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

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

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

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

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

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9611.
Part 1/1, total size 235473 bytes:

----- Cut here -----
>From N.Moon@maires.co.uk Fri Nov 1 02:12:05 1996
Return-Path: N.Moon@maires.co.uk
Received: from savoy.maires.co.uk (savoy.maires.co.uk [193.129.1.205])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id CAA20782 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 02:11:58 -0800
(PST)
Received: from itserv.maires.co.uk by savoy.maires.co.uk id aa11767;
1 Nov 96 10:11 GMT
Received: from rfmserv.maires.co.uk by itserv.maires.co.uk id aa25967;
1 Nov 96 10:12 GMT
Received: from MAI1/SpoolDir by rfmserv.maires.co.uk (Mercury 1.21);
1 Nov 96 10:12:48 +0000
Received: from SpoolDir by MAI1 (Mercury 1.30); 1 Nov 96 10:12:42 +0000
From: Nick Moon <N.Moon@maires.co.uk>
Organization: Consumer Market Research
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Fri, 1 Nov 1996 10:12:41 +0000
Subject: Re: missing males
Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.42a)
Message-ID: <11B6E9C37E6B@rfmserv.maires.co.uk>

I'm sorry about returning to an old strand, and doubly sorry if someone has already made this point, but I am catching up on my e-mails after an excellent 3 week holiday in Utah and Arizona.

A number of posters have raised the point that as males are less likely to live in single-adult households they will inevitably be

under-represented in any survey using household based sampling.

As far as I can see this is true as far as raw figures are concerned, but surely if one is selecting one respondent from within each of a set of sampled households, the data will be weighted by the inverse of household size to correct for differential probabilities of selection, and this will restore men to the proper proportion (differential response notwithstanding).

Nick Moon

nickm@nopres.co.uk

tel 0171 612 0830 fax 0171 612 0744

NOP Social and Political, Tower House, Southampton St

London WC2E 7HN

>From derek_leeboosh@environics.ca Fri Nov 1 07:18:44 1996

Return-Path: derek_leeboosh@environics.ca

Received: from seraph.uunet.ca (uunet.ca [142.77.1.254])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP

id HAA12299 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 07:18:42 -0800

(PST)

Received: from envrnx by seraph.uunet.ca with UUCP id <656688-1607>; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 10:18:29 -0500

Received: from pc6.environics.ca by envhost.environics.ca (8.6.10/5.40/1.0) id JAA06245; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 09:40:47 -0500

Date: Fri, 1 Nov 1996 09:40:47 -0500

Message-Id: <199611011440.JAA06245@envhost.environics.ca>

X-Sender: leeboosh@envhost

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: derek_leeboosh@environics.ca (Derek Leeboosh)

Subject: Getting household income info.

X-Mailer: <Windows Eudora Version 2.0.2>

Does anyone have any experience in posing round about questions to find out people's incomes when they are reluctant to respond to the trandition "What is your annual household income?" question?

I am doing a survey of Chinese-Canadians and the problem is that they seem to have a cultural predisposition to refuse to divulge their income in a survey. Last time we tried, the refusal rate on that question was 70%!! Nonetheless it is important for my survey to find some way of segmenting them into income or wealth categories. Are their roundabout ways (ie: do you drive a cadillac?, if yes, person must be in top income quintile etc....)

Any advice would be much appreciated.

Derek Leeboosh

Environics Research

Toronto, Ontario

derek_leeboosh@environics.ca

>From NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU Fri Nov 1 09:34:55 1996

Return-Path: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU

Received: from UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (uchimvs1.uchicago.edu [128.135.19.10])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id JAA00360 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 09:34:52 -0800
(PST)
Message-Id: <199611011734.JAA00360@usc.edu>
Received: from UCHIMVS1.BITNET by UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (IBM MVS SMTP V3R1)
with BSMTMP id 3537; Fri, 01 Nov 96 11:33:24 CDT
Date: Fri, 01 Nov 96 11:26 CST
From: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU
To: aapornet@USC.EDU
Subject: Re: Getting household income info.

If you really want income or wealth rather than just a measure of social standing, there's no real good substitute. You should be able to get some income information by using broad categories or an unfolding technique. Among the few items that are close to allowing an income estimate are 1) homeownership, 2) value of home or rent paid, and 3) business ownership. You could of course ask about various wealth holding but people and a) less like to know and b) less likely to report than for income. PS If a personal interview there are other useful techniques. tom w smith

>From hschuman@umich.edu Fri Nov 1 10:03:49 1996
Return-Path: hschuman@umich.edu
Received: from choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu (root@choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.90])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP
id KAA05644 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 10:03:47 -0800
(PST)

Received: from localhost by choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.7.5/2.3)
with SMTP id NAA02820; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 13:03:31 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 1 Nov 1996 13:03:30 -0500 (EST)

From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
X-Sender: hschuman@choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Getting household income info.
In-Reply-To: <199611011734.JAA00360@usc.edu>
Message-ID:
<Pine.SOL.3.95.961101130239.2458A-100000@choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hello Tom,

Is there an update on when the 1996 GSS will be sent to the Roper Center?
-Howard

>From sgoold@unm.edu Fri Nov 1 12:23:49 1996
Return-Path: sgoold@unm.edu
Received: from pyxis.unm.edu (pyxis.unm.edu [129.24.8.31])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA06020 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 12:23:47 -0800
(PST)

Received: from DialupEudora(really [129.24.9.127]) by pyxis.unm.edu
via sendmail with smtp
id <m0vJQ4c-00014yC@pyxis.unm.edu>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 13:20:14 -0700 (MST)
(Smail-3.2 1996-Jul-4 #51 built 1996-Oct-30)

Message-Id: <v02130504ae9eb3e4731c@DialupEudora>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Thu, 31 Oct 1996 13:29:25 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: sgoold@unm.edu (Scott Goold)
Subject: Re: Getting household income info.

Derek,

In my experience as the SRC manager at UNM*, we have been successful obtaining sensitive income information using the following format:

Q1: Was the estimated annual income for your household for the past year greater or less than \$30,000? (this can be altered, you may want to use 50K, for example)

Less than \$30,000 (goto Q2)
More than \$30,000 (goto Q3)
DK/NA

Q2: I'm going to read you some broad income categories. Please stop me when I get to the one which includes the estimated annual income for your household for 199X.

Was it:

[READ OPTIONS]

Less than \$10,000
10 to \$20,000, or
20 to \$30,000
DK/NA

Q3: I'm going to read you some broad income categories. Please stop me when I get to the one which includes the estimated annual income for your household for 199X.

Was it:

[READ OPTIONS]

30 to \$40,000
40 to \$50,000
50 to \$60,000
60 to \$70,000
70 to \$80,000, or
More than \$80,000
-DK/NA

In this manner, item nonresponse was never over 10%, and usually much lower. We subdivide the income list to facilitate the interviewing, using programmed skips in our CATI. Rather than asking for a specific amount, which is believed to make individuals sensitive, we offer a range and then ask them to stop us when we read the category that best represents their household.

*This format was used for telephone surveying at the University of New Mexico's Institute for Public Policy.

>Does anyone have any experience in posing round about questions to find
>out people's incomes when they are reluctant to respond to the
>tradition "What is your annual household income?" question?
>
>I am doing a survey of Chinese-Canadians and the problem is that they
>seem to have a cultural predisposition to refuse to divulge their
>income in a survey. Last time we tried, the refusal rate on that
>question was 70%!! Nonetheless it is important for my survey to find
>some way of segmenting them into income or wealth categories. Are
>their roundabout ways (ie: do you drive a cadillac?, if yes, person
>must be in top income quintile etc....)
>
>Any advice would be much appreciated.
>
>Derek Leebosh
>Environics Research
>Toronto, Ontario
>derek_leebosh@environics.ca

```

-----
X          Scott Goold
X
X          PhD Candidate
X
X          University of New Mexico
X
X          505.247.3398
X
X
X
X "I Can't Accept Not Trying"
X          MJ on Pursuing Excellence, 1994
-----

```

>From EDWARDS1@westatpo.westat.com Fri Nov 1 13:18:23 1996
Return-Path: EDWARDS1@westatpo.westat.com
Received: from relay2.UU.NET (relay2.UU.NET [192.48.96.7])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA14554 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 13:18:19 -0800
(PST)
From: EDWARDS1@westatpo.westat.com
Received: from alterdial.UU.NET by relay2.UU.NET with ESMTTP
(peer crosschecked as: alterdial.UU.NET [192.48.96.22])
id QQbnzp06044; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 16:18:01 -0500 (EST)
Received: from westatpo.westat.com by alterdial.UU.NET with SMTP
(peer crosschecked as: [198.232.250.102])
id QQbnzp04436; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 16:17:49 -0500 (EST)
Received: from ccMail by westatpo.westat.com (SMTPLINK V2.11)
id AA846893858; Fri, 01 Nov 96 16:10:42 EDT
Date: Fri, 01 Nov 96 16:10:42 EDT
Encoding: 30 Text
Message-Id: <9610018468.AA846893858@westatpo.westat.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Job Opening for Telephone and In-person Survey Professionals

Westat, Inc., an employee-owned research corporation located in
Rockville, Maryland, has several openings for professionals in

telephone and in-person survey operations. Immediate openings exist for those with experience in one or more of the following areas:

- Management of In-Person/Telephone Studies; - Management of Telephone Facilities;
- Development of training materials; - Conducting interviewer training;
- Interviewer supervision, coaching, and quality control; - Management of interviewer and supervisory staff; and
- Monitoring production statistics.

Experience in a CATI/CAPI environment is desirable. We offer a professional work environment and competitive salaries. We have a highly professional atmosphere and provide excellent opportunities for advancement. Outstanding fringe benefits include life and health insurance, participation in Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP), 401(k) plans, and support for professional development. Interested candidates please send curriculum vitae and salary history to:

Westat, Inc.
Department PC962
1650 Research Blvd.
Rockville, Maryland 20850
EOE

E-MAIL: HR1@Westat.com
or
FAX: (301)294-2040

>From LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU Fri Nov 1 19:29:40 1996
Return-Path: LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU
Received: from PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU (SMTP@pacevm.dac.pace.edu [198.105.36.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id TAA07832 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 19:29:37 -0800
(PST)
Message-Id: <199611020329.TAA07832@usc.edu>
Received: from PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU by PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)
with BSMTMP id 6789; Fri, 01 Nov 96 22:29:19 EST
Received: from PACEVM (NJE origin LEE@PACEVM) by PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU (LMail
V1.2b/1.8b) with BSMTMP id 6787; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 22:27:32 -0500
Date: Fri, 01 Nov 96 22:26:37 EST
From: Bob Lee <LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU>
Subject: Re: Getting household income info.
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: Message of Thu, 31 Oct 1996 13:29:25 -0700 from
<sgoold@unm.edu>

On your last option, what is the respondent supposed to answer if he or she had an income of \$40,000?

ROBERT S. LEE
PACE UNIVERSITY, 1 PACE PLAZA, NEW YORK, NY 10038
VOICE: 212/620-7851 FAX: 212/346-1573
LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU
>From sgoold@unm.edu Fri Nov 1 23:53:04 1996
Return-Path: sgoold@unm.edu
Received: from pyxis.unm.edu (pyxis.unm.edu [129.24.8.31])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id XAA28606 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Nov 1996 23:53:02 -0800
(PST)
Received: from DialupEudora(really [129.24.9.127]) by pyxis.unm.edu
via sendmail with smtp
id <m0vJapj-00014CC@pyxis.unm.edu>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 2 Nov 1996 00:49:35 -0700 (MST)
(Smail-3.2 1996-Jul-4 #51 built 1996-Oct-30)
Message-Id: <v02130505ae9f5ca21aea@DialupEudora>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Fri, 1 Nov 1996 00:58:48 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: sgoold@unm.edu (Scott Goold)
Subject: Re: Getting household income info.

My apologies! That is a training point, in house, and I forgot to clarify the procedure for the group. Our categories are used in the following manner: 30 to \$40,000 means 30 to 39,999; the next category begins with 40 and terminates at \$49,999; and, etc. While it would be more precise to state the categories in such a fashion, you can obviously see why it is difficult to operationalize. It doesn't cause us much confusion in the day-to-day efforts of our lab.

Thanks for catching the oversight!

>On your last option, what is the respondent supposed to answer if he or
>she had an income of \$40,000?
>
>ROBERT S. LEE
>PACE UNIVERSITY, 1 PACE PLAZA, NEW YORK, NY 10038
>VOICE: 212/620-7851 FAX: 212/346-1573
>LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU

```
-----  
X          Scott Goold  
X  
X          PhD Candidate  
X  
X          University of New Mexico  
X          505.247.3398  
X  
X  
X  
X "I Can't Accept Not Trying" X  
X          MJ on Pursuing Excellence, 1994 X  
-----
```

>From DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU Mon Nov 4 08:38:04 1996
Return-Path: DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU
Received: from icarus.cc.uic.edu (root@ICARUS-FDDI.CC.UIC.EDU
[128.248.100.53])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA15440 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 Nov 1996 08:38:02 -0800
(PST)
Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (MAIL.SRL.UIC.EDU [128.248.232.55]) by

icarus.cc.uic.edu (8.7.6/8.7.6) with SMTP id KAA19308 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 Nov 1996 10:38:20 -0600 (CST)
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 04 Nov 1996 10:34:19 -0600
Message-Id: <s27dc6ab.098@SRL.UIC.EDU>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Mon, 04 Nov 1996 10:29:05 -0600
From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOroureke@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Owen Thornberry

To the friends and colleagues of Owen Thornberry (NCHS, Director, Division
of Health Interview Statistics):

It is with great sadness that I must tell you that Owen died last Thursday,
October 31, after a long battle with prostate cancer. He was 58. Owen was
a wonderful person who will be missed by many.
There will be no memorial service. Condolences may be sent to his widow,
Jutta, at 4212 Howard Dr., Beltsville, MD 20705.

Diane O'Rourke
Survey Research Laboratory
Univ. of IL
Urbana, IL
217-333-7170

>From daves@startribune.com Mon Nov 4 08:57:08 1996
Return-Path: daves@startribune.com
Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com
[132.148.80.211])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id IAA19601 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 Nov 1996 08:57:02 -0800
(PST)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id KAA24944; Mon, 4 Nov 1996
10:55:51 -0600
Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by
firewall2.startribune.com via smap (V3.1)
id xma024927; Mon, 4 Nov 96 10:55:32 -0600
Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 04 Nov 1996 10:58:36 -0600
Message-Id: <s27dcc5c.003@mail.startribune.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Mon, 04 Nov 1996 10:58:42 -0600
From: Rob Daves <daves@startribune.com>
To: por@unc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Minnesota Poll results for U.S. Senate, presidential ballot
tests

POR and AAPORNET folk:

In Sunday's paper we shared with readers the latest presidential and U.S.
Senate ballot tests from the Minnesota Poll. If you are interested in
getting more information, point your web browser to
<http://www.startribune.com>.
Please excuse the double posting if you are member of both lists.

Rob Daves

The findings:

		July 8-14	Sept. 3-8	Oct. 7-13	Oct. 29- Nov. 1
	n=	1,207	701	900	1,007
Clinton		53%	59%	55%	55%
Dole		29	31	33	28
Perot		12	6	5	9
Other candidates	3	1	4	3	3
No opinion	3	3	3	3	5
U.S. Senate Race					
Wellstone		47%	43%	47%	50%
Boschwitz	39	42	38	37	
Barkley	7	2	3	4	
Other candidates	2	6	7	3	
No opinion	5	7	5	6	

Note: Researchers read respondents the names and party affiliations of all candidates that will appear on the Minnesota presidential and U.S. Senate ballots.

Source: Star Tribune/WCCO-TV Minnesota Polls of likely voters statewide

Director of Polling & News Research

Star Tribune

425 Portland Av. S. Minneapolis MN 55488 USA

daves@startribune.com v: 612/673-7278 f: 612/673-4359

>From rbezilla@ix.netcom.com Mon Nov 4 12:14:16 1996

Return-Path: rbezilla@ix.netcom.com

Received: from dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.6])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id MAA28704 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 Nov 1996 12:14:12 -0800

(PST)

Received: from [199.183.207.55] (prn-nj1-07.ix.netcom.com [199.183.207.39])

by dfw-ix6.ix.netcom.com (8.6.13/8.6.12) with ESMTTP id MAA08018 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 Nov 1996 12:13:33 -0800

X-Sender: rbezilla@popd.ix.netcom.com

Message-Id: <v03007802aea3e921cb3c@[199.183.207.55]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Mon, 4 Nov 1996 15:13:04 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Robert Bezilla <rbezilla@ix.netcom.com>

Subject: Graveyard voters

As in past years there undoubtedly will be claims that the opposition party got names from tombstones and cast ballots for them, but I have to wonder if there are indeed votes cast by the dead. By that I mean that with the increasing number of absentee ballots and mail ballots being cast, there is a good chance that some of those votes will come from people who died between the time they sent their questionnaires in and before election day. The number of course is probably very small, but could be critical in a recount situation, particularly since older people tend to favor conservative and GOP candidates and causes.

Do election laws cover this contingency? Are there mechanisms against this sort of thing? Have there been challenges in the past on this basis? Could the probable proportion be estimated from mortality statistics?

Robert Bezilla
rbezilla@ix.netcom.com

>From paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua Wed Nov 6 11:54:51 1996
Return-Path: kmis.kiev.ua!paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua
Received: from shiva.adam.kiev.ua (root@[194.93.172.35])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA23895 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 11:54:35 -0800
(PST)
Received: from kmisua.UUCP (uukmis@localhost) by shiva.adam.kiev.ua
(8.8.2/8.8.2) with UUCP id VAA11603 for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 6 Nov 1996
21:58:33 +0200
X-Authentication-Warning: shiva.adam.kiev.ua: uukmis set sender to
<kmisua!kmis.kiev.ua!paniotto> using -f
Received: by kmis.kiev.ua (UUPC/@ v5.09gamma, 14Mar93);
Wed, 6 Nov 1996 21:05:45 +0200
To: aapornet@usc.edu
References: <199611011440.JAA06245@envhost.vironics.ca>
Message-Id: <AA86EWoqP8@kmis.kiev.ua>
Organization: KIIS
From: "Vladimir I. Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 96 21:05:44 +0200
X-Mailer: BML [MS/DOS Beauty Mail v.1.36]
Subject: Re: Getting household income info.
Lines: 123

Dear Mr.Leebosh,

We have done 2 surveys representative for Ukraine for World Bank, using several hundreds of questions to measure income, expenditures and real consumption. We found that reported income is not good indicator of welfare, expenditure or consumption are much better, but it's impossible to measure it just by 1 question. So we can suggest such approach. You see, all persons have shortage of money. The main thing - for what: one of them can't buy food, another one - new plant. So we try to receive self-estimation of the structure of shortages:

E20. Please look at this card and tell me which of the variants suits your household's financial situation best of all. SHOW THE OD-5 CARD.

We have not got enough money even for food

1

We have enough money for food, but it is difficult to buy cloths or footwear

2

We have enough money for food, cloths and footwear and we can make some savings,

but it is not enough to buy some expensive items (like a refrigerator or a TV set) 3

We can afford some expensive items (like a refrigerator or a TV set), but we

cannot afford everything we want

4

We can afford everything we want

5

We have practically no refuses to answer that question.

Below is the correspondence with income, expenditures and consumption.

Ukraine - 1995 (Valid cases -2023 households, Missing cases - 1)

	Household per capita:		
	income	expenditures	consumption
	(in thousand Ukrainian coupons - krb)		
For Entire Population	3405	4381	7104
1.00 not enough for food	2504	3254	5834
2.00 enough for food	3834	4704	7624
3.00 enough for cloths	6076	9210	12176
4.00 expensive items	18163	20644	20271
5.00 everything we want	*	*	*)

*) data unreliable

I understand that for Canada situation may be different and item of the questions must be another, it's just idea.

All the best.

Vladimir Paniotto,

Director of Kiev International Institute of Sociology, paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua

>From paniotto Wed Nov 6 21:03:29 UKR 1996

Dear Mr.Leebosh,

We have done 2 surveys representative for Ukraine for World Bank, using several hundreds of questions to measure income, expenditures and real consumption. We found that reported income is not good indicator of welfare, expenditure or consumption are much better, but it's impossible to measure it just by 1 question.

So we can suggest such approach. You see, all persons have shortage of money. The main thing - for what: one of them can't buy food, another one - new plant. So we try to receive self-estimation of the structure of shortages:

E20. Please look at this card and tell me which of the variants suits your household's financial situation best of all. SHOW THE OD-5 CARD.

We have not got enough money even for food 1

We have enough money for food, but it is

difficult to buy cloths or footwear	2
We have enough money for food, cloths and footwear and we can make some savings, but it is not enough to buy some expensive items (like a refrigerator or a TV set)	3
We can afford some expensive items (like a refrigerator or a TV set), but we cannot afford everything we want	4
We can afford everything we want	5

We have practically no refuses to answer that question. Below is the correspondence with income, expenditures and consumption.

Ukraine - 1995 (Valid cases -2023 households, Missing cases - 1)

	Household per capita:		
	income	expenditures	consumption
	(in thousand Ukrainian coupons - krb)		
For Entire Population	3405	4381	7104
1.00 not enough for food	2504	3254	5834
2.00 enough for food	3834	4704	7624
3.00 enough for cloths	6076	9210	12176
4.00 expensive items	18163	20644	20271
5.00 everything we want	*	*	*)

*) data unreliable

I understand that for Canada situation may be different and items of the questions must be another, it's just idea.

All the best.

Vladimir Paniotto,
 Kiev International Institute of Sociology,
 Kiev, Ukraine
 paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua

```
>From mike_battaglia@abtassoc.com Thu Nov 7 05:52:29 1996
Return-Path: mike_battaglia@abtassoc.com
Received: from abtmail.abtassoc.com (abtmail.abtassoc.com [198.105.0.7])
  by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
  id FAA18730 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 05:52:27 -0800
(PST)
From: mike_battaglia@abtassoc.com
Received: from abtgwy.abtassoc.com (abtgw.abtassoc.com [198.105.0.10]) by
  abtmail.abtassoc.com (8.7.5/8.7.3/LeftBank-Abtassoc1.0) with SMTP id
  IAA13682 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 08:52:59 -0500
Received: from cc:Mail by abtgwy.abtassoc.com
  id AA847385643; Thu, 07 Nov 96 08:53:52 est
```

Date: Thu, 07 Nov 96 08:53:52 est
Message-Id: <9610078473.AA847385643@abtgwy.abtassoc.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Dr. Martin Frankel Joins Abt Associates

Dr. Martin Frankel Joins Abt Associates

CAMBRIDGE, Massachusetts -- (November 7, 1996) -- Martin R. Frankel has joined Abt Associates Inc. as Senior Statistical Scientist. With more than 30 years experience in the application of statistical sampling and analysis to social and business issues, Dr. Frankel has been involved in the design, execution, and analysis of major national sample surveys for a number of government agencies and commercial enterprises.

Abt Associates' president and CEO, Wendell J. Knox, remarks about the appointment, "We are obviously pleased to have a social scientist of Dr. Frankel's stature and international repute join us. He will add even further to the deep fund of knowledge and experience that our current staff of survey research and statistical design experts possess. His broad experience in the design, implementation, and analysis of large and complex surveys will serve us and our clients well in so many ways as we continue to build our world class survey capabilities."

Prior to joining Abt Associates, Dr. Frankel was, since 1974, Technical Director and then Senior Statistical Scientist at the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago. Since 1971, Dr. Frankel has been Professor of Statistics and Computer Information Systems, Bernard Baruch College, City University of New York.

He has had primary responsibility for the statistical sampling aspects of the General Social Survey (for the National Science Foundation), High School and Beyond and the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (for the National Center for Education Statistics), the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (for the Department of Labor), and the National Medical Expenditure Survey (for the Department of Health and Human Services).

In addition to his work with NORC, Dr. Frankel has been involved in the design and implementation of a number of surveys conducted by commercial marketing, advertising, and media research organizations. He is currently Chair of the Research Quality and Practices Council of the Advertising Research Foundation, and in 1995-96, he was President of the Market Research Council. He has served as a consultant to the AC Nielsen Company, Louis Harris and Associates, Mediamark Research, and Yankelovich Partners.

Dr. Frankel is former Chairman of the American Statistical Association's Section on Survey Research Methods and the Association's Advisory Committee to the U.S. Census. He is past Chair of the Standards Committee of the American Association for Public Opinion Research and is a Fellow of the American Statistical Association. He is the author or co-author of 3 books, 10 book chapters, and numerous

articles in professional and scholarly journals.

Abt Associates Inc. is a private, employee-owned, for-profit company which does social, demographic, economic, and policy research, as well as business research and consulting. Its regular staff of 750 employees are located in offices in Cambridge and Amherst, Massachusetts, Bethesda, Maryland, Chicago, Illinois, Moscow, Russia, and Johannesburg, South Africa. Its two survey research operations centers in Amherst and Chicago provide complete survey services for national and local in-person, mail, and telephone surveys.

#

>From altschul@oswego.edu Thu Nov 7 06:50:43 1996
Return-Path: altschul@Oswego.EDU
Received: from rocky-gw.oswego.edu (rocky-g1.oswego.edu [129.3.22.36])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id GAA25609 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 06:50:38 -0800
(PST)
Received: (from altschul@localhost) by rocky-gw.oswego.edu (8.7.5/8.7.3) id
JAA04876; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 09:50:35 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 09:50:35 -0500 (EST)
From: Bruce Altschuler <altschul@oswego.edu>
Subject: Election Polls
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <Pine.3.89.9611070958.A3054-0100000@rocky-gw.oswego.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Now that the election is finally over it is time to start our usual exercise of assessing the polls. I would suggest three areas in which many fell short:

1. The phantom Perot surge. Many preelection polls picked up a Perot surge that moved him into double digits during the last days of the campaign but this proved a mirage.
2. The shrinking Clinton margin. Surveys did well on the easy part, unanimously predicting a Clinton win by a significant margin. However, the ultimate gap turned out to be smaller than forecast. For many polls this was within the margin of sampling error but it still seems somewhat troubling. Could that phantom Perot surge have actually been a small shift toward Dole due to the revelations about shady political contributions to Clinton? Or could Dole have picked up some doubting members of the Republican base who shifted from the undecided column. Exit polls do indicate that Dole won a plurality of 1992 Perot voters.
3. The gender gap. Although exit polls indicate a significant gender gap, the margin appears comparable to that of the Reagan years rather than the chasm that some preelection polls had suggested. Many of those surveys gave Clinton a lead of as much as 2-1 among women but his actual margin was significantly less. What happened?

I would be interested to hear the responses of AAPORNETers. Is it possible that low turnout had an effect?

Bruce E. Altschuler
SUNY Oswego

>From rshalp@cris.com Thu Nov 7 08:56:57 1996
Return-Path: rshalp@cris.com
Received: from franklin.cris.com (franklin.cris.com [199.3.12.31])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA13827 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 08:56:50 -0800
(PST)
Received: from beasley.cris.com (beasley.cris.com [199.3.12.41])
by franklin.cris.com (8.7.5/(96/10/30 3.5))
id LAA04619; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 11:56:14 -0500 (EST)
[1-800-745-2747 The Concentric Network]
Errors-To: <rshalp@cris.com>
Received: from LOCALNAME (cnc028087.concentric.net [206.83.93.87])
by beasley.cris.com (8.8.2)
id LAA19196; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 11:55:53 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 11:55:53 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199611071655.LAA19196@beasley.cris.com>
X-Sender: rshalp@pop3.concentric.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalp@cris.com>
Subject: Wall St. Journal unhappy with election polls

The Wall Street Journal is evidently very unhappy with polls, pollsters, and indirectly with other media, as evidenced by their lead editorial in yesterday's edition (Nov 6, 1996). After saying that they "won't spend much space trying to analyze the outcome of yesterday's election"....because of the "....reality of newspaper deadlines and our preference for thinking about what we say", they go on to talk about the "battle of the pollsters" [Funny that all other media were prepared and took the time to play "what if?". Is the Journal above it all?]

"...in addition to the battle of the candidates...there is also the battle of the pollsters. The disparities in the final polls were dramatic, ranging from a Clinton lead of 18 points in the New York Times/CBS poll down to a Clinton lead of only 7 points in the Reuters/Zogby poll."

"In polling on whether Democrats or Republicans would win the House, the variation was even greater. The ABC tracking poll gave Democrats and 11 point advantage. Reuters/Zogby and the HOTLINE tracking polls showed the GOP with a slight lead. With those variations, the actual vote will clearly show some polls were consistently more on target than others. We wonder if the more errant pollsters will adjust their methodologies, and whether their media clients will consider reducing the saturation level of attention they pay to polls. The media's constant recitation of the latest polling results has come to look like a substitute for thinking about politics."

As far as I know the Wall St. Journal is one of the very few papers not to have its own poll or report, on some regular basis, the findings from others. I will reserve my own views as to why the Journal said what they did, suffice to say that they are not complimentary to the Journal. Possibly

Barry A. Hollander
Assistant Professor
BARRY@uga.cc.uga.edu
Phone (706) 542-5027

College of Journalism
and Mass Communication
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

>From ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU Thu Nov 7 09:34:06 1996
Return-Path: ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.96])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA23128 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 09:33:59 -0800
(PST)
Received: (from ksherril@localhost) by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george)
id MAA09593; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 12:37:57 -0500
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 12:37:56 -0500 (EST)
From: Kenneth Sherrill <ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Angry voters
In-Reply-To: <961107.122648.EST.BARRY@UGA.CC.UGA.EDU>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961107123649.8856E-100000@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

If the low turnout did not reflect angry citizens, what did it reflect?

And, had it not been for Motor Voter, how much lower would turnout have been?

Ken Sherrill
Hunter College

>From N.Moon@maires.co.uk Thu Nov 7 09:50:15 1996
Return-Path: N.Moon@maires.co.uk
Received: from savoy.maires.co.uk (savoy.maires.co.uk [193.129.1.205])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA27709 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 09:50:03 -0800
(PST)
Received: from itserv.maires.co.uk by savoy.maires.co.uk id aa20042;
7 Nov 96 17:49 GMT
Received: from rfmserv.maires.co.uk by itserv.maires.co.uk id aa26519;
7 Nov 96 17:50 GMT
Received: from MAI1/SpoolDir by rfmserv.maires.co.uk (Mercury 1.21);
7 Nov 96 17:50:59 +0000
Received: from SpoolDir by MAI1 (Mercury 1.30); 7 Nov 96 17:50:56 +0000
From: Nick Moon <N.Moon@maires.co.uk>
Organization: Consumer Market Research
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 17:50:56 +0000
Subject: Re: Wall St. Journal unhappy with election polls
Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.42a)
Message-ID: <124E913F5286@rfmserv.maires.co.uk>

Richard Halpern criticises the Wall St Journal for its post-election comments on the polls.

Speaking from the bitter British experience of 1992, I can say that if we had predicted a Clinton lead 10% greater than it actually was, or had predicted an 11% Democrat lead in the House race, I would be thinking very seriously about adjusting my methodologies even without newspapers to suggest it, and if any did so I would hardly say they were cavalier.

As pollsters we have to stand up and be counted after an election, and such variations in predictions can hardly be swept under the carpet.

Nick Moon

nickm@nopres.co.uk

tel 0171 612 0830 fax 0171 612 0744

NOP Social and Political, Tower House, Southampton St
London WC2E 7HN

>From rusciano@enigma.rider.edu Thu Nov 7 10:24:39 1996

Return-Path: RUSCIANO@enigma.rider.edu

Received: from enigma (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP

id KAA04311 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 10:24:34 -0800

(PST)

Received: from enigma.rider.edu by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.0-4 #15764) id

<01IBKDT3FL4W8X57CM@enigma.rider.edu>; Thu, 07 Nov 1996 13:23:30 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Thu, 07 Nov 1996 13:23:30 -0400 (EDT)

From: rusciano@enigma.rider.edu

Subject: Re: Election Polls

In-reply-to: <Pine.3.89.9611070958.A3054-0100000@rocky-gw.oswego.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Cc: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <Pine.PMDF.3.91.961107131419.539399542A-100000@enigma.rider.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Fellow aaporneters:

With reference to Bruce Altshuler's comments, I think two points are important. First, I believe that the first two phenomena might be explained by low voter turnout. Since the Perot vote would probably come from Independents who are less likely to turn out than partisans, Perot might have come up shorter in the end because these people decided it was not worthwhile to vote. Similarly, regarding Clinton's margin, that could also have shrunk due to Democrats not voting because they felt Clinton was a shoe-in anyway; Republicans tend to vote at higher rates than Democrats, and this difference might account for the smaller margin than what was expected.

I believe, however, the real story concerns Prof. Altshuler's third question. This election was HISTORIC in one sense-- it was the first time women elected the President of the United States. According to the CNN exit polls, Clinton won 43% of the male vote, while Dole won 44% of the male vote. However, Clinton won 54% of the female vote, while Dole won only 38% of the female vote. Putting aside considerations of the electoral college for the moment, if only men had voted, Dole would have been elected President if these exit polls are correct.

Of course, there have been gender gaps in previous Presidential

elections, dating back to 1980. However, the gender gap never DECIDED the election before; instead, women were more likely to support the Democratic candidate than men, but both supported the winner. As an example, women supported Mondale more than Reagan in 1984, but more women supported Reagan than supported Mondale. This prompted one Reagan advisor to say that Reagan was not unpopular amongst women, he was just extremely popular amongst men.

That argument does not hold for this election. Studies of the gender gap have often been shunted to the periphery of elections research. This is not to say that such studies were not important or well done; rather, gender just has not tended to be one of the first factors one looked at in interpreting elections. With these results, that will change; I suspect we will see many social scientists and pollsters frantically searching for the issues, and usable theories, to explain why this gap exists now that it has clearly decided an American Presidential election (and may do so in the future).

Frank L. Rusciano
Rider University
email at rusciano@enigma.rider.edu

On Thu, 7 Nov 1996, Bruce Altschuler wrote:

> Now that the election is finally over it is time to start our usual
> exercise of assessing the polls. I would suggest three areas in which
> many fell short:
>
> 1. The phantom Perot surge. Many preelection polls picked up a Perot
> surge that moved him into double digits during the last days of the
> campaign but this proved a mirage.
>
> 2. The shrinking Clinton margin. Surveys did well on the easy part,
> unanimously predicting a Clinton win by a significant margin. However,
> the ultimate gap turned out to be smaller than forecast. For many polls
> this was within the margin of sampling error but it still seems somewhat
> troubling. Could that phantom Perot surge have actually been a small
> shift toward Dole due to the revelations about shady political
> contributions to Clinton? Or could Dole have picked up some doubting
> members of the Republican base who shifted from the undecided column.
> Exit polls do indicate that Dole won a plurality of 1992 Perot voters.
>
> 3. The gender gap. Although exit polls indicate a significant gender
> gap,
> the margin appears comparable to that of the Reagan years rather than the
> chasm that some preelection polls had suggested. Many of those surveys
> gave Clinton a lead of as much as 2-1 among women but his actual margin
> was significantly less. What happened?
>
> I would be interested to hear the responses of AAPORNETers. Is it
> possible that low turnout had an effect?
>
> Bruce E. Altschuler
> SUNY Oswego
>
>From David_Moore@internet.gallup.com Thu Nov 7 11:00:42 1996
Return-Path: David_Moore@internet.gallup.com

Received: from gateway.gallup.com (firewall-user@gateway.gallup.com [206.158.235.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA09891 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 11:00:40 -0800
(PST)
From: David_Moore@internet.gallup.com
Received: (from uucp@localhost) by gateway.gallup.com (8.8.2/8.6.11) id
MAA12813 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 12:56:56 -0600 (CST)
Received: from internt2.gallup.com(198.247.195.182) by gateway.gallup.com
via smap (3.2)
id xma012722; Thu, 7 Nov 96 12:56:31 -0600
Received: from ccMail by internet.gallup.com (SMTPLINK V2.11 PreRelease 4)
id AA847400422; Thu, 07 Nov 96 13:45:26 CDT
Date: Thu, 07 Nov 96 13:45:26 CDT
Message-Id: <9610078474.AA847400422@internet.gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Wall St. Journal unhappy with election polls

I am not so sure it is necessary or even useful to reply to the WSJ for their criticism of polls. There are simply different philosophies about the journalistic uses of polls, which to some degree are no doubt related to the presumed interests of the consumers. The WSJ of course does have its own poll, in combination with NBC, conducted by the Democratic polling firm headed by Peter Hart and the Republican polling firm headed by Bob Teeter. According to a representative of NBC, with whom I spoke just recently, this poll (WSJ/NBC) has a contract for just 10 regular "in-depth" polls during the year, with the possibility of two ad hoc polls. Thus, their "positioning" is clearly different from, say, the CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll, which conducts over 40 polls in a year -- many of which are "in-depth," many of which are intended to track current issues over time.

Personally, I have never been persuaded that the increase in polls has served as a "substitute for thinking about politics." In fact, both CNN and USA Today use the frequent polls to explore the public opinion dimension of politics -- which does not preclude, but reinforces, their reporting on the other dimensions as well.

But there is no right or wrong here. If the WSJ, or other news consumers, don't want to look at the poll results, they don't have to. The WSJ has decided not to covers sports -- but I wouldn't want all newspapers to follow that practice. The same principle applies to polls as well.

David Moore
The Gallup Organization
david_moore@internet.gallup.com

Reply Separator

Subject: Wall St. Journal unhappy with election polls
Author: aapornet@usc.edu at Internet
Date: 11/7/96 11:06 AM

The Wall Street Journal is evidently very unhappy with polls, pollsters, and indirectly with other media, as evidenced by their lead editorial in yesterday's edition (Nov 6, 1996). After saying that they "won't spend much space trying to analyze the outcome of yesterday's election"...because of the "...reality of newspaper deadlines and our preference for thinking about what we say", they go on to talk about the "battle of the pollsters" [Funny that all other media were prepared and took the time to play "what if?". Is the Journal above it all?]

"...in addition to the battle of the candidates...there is also the battle of the pollsters. The disparities in the final polls were dramatic, ranging from a Clinton lead of 18 points in the New York Times/CBS poll down to a Clinton lead of only 7 points in the Reuters/Zogby poll."

"In polling on whether Democrats or Republicans would win the House, the variation was even greater. The ABC tracking poll gave Democrats and 11 point advantage. Reuters/Zogby and the HOTLINE tracking polls showed the GOP with a slight lead. With those variations, the actual vote will clearly show some polls were consistently more on target than others. We wonder if the more errant pollsters will adjust their methodologies, and whether their media clients will consider reducing the saturation level of attention they pay to polls. The media's constant recitation of the latest polling results has come to look like a substitute for thinking about politics."

As far as I know the Wall St. Journal is one of the very few papers not to have its own poll or report, on some regular basis, the findings from others. I will reserve my own views as to why the Journal said what they did, suffice to say that they are not complimentary to the Journal. Possibly they were so overcome by the election result that they were left speechless. In any event, some response to the Journal's rather cavalier viewpoint might be warranted. Ordinarily, it wouldn't be so important except that the Journal is read regularly by most business executives and others with conservative outlooks (except me).

Any thoughts?

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

>From billt@pos.org Thu Nov 7 12:03:24 1996
Return-Path: billt@pos.org
Received: from netrail.net (root@netrail.net [205.215.6.3])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA24452 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 12:03:15 -0800
(PST)
Received: from info (neil.pos.org [205.215.50.23]) by netrail.net
(8.8.2/Netrail) with SMTP id PAA19126 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov
1996 15:01:37 -0500
Message-Id: <199611072001.PAA19126@netrail.net>
Comments: Authenticated sender is <billt@pos.org>
From: "Bill Thompson" <billt@pos.org>
Organization: Public Opinion Strategies
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 15:08:03 -0400
Subject: Re: Angry voters
Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.42)

Hello all,

> If the low turnout did not reflect angry citizens, what did it
> reflect?

We don't know for sure that people didn't vote because they are
angry. It is likely that voters decided early that
Dole was un-electable or at least a poor choice so that made it *no
contest*. (At least that's how it was portrayed in the media for a
long time - Dole's too old, too grumpy, etc.)

I think that the polls that were out there (and later, turnout) showed not
anger but
resignation that Clinton was the *better* choice and since Clinton
still is not the most liked President we have had, many voters simply
were not interested in the race.

Angry voters do not return an incumbent to office and re-elect the
same party to control of the Congress (in the same year no less). I
would submit they were resigned to unpopular choices and many chose
not to vote because of it.

>
> And, had it not been for Motor Voter, how much lower would turnout
> have been?
>
> Ken Sherrill
> Hunter College
>
>

Regards, Bill

Bill Thompson, Virginia, USA

"And the men who hold high places must be the ones to start,
to mold a new reality, closer to the heart"

>From rbezilla@ix.netcom.com Thu Nov 7 12:32:13 1996

Return-Path: rbezilla@ix.netcom.com

Received: from dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.2])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id MAA29485 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 12:32:11 -0800

(PST)

Received: from [199.183.207.33] (prn-nj1-01.ix.netcom.com [199.183.207.33])

by dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com (8.6.13/8.6.12) with ESMTP id MAA24574 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 12:31:31 -0800

X-Sender: rbezilla@popd.ix.netcom.com

Message-Id: <v03007800aea7f327d5b8@[205.184.179.52]>

In-Reply-To: <9610078474.AA847400422@internet.gallup.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 15:32:00 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Robert Bezilla <rbezilla@ix.netcom.com>

Subject: Re: Wall St. Journal unhappy with election polls

>Any thoughts?

>

Dow Jones publications have always carefully divided editorial reporting
from editorial opinion. Concerning the WSJ I have heard Peter Kann,
publisher and CEO, remark, "It's a great bargain: you get two very different
daily publications for the price of one."

On a positive note, some may remember when the editor of the now defunct
(Dow Jones) National Observer blew the whistle on his own marketing people
for using ultraviolet control markings on mail questionnaires to the
publication's subscribers. I believe there was a discussion of this in POQ,
and the publicity helped to put an end to what was becoming a growing
practice.

Robert Bezilla

rbezilla@ix.netcom.com

>From ABIDER@american.edu Thu Nov 7 14:27:22 1996

Return-Path: ABIDER@AUVV.AMERICAN.EDU

Received: from AUVV.AMERICAN.EDU (smtp@auvm.american.edu [147.9.1.2])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id OAA27250 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:27:14 -0800

(PST)

Message-Id: <199611072227.OAA27250@usc.edu>

Received: from AUVV.AMERICAN.EDU by AUVV.AMERICAN.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)

with BSMTP id 1716; Thu, 07 Nov 96 17:25:53 EST

Received: from american.edu (NJE origin ABIDER@AUVV) by AUVV.AMERICAN.EDU

(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 7678; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 17:25:54 -0500

Date: Thu, 07 Nov 96 17:07:27 EST

From: Albert Biderman <ABIDER@american.edu>

Organization: The American University

Subject: Re: Angry voters
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: Message of Thu, 7 Nov 1996 12:37:56 -0500 (EST) from
<ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU>

The post on motor voter lowering "turnout" misses that the indicator that was lowered is a rate. A half-dozen talking heads and op eds I've seen this week made same mistake. Motor voter loads up the denominator disproportionately with low-motivation registrants, thus depressing the turnout rate. The relevant indicator would be change from previous presidential elections of a rate taking numbers who voted in ratio to some standardized population count (e,g., age, citizen).

(Yup, wake me if you ever see one like it in the "prestige press" or in the copy of "one of America's most respected political columnists."

Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu

>From Jaki_Stanley_at_NASS-HQ@nass.usda.gov Thu Nov 7 14:45:36 1996
Return-Path: Jaki_Stanley_at_NASS-HQ@nass.usda.gov
Received: from ag.gov (ag.gov [162.79.3.5])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA01227 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:45:34 -0800
(PST)
From: Jaki_Stanley_at_NASS-HQ@nass.usda.gov
Received: from nass.usda.gov ([199.129.206.11]) by ag.gov (4.1/SMI-4.1)
id AA06470; Thu, 7 Nov 96 15:46:48 MST
Received: from ccMail by nass.usda.gov (SMTPLINK V2.11 PreRelease 4)
id AA847417442; Thu, 07 Nov 96 17:39:53 EST
Date: Thu, 07 Nov 96 17:39:53 EST
Message-Id: <9610078474.AA847417442@nass.usda.gov>
To: aapornet@usc.edu, por@irss.unc.edu
Subject: Perceived Respondent Burden

(Cross posted to POR and AAPORNET)

Because of the large number of survey contacts we make with a shrinking population (farmers and ranchers), we are very concerned with respondent burden. Before we attempt to reduce the burden we place on our survey respondents, it would be nice to know how RESPONDENTS perceive the burden we place on them. We typically use the (very) gross measure of length of interview in minutes to gauge burden. However, I'm sure that there are lengthy interviews which are not perceived as being burdensome and short ones that are, depending on the type and format of data requested, etc.

My question to the members of this list is:
Has anyone tried to measure (or know of others who have) how respondents perceive response burden?

Because we can't immediately work on reducing burden everywhere and for everyone, we would like some measure to indicate where the most burden is perceived (and therefore might be most likely to prompt non-respondents). After all, there is no sense expending resources to reduce burden where people do not mind being interviewed or providing data.

>might be warranted. Ordinarily, it wouldn't be so important except that
>the Journal is read regularly by most business executives and others
>with conservative outlooks (except me).

The WSJ does have a regular poll, done jointly with NBC News. In a recent article in Slate, James Carville praised it as the most accurate of all, in fact.

I read the Journal, too, as do most pinkos I know. In many ways, it's the best newspaper in the country.

Doug

--

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

>From rstuefen@charlie.usd.edu Thu Nov 7 16:03:14 1996
Return-Path: rstuefen@charlie.usd.edu
Received: from charlie.usd.edu (charlie.usd.edu [192.55.228.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id QAA22860 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 16:03:08 -0800
(PST)
Message-Id: <199611080003.QAA22860@usc.edu>
Received: from stuefen.bus.usd.edu ([206.176.1.151]) by charlie.usd.edu with
SMTP;
Thu, 7 Nov 1996 18:00:36 -0600 (CST)
From: "Randall M. Stuefen" <rstuefen@charlie.usd.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Trickle Down or Education
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 17:59:23 -0600
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1155
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear All,

I would like to explore peoples perceptions of income disparities in our state and the desired investment of state funds to best benefit the incomes of the citizenry.

I would like to determine if people think a greater investment in efforts to attract more business activity is more productive in increasing incomes than a greater expenditure on higher education. This may be the age old chicken

or egg question. Which comes first or it may be a question of balance? If people think both are important, what proportion of funds should be expended on each?

The paths of trickle down vs education are concepts close to the major parties. I thought it possible that a tried and refined questionnaire addressing these issues might exist.

Thanks for your help,
Randall M. Stuefen

```
>From rshalp@cris.com Thu Nov 7 21:04:11 1996
Return-Path: rshalp@cris.com
Received: from franklin.cris.com (franklin.cris.com [199.3.12.31])
        by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
        id VAA01203 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 21:04:08 -0800
(PST)
Received: from beasley.cris.com (beasley.cris.com [199.3.12.41])
        by franklin.cris.com (8.7.5/(96/10/30 3.5))
        id AAA18326; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 00:03:36 -0500 (EST)
        [1-800-745-2747 The Concentric Network]
Errors-To: <rshalp@cris.com>
Received: from LOCALNAME (cnc028032.concentric.net [206.83.93.32])
        by beasley.cris.com (8.8.2)
        id AAA18326; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 00:02:23 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 1996 00:02:23 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199611080502.AAA18326@beasley.cris.com>
X-Sender: rshalp@pop3.concentric.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalp@cris.com>
Subject: Re: Angry voters
```

Could the reason for low voter turnout indicate a sense of impotence on the part of many voters, an absence of a sense of empowerment or control over political processes, a desire to distance oneself from a process seen as unpleasant or as irrelevant to ones daily life (i.e.. the outcome won't make any difference), etc? Some may be angry but I wonder how many are simply bored, frustrated and just turned off by the political process they have witnessed over the last year or so. Certainly, few candidates behaved toward their opponents in a manner that one might recommend as an appropriate role model for bringing up one's children.

Although there were undoubtedly many who were dissuaded from voting because of their dislike of both presidential choices, there were many, many other local candidates also up for election along with numerous local referendums. Is it fair to assume that lack of interest (for whatever reason) in the presidential race automatically blocks out interest in all other contests? Or, is the disaffection and alienation from the political process much more complex and generalized to the whole political process?

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. Phone/Fax: (770) 434 4121
Halpern & Associates E-Mail: rshalp@cris.com
Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research E-Mail: rshalp@concentric.net

3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-4248

>From ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Fri Nov 8 04:41:50 1996
Return-Path: ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.96])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id EAA20638 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 04:41:49 -0800
(PST)
Received: (from ksherril@localhost) by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george)
id HAA24608; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 07:45:47 -0500
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 1996 07:45:47 -0500 (EST)
From: Kenneth Sherrill <ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Angry voters
In-Reply-To: <199611072227.OAA27250@usc.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961108074108.23725J-100000@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Thu, 7 Nov 1996, Albert Biderman wrote:

> The post on motor voter lowering "turnout" misses that the indicator
> that was lowered is a rate. A half-dozen talking heads and op eds
> I've seen this week made same mistake. Motor voter loads up the
> denominator disproportionately with low-motivation registrants, thus
> depressing the turnout rate. The relevant indicator would be change
> from previous presidential elections of a rate taking numbers who
> voted in ratio to some standardized population count (e,g., age,
> citizen).

>
> (Yup, wake me if you ever see one like it in the "prestige press" or
> in the copy of "one of America's most respected political columnists."
>

>
> Albert Biderman
> abider@american.edu
>

>
The rate is of the voting age population, not of registered voters. The effect of Motor-Voter was to expand the pool of registered voters. It did not add to the number of citizens over the age of 18. Thus, Motor-Voter did not affect the denominator, contrary to Prof. Biderman's assertion. If anything, Motor-Voter expanded the numerator and drove the percentage up. I hesitate to imagine how much lower the turnout would have been were it not for Motor-Voter.

Ken Sherrill

Hunter College

>From derek_leeboosh@environics.ca Fri Nov 8 07:21:13 1996

Return-Path: derek_leeboosh@environics.ca

Received: from seraph.uunet.ca (uunet.ca [142.77.1.254])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP

id HAA02165 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 07:21:10 -0800

(PST)

Received: from envrnx by seraph.uunet.ca with UUCP id <656710-4098>; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 10:18:30 -0500

Received: from pc6.environics.ca by envhost.environics.ca (8.6.10/5.40/1.0) id JAA00075; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 09:42:50 -0500

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 1996 09:42:50 -0500

Message-Id: <199611081442.JAA00075@envhost.environics.ca>

X-Sender: leeboosh@envhost

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: derek_leeboosh@environics.ca (Derek Leeboosh)

Subject: Clinton Win is Good for Food!

X-Mailer: <Windows Eudora Version 2.0.2>

Just to add a new light on the election results. i watched an interview with Julia Child last night and she strongly feels that Clinton's win is good for the "food" in America. Given that the President tends to set a certain style and trend etc... She says that Clinton and the Dems. tend to be bon vivants who know what fine foods are all about. The "other side" (ie: Republicans) tend to retreat to their country clubs and chow down a lot of overcooked roasts and don't know the difference between the good stuff and the bad.

Had anyone ever heard of any research indicating that gourmets tend to be Democrats ?

Derek Leeboosh

Environics Research

Toronto, Ontario

derek_leeboosh@environics.ca

>From billt@pos.org Fri Nov 8 09:34:09 1996

Return-Path: billt@pos.org

Received: from netrail.net (root@netrail.net [205.215.6.3])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP

id JAA25600 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 09:34:06 -0800

(PST)

Received: from info (neil.pos.org [205.215.50.23]) by netrail.net (8.8.2/Netrail) with SMTP id MAA17841 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 12:32:28 -0500

Message-Id: <199611081732.MAA17841@netrail.net>

Comments: Authenticated sender is <billt@pos.org>

From: "Bill Thompson" <billt@pos.org>

Organization: Public Opinion Strategies

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 1996 12:38:55 -0400

Subject: Re: Clinton Win is Good for Food!

Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.42)

Derek,

> Had anyone ever heard of any research indicating that gourmets tend to
> be Democrats ?

How can they be? If you listen to the DNC, there are no Democrats
with enough money who could ever afford gourmet food?! ;-)

Perhaps Richard Nixon would have said...my wife doesn't eat filet
mignon, she prefers a good ol' Republican hot dog! (To badly parody
the Checkers speech!)

Sorry folks, but I couldn't resist! Don't hate me, it's been a long
election year!

Regards, Bill

Bill Thompson, Virginia, USA

"And the men who hold high places must be the ones to start,
to mold a new reality, closer to the heart"
>From FEICK@vms.cis.pitt.edu Fri Nov 8 10:42:55 1996
Return-Path: FEICK@vms.cis.pitt.edu
Received: from myriad.cis.pitt.edu (myriad.cis.pitt.edu [136.142.186.16])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA11568 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 10:42:53 -0800
(PST)
Received: from vms.cis.pitt.edu by vms.cis.pitt.edu (PMDF V4.3-10 #16365)
id <01IBLSM7UVVW8ZJJ6V@vms.cis.pitt.edu>; Fri, 08 Nov 1996 13:42:16 -0500
(EST)
Date: Fri, 08 Nov 1996 13:42:16 -0500 (EST)
From: "LARRY FEICK;PHONE 1-412-648-1562,FAX -1552" <FEICK@vms.cis.pitt.edu>
Subject: Re: Clinton Win is Good for Food!
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01IBLSM7VWN68ZJJ6V@vms.cis.pitt.edu>
X-Envelope-to: aapornet@usc.edu
X-VMS-To: IN%"aapornet@usc.edu"
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Folks,

What kind of mushrooms has Julia Child been eating? Bill "I'll have the
large fries" Clinton's reelection may be good for food volume, but I can't
believe it would be for quality. Also, wouldn't the demographics suggest
that it is the Republicans who visit the more upscale, high quality
restaurants? Larry Feick

>From ABIDER@american.edu Fri Nov 8 11:09:07 1996
Return-Path: ABIDER@AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (smtp@auvm.american.edu [147.9.1.2])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA18349 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 11:09:00 -0800
(PST)
Message-Id: <199611081909.LAA18349@usc.edu>
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTMP id 2763; Fri, 08 Nov 96 14:04:41 EST
Received: from american.edu (NJE origin ABIDER@AUVM) by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 0225; Fri, 8 Nov 1996 14:04:41 -0500
Date: Fri, 08 Nov 96 13:58:56 EST
From: Albert Biderman <ABIDER@american.edu>
Organization: The American University
Subject: Re: Angry voters
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: Message of Fri, 8 Nov 1996 07:45:47 -0500 (EST) from
<ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Apologies are in order for my rejoinder on voter turnout.
It (and me) derive from the past and deserve (and will probably
get) an early death. Poor excuse: I reacted to local press which used base
of registered voters rather than population. Eric Schmitt's Nov 7 New York
Times story using Voter News Service figures is quite good.

My comment did refer to one significant missing element: the inclusion of
non-citizens in the base given particularly the importance of a rapidly
accumulating recent immigrant component. Another distortion involves the
exclusion from the base of the declining military population. It might also
be worth checking if the rate for 1992 has been updated to reflect post-1992
post- censal population adjustments.

--Albert Biderman

>From ghadialy@norcmail.uchicago.edu Sat Nov 9 09:05:46 1996
Return-Path: ghadialy@norcmail.uchicago.edu
Received: from genesis0s.norc.uchicago.edu (root@genesis0s.norc.uchicago.edu
[128.135.45.68])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA07329 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 9 Nov 1996 09:05:44 -0800
(PST)
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])
by genesis0s.norc.uchicago.edu (8.6.12/8.6.9) with SMTP id MAA10958; Sat, 9
Nov 1996 12:06:05 -0600
Received: from cc:Mail by norcmail.uchicago.edu
id AA847566340; Sat, 09 Nov 96 11:46:33 CST
Date: Sat, 09 Nov 96 11:46:33 CST
From: "GHADIALY-RASHNA" <ghadialy@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
Message-Id: <9610098475.AA847566340@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re[2]: Clinton Win is Good for Food!

What about the nearest Mac Donalds to the White House that Clinton
searched for after he was first elected as President in 1992? I
wonder about Al Gore though... He probably sends his housekeeper to
Bread and Circus to shop for organic groceries.

In the metro Washington, DC area, we have noticed a marked increase of

organic and natural food stores and supermarkets in the past year. Democrats may be choosing organic and healthy over "gourmet." Let's check again with Julia Childs if that is what she really meant :).

Rashna Ghadialy
NORC, DC

>From mathornberry@davidson.edu Sun Nov 10 14:23:31 1996
Return-Path: mathornberry@davidson.edu
Received: from pollux.davidson.edu (pollux.davidson.edu [152.42.2.11])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA13779 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 10 Nov 1996 14:23:30 -0800
(PST)
Received: from polwmct.davidson.edu (152.42.7.161)
by POLLUX.DAVIDSON.EDU (PMDF V5.0-6 #7389)
id <01IBOT5BL2HC9GVWZH@POLLUX.DAVIDSON.EDU> for aapornet@usc.edu; Sun, 10
Nov 1996 17:25:38 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sun, 10 Nov 1996 18:27:06 +0500
From: mathornberry@davidson.edu (Mary Thornberry)
Subject: turnout
X-Sender: mathornberry@pollux.davidson.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01IBOT5BMUIQ9GVWZH@POLLUX.DAVIDSON.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

In North Carolina we had long lines at polling places and two hour waits. Some people were not prepared to invest that kind of time. I wonder about the impact on mothers of young children especially. Although the total turnout rates were almost identical for males and females, were the soccer moms eventually caught in traffic or needed at home to fix dinner?

Mary Thornberry
Box 1719 Davidson College
Davidson NC 28036
mathornberry@davidson.edu

>From derek_leeboosh@environics.ca Mon Nov 11 07:18:52 1996
Return-Path: derek_leeboosh@environics.ca
Received: from seraph.uunet.ca (uunet.ca [142.77.1.254])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA27613 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Nov 1996 07:18:45 -0800
(PST)
Received: from envrnx by seraph.uunet.ca with UUCP id <656695-25690>; Mon,
11 Nov 1996 10:18:44 -0500
Received: from pc6.environics.ca by envhost.environics.ca (8.6.10/5.40/1.0)
id JAA06670; Mon, 11 Nov 1996 09:55:38 -0500
Date: Mon, 11 Nov 1996 09:55:38 -0500
Message-Id: <199611111455.JAA06670@envhost.environics.ca>
X-Sender: leeboosh@envhost
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: derek_leeboosh@environics.ca (Derek Leeboosh)

Subject: Re: Clinton Win is Good for Food!
X-Mailer: <Windows Eudora Version 2.0.2>

>Folks,
>What kind of mushrooms has Julia Child been eating? Bill "I'll have
>the large fries" Clinton's reelection may be good for food volume, but
>I can't believe it would be for quality. Also, wouldn't the
>demographics suggest that it is the Republicans who visit the more
>upscale, high quality restaurants? Larry Feick
>
>

Well Larry your point may be well taken with regard to Bill Clinton's love of junk food, though i have read that he likes to eat well and not just a lot.

As far as your observation of the demographics of party support are concerned. i have to disagree. While it is true that the average income of Republicans is higher than those of Democrats, Democrats do better than Republicans among those with post-graduate degrees and with certain segments of the upper class. For instance some of the safest Democratic congressional seats are in wealthy areas like Beverly Hills, the Upper East Side of manhattan, the North Shore of Chicago and every seat in and around Boston and San Francisco (inc. the wealthiest suburbs). These, not coincidentally areas known for their affinities for fine foods and are choc a bloc with fine restaurants.

Republicans do better with people with college educations who live in very white, distant commuterland suburbs where fine dining tends to mean overcooked roasts at a dusty old local country club which probably doesn't allow Jews or Blacks to join, or else a steak house in the local strip mall.

I read that when Clinton and the Dems were firmly in the driver's seat from 1992-1994, the most "in" restaurants in Washington were various French and Nouvelle cuisine type palces near Capital Hill. When Gingrich and co. came in in 1994, the action shifted to several pricey steakhouses in Virginia!

I welcome any further comments on this topic.

Derek Leebosh
Environics Research
Toronto, Canada

>From DMMerkle@aol.com Mon Nov 11 07:29:45 1996
Return-Path: DMMerkle@aol.com
Received: from emout05.mail.aol.com (emout05.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.96])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id HAA28736 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Nov 1996 07:29:44 -0800
(PST)
From: DMMerkle@aol.com
Received: by emout05.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id KAA24534 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 11 Nov 1996 10:29:15 -0500
Date: Mon, 11 Nov 1996 10:29:15 -0500
Message-ID: <961111102914_1714974763@emout05.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: POLLING AND THE 1996 ELECTIONS -- A POST-MORTEM

This Thursday, November 14, NYAAPOR is presenting a panel discussion on

polling and the 1996 elections. The full announcement for this program is below. Members and nonmembers are welcome. However, you must call by tomorrow, November 12 if you want to attend. Details are below.

Daniel Merkle
Program Chair, NYAAPOR

POLLING AND THE 1996 ELECTIONS -- A POST-MORTEM

Our distinguished panel of pollsters will discuss the outcome of the 1996 elections and how public opinion polls were used during the 1996 election campaign (including pre-election polls, "push" polls and exit polls).

Presenters:

Margaret Ann Campbell, NBC News
Dr. Murray Edelman, Voter News Service
Dr. Kathleen Frankovic, CBS News
Gary Langer, ABC News
Warren Mitofsky, Mitofsky International

Date: Thursday, 14 November 1996

Time: 5:30 p.m.-- 8:00 p.m.

Place: NOTE NEW LOCATION!!
The Media Studies Center
590 Madison Ave. (57th St.)**
Mezzanine Level

Admission*: Free to NYAAPOR & NYSPA members, The Media Studies Center, students; all others, \$10

* BUILDING SECURITY CANNOT ADMIT ANYONE WHOSE NAME IS NOT ON OUR LIST!!
Anyone planning to attend must phone or e-mail by Tues., 12 Nov.
Just call 722-5333 or e-mail ronirosner@aol.com
Please do it now before you forget

** Nearest subway stop is at Lexington Ave. & 59th St. (4, 5, 6, N, R)

THIS SESSION IS BEING CO-SPONSORED BY THE MEDIA STUDIES CENTER and THE NEW YORK STATE PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, SOCIAL ISSUES & CROSS-CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY DIVISION

AAPOR
New York Chapter
Established 1978
AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION for
PUBLIC OPINION
RESEARCH

>From ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU Mon Nov 11 07:53:34 1996
Return-Path: ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.96])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id HAA00908 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Nov 1996 07:53:31 -0800
(PST)
Received: (from ksherril@localhost) by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george)
id KAA03189; Mon, 11 Nov 1996 10:57:33 -0500
Date: Mon, 11 Nov 1996 10:57:33 -0500 (EST)
From: Kenneth Sherrill <ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Clinton Win is Good for Food!
In-Reply-To: <199611111455.JAA06670@envhost.environics.ca>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961111105500.2195G-100000@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

You forget Jerry Nadler's seat on the West Side of Manhattan and Brooklyn. When the district was reapportioned, Ted Weiss, the then-incumbent, exclaimed, "I love it! The Zabar's to Nathan's District!"

Ken Sherrill

On Mon, 11 Nov 1996, Derek Leebosh wrote:

> >Folks,
> >What kind of mushrooms has Julia Child been eating? Bill "I'll have
> >the large fries" Clinton's reelection may be good for food volume,
> >but I can't believe it would be for quality. Also, wouldn't the
> >demographics suggest that it is the Republicans who visit the more
> >upscale, high quality restaurants? Larry Feick
> >
> >
> Well Larry your point may be well taken with regard to Bill Clinton's
> love of junk food, though i have read that he likes to eat well and not
> just a lot.
>
> As far as your observation of the demographics of party support are
> concerned. i have to disagree. While it is true that the average
> income of Republicans is higher than those of Democrats, Democrats do
> better than Republicans among those with post-graduate degrees and
> with certain segments of the upper class. For instance some of the
> safest Democratic congressional seats are in wealthy areas like
> Beverly Hills, the Upper East Side of manhattan, the North Shore of
> Chicago and every seat in and around Boston and San Francisco (inc.
> the wealthiest suburbs). These, not coincidentally areas known for
> their affinities for fine foods and are choc a bloc with fine restaurants.
>
> Republicans do better with people with college educations who live in
> very white, distant commuterland suburbs where fine dining tends to
> mean overcooked roasts at a dusty old local country club which
> probably doesn't allow Jews or Blacks to join, or else a steak house
> in the local strip mall.
>
> I read that when Clinton and the Dems were firmly in the driver's seat
> from 1992-1994, the most "in" restaurants in Washington were various
> French and Nouvelle cuisine type palces near Capital Hill. When

> Gingrich and co. came in in 1994, the action shifted to several pricey
> steakhouses in Virginia!

>
> I welcome any further comments on this topic.

>
> Derek Leebosh
> Environics Research
> Toronto, Canada

>
>

>From mcohen@inet.ed.gov Mon Nov 11 18:57:03 1996
Return-Path: mcohen@inet.ed.gov
Received: from inet.ed.gov (inet.ed.gov [192.239.34.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id SAA22048 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Nov 1996 18:57:01 -0800
(PST)

Message-Id: <199611120257.SAA22048@usc.edu>
Date: Mon, 11 Nov 1996 21:58:49 -0500
From: mcohen@inet.ed.gov (Michael P. Cohen)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Re: Clinton Win is Good for Food!
X-Status: ON 32768

Derek Leebosh writes

>
> I read that when Clinton and the Dems were firmly in the driver's seat
> from 1992-1994, the most "in" restaurants in Washington were various
> French and Nouvelle cuisine type palces near Capital Hill. When
> Gingrich and co. came in in 1994, the action shifted to several pricey
> steakhouses in Virginia!

>

So long as we're being anecdotal, I had lunch on Friday at the Hunan Gourmet
in
DC's Chinatown. Strom Thurmond was at the next table... President Bush,
who
once was a diplomat in Beijing, also likes Chinese food.

Michael P. Cohen phone 202-219-1917
National Center for Education Statistics fax 202-219-2061
555 New Jersey Avenue NW #408 Internet mcohen@inet.ed.gov

Washington DC 20208-5654 USA

>From ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU Tue Nov 12 14:25:48 1996
Return-Path: ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.96])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA25500 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Nov 1996 14:24:33 -0800
(PST)
Received: (from ksherril@localhost) by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george)
id RAA09179; Tue, 12 Nov 1996 17:20:56 -0500
Date: Tue, 12 Nov 1996 17:20:55 -0500 (EST)
From: Kenneth Sherrill <ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU>
Subject: Exit polls by race
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961112171811.61650-100000@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I have been asked to do a radio interview on Thursday or Friday, discussing the election and questions of race. Does anyone have access to exit polls or other data that I might use in my preparation? I would greatly appreciate -- and acknowledge -- any assistance.

Ken Sherrill
Hunter College

Kenneth Sherrill (w) ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Dep't of Political Science -- 1724W Hunter College, CUNY 695 Park Avenue, NY NY 10021	Phone: (212) 772-5500/5798/4200 home fax/modem 212 595 5274 Department fax 212 650 3669 Home address: 162 W. 81 St. New York, NY 10024-5902
--	---

<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/polsc/ksherrill/>

>From Fred.Solop@nau.edu Tue Nov 12 15:11:57 1996
Return-Path: Fred.Solop@nau.edu
Received: from logjam.ucc.nau.edu (mailgate.nau.edu [134.114.96.14])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA08167 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Nov 1996 15:11:51 -0800
(PST)
Received: from NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU by NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU (PMDF V5.0-6 #18805)
id <01IBRIYE7QHSHSPHLO@NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU> for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 12
Nov 1996 16:11:29 -0700 (MST)
Date: Tue, 12 Nov 1996 16:11:29 -0700 (MST)
From: Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@nau.edu>
Subject: Re: Exit polls by race
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01IBRIYE8JFMHSPHLO@NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU>
X-VMS-To: IN%"aapornet@usc.edu"
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Ken,

You can find national and state exit poll data at the allpolitics
web site: <http://www.allpolitics.com>

The state exit polls are at:
<http://allpolitics.com/elections/president/pres.return.html>

The national exit poll data is at:
<http://www.allpolitics.com/elections/natl.exit.poll/index1.html>
<http://www.allpolitics.com/elections/natl.exit.poll/index2.html>

Fred Solop

>

>I have been asked to do a radio interview on Thursday or Friday,

>discussing the election and questions of race. Does anyone have access to
>exit polls or other data that I might use in my preparation? I would
>greatly appreciate -- and acknowledge -- any assistance.

>
>Ken Sherrill

```
*****  
* Fred Solop *** Northern Arizona University *  
* *** P.O. BOX 15036 *  
* Associate Professor, *** Flagstaff, AZ 86011 *  
* Dept. of Political Science *****  
* *** E-mail: Fred.Solop@nau.edu *  
* Associate Director, *** Web Address: http://www.nau.edu/~srl *  
* The Social Research Lab *** Phone: (520) 523-3135; FAX: (520) 523-6777 *  
*****
```

>From RoniRosner@aol.com Tue Nov 12 18:48:26 1996
Return-Path: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: from emout14.mail.aol.com (emout14.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.40])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id SAA15535 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Nov 1996 18:48:19 -0800
(PST)
From: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: by emout14.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id VAA28610 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 12 Nov 1996 21:47:43 -0500
Date: Tue, 12 Nov 1996 21:47:43 -0500
Message-ID: <961112214741_1384229889@emout14.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Exit polls by race

Ken,

Why don't you contact Murray Edelman at Voter News Service
(murray1@pipeline.com or 947-7280). Or you can talk to him Thursday evening
at the NYAAPOR meeting, if that's not too late.

Roni Rosner

>From 72530.2007@CompuServe.COM Wed Nov 13 13:00:47 1996
Return-Path: 72530.2007@CompuServe.COM
Received: from dub-img-6.compuserve.com (dub-img-6.compuserve.com
[149.174.206.136])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA19341 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 13:00:44 -0800
(PST)
Received: by dub-img-6.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id QAA29518; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 16:00:09 -0500
Date: 13 Nov 96 15:58:13 EST
From: "Carolyn A. Eldred" <72530.2007@CompuServe.COM>
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: MDRC Seeks to Identify Minority Survey Firms
Message-ID: <961113205813_72530.2007_IHD127-1@CompuServe.COM>

The Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) asked me to post
the following notice:

MDRC regularly contracts with survey organizations to conduct
interviews in support of its evaluations of a variety of social programs and
is interested in expanding the pool of potential survey contractors with
which the firm does business, by reaching out to include those that are

Barry A. Hollander
Assistant Professor
BARRY@uga.cc.uga.edu
Phone (706) 542-5027

College of Journalism
and Mass Communication
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

>From abelson@wws.princeton.edu Wed Nov 13 19:03:54 1996
Return-Path: abelson@wws.princeton.edu
Received: from ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU (root@ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.131])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id TAA17977 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 19:03:53 -0800 (PST)
Received: from wws214.Princeton.EDU (wws214.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.69])
by ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP id NAA29267; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 13:13:58 -0500
Message-ID: <328A38E8.358E@wws.princeton.edu>
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 1996 13:12:32 -0800
From: Herb Abelson <abelson@wws.princeton.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win16; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Call for Papers, 1997 AAPOR Conference
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The committee has asked me to post the Call for Papers information and to keep it until the Dec 15 deadline.

Here it is: <http://www.princeton.edu/~abelson/AAPOR/papers.html>
>From KydonieL@pol.ocsp.bls.gov Thu Nov 14 10:19:07 1996
Return-Path: KydonieL@pol.ocsp.bls.gov
Received: from dcgate ([146.142.4.13])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA28740 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Nov 1996 10:19:04 -0800 (PST)
Received: from psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov ([146.142.42.8]) by mailgate.bls.gov (5.x/SMI-SVR4)
id AA07405; Thu, 14 Nov 1996 13:15:46 -0500
Received: by psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.37)
id <01BBD22E.971D9ED0@psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov>; Thu, 14 Nov 1996 13:20:22 -0500
Message-Id: <c=US%a=_%p=BLS%l=BLS/PSB/00048916@psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov>
From: Kydoniefs_L <KydonieL@pol.ocsp.bls.gov>
To: "'aporl'" <aapornet@usc.edu>, POR <por@irss.unc.edu>
Subject: RE: Perceived Respondent Burden
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 1996 13:18:00 -0500
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.37
Encoding: 71 TEXT

Two of us at the Bureau of Labor Statistics have been working for the past year on building a model of RESPONSE burden. We too, agree that there is much that goes into how, how much, and why a respondent experiences a particular instrument completion task (such as a survey) as burdensome.

The model is built around three major domains each of which address a

>From abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU Thu Nov 14 10:46:26 1996
Return-Path: abelson@wws.princeton.edu
Received: from ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU (root@ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.131])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA02975 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Nov 1996 10:46:16 -0800
(PST)
Received: from wws214.Princeton.EDU (wws214.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.69])
by ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP id KAA21216; Thu, 14 Nov 1996 10:59:22 -0500
Message-ID: <328B6BB4.35AD@wws.princeton.edu>
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 1996 10:57:56 -0800
From: Herb Abelson <abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win16; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Survey research on children
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----16781D3E4388"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----16781D3E4388
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This posting is for a new research center on children. Please see attachment.

-----16781D3E4388
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; name="REVISED.POR"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline; filename="REVISED.POR"

Request for information about survey research on children.

In connection with the establishment of a new center for research on children, the Director, Prof Sara McLanahan would like information on companies and organizations that either specialize in or have extensive experience conducting survey research with children (ie persons age 17 and younger).

We are especially interested in surveys that ask children questions about (1) their families, schools, and communities and (2) political attitudes and attitudes towards any type and level of government services and agencies.

Purposes: to compile an experience file, and for future collaboration with and utilization of other organizations and companies.

Please reply privately to abelson@wws.princeton.edu. I will be glad

to compile and post whatever we receive.

This request is going to more than one list.

Thank you

-----16781D3E4388--

>From CODA89@aol.com Thu Nov 14 11:45:39 1996
Return-Path: CODA89@aol.com
Received: from emout02.mail.aol.com (emout02.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.93])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA16897 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Nov 1996 11:45:35 -0800
(PST)
From: CODA89@aol.com
Received: by emout02.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id OAA26969 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 14 Nov 1996 14:45:04 -0500
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 1996 14:45:04 -0500
Message-ID: <961114144503_1648446891@emout02.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Survey research on children

Nick Zill, now at Westat, has done some interesting surveys of children.

Doris Northrup
CODA, Inc.

>From mcouper@survey.umd.edu Fri Nov 15 04:41:45 1996
Return-Path: mcouper@survey.umd.edu
Received: from umail.umd.edu (umail.umd.edu [128.8.10.28])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP
id EAA05839 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 15 Nov 1996 04:41:43 -0800
(PST)
Received: from survey.umd.edu (survey.umd.edu [129.2.169.100]) by
umail.umd.edu (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id HAA28799 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Fri, 15 Nov 1996 07:42:00 -0500 (EST)
Received: from SURVEY/MAILQUEUE1 by survey.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);
Fri, 15 Nov 96 7:42:45 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by SURVEY (Mercury 1.13); Fri, 15 Nov 96 7:42:22
+1100
From: "Mick Couper" <mcouper@survey.umd.edu>
Organization: Joint Program In Survey Methodology
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 1996 07:42:22 EST
Subject: Advance registration deadline for InterCASIC' 96
Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.23)
Message-ID: <17D05647710@survey.umd.edu>

Dear fellow AAPORnetters:

This is to remind you that the deadline for advance registrations for
the International Conference on Computer-Assisted Survey Information
Collection (InterCASIC) is November 18th. This conference,

co-sponsored by ASA is to be held in San Antonio, December 11-14.
There are still some spaces available.

For further information on the conference, visit our web page:
<http://www.bsos.umd.edu/jpsm/casic.html>
If you did not receive registration materials, send me your fax
number and I will fax you the relevant pages of the brochure.

Thanks,

Mick Couper
mcouper@survey.umd.edu

>From PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU Fri Nov 15 16:14:05 1996
Return-Path: PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU
Received: from oregon.uoregon.edu (oregon.uoregon.edu [128.223.32.18])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id QAA18453 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 15 Nov 1996 16:14:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: from OREGON.UOREGON.EDU by OREGON.UOREGON.EDU (PMDF V5.0-5 #18639)
id <01IBVQ06L7M890NH7R@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU> for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 15
Nov 1996 16:14:04 -0800 (PST)
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 1996 16:14:04 -0800 (PST)
From: Patricia Gwartney <PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: international effort to treat factual data as private property?
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01IBVQ06MC4I90NH7R@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
X-VMS-To: IN%"aapornet@usc.edu"
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

My university librarian has alerted me to a newly proposed
intellectual property treaty, which apparently would aggressively eliminate
whole regions of public domain data, frequently used by sociologists and
others. The treaty text is being drafted by the World Intellectual Property
Organization (WIPO), to which the USA sends representatives from the Patent
Office. They want comments on the "chairman's text" by Nov 22. Our
librarian says it is at:

http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/olia/diploconf/6dc_sta.htm

I don't pretend to know much about this, but it would seem to be of real
potential concern to AAPOR. Does our elected leadership know about it? Is
AAPOR prepared to take a stand if necessary?

Patricia A. Gwartney
Professor, Sociology
Director, Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
University of Oregon

>From Jerold.Pearson@Forsythe.Stanford.EDU Tue Nov 19 14:24:33 1996
Return-Path: Jerold.Pearson@Forsythe.Stanford.EDU
Received: from Forsythe.Stanford.EDU (forsythe.Stanford.EDU [36.54.0.16])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA22647 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 14:24:26 -0800
(PST)
Message-Id: <199611192224.OAA22647@usc.edu>
Date: Tue, 19 Nov 96 14:23:35 PST

From: "Jerold Pearson" <Jerold.Pearson@Forsythe.Stanford.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu, por@irss.unc.edu
Subject: What we are up against

Rereading "Mother Night" by Kurt Vonnegut last night, I came across this passage that I think we, as market researchers, should quote to clients we are trying to discourage from hiring us. It may also be of personal benefit -- especially when wrestling with confusing data or when hubris gets the better of us -- to simply keep this thought in mind:

"People are insane. They will do anything at any time, and God help anybody who looks for reasons."

Jerold Pearson
Director of Market Research
Stanford University
jpearson@stanford.edu

To: POR(AAPORNET@USC.EDU, POR@IRSS.UNC.EDU)
>From DMMerkle@aol.com Tue Nov 19 14:27:41 1996
Return-Path: DMMerkle@aol.com
Received: from emout15.mail.aol.com (emout15.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.41])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA23194 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 14:27:34 -0800
(PST)
From: DMMerkle@aol.com
Received: by emout15.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id RAA13256 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 17:26:50 -0500
Date: Tue, 19 Nov 1996 17:26:50 -0500
Message-ID: <961119172648_1883184124@emout15.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: NYAAPOR Holiday Dinner Party

NYAAPOR's 3rd annual Holiday Dinner Party is December 13th. Our featured speaker is Dr. Robert Shapiro who will be talking about Presidents and their Pollsters. NYAAPOR members and their guests are invited. Details are below.

Daniel Merkle
NYAAPOR, Program Chair

Date: Friday, 13 December 1996
Cash Bar: 5:30 p.m.
Dinner: 6:00 p.m.
Presentation: 7:30 p.m.

Place: Tennessee Mountain
143 Spring Street (at Wooster)

Admission: TELEPHONE RESERVATION ONLY!

3rd ANNUAL HOLIDAY DINNER PARTY

"PRESIDENTS AND THEIR POLLSTERS"
Dr. Robert Shapiro

This year we are going "trendy" for the holidays as we meet and eat in one

of SoHo's most popular restaurants. And like good pollsters, we will also be discussing trends.

Our after-dinner speaker will discuss the history of the relationship between the President and his pollsters, from Kennedy to Clinton, and the effect it has had on American politics. His talk will draw on his own interviews, and archival evidence that has only recently become available.

Robert Shapiro is Professor of Political Science at Columbia University and Associate Director of Columbia's Center for the Social Sciences. He has published numerous articles in major academic journals, and is co-author of *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*.

PRIX FIXE DINNER MENU
(choice of vegetarian or meat courses)

- * APPETIZER
- * RIBS or CHICKEN or PASTA
- * GLASS OF WINE or BEER
- * DESSERT
- * SALAD
- * COFFEE or TEA

Subway directions: "6" to Spring St., walk 5 blocks to Wooster St. or "N", "R" to Prince St., walk 2 blocks west to Wooster St. and 1 block south to Spring St. or "C" to Spring St., walk 3 blocks east to Wooster St.

Parking: on Wooster St. (between Prince & Houston) and on Greene St. (between Spring & Prince)

MAKE RESERVATIONS BY CALLING RONI ROSNER AT 212/722-5333
OR e-mail ronirosner@aol.com

If paid by Friday, November 22nd, dinner with tip included will be: \$28 each for members and their guests, \$20 for full-time students and their guests. After November 22nd, the cost will be: \$35 each for members and their guests, \$25 for full-time students and their guests. Sorry, no refunds, but you can send someone in your place.

--

I will attend the NYAAPOR dinner meeting on Friday, the 13th of December 1996 with _____ additional guests.

NAME: _____
GUEST'S NAME: _____

OFFICE PHONE: () _____
HOME PHONE: () _____

AMOUNT ENCLOSED:
\$ _____ \$28 each (by 22 November, members and their guests) \$ _____
\$20 each (by 22 November, students and their guests) \$ _____ \$35 each
(after 22 November, members and their guests) \$ _____ \$25 each (after
22 November, students and their guests)

1. Be sure to call 212/722-5333 or e-mail ronirosner@aol.com, in case we are sold out or the mail goes astray.
2. Send this with cheque, payable to NYAAPOR, to: Roni Rosner 1235 Park Avenue/ #7C NY, NY 10128-1759

>From WEI@OFM.WA.GOV Tue Nov 19 15:35:15 1996
Return-Path: WEI@OFM.WA.GOV
Received: from mail1.wa.gov (mail1.wa.gov [147.55.96.33])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id PAA04376 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 15:35:11 -0800
(PST)
Received: by mail1.wa.gov (5.65/DEC-Ultrix/4.3)
id AA18548; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 15:34:15 -0800
Received: from Microsoft Mail (PU Serial #1029)
by OFM.WA.GOV (PostalUnion/SMTP(tm) v2.1.8d for Windows NT(tm))
id AA-1996Nov19.150600.1029.426868; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 15:34:37 -0800
From: WEI@OFM.WA.GOV (Wei Yen)
To: aapornet@usc.edu (aapornet)
Message-Id: <1996Nov19.150600.1029.426868@OFM.WA.GOV>
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail via PostalUnion/SMTP for Windows NT
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Organization: Office of Financial Management, State of Washington
Date: Tue, 19 Nov 1996 15:34:37 -0800
Subject: RE: NYAAPOR Holiday Dinner Party

I just couldn't resist this - Is the feature speaker the same Shapiro in O.J. Simpson's criminal trial?

From: aapornet
To: WEI; aapornet
Subject: NYAAPOR Holiday Dinner Party
Date: Friday, December 13, 1996 12:00AM

NYAAPOR's 3rd annual Holiday Dinner Party is December 13th. Our featured speaker is Dr. Robert Shapiro who will be talking about Presidents and their Pollsters. NYAAPOR members and their guests are invited. Details are below.

Daniel Merkle
NYAAPOR, Program Chair

Date: Friday, 13 December 1996
Cash Bar: 5:30 p.m.
Dinner: 6:00 p.m.
Presentation: 7:30 p.m.

Place: Tennessee Mountain
143 Spring Street (at Wooster)

Admission: TELEPHONE RESERVATION ONLY!

I will attend the NYAAPOR dinner meeting on Friday, the 13th of December 1996 with _____ additional guests.

NAME: _____

GUEST'S NAME: _____

OFFICE PHONE: () _____

HOME PHONE: () _____

AMOUNT ENCLOSED:

\$ _____ \$28 each (by 22 November, members and their guests) \$ _____
\$20 each (by 22 November, students and their guests) \$ _____ \$35 each
(after 22 November, members and their guests) \$ _____ \$25 each (after
22 November, students and their guests)

1. Be sure to call 212/722-5333 or e-mail ronirosner@aol.com, in case we are sold out or the mail goes astray.
2. Send this with cheque, payable to NYAAPOR, to: Roni Rosner 1235 Park Avenue/ #7C NY, NY 10128-1759

----- Message Header Follows -----

Received: from usc.edu by OFM.WA.GOV

(PostalUnion/SMTP(tm) v2.1.8d for Windows NT(tm))

id AA-1996Nov19.143648.1029.171516; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 14:36:49 -0800

Received: from usc.edu (localhost [127.0.0.1])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id OAA23861; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 14:30:44 -0800 (PST)

Received: from emout15.mail.aol.com (emout15.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.41])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id OAA23194 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 14:27:34 -0800

(PST)

Received: by emout15.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id RAA13256 for

aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 17:26:50 -0500

Message-Id: <961119172648_1883184124@emout15.mail.aol.com>

Date: Tue, 19 Nov 1996 17:26:50 -0500

Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

Precedence: bulk

From: DMMerke@aol.com

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: NYAAPOR Holiday Dinner Party

X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.0 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

>From Monson.6@osu.edu Wed Nov 20 05:42:19 1996

Return-Path: Monson.6@osu.edu

Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu

[128.146.214.31])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP

id FAA14435 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 05:42:18 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ts37-3.homenet.ohio-state.edu (ts37-3.homenet.ohio-state.edu
[140.254.115.26]) by mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.8.3/8.7.3) with SMTP id
IAA25288; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 08:42:13 -0500 (EST)
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 08:42:13 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199611201342.IAA25288@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: monson.6@pop.service.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu, por@frosty.irss.edu
From: Quin Monson <Monson.6@osu.edu>
Subject: likely and undecided voters

I am researching methods of determining likely voters and allocating (or not allocating) undecided voters in preelection polling. After reviewing some of the literature on the subject I need help from some of you experienced pollsters.

What methods are most preferred for determining likely voters? Is it a question of the resources available to you for the poll? If you had "unlimited" resources available from a sugar daddy client, how many questions would you need to determine likely voters? Is the answer situational--would your answer change if you were polling in a primary election versus a general election? What if the budget was extremely tight? Would your method for determining likely voters change?

Finally, several articles (including a chapter by Rob Daves and Sharon Warden in Presidential Polls and the News Media ed. by Lavrakas, Traugott, and Miller) review methods of allocating undecided voters. What method (if any) do you use and why? Does the method change the closer you get to the election?

For both questions, are more sophisticated methods like discriminant analysis worth the effort?

Responses of any length and detail are welcome.

Sincerely,
Quin Monson
Ohio State University
e-mail: Monson.6@osu.edu

>From dykers@sisters.salem.edu Wed Nov 20 08:59:07 1996
Return-Path: dykers@sisters.salem.edu
Received: from sisters.salem.edu (sisters.salem.edu [192.154.64.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id IAA06015 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 08:59:04 -0800
(PST)
Received: by sisters.salem.edu (5.x/SMI-SVR4)
id AA28864; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 11:58:18 -0500
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 11:58:18 -0500 (EST)
From: Carol Dykers <dykers@sisters.salem.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: need advice on sample size

In-Reply-To: <960908122856_1377074241@emout07.mail.aol.com>
Message-Id: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961120114708.28418B-100000@sisters.salem.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

A small problem (it would seem) is making me crazed, so I turn to the experts for advice. One of my journalism students is doing an on-campus survey where the Population of interest is 500. She's doing the survey to satisfy requirements for a Math course and also for her final project in my reporting course. Using standard formula (provided by the math prof to generate a 95% confidence level), she's being told she needs a sample size of 270. I say she doesn't need that large a sample, but I'm having trouble, reading through my stat books, to find the basis in probability theory for arguing that she should be able to create a simple random sample with an $n =$ to around 75 or 80, and do an okay job. But every formula I try seems to generate the same $n=270$ that the math prof requires. Enter AAPOR, please. How can I mathematically justify the smaller sample? Thanks for any help you can give. Carol

Carol R. Dykers
dykers@salem.edu
Communication Department, Salem College
office: 910-721-2740; home: 919-663-2436; fax: 919-663-2254

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Wed Nov 20 10:47:46 1996
Return-Path: lavrakas.1@osu.edu
Received: from postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu (postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.20])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA24629 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 10:47:42 -0800
(PST)
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45]) by
postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu (8.8.3/8.7.3) with SMTP id NAA01670 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 13:47:41 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19961120184914.006ccbd8@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 13:49:14 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Re: need advice on sample size

CAROL: Please tell us what is the likely (i.e., expected) distribution of the variable(s) your student is trying to measure, e.g., is it a dichotomous variable distributed about 50/50?, and what sampling error size is acceptable.

Then, better answers can come your way.

(Since the finite population is relatively small, that can be factored into the formula used once you've supplied the other information.)

At 11:58 AM 11/20/96 -0500, you wrote:

>A small problem (it would seem) is making me crazed, so I turn to the

>experts for advice. One of my journalism students is doing an on-campus
>survey where the Population of interest is 500. She's doing the survey
>to satisfy requirements for a Math course and also for her final project
>in my reporting course. Using standard formula (provided by the math
>prof to generate a 95% confidence level), she's being told she needs a
>sample size of 270. I say she doesn't need that large a sample, but I'm
>having trouble, reading through my stat books, to find the basis in
>probability theory for arguing that she should be able to create a simple
>random sample with an n = to around 75 or 80, and do an okay job. But
>every formula I try seems to generate the same n=270 that the math prof
>requires. Enter AAPOR, please. How can I mathematically justify the
>smaller sample? Thanks for any help you can give. Carol

>
>Carol R. Dykers
>dykers@salem.edu
>Communication Department, Salem College
>office: 910-721-2740; home: 919-663-2436; fax:919-663-2254

>
>
>
* * * * *
* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
* Professor of Communication & Journalism *
* Director, Survey Research Unit *
* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University *
* Derby Hall [Room 0126], 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210 *
* Voice: 614-292-3468 Fax: 614-292-6673 *
* * * * *

>From shap.wolf@asu.edu Wed Nov 20 11:01:21 1996
Return-Path: shap.wolf@asu.edu
Received: from post3.inre.asu.edu (post3.INRE.ASU.EDU [129.219.10.148])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA27052 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 11:01:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: from smtp1.asu.edu by asu.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #7723)
id <01IC2GQB EA288Y75QM@asu.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed,
20 Nov 1996 12:01:02 -0700 (MST)
Received: from survey-lab.la.asu.edu ([129.219.74.220])
by smtp1.asu.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP id MAA23670 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 12:00:59 -0700
Received: by survey-lab.la.asu.edu with Microsoft Mail id
<01BBD6DA.7E4709E0@survey-lab.la.asu.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 12:00:59 +0000
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 12:00:56 +0000
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@asu.edu>
Subject: RE: need advice on sample size
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-id: <01BBD6DA.7E4709E0@survey-lab.la.asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=NextPart_000_01BBD6DA.7E4709E0"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

----- =NextPart_000_01BBD6DA.7E4709E0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

What you're looking for is the finite population correction factor, which is just population-sample over population minus 1. This fraction can be multiplied by the sample size to give the same margin of sampling error with a smaller sample, or by the margin of error to give a narrower margin with the same sample size.

Kish gives the equivalent formula of $1 - n / N$ in Survey Sampling (1965). One reason you don't see much discussion of it is that it only matters when the sample is a significant fraction of the population. Another reason, according to Kish, is that another way to conceive of your population is as a sample of a larger "infinite" population, in which case one should also ignore the fpc (p. 44).

BTW, solving for sample size using $\pm 5\%$ and $p=0.5$, I got $n=271$ using 1.645 standard errors, or 90%. (Actually 270.6, must always round up). Using 271 and 500, the fpc is .458, giving a corrected sample size of 125, or $\pm 1.2\%$ if you still took 271.

I only know this because it is the most common question when I'm asked for sampling advice: "What proportion of my population do I need to sample?" Explaining fpc and showing how little impact it has on most populations is the only way to disabuse people of this notion.

Please note that I am not a sampling statistician, and if I'm wrong on any of this I would welcome learning more. Thanks.

Shapard Wolf, Survey Research Laboratory, Arizona State University
shap.wolf@asu.edu

original message:

From: Carol Dykers[SMTP:dykers@sisters.salem.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 1996 9:58 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: need advice on sample size

A small problem (it would seem) is making me crazed, so I turn to the experts for advice. One of my journalism students is doing an on-campus

survey where the Population of interest is 500. She's doing the survey to satisfy requirements for a Math course and also for her final project

in my reporting course. Using standard formula (provided by the math prof to generate a 95% confidence level), she's being told she needs a sample size of 270. I say she doesn't need that large a sample, but I'm

having trouble, reading through my stat books, to find the basis in probability theory for arguing that she should be able to create a simple random sample with an n around 75 or 80, and do an okay job. But

every formula I try seems to generate the same $n=270$ that the math prof requires. Enter AAPOR, please. How can I mathematically justify the smaller sample? Thanks for any help you can give. Carol

----- =_NextPart_000_01BBD6DA.7E4709E0

Content-Type: application/ms-tnef
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

eJ8+IjsTAQAQCAAEAAAAAAAAABAAEAAQeQBgAIAAAA5AQAAAAAAAAADoAAEIgAcAGAAAAE1QTS5N
eJ8+aWNy
b3NvZnQgTWFpbC50b3RlADEIAQ2ABAACAAAAAgACAAEEkAYADAEAAAAEAAAAAMAAAAAwAAMAQAAAAAL
AA8OAAAAAIB/w8BAAAAPwAAAAAAACBKx+kvqMQGZ1uAN0BD1QCAAAAAGFhcG9ybmV0QHVzYy51
ZHUAU01UUABhYXBvcm51dEB1c2MuZWR1AAAEAAIwAQAAAAUAAABTTVRQAAAAAB4AAzABAAAAEQAA
AGFhcG9ybmV0QHVzYy51ZHUAAAAAAwAVDAEAAAAADAP4PBgAAAB4AATABAAAAEwAAACdhYXBvcm51
dEB1c2MuZWR1JwAAAgELMAEAAAAWAAAAU01UUDpBQVBPUk5FVEBVU0MuRURVAAAAAAwAAOQAAAAAL
AEA6AQAAAAIB9g8BAAAABAAAAAAASsLQEEgAEAHwAAAFJFOiBuZwVkiGFkdmljZSBvbiBzYW1w
bGUgc2l6ZQCTCgEFgAMADgAAAMwHCwAUAAwAAAA4AAMAQOEBIADAA4AAADMbWwAFAALABsAGAAD
ADMBAQmAAQAhAAAAQTk4NUI0NDdGNDQyRDaxMUE3ODAwMDIwQUZFRENGEMEMALAcBA5AGAGgJAAAU
AAAACwAjAAAAAADACYAAAAAAASAKQAAAAAAAwAuAAAAAADADYAAAAAAEAAOQCQYjSpFde7AR4A
cAABAAAAHwAAAFJFOiBuZwVkiGFkdmljZSBvbiBzYW1wbGUgc2l6ZQAAAgFxAEEAAAAWAAAAAbvX
FSkxR7SFqkL0EdCngAAgr+3PDAAHgAeDAEAAAAFAAAU01UAAAAAAEAB8MAQAAABIAAABz
FSkxR7SFqkL0EdCngAAgr+aGfW
LndvbGZAYXN1LmVkdQAAAAAMABhAd8FXUAWAHEP4HAAAeAAgQAQAAAGUAAABXSEFUWU9VUkVMT09L
SU5HRk9SSVNUSEVGSU5JVEVQT1BVTEFUSU9OQ09SUkVDVlPTkZBQ1RPUixXSElDSElTS1VTVFBP
UFVMQVRJT04tU0FNUEXFT1ZFU1BPUFVMQVRJT05NAAAAAAIBCRABAAAA1QcAANEHAAAtDQAATFpG
daW6KgT/AAoBDwIVAqQD5AXrAoMAUBMDVAIAY2gKwHn1d04yBgAGwwKDMgPGBxMCg8YzA8UCAHBy
cRIgE4giNA96aGVsAyBEBOPnAoM1Ew19CoAIzwnZ4jsZLzI1NQKACoENscELYG5nMTAzFCALCcssU
IgwBYwBAIFcRwAVAKnkIYCCZMCAYwG9rOQuAZyACEAXABAAGdCcWgB9AC4BpdB6wcG+kCHUL
IgwBYwBAIFcRwAVAKnkIYCCZMCAYwG9rOQuAZyACEAXABAAGdCcWgB9AC4BpdB6wcG+YHRp
AiAgBaFVGTbjINNmANB0BbAsMCB3aGkRsB+CanWGcwVAIHgtc2FtC1DZHRbvdgSQIGptC4Ai
AiAgBaFVGTbjINNmANB0BbAsMCB3aGkRsB+8OAg
MS4gVCJgBCADUNCh4SDjA5FiHrBtIKAg00sLUaiQZCbwEr+zI+UakMz6HrAiACBnaSRgKAbP
MS4gVCJgBCADUNCh4SDjA5FiHrBtIKAg00sLUaiQZCbwEr+zI+JxEK
wClAA6BvZihEHxKfBJADYAXAA/AfwCBhKED/AMAWoCRxI+QiMAWxJ+UqKLcrVCkWLABuCsADYHck
cW8qJSuzKZcoWS4KhQqFS48EACKQKUIfpGVxdS1Q/wdAcFAFQB9RjZEsACqRHfByLS9QIC8HsB+A
A6BTHwhwJGAn8AYQkuUoMTnINjUpJcBPbh6wGTBMXYMg8R5hIGQCICevBUAR8CcSioFkBABjIvD/
AJAg8SqRIDAfhB4xOkECIP5sJ/AwAJABJAEICJQCfDnKAofkSwBaWcDACAAsE/NGEmRiqRH8Ig
eCXAQW7+bx/BBcA3xCiWANAfoTlGfx8hKREy4iIwOnYAcD/kd45hJ/EpIAWgBmN1KVL/KpEe
eCXAQW7+YSSL
PPI9AyP1KqAsALcLYCpAJHEiC4AgBCIgaX9B0TBBImMmwBHwOxEoMWj9CGBsJ8AHQDfwh4A9YAWw
Ky10FLBjNvBwJcA0NGM3UDIMQ1RXIjA38Gxedh8WKFOi8B8SKzVQNY1QmEnWHA9LjUiMBwgSSkw
P+AvUD0yN8cd8E5EJbA2NDUoQAGQF08QCxErRHMTazkwJeklwChBIXB1LEEn8FAw/jBQ4CIw
P+JzAj
AQdAQvEEIKUDYHVPEXVwN1FVT1PjUDJPAjUwMCIwSpYfKfouUQA4IjApQR8SLAAhJX8nsShaNQIb
YC0DTqElSdl/TuAGkDgjIwADEAMgIgaE809VkjH9T7A7I2s/0AfgH8B/H5EnACbAIVa80TpVJxFv
+yMBBaBtBGADoDPgB5Ag09E780knbUVBayexTUftV7NkTPBDkDpGwB4TFMD3IIAY0TnVbSfw
+IHk4
ce+hLzeQJ7EpESPkP0dgRXj/C1MfE0rhTwJJYQPwHyFnYfsewCAwdDzCJAah4ToyEcD/BCAl
ce+I18i
IHgEIB+VOyNC9ec5YQGgXjJwZSCARedo/c/0T9yMgxQJCBI4j/RKXL/HjFPsCPwbUJFdh8S
IHgEIB+UTeg
0H1bEWMHMECSTxFaoWCyd38DYB8hIPEAcCfwbNZPsHf7SYMvsGxfYR6xN9AEoB8SzwRgGTA1wgBw
a3Mx/RZwbmELAh4ABvBmIjA2BVL3B5B04SKBTAGgBbAeMAWwtNkiMAcRegIglABTcQGdHrBVAWAk
YQCQdHkKhVsZAHcWLnPwD7BAN+B1+i4JgHUyDAWwPVALgAdAbyVAB5Aj4EaQOgqLJ5AxxjhW
YQCQdHkKhVsZAHcWLnPwD7BAN+B1+MAIA
aS0xS1AN80cm0IATC1kxNgqgA2AgQH1owS2CNwqHgOsMMIG2Rp8DYWKAgM+B1AyCIEMKwBsG
aS0xS1AN80cm0IATC1kxNgqgA2AgQH1owS2CNwqHgOsMMIG2Rp8DYWKAgM+8BbA
eWEQEeBbU03QVFA6ZIdjQACQIwCt07EuI+AkIG18c12C39+D7QZgAjCFH4YrVwMAN5D2c1Fw
eWEQEeBbU03QVFA6ZIdjQACQIwCt07EuI+AkIG18c12C39+eYFO
JFEG0CRxAdBvIjA3EDcgUmA6V0ATce2zia+D7VRvi++GK2F3MNMfSDeQdEAI8GN8eZB/8Ysn
JFEG0CRxAdBvIjA3EDcgUmA6V0ATce2zia+D7VRvi++dWJq
IWGSL4YreGB/YoBlE2IkaViOwTImfxYz3jaAtxdSDAGBtkEsFGLyPwJgiTA28DpBc/Q40W0pXx+C

AMAFaynxQBhKOBkf0yiT6FS8AShKREfwgqFzftmMASQdCYRBbFiJCXAN3N9Y7RqCGF94QQAYNAj
AHX/DbACMGqDOHBXsypxI8AmwL8kACWBezY2FDvxSmVQIIj/OhICMKiRIWefkVYhpCEWcX4npkYo
EzYUCoVlY3EhZv8n8BkwM+EZMAeApfKjgwXQ/x4wSLEIYUjxTwJJ0x9SQAL/IAF98WMB1zIy
EzYUCoVlY3EhZv8n8BkwM+Ziph
Y+EZMP9jMx8hrySkIVVEUTc0hksQ/wNgTPANsCFHO3EikAqFYwG/PqEpIQnwBJB6UiwAOU7R
Y+P0Nh
IAC10ZohJCAkYGwp/0yhqyMnAEEkn6If0WUSPQL/ezZYzFNI5Ij4CfwunI4cP8HkDiSZRQeIkZj
RXciMGwQ32+RYMEKhrHATPN0VJGe4dciMDfBQRRoVJFnIpBj4f9w8ibwHuFSESkRIAG+Qh6w
RXciMGwQ32+RYMEKhrHATPN0VJGe4dciMDfBQRRoVJFnIpBj4f9w8ibwHuFSESkRIAG+vmI3
4B+RKMg2WMRQYgMQ/3sBH7J5YaN0KkAz8KujHjH/unJJZScBAaAkIUMyN8G3o/8AkQCDCoUm
4B+QE8Q
A3AoRiu0uwOgA6A9KQKHAVSyN1EQ3wWxf6BxtGTBpsJrQwGk8PpipCFCv8GiliRhxM0s3+h
A3AoRiu0uwOgA6A9KQKHAVSyN1EQ3wWxf6BxtGTBpsJrQwGk8PpipCFCv8GiliRhxM0s3+scZR
n9IfobcpKZdQEjB/OpS1x7bDyfattHYQT5BFw6oCE3BBUE9SIjAkEftI4aQhSF1xJsJPsLYCiTD/
IMEwFMiIuIGkCf0ezYsO74/T5B1xKN0cyEWgXA4I/8mwilCJcCG85uvGlcS8p2JCwqFGFEA38AA
AADABAQAAAAAMAERAAAAQA AHMMaid3kQ17sBQAAIMMAid3kQ17sBHgA9AAEAAAAFAAAAUkU6
IAAAAAADAA00/TcAAJcS

----- =_NextPart_000_01BBD6DA.7E4709E0--

>From dykers@sisters.salem.edu Wed Nov 20 11:49:00 1996
Return-Path: dykers@sisters.salem.edu
Received: from sisters.salem.edu (sisters.salem.edu [192.154.64.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA06008 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 11:48:54 -0800
(PST)
Received: by sisters.salem.edu (5.x/SMI-SVR4)
id AA04112; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 14:48:12 -0500
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 14:48:12 -0500 (EST)
From: Carol Dykers <dykers@sisters.salem.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: need advice on sample size
In-Reply-To: <2.2.32.19961120184914.006ccbd8@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu>
Message-Id: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961120144510.2284L-100000@sisters.salem.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Paul,
the main dependent variable is apathy about attending student government
association meetings on campus -- attendance which is required from
residents of the campus. It's an interval-level variable, and we've been
talking about using a 90% confidence level because this is, after all, a
class assignment, not a NYTimes poll. And, as someone has reminded me,
the variance among this sample surely is less than for a general
population survey. I'm expecting that the answers would be skewed in the
direction of "don't want to attend." Which is my student's hypothesis.
Carol

Carol R. Dykers
dykers@salem.edu
Communication Department, Salem College
office: 910-721-2740; home: 919-663-2436; fax: 919-663-2254

>From dykers@sisters.salem.edu Wed Nov 20 11:58:07 1996
Return-Path: dykers@sisters.salem.edu
Received: from sisters.salem.edu (sisters.salem.edu [192.154.64.1])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA07690 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 11:58:04 -0800
(PST)
Received: by sisters.salem.edu (5.x/SMI-SVR4)
id AA04563; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 14:57:21 -0500
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 14:57:20 -0500 (EST)
From: Carol Dykers <dykers@sisters.salem.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: need advice on sample size
In-Reply-To: <01BBD6DA.7E4709E0@survey-lab.la.asu.edu>
Message-Id: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961120145513.2284M-100000@sisters.salem.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

And, yes, the "finite population correction factor" is exactly what I was looking for, although I'd never read about it (or remembered it if I did). But I just couldn't believe there wasn't such a formula. The standard texts do a good job of disabusing people of the notion that there's a standard proportion of the population that one must sample, but they don't (so far as I've found) address the opposite problem (which is mine!!)> Thank you, Shapard!!). Carol

Carol R. Dykers
dykers@salem.edu
Communication Department, Salem College
office: 910-721-2740; home: 919-663-2436; fax: 919-663-2254

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Wed Nov 20 12:05:38 1996
Return-Path: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (root@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.96])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA08899 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 12:05:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: from social54.hunter.cuny.edu (social54.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.12.54]) by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george) with SMTP id
PAA07804 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 15:09:40 -0500
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 15:09:40 -0500
Message-Id: <1.5.4.16.19961120160955.338f8bdc@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (16)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Sampling from finite populations

At 12:00 PM 11/20/96 +0000, Shapard Wolf, Survey Research Laboratory,
Arizona State University wrote:

>BTW, solving for sample size using $\pm 5\%$ and $p=.5$, I got $n=271$ using
>1.645
standard errors, or 90%. (Actually 270.6, must always round up). Using 271
and 500, the fpc is .458, giving a corrected sample size of 125, or $\pm 1.2\%$
if you still took 271.
>

in response to a question posed by Carol
Dykers[SMTP:dykers@sisters.salem.edu]

I think that responses to questions of this sort (fairly basic, routine stuff where the answer can be found in any decent textbook on the subject) should be addressed to the person seeking help directly (and I have responded to Carol D. already). But now, we also have S.W.'s confused answer using the fpc the wrong way. What Kish calls the "effective sample size" (p.45) is the sample size that gives the same length confidence interval at the same confidence level assuming sampling from an infinite population. So, in the example above: Rather than multiplying $N=271$ with $.458$, we need to divide 271 by $.458$ (resulting in 592) to get the effective sample size. So, a sample of $N=591$ from an infinite population is as good as a sample of $N=271$ from a finite population of $M=500$ and vice versa.

I only hope that the SRL at ASU has a statistician on staff. Also, there are great summer courses at the University of Michigan. :-) Manfred Kuechler
Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY) 695 Park Avenue, NY, NY 10021
Tel: 212-772-5588 Fax: 212-772-5645
Web: <http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/>

>From rys4@columbia.edu Wed Nov 20 12:14:02 1996
Return-Path: rys4@columbia.edu
Received: from labdien.cc.columbia.edu (labdien.cc.columbia.edu [128.59.35.20])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA11322 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 12:14:00 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (rys4@localhost) by labdien.cc.columbia.edu (8.8.3/8.8.3) with SMTP id PAA13269 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 15:13:51 -0500 (EST)
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 15:13:50 -0500 (EST)
From: Robert Yale Shapiro <rys4@columbia.edu>
Sender: rys4@columbia.edu
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Correlation between having a listed phone number and...
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961120145513.2284M-100000@sisters.salem.edu>
Message-ID:
<Pine.SUN.3.95L.961120150358.10983A-100000@labdien.cc.columbia.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I am scratching my head about the Reuter's/Zogby poll being described as a poll that did use phone listings, not an RDD method (correct me if I am wrong), in addition to some other ostensibly unusual things (though I find weighting by party id a sensible idea). Has anyone estimated the correlation between having a listed vs. unlisted phone number and whether one votes or not? Does having a listed number provide additional information regarding being a "likely voter"? Can we really learn anything from Reuter's/Zogby? Or will their "Literary Digest" day come? What prompts this is that this poll one-upped others in producing the best prediction in the 1996 presidential race and also in predicting Governor Pataki would defeat Cuomo in the last NY Governor election.
Bob Shapiro, rys4@columbia.edu

>From BWARD@habaco.com Wed Nov 20 12:31:14 1996
Return-Path: BWARD@habaco.com

Received: from habaco.com ([199.97.248.230])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA15174 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 12:31:11 -0800
(PST)

Received: from rcgva-Message_Server by habaco.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 15:31:03 -0500
Message-Id: <s2932437.082@habaco.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 15:42:01 -0500
From: Bryan Ward <BWARD@habaco.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: My \$0.02 RE: Use of AAPORNET
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline

I believe that the thread re: sampling from finite populations is exactly what AAPORNET is designed for and found this of greater interest than much of what transpires. This forum should function as a means of transferring knowledge from those who have an answer readily available and are willing to share their knowledge. Certainly the answer to the finite population question could have been discovered in a text, however, apparently even the text can be interpreted (misinterpreted) differently. If I am in the minority of AAPORNETTERS in my opinion, maybe an alternative would be another list to which only those interested in participating in a such forum subscribe.

Bryan K. Ward
Hagler Bailly Survey Research
Madison, WI

>From P.Gendall@massey.ac.nz Wed Nov 20 12:31:16 1996
Return-Path: P.Gendall@massey.ac.nz
Received: from cc-server9.massey.ac.nz (cc-server9.massey.ac.nz
[130.123.128.11])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA15179 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 12:31:12 -0800
(PST)
From: P.Gendall@massey.ac.nz
Message-Id: <199611202031.MAA15179@usc.edu>
Received: from mk-pc24 by cc-server9 with SMTP (PP);
Thu, 21 Nov 1996 09:30:51 +1300
X-Sender: PGendall@mail.massey.ac.nz
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.3
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Thu, 21 Nov 1996 09:31:13 +1200
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: need advice on sample size

Carol

The answer to your question also depends on what you are estimating. If it is a population proportion (e.g., proportion of students who attend meetings), then the advice you have been given applies. But if you were estimating a mean (e.g., average number of meetings attended), the answer would be different (and smaller).

For example, if there were 12 meetings a year and you wanted to estimate the average number of meetings attended, with an error margin of .5, the sample size required is about 30. (This assumes the $sd=range/6=2$ and a 95% confidence interval).

Phil Gendall

Professor P J Gendall
Professor of Marketing
Massey University
Private Bag 11222
Palmerston North
New Zealand
Tel: 64-6-3505582
Fax: 64-6-3505608
Email P.Gendall@massey.ac.nz

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Wed Nov 20 12:58:51 1996
Return-Path: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (root@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.96])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA20337 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 12:58:47 -0800
(PST)
Received: from social54.hunter.cuny.edu (social54.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.12.54]) by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george) with SMTP id
QAA11875 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 16:02:53 -0500
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 16:02:53 -0500
Message-Id: <1.5.4.16.19961120170308.338facda@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (16)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Re: Correlation between having a listed phone number and...

In response to Robert Shapiro's posting on the apparent success of a polling organization that supposedly uses "bad" methods. I am not familiar with this particular organization and I am not sure about a correlation between telephone listing preference and voting.

However, what we often overlook is the fact the final quality of survey results depend on the *actual* or *realized* sample, not the "target sample". Method textbook almost exclusively deal with the "target sample" and hence the strong emphasis on random sampling, RDD, etc. With (realistically calculated) response rates of 50-60% for telephone surveys with extremely short field periods, however, the assumption that the realized sample truly represents the target sample is rather -- shall we say, naive? I think we need to focus much more on the interviewing process and the lack of cooperation (non-reach, refusal, careless responses) on part of targeted respondents. No formulas for this and little help in the textbooks, especially since most of this information is guarded by the survey organizations and, thus, systematic studies are difficult to do.

I am also reminded about rather surprising (and unsettling to me at the time) results of a systematic comparison of different survey organizations in Germany. Looking at a fairly large number of political polls over quite a

period of time, the organization that came on average closest to the actual election results was one that used -- quota sampling. (In the US, the editor of a leading journal in our field routinely rejects articles using data from quota samples for the sole reason that these data are not scientific.) So, once again, there is much more to survey research than just selecting a target sample.

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

>From BWARD@habaco.com Wed Nov 20 13:26:55 1996
Return-Path: BWARD@habaco.com
Received: from habaco.com ([199.97.248.230])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA27273 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 13:26:46 -0800
(PST)
Received: from rcgva-Message_Server by habaco.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 16:26:40 -0500
Message-Id: <s2933140.033@habaco.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 16:37:35 -0500
From: Bryan Ward <BWARD@habaco.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Survey Research Positions
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline

The survey center at Hagler Bailly Consulting, Inc. in Madison, Wisconsin (rated the Number-1 place to live by Money Magazine in 1996) is currently taking applications for the positions of Project Manager and Project Supervisor.

The ideal candidate for the project manager position will have the following qualifications:

- * B.A. or M.S. degree in Market Research, Social Science research or related field
- * At least 5 years' experience in market research and/or survey research
- * Experience designing and testing survey instruments
- * Experience in sample design
- * Experience in data analysis
- * Strong working knowledge of statistical packages, such as SPSS or SAS
- * Excellent writing and communication skills
- * Experience in working directly with clients

The Survey Center's project managers work closely with clients to ensure that the survey's objectives are being met. They are responsible for directing the activities of the project supervisors assigned to their projects. They are directly involved with implementing the Center's qualitative and quantitative research projects, analyzing the data, and

reporting the findings.

The ideal candidate for the project supervisor position will have the following qualifications:

- * At least 2 years' experience in market research and/or survey research
- * Experience programming surveys for a CATI system
- * Experience with implementing surveys in a CATI environment
- * Experience training and supervising interviewers on project-specific survey issues
- * Experience working with data using SPSS or SAS
- * Experience working with data using database applications, e.g., MS Access, Paradox, Dbase

Experience in other areas such as questionnaire design, sampling design, and data analysis would be a plus.

The Center's project supervisors work closely with the project managers. Supervisors are responsible for overseeing day-to-day data collection activities: training interviewers, implementing and monitoring quality control procedures, updating clients on the progress of the research, working with project managers to resolve questionnaire or sampling issues, ensuring that the survey is implemented as designed, managing sample selection, tracking the response rate, and providing a clean data set to the client.

These are full-time salaried positions with benefits. If you would like additional information, please call Bryan Ward at (608) 232-2800.

Please send resumes by December 13, 1996 to:

Margy Syse
Senior Administrator
Hagler Bailly Consulting, Inc.
455 Science Dr.
Madison, WI 53711

>From richman@usia.gov Wed Nov 20 13:30:22 1996
Return-Path: richman@usia.gov
Received: from usia.gov (XGATE.USIA.GOV [198.67.64.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA28133 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 13:30:18 -0800
(PST)
Received: from Connect2 Message Router by usia.gov
via Connect2-SMTP 4.20A; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 16:29:25 -0500
Message-ID: <7465933201BD1110@usia.gov>
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 16:26:34 -0500

From: "Richman, Alvin" <richman@usia.gov>
Sender: "Richman, Alvin" <richman@usia.gov>
Organization: USIA
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: richman@usia.gov (Richman, Alvin)
Subject: Presidential Poll Assessment
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-disposition: inline
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Connect2-SMTP 4.20A MHS/SMF to SMTP Gateway

Dear AAPORNETers:

The following report, prepared initially for U.S. government officials and foreign audiences, assesses the performance of the U.S. presidential preference polls in comparison to the actual vote distribution. It presents an interpretation contrary to current conventional wisdom. Back-up tables containing 1996 trend data on this question for each polling organization selected are attached.

1996 Presidential Preference

Polls: An Assessment

Some of the early commentary on the performance of this year's presidential preference polls has attributed the sizeable differences between most of these polls and the actual vote to problems in polling methodology. This view raises doubts about the ability of pre-election polls to accurately predict vote outcomes. An alternate interpretation -- based on aggregating and analyzing the pre-election polls week-by-week -- is that real changes in presidential preference of a small proportion of voters occurred during the final week of the campaign.

CLINTON'S LEAD OVER DOLE DECLINED IN FINAL DAYS OF CAMPAIGN -- Eight media polls of registered or likely voters conducted in early November shortly before the election show Clinton's lead over Dole in the three-way race averaged 12 percentage points (49% Clinton vs. 37% Dole; Perot with 8%) -- down from the 16-point margin in late October (average of 51% Clinton vs. 35% Dole; Perot with 8%). This 12-point average margin between Clinton and Dole still is greater, in turn, than the actual popular vote margin of 8 percentage points obtained on election day (49% Clinton vs. 41% Dole; Perot with 8%).1

All in all, these results show Clinton's lead over Dole was cut in half during the final week of the campaign (from 16% in late October to 8% on election day). This was produced by a gain of 6 points by Dole and a 2-point loss of support for Clinton, as well as a reduction in the percentage of "not sure" voters. (See Trends Table attached. Note: Support for Perot rose from 6% to 8% in late October, but did not reach the double-digit level Perot had recorded before the Republican and Democratic party conventions.)

SOFTNESS OF SUPPORT -- These shifts in voters' preferences late in

the campaign are less surprising when compared to the number of voters who indicated their support was "soft" immediately before the election. A Harris poll taken between November 1-3 showed about one-fifth of Clinton supporters (11% of all likely voters) said they might still change their mind about supporting Clinton. At the same time, eight percent of all voters said they might switch to Dole -- that is, they did not express support for Dole in the poll but said there was still "a chance" they will vote for him on election day (PEW Research Center, 10/31-11/3). 2

Trends in Presidential Preference Polls:

3-Way Race Summary

. (Averages by Period Among Registered Voters or Likely Voters)

Period	# Polls	Clinton	Dole	(Gap)
Perot	N. O.			
January	3	43%	37%	(6%)
14%				
February	0			
March	7	47	33	(14)
	15	5		
April	3		48	33
(15)	15	4		
May	9		49	32
(17)	13	5		
June	10		48	32
	14	6		(16)
July	10		49	31
(18)	14	6		
Aug. 1-9 (Before Republican Convention):				
	10		49	31
(18)	11	9		
Aug. 16-25 (Between conventions):				
	11		47	39
(8)	7	7		
September	34	52	36	(16)
	6			
OCTOBER	47	52	36	(16)
	6			
Oct. 1-5 (Before 1st Pres. Debate):				
	7		51	36
(15)	6	7		
Oct. 7-15 (Between Debates):				
	14		52	36
(16)	6	6		
Oct. 17-23 (After Pres. Debate):				
	14		52	36
(16)	6	6		
Oct. 24-31:				
	12		51	35
(16)	8	6		
NOV. 1-4	8	Average: 49	37	(12)
	8	6		
Gallup, 11/3-4		49	36	(13)

	9		6			
ABC/WP, 11/2-3			51	39		(12)
	7	3				
NBC/WSJ, 11/2-3			49	37		(12)
	9	5				
USNews & WR, 11/2-3		47	35			(12)
	9	9				
Harris, 11/1-3			51	39		(12)
	9		1			
Reuters/Zogby, 11/1-3		44	37			(7)
	7	12				
PEW, 10/31-11/3			49	36		(13)
	8	7				
CBS/NYT, 10/30-11/2		53	35			(18)
	9	3				
VOTE ON NOV. 5	5		49	41		(8)
	8	2				

NOTES:

1. The average response obtained from a number of polls during a particular period normally provides a statistically more reliable measure of presidential preference than using only a single poll. Both of these 4-point declines in the average margin between Clinton and Dole are statistically significant. For example, the difference of four percentage points between the 16-point average margin obtained in late October (based on 12 polls) and the 12-point average margin recorded in early November (based on 8 polls) is statistically significant at the 95% confidence level. (Refer to Leslie Kish, Survey Sampling, John Wiley and Sons, 1965, p. 130.) For comparison, a difference of approximately eight percentage points between the Clinton-Dole margins on two individual polls is required to reach the 95% confidence level.

2. A post-election survey found 16 percent of voters said that they made their decision on whom to vote for President after the Presidential debates (i.e., after October 16 -- survey taken by Washington Post/Harvard University/Kaiser Foundation, 11/6-10).

Selected Trends in Presidential Preference Polls: 3-Way Race						
Pollster	# Reg. Voters		Clinton	Dole	Perot	
N.O.						
Gallup:						
11/3-4	1448 LV		49	36	9	
6						
11/1-2				50	37	
7	6					
10/30-31				52	34	10
4						
10/27-28	718 LV	51	35	7	7	

10/24-25			54		34		7		7		
10/22-23	733			51		34		7		8	
10/19-20	732			55		34		6		5	
10/17-18			55		32		8		5		
10/14-15	719			48		39		5		8	
10/10-11			57		34		4		5		
10/7-8		741			55		34			6	5
10/4-5		720			54		36			5	5
10/1-2		764			53		36			6	5
9/28-30	732			57		32		5		6	
9/27-29	768			56		34		5		5	
9/23-25	737			49		39		6		6	
9/19-21	735			53		34		6		7	
9/15-17	731			52		35		5		8	
9/11-13	698			51		35		7		7	
9/7-9		716			55		34			5	6
9/3-5		765			52		36			5	7
8/30-9/1	1009		55		34		6		5		
8/28-29	622			51		38		7		4	
8/23-25	1003		50		38		7		5		
8/16-18	1006		48		41		7		4		
8/14-15	707			50		39		7		4	
8/11	627			50		38		6		6	
8/5-7		1003		52		30		12		6	
7/25-28	844			50		35		10		5	
7/18-21	866			50		33		12		5	
6/18-19	859			49		33		17		1	
5/28-29	838			49		34		15		2	
5/9-12		856			47		32		19		2
4/9-10		857			49		35		15		1
3/15-17	865			46		36		16		2	
1/12-15	434			43		39		16		2	

Selected Trends in Presidential Preference Polls: 3-Way Race

Pollster	# Reg. Voters		Clinton		Dole		Perot			
N.O.										
Harris:										
11/1-3		1339 LV		51		39		9	1	
10/17-20	943 LV		54		36		7	3		
9/26-30	966 LV		55		34		7	3		
9/5-8		937 LV		52		37		7	4	
8/15-19	Approx.	850 RV		49		39		8	4	
7/9-13		871 RV		54		29		16	1	
6/6-10	Approx	850 RV		53		32		14	1	
5/2-6	Approx	850 Likely Voters				54		29	16	
1										
4/19-22	"	850	"	"	51		31		12	
6										
3/28-4/1	"	850	"	"	49		32		16	3

ABC/WPost:

11/2-3			51		39		7		3
10/30-31			51	40		7		2	
10/27-28	713	LV	54	35		7		4	
10/24-25			51	38		8		3	
10/22-23	713	LV	53	38		7		2	
10/20-21	738	LV	53	40		6		1	
10/17-19	1058	LV	52	40		4		4	
10/12-14	706	LV	53	38		6		3	
10/7-8		848 LV		54	38		5		3
10/4	616	LV	51	40		5		4	
9/25-29	623	LV	52	37		5		6	
9/20-26 (WP/Kaiser)		954 LV	52		37		5		6
9/18-22	636	LV	52	40		4		4	
9/11-15	623	LV	49	41		5		5	
9/4-8		640 LV		53	38		5		4
9/3-4		879 LV		51	40		7		2
8/28-29	1001	RV	54	34		8		4	
8/26-27	1003		51	36		7		6	
8/24-25	1008		47	38		9		6	
8/18-19	Approx.	1000		49		37		10	4
8/14-15	1015		47	38		11		4	
8/12-13	1037		47	37		12		4	
8/10-11	1006		51	32		11		6	
8/1-6	Approx.	1000		50		34		13	3
6/27-30	814			48	33		16		3
5/20-22	790			50	29		15		6
3/8-10	Approx	800		49		32		14	6

Selected Trends in Presidential Preference Polls: 3-Way Race

Pollster	# Reg. Voters		Clinton		Dole		Perot	
N.O.								
CBS/NYTimes:								
10/30-11/2	1519	RV	53		35		9	3
10-/27-29	875		54		36		8	2
10/23-27	1153		58	33		6		3
10/17-20	1157		58	34		5		3
10/10-13	1130		55	37		5		3
10/7-8		972		56	35		5	4
9/16-18	1202		56	34		6		4
9/2-4		954		54		36		6
8/26-28	1346		51	36		8		5
8/16-18	856		49	37		8		6
8/3-5		900		58	28		10	4
7/11-13	743		49		27		16	8
6/20-23 (NYT)		903			51		31	13
5								
5/31-6/3	977		48		32		16	4
3/31-4/2		1035		44	33		18	5

NBC/WSJournal: (includes MS/NBC after June)

11/2-3	1020 RV	49	37	9	5
10/19-20	1008 RV	52	35	6	7
9/12-17	1623 RV	51	38	5	6
8/26-27 (MS/NBC)		47	34	6	13
8/20-21	806 RV	48	38	8	6
8/12-13 (MS/NBC)	819 RV	42	34	11	13
8/2-6	1102 RV	50	30	10	10
7/12-14	804 RV	50	25	13	12
6/20-25	1637 RV	47	32	13	8
5/10-14	1001 RV	49	31	12	8
3/1-5	2001 Adults	46	29	16	9
1/13-16	1001 "	41	34	16	9

Selected Trends in Presidential Preference Polls: 3-Way Race

Pollster	# Reg. Voters	Clinton	Dole	Perot
----------	---------------	---------	------	-------

N.O.

LA Times:

10/24-27	1112 LV	51	34	12	3
10/6-7	695 LV	54	41	4	1
10/3-6	695 LV	51	40	6	3
9/7-9	1265	51	35	10	4
8/3-6	1290	47	30	18	5

Newsweek/Princeton Survey Research:

10/17-18	755	52	29	8	11
10/2-3		53	32	7	8
9/19-20	624	51	35	5	9
8/28-29	862	54	33	5	8
8/22-23	751	47	40	7	6
8/15-16	933	44	42	3	11
8/8-9	761	53	33	7	7
6/27-28	615	49	33	9	9
5/30-31	622	49	32	10	9
5/22-23	640	52	35	6	7
5/16-17	626	49	33	11	7
1/ ?	?	44	37	13	6

Time-CNN/Yankelovich:

10/10-11	1387 LV	53	35	7	5
9/4-5	1527 LV	52	38	6	4

8/7-8	Approx.	960	RV	51	31	10	8
7/26-30	2435		53	33	9	5	
7/10-11	796		48	32	13	7	
5/8-9	808			45	35	14	6
3/6-7	826			46	33	14	7

Selected Trends in Presidential Preference Polls: 3-Way Race

Pollster	# Reg. Voters		Clinton		Dole		Perot
N.O.							
PEW Research Center:							
10/30-11/3	1211	LV	49		36	8	7
10/14-20	1546	RV	51	34		8	7
9/25-29	1517		51	35		7	7
9/5-8	1508		52		34	8	6
7/25-28	928		44		34	16	6
3/28-31	554		44		35	16	5
U.S. News & World Report/Lake and Tarrance:							
11/2-3	1000	RV	47		35	9	9
9/3-4	1000		52		35	6	7
6/1-3	1000		48		35	11	6
Gannett News Service/Opinion Research:							
6/20-25	1027		41	30	20		9
Politics Now/ICR:							
9/18-24	1391	LV	51	36		6	7
9/11-17			50	36		8	6
9/4-10				53	33		7
6/28-7/2	793		46	34		10	10
AP/ICR:							
7/12-16	822		45	33		11	11

Selected Trends in Presidential Preference Polls: 3-Way Race

Pollster	# Reg. Voters		Clinton		Dole		Perot		
N.O.									
Fox News/Opinion Dynamics:									
10/25	909 RV		48		35		7	10	
10/17			52		34		6	8	
9/6	900 LV		52	34		5		9	
8/22-23	900 LV		45	38		7		10	
8/9	900 LV		44	33		14		9	
7/26	900 LV		42	27		14		17	
Zogby Group/Reuters:									
11/1-3	Approx. 900 LV		44		37		7	12	
10/27-29	Approx. 900 LV		43		33		8	16	
10/24-26	" "		47		33		8	12	
10/21-23	" "		45		36		5	14	
10/17-19	" "		45		37		5	13	
10/13-15	" "		46		33		5	16	
10/10-12	" "		46		33		7	14	
10/7-9	" "			44		36		6	14
10/1-3	" "			48		33		4	15
9/28-30	" "		45		34		5	16	
9/2-4	Approx. 1000 LV		48		33		6	13	
8/18-20	" "			43		39		6	12
8/1-5	" "			43		31		9	17

Selected Trends in Presidential Preference Polls: 3-Way Race

Pollster N.O.	# Reg. Voters	Clinton	Dole	Perot	
Hotline:					
10/24-29	1000	46	35	9	10
10/17-22	1000	48	38	7	7
10/10-15	1000	50	37	7	6
10/7-10	1000	50	36	7	7
10/1-6	1000	50	34	8	8
9/22-25	1000	51	34	8	7
9/16-19	1000	48	37	7	8
9/10-15	1000	47	39	6	8
9/3-8	1000	51	34	7	8
8/26-28	1500	46	38	6	10
8/12-14	1500	48	35	8	9
Chicago Tribune:					
7/29-8/4	1397 LV	46	27	11	16

Alvin Richman
 Office of Research
 U.S. Information Agency
 INTERNET:Richman@USIA.gov
 PHONE:202-619-5140

>From billt@pos.org Wed Nov 20 13:33:47 1996
 Return-Path: billt@pos.org
 Received: from netrail.net (root@netrail.net [205.215.6.3])
 by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
 id NAA29066 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 13:33:41 -0800
 (PST)
 Received: from info (neil.pos.org [205.215.50.23]) by netrail.net
 (8.8.3/Netrail) with SMTP id QAA27968 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov
 1996 16:33:06 -0500
 Message-Id: <199611202133.QAA27968@netrail.net>
 Comments: Authenticated sender is <billt@pos.org>
 From: "Bill Thompson" <billt@pos.org>

Organization: Public Opinion Strategies
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 16:38:07 -0400
Subject: Re: My \$0.02 RE: Use of AAPORNET
Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.42)

I agree totally with Mr. Ward's statement below:

> I believe that the thread re: sampling from finite populations is
> exactly what AAPORNET is designed for and found this of greater
> interest than much of what transpires.

> Bryan K. Ward
> Hagler Bailly Survey Research
> Madison, WI
>
>

This list is for researchers at all levels of experience (students and teachers alike) and can serve as a great tool for those who need a reference and don't know where else to turn.

We academics and researchers have (in my opinion) an obligation to assist our colleagues whenever possible and if this is a forum where that can happen then I'm all for it!

Regards, Bill

Bill Thompson, Virginia, USA

"And the men who hold high places must be the ones to start, to mold a new reality, closer to the heart"

>From Lydia_Saad@internet.gallup.com Wed Nov 20 13:35:20 1996
Return-Path: Lydia_Saad@internet.gallup.com
Received: from gateway.gallup.com (firewall-user@gateway.gallup.com [206.158.235.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA29447 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 13:35:16 -0800 (PST)
From: Lydia_Saad@internet.gallup.com
Received: (from uucp@localhost) by gateway.gallup.com (8.8.2/8.6.11) id PAA04558 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 15:31:03 -0600 (CST)
Received: from internt2.gallup.com(198.247.195.182) by gateway.gallup.com via smap (3.2)
id xma004544; Wed, 20 Nov 96 15:31:01 -0600
Received: from ccMail by internet.gallup.com (SMTPLINK V2.11 PreRelease 4) id AA848532921; Wed, 20 Nov 96 16:26:01 CDT
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 96 16:26:01 CDT
Message-Id: <9610208485.AA848532921@internet.gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Correlation between having a listed phone number and...

This is a response to your comment that Zogby's poll was "best." I'll

leave dialogue about listed phone bias to others.

My premise is that best way to compare the accuracy of pre-election polls -- and particularly the accuracy of telephone methods -- is to look at UNALLOCATED results. The allocation decision, however executed, involves decisions and assumptions which are outside of polling and, while possibly a cue to the genius of the pollster, bear no relation to his sampling.

Zogby's reported final unallocated estimate was quite accurate on estimating Clinton's margin of victory, but was substantially off in estimating the percentage of vote for Clinton and Dole. Measuring accuracy on the basis of the gap, Gallup came the closest. Measuring accuracy on the basis of the Clinton/Dole/Perot percentages, at least six other polls came closer than Zogby.

This is not meant to malign Zogby in any way. Only to reinforce the fact that several polls were highly accurate this year. And, as far as I know, all the non-Zogby polls used traditional sampling methods.

	Clinton %	Dole %	Perot %	Undecided/ Other %	C/D GAP	C/D/P PCT. PT ERROR
ACTUAL	49	41	8	2	+8	--
Zogby	44	37	7	12	+7	10
Gallup	48	40	6	6	+8	4
Hotline	45	36	8	11	+9	9
Harris	50	38	8	3	+12	4
NBC/WSJ	49	37	9	5	+12	5
ABC News	51	39	7	3	+12	5
Pew	49	36	8	7	+13	5
CBS/NYT	53	35	9	3	+18	11

For those who do choose to compare on the basis of allocated results, Zogby may have hit it right on, but Gallup came very, very close -- and certainly was within sampling error (Our allocated final estimate was 52% for Clinton, 41% for Dole and 7% for Perot.) Some comfort that we do not all need to rush out buy listed sample.

Lydia Saad
Managing Editor, The Gallup Poll
saadlk@gallup.com
ph: (609) 924-9600

Reply Separator

Subject: Correlation between having a listed phone number and...
Author: aapornet@usc.edu at Internet
Date: 11/20/96 2:15 PM

I am scratching my head about the Reuter's/Zogby poll being described as a poll that did use phone listings, not an RDD method (correct me if I am

wrong), in addition to some other ostensibly unusual things (though I find weighting by party id a sensible idea). Has anyone estimated the correlation between having a listed vs. unlisted phone number and whether one votes or not? Does having a listed number provide additional information regarding being a "likely voter"? Can we really learn anything from Reuter's/Zogby? Or will their "Literary Digest" day come? What prompts this is that this poll one-upped others in producing the best prediction in the 1996 presidential race and also in predicting Governor Pataki would defeat Cuomo in the last NY Governor election.
Bob Shapiro, rys4@columbia.edu

>From BBAUMGAR@habaco.com Wed Nov 20 13:55:56 1996
Return-Path: BBAUMGAR@habaco.com
Received: from habaco.com ([199.97.248.230])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA04670 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 13:55:53 -0800
(PST)
Received: from rcgva-Message_Server by habaco.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 16:55:50 -0500
Message-Id: <s2933816.060@habaco.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 16:16:33 -0500
From: Bob Baumgartner <BBAUMGAR@habaco.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Survey Research Positions -Reply
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline

Bryan: We have to be sure to post these positions internally here in the office, even if we don't think it is likely that we have anyone to fill the positions.

Bob

>From abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU Wed Nov 20 14:20:19 1996
Return-Path: <@lists.Princeton.EDU:abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU>
Received: from lists.Princeton.EDU (root@lists.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.129.249])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA09808 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 14:20:15 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU ([128.112.129.131]) by
lists.Princeton.EDU with ESMTTP id <23131.sl-2>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 17:20:02
-0500
Received: from wws214.Princeton.EDU (wws214.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.69])
by ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP id QAA07466; Wed, 20
Nov 1996 16:11:50 -0500
Message-ID: <32939DEF.1194@wws.princeton.edu>
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 16:10:23 -0800
From: Herb Abelson <abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win16; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu, por@frosty.irss.unc.edu
Subject: Up and running
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; name="WEBSITE"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline; filename="WEBSITE"

The Princeton Survey Research Center online has just been overhauled.

<http://www.princeton.edu/~abelson/>

The site now has six content areas: Survey Findings, Other Research Resources, Research Practice, Survey Research Centers, Market Research, and The Establishment. Have a look; use it; send email.

Your suggestions are very welcome and appreciated.

>From stakacs@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Wed Nov 20 14:54:50 1996
Return-Path: stakacs@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Received: from mailer.fsu.edu (mailer.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA16774 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 14:54:45 -0800
(PST)
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu by mailer.fsu.edu with SMTP id AA01454
(5.65c/IDA-1.4.4 for <aapornet@usc.edu>); Wed, 20 Nov 1996 17:54:40 -0500
Received: (from stakacs@localhost) by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.7.6/8.7.3) id
MAA221351 for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 12:59:08 -0500
From: "Scott J. Takacs" <stakacs@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Message-Id: <199611201759.MAA221351@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: need advice on sample size
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 12:59:02 -0500 (EST)
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961120114708.28418B-100000@sisters.salem.edu>
from "Carol Dykers" at Nov 20, 96 11:58:18 am
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL17]
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>
> A small problem (it would seem) is making me crazed, so I turn to the
> experts for advice. One of my journalism students is doing an on-campus
> survey where the Population of interest is 500. She's doing the survey
> to satisfy requirements for a Math course and also for her final project
> in my reporting course. Using standard formula (provided by the math
> prof to generate a 95% confidence level), she's being told she needs a
> sample size of 270. I say she doesn't need that large a sample.

You may both be right...if your formula is for an infinite population,
the sample size of 270 may apply, but for a sample size of a finite
population, according to Weiers' "Introduction to Business Statistics" you
should try either:

$$n = \frac{\sigma^2}{\frac{e^2}{z^2} + \frac{\sigma^2}{N}}$$

for an estimate of a mean, or

$$n = \frac{p(1-p)}{\frac{e^2}{z^2} + \frac{p(1-p)}{N}}$$

for a proportion,

where z is the z -value for the level of confidence, n is the sample size, e is the maximum acceptable error, σ is the population standard deviation, p is the estimated population proportion (use .5 if you want to be conservative), and N is the population sample size (in this case, 500.) Also $^$ means "squared", and Greek symbols don't translate real well on the computer.

(I was prepping a lecture right before I checked my e-mail so I had the book handy.)

Scott Takacs
stakacs@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

```
>From dykers@sisters.salem.edu Wed Nov 20 17:02:30 1996
Return-Path: dykers@sisters.salem.edu
Received: from sisters.salem.edu (sisters.salem.edu [192.154.64.1])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id RAA05030 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 17:02:28 -0800
(PST)
Received: by sisters.salem.edu (5.x/SMI-SVR4)
    id AA10957; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 20:01:30 -0500
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 1996 20:01:30 -0500 (EST)
From: Carol Dykers <dykers@sisters.salem.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: My $0.02 RE: Use of AAPORNET
In-Reply-To: <s2932437.082@habaco.com>
Message-Id: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961120195608.10727B-100000@sisters.salem.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
```

I've been so appreciative of the help I've gotten from the list today -- and I did not approach the list lightly. I had been through 7 textbooks and consulted three friends (who know stats) -- plus the math prof. This list is wonderful because the "standard" texts for one bunch of folks seem to be different (and very useful) from those used by others of us. I also did not want to embarrass my alma mater (unc-chapel hill) by asking a silly question. So, I do hope we can continue such discussions -- I've learned as much from "lurking" on this listserv for a couple years as I did in my 6 or 7 research methods and stats courses -- but those courses did give me a good foundation for understanding the discussion here. And, of course, I've grown rusty because I haven't done any survey research for a couple of years now -- and I'd bet that also is the case for some others on this list. So, thanks to all who have helped in this discussion. And I'm still listening ... Carol

Carol R. Dykers
dykers@salem.edu

Communication Department, Salem College
office: 910-721-2740; home: 919-663-2436; fax: 919-663-2254

>From Mitofsky@aol.com Wed Nov 20 23:11:35 1996
Return-Path: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: from emout02.mail.aol.com (emout02.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.93])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id XAA11719 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Nov 1996 23:11:32 -0800
(PST)
From: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: by emout02.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id CAA14657 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 21 Nov 1996 02:11:03 -0500
Date: Thu, 21 Nov 1996 02:11:03 -0500
Message-ID: <961121021103_1485460786@emout02.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: need advice on sample size

The answers given to Carol Dykers problem do not seem correct. The problem as stated does not have enough information to solve for the sample size.

The formula for sample size is as follows: $(\text{sampling error})^{**2} = [(p*q)/n] * [(N-n)/N-1]$. N is the population = 500; assume $p=q=50\%$.

In order to solve for n we need the required sampling error. The information in the problem does not provide this problem. What is given is a confidence interval, which is nothing more than $1.96 * \text{sampling error}$. Carol's statement does NOT mean that $1.96 * \text{sampling error} = 5\%$

If the sample size were 270 the sampling error would be 2.1% If sample size were 75 the sampling error would be 5.3% To get the 95% confidence interval multiply the sampling error by 1.96
In a message dated 96-11-20 12:00:37 EST, you write:

<<

A small problem (it would seem) is making me crazed, so I turn to the experts for advice. One of my journalism students is doing an on-campus survey where the Population of interest is 500. She's doing the survey to satisfy requirements for a Math course and also for her final project in my reporting course. Using standard formula (provided by the math prof to generate a 95% confidence level), she's being told she needs a sample size of 270. I say she doesn't need that large a sample, but I'm having trouble, reading through my stat books, to find the basis in probability theory for arguing that she should be able to create a simple random sample with an n = to around 75 or 80, and do an okay job. But every formula I try seems to generate the same $n=270$ that the math prof requires. Enter AAPOR, please. How can I mathematically justify the smaller sample? Thanks for any help you can give. Carol

Carol R. Dykers >>

>From arobbin@mailier.fsu.edu Thu Nov 21 03:26:25 1996
Return-Path: arobbin@mailier.fsu.edu
Received: from mailier.fsu.edu (mailier.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id DAA16396 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Nov 1996 03:26:24 -0800
(PST)

Received: by mailer.fsu.edu id AA23520
(5.65c/IDA-1.4.4 for aapornet@usc.edu); Thu, 21 Nov 1996 06:26:23 -0500
Date: Thu, 21 Nov 1996 06:26:22 -0500 (EST)
From: ALICE R ROBBIN <arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: international effort to treat factual data as private property?
(fwd)
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.961121062507.22897E-100000@mailer.fsu.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Pat Gwartney is correct. The WIPO developments are worrisome and do affect us social scientists. A concise summary of scientific concerns can be found in Andrew Lawler's article, "Treaty Draft Raises Scientific Hackles" in Science (v. 274, 25 Oct 1996, p. 494).

The full text of the proposed treaties that will be debated in early Dec (the 2nd) in Geneva can be found at:
<http://lcweb.loc.gov/copyright/wipo.html>
(in addition to the url that Pat gave).

If you want to know the position of the Information Industry, tap into:
<http://www.infoindustry.org/ppgrc/prc/prc.htm>
The electronic publishing companies have been mobilizing ever since the Supreme Court issued the Feist decision a few years ago.

Many groups that have traditionally fought for the "public's right..." are mobilizing to make their views known to the Clinton Administration. There is a very strong publishers spokesperson in the name of Bruce Lehman in Commerce who has consistently taken (in a variety of forms) a view that supports the Information Industry (which is not to say, however, that there is "one voice").

Alice Robbin
Florida State University
arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Nov 21 03:36:14 1996
Return-Path: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.166])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id DAA17210 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Nov 1996 03:36:13 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.3/usc) with SMTP
id DAA01911 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Nov 1996 03:36:13 -0800
(PST)
Date: Thu, 21 Nov 1996 03:36:13 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Happy Birthday to Us!
Message-ID: <Pine.SV4.3.94.961121033355.1792A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

This Saturday, November 23, marks AAPORNET's second anniversary. On a Wednesday morning two years ago, the day before Thanksgiving 1994, 260 AAPOR members found something unexpected on their computer screens: a message introducing our electronic version of AAPOR as "a meeting place" (as the volume of our history is titled) amid the clutter of the Internet.

"Your Internet address has been added to AAPORNET, a news and discussion list available only to members of the American Association for Public Opinion Research," the message began. "AAPORNET is intended both to help launch AAPOR's 50th Anniversary celebrations and to explore new means of communication and other benefits for members as AAPOR moves into its second half-century and on into the new millennium. Please keep AAPORNET in mind, both as a means to communicate with the AAPOR membership and as a source of professional information from others, including the AAPOR Secretariat and Council."

AAPORNET had just five days earlier been approved as an experiment by the AAPOR Executive Council at its November 18 meeting--led by then-President Andy Kohut--in New York City. Impetus for the idea had come from the 30-member AAPOR Conference Committee, which had been meeting online since the previous May--on a private Internet list AAPOR50--to plan last May's 50th Anniversary Conference. Begun with the 260 still-functioning Internet addresses in the 1993-94 AAPOR Directory, AAPORNET grew--after only one week--to include 409 subscribers (30 percent of the total AAPOR membership) in ten countries.

Because of this favorable response from AAPOR members, AAPORNET soon lost its experimental status.: The Executive Council agreed at its January 13, 1995 meeting in Washington to continue our list indefinitely. Today AAPORNET has some 800 subscribers.

So Happy Birthday to us all!

>From jwerner@vgernet.net Thu Nov 21 05:33:26 1996
Return-Path: jwerner@vgernet.net
Received: from photon.vgernet.net (root@photon.vgernet.net [205.219.186.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id FAA22737 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Nov 1996 05:33:22 -0800
(PST)
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vger.vgernet.net [205.219.186.1]) by
photon.vgernet.net (8.7.6/8.7.3) with ESMTTP id IAA27325 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Nov 1996 08:33:17 -0500
Received: from Pjwerner.vgernet.net (plp19.vgernet.net [205.219.186.119]) by
vger.vgernet.net (8.7.6/8.7.3) with SMTP id IAA09659 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 21 Nov 1996 08:33:16 -0500
Message-ID: <329459C5.339F@vgernet.net>
Date: Thu, 21 Nov 1996 08:31:49 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@vgernet.net>
Reply-To: jwerner@vgernet.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0Gold (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Correlation between having a listed phone number and...
References: <1.5.4.16.19961120170308.338facda@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On Wed, 20 Nov 1996, Manfred Kuechler wrote:

>>>> However, what we often overlook is the fact the final quality of survey results depend on the *actual* or *realized* sample, not the "target sample". Method textbook almost exclusively deal with the "target sample" and hence the strong emphasis on random sampling, RDD, etc. With (realistically calculated) response rates of 50-60% for telephone surveys with extremely short field periods, however, the assumption that the realized sample truly represents the target sample is rather -- shall we say, naive? I think we need to focus much more on the interviewing process and the lack of cooperation (non-reach, refusal, careless responses) on part of targeted respondents. No formulas for this and little help in the textbooks, especially since most of this information is guarded by the survey organizations and, thus, systematic studies are difficult to do.<<<<

The reporting of error is in fact quite misleading because the theory developed around the target sample is applied to the "realized" sample as if the two were the same, which is patently NOT the case. In fact, the potential error arising from non-response dwarfs any sampling error, meaning that confidence intervals based on sampling error alone are utterly meaningless.

The only polling organization that I have seen actually report this information is the Minnesota Poll, conducted by the Minneapolis Star Tribune, who include what they call the "cooperation rate" for their surveys in the web page description of how the polls were conducted (I do not know if this information actually appears in the print edition). They average around 65% "cooperation", which is much better than what I gather to be the rates for the outfits (ICR, Chilton, Gallup,...) who conduct most of the national polls for the major media groups, and who appear to average closer to 50%.

Given a "realized" sample of 1100 for a rigorously conducted probability sample with a 65% response rate, if a poll had shown 49% for Clinton, and 41% for Dole, the true ranges accounting for sample non-response, would be {32%-67%} for Clinton, and {27%-62%} for Dole. At a 50% response rate, these ranges would be {25%-75%} Clinton, {21%-71%} Dole. The sampling error (assuming a SRS) should be 2.4% based on the 1692 "target" sample, rather than 3%, based on the 1100 "realized" sample.

Ignoring the error due to non-response is equivalent to imputing the same distribution of responses to both non-respondents as to the survey respondents. Even if this turns out to often be a good guess, it is a judgement call and has no basis in statistical theory.

Given that quota and judgement samples seek to minimize what is a far larger source of error than that due to chance alone when faced with large non-response rates, they may well turn out to be more effective in practice than rigorously designed samples that ignore the practicalities of conducting surveys, even if the results are not projectable.

For a good discussion of this and other related issues, I would suggest reading the first 2 chapters of W.E. Deming, "Some Theory of Sampling", available in an inexpensive paperback reprint from Dover.

Jan Werner

jwerner@vgernet.net

>From jwerner@vgernet.net Thu Nov 21 07:09:57 1996

Return-Path: jwerner@vgernet.net

Received: from photon.vgernet.net (root@photon.vgernet.net [205.219.186.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA02026 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Nov 1996 07:09:56 -0800

(PST)

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vger.vgernet.net [205.219.186.1]) by
photon.vgernet.net (8.7.6/8.7.3) with ESMTTP id KAA27708 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Nov 1996 10:09:55 -0500

Received: from Pjwerner.vgernet.net (plp0.vgernet.net [205.219.186.100]) by
vger.vgernet.net (8.7.6/8.7.3) with SMTP id KAA12422 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 21 Nov 1996 10:09:55 -0500

Message-ID: <3294706B.4EEF@vgernet.net>

Date: Thu, 21 Nov 1996 10:08:27 -0500

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@vgernet.net>

Reply-To: jwerner@vgernet.net

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0Gold (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: need advice on sample size

References: <961121021103_1485460786@emout02.mail.aol.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mitofsky@aol.com wrote:

>

> The answers given to Carol Dykers problem do not seem correct. The problem
as

> stated does not have enough information to solve for the sample size.

>

> The formula for sample size is as follows: (sampling error)**2 = [(p*q)/n]
*

> [(N-n)/N-1]. N is the population = 500; assume p=q=50%.

>

> In order to solve for n we need the required sampling error. The
information

> in the problem does not provide this problem. What is given is a
confidence

> interval, which is nothing more than 1.96*sampling error. Carol's
statement

> does NOT mean that 1.96*sampling error = 5%

>

> If the sample size were 270 the sampling error would be 2.1% If sample
size

> were 75 the sampling error would be 5.3% To get the 95% confidence interval
> multiply the sampling error by 1.96

Correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that the sampling error is actually unknown. What you are referring to here are both the sampling error and the standard error of the sample, which is used as an unbiased estimator of the sampling error. The confidence interval actually refers to the probability that the sampling error lies within a certain range of the standard error of the sample. This is expressed using the standard error of the sample as the unit of measurement, so that there is a 95% probability that the sampling error lies within 1.96*(Standard Error of Sample).

While this semantic difference does not detract from the argument made above, it should make it easier to understand.

>From edithl@educ.uva.nl Fri Nov 22 02:56:34 1996
Return-Path: edithl@educ.uva.nl
Received: from pooh.educ.uva.nl (pooh.educ.uva.nl [145.18.96.16])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id CAA26247 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 02:56:30 -0800
(PST)
Received: from gregorius.educ.uva.nl (gregorius [145.18.103.16]) by
pooh.educ.uva.nl (8.7.5/8.7.3) with ESMTTP id LAA17140 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 11:55:58 +0100 (MET)
Received: from localhost (edithl@localhost) by gregorius.educ.uva.nl
(8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id LAA03784 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Nov 1996
11:56:07 +0100 (MET)
X-Authentication-Warning: gregorius.educ.uva.nl: edithl owned process doing
-bs
Date: Fri, 22 Nov 1996 11:56:06 +0100 (MET)
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@educ.uva.nl>
X-Sender: edithl@gregorius
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Happy Birthday to Us!
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SV4.3.94.961121033355.1792A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.95.961122115356.3679A-100000@gregorius>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

And let us not forget to wish a very SPECIAL happy birthday to

Jim Beniger

who made this party possible.

Thank you Jim,

Edith (*_-)

=====
| Edith de Leeuw, Department of Education, University of Amsterdam |
| Wibautstraat 4, NL-1091 GM, Amsterdam, the Netherlands |
| tel + 31 20 525 1530, or + 31 20 622 3438, fax + 31 20 525 1500 |
| e-mail edithl@educ.uva.nl |
=====

A man said to the universe, "Madam I exist"
"Excellent", replied the universe,
"I need someone to take care of my cats"

with thanks to Stephen Crane's cat

=====
>From mcohen@inet.ed.gov Fri Nov 22 06:22:23 1996
Return-Path: mcohen@inet.ed.gov
Received: from inet.ed.gov (inet.ed.gov [192.239.34.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id GAA13664 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 06:22:20 -0800
(PST)
Message-Id: <199611221422.GAA13664@usc.edu>
Date: Fri, 22 Nov 1996 09:24:11 -0500
From: mcohen@inet.ed.gov (Michael P. Cohen)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Re: Correlation between having a listed phone number and...
X-Status: ON 32768

Jan Werner writes (November 22, 1996):

>
> Given that quota and judgement samples seek to minimize what is a far
> larger source of error than that due to chance alone when faced with
> large non-response rates, they may well turn out to be more effective
> in practice than rigorously designed samples that ignore the
> practicalities of conducting surveys, even if the results are not
> projectable.
>

It seems to me the quota and judgment samples are being compared to a "straw
man." Are there any advantages to these forms of sampling over probability
sampling combined with proper nonresponse weighting adjustments?

Michael P. Cohen phone 202-219-1917
National Center for Education Statistics fax 202-219-2061
555 New Jersey Avenue NW #408 Internet mcohen@inet.ed.gov

Washington DC 20208-5654 USA

>From rshalp@cris.com Fri Nov 22 11:38:27 1996
Return-Path: rshalp@cris.com
Received: from franklin.cris.com (franklin.cris.com [199.3.12.31])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA20997 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 11:38:12 -0800
(PST)
Received: from beasley.cris.com (beasley.cris.com [199.3.12.41])
by franklin.cris.com (8.7.5/(96/11/08 3.6))
id OAA28288; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 14:38:03 -0500 (EST)
[1-800-745-2747 The Concentric Network]
Errors-To: <rshalp@cris.com>
Received: from LOCALNAME (61006d0017at.concentric.net [206.173.82.149])
by beasley.cris.com (8.8.3)
id OAA25199; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 14:38:00 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 22 Nov 1996 14:38:00 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <199611221938.OAA25199@beasley.cris.com>
X-Sender: rshalp@pop3.concentric.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalp@cris.com>
Subject: Re: Happy Birthday to Us!

And a hearty congratulations to Jim for making it all happen! I think we all owe him a deep debt of gratitude. AAPORNET has been enormously interesting and certainly helpful, and I think it has added immeasurably to the sense of professional (as well as social) community that AAPOR has always encouraged and been noted for.

Thanks, Jim

Dick Halpern

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. Phone/Fax: (770) 434 4121
Halpern & Associates E-Mail: rshalp@cris.com
Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research E-Mail: rshalp@concentric.net

3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-4248

>From DMMerkle@aol.com Fri Nov 22 11:55:51 1996
Return-Path: DMMerkle@aol.com
Received: from emout15.mail.aol.com (emout15.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.41])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA25104 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 11:55:49 -0800
(PST)
From: DMMerkle@aol.com
Received: by emout15.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id OAA00238 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 14:55:18 -0500
Date: Fri, 22 Nov 1996 14:55:18 -0500
Message-ID: <961122145516_637694877@emout15.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: need advice on sample size

In a message dated 96-11-22 03:07:11 EST, jwerner@vgernet.net writes:

>The confidence interval actually
>refers to the probability that the sampling error lies within a certain
>range of the standard error of the sample. This is expressed using the
>standard error of the sample as the unit of measurement, so that there
>is a 95% probability that the sampling error lies within 1.96*(Standard
>Error of Sample).
>While this semantic difference does not detract from the argument made
>above, it should make it easier to understand.

The above is actually more confusing. Take for example a 95 percent

confidence interval of +/-3 percentage points. What you can say is that the probability that the random interval (i.e., X-3, X+3) covers the unknown TRUE POPULATION VALUE is .95.

Daniel Merkle

>From tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu Fri Nov 22 15:54:21 1996
Return-Path: tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu
Received: from mhub1.tc.umn.edu (mhub1.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.51])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id PAA08885 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 15:54:19 -0800
(PST)
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub1.tc.umn.edu; Fri, 22 Nov 96
17:54:07 -0600
Received: by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Fri, 22 Nov 96 17:52:54 -0600
Date: Fri, 22 Nov 1996 17:52:53 -0600 (CST)
From: Phillip J Tichenor <tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Happy Birthday to Us!
In-Reply-To: <199611221938.OAA25199@beasley.cris.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961122175127.15964A-100000@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I would like to second everything Dick Halpern said. Jim has done a great job!

Phil Tichenor

On Fri, 22 Nov 1996, richard s. halpern wrote:

> And a hearty congratulations to Jim for making it all happen! I think we
> all
> owe him a deep debt of gratitude. AAPORNET has been enormously interesting
> and certainly helpful, and I think it has added immeasurably to the sense
> of
> professional (as well as social) community that AAPOR has always
encouraged
> and been noted for.

>
> Thanks, Jim
>
>
> Dick Halpern
>
>

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

> *****

>

>From RoniRosner@aol.com Sat Nov 23 06:31:51 1996
Return-Path: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: from emout17.mail.aol.com (emout17.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.43])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id GAA22209 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 23 Nov 1996 06:31:49 -0800
(PST)
From: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: by emout17.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id JAA19143 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Sat, 23 Nov 1996 09:31:20 -0500
Date: Sat, 23 Nov 1996 09:31:20 -0500
Message-ID: <961123093119_1750335372@emout17.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: NYAAPOR Holiday Dinner Party

The answer is NO!, NO!, NO! This Bob Shapiro is NYAAPOR's own of Columbia University fame.

Roni Rosner, NYAAPOR Secretariat

>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Sat Nov 23 12:12:48 1996
Return-Path: s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu
Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu (bones.asic.csuohio.edu
[137.148.16.17])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA16222 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 23 Nov 1996 12:12:44 -0800
(PST)
Received: from portc21.async.csuohio.edu (137.148.59.31) by
mail.asic.csuohio.edu
with SMTP (MailShare 1.0fc6); Sat, 23 Nov 1996 15:12:40 -0500
X-Sender: s.kraus@bones.asic.csuohio.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Dr. Sidney Kraus" <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>
Subject: Re: Happy Birthday to Us!
Date: Sat, 23 Nov 1996 15:12:40 -0500
Message-ID: <1363360536-11584050@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

AAdd my name to the cudos for Jim!

t 05:52 PM 11/22/96 -0600, you wrote:

>

>I would like to second everything Dick Halpern said. Jim has done a
>great job!

>

> Phil Tichenor

>

>On Fri, 22 Nov 1996, richard s. halpern wrote:

>

>> And a hearty congratulations to Jim for making it all happen! I think we
all

>> owe him a deep debt of gratitude. AAPORNET has been enormously interesting
>> and certainly helpful, and I think it has added immeasurably to the sense of
>> professional (as well as social) community that AAPOR has always encouraged
>> and been noted for.
>>
>> Thanks, Jim
>>
>>
>> Dick Halpern
>>
>>

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

>> *****
>>
>

Dr. Sidney Kraus
Dept. of Communication
College of Arts & Sciences
Cleveland State University
email: s.kraus@csuohio.edu

>From Usapolls@aol.com Sun Nov 24 13:24:03 1996
Return-Path: Usapolls@aol.com
Received: from emout06.mail.aol.com (emout06.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.97])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA03829 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 24 Nov 1996 13:24:01 -0800
(PST)
From: Usapolls@aol.com
Received: by emout06.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id QAA11756 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Sun, 24 Nov 1996 16:23:32 -0500
Date: Sun, 24 Nov 1996 16:23:32 -0500
Message-ID: <961124162331_637913632@emout06.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Democracy in Iowa?

I would appreciate any information anyone has regarding the system used for political reapportionment in Iowa.

It is my understanding that Iowa has implemented a reform of the process whereby a citizen commission actually draws the lines instead of legislators who as we know otherwise draw lines to preserve incumbents and advantage their party at the expense of competitive elections. While I am sure that the motivations of those who do become involved are less than completely pure, I do understand that there are some safeguards, such as a prohibition against running for an office by anyone involved in drawing the lines for

that office. I also recall reading that the system has actually worked to a great extent as intended.

My knowledge of the Iowa system, however, is only anecdotal and quite sketchy. I would really appreciate it if anyone who knows anything about the Iowa system, its provisions, its history, or how it has actually operated would send me information or let me know where I could best look for it.

Many thanks.

Mike O'Neil
O'Neil Associates, Inc..
412 East Southern Ave.
Tempe, AZ 85282
602.967.4441

>From JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu Sun Nov 24 20:08:01 1996
Return-Path: JTANUR@CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU
Received: from ccvm.sunysb.edu (ccvm.sunysb.edu [129.49.2.183])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id UAA03867 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Sun, 24 Nov 1996 20:07:59 -0800
(PST)
Received: from CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU by ccvm.sunysb.edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)
with BSMTP id 1126; Sun, 24 Nov 96 23:06:40 EST
Received: from ccvm.sunysb.edu (NJE origin JTANUR@SBCCVM) by CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 9676; Sun, 24 Nov 1996 23:06:40 -0500
Date: Sun, 24 Nov 96 23:05:55 EST
From: Judy Tanur <JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu>
Organization: State University of New York at Stony Brook
Subject: Re: Happy Birthday to Us!
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: Message of Thu, 21 Nov 1996 03:36:13 -0800 (PST) from
<beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
X-Mailer: MailBook 95.01.000
Message-Id: <961124.230639.EST.JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu>

Let me add my voice to the chorus of thanks to Jim for making aapornet possible

and keeping it going. Judy Tanur

>From Mitofsky@aol.com Sun Nov 24 21:53:45 1996
Return-Path: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: from emout18.mail.aol.com (emout18.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.44])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id VAA13572 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 24 Nov 1996 21:53:43 -0800
(PST)
From: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: by emout18.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id AAA04287 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 00:53:12 -0500
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 1996 00:53:12 -0500
Message-ID: <961125005311_1385911701@emout18.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: need advice on sample size

In a message dated 96-11-23 03:02:04 EST, you write:

<< The above is actually more confusing. Take for example a 95 percent confidence interval of +/-3 percentage points. What you can say is that the

probability that the random interval (i.e., X-3, X+3) covers the unknown
TRUE
POPULATION VALUE is .95.

Daniel Merkle
>>

The probability that the TRUE POPULATION VALUE is in AN interval is 0 or 1.
The .95 refers to something else. If a very large number of samples were
selected the proportion of intervals created around the sample mean that
would contain the TRUE POPULATION VALUE is .95

warren mitofsky

>From 71501.716@CompuServe.COM Mon Nov 25 05:46:58 1996
Return-Path: 71501.716@CompuServe.COM
Received: from dub-img-4.compuserve.com (dub-img-4.compuserve.com
[149.174.206.134])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id FAA26414 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 05:46:56 -0800
(PST)
Received: by dub-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id IAA01644; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 08:46:26 -0500
Date: 25 Nov 96 08:44:27 EST
From: "Margaret R. Roller" <71501.716@CompuServe.COM>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Congrats to Jim!!!
Message-ID: <961125134427_71501.716_FHD58-6@CompuServe.COM>

I just want to add my congratulations to Jim on the absolutely
wonderful job he has done with AAPORNET. As a member of
other lists, it is obvious to me that list management is not an
easy task. And, I know of no other list manager that has
performed as well as Jim. Thanks for a job very well done, Jim!

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
Tel 804-758-3236
Fax 804-758-0411
email: 71501.716@compuserve.com

>From dykema@ssc.wisc.edu Mon Nov 25 10:26:01 1996
Return-Path: dykema@ssc.wisc.edu
Received: from eunice.ssc.wisc.edu (eunice.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.190.81])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA06590 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 10:25:56 -0800
(PST)
Received: from EAGLE.DECnet MAIL11D_V3 by eunice.ssc.wisc.edu;
id AA29530; 5.65/43; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 12:23:24 -0600
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 1996 12:23:23 -0600
Message-Id: <9611251823.AA29530@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>
From: dykema@ssc.wisc.edu (Jennifer Dykema)
To: aapornet@ssc.wisc.edu
Cc: STEVENSON@ssc.wisc.edu
Subject: Inquiry about behavior coding programs

Dear Colleagues,

The following message concerns interest in locating and obtaining

software to "behavior code" or "interaction code" interviewer-respondent interactions.

We are planning on undertaking a large-scale project for which we would like to behavior code (interaction code) tape recordings of telephone interviews about child support transfers.

We would like to know about the existence and availability of programs of this type. Any information members of this list have will be greatly appreciated!

Please respond directly to me and I will post a summary to the list.

Thanks, Jennifer

Jennifer Dykema	Office: (608) 263-3853
Department of Sociology	FAX: (608) 262-8400
1180 Observatory Drive	Email: DYKEMA@ssc.wisc.edu
University of Wisconsin-Madison	
Madison, WI 53706	

>From Jennifer.M.Rothgeb@ccMail.Census.GOV Mon Nov 25 11:20:11 1996
Return-Path: Jennifer.M.Rothgeb@ccMail.Census.GOV
Received: from info.census.gov (info.census.gov [148.129.129.10])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP
id LAA19271 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 11:20:08 -0800
(PST)
Received: from gate.census.gov (gate.census.gov [148.129.129.2]) by
info.census.gov (8.8.3/8.7.3) with SMTP id OAA25798 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Mon, 25 Nov 1996 14:19:35 -0500 (EST)
Received: from it-relay1.census.gov by gate.census.gov with SMTP id AA26580
(InterLock SMTP Gateway 3.0 for <aapornet@usc.edu>);
Mon, 25 Nov 1996 14:19:34 -0500
Received: from smtp-gw1.census.gov ([148.129.126.72]) by
it-relay1.census.gov (8.8.3/8.7.3/v1.9) with SMTP id OAA07530 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 14:19:32 -0500 (EST)
Received: from ccMail by smtp-gw1.census.gov (SMTPLINK V2.10.05)
id AA848960711; Mon, 25 Nov 96 14:20:24 EST
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 96 14:20:24 EST
From: "Jennifer M Rothgeb" <Jennifer.M.Rothgeb@ccMail.Census.GOV>
Message-Id: <9610258489.AA848960711@smtp-gw1.census.gov>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Inquiry about behavior coding programs

Jennifer

The only software I know of related to behavior coding is Ruth Bolton's stuff, and it's been a while since I read about her research, so I'm not even sure if that's appropriate to what you need.

Hope things are going well for you. I had an opportunity to visit with Nora and Emma a couple of weeks ago. What a doll that Emma is!!

Jennifer

>
>
>
>
>
>
>t 05:52 PM 11/22/96 -0600, you wrote:
>>
>>I would like to second everything Dick Halpern said. Jim has done a
>>great job!
>>
>> Phil Tichenor
>>
>>On Fri, 22 Nov 1996, richard s. halpern wrote:
>>
>>> And a hearty congratulations to Jim for making it all happen! I think we
>>> all
>>> owe him a deep debt of gratitude. AAPORNET has been enormously
>>> interesting
>>> and certainly helpful, and I think it has added immeasurably to the
>>> sense of
>>> professional (as well as social) community that AAPOR has always
>>> encouraged
>>> and been noted for.
>>>
>>> Thanks, Jim
>>>
>>>
>>> Dick Halpern
>>>
>>>
>>> *****
>>> *****
>>> Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. Phone/Fax: (770) 434 4121
>>> Halpern & Associates E-Mail: rshalp@cris.com
>>> Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research E-Mail:
>>> rshalp@concentric.net
>>> 3837 Courtyard Drive
>>> Atlanta, Georgia 30339-4248
>>>
>>> *****
>>> *****
>>>
>>
>Dr. Sidney Kraus
>Dept. of Communication
>College of Arts & Sciences
>Cleveland State University
>email: s.kraus@csuohio.edu
>
>
Dr. Sidney Kraus
Dept. of Communication
College of Arts & Sciences
Cleveland State University
email: s.kraus@csuohio.edu

>From je7@columbia.edu Tue Nov 26 13:23:56 1996

Return-Path: je7@columbia.edu
Received: from aloha.cc.columbia.edu (aloha.cc.columbia.edu [128.59.35.134])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA11084 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 13:23:54 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (je7@localhost) by aloha.cc.columbia.edu
(8.8.3/8.8.3) with SMTP id QAA02062 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Nov 1996
16:23:53 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 16:23:52 -0500 (EST)
From: Jack Elinson <je7@columbia.edu>
Sender: je7@columbia.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Happy Birthday to Us!
In-Reply-To: <961124.230639.EST.JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu>
Message-ID:
<Pine.SUN.3.95L.961126162259.28245D-100000@aloha.cc.columbia.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Sun, 24 Nov 1996, Judy Tanur wrote:

> Let me add my voice to the chorus of thanks to Jim for making aapornet
> possible
> and keeping it going. Judy Tanur
>
> And mine Jack Elinson>
>

>From abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU Tue Nov 26 14:08:51 1996
Return-Path: <@lists.Princeton.EDU:abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU>
Received: from lists.Princeton.EDU (root@lists.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.129.249])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA20825 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 14:08:49 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU ([128.112.129.131]) by
lists.Princeton.EDU with ESMTP id <370191.s3-1>; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 17:08:36
-0500
Received: from bundespost.Princeton.EDU (bundespost.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.128.119]) by ponyexpress.Princeton.EDU (8.6.12/8.6.12) with ESMTP
id RAA06945; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 17:08:32 -0500
Received: from wws214.Princeton.EDU (wws214.Princeton.EDU [128.112.44.69])
by bundespost.Princeton.EDU (SMI-8.6/8.6.12) with SMTP id RAA12342; Tue, 26
Nov 1996 17:08:29 -0500
Message-ID: <329B9415.28CE@wws.princeton.edu>
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 17:06:29 -0800
From: Herb Abelson <abelson@wws.Princeton.EDU>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win16; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu, POR@frosty.irss.unc.edu
Subject: Responses to inquiry about children research.
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; name="COMPILE2.WPD"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline; filename="COMPILE2.WPD"

November 26, 1996

Thanks to everyone who replied to my inquiry about experience with children as survey respondents. (Posted Nov 15)

Here is a slightly edited version of the replies. Not so incidentally, thanks to Jim Beniger for an incredibly well managed listserv.

From: Norma Pecora <PECORA@ouvaxa.cats.ohiou.edu>

My research has been on the children's entertainment industry and I have a background in survey research at NORC and the University of Maryland, Survey Research Center. I am trying to bring those together here at Ohio University.

I would be very interested in knowing what you learn through the responses to your postings and to contribute in any way I can to your work.

From: "Sherry Marcy" <smarcy@datastat.com>

DataStat has done the telephone interviewing for *two* major studies about children.

First, the "Speaking of Kids" survey, done by the National Commission on Children in 1990 in conjunction with Child Trends, Inc. and Princeton Survey Research, talked to kids 10-17 *and their parents* about some of the issues you mention. The survey included African-American and Latino/a oversamples.

Second, we did the phone interviewing of parents of very young children last year for The Commonwealth Fund. In this one, we did *not* talk to the kids, although you may be interested in the results.

Finally, we fairly routinely interview kids regarding television shows they may or may not like to watch, for a media client.

From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@educ.uva.nl>

Two short remarks: At the 1995 Bristol conference on Survey measurement and process quality Jackie Scott presented a paper on how they in Britain surveyed children as part of an official (census) survey. She includes some interesting things about pretesting questionnaires with focus groups of children. The paper will be published in the Monograph (in press now by Wiley), but as editor of the monograph I have a copy and can send it to you. (I also co-authored a small article on errors in questionnaires)

when children are subjects).

Secondly, we have a project here at the department of education on surveying children. One of our graduate students (Natacha Borgers) is now starting to collect and reanalyze datafiles of children (child's questionnaires) regarding cognitive growth and data quality. Her name is Natacha Borgers, and in a couple of months she will have some nice preliminary results. I will ask her direct supervisor (professor Hox) to contact you. I do think that it will be fruitful for us all to keep in touch and share our experiences.

best personal regards, Edith

From: "EFuchs" <efuchs@SMTPLink.Barnard.Columbia.edu>

There is an organization in NYC called PENCIL run by Lisa Belzberg. They did a survey of NYC highschool kids. It was very interesting and you might find it useful. Her number is (212) 9091724.

Ester Fuchs,
Director, Barnard-Columbia Center for Urban Policy

From: Robert Bezilla <rbezilla@ix.netcom.com>

The Gallup Youth Survey has been studying children since 1977. It generally covers the ages 13 to 17, and on occasion has interviewed those 12 or younger. GYS is an entity of The George H. Gallup International Institute. I am its director and further inquiries should be directed to me.

From: "Kris Moore (CTI)" <76712.3004@compuserve.com>

Sara -- I got a copy of your e-mail indicating an interest in survey firms that do work on children. There are two good ones right in Princeton. One is Princeton Survey Research Associates, headed by a U. of Michigan sociologist named Diane Colosanto. She does a fair amount of polling and market work, but loves research studies, especially on family issues. The second is RAC, which stands for Response Analysis Corporation; they have been working with MDRC and Child Trends for about five years on the JOBS study. I think they have done a really solid job overall. Hope all goes well. Regards -- Kris Moore, whose real e-mail is kmoore@child trends.org.

From: Dcolasanto@aol.com

In 1990, we conducted the "Speaking of Kids" survey for the National Commission on Children, headed by Senator Jay Rockefeller. We interviewed 929 kids age 10-17, and their parents. We also interviewed parents of younger kids. The sample contained over-samples of Black, Hispanic and low-income families.

We have conducted three surveys about children's health and safety practices for Prevention magazine. Two of these surveys included interviews with children, as well as parents. PSRA designed a "Children's Health Index" to highlight the specific health and developmental challenges facing America's children.

We conducted a survey about children's perspectives on violence that was jointly sponsored by Newsweek magazine, Disney, and the Children's Defense Fund. The survey results served as the basis for a National Children's Day forum in 1993.

This year we interviewed 1,510 teens age 12-18 for The Kaiser Family Foundation to investigate teenagers' knowledge and attitudes about contraception and the risk of unplanned pregnancy. We are currently conducting another study for The Kaiser Family Foundation where we have interviewed 365 children age 10 to 15 and their parents (parents of younger children were also interviewed). The general topic is how parents and children discuss sensitive issues, particularly those related to sexuality.

This survey will not be released until later this year.

We have conducted other surveys on children's issues where parents, but not children, were interviewed. If you'd like to know about these too, just let me know.

Diane

Date: Thu, 14 Nov 1996 14:45:04 -0500

From: CODA89@aol.com

Nick Zill, now at Westat, has done some interesting surveys of children.

Doris Northrup

CODA, Inc.

From: tarnai@wsu.edu

FYI: In response to your AAPORnet email message, I would be glad to tell you that my organization has some experience in this area. We recently completed a large

statewide RDD survey of household residents, which included interviews of adolescents between the ages of 12 and 17 for a study of alcohol and drug use. We gained some valuable experience in the problems and procedures involved in conducting these kinds of surveys. We are currently repeating a similar survey for the state of Idaho, and we plan on making a number of changes to improve overall response rates. We also currently are participating in proposals for two nationwide telephone surveys of adolescents age 12 to 17 about alcohol and drug issues. Hopethis helps.

* John Tarnai *
* SESRC & Assessment *
* Washington State University *
* Pullman, WA 99164-4014 *
* Tel: 509/335-1511 *

|

>From frh@asc.upenn.edu Wed Nov 27 05:49:12 1996
Return-Path: frh@asc.upenn.edu
Received: from noc4.dccs.upenn.edu (NOC4.DCCS.UPENN.EDU [128.91.254.39])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP

id FAA22446 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 05:49:10 -0800
(PST)
From: frh@asc.upenn.edu
Received: from asc.upenn.edu (ASC.UPENN.EDU [130.91.52.31]) by
noc4.dccs.upenn.edu (8.7.6/8.7.3) with SMTP id IAA08385 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 08:49:05 -0500
Received: from cc:Mail by asc.upenn.edu
id AA849113609; Wed, 27 Nov 96 08:48:01 edt
Date: Wed, 27 Nov 96 08:48:01 edt
Encoding: 44 Text
Message-Id: <9610278491.AA849113609@asc.upenn.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Annenberg Scholars Program

THE ANNENBERG SCHOLARS PROGRAM FOR FALL 1997

DYNAMICS OF DIFFUSION

The Annenberg Scholar Program for 1997 (Fall Semester only) invites proposals for research on the dynamics of diffusion implicit in one or more disciplines in the humanities, social and biological sciences, and medical epidemiology. The aim is to examine how ideas, behavior or institutional practices diffuse within and across societies. These diffusion processes are embedded in the work of many disciplines, and we are interested in comparing the theories and methods that are used to describe them. Topics might range from the history of religions to health behavior, from stylistic change in fashion and the arts to technology transfer across cultures.

Applicants are asked to propose a project of research and writing that addresses the theme. Proposals should be concise but specific, and will be judged for their quality and feasibility. Preference will be given to projects informed by empirical observations.

Scholars are offered a stipend of \$30,000 for the Fall Semester (September-December 1997), and are expected to reside in the Philadelphia area during their appointment to the school. Scholars participate in the Program's weekly seminar, and prepare a paper or monograph.

Applicants should have a doctoral degree, and ideally, some years of post-doctoral experience. In addition to the project proposal, the application must include a curriculum vitae. Three letters of recommendation should be forwarded separately.

Requests for further information and research proposals should be addressed to Professor Elihu Katz, Director, Annenberg Scholars Program, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, 3620 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6220. Information can also be obtained by phone (215-898-4775) or by fax (215-898-2024). Applications and recommendations should be submitted by February 3. Announcement of awards will be

made by March 14. Six awards will be made.

>From lees@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu Wed Nov 27 08:07:15 1996
Return-Path: lees@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu
Received: from research.circ.gwu.edu (research.circ.gwu.edu
[128.164.127.250])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA10224 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 08:07:12 -0800
(PST)
Received: from gwis2.circ.gwu.edu (gwis2.circ.gwu.edu [128.164.127.252]) by
research.circ.gwu.edu (8.8.3/8.6.12) with ESMTTP id LAA11823 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 11:06:37 -0500 (EST)
Received: from localhost (lees@localhost) by gwis2.circ.gwu.edu
(8.8.3/8.6.12) with SMTP id LAA08135 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Nov
1996 11:07:04 -0500 (EST)
Date: Wed, 27 Nov 1996 11:07:04 -0500 (EST)
From: Lee Sigelman <lees@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Special issue on political forecasting
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.93.961127110236.2863B-100000@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

(Please excuse any duplication. I'm posting this to three lists, so you
may receive it more than once.)

Special Issue of the International Journal of Forecasting on Political
Forecasting

The International Journal of Forecasting is planning a special issue on
political forecasting. Submissions are invited on such topics as:

- methods for modeling election outcomes
- the predictive value of polls and surveys
- assessments of particular election predictions for the
US, UK, Russia, Israel, etc., in recent years and/or,
where feasible, the more distant past
- analysis of the factors that shape election outcomes,
with attention to their predictive value in the future

Theoretical analyses, empirical studies, and reviews are welcomed. All
submissions will be peer-reviewed.

Authors considering submitting material for this special issue are
encouraged to contact one of the special issue editors as soon as
possible.

Submissions from the Western Hemisphere should be sent by
September 15, 1997 to either:

Lee Sigelman
Department of Political Science

The George Washington University
Washington DC 20052 USA

or

H.O. Stekler

Department of Economics
The George Washington University
Washington DC 20052 USA

Submissions from the rest of the world should be sent by September
15,1997 to:

Prof. Roy Batchelor
Department of Banking and Finance
City University Business School
Barbican
London EC2Y

8HB
UK

Lee Sigelman
Department of Political Science
The George Washington University
Washington, DC 20052

VOICE: (202) 994-6290
FAX: (202) 994-7743
E-MAIL: lees@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu

>From wordwitch@prodigy.com Wed Nov 27 22:31:40 1996
Return-Path: wordwitch@prodigy.com
Received: from pimaia4w.prodigy.com (pimaia4w.prodigy.com [198.83.18.139])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id WAA21681 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 22:31:36 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mime2.prodigy.com (mime2.prodigy.com [192.168.253.26]) by
pimaia4w.prodigy.com (8.6.10/8.6.9) with ESMTTP id BAA10344 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Nov 1996 01:21:53 -0500
Received: (from root@localhost) by mime2.prodigy.com (8.6.10/8.6.9) id
BAA25498 for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 28 Nov 1996 01:15:48 -0500
Message-Id: <199611280615.BAA25498@mime2.prodigy.com>
X-Mailer: Prodigy Internet GW(v0.9beta) - ae01dm04sc03
From: wordwitch@prodigy.com (R M SCHWARZ)
Date: Thu, 28 Nov 1996 01:15:48, -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Survey research on children

Herb:

I am assuming you are interested in recent research on children, not
on things like the DHEW Runaways study from 1975 and a study using
projective techniques to interview children of addicts in surrogate
care, about the same vintage. If you do want info on these, let me
know.

Rosi

>From Michael.Margolis@UC.Edu Thu Nov 28 07:07:23 1996
Return-Path: Michael.Margolis@UC.Edu

Received: from blues.fdl.uc.edu (blues.fdl.uc.edu [129.137.244.7])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA07067 for <aapornet@usc.EDU>; Thu, 28 Nov 1996 07:07:21 -0800
(PST)
Received: from [129.137.178.184] (ucxy06-01.slip.uc.edu)
by UCBEH.SAN.UC.EDU (PMDF V5.0-7 #15949)
id <01ICDJ0VA99CAZT806@UCBEH.SAN.UC.EDU>; Thu, 28 Nov 1996 10:05:39 -0500
(EST)
Date: Thu, 28 Nov 1996 10:10:08 -0500
From: Michael.Margolis@UC.Edu (Mike Margolis)
Subject: Statistics on Internet users
To: PSRT-L@mizzoul.MISSOURI.EDU, por@frosty.irss.unc.EDU, aapornet@usc.EDU
Cc: David.Resnick@UC.Edu, Bonnie.Fisher@UC.Edu
Message-id: <v01540b0aaec3554f718c@[129.137.178.184]>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Does anyone have or know where to obtain reliable statistics on the proportions of Internet Users who primarily "surf the web" to find entertaining or informative Websites versus those who primarily use the Net to participate in newsgroups, Listservs or to send e-mail? Thanks. Mike Margolis.

Michael Margolis
Dep't of Political Science
University of Cincinnati ML0375
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375
Tel: 513-556-3310 Fax: 513-556-2314

>From dg@SEI.CMU.EDU Fri Nov 29 09:01:31 1996
Return-Path: dg@SEI.CMU.EDU
Received: from as0a.sei.cmu.edu (as0a.sei.cmu.edu [128.237.1.11])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA23480 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Nov 1996 09:01:30 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ts3a.sei.cmu.edu by as0a.sei.cmu.edu (8.6.10/3.00)
id LAA18683; Fri, 29 Nov 1996 11:52:08 -0500
Received: from localhost.sei.cmu.edu by ts3a.sei.cmu.edu (8.6.10/3.00)
id LAA08343; Fri, 29 Nov 1996 11:51:59 -0500
Message-Id: <199611291651.LAA08343@ts3a.sei.cmu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Statistics on Internet users
In-reply-to: Your message of "Thu, 28 Nov 96 10:10:08 EST."
<v01540b0aaec3554f718c@[129.137.178.184]>
Date: Fri, 29 Nov 96 11:51:58 EST
From: Dennis R Goldenson <dg@SEI.CMU.EDU>

Michael, et al.,

See the most recent issue of Communications of the ACM (Association for Computing Machinery), December 1996, Volume 39, number 12, for a series of articles on "The Internet@Home." I haven't yet read it, so I'm not sure how they address your question about web use versus other participation. I suspect that the statistics (and cites) are about as good as you'll get right

now though. See, esp., the lead article by Hoffman, Kalsbeek, and Novak.

Enjoy,

Dennis

Dennis R. Goldenson	Office:	412/268-8506
Software Engineering Institute	Fax:	412/268-5758
Carnegie Mellon University	Internet:	dg@sei.cmu.edu
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890		

In message <v01540b0aaec3554f718c@[129.137.178.184]> you write:

>
> Does anyone have or know where to obtain reliable statistics on the
> proportions of Internet Users who primarily "surf the web" to find
> entertaining or informative Websites versus those who primarily use the
> Net
> to participate in newsgroups, Listservs or to send e-mail? Thanks. Mike
> Margolis.
>
> Michael Margolis
> Dep't of Political Science
> University of Cincinnati ML0375
> Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375
> Tel: 513-556-3310 Fax: 513-556-2314
>
>
>