in a sales call, or on the outside of a request for money, is
>>a form of fraud. I would like to see AAPOR, CMOR and CASRO work to get
>>such a law passed. For our long term health and survival we have to
>>stop marketers from abusing what is left of the good name of the real
>>opinion research industry. The only way to make this happen is to draw as
>sharp as possible
>>a distinction between research and sales in the public's minds. Each
(piece
>>of mail people get saying "important survey" outside and "send money"
>
>>Hank Zucker
>
>>Creative Research Systems
>>makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
>>http://www.surveysystem.com hzucker@usa.net
>
>
>> It is tempting to look at a ban on "evening meal" calling in a
>> positive light (it's bad practice anyway, etc., etc.), but I think
>> this is very dangerous ground for survey researchers. Remember, there
>> are two parts of this proposal that need to be operationally defined.
>> First, as has already been discussed fairly extensively, what exactly
>> is the evening meal hour. This is probably too fuzzy to define,
>> especially for a state legislature. Besides, if you set aside a
>> certain hour, are you also compelling the people you are trying to
>> protect to eat during that hour? The reasonable person would assume
>> that most protectees will do no such thing. In which case, what's the
>> point of the ban? If you set aside too much time you may end up
>> practically banning evening calling.
>>
>> The second thing to define is telemarketing. I'm afraid that the
>> telephone public does not make this neat distinction between
>> telemarketing and legitimate marketing research. We have substantial
>> minorities of potential respondents who refuse to participate in
>> federally-funded academic research because they get too many
>> solicitations (for their money AND for their time) over the
>> telephone. Many keep asking what we are trying to sell, and
>> apparently "nothing" is not a believable response. If telemarketing
is defined narrowly, then I suspect the result will be many pitches
preceded by a quick-and-dirty marketing survey. Maybe "many more" is
a more accurate assessment. Circumventing the ban will cause people
to clamor for a more wide-ranging definition of telemarketing and
then we can really get into "deep do-do". Combine this with the
problems of enforcing this against companies calling from outside the
state or even the country (the lottery scams have been based in
Canada), I think this has all the makings of a first class disaster.

I do not normally subscribe to "slippery slope" arguments, but I
think this may well be a hint of trouble to come. Some things I think
cannot be legislated and this is one of them. Regardless, I think
AAPOR members should think long and hard about whether you want to be
"on the record" endorsing this kind of proposal.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Day [SMTP:rday@mcs.net]
Sent: Monday, May 17, 1999 7:48 AM
To: aaornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Make the dinner hour sacred

banning telemarketing from the dinner hour could be a good thing. The
ting you should wztch is the distinction between legitimate opinion
and market
research and telemarketing. That is the role of CMOR see their website. At
12:01 AM 5/14/99 -0500, you wrote:

I thought it is interesting to note that on Friday morning our local public radio station here in the midwest (Wisconsin) will be discussing legislation banning telemarketing during the "dinner hour." Is this a hint of things to come?

Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

Ben Merens in for Tom Clark

*People are tired of racing to the phone with a mouthful of spaghetti only to find a telemarketer at the other end of the line. That's why BEN MERENS' guest after six is working on legislation to help make the dinner hour free from unsolicited calls.

Spencer Black, Democratic State Representative from Madison
One issue here is: Does legislation differentiate between telemarketing and survey research?

This discussion began with pending legislation in Wisconsin. Is that bill
restricted to telemarketing as we define it?

Richard Day wrote:

> That is exactly what CMOR has been doing, very successfully. Bringing
> AAPOR further into this process could only help. At 01:11 PM 5/17/99
> -0700, you wrote:
> >> Some things I think cannot
> >> be legislated and this is one of them.
> >>
> >> I agree with Lance on this one, but...
> >>
> >> What can (and I think should) be legislated is that using the word
> >> "survey" in a sales call, or on the outside of a request for money,
> >> is a form of fraud. I would like to see AAPOR, CMOR and CASRO work
> >> to get such a law passed. For our long term health and survival we
> >> have to stop marketers from abusing what is left of the good name of
> >> the real opinion research industry. The only way to make this happen is
to draw as sharp as possible
> >> a distinction between research and sales in the public's minds. Each
piece
> >> of mail people get saying "important survey" outside and "send money"
> >>
> >> Hank Zucker
> >> Creative Research Systems
> >> makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
> >> http://www.surveysystem.com hzucker@usa.net
> >>
It is tempting to look at a ban on "evening meal" calling in a positive light (it's bad practice anyway, etc., etc.), but I think this is very dangerous ground for survey researchers. Remember, there are two parts of this proposal that need to be operationally defined. First, as has already been discussed fairly extensively, what exactly is the evening meal hour. This is probably too fuzzy to define, especially for a state legislature. Besides, if you set aside a certain hour, are you also compelling the people you are trying to protect to eat during that hour? The reasonable person would assume that most protectees will do no such thing. In which case, what's the point of the ban? If you set aside too much time you may end up practically banning evening calling.

The second thing to define is telemarketing. I'm afraid that the telephone public does not make this neat distinction between telemarketing and legitimate marketing research. We have substantial minorities of potential respondents who refuse to participate in federally-funded academic research because they get too many solicitations (for their money AND for their time) over the telephone. Many keep asking what we are trying to sell, and
apparently "nothing" is not a believable response. If telemarketing is defined narrowly, then I suspect the result will be many pitches preceded by a quick-and-dirty marketing survey. Maybe "many more" is a more accurate assessment. Circumventing the ban will cause people to clamor for a more wide-ranging definition of telemarketing and then we can really get into "deep do-do". Combine this with the problems of enforcing this against companies calling from outside the state or even the country (the lottery scams have been based in Canada), I think this has all the makings of a first class disaster.

I do not normally subscribe to "slippery slope" arguments, but I think this may well be a hint of trouble to come. Some things I think cannot be legislated and this is one of them. Regardless, I think AAPOR members should think long and hard about whether you want to be "on the record" endorsing this kind of proposal.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Day [SMTP:rday@mcs.net]
Sent: Monday, May 17, 1999 7:48 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Make the dinner hour sacred

banning telmarketing from the dinner hour could be a good thing.
The thing you should watch is the distinction between legitimate opinion and market research and telemarketing. That is the role of CMOR see their website. At 12:01 AM 5/14/99 -0500, you wrote:

I thought it is interesting to note that on Friday morning our local public radio station here in the midwest (Wisconsin) will be discussing legislation banning telemarketing during the "dinner hour." Is this a hint of things to come?

Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

Ben Merens in for Tom Clark

*People are tired of racing to the phone with a mouthful of spaghetti
only to find a telemarketer at the other end of the line.
That's why BEN MERENS' guest after six is working on legislation to make the dinner hour free from unsolicited calls.
Spencer Black, Democratic State Representative from Madison
Dear Fellow AAPOR members:

AAPORNET exchanges on Kosovo began when Phil Tichenor raised legitimate concerns about "the barrage of claims and counterclaims" concerning the atrocities being committed. His main point was to learn and I quote "What polling is being done by what agencies in the refugee camps...?"
I have been helping in such an endeavor and feel compelled to respond, especially since I went to the AAPOR meetings this past weekend and mentioned my involvement informally to a few people. Eleanor Singer, who is a good friend, was one of these and she cited me by name in a followup note to the original AAPORNET posting.

Frankly, the experience is still one I have not digested but I will say a little now and maybe more later. First, let me give some background about my small role; then I will describe a few professional details that may be of interest. Finally, a personal note on the tragedy and courage I saw.

Background

The project I have been associated with is sponsored by the Albanian Institute for Policy and Legal Studies with offices in Tirana, the capitol. Technical assistance is being offered to the Institute by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).

Patrick Ball, Deputy Director of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program, heads the AAAS effort in Albania in support of local efforts. Dr. Ball has extensive experience with similar tragedies including those in El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti and South Africa. My role was to act as an on-site (pro bono) statistical advisor to Patrick and the team of Albanians assembled to carry out the work.
It is important to stress that the effort is Albanian run with a completely Albanian/Kosovar leadership and interviewing staff. Nonetheless, there is every expectation that it will meet the highest professional standards. While new to survey research, the people assembled as interviewers are outstanding -- virtually all college graduates.

The focus of the effort is to have the refugees tell their stories and to record what has happened before it is forgotten. The usual scientific strictures are in full force, with careful instrument design, structured data gathering and objective analysis. To do less would be to lose the evidential value of the process. Various methods are planned to do cross-checking and, when possible, independent corroboration.

Some Survey Details

The situation, as anyone following the generally excellent media coverage will know, is highly complex and fluid. Refugees continue to enter the countries neighboring Yugoslavia. Some are being housed in the many temporary camps which have sprung up; some are living with relatives and some have already left for other locations, including the United States.

When I was in Albania this month we designed the initial sampling of the formally designated camps. This is the easiest and most accessible group. As
I write this, the Albanian interview staff is conducting a pre-listing step in all the camps. Simultaneously they are perfecting the instrument and data collection process. We have hopes to do a complete listing of the formal camps as part of the actual sampling; then to compare these with the border registers which will also be processed for the project.

Survey methods alone will not work so a combination of techniques including demographic analysis will be necessary. After all, some crimes have no witnesses to report them and will be missed by relying only on reports of survivors.

Conventional considerations of sample size (and resources) come into play, of course. At the moment, resources are being sought for a sample of about 2,500 refugee families in the Albanian camps, with similar numbers in Macedonia, plus area probability samples of households (and informal camps) in both countries to account for the bulk of the remaining refugees -- perhaps 10,000 interviews in all. Methods to sample families that have already been moved out of the immediate area have not been developed. For them, expense is a major issue and access may be a problem too.

A complete pilot is planned in two camps beginning on May 31, with the full survey scheduled to begin June 21. This assumes, of course, that the resources being sought internationally become available as expected.

A Personal Note
The Kosovar tragedy on television has a personal force when seen firsthand. Having some technical assistance to offer helped me cope with the many personal encounters I had, but not enough to speak of them at length.

The bravery and self-sacrifice I saw on all sides, though, heartened me greatly. There were many Americans and Europeans and Arabs I met who are giving unstintingly of themselves. How can I speak highly enough of the dignity of the proud Kosovar people who have been driven from their homes, brutalized and often seen their husbands and fathers murdered.

Fritz Scheuren

>From HOneill536@aol.com Mon May 17 18:24:32 1999
Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.70])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id SAA25659 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 May 1999 18:24:23 -0700 (PDT)
From: HOneill536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill536@aol.com (14390)
    by imo26.mx.aol.com (IMOv20) id 5HNCa05091
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 May 1999 21:21:50 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <b486b3c0.24721aae@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 17 May 1999 21:21:50 EDT
Subject: Re: Make the dinner hour sacred
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
the legislation distinguishes between surveys and telemarketing. CMOR follows all proposed legislation at federal and state levels. Nothing to date has passed that has a negative effect on legitimate survey research. I'm surprised by the lack of knowledge.

Since I haven't seen another such message on aapornet since the conference, let me be the first to start the kudos:
To Paul, and to all who worked to make this year's conference such a success,

CONGRATULATIONS!!! It was excellent.

It was superb.

And the beautiful beach didn't hurt, either.

Thanks

Rachel Hickson

>From arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu Tue May 18 05:25:53 1999

Received: from mailer.fsu.edu (mailer.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id FAA05104 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 May 1999 05:25:52 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from localhost (arobbin@localhost)
   by mailer.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA23961
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 May 1999 08:25:51 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Tue, 18 May 1999 08:25:50 -0400 (EDT)
From: ALICE R ROBBIN <arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Kudos
In-Reply-To: <37415C3A.317A@monmouth.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9905180823440.23332-100000@mailer.fsu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Mea culpa! I too want to thank everyone who made this year’s St. Pete meeting a success. It was rejuvenating in so many ways. Thank you very, very much. Alice Robbin

On Tue, 18 May 1999, Rachel Hickson wrote:

> Since I haven't seen another such message on aapornet since the
> conference, let me be
> the first to start the kudos:
> To Paul, and to all who worked to make this year's conference such a
> success,
> CONGRATULATIONS!!! It was excellent.
>
> It was superb.
>
> And the beautiful beach didn't hurt, either.
>
> Thanks
>
> Rachel Hickson
>
>From mkshares@mcs.net Tue May 18 06:43:43 1999
Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA14693 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 May 1999 06:43:42 -0700
   (PDT)
Given Harry's comments below, banning telemarketing calls at the "dinner hour" can only help our survey interview operations by reducing the overall volume or clutter of calls.

HOneill536@aol.com wrote:

> the legislation distinguishes between surveys and telemarketing. CMOR
> follows all proposed legislation at federal and state levels. Nothing
> to date has passed that has a negative effect on legitimate survey
> research. I'm surprised by the lack of knowledge.

>From SMarcy@NationalResearch.com Tue May 18 06:43:53 1999
Received: from nrc7.nationalresearch.com ([12.13.114.6])
Yes, to Paul and Dawn and their teams of people:

THANKS! It was great fun!
I apologize for not "beating" Rachel and Alice in thanking everyone via aapornet for their own personal contributions towards making our '99 conference the great success that most appear to believe it was.

AAPOR is certainly a VERY special organization and our annual conferences are manifestations of all that's best in us -- stimulating exchange of ideas, mentoring those new to the field, energized but civil disagreements, and great friendships.

Take care and look forward to seeing you in Portland for AAPOR 2000! (Or in Portland this fall for the Nonresponse conference.)

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Professor Paul J. Lavrakas, Chair
1999 AAPOR Conference Committee
Hmmm Bad News and Good?

Anyway it appears to be free at least through June 1!
Government Halts New Search Service

By JERI CLAUSING

WASHINGTON -- A few hours after launching a new fee-based search engine for Federal Government Internet sites and documents, the Department of Commerce on Monday put the service on hold to review whether it conflicts with the Clinton Administration's policy on unrestricted access to Government information.

For the full story go to:

And I'd like to add my kudos to those heaped around the feet of the organizers of this years meeting.

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

>From vector@sympatico.ca Tue May 18 12:14:12 1999
Received: from smtp11.bellglobal.com (smtp11.bellglobal.com [204.101.251.53])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id MAA18238 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 May 1999 12:14:11 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from m-zwelling ([206.172.84.1])
   by smtp11.bellglobal.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA00645
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 May 1999 15:16:48 -0400 (EDT)

Marc Zwelling/Vector Research/Toronto/ Frank Rusciano wrote:

> I am not sure about this particular sample, but I do know from a
colleague who used to work for Radio Free Europe before the Berlin
Wall fell that refugees used to be a source of information about
closed societies. One can imagine, of course, the problems of
reliability that these surveys encountered, but apparently the
practice is not new.

> Frank Rusciano

> Political Science Dept.

> Rider University

>
Phil Tichenor wrote:

This evening's 60 Minutes presentation on war crimes in Kosovo, by Christianne Amanpour, raises a rather obvious question:

What polling is being done by what agencies in the refugee camps, asking carefully selected samples of respondents such questions as (a) what precipitated their departure, (b) whether they observed specific war crimes at first hand, (c) whether they had specific knowledge of damage and/or casualties from NATO bombing, (d) whether they have relatives in the KLA and (e) what their relationships with Serbs in Kosovo had been before the Serbian onslaught that began this winter.

There are many more such questions. It seems that with the barrage of claims and counterclaims from both sides, all getting much attention in the media, professional survey research agencies have an unusual opportunity to get some unbiased data on the refugee experience.

Are such surveys being conducted? Are they accessible on the web?

From Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com Tue May 18 15:53:20 1999
Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id PAA26363 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 May 1999 15:53:04 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id SAA13182; Tue, 18 May 1999 18:44:51
Call Donna McElhinney at CMOR. They are actively working on this one and so far all of the legislation is separating surveys from telemarketing. They are trying to get the telephone privacy equipment vendors to differentiate researchers from telemarketers as well. The problem falls, I believe, with the respondents who do not make that distinction and just do not wish to be bothered by either.

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Nick Panagakis [SMTP:mkshares@mcs.net]
> Sent: Monday, May 17, 1999 6:25 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Make the dinner hour sacred
> 
>
> One issue here is: Does legislation differentiate between
telemarketing and survey research?
>
> This discussion began with pending legislation in Wisconsin. Is that
bill restricted to telemarketing as we define it?
>
> Richard Day wrote:
>
> >> That is exactly what CMOR has been doing, very successfully.
>> Bringing AAPOR further into this process could only help. At 01:11
>> PM 5/17/99 -0700, you wrote:
>> >> Some things I think cannot
>> >> be legislated and this is one of them.
>> >>
>> >> I agree with Lance on this one, but...
>> >>
>> >> What can (and I think should) be legislated is that using the word
"survey"
>> >> in a sales call, or on the outside of a request for money, is a
>> >> form of fraud. I would like to see AAPOR, CMOR and CASRO work to
>> >> get such a
> law
>> >> passed. For our long term health and survival we have to stop
> marketers
>> >> from abusing what is left of the good name of the real opinion
>> >> research industry. The only way to make this happen is to draw as
>> >> sharp as
> possible
>> >> a distinction between research and sales in the public's minds. Each
> piece
> > > of mail people get saying "important survey" outside and "send
> > > money"
> > inside
> > >
> > > Hank Zucker
> > > Creative Research Systems
> > > makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look
> > > Good http://www.surveysystem.com hzucker@usa.net
> > >
> > > ----- Original Message ----- 
> > > From: <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>
> > > To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > > Sent: Monday, May 17, 1999 8:23 AM
> > > Subject: RE: Make the dinner hour sacred
> > >
> > >
> > > It is tempting to look at a ban on "evening meal" calling in a
> > positive
> > > light (it's bad practice anyway, etc., etc.), but I think this is
> > very
> > > dangerous ground for survey researchers. Remember, there are two
> > parts
> > > of this proposal that need to be operationally defined. First, as
> > > has already been discussed fairly extensively, what exactly is
> > > the
evening meal hour. This is probably too fuzzy to define, especially for a state legislature. Besides, if you set aside a certain hour, are you also compelling the people you are trying to protect to eat during that hour? The reasonable person would assume that most protectees will do no such thing. In which case, what's the point of the ban? If you set aside too much time you may end up practically banning evening calling. The second thing to define is telemarketing. I'm afraid that the telephone public does not make this neat distinction between telemarketing and legitimate marketing research. We have substantial minorities of potential respondents who refuse to participate in federally-funded academic research because they get too many solicitations (for their money AND for their time) over the telephone. Many keep asking what we are trying to sell, and apparently "nothing" is not a believable response. If telemarketing is defined narrowly, then
suspect the result will be many pitches preceded by a quick-and-dirty marketing survey. Maybe "many more" is a more accurate assessment. Circumventing the ban will cause people to clamor for a more wide-ranging definition of telemarketing and then we can really get into "deep do-do". Combine this with the problems of enforcing this against companies calling from outside the state or even the country (the lottery scams have been based in Canada), I think this has all the makings of a first class disaster.

I do not normally subscribe to "slippery slope" arguments, but I think this may well be a hint of trouble to come. Some things I think cannot be legislated and this is one of them. Regardless, I think AAPOR members should think long and hard about whether you want to be "on the record" endorsing this kind of proposal.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Day [SMTP:rday@mcs.net]
Sent: Monday, May 17, 1999 7:48 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
banning telemarketing from the dinner hour could be a good thing.
The thing you should watch is the distinction between legitimate opinion and market research and telemarketing. That is the role of CMOR see their website. At 12:01 AM 5/14/99 -0500, you wrote:
I thought it is interesting to note that on Friday morning our local public radio station here in the midwest (Wisconsin) will be discussing legislation banning telemarketing during the "dinner hour." Is this a hint of things to come?
Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

Ben Merens in for Tom Clark
*People are tired of racing to the phone with a mouthful of spaghetti only to find a telemarketer at the other end of the line. That's why BEN MERENS' guest after six is working on legislation to help make
the dinner hour free from unsolicited calls.
> Spencer Black, Democratic State Representative from Madison
> From HKassarj@ucla.edu Tue May 18 19:34:01 1999
Received: from serval.noc.ucla.edu (smtp.ucla.edu [169.232.10.57])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id TAA02793 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 May 1999 19:33:45 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ycfststo (pool0044-max2.ucla-ca-us.dialup.earthlink.net
  [207.217.13.108])
  by serval.noc.ucla.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id TAA10156
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 May 1999 19:33:43 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <4.0.1.19990520172437.00e18290@pop.ben2.ucla.edu>
X-Sender: hkassarj@pop.ben2.ucla.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
Date: Thu, 20 May 1999 17:26:09 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "H.H.Kassarjian" <HKassarj@ucla.edu>
Subject: T-Shirts
In-Reply-To: <37415C3A.317A@monmouth.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
  types="text/plain,text/html";
I am sad that I could not be at the AAPOR meetings this year. I am pleased that it went well. Does anyone know if there are any AAPOR t-shirts left and if I can purchase one. Hal Kassarjian

Hal Kassarjian
HKassarj@ucla.edu
Phone: 1 (818) 784-5669
FAX: 1 (818) 784-3325

<font size=3>I am sad that I could not be at the AAPOR meetings this year. I am pleased that it went well. Does anyone know if there are any AAPOR t-shirts left and if I can purchase one. Hal Kassarjian</font>

HKassarj@ucla.edu
Phone: 1 (818) 784-5669
FAX: 1 (818) 784-3325
Is there anyway for those of us who were unable to attend AAPOR's annual meeting due to work commitments to have access to papers and proceedings of interest?

Could someone please let me know how to go about obtaining that information?

Thank you. Dominic

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

Dominic Lusinchi
Statistical Consultant
Far West Research
Demography-Survey Research- Applied Statistics
1323 Sixteenth Avenue
One way to learn some of the things about the '99 AAPOR conference would be to go to the Survey Sampling, Inc. website. It is my understanding that they have, or soon will, put up coverage of the conference.

Another way would be to go to AAPOR's webpage and see the final version of the program. Then similar to what one would do with a printed copy of the
program, you could contact the authors of the papers you want. Getting their email addresses or other contact info might be as easy as looking at AAPOR's membership book, or it might take more resourcefulness.

Third, there eventually will a published volume of many of the methodological papers from the conference as part of the joint AAPOR-ASA partnership to do this each year as it applies to survey methods.

At 02:05 AM 5/19/99 EDT, you wrote:
> Is there anyway for those of us who were unable to attend AAPOR's annual meeting due to work commitments to have access to papers and proceedings of interest?
>
> Could someone please let me know how to go about obtaining that information? Thank you. Dominic
>
>
> ****************************************
> Dominic Lusinchi
> Statistical Consultant
> Far West Research
> Demography-Survey Research-Applied Statistics
> 1323 Sixteenth Avenue
> San Francisco, CA 94122-2042
Below, please see a note from Survey Sampling Inc. about their web site
coverage of AAPOR '99. AAPOR greatly appreciates this annual support and service from SSI.

> Date: Wed, 19 May 1999 10:22:56 -0400
> Subject: Coverage of AAPOR Conference
> X-PH: V4.4@orb2
> From: "Jackie Lorch" <Jackie_Lorch@surveysampling.com>
> To: lavrakas.1@osu.edu
>
> As a follow up to your AAPORNET message this morning, SSI's coverage of the conference will be at our WorldOpinion web site, at www.worldopinion.com, linked from the home page's "What's New" section.
> We've posted a brief overview and a few dozen photos so far, and will be posting more detailed reports during the next week. Best, Jackie
> Lorch, Web Editor.
>
> WorldOpinion: Market research news and information online
> http://www.worldopinion.com
>
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
Back in the bad old days when we key entered survey data onto cards using an 029 keypunch, it was widely agreed that single pass key entry would produce about 95% accuracy while key entry with verification would produce about 99.8% accuracy.

A lot has changed since then. Is anyone aware of anything that has been published comparing the accuracy obtainable with more modern machinery (e.g., SPSS DE or other proprietary products)?

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed May 19 14:07:15 1999

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id OAA12889 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 May 1999 14:07:14 -0700 (PDT)
Data entry accuracy depends on many factors, the most important of which are the caliber of the operators and the legibility of the instrument they are transcribing from.

The numbers you cite as "widely agreed to" (by whom??) might apply to some novice operators, but certainly not to seasoned professionals. 95% of what, in the first place? of strokes? of fields? of records? Any way you look at it, that would be some pretty dismal keypunching.

It is my experience that most data entry errors are caused by something in the instrument or the way it was marked. As a result, the error reduction from double entry verification tends to be minimal, because both operators
will tend to make the same error at the same place, for the same reasons.

Many of the PC-based data entry programs have the ability to check for out of range or invalid entries and notify the operator immediately. That may help eliminate certain types of errors, but may possibly increase the number of legal but incorrect entries if operators rely too heavily on those aids to catch any lapses.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

_________________________

Mike Sullivan wrote:
>
> Back in the bad old days when we key entered survey data onto cards
> using an 029 keypunch, it was widely agreed that single pass key entry
> would produce about 95% accuracy while key entry with verification
> would produce about 99.8% accuracy.
>
> A lot has changed since then. Is anyone aware of anything that has
> been published comparing the accuracy obtainable with more modern
> machinery (e.g., SPSS DE or other proprietary products)? From
> daves@startribune.com Thu May 20 09:17:33 1999

Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com [132.148.80.211])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA09043 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 May 1999 09:17:32 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id LAA12950; Thu, 20 May 1999
Colleagues,

I'm interested in talking with any of you who maintains a database or sampling frame that you use to generate your own RDD telephone samples. Please feel free to e-mail me privately, so we don't clutter up others' e-mailboxes. My other numbers are below, too.

Cheers...

Rob Daves
Director of Polling & News Research
Star Tribune v: 612-673-7278
425 Portland Av. S. f: 612-673-4529
Minneapolis MN 55488 e: daves@startribune.com

>From Jill.Richardson@latimes.com Thu May 20 12:16:54 1999
Received: from mail03-lax.pilot.net (mail-lax-3.pilot.net [205.139.40.17])
Hi Rob. I maintain the L.A. Times Poll's proprietary RDD sampling database... What's on your mind?

Jill Darling Richardson
Assistant Director, Los Angeles Times Poll Jill.Richardson@LATimes.com
> -----Original Message-----
> From:     Rob Daves [SMTP:daves@startribune.com]
> Sent:     Thursday, May 20, 1999 10:13 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject:  Telephone sample databases
>
> Colleagues,
>
> I'm interested in talking with any of you who maintains a database or
> sampling frame that you use to generate your own RDD telephone
> samples. Please feel free to e-mail me privately, so we don't clutter
> up others' e-mailboxes. My other numbers are below, too.
>
> Cheers...
>
> Rob Daves
> Director of Polling & News Research
> Star Tribune           v:  612-673-7278
> 425 Portland Av. S.           f:  612-673-4529
> Minneapolis MN 55488   e:  daves@startribune.com

Received: from pyxis.unm.edu Thu May 20 14:22:03 1999
Received: from dial70.abqdial.technet.unm.edu (HELO unm.edu) (207.66.72.70)
by pyxis.unm.edu with SMTP; 20 May 1999 21:21:50 -0000
(PDT)
Rob: The University of New Mexico Institute for Public Policy maintains a sampling frame program, used to generate RDD samples for our Survey Research Center. It's a C++ program, using an automated updater to read in the valid ranges of residential numbers, and number densities, to create the frame (which we re-run as needed), and a number generator that creates lists for geographic regions as specified from the frame. It's designed to work for any region (to the County level), but we use it primarily to generate New Mexico samples.

Cheers, Hank

Rob Daves wrote:

> Colleagues,

> I'm interested in talking with any of you who maintains a database or
> sampling frame that you use to generate your own RDD telephone
> samples. Please feel free to e-mail me privately, so we don't clutter
> up others' e-mailboxes. My other numbers are below, too.
>
> > Cheers...
> >
> > Rob Daves
> > Director of Polling & News Research
> > Star Tribune v: 612-673-7278
> > 425 Portland Av. S. f: 612-673-4529
> > Minneapolis MN 55488 e: daves@startribune.com
>
> --

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

Hank C. Jenkins-Smith
Director, UNM Institute for Public Policy
Professor, UNM Department of Political Science
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico  87131
Phone:  505-277-1099
Fax:  505-277-3115
Email:  hjsmith@unm.edu

>From Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com Thu May 20 15:16:02 1999
Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA26204 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 20 May 1999 15:16:01 -0700
(PDT)
Data entry accuracy depends on many factors, the most important of which are the caliber of the operators and the legibility of the instrument they are transcribing from.
The numbers you cite as "widely agreed to" (by whom??) might apply to some novice operators, but certainly not to seasoned professionals. 95% of what, in the first place? of strokes? of fields? of records? Any way you look at it, that would be some pretty dismal keypunching.

It is my experience that most data entry errors are caused by something in the instrument or the way it was marked. As a result, the error reduction from double entry verification tends to be minimal, because both operators will tend to make the same error at the same place, for the same reasons.

Many of the PC-based data entry programs have the ability to check for out of range or invalid entries and notify the operator immediately. That may help eliminate certain types of errors, but may possibly increase the number of legal but incorrect entries if operators rely too heavily on those aids to catch any lapses.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Mike Sullivan wrote:

Back in the bad old days when we key entered survey data onto cards using an 029 keypunch, it was widely agreed that single pass key entry would produce about 95% accuracy while key entry with verification would produce about 99.8% accuracy.
A lot has changed since then. Is anyone aware of anything that has been published comparing the accuracy obtainable with more modern machinery (e.g., SPSS DE or other proprietary products)?

For additional coverage of the "Media and the Public" session, see The Freedom Forum's website at the following address:
http://www.freedomforum.org/professional/1999/5/18badpress.asp

Larry McGill

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 1999 12:36 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Coverage of AAPOR Conference

Below, please see a note from Survey Sampling Inc. about their web site coverage of AAPOR '99. AAPOR greatly appreciates this annual support and service from SSI.

> Date: Wed, 19 May 1999 10:22:56 -0400
> Subject: Coverage of AAPOR Conference
> X-PH: V4.4@orb2
> From: "Jackie Lorch" <Jackie_Lorch@surveysampling.com>
> To: lavrakas.1@osu.edu
> 
> As a follow up to your AAPORNETER message this morning, SSI's coverage of the conference will be at our WorldOpinion web site, at www.worldopinion.com, linked from the home page's "What's New" section.
> We've posted a brief overview and a few dozen photos so far, and will be posting more detailed reports during the next week. Best, Jackie
> Lorch, Web Editor.
> --
Professor Paul J. Lavrakas, Chair
1999 AAPOR Conference Committee

>From mbednarz@umich.edu Fri May 21 09:43:21 1999
Received: from donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.19])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id JAA28550 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 May 1999 09:43:17 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from centipede.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@centipede.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.91])
    by donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id MAA17346
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 May 1999 12:43:15 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (mbednarz@localhost)
    by centipede.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id MAA20266
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 May 1999 12:43:15 -0400 (EDT)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Fri, 21 May 1999 12:43:15 -0400 (EDT)
From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>
X-Sender: mbednarz@centipede.rs.itd.umich.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Lose Watch at Conference?
If you lost a watch at the TradeWinds Resort last week at the conference, please contact the AAPOR office in Michigan.

e-mail:     AAPOR@umich.edu
call: 734.764.1555
fax:  734.764.3341

Thanks.

>From arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu Fri May 21 10:45:35 1999
Received: from mailer.fsu.edu (mailer.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA14407 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 May 1999 10:45:32 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (arobbin@localhost)
    by mailer.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id NAA23455
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 May 1999 13:45:33 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Fri, 21 May 1999 13:45:33 -0400 (EDT)
From: ALICE R ROBBIN <arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Lose Watch at Conference?
Marlene, I lost a beautiful silver mesh watch. The clasp opened. I was heartbroken because it was a gift from my daughter (expensive for her).

Alice

On Fri, 21 May 1999, Marlene Bednarz wrote:

> from the AAPOR Secretariat, Ann Arbor, MI
> 
> If you lost a watch at the TradeWinds Resort last week at the conference, please contact the AAPOR office in Michigan.
> 
> e-mail: AAPOR@umich.edu
> call: 734.764.1555
> fax: 734.764.3341
> 
> Thanks.
> 
>
From jeffrey_c_moore@ccMail.Census.GOV Fri May 21 11:22:49 1999
Received: from info.census.gov (info.census.gov [148.129.129.10])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA28541 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 May 1999 11:22:45 -0700 (PDT)
From: jeffrey_c_moore@ccMail.Census.GOV
Received: from it-relay1.census.gov (inet-gw.census.gov [148.129.129.8])
    by info.census.gov (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id OAA19114
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 May 1999 14:22:46 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from smtp-gw1.census.gov (smtp-gw1.census.gov [148.129.126.72])
    by it-relay1.census.gov (8.9.3/8.9.3/v3.4) with SMTP id OAA10607
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 May 1999 14:22:44 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from ccMail by smtp-gw1.census.gov (ccMail Link to SMTP R8.30.00.7)
    id AA927311126; Fri, 21 May 1999 14:25:27 -0400
Message-Id: <9905219273.AA927311126@smtp-gw1.census.gov>
X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.30.00.7
Date: Fri, 21 May 1999 14:20:33 -0400
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re[2]: Lose Watch at Conference?
Fellow AAPORNETers:

I know this has been said before, but perhaps it needs saying again. Could we please be a little more careful in our replies to AAPORNET messages, so that we don't send messages to everyone when the desired audience is much more limited than that? Message senders could definitely help the cause by including their e-mail address on all messages.

I don't mean to single out the "lost watch" example; it just happens to be the 3rd or 4th one I've received today, and the bozillionth since I re-upped on AAPORNET a few weeks ago. I want to stay in touch with AAPOR issues, but the high chaff-to-wheat ratio makes me wonder whether getting back on-line was the right decision.

jeffrey.c.moore@ccmail.census.gov
[aka Jeff Moore]

>From RoniRosner@aol.com Fri May 21 14:11:29 1999
Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.4])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id OAA11122 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 May 1999 14:11:28 -0700
(PDT)
From: RoniRosner@aol.com
StrategyOne, an Edelman Public Relations Worldwide firm, is searching for innovative, experienced, leaders for its New York offices. StrategyOne will provide Edelman offices worldwide with a wide range of market and public opinion research to support the firm's corporate reputation, public affairs, investor relations, crisis and marketing practices including consumer, technology and healthcare.

Vice President- Serves as a senior manager on client projects, acts as client liaison, and demonstrates strong leadership and mentoring skills. VP in StrategyOne will have 4-6 years experience in market/public opinion research. Applicant should possess strong quantitative and qualitative research background and experience moderating focus groups. Secondary analysis quantitative techniques preferred.
Senior Account Executive, Internet Research - Responsible for maintaining client relations/communication, participate in special projects, stay on top of industry trends and manage online research projects. The SAE must have 2 years experience conducting market/public opinion research (quantitative & qualitative) online.

>From wattsm@fiu.edu Sat May 22 14:47:57 1999

Received: from rottweiler.fiu.edu (rottweiler.fiu.edu [131.94.128.47])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA11565 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 22 May 1999 14:47:52 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from fiu.edu (iporh3g.fiu.edu [131.94.227.22])
   by rottweiler.fiu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/FIU) with ESMTP id RAA20403
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 22 May 1999 17:47:50 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <374726FD.F29D4E6E@fiu.edu>
Date: Sat, 22 May 1999 17:51:58 -0400
From: Mark Watts <wattsm@fiu.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Volleyball in St. Pete
References: <19990429143642.4347.rocketmail@web706.mail.yahoo.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I am going through all of these old e-mail messages that have piled up. In doing so I discovered I had all of these messages (like the one below) from you. You have been writing to me all this time, and I had no
Kat Lind wrote:

> Volleyball in St. Pete:
>
> There will be a volleyball net set up on the beach for the exclusive use of AAPOR conference attendees - Thursday through Sunday.
>
> In addition to free play during these days, I would like to schedule some "team" games for a tournament of sorts at 3:30pm on Thursday, Friday & Saturday. Sign up sheets teams will be at registration. The champion team will be recognized at the Saturday night banquet.
>
> (If you know someone who is going to AAPOR but is not on this list serve, please pass this along - the more the merrier).
>
> If you have questions, please email me directly.
>
> ===

> Katherine "Kat" Lind
> Kat_Lind99@yahoo.com

> Do You Yahoo?
Mark Watts, Ph.D.
Associate Director
Institute for Public Opinion Research
Florida International University
3000 NE 151st St.
North Miami, FL
33181

phone: (305) 919-5711
fax: (305) 919-5242
http://www.fiu.edu/orgs/ipor

>From HOneill536@aol.com Sat May 22 16:37:09 1999
Received: from imo11.mx.aol.com (imo11.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id QAA21843 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 22 May 1999 16:37:08 -0700
(PDT)
From: HOneill536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill536@aol.com (14409)
    by imo11.mx.aol.com (IMOv20) id 5QAa003101
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 22 May 1999 19:35:30 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <4b1e2683.24789941@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 22 May 1999 19:35:29 EDT
Subject: Re: Volleyball in St. Pete
To: aapornet@usc.edu
why send your volleyball messages to everybody? I'm sure many of us don't give a damn - and it's annoying how AAPORNENET is misused for personal messages.

>From Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com Mon May 24 07:40:27 1999
Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA06588 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 May 1999 07:40:25 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id KAA00567; Mon, 24 May 1999 10:21:16 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from arbmdex.arbitron.com(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via
    smap (4.1)
    id xmab28714; Mon, 24 May 99 10:16:22 -0400
Received: by arbmdex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <LR94WK88>; Mon, 24 May 1999 10:19:33 -0400
Message-ID: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B328BCDB@arbmdex.arbitron.com>
From: "Cralley, Marla" <Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Lapovsky, David" <David.Lapovsky@arbitron.com>
Subject: Response Rates
Date: Mon, 24 May 1999 09:36:35 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain
First, I would agree with the kudos for the program for this year's conference. The only problem I had was in deciding which sessions to attend -- they were all enticing. The best expression concerning the value of the sessions is the lack of empty chairs in most sessions -- even on Sunday.

The general consensus I came away with is that response rates are declining at a steady rate for almost every kind of survey. I would be very interested in hearing from anyone who has response rate trend statistics (or other related information) for the studies you are conducting.

Please e-mail me at marla.cralley@arbitron.com or call me at 410-312-8449. I would love to chat with you. Thanks.

I am looking forward to Portland and hope we can all put our heads together to uncover solutions to our common concerns.

Marla

Thanks,

Marla

>From morrison@spss.com Mon May 24 14:32:03 1999
Received: from hqimail1.spss.com (hqimail1.spss.com [192.35.251.74])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA19504 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 May 1999 14:32:00 -0700
Can any of you help a friend of mine who is looking for a questionnaire or questions on a climate survey for parents and also teachers that would help gauge the climate at a campus? His campuses are schools in a K-12 school district. He had been lead to believe that there might be a company that conducts surveys of this type; but has been unable to get any more information. Does anyone know of such a company or any other source of information for these types of surveys?

Please respond directly to morrison@spss.com and I'll pass along any information.

Nancy Morrison
Almost everyone in the field asserts that response rates are falling,
It is commonly believed that response rates are falling and have been falling for decades. But what time series information is available presents a more complex picture. A review of 56 times series around the world showed 22 declines in response rates, 16 with no change, 14 with variables trends (ups and downs), and 4 with rising response rates. While declines clearly greatly outnumber increases, the
patterns is hardly one of general, unfettered decline. But to complicate matters,

However, these time series are not representative of all surveys. They are based on studies with figures in the public domain and contain few commercial polls and no market research surveys.

Tom W. Smith

>From Sameer_Abraham@gallup.com Tue May 25 06:53:39 1999
Received: from fw (fw.gallup.com [206.158.235.10])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id GAA22240 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 May 1999 06:53:38 -0700
(PDT)
From: Sameer_Abraham@gallup.com
Received: from exchng5.gallup.com (exchng5.gallup.com [198.175.140.78])
  by fw (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id IAA14816
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 May 1999 08:53:05 -0500 (CDT)
Received: by exchng5.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
id <LD3CYT5C>; Tue, 25 May 1999 08:53:06 -0500
Message-ID: <1DA55C2176E0D111BE14006008CE8EE6F3D1A3@exchng5.gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Education Climate Survey??
Date: Tue, 25 May 1999 08:52:56 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Can any of you help a friend of mine who is looking for a questionnaire or questions on a climate survey for parents and also teachers that would help gauge the climate at a campus? His campuses are schools in a K-12 school district. He had been lead to believe that there might be a company that conducts surveys of this type; but has been unable to get any more information. Does anyone know of such a company or any other source of information for these types of surveys?

Please respond directly to morrison@spss.com and I'll pass along any information.

Nancy Morrison
520/325-3175

Check with the US Dept of Education's National Center for Education Statistics.
Tom, quite interesting! I'm looking forward to more detail here, particularly on the interview mode, telephone or in-person and sample type. My suspicion is that many of these time series are in-person, since telephone RDD came along much later outside of the U.S.

For RDD sample, it is particularly important to break out the individual components of the response rate calculation -- non-contact vs. refusal. The Survey Sampling, Inc. folks presented a paper in St. Pete examining the growing number of "unknown cases," that is, working numbers for which contact is never made. They hypothesize that we may be dialing an increased number of fax/modem lines, cell phone numbers and otherwise
ineligible non-voice lines. If the machine is off, we get no identifying tone.

To the extent that this is correct, our non-contact rate may be inflated, lowering our response rate calculations. This would raise serious issues about our formulae for calculating response rates for RDD surveys.

In short, that's why it is important to break out the components of the response rate formula to determine where the problem(s) lies. We need to trend both refusals and non-contacts.

>>> "Tom_W. Smith" <abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu> 05/25/99 08:27AM >>>

Almost everyone in the field asserts that response rates are falling, and it is commonly believed that response rates have been falling for decades. But what time series information is available presents a more complex picture. A review of 56 times series around the world showed 22 declines in response rates, 16 with no change, 14 with variables trends (ups and downs), and 4 with rising response rates. While declines clearly greatly outnumber increases, the patterns is hardly one of general, unfettered decline. But to complicate matters, these time series are not representative of all surveys. They are based on studies with figures in the public domain and contain few commercial polls and no market research surveys.
About 5 years ago, I participated in a panel at NYAAPOR on declining response rates. The common presumption, then as now, was that rates were suffering a "secular" decline. However a review of 10 years worth of Time Inc.'s subscriber studies -- all postal surveys based on random samples of subscriber, designed to monitor things like customer satisfaction or
response to editorial innovations -- showed no overall pattern of decline.
Similarly, our telephone polls over that same time period were not showing lower cooperation rates, though contact rates were lower.

I am curious to know whether the commercial research firms have any longitudinal data on this.

Scott McDonald
Director of Research
Time Warner Inc.
New York, NY

"Tom_W. Smith" wrote:

> Almost everyone in the field asserts that response rates are falling,
> it is commonly believed that response rates are falling and have been falling for decades. But what time series information is available presents a more complex picture. A review of 56 times series around the world showed 22 declines in response rates, 16 with no change, 14 with variables trends (ups and downs), and 4 with rising response rates. While declines clearly greatly outnumber increases, the patterns is hardly one of general, unfettered decline.

> But to complicate matters,
> However, these time series are not representative of all surveys. They are based on studies with figures in the public domain and contain few commercial polls and no market research surveys.
I received a survey in the mail a few days ago and it really worries me...

The envelope was labeled "U.S. & World Events" and stated that a questionnaire was inside. I opened the envelope, found the questionnaire,
and began to fill it out. For the most part it was demographics and some poorly worded news media use and current events opinion items. However, I filled it out faithfully.

At the end of the survey there was a check box: "Yes, I have filled out both sides of the survey, please send me 3 participation rewards." I checked the box and casually read the text below, learning that the first two rewards were a 35mm camera and a travel guide. As I continued, however, I found that the third "reward" was the activation of a 26 issue subscription to U.S. News & World Report for which I would be billed $15!

Has anyone else seen this poll from what I would have expected to be a reputable organization to whom I would have been willing to express my opinion if I believed it was a valid poll? Can AAPOR formally contact U.S. News & World Report--a regular user of poll data in its news coverage--and give them a tongue lashing with the stamp of approval of the public opinion research community?

Sincerely,

William "Chip" Eveland

William "Chip" Eveland
Assistant Professor
Department of Communication
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
Email: eveland@sscf.ucsb.edu
I'm a little slow, but... ditto-AAPOR's annual conference was = refreshing, stimulating, and it is always a pleasure to hear the ideas = and interesting projects friends and colleagues are working on across = the country. I'm sorry to say, but the annual meeting is nearly the = only time I see and socialize with my local colleagues and catch = up-reality of time
constraints. And the new friends and late night = dancing and beach bummying were great fun too... Thanks to all who put = in many hours of hard work so we can all come together-these things = don't happen on their own, and we're very appreciative (even if one of = our past times is bonding over those rubber chickens that follow us from = city to city!). Speaking of chickens, while at AAPOR, a squatter moved = onto our tiny yard in Woodley Place in DC and hid in the bushes every = time someone passed on the sidewalk. I let a DC reporter know about the = unusual wildlife living in our urban garden. Channel 4 sent over a crew = and did a story on the little black hen who wouldn't cross the road but = preferred to stay in the research company's yard... was funny! Found = her a good home, so won't bring her to Portland.

cheers, Mark Richards

--------

From:  Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
Sent:  Tuesday, May 18, 1999 9:46 AM
To:  aapornet@usc.edu
Subject:  Re: Kudos

I apologize for not "beating" Rachel and Alice in thanking everyone via aapornet for their own personal contributions towards making our ’99 conference the great success that most appear to believe it was.

AAPOR is certainly a VERY special organization and our annual = conferences are manifestations of all that's best in us -- stimulating exchange of ideas, mentoring those new to the field, energized but civil = disagreements, and great friendships.

Take care and look forward to seeing you in Portland for AAPOR 2000! (Or =
in Portland this fall for the Nonresponse conference.)

Professor Paul J. Lavrakas, Chair
1999 AAPOR Conference Committee

>From jbason@arches.uga.edu Tue May 25 12:19:30 1999
Received: from mailgw.cc.uga.edu (mailgw.cc.uga.edu [128.192.1.101])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id MAA22519 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 May 1999 12:19:28 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from archa7.cc.uga.edu (arch7.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu
   (LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.00D29C65@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>;
   Tue, 25 May 1999 15:18:13 -0400
Received: from jud.ibr.uga.edu (jud.ibr.uga.edu [128.192.63.15])
   by archa7.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id PAA28044
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 May 1999 15:19:15 -0400
From: James Bason <jbason@arches.uga.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: 1999 SAPOR Conference
Message-ID: <SIMEON.9905251504.J@jud.ibr.uga.edu>
Date: Tue, 25 May 1999 15:21:04 -0700 (Pacific Daylight Time)
X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.3 Build (39)
X-Authentication: IMSP
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Just a reminder that the deadline for paper proposals for the 1999
Southern Association for Public Opinion Research (SAPOR) is JUNE 15th.
The conference will be held in Raleigh, NC at the University Club on the N.C. State University campus on October 7th and 8th, 1999.

Paper proposals are invited in all areas of opinion and survey research, including political communication, public opinion, electoral behavior, the media, as well as other relevant areas. Papers on applied sampling, survey methodology, and CAI are also welcome.

For more information concerning the conference, please contact Mark D. West, Conference Chair, at:

west@unca.edu
or
828-251-6615

You can also learn about SAPOR and the annual conference by accessing:

www.irss.unc.edu/sapor

James J. Bason, Ph.D.
Director
Survey Research Center
University of Georgia
114 Barrow Hall
Athens, GA 30602
jbason@arches.uga.edu
(706) 542-6110
The details of the trends in response rates cited earlier can be found in the International Journal of Public Opinion Research 7 (Summer, 1995), 151-171. Tom W. Smith
Hi all,

The recent discussion on trends in response rates is very interesting, thanks for the information. For those interested in nonresponse two tips:

1) The coming issue of the Journal of Official Statistics (JOS) will be a special issue on nonresponse. One of the articles (although all are very interesting) is by Wim de Heer, who studied response trends in official surveys (Labour Force Survey) over time and in different countries. In short it depends. Some countries have a clear downward trend, others remain stable overall, but show an increase in refusal and a decrease in noncontacts, indicating more fieldwork effort. A few (special mandatory) surveys also remain stable. For more details see coming JOS.

2) At the coming international conference on survey nonresponse in Portland (October 28-31), nonresponse trends will be the topic of several
presentations.

warm regards, Edith

===========================================================
| Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA Amsterdam |  
| Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN, Amsterdam, the Netherlands |  
| phone + 31 20 622 34 38, Fax + 31 20 622 34 38 |  
| e-mail edithL@educ.uva.nl |  
===========================================================

In God We Trust

Everyone Else Should Bring DATA

> From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed May 26 07:29:07 1999

Received: from smtp2.mindspring.com (smtp2.mindspring.com [207.69.200.32]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id HAA24430 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 07:29:03 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from default (user-38ld44i.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.144.146]) by smtp2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id KAA23694 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 10:29:00 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.2.0.37.19990526095803.009e3600@mail.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.37 (Beta)
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 10:11:45 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Bogus U.S. News Poll---The Pied Piper Approach
In-Reply-To: <3.0.1.32.19990525095928.00ab3edc@sscf.ucsb.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
I sympathize with Chip Eveland's comments about his recently received questionnaire from US & World Report

BUT, if I had a buck for every fund solicitation buried in what looks like a legitimate poll (from reputable organizations trying to raise money) it would pay for a nice weekend away. All the political parties do this along with those concerned with environmental issues, social issues, etc. etc. Most of the questions are "leading" so that when you finish answering you feel guilty not to send in a contribution or subscribe to a magazine. I call this the Pied Piper approach.

What to do is another matter. Sitcoms on TV use sex and violence to draw in viewers. Other organizations have learned that polls are almost as seductive..in a somewhat different way. Just follow the Pied Piper. Bet you never thought of them that way!

Dick Halpern

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
rshalpern@mindspring.com
phone/fax 770 434 4121
I received a "survey" from an animal protection organization (I can't remember the exact name). It asked a bunch of questions (biased ones) and then asked for a contribution. Although I typically support the work that these types of organizations do, I refused to fill out their questionnaire or send money. Instead I wrote them a note that suggested that they either send me a survey or a request for money, but not both at the same time. I also told them that they violated some basic rules of survey research with such mailings and referred them to the AAPOR home page. I haven't heard from them since.

Linda Owens
All the political parties do this along with those concerned with environmental issues, social issues, etc. etc. Most of the questions are "leading" so that when you finish answering you feel guilty not to send in a contribution or subscribe to a magazine. I call this the Pied Piper approach.
Dear AAPORites,

If you haven't already seen it, Arianna Huffington has another anti-polling column out today. One place to look is the Chicago Sun-Times' webpage.

It is no surprise that I find her views VERY DANGEROUS to the cause of quality public opinion polling and the great potential value I believe ethical polls, and in particular public polls, have to our democracy.

If you have a chance to respond to Ms. Huffington (e.g., writing a letter or email to your local newspaper editor) and other poll-bashers in some way I would suggest considering the following observations (which are my own opinions, of course):

1. Huffington appears to know very little about what is likely to make an opinion poll accurate and what makes it inaccurate. She appears to not think that arguing from a position of real knowledge about polling methods serves her purposes.

2. Huffington's criticisms of polling are highly partisan and sound a real "sour grapes" theme, apparently since she just can't stand the fact that good quality public polls keep coming up with findings that she doesn't care for.

3. In turn, the American public is not at all well equipped to be critical of her arguments or to understand what makes quality opinion polls very likely to be accurate. Huffington takes great advantage of this level of public ignorance to bad-mouth polls with little being done to counter her
efforts.

4. Huffington writes as though she doesn't understand *or value* the U.S. Constitution's protection of freedom of speech. Her idea of how to expand the Telephone Consumer Protection Act is loudly voiced but is empty rhetoric in a nation such as ours.

Of course that doesn't mean that her arguments are harmless to polling, far from it -- they are very dangerous because many citizens exposed directly and indirectly to these views have no ability or motivation to want to reject her opinions as being just plain wrong.

5. When she writes that policy should be "divorced from polling," I sense that her own elitist views are rearing their ugly head and that she entirely discounts the value of considering the opinions of the "average citizen" in all policy formulations -- or is it just discounting those views that citizens hold that she doesn't agree with???

6. This latest effort on her part is merely one of many we can expect that will attack poll credibility in highly biased/partisan ways.

Good luck to us all in this escalating battle to preserve the credibility of quality opinion polling.
Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.  
Professor of Journalism & Communication  
Professor of Public Policy & Management  
Director, Center for Survey Research  
College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University  
Derby Hall [Room 3045], 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210  
Voice: 614-292-3468  Fax: 614-292-6673  E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu

>From ande271@ibm.net Wed May 26 08:13:47 1999
Received: from out4.ibm.net (out4.ibm.net [165.87.194.239])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA05486 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 08:13:45 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (slip129-37-113-118.pa.us.ibm.net [129.37.113.118])
by out4.ibm.net (8.8.5/8.6.9) with SMTP id PAA142764 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Wed, 26 May 1999 15:13:42 GMT
Message-ID: <374C3AB2.400F@ibm.net>
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 11:17:22 -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
Bravo for those who take the time to write notes to fundraisers who send bogus "surveys" with an appeal attached (or FRUG, meaning "Fund Raising Under the Guise...". I have tried it several times, and actually wrote a form letter for NY-AAPOR to use. We never circulated it to NY-AAPOR members, however, and it does take time to write a unique letter. It would not take much time to write to AAPORNET with the name and address of the miscreant, and not much time for AAPORNET members to send the form letter via e-mail.

Standards Committee once had a form letter to send on behalf of AAPOR and I hope that still is done whenever the Committee is alerted.

However, it would do no harm for everyone else to have a quick way of reacting directly. Who knows? Floods of letters might help.

Another thought. There appears to be at least one firm in DC (marketing? consulting?) that recommends FRUG-type appeals and mails them out on behalf of its clients. I was on the verge of identifying such a firm, but had no real support from the Standards Committee at that time. If the real "perp" is the consultant rather than the npo or political organization, AAPOR might consider contacting the consultant and suggesting other ways to do what otherwise might be legitimate business.

Could AAPOR Standards draft a form letter and make it available to all on AAPORNET for use whenever any AAPORNET member reports receiving a

>From Sangster_R@bls.gov Wed May 26 08:26:27 1999
My favorite survey is one I received about Angels. It was a tri-fold mail out. One section was a four question survey about my belief in Angels that appeared on the flip-side of a self-addressed return postcard (tear off) ---and of course they would sign me up for their Angels On Earth magazine for just $16.95. It was sent from Guideposts.

Robie Sangster

Bureau of Labor Statistics
Office of Research and Evaluation
I sympathize with Chip Eveland's comments about his recently received questionnaire from US & World Report.

BUT, if I had a buck for every fund solicitation buried in what looks like a legitimate poll (from reputable organizations trying to raise money) it would pay for a nice weekend away. All the political parties do this along with those concerned with environmental issues, social issues, etc. etc. Most of the questions are "leading" so that when you finish answering you feel guilty not to send in a contribution or subscribe to a magazine. I call this the Pied Piper approach.

What to do is another matter. Sitcoms on TV use sex and violence to draw in viewers. Other organizations have learned that polls are almost as seductive..in a somewhat different way. Just follow the Pied Piper. Bet you
> never thought of them that way!
>
> Dick Halpern
>
>
> +++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
>
> Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
> Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
> Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology
> 3837 Courtyard Drive
> Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
> rshalpern@mindspring.com
> phone/fax 770 434 4121
> +++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

>From rday@mcs.net Wed May 26 08:28:50 1999
Received: from Mailbox.mcs.net (Mailbox.mcs.com [192.160.127.87])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA09041 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 08:28:49 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from gopher (P17-Chi-Dial-7.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.145]) by
Mailbox.mcs.net (8.8.7/8.8.2) with SMTP id KAA14663 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Wed, 26 May 1999 10:28:46 -0500 (CDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990526102640.0074fa4c@popmail.mcs.net>
X-Sender: rday@popmail.mcs.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.2 (32)
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 10:26:40 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
Please refer all of these issues to CMOR they have a website. CMOR the Council of Marketing and Opinion Rsearch deals with issues such as these.

At 09:33 AM 5/26/99 -0500, you wrote:
>I received a "survey" from an animal protection organization (I can't
>remember the exact name). It asked a bunch of questions (biased ones)
>and then asked for a contribution. Although I typically support the
>work that these types of organizations do, I refused to fill out their
>questionnaire or send money. Instead I wrote them a note that
>suggested that they either send me a survey or a request for money, but
>not both at the same time. I also told them that they violated some
>basic rules of survey research with such mailings and referred them to
>the AAPOR home page. I haven't heard from them since.
>Linda Owens
>
>>> dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com> 05/26/99
>09:11am >>>
>
>All the political parties do this along with those concerned with
>environmental issues, social issues, etc. etc. Most of the questions
>are "leading" so that when you finish answering you feel guilty not to
>send in a contribution or subscribe to a magazine. I call this the
>Pied Piper approach.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>From efreelan@Princeton.EDU Wed May 26 08:29:39 1999

Received: from Princeton.EDU (outbound2.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA09465 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 08:29:35 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from mail.Princeton.EDU (mail.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.14])
   by Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA29880
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 11:29:34 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from princeton.edu (wws-9nkmv.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.125])
   by mail.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA11396
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 11:29:33 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <374C1315.DB4BF90@princeton.edu>
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 11:28:21 -0400
From: Edward Freeland <efreelan@Princeton.EDU>
Reply-To: efreelan@Princeton.EDU
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (WinNT; l)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Today's Huffington column
References: <2.2.32.19990526150934.00bbe040@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Here's the website address for the latest Huffington column:


I found her column under the following URL:


----------

Original Text

From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>, on 5/26/99 11:09 AM:
Dear AAPORites,

If you haven't already seen it, Arianna Huffington has another anti-polling column out today. One place to look is the Chicago Sun-Times' webpage.

It is no surprise that I find her views VERY DANGEROUS to the cause of quality public opinion polling and the great potential value I believe ethical polls, and in particular public polls, have to our democracy.

If you have a chance to respond to Ms. Huffington (e.g., writing a letter or email to your local newspaper editor) and other poll-bashers in some way I would suggest considering the following observations (which are my own opinions, of course):

1. Huffington appears to know very little about what is likely to make an opinion poll accurate and what makes it inaccurate. She appears to not think that arguing from a position of real knowledge about polling methods serves her purposes.

2. Huffington's criticisms of polling are highly partisan and sound a real "sour grapes" theme, apparently since she just can't stand the fact that good quality public polls keep coming up with findings that she doesn't care for.

3. In turn, the American public is not at all well equipped to be critical of her arguments or to understand what makes quality opinion polls very likely to be accurate. Huffington takes great advantage of this level of
public ignorance to bad-mouth polls with little being done to counter her efforts.

4. Huffington writes as though she doesn't understand *or value* the U.S. Constitution's protection of freedom of speech. Her idea of how to expand the Telephone Consumer Protection Act is loudly voiced but is empty rhetoric in a nation such as ours.

Of course that doesn't mean that her arguments are harmless to polling, far from it -- they are very dangerous because many citizens exposed directly and indirectly to these views have no ability or motivation to want to reject her opinions as being just plain wrong.

5. When she writes that policy should be "divorced from polling," I sense that her own elitist views are rearing their ugly head and that she entirely discounts the value of considering the opinions of the "average citizen" in all policy formulations -- or is it just discounting those views that citizens hold that she doesn't agree with???

6. This latest effort on her part is merely one of many we can expect that will attack poll credibility in highly biased/partisan ways.

Good luck to us all in this escalating battle to preserve the credibility of quality opinion polling.
David Krane
Louis Harris and Associates
111 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10003
(Tel) 212-539-9648
(Fax)212-539-9669
(Email) david@lha.gsbc.com
>From daves@startribune.com Wed May 26 09:08:03 1999
Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com [132.148.80.211])
       by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
As a followup to Paul Lavrakas' note, you also can read Arianna Huffington's column at http://www.ariannaonline.com

And while you're there =AF if you are of a mind =AF you also can pledge to =
"just say no" to pollsters (what she's urging) and sign up for her =
Partnership for a Poll Free America, chat about it in her chat room, and =
read about her other crusades, too.

Cheers...
Fellow survey researchers:

Below is a copy of a letter that I sent to Ms. Huffington in response to her article questioning polls. Ms. Huffington continues to allow her own partisan leanings to cloud her judgment about the objective truths of polling. All of us should speak out against this and write to our local newspapers to help counteract the inaccuracies that her syndicated column distributes across the country. I have my own partisan feelings but I have never let that cloud my judgment about the work I do nor do I criticize polls because of the results, I accept that that is what the American people think, whether I like it or not.

I would encourage the field to speak out more vociferously about these types articles written by political pundits and cynics.

Brian E. Harpuder
Graduate Research Associate
Center for Survey Research
The Ohio State University
Harpuder.1@osu.edu
Ms. Huffington,

I, like yourself am a partisan Republican. I dislike President Clinton as much as the next Republican and I contribute to the Republican National Committee and the Ohio Republican Party on a yearly basis.

I did not like the way the American people were thinking about the President earlier in the year and cannot understand how anyone could respect him anymore. I cannot understand why he has not resigned yet, if nothing else out of pure shame.

While I do not like the President I also work in an academic survey research center and as such do not allow my own partisan political judgment to cloud my judgment regarding the wording of questions and the validity of polls. Just because I do not like the message does not mean I should go attack the messenger.

Your articles show your complete lack of knowledge and understanding about how surveys work and why they are valid. You apparently have no understanding of the scientific principles that underlie polls. Rather than making the American public more informed you are making for a more ignorant American public.

Response rates to surveys are low in part because of cynics like yourself who disparage them without understanding one aspect of them. Low response does not mean a lack of validity. Much of the research that I have conducted on error (bias) that is associated with non-response when compared to Census population values is that the differences between those who
respond and those who do not respond are within a few percentage points, nothing that would alter the meaning of the polls. The amount of error if any that exists is randomly distributed and does not affect the legitimacy or accuracy of polls.

You also disparage the appropriate role of polls in a democratic society. The American people do not vote often and polls provide them an easy opportunity to speak their mind. To be sure not all polls are equal, but polls conducted by legitimate organizations like the media survey units and academic survey units provide an important vehicle for citizens to voice their opinions. The polls do not tell politicians what to do but they help to define the limits within which officials can act. Polls help to make the United States an even more free and democratic society. Your proposal to stop answering polls will only lead to less democracy in the United States and would infringe on the First Amendment rights of a free press to gather information.

Moreover, there are many polls which are conducted on behalf of the U.S. government as well as other state and local governments. These polls help government officials to plan for the future and better judge how they are helping the people they wish to serve. For instance the National Institutes of Health studies how children are immunized around the country in order to develop programs that will help the government to ensure that more children are immunized from potentially fatal diseases. If you tell people to stop answering surveys, programs like these may suffer and children will suffer because the government will not have directed its resources appropriately. Do you want that to happen? You obviously have no understanding of the wide use of polls and the CRITICAL role they play to democracy and to the work of the government in helping it serve its citizens.
Your articles only show your own ignorance and lack of desire to accurately discuss subjects. It would serve you and your readers better if you actually did some research before you start writing. Develop an understanding before you start criticizing. Your articles are like a child saying that they do not like tomatoes without even trying them; you draw a conclusion based on no legitimate facts, or at a minimum you never cite anything that would lend any legitimacy to your articles.

If you want to hurt democracy and limit the voice of the people then you will continue writing in the same vein as you currently do. If you would like to help democracy then you will retract the inaccurate statements that you have made. Polls play an important role in society and help our elected officials Republicans and Democrats alike. If you do not like the message why don't you try to present evidence to the American people to encourage them to change their minds rather than attract the messenger.

I encourage you to think and research before you speak. Show some responsibility for your words and do not let your political agenda interfere with objective truth. I will continue to vote Republican and convince others to do the same but I will also not criticize polls because I understand how legitimate they are and the importance that they play to society, government, and both political parties. I will also not let my own strong partisan feelings interfere with my judgement when I help to construct and analyze surveys. I will report the facts honestly and accurately so as not to compromise my own integrity or the integrity of those I work with. I assure you that legitimate survey researchers around the country do the same thing in spite of their own partisan leanings. We keep our politics private so we can inform the public accurately and
impartially, you on the other hand allow politics to cloud your judgment.

The American public will benefit from your taking greater responsibility and showing greater honesty and integrity.

Brian E. Harpuder, M.A.

Brian E. Harpuder, M.A.
Graduate Research Associate
Center for Survey Research and Department of Political Science The Ohio State University harpuder.1@osu.edu
Office: (614) 292-6672
Home: (614) 538-0455

>From efreelan@Princeton.EDU Wed May 26 10:31:41 1999
Received: from Princeton.EDU (outbound2.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id KAA20747 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 10:31:26 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mail.Princeton.EDU (mail.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.125])
   by mail.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id NAA29265
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 13:31:24 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from princeton.edu (wws-9nkmv.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.125])
   by mail.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id NAA10486
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 13:31:25 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <374C2FA4.73600F7F@princeton.edu>
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 13:30:12 -0400
AAPORites curious about Arianna Huffington will also want to check out her Partnership for a Poll-Free America website.

http://www.ariannaonline.com/crusades/ppfa.html

I've included the text of the site below. Before you get riled by this, note that Harry Shearer (her partner) is a comedian.

Just a thought: as long as we're getting rid of polling, maybe we should get rid of elections too. This way our "spineless" politicians can better follow their own consciences.

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

PARTNERSHIP FOR A POLL-FREE AMERICA

A joint project of Arianna Huffington and Harry Shearer

There is a specter America. It happens daily--practically hourly. It affects the life of every person in our country. And you can help stop it.

The problem is that what our country needs and what 500 people say they want
are often two different things. There is, however, a way to join the two together: leadership. But because of public opinion polls, our political leaders have been turned into spineless followers.

But get rid of public opinion polls and maybe the natural selection of our political process will once again reward the fittest leaders. Clearly, our politicians will be no help in the fight--the demand side is too strong. But you can affect the supply.

By signing your name, email address, and (optional) street address, you can pledge to say no to pollsters. The follow through is easy: when pollsters call, just refuse to answer any questions. Once enough people join us, poll results will become useless, and our leaders will be forced to lead.

JUST SAY NO!

Name

Email:

Phone:

(optional)

Address:

(optional)

I WILL NO LONGER PARTICIPATE IN PUBLIC OPINION POLLS
From KathrynC@socialresearch.com Wed May 26 10:46:11 1999
Received: from mail.isp.net (psion.isp.net [216.38.129.30])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA28965 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 10:46:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from researchnt.socialresearch.com (mail.socialresearch.com
[208.128.218.194])
    by mail.isp.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA46251
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 10:47:19 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <199905261747.KAA46251@mail.isp.net>
Received: by mail.socialresearch.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
    id <K39J5DBB>; Wed, 26 May 1999 10:35:49 -0700
From: Kathy Cirksena <KathrynC@socialresearch.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Surveying children
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 10:43:48 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
Content-Type: text/plain
Hello AAPORites,

I'm looking for references on surveying children, especially research and suggestions on questionnaire design and question wording that are developmentally appropriate for kids between 7 and 12. Thanks in advance for your help.

Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.
Research Services Manager
Communication Sciences Group/
Survey Methods Group
140 Second Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 495-6692 ext. 269
Good idea. It would probably be helpful if those in AAPOR who share =
Huffington's political views would write her or set up a personal visit = to
hear her fears and goals, and to explain the technical issues. = Perhaps
there is a more effective way to accomplish her goal? short of = poll
bashing. At minimum, she can be asked to get her facts straight, = since
the golden rule of journalism is "accuracy, accuracy, accuracy." = She
shouldn't lower the standards of her profession, which is also = taking a
beating these days.

She needs to understand that polling isn't an ideological issue-groups = on
both sides of the isle find it valuable, whether they speak of their = polls
or not. Maybe her goal is to lower public confidence in polls so = they
cannot be used as easily as a "fence" around decision-makers. = Wonder if
she is advising her colleagues running for election to avoid = using polls?

Even if public confidence in polling results drops, elites on both sides =
of the isle will continue to use the polls to gain an edge on = intelligence
for framing their arguments and prioritizing the issues to = win elections
among the very public who doesn't believe in them. = Ironic.
Dear AAPORites,

If you haven't already seen it, Arianna Huffington has another anti-polling column out today. One place to look is the Chicago Sun-Times' webpage.

It is no surprise that I find her views VERY DANGEROUS to the cause of quality public opinion polling and the great potential value I believe ethical polls, and in particular public polls, have to our democracy.

If you have a chance to respond to Ms. Huffington (e.g., writing a letter or email to your local newspaper editor) and other poll-bashers in some way = I would suggest considering the following observations (which are my own opinions, of course):

1. Huffington appears to know very little about what is likely to make an opinion poll accurate and what makes it inaccurate. She appears to not think that arguing from a position of real knowledge about polling = methods serves her purposes.

2. Huffington's criticisms of polling are highly partisan and sound a =
real "sour grapes" theme, apparently since she just can't stand the fact that good quality public polls keep coming up with findings that she doesn't care for.

3. In turn, the American public is not at all well equipped to be critical of her arguments or to understand what makes quality opinion polls very likely to be accurate. Huffington takes great advantage of this level of public ignorance to bad-mouth polls with little being done to counter her efforts.

4. Huffington writes as though she doesn't understand *or value* the U.S. Constitution's protection of freedom of speech. Her idea of how to expand the Telephone Consumer Protection Act is loudly voiced but is empty rhetoric in a nation such as ours. Of course that doesn't mean that her arguments are harmless to polling, far from it -- they are very dangerous because many citizens exposed directly and indirectly to these views have no ability or motivation to want to reject her opinions as being just plain wrong.

5. When she writes that policy should be "divorced from polling," I sense that her own elitist views are rearing their ugly head and that she entirely discounts the value of considering the opinions of the "average citizen" in all policy formulations -- or is it just discounting those views that citizens hold that she doesn't agree with???

6. This latest effort on her part is merely one of many we can expect that will attack poll credibility in highly biased/partisan ways.
Good luck to us all in this escalating battle to preserve the credibility of quality opinion polling.

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

>From SMarcy@NationalResearch.com Wed May 26 12:25:42 1999
Received: from nrc7.nationalresearch.com ([12.13.114.6])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
      id MAA21210 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 12:25:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by nrc7.nationalresearch.com with Internet Mail Service
   (5.5.2448.0)
      id <KYPMS7HB>; Wed, 26 May 1999 14:23:02 -0500
Gee, and I thought that that's what the Republican House of Reps had done: ignored the polls and voted their consciences -- just as Arianna wanted them to. Of course, meanwhile they have begun to worry about the opinions of many Americans -- as measured by polls, of course.

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed May 26 12:37:51 1999
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA25348 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 12:37:46 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from jwp.com (plp34.vgernet.net [205.219.186.134])
    by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id QAA14252
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 16:38:54 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <374C4D9C.CB835B5@jwdp.com>
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 15:38:04 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.51 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
This is clearly the same "survey" I received from USN&WR last October and forwarded to AAPOR Standards Chair Kathy Frankovic, after mentioning it on AAPORNET at the time.

If Kathy contacted USN&WR, it clearly didn't have much effect.

I get lots of phony polls in the mail, most of which are pretty obvious sales pitches, and I throw them out without paying much attention to them, but this one really goes to extreme lengths to be deceptive.

For those of you who follow subscription scams, watch for one from American Express, which is offering very good rates on a number of magazines, while burying near the bottom of a page of 4-point type the information that you are agreeing that all subscriptions will be automatically renewed every year and charged to your card.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

"William P. Eveland, Jr." wrote:
>
>
I received a survey in the mail a few days ago and it really worries me...

The envelope was labeled "U.S. & World Events" and stated that a questionnaire was inside. I opened the envelope, found the questionnaire, and began to fill it out. For the most part it was demographics and some poorly worded news media use and current events opinion items. However, I filled it out faithfully.

At the end of the survey there was a check box: "Yes, I have filled out both sides of the survey, please send me 3 participation rewards."

I checked the box and casually read the text below, learning that the first two rewards were a 35mm camera and a travel guide. As I continued, however, I found that the third "reward" was the activation of a 26 issue subscription to U.S. News & World Report for which I would be billed $15!

Has anyone else seen this poll from what I would have expected to be a reputable organization to whom I would have been willing to express my opinion if I believed it was a valid poll? Can AAPOR formally contact U.S. News & World Report--a regular user of poll data in its news coverage--and give them a tongue lashing with the stamp of approval of the public opinion research community?

Sincerely,

William "Chip" Eveland

William "Chip" Eveland
It may be premature, but I think Ms. Huffington would make a fine keynote/plenary speaker for the Portland conference. I'd also invite
Christopher Hitchens; he too repeatedly has made anti-polling comments over the years. Hitchens and Huffington are entitled to their opinions, but it would be optimal if we could hear from them and refute their claims directly.

Food for thought.
-Robert Eisinger

p.s.: It's 75 degrees and sunny in Portland. Go Blazers?

>From Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com Wed May 26 12:39:28 1999
Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA26556 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 May 1999 12:39:23 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id PAA26224; Wed, 26 May 1999 15:30:51 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from arbmdex.arbitron.com(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via smap (4.1)
    id xma026096; Wed, 26 May 99 15:29:56 -0400
Received: by arbmdex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <LR94WR8R>; Wed, 26 May 1999 15:33:29 -0400
Message-ID: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B3014198AC@arbmdex.arbitron.com>
From: "Cralley, Marla" <Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Surveying children
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 15:33:28 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain
I have some questionnaires used to obtain radio listening information from children 6-11. Do you want me to send them to you? Also I have some information regarding interviewing children from the ARF Children's research council.

> -----Original Message-----
> From:     Kathy Cirksena [SMTP:KathrynC@socialresearch.com]
> Sent:     Wednesday, May 26, 1999 1:44 PM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject:  Surveying children
> >
> Hello AAPORites,
> >
> I'm looking for references on surveying children, especially research
> and suggestions on questionnaire design and question wording that are
> developmentally appropriate for kids between 7 and 12. Thanks in
> advance for your help.
> >
> Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.
> Research Services Manager
> Communication Sciences Group/
> Survey Methods Group
> 140 Second Street, Suite 400
> San Francisco, CA 94105
> (415) 495-6692 ext. 269

Received: from cheetah.it.wsu.edu Wed May 26 17:43:29 1999
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
I read with interest your column extolling the virtues of asserting one's right to not be bothered with telemarketer phone calls. However, I wish that you would distinguish among the types of telephone calling, i.e., for marketing purposes, for political polls, for 'customer' satisfaction and feedback, and for research. For instance, in our situation, there is no other viable way to gather thorough feedback from students about their experience and satisfaction with their education here at WSU. When public entities attempt to gather the opinions of constituents about aspects of public policy, phone surveys achieve so much higher a response rate than mailed surveys as to justify the extra expense. Of course, any individual maintains the right to refuse to answer the whole survey or any specific questions on it.
The fact that we get so many respondents thanking us for including their views and feedback for decision-making would seem to indicate that those who prefer not to be included are a very small minority (who do maintain their right to that preference, nonetheless). Also, all survey researchers spend extensive screening and training time to get interviewers who are sensitive to the timing of their calls and to accommodate appointments for a call-back. Please do not overlook these aspects of 'polling' and make the mistake of lumping them all together. MB Mary Boynton Student Affairs Research Washington State University Pullman, WA 99164-1066 (509) 335-4999 FAX: (509) 335-1208

>From mohler@zuma-mannheim.de Thu May 27 01:10:26 1999
Received: from mail.zuma-mannheim.de (mail.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.12])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id BAA27747 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 01:10:23 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from zuma-mannheim.de (pc-mohler.zuma-mannheim.de [193.196.10.35])
   by mail.zuma-mannheim.de (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id KAA19537
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 10:06:37 +0200
Message-ID: <374CFD80.FC6F658F@zuma-mannheim.de>
Date: Thu, 27 May 1999 10:08:33 +0200
From: "Peter Ph. Mohler" <mohler@zuma-mannheim.de>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (WinNT; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: [Fwd: Response Rates short comment]
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="------------16D6C9A2A15EB37C1CA8EE5F"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------------16D6C9A2A15EB37C1CA8EE5F
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

------------16D6C9A2A15EB37C1CA8EE5F
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

X-Mozilla-Status2: 00000000
Message-ID: <374CF272.2A7FF4C3@zuma-mannheim.de>
Date: Thu, 27 May 1999 09:21:22 +0200
From: "Peter Ph. Mohler" <director@zuma-mannheim.de>
Organization: ZUMA
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (WinNT; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Response Rates short comment
References: <3.0.16.19990526163336.2c2fa69e@mail.educ.uva.nl>
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="------------AFD4ABD3E471BB90E61D7B63"
in addition to Edith's and other comments: some people say the observed decline is, at least partially, associated with with higher awareness of the problem and hence different reporting techniques (for instance "substitution" once was categorised as "neutral" , today it is either "forbidden" or categorised as "non-response of a target address which is then substituted"). This hypothesis is to some extent supported by a comparison of survey demographics with census data. There is evidence (still little) that some high-response rates at least in Germany are accompanied by non-random distribution of the non-responses across demographics (or more directly said, if you like: all the rich, all the poor, all the hard to reach people are packed in the 20% non-response, while the middle-classes and the easy to get are in the 80% of responses) (study in German, by A. Koch from ZUMA with some hints to this effect). Are there other data supporting this hypothesis out there? Peter Mohler

Edith de Leeuw wrote:

> Hi all,
> The recent discussion on trends in response rates is very interesting,
> thanks for the information. For those interested in nonresponse two tips:
> 1) The coming issue of the Journal of Official Statistics (JOS)
> will be a special issue on nonresponse. One of the articles (although all are very interesting) is by Wim de Heer, who studied response trends in official surveys (Labour Force Survey) over time and in
different countries. In short it depends. Some countries have a clear
downward trend, others remain stable overall, but show an increase in
refusal and a decrease in noncontacts, indicating more fieldwork
effort. A few (special mandatory) surveys also remain stable. For more
details see coming JOS.

2) At the coming international conference on survey
nonresponse in Portland (October 28-31), nonresponse trends will be
the topic of several presentations.

warm regards, Edith

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA Amsterdam
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
phone +31 20 622 34 38, Fax +31 20 622 34 38
e-mail edithL@educ.uva.nl

In God We Trust

Everyone Else Should Bring DATA

------------------AFD4ABD3E471BB90E61D7B63
Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii; name="director.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: Card for Peter Ph. Mohler
Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="director.vcf"

begin:vcard
n:Mohler;Peter Ph.
x-mozilla-html:TRUE
org:ZUMA ;Director
adr;;;P.O. Box 122155;Mannheim;;68072;Germany
version:2.1
eemail;internet:director@zuma-mannheim.de
title:Prof. Peter Ph. Mohler
x-mozilla-cpt::0
fn:Peter Ph. Mohler
end:vcard

--------------AFD4ABD3E471BB90E61D7B63--

--------------16D6C9A2A15EB37C1CA8EE5F
Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii;
name="mohler.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: Card for Peter Ph. Mohler
Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="mohler.vcf"

begin:vcard
n:Mohler;Peter Ph.
x-mozilla-html:TRUE
org:ZUMA ;Director
adr;;;P.O. Box 122155;Mannheim;;68072;Germany
version:2.1
eemail;internet:director@zuma-mannheim.de
title:Prof. Peter Ph. Mohler
A good chapter on interviewing children, including some information on how
to pretest questionnaires is the chapter of Jacqueline Scott (children as respondents) in L. Lyberg et al. Survey measurement and process quality, New York, Wiley, 1997.

Also, a graduate student of mine (Natacha Borgers) is working on her thesis on survey data quality when surveying children. We welcome any information about "survey data quality and interviewing children". As a tit-for-tat we can send to those interested a copy of an invited paper for the conference on methodological issues in official statistics, last year. This paper summarizes her findings up till now, discusses the influence of development stages and their relevance for surveying children and ends with practical recommendations.

If you want a copy of Natascha's paper, or can send us your experiences with surveying children or references, please send an e-mail to:

   edithL@educ.uva.nl (NOT to the list), or if you have a printed paper to: Edith de Leeuw/Natacha Borgers, Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Best regards from a summery and sunny Amsterdam.

Edith de Leeuw

At 10:43 26-05-99 -0700, you wrote:

>Hello AAPORites,
>
> I'm looking for references on surveying children, especially research
> and suggestions on questionnaire design and question wording that are
developmentally appropriate for kids between 7 and 12. Thanks in advance for your help.

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

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
tel/fax + 31 20 622 34 38 e-mail edithl@educ.uva.nl

Ode to Heinz (sorry Spot):

A tail is quite essential for your acrobatic talents
You would not be so agile if you lacked its counterbalance
And when not being utilized to aid in locomotion
It ALWAYS serves to illustrate the state of your emotion
To contrast with Arianna, our newspaper, The Tallahassee Democrat (NONPARTISAN, OF COURSE), published two small announcements about the local telephone survey we did to replicate the national and state Behavioral Health Risks data for the area. We got a 71 percent response rate and a 77 percent "hit" rate for answered residential phones. The Democrat did a front page article on the results too.

A rousing cheer for the Tallahasee Democrat who (that?)(which?) demonstrated the positive power of the press.

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

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

PHONE 850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208

>From morinr@washpost.com Thu May 27 08:23:20 1999
Received: from stamp.digitalink.com (stamp.digitalink.com [206.137.160.25])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA01232 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 08:23:16 -0700
   (PDT)
From: morinr@washpost.com
Received: from utility.washpost.com (utility.washpost.com [10.4.1.97])
   by stamp.digitalink.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA13502
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 11:30:42 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by notesnt1.washpost.com (Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2
   (651.2 6-10-1998)) id 8525677E.005395AF ; Thu, 27 May 1999 11:12:58 -0400
Bob,

Here's the portion of my Lincoln talk on our 1975 Public Affairs Act re-test. Apologies for the delay.

Regards,

Rich
A famous polling experiment illustrates the prevalence of pseudo-opinions: More than 20 years ago, a group of researchers at the University of Cincinnati asked a random sample of local residents whether the 1975 Public Affairs Act should be repealed. About half expressed a view one way or another.

Of course there never was a Public Affairs Act of 1975. Researchers made it up to see how willing people were to express opinions on things they knew absolutely nothing about.

Four years ago, to honor the 20th anniversary of the Public Affairs Act, I duplicated the original experiment in a national survey, and added some additional tests.
Some people say the 1975 Public Affairs Act should be repealed. Do you agree or disagree that it should be repealed?

43 percent expressed an opinion one way or another

24 percent said it should be repealed

19 percent said it should not

Asked a second version of the question: President Clinton =
that the 1975 Public Affairs Act should be repealed. Do you agree or disagree?

This time more than half-9753 percent-97expressed an opinion

36 percent of all Democrats agreed

But only 16 percent of all Republicans

Asked a third version of the question: The Republicans in Congress said that the 1975 Public Affairs Act should be repealed. Do you agree or disagree?

You can guess what happened:
36 percent of all Republicans agreed

But only 19 percent of all Democrats
The data are quite straightforward but what was your point? That people construct their opinions and attitudes and that framing effects are important? Or that the responses are worthless? (Yawn). Did you suggest doing anything about it? In terms of survey methods or analysis?

At 11:17 AM 5/27/99 -0400, you wrote:

> Bob,
>
> Here's the portion of my Lincoln talk on our 1975 Public Affairs Act
>
> re-test. Apologies for the delay.
>
> Regards,
>
> Rich

A famous polling experiment illustrates the prevalence of pseudo-opinions: More than 20 years ago, a group of researchers at the
University of Cincinnati asked a random sample of local residents whether the 1975 Public Affairs Act should be repealed. About half expressed a view one way or another.

Of course there never was a Public Affairs Act of 1975. Researchers made it up to see how willing people were to express opinions on things they knew absolutely nothing about.

Four years ago, to honor the 20th anniversary of the Public Affairs Act, I duplicated the original experiment in a national survey, and added some additional tests.

Asked the original question, which read:

Some people say the
1975 Public Affairs Act should be repealed. Do you agree or disagree that it should be repealed?

43 percent expressed an opinion one way or another

24 percent said it should be repealed

19 percent said it should not

Asked a second version of the question: President Clinton said that the 1975 Public Affairs Act should be repealed. Do you agree or disagree?

This time more than half 9753 percent expressed an opinion
36 percent of all Democrats agreed

But=85 only 16 percent of all Republicans

Asked a third version of the question: =93The Republicans in Congress said that the 1975 Public Affairs Act should be repealed. Do you agree or disagree?

You can guess what happened:

36 percent of all Republicans agreed

But=85 only 19 percent of all Democrats

James Flynn
Decision Research
1201 Oak St., Eugene, OR 97401
Is her crusade a threat to polling, or just a lot of irritating noise = that will have little impact? If a threat, AAPOR should have a = concerted strategy. If not, ignore her. Here are some ideas if it's = worth the effort:

How many people who read her column would still participate in a poll if =
called? Why? Give her some opinion data to ignore!

Huffington's column is syndicated. Is there any way for the AAPOR =
leadership to identify another syndicated columnist who would write an =
article explaining the value of opinion research, explain why = Huffington's
generalization is wrong/why polling is not the devil? It = may be more
effective to ignore her negative attacks, don't go = defensive, and come out
with articles on the advantages and benefits of = polling to society. Show
how people like to be interviewed (which in = fact people say over and
over.)

Or, a collaborative and generic letter to the editor or media advisory =
from AAPOR and other survey research organizations put on website, =
released in press release and/or distributed to all papers on =
misperceptions about polls.

Or political science association pointing out how public policy = decisions
are made-politicians rarely use polls as their only source of = knowledge
when making public policy, it is one source among many, = including columns
by people like Huffington. (Most of us would probably = agree with
Huffington that polling shouldn't be used by itself for = making public
policy, no opinion issues, etc.)

Also, the Council of Better Business Bureaus (CBBB) has a National =
Advertising Division that polices advertisers for accuracy. Not sure if =
there is something similar for journalists, but might be worth exploring =
having them approach her about her factual inaccuracies.=20

Then there is the legal angle-is this libel?! If that could be =
demonstrated, it might backfire to sue because she would launch an Arianna defense fund and get rich!!

Not sure it's worth a fight (how many people actually read her?), but if so, there is more than one way to dice an onion. Mark Richards

>I, too, recently received a FRUG survey recently, this one from Planned Parenthood. I know previous standards chairs have contacted them, but to no
avail. The problem is, from the standpoint of an organization, FRUGging works--the organization raises money. How organizations use the obviously-biased data they obtain from the "surveys" is another issue.

Maybe it's time for AAPOR to issue a position paper on FRUGging, similar to the one on push polling. If we can enlighten the general public, perhaps we can make the technique less effective.

Karen Goldenberg
goldenberg_k@bls.gov

>From vish+@osu.edu Thu May 27 09:06:41 1999
Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id JAA23839 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 09:06:40 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from [128.146.105.35] ([128.146.105.35])
    by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with ESMTP id MAA04436
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 12:06:38 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: viswanath.2@pop.service.ohio-state.edu
Message-Id: <v04003a04b3731db8a3e5@[128.146.105.35]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Thu, 27 May 1999 12:05:56 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "K. Viswanath" <vish+@osu.edu>
1999 CALL FOR PAPERS

Annual Research Conference

Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research
November 19-20, 1999

The Radisson Hotel & Suites Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

The Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research (MAPOR), a chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, invites proposals and abstracts for papers or presentations related to public opinion processes or opinion research methodology. Proposals on all topics related to public opinion are welcome, including theoretical work, analyses of public opinion data and survey methods.

RESEARCH PAPERS

Submissions for papers must be abstracts no longer than two typed, double-spaced pages. No full-length papers will be reviewed. Please put the name(s) of the author(s) and affiliation on a separate page (for blind refereeing). Please include your full mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address. Student submissions should be identified as such on a separate page. You will receive notification of the action on your proposal

Send submissions to:
William L. Rosenberg, MAPOR Conference Chair
Drexel University Survey Research Center
3141 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
E-mail: Rosenberg@Drexel.edu

The preferred submission mode is by e-mail, to facilitate placing program
information on MAPOR's website. Submissions must be postmarked by June 30,
1999. Faxes or e-mail must be received by 5 p.m. EST on June 30.

PANELS
Please submit proposals for panels by June 30, 1999. You may submit a
written proposal (up to two typed double-spaced pages) or contact the
program chair, William L. Rosenberg. Proposals should identify the topic,
briefly explain its importance, and indicate the number of panelists and
their areas of interest/expertise.

POSTER SESSIONS
We've planned a poster session again for this year's conference. Please
indicate on your proposal cover sheet if you would prefer to present your paper in the poster session.

TOPICS

Topics may include, but are not limited to:
Internet Surveys. Survey research on the World Wide Web, issues and answers, possibilities and stories.


Mass Media and Public Opinion. Public journalism and public opinion, the role of polls in agenda setting, influences of the mass media on public opinion, the use of polls by the media.


Ethical Issues in Survey Research. Confidentiality for the respondent, the client, the data, or the instrument, when it applies/when it doesn't. IRB's impact on survey research. Other ethical issues.

Electoral Campaigns. Methodological and substantive issues as they relate to election polls, the use of polling in a campaign, media coverage of the polls.

Qualitative Studies. Qualitative approaches, including focus groups, the study of public opinion, as an aid to questionnaire construction or interpretation.

Public Opinion Processes and Effects. The variety of theoretical and analytical questions raised in public opinion studies.
K. Viswanath
Associate Professor of Journalism, Communication
& Public Health

School of Journalism and Communication
The Ohio State University
3026 Derby Hall
154 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210

Tel: (614) 292-1319 (voice)
(614) 292-2055 (FAX)
e-mail: vish+@osu.edu

>From Mark@bisconti.com Thu May 27 09:14:21 1999
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA26572 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 09:14:20 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified) by medusa.nei.org (Content Technologies SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000581477@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 12:13:14 -0400
Received: from MARK-BRI ([10.2.0.182]) by jetson.nei.org with SMTP
(Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2448.0)
    id LFZC4QBQ; Thu, 27 May 1999 12:14:26 -0400
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
    id <01BEA838.E3C499E0@mark-bri>; Thu, 27 May 1999 12:03:10 -0400
Message-Id: <01BEA838.E3C499E0@mark-bri>
I just got off the phone with an interviewer who called my office, first told me this was a market research survey, not a sales call, then proceeded to try to find out who was responsible for making the purchasing decisions related to the Internet. When I told her we didn't need Internet services, she thanked me and hung up. Are sales calling firms realizing they get a higher response rate if they say "market research" or "survey research"? Maybe we need clearer definitions? = Mark Richards
My apologies to AAPORNET, Arianna Huffington and James Flynn. I inadvertently sent a private e-mail to everyone on the list. My "Reply" privileges have been revoked for the remainder of the day and I've been ordered to sit in the cyber-corner. Rich Morin

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu May 27 09:43:50 1999
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA04889 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 09:43:48 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA28226 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 09:43:48 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 27 May 1999 09:43:47 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Folks,

Here's some very welcome data, for those who haven't already seen it. It looks like the Internet might yet become a legitimate means to conduct national surveys in many of our lifetimes.

-- Jim

*****

POPULARITY OF INTERNET WON'T PEAK FOR YEARS

The Internet has not penetrated the majority of American homes, according to studies from major Internet consulting firms Inteco, Forrester Research, and Neilsen Media Research. Neilsen found that one-third of U.S. households have Internet access, and only one-third of those, or 13 percent of all U.S. households, go online more than once a week. This reluctance to use the Internet at home can be attributed to fears that technology is difficult to learn as well as perceptions that the Web is full of scams. Although many adults have yet to become acclimated to technology, as many as 81 percent of teenagers are using the Internet frequently and knowledgeably. The next generation is expected to usher in the rise of household Internet acceptance, with 90 percent of U.S. households predicted to have Internet access by 2005 or 2010. (Puget Sound Business Journal Online
>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Thu May 27 09:54:25 1999
Received: from smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA07531 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 09:54:22 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from login6.isis.unc.edu (root@login6.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.136])
    by smtpsrv2.isis.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id MAA08841
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 12:54:09 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by email.unc.edu id <9236-61336>; Thu, 27 May 1999 12:54:03 -0400
Date:       Thu, 27 May 1999 12:54:00 -0400 (EDT)
Sender: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login6.isis.unc.edu
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Huffington and friends a threat or just irritating?
In-Reply-To: <01BEA835.A250F420@mark-bri>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990527125324.99002E-10000@login6.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
I would vote for ignoring Huffington. Sending her angry letters and email just feeds her disease.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  Voice: 919 962-4085  
CB 3365 Howell Hall  Fax: 919 962-1549  
University of North Carolina  Cell: 919 906-3425  
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365  http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

---

>From Sangster_R@bls.gov Thu May 27 11:28:46 1999
Received: from dcmgate.blsmail.bls.gov (blsmail.bls.gov [146.142.4.13])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA09194 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 11:28:44 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from psbmail1.psb.bls.gov (psbmail1.psb.bls.gov [146.142.42.18]) by
dcmgate.blsmail.bls.gov (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id OAA05961
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 14:28:42 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by PSBMAIL1 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <LS116KV5>; Thu, 27 May 1999 14:28:07 -0400
Message-ID: <308A68716B76D211A7910008C74C12E34616EF@PSBMAIL2>
From: Sangster_R <Sangster_R@bls.gov>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: [Fwd: Response Rates short comment]
Date: Thu, 27 May 1999 14:28:06 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Thanks.
Robie Sangster

Bureau of Labor Statistics
Office of Research and Evaluation
2 Massachusetts Ave. N.E., Rm 4915
Washington DC 20212
Voice Mail 202-606-7517 Fax 202-606-7426

> --------
> From: Peter Ph. Mohler[SMTP:mohler@zumamannheim.de]
> Sent: Thursday, May 27, 1999 4:08 AM
> To: aapornet
> Subject: [Fwd: Response Rates short comment]
>
> <<Message: Re: Response Rates short comment>><<File: mohler.vcf>>
>
> From imhoflau@norcmail.uchicago.edu Thu May 27 13:38:21 1999
Received: from genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.28])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA22258 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 May 1999 13:38:18 -0700 (PDT)
From: imhoflau@norcmail.uchicago.edu
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])
by genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id QAA18561
The following was passed on to me by one of my colleagues. It is a letter he wrote to the editor of the Chicago Sun-Times.

Dear Editor,

I find it very ironic that Arianna Huffington is bashing opinion polling while using poll findings for her own marketing purposes.

On her homepage at:
http://www.ariannaonline.com/community/main.html
she cites a 1996 poll from the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press regarding television viewing in an attempt to market her "proposed national TV magazine."
I believe Ms. Huffington’s problem with polling is not that it exists, but that polls consistently find the majority of Americans disagree with her.

Dennis Dew
Chicago, IL

AAPORites,

I need your help in tracking down some empirical publications on the subjective experience of discrimination. These could be statistical, survey
research types of analyses or qualitative summaries of lived experiences. Most important to me is that the analyses be theoretically grounded.

Can you point me to surveys or studies which have devised questions or scales on the subjective experience of discrimination, or studies which have use discrimination as a dependent variable?

Please respond to me privately at the email address below. I will summarize and send the compilation to interested others.

Thank you,
Patty

Patricia Anne Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
University of Oregon University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 Eugene OR 97403-2545

telephone: 541-346-5007 WWW: http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
fax: 541-346-5026 email: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu
Jim Beniger's message about Internet penetration prompted me to add this.

I report on the Gallup Youth Survey, which does 3 waves of data collection per year with 500 American teens each wave. Age range is 13 to 17.

The figures on our most recent wave, which was collected January through April of this year, shows 89 percent of teens have used the Internet, including 91 percent of boys and 87 percent of girls.

Two years ago (spring 1997) the figure was 55 percent.

-- Rachel Hickson
Phil is probably right. Folks like Huffington live off publicity the way
the rest of us eat food. She loves the attention....but why nourish her?
Better to contact the papers she writes for and let them know how off the
wall she is.

At 12:54 PM 5/27/99, you wrote:
> I would vote for ignoring Huffington. Sending her angry letters and
> email just feeds her disease.
Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
rshalpern@mindspring.com
phone/fax 770 434 4121
> As Dennis Dew commented:

>     I believe Ms. Huffington's problem with polling is not that it exists,
>     but that polls consistently find the majority of Americans disagree
>     with her.
>
>     Dennis Dew
>
>     Chicago, IL

This seems to be true of so many others when they come upon findings that contradict their own point of view. One just has to turn to the corporate world to see this phenomena...not just the political world. It's the old "shoot the messenger" syndrome.

Dick Halpern
>From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Fri May 28 06:58:45 1999
Received: from mtiwmhc07.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc07.worldnet.att.net
[204.127.131.42])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA28233 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 May 1999 06:58:42 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from default ([12.75.196.193]) by mtiwmhc07.worldnet.att.net
   (InterMail v03.02.07 118 124) with SMTP
   id <19990528135810.CRBY1486@default> for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
   Fri, 28 May 1999 13:58:10 +0000
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19990528085539.006b9ec8@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>
X-Sender: Jim-Wolf@postoffice.worldnet.att.net
Date: Fri, 28 May 1999 08:55:39 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net>
Subject: RE: Huffington and friends a threat or just irritating?
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990527125324.99002E-10000@login6.isis.unc.
edu>
After spending a short time reviewing some of the material on her website, I must agree with Meyer. I'm sure she's entertaining to a certain target market, but I am at a loss to understand all the attention being paid to her "poll-bashing" opinions. I put her in the same category as Howard Stern and Rush Limbaugh. They are all very good at getting a rise out of a crowd, but in the end they're all sizzle and no meat.

Am I missing something here?

At 12:54 PM 5/27/99 -0400, Philip Meyer wrote:
>   I would vote for ignoring Huffington. Sending her angry letters and
>email just feeds her disease.
>

=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=
Jim Wolf              Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

>From Steve_Hanway@gallup.com Fri May 28 07:13:05 1999
Received: from fw (fw.gallup.com [206.158.235.10])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id HAA02282 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 May 1999 07:13:04 -0700
(PDT)
From: Steve_Hanway@gallup.com
Received: from exchng1.gallup.com (gallup.com [198.175.140.73])
   by fw (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id JAA20037
Mark,

What you experienced may in fact have been legitimate market research. The target population for market research studies is often the person who makes purchasing decisions. This makes sense as this is usually the person that companies wish to influence with their marketing campaigns.

While the "interviewer's" termination of the "interview" is suspicious, it could be the result of inexperience and/or poor training. First, the interviewer may have interpreted your remark as a refusal. Second, the likelihood to purchase Internet services may have been part of the screening criteria for participation in the study. Finally, an inexperienced/poorly trained interviewer can sometimes be influenced by respondents who say "I would not be a good person for your study".

Inexperience is a problem that all firms who conduct telephone surveys face. There are a number of studies that identify a disparity in quality between
new interviewers and more experienced ones. Not surprisingly, turnover is very high among these workers, as they often absorb a great deal of abuse from sampled households. Consequently, a sizeable proportion of interviewers are usually new to the job.

It is no wonder that so many people have difficulty distinguishing between sales calls and research calls, because too often sales are disguised as research. However, legitimate market research can benefit the economy, as it prevents resources from being wasted bringing products to market that people don’t want. If in fact what you experienced was research, a more knowledgeable interviewer might have been able to convey that message.

-----Original Message-----
From: Mark Richards [mailto:Mark@bisconti.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 1999 12:03 PM
To: 'AAPORNET'
Subject: Not good.

I just got off the phone with an interviewer who called my office, first told me this was a market research survey, not a sales call, then proceeded to try to find out who was responsible for making the purchasing decisions related to the Internet. When I told her we didn't need Internet services, she thanked me and hung up. Are sales calling firms realizing they get a higher response rate if they say "market research" or "survey research"? Maybe we need clearer definitions? Mark Richards

>From kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu Fri May 28 09:25:21 1999
Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21])
Thanks to Jim for the posting. While these numbers are relevant if we are thinking about sampling households, they are troubling if we think about individual internet use. The reality is that cheapos like me do most of my on-line work at WORK, not at home. At home I need a usable phone line, an online service and the stomach to pay the charges. When you ask if people access from any site (home, school, office, library) during the week the user numbers rise appreciably.

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

> Folks,
>
> Here's some very welcome data, for those who haven't already seen it.
> It looks like the Internet might yet become a legitimate means to
> conduct national surveys in many of our lifetimes.
> -- Jim

> *******
>
> POPULARITY OF INTERNET WON'T PEAK FOR YEARS

> The Internet has not penetrated the majority of American homes,
> according to studies from major Internet consulting firms Inteco,
> Forrester Research, and Nielsen Media Research. Nielsen found that
> one-third of U.S. households have Internet access, and only one-third
> of those, or 13 percent of all U.S. households, go online more than
> once a week. This reluctance to use the Internet at home can be
> attributed to fears that technology is difficult to learn as well as
> perceptions that the Web is full of scams. Although many adults have
> yet to become acclimated to technology, as many as 81 percent of
> teenagers are using the Internet frequently and knowledgeably. The
> next generation is expected to usher in the rise of household Internet
> acceptance, with 90 percent of U.S. households predicted to have
> Internet access by 2005 or 2010. (Puget Sound Business Journal Online
> 05/24/99)
> 
> > News abstracts Copyright 1999, Information Inc., Bethesda, MD
>   Edupage Copyright 1999, EDUCAUSE
> > 
> > From mdp7@dana.ucc.nau.edu Fri May 28 09:40:56 1999
> Received: from mailgate.nau.edu (mailgate.nau.edu [134.114.96.19])
>     by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
>     id JAA09107 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 May 1999 09:40:54 -0700
> (PDT)
> Received: from default (ts5-

> 14.ppp.nau.edu [134.114.14.103])
>     by mailgate.nau.edu (PMDF V5.2-32 #31141)
>     with SMTP id <0FCG00CZGBNZBL@mailgate.nau.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri,
> 28 May 1999 09:40:49 -0700 (MST)
> Date: Fri, 28 May 1999 09:39:25 -0700
> From: "Michelle D. Pettit" <mdp7@dana.ucc.nau.edu>
> Subject: e-mail
> X-Sender: mdp7@dana.ucc.nau.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Message-id: <0FCG00CZIBNZBL@mailgate.nau.edu>
> MIME-version: 1.0
> X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
> Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Please discontinue sending me your e-mail, every day there is an ungodly amount of it on my computer. It is a waste of your time as well as mine.

Thank you.

>From scrawfrd@isr.umich.edu Fri May 28 10:04:11 1999
Received: from runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.144.15])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA15685 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 May 1999 10:04:10 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from s-isr-m1.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])
    by runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.5/2.3) with ESMTP id NAA09652 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 May 1999 13:04:10 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <K7BLH54K>; Fri, 28 May 1999 13:05:06 -0400
Message-ID: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E01C09E8A@isr.umich.edu>
From: Scott Crawford <scrawfrd@isr.umich.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: FW: Article from www.mediainfo.com -- Internet Decreasing Polls' Credibility
Date: Fri, 28 May 1999 13:04:58 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

This just arrived in my mailbox earlier today... thought that it might be of interest to those on the list since it starts off talking about AAPOR.

================================
Stop The Presses!

By Steve Outing

Friday, May 28, 1999

Earlier this month, the American Association of Public Opinion Research held its annual meeting. Pollsters who gathered in St.
Pete Beach, Fla., bemoaned some unfortunate trends that are hurting the polling industry, and potentially damaging the reliability of polls.

Foremost, new technologies are making it more difficult to get responses from citizens chosen in random selections to participate in telephone polls - which are still the most prevalent form of opinion polling. A growing problem is 'non-response' to survey takers' efforts to contact an individual selected at random.

Nowadays, more people have 'caller ID' service which flashes the phone number and name of the calling party, and they may not answer calls that they suspect to be sales calls. Others subscribe to call blocking services, which only allow calls to ring through that are from selected numbers (typically of friends and relatives); other callers are relegated to leaving a voicemail message.
A general trend in the U.S. (and it's mirrored in other industrialized
countries) is that people feel they have less time and too much to
do already, so increasingly they block out extra stimuli - such as
calls from pollsters.

There's also the problem that there are more phone numbers.

Households are adding phone lines for computer modems and fax
machines in increasing numbers; many have cellular phone lines
that seldom get answered. An estimated 25% of U.S. households
now have more than one phone line. Since these extra lines are
listed under the homeowners' names, polling organizations end up
calling these numbers and getting no answer or a busy signal. With
a scientific poll, where a demographically representative subset of
the population is selected and then a random selection of phone numbers within the subset are chosen to participate in the poll, this can muck up the statistical validity of the survey.

Caution: Internet poll

As if that isn't bad enough, polling is facing a threat to its credibility from the increasing use of Internet polls, which are particularly prevalent among news organizations' Web sites. Most online opinion polls are non-scientific, since they typically make no effort to control who are the respondents. The polling industry has coined an acronym that applies to most Internet polls as practiced today: 'SLOP,' or Self-selected Listener Opinion Polls.

Michael Traugott, president of AAPOR and a senior research scientist at the Institute for Social Research at the University of
Michigan, says his own preference would be that news Web sites refrain from running opinion polls of online users, because their statistical reliability is so poor. Such polls are popular, he says, because news managers 'are so concerned about attracting audiences' that they run the instant online polls in order to encourage direct contact with readers. Online polls are interactive in the sense that they let the Web user 'have his say' and be directly involved with the site. This is a technique to establish contact with a site's users and get them to 'stick,' and thus it's appealing from the site publisher's perspective.

Traugott concedes that Web news publishers are unlikely to heed his advice to avoid online opinion polls. He suggests instead that at the point of data collection and tabulation, the publisher make it
abundantly clear that the Internet opinion poll is unscientific.

That's often not done in a manner where it's obvious to the Web user that the online poll does not have the reliability of other media opinion polls.

AAPOR members have been discussing establishing better definitions of scientific vs. unscientific polling techniques. Such policy statements from polling organizations attached to all polls would better inform the public about any given poll's reliability.

Some Internet polling can and is being done under the assumption of using scientific polling principles. Because household PC penetration currently is around 50% in the U.S., and Internet usage is below that, Internet polls will continue to have a bias toward a population with higher income and more education, Traugott says.
But in time, he expects the Internet to support opinion polls that are as valid as today's phone-based polls.

Already, online polling software is becoming more sophisticated, allowing Web publishers to limit the number of times an individual Web user can participate in a poll. But such technological innovations can't overcome the inherent bias introduced by using as a polling venue a medium which does not have a user population that mirrors demographics of the general population.

In time, polling will move online

Traugott points out that up until the 1970s, opinion polls had to be done by knocking on doors. At that point, telephones became ubiquitous enough in households to support scientific phone
polling. He expects that day to come for online polls, too, but he predicts it will be 15 to 20 years before general-topic and political polling via the Internet will be appropriate.

Meantime, the Internet can be used for polling some population subgroups. For example, a recent Internet survey of University of Michigan students was feasible, says Traugott, because every student on campus has access to computers and Internet access.

Opinion polling has long been a contentious endeavor. The Internet era has made it a more challenging one. News publishers engaged in polling must recognize their role in maintaining the credibility of the polling profession in the face of the trends I've identified above. That means being responsible when publishing opinion polls based on a sample of online users, and making it clear to Web
readers that the results may be less than accurate.

Contact: Michael Traugott, mtrau@umich.edu

'Zwire' debuts

In my previous column, I discussed International News Network, which offers a solution for small newspapers to have a revenue-producing Web site without the need to employ a new media department. On the day after I wrote that column, New York-based PowerAdz announced a turnkey newspaper Web publishing solution called Zwire - which offers similar functionality and addresses the same market as INN.

Zwire has been in beta testing at several U.S. newspapers in recent
weeks and is scheduled for release in June. Its target market is small to medium size newspapers that currently have minimal Internet presence, according to PowerAdz director of marketing Bruce McEwing. The system 'includes pretty much everything they need to launch a strong Web presence locally - including all manner of revenue generating opportunities,' he says.

The Zwire solution integrates editorial, community publishing, classifieds, yellow pages directory, and online auction features. Its design supports extending the print franchise online, as opposed to spending money and staff on creating a staffed Web site. Its editorial features, for example, have been designed to allow newsroom employees without HTML skills to use a Web form interface to publish text and photos online. Advertising components include porting newspaper classifieds to the Web site.
(using AdQuest 3D technology); categorized yellow pages listings;

and online auctions (using Auction Hill) designed to attract local

advertisers.

News Web site solutions such as PowerAdz Zwire and INN

represent an effort to get those smaller newspapers that are not yet

online onto the Web and gathering local advertising revenues.

They're also well suited for newspapers that operate modest Web

sites which remain unprofitable. Rather than requiring a substantial

in-house staff, such systems allow print-side editorial employees to

maintain a paper's Web site, and print ad sales representatives are

sent out hawking a combination of print and online placements.

PowerAdz already has relationships with some 700 newspapers,
which are part of its national Web advertising network.

Contact: Bruce McEwing, bruce@poweradz.com

No column on Monday

Due to the Memorial Day holiday in the U.S., there will be no 'Stop The Presses!' on Monday. The column will resume its normal publishing schedule on Wednesday, June 2.

---

This column is written by Steve Outing for Editor & Publisher Interactive. Tips, letters and feedback can be sent to Steve at steve@planetarynews.com.
>From SMarcy@NationalResearch.com Fri May 28 10:57:16 1999
Received: from nrc7.nationalresearch.com ([12.13.114.6])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA05008 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 May 1999 10:57:11 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by nrc7.nationalresearch.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2448.0)
    id <KYPMS9TG>; Fri, 28 May 1999 12:56:24 -0500
Message-ID:
<A1D26D98B20AD211A2A00060089F9C0A5B7CC5@nrc7.nationalresearch.com>
From: Sherry Marcy <SMarcy@NationalResearch.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Data on Internet Use
Date: Fri, 28 May 1999 12:55:51 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
In regard to the Internet being used by 90% of U.S. households in the near future: will surveys still be panel surveys, selected by the researcher using some kind of interesting scheme, with all of the caveats surrounding panels? Or will there be a way to randomly select among all (internet) households? Who's working on this now, except perhaps Harris Black? Also, what does the research on panels vs. RDD surveys in *phone* households show?

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

>From jbason@arches.uga.edu Fri May 28 11:43:09 1999
Received: from mailgw.cc.uga.edu (mailgw.cc.uga.edu [128.192.1.101])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA24090 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 May 1999 11:42:48 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from archa7.cc.uga.edu (archa7.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu
    (LSMTF for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.00D4ECBE@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>;
    Fri, 28 May 1999 14:40:13 -0400
Received: from jud.ibr.uga.edu (jud.ibr.uga.edu [128.192.63.15])
    by archa7.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id OAA19062;
    Fri, 28 May 1999 14:41:21 -0400
From: James Bason <jbason@arches.uga.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: por@unc.edu
Subject: Environmental Attitudes
Message-ID: <SIMEON.9905281415.H@jud.ibr.uga.edu>
Date: Fri, 28 May 1999 14:43:15 -0700 (Pacific Daylight Time)
X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.3 Build (39)
X-Authentication: IMSP
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Please excuse the crossposting to AAPORNET and POR:

I am trying to help a graduate student locate survey data on attitudes towards the environment, and specifically, watershed management. If anyone on the list is aware of such research, I would be most appreciative if you could let me know.

Please respond to me privately at jbason@arches.uga.edu

Thank you. Jim.

James J. Bason, Ph.D.
Director
Survey Research Center
University of Georgia
114 Barrow Hall
Athens, GA 30602
jbason@arches.uga.edu
(706) 542-6110
> From: Mark Richards [mailto:Mark@bisconti.com]
> wrote:
>
> > Is her crusade a threat to polling, or just a lot of
> > irritating noise that will have little impact? If a threat,
> > AAPOR should have a concerted strategy. If not, ignore her.
> > Here are some ideas if it's worth the effort:
>
> I have to confess I am of two minds on this one. As Dick Halpren and others
have pointed out it is difficult to take Ms Huffington seriously as an objective reporter of fact or even as an serious purveyor of opinion.

Despite this evaluation she does swing a pretty mean axe as someone pointed out in Warren's session on Reporting response rates at AAPOR.

Her railing about pollsters calling during dinner time and the pledge not to answer polls bothers me much less than her beating us about the head and shoulders with our own response rates. As Dick pointed out those who are unhappy with poll findings will always find fault with the pollsters, my interest is that we address the real concerns about response rate and other quality related areas so that we can be more secure about less biased opinion-meisters bashing us.

If we do not, Ms Huffington will be least of our concerns.

--

Leo G. Simonetta    simonetta@artsci.com
Art & Science Group, http://www.artsci.com
190 W. Ostend St. #216
Baltimore MD 21230

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Fri May 28 12:27:13 1999
Received: from smtp3.mindspring.com (smtp3.mindspring.com [207.69.200.33])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA08082 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 May 1999 12:27:12 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from warrenmi (user-2ive1i8.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.6.72])
by smtp3.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA20310
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 May 1999 15:27:08 -0400 (EDT)
At last. Someone has finally figured out how best to deal with Arianna Huffington. Congratulations Phil.

At 12:54 PM 5/27/99 -0400, you wrote:
> I would vote for ignoring Huffington. Sending her angry letters and
> email just feeds her disease.
>
>====================================================================
>Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
>CB 3365 Howell Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
>University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
>Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
>
>====================================================================

Warren Mitofsky
Even if 100% of the US households have internet access one still would need a sampling frame to select respondents. At present, I know of no way to do this directly through the internet.
At 12:55 PM 5/28/99 -0500, you wrote:

> In regard to the Internet being used by 90% of U.S. households in the
> near
> future: will surveys still be panel surveys, selected by the researcher
> using some kind of interesting scheme, with all of the caveats surrounding
> panels? Or will there be a way to randomly select among all (internet)
> households? Who's working on this now, except perhaps Harris Black? Also,
> what does the research on panels vs. RDD surveys in *phone* households
> show?
>
> Sherry Marcy, M.P.H.
> National Research Corporation
> 325 East Eisenhower Parkway
> Suite 106
> Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108
> Phone: 734/327-4111
> Fax: 734/665-4104
> Email: smarcy@nationalresearch.com

Warren Mitofsky
2211 Broadway, Apt 6LN
New York, NY 10024

212 496-2945
212 496-0846 FAX
The Chicago Sun-Times has scheduled my letter to the Editor below to run next Wednesday, June 2.

You will note that Arianna is not above stretching the truth to make her point.

Where else does her column appear?

FIGURES DON'T LIE

In her May 26 column, Arianna Huffington warns her readers that polls
"enable a habit that is hazardous to our political health". To demonstrate this hazard, she cites early April poll results showing a consensus of Americans favoring the use of ground troops in Kosovo and then a decline in support to only 15% in a mid-May Zogby poll.

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

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

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

Nick Panagakis, President
Market Shares Corporation
Mount Prospect, IL
Kathy Cirksena wrote:

> Hello AAPORites,

> I'm looking for references on surveying children, especially research
> and suggestions on questionnaire design and question wording that are
> developmentally appropriate for kids between 7 and 12. Thanks in
> advance for your help.
In a message dated 5/29/99 1:24:28 PM, vector@sympatico.ca wrote:

<< I'm looking for references on surveying children, especially research
And suggestions on questionnaire design and question wording that are developmentally appropriate for kids between 7 and 12. >>

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

Good luck!

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.
Research Psychologist and Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

>From vector@sympatico.ca Sun May 30 17:55:31 1999
Received: from smtp11.bellglobal.com (smtp11.bellglobal.com [204.101.251.53])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id RAA24342 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 May 1999 17:55:30 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from m-zwelling ([206.172.84.34])
  by smtp11.bellglobal.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id UAA07082
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 May 1999 20:58:02 -0400 (EDT)
Try Marilyn Sandler, president, Creative Research International. She has experience interviewing kids. Her E-mail: marilyn@crii.com - Marc Zwelling/Vector Research + Development, Toronto.

> Kathy Cirksena wrote:
>>
>> Hello AAPORites,
>>
>> I'm looking for references on surveying children, especially research and suggestions on questionnaire design and question wording that are developmentally appropriate for kids between 7 and 12. Thanks in advance for your help.
>>
>> Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.
Karen Goldenberg raised the question of AAPOR creating position papers like that on push polling for sugging and fruggling. There is a long history of this. Among other activities, AAPOR years ago joined with other research organizations in the Research Industry Coalition. RIC has produced a variety of position papers that AAPOR has endorsed, including one on "phony polls."
The problem, of course, is that these are long-standing concerns, and the original adoption of the position paper occurred more than a decade ago. At the time of adoption, they were distributed to members. All the RIC position papers can be found at RIC's website: www.researchindustry.org.

Kathy Frankovic