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

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

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

Shap Wolf

Survey Research Laboratory

Arizona State University

shap.wolf@asu.edu

AAPORNET volunteer host

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9911.

Part 1/1, total size 1161910 bytes:

----------------------------- Cut here -----------------------------

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Nov 1 10:50:44 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.166])

    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

    id KAA29956 for ; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 10:50:43 -0800 (PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

Fellow AAPORNETters,

In William Safire's regular op-ed page column in this morning's New York
Times, he attacks what he calls "Gramm-Summers," the agreement between
Senate Banking Chair Phil Gramm and Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers "to
knock down all fire walls between banks, insurance companies and brokerage
houses." Because the second half of this column raises serious questions
about the privacy and confidentiality of data of many types, I post it here
to AAPORNET.

                         -- Jim

_____

_____

November 1, 1999

ESSAY / By WILLIAM SAFIRE

Running Huge Risks

WASHINGTON -- Americans are unaware that Congress
and the president have just agreed to put us all
at extraordinary financial and personal risk.

[The first part of the column discusses what Safire
 sees as the financial risk, which he does not
 relate to privacy, and hence is omitted here.]

But that's just a monetary risk that, come
hard-to-imagine hard times, would wipe out a
decade's projected surplus. More irreversible is
a greater risk that we are assuming this month --
the much more imminent risk to our private lives.

We have already seen the veil over our health
records ripped away. The feckless G.O.P. Congress
tossed that hot potato to Clinton, who caved to
the insurance and hospital lobbies. The key word
is consent. Instead of requiring written
permission from patients before confidential

health records are shopped to drug marketers or shown to prospective employers, Clinton's phony "controls" put patients and doctors at a disadvantage.

As for financial privacy, the Gramm-Summers sellout makes your bank account everybody's business. You will hear much huffing and puffing about privacy protection as the fire walls are torn down, especially about allowing you to object after the fact to the handing-around of your personal records, like a plate of cookies, to other companies.

Here's the catch: What happens when those "outside companies" are not outside at all -- but are part of one great big family of broker-banking-insurance services? Then, without your consent, the private information you write on your mortgage application, with your tax return attached, goes to your insurance company, which already has your health history -- and its snoops can also see your investment behavior and what you've been buying with your credit cards.

Under Gramm-Summers, giant financial conglomerates -- using other surveillance to protect against fraud -- will know more about your money habits, your assets, your diseases and

your genetic makeup than your spouse or paramour does, and probably more than you do.

And just as he has done with his health-privacy "protection," Mr. Clinton will sign the bipartisan legislation, leaving you naked to any prying eyes with an Orwellian statement about how this protects your privacy.

Listen for the word consent. Listen for the word permission. You won't hear them, because that puts the expensive obligation on the marketers and snoops to seek your consent and alert you to their intrusion.

Instead, you will hear malarkey about how you will have control. That code word means that you must search for invasions of your privacy from punch-this-number telephone-answering computers and impenetrable bureaucracies. Some "control."

Sheer size rules. We look to government either to regulate monopoly or enforce competition. But as we have deregulated to let the free market operate, government has failed to enforce antitrust laws to maintain competition in media and now in money.

Today's result: mergermania, dangerous

concentration of financial risk, and the even

greater risk to that part of our freedom we call

privacy.

_____

_____

****

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Nov 1 11:35:50 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.166])

    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

    id LAA03579 for ; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 11:35:50 -0800 (PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

    by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

    id LAA06700 for ; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 11:35:28 -0800 (PST)

Date: Mon, 1 Nov 1999 11:34:10 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger

To: AAPORNET

Subject: Monitoring Internet Habits

Message-ID:

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

In a lead story on the front page of this morning's New York Times business section, Sara Robinson reports on the data collection

methods of the Internet company RealNetworks, which she says all of the privacy advocates and security experts she has interviewed

condemn as a violation of privacy.

Here we might also glimpse one likely future direction for social and market research. If we don't like that future, the time to

begin to discuss and act on the problem perhaps has come.

-- Jim

_____

_____

November 1, 1999

CD Software Is Said to Monitor Users' Listening Habits

By SARA ROBINSON

RealNetworks' popular RealJukebox software for

playing CD's on computers surreptitiously

monitors the listening habits and certain other

activities of people who use it and continually

reports this information, along with the user's identity, to RealNetworks, said a security expert who intercepted and examined data generated by the program.

In interviews last week, company officials acknowledged that RealJukebox, which can copy music to a user's hard drive and download it from the Internet as well as play it, gathers information on what music users are playing and recording.

Dave Richards, RealNetworks' vice president for consumer products, said the company gathered the information to customize services for individual users.

He and other company officials insisted that the practice did not violate consumer privacy because the information was not being stored by RealNetworks nor distributed to other companies.

But privacy advocates and security experts interviewed last week were unanimous in condemning the practice, calling it a violation of the privacy of the 13.5 million registered users of RealJukebox, almost all of whom have given the company their names and e-mail addresses.

Even if the company's use of the data is benign, these experts said, the practice is unacceptable because of the secrecy: RealNetworks, one of the largest distributors of audio software on the Internet, does not inform consumers that they are being identified and monitored by the company.

The information that RealNetworks gathers is extensive. According to Richard M. Smith, an independent Internet security consultant from Brookline, Mass., who discovered RealJukebox's monitoring functions, each time the program is started on a computer connected to the Internet, it sends in the following information to the company: the number of songs stored on the user's hard drive; the kind of file formats -- RealAudio or MP3 -- the songs are stored in; the quality level of the recordings; the user's preferred music genre, and the type of portable music player, if any, that the user has connected to the computer. Officials at RealNetworks said most of this information was used to offer music selections to users based on their preferences.

All this information is combined with a personal serial number known as a globally unique identifier, or GUID, which is assigned to each user when he or she registers the software.

RealJukebox is distributed only on the Internet, and users are instructed to register -- giving the company their names, e-mail addresses and ZIP codes -- when they install the software.

What is more, if RealJukebox is used with its default settings, it automatically loads each time a CD is inserted in the CD-ROM drive, and if the computer is connected to the Internet, the title of the CD is sent, together with the GUID, to RealNetworks.

"Either they have been dazzlingly careless with their treatment of personally identifiable information or they are completely disingenuous," said Jason Catlett, founder and president of Junkbusters, a privacy watchdog organization. "Which is worse? If they are not disclosing what they are doing, that is unconscionable."

Some other CD player programs also assign GUID's to each copy of the software. The difference lies in what they do with it. The Microsoft Corporation, for example, says that the unique identifier in its Windows Media Player is used for such things as purchasing multimedia from a Web site. It is not routed through Microsoft, nor does Microsoft require users to register, and it

does not gather information through Media Player, said a spokesman for Waggener Edstrom, a public relations firm that represents Microsoft.

The fact that RealJukebox is gathering this information is not mentioned in the long privacy policy the company posts on its Web site. Nor is it acknowledged in the licensing agreement that users must approve when installing the program.

David Banisar, a lawyer in Washington who specializes in Internet law, said that RealNetworks' surveillance practices could violate various state and federal statutes, including the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act. "It's a new type of case that hasn't been brought before," he said. "But I think it's a pretty good case."

Banisar argued that RealJukebox could be considered a "trojan horse," a legitimate program that contains hidden instructions to perform illegitimate functions.

Company officials said on Friday that the registration procedure for the free version of RealJukebox did ask for personal information, including name and e-mail address, but they said that users could skip the registration and still

use the program and that RealJukebox would stop prompting users to register after five attempts. Some customers, they said, had stumbled on this fact and had declined to register.

However, customers who purchase RealJukebox Plus, a version with enhanced features that RealNetworks sells online for $29.99 with a money-back guarantee, cannot avoid registering since they must type in a unique serial number to install the program. And in this case, RealNetworks also gathers credit card and mailing address information before it assigns the number.

Richards of RealNetworks said the reason the program tallied the number of songs a user had recorded was to enable the company to determine whether the user was "na?ve" or "sophisticated." This better enables the software to steer sophisticated users toward its advanced features, he said.

But this seemed at odds with a statement by Steve Banfield, RealNetworks' general manager of consumer products, who said the company was gathering only "aggregate usage" information about users of the software.

Privacy experts said the kind of information

being gathered by RealJukebox had the potential
to be used to detect copyright violations.

Banfield said that to his knowledge, the company
had no plans to allow information about
individual users to be used in this manner.

But Catlett of Junkbusters said that such
information could be subpoenaed under the Digital
Millennium Copyright Act. "This usage and
tracking information is a way for them to collect
intrusive profiles about people and possibly set
up prosecutions for copyright infringements," he
said.

Like some 250 other such programs, RealJukebox
licenses the right to use a database of CD titles
and tracks that is compiled and maintained by a
company called CDDB. This enables the software to
display the title and tracks of a CD moments
after it is loaded into the computer.

To do this, the program must send out information
to CDDB every time a user plays a CD.

But unlike other popular programs, RealJukebox
routes the information through its own servers
and tags it with the GUID, which uniquely
identifies the user.

Banfield said the information went to CDDB via a proxy server, a computer that masks certain data, to protect the privacy of RealJukebox users. He said it was his understanding that CDDB typically collected a user's e-mail addresses each time its database was queried, but by using a proxy server, he said, RealNetworks' users were all generically identified as user@real.com.

Banfield painted RealNetworks as a defender of consumer privacy, asserting: "Everyone else who uses that database sends them their e-mail address. We don't."

Ann Greenberg, senior vice president of marketing and business development for CDDB, said last week that her company "strongly encourages but does not require" e-mail addresses or any other identifiers that enable the company to tally unique users of its database. She said the addresses were purged every four days. But she said it was not fair for RealNetworks' to blame CDDB for gathering personal information.

****

>From kbcg@mindspring.com Mon Nov 1 14:16:33 1999

Received: from smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (smtp7.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.128.51])

    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP

    id OAA01383 for ; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 14:16:32 -0800 (PST)

Received: from fb0zt (user-38lcem8.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.58.200])

    by smtp7.atl.mindspring.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id RAA19411

    for ; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 17:16:30 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <000001bf249b$685cb460$21a8a8c0@fb0zt>

From: "Chris Grecco"

To:

Subject: Position Announcement

Date: Mon, 1 Nov 1999 10:25:11 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

    boundary="----=_NextPart_000_026C_01BF2453.60C6F3C0"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_026C_01BF2453.60C6F3C0

Content-Type: text/plain;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

Position Announcement

King, Brown & Partners, Inc. a full service market research company is = looking for senior quantitative market research

professionals. = Candidates must have at least 3 years experience managing major = quantitative research projects. We work with

many of the largest = consumer (Disney, GAP, BofA) and technology (Microsoft, HP, Sun) = companies in the country using traditional

and online methodologies.

Positions are being considered for both the firm's Sausalito, CA and = Lexington, KY offices.

Please fax or email your resume and salary requirements to Chris Grecco.

chris@kingbrown.com

f. 606.335.0261

http://www.kingbrown.com

Position Announcement

King, Brown & = Partners, Inc.=20 a full service market research company is looking for senior = quantitative market=20

research professionals.Candidates must have at least 3 years = experience=20 managing major quantitative research projects. We work with many of the=20

largest consumer (Disney, GAP, BofA) and technology (Microsoft, HP, = Sun)=20 companies in the country using traditional and online=20

methodologies.

Positions are being considered for both the = firm's=20 Sausalito, CA and Lexington, KY offices.

Please fax or email your = resume=20 and salary requirements to Chris Grecco.

chris@kingbrown.com

=

f. 606.335.0261

http://www.kingbrown.com ------

=_NextPart_000_026C_01BF2453.60C6F3C0--

>From teed@clark.net

Mon Nov 1 17:21:31 1999

Received: from smtp-out.vma.verio.net (smtp-out.vma.verio.net [168.143.0.23])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id RAA22990 for ; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 17:21:19 -0800 (PST)

Received: from smtp-gw2.vma.verio.net ([168.143.0.22])

by smtp-out.vma.verio.net with esmtp (Exim 2.10 #1) id 11iSdR-0003fq-00 for aapornet@usc.edu;

Mon, 1 Nov 1999 20:21:17 -0500

Received: from 16jvr (teed.clark.net [168.143.18.20]) by smtp-gw2.vma.verio.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id UAA21391 for ;

Mon, 1 Nov 1999 20:21:15 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <004401bf24d1$1b0a7c20$14128fa8@16jvr>

From: "Nancy & Phil Teed"

To: References:

Subject: Re: Gramm-Summers and Privacy

Date: Mon, 1 Nov 1999 19:55:22 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority:

Normal X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200 more privacy stuff

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

From: James Beniger

To: AAPORNET

Sent: Monday, November 01, 1999 1:50 PM

Subject: Gramm-Summers and Privacy

> > > > Fellow AAPORNETters,

> > In William Safire's regular op-ed page column in this morning's New

> York Times, he attacks what he calls "Gramm-Summers," the agreement

> between Senate Banking Chair Phil Gramm and Treasury Secretary

> Lawrence Summers "to knock down all fire walls between banks,

> insurance companies and brokerage houses." Because the second half of

> this column raises serious questions about the privacy and

> confidentiality of data of many types, I post it here to AAPORNET.

> -- Jim

>

> _____ ____

>

> Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

> _____ ____

>

>

> November 1, 1999

>

> ESSAY / By WILLIAM SAFIRE

>

> Running Huge Risks

>

> WASHINGTON -- Americans are unaware that Congress

> and the president have just agreed to put us all

> at extraordinary financial and personal risk.

>

> --

> [The first part of the column discusses what Safire

> sees as the financial risk, which he does not

> relate to privacy, and hence is omitted here.]

> --

>

> But that's just a monetary risk that, come

> hard-to-imagine hard times, would wipe out a

> decade's projected surplus. More irreversible is

> a greater risk that we are assuming this month --

> the much more imminent risk to our private lives.

>

> We have already seen the veil over our health

> records ripped away. The feckless G.O.P. Congress

> tossed that hot potato to Clinton, who caved to

> the insurance and hospital lobbies. The key word

> is consent. Instead of requiring written

> permission from patients before confidential

> health records are shopped to drug marketers or

> shown to prospective employers, Clinton's phony

> "controls" put patients and doctors at a > disadvantage.

>

> As for financial privacy, the Gramm-Summers

> sellout makes your bank account everybody's

> business. You will hear much huffing and puffing

> about privacy protection as the fire walls are

> torn down, especially about allowing you to

> object after the fact to the handing-around of

> your personal records, like a plate of cookies,

> to other companies.

>

> Here's the catch: What happens when those

> "outside companies" are not outside at all -- but

> are part of one great big family of

> broker-banking-insurance services? Then, without

> your consent, the private information you write

> on your mortgage application, with your tax

> return attached, goes to your insurance company,

> which already has your health history -- and its

> snoops can also see your investment behavior and

> what you've been buying with your credit cards.

>

> Under Gramm-Summers, giant financial

> conglomerates -- using other surveillance to

> protect against fraud -- will know more about

> your money habits, your assets, your diseases and

> your genetic makeup than your spouse or paramour

> does, and probably more than you do.

>

> And just as he has done with his health-privacy

> "protection," Mr. Clinton will sign the

> bipartisan legislation, leaving you naked to any

> prying eyes with an Orwellian statement about how

> this protects your privacy.

>

> Listen for the word consent. Listen for the word

> permission. You won't hear them, because that

> puts the expensive obligation on the marketers

> and snoops to seek your consent and alert you to

> their intrusion.

>

> Instead, you will hear malarkey about how you

> will have control. That code word means that you

> must search for invasions of your privacy from

> punch-this-number telephone-answering computers

> and impenetrable bureaucracies. Some "control."

>

> Sheer size rules. We look to government either to

> regulate monopoly or enforce competition. But as

> we have deregulated to let the free market

> operate, government has failed to enforce

> antitrust laws to maintain competition in media

> and now in money.

>

> Today's result: mergermania, dangerous

> concentration of financial risk, and the even

> greater risk to that part of our freedom we call

> privacy.

>

> _____ ____

>

> Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

> _____ ____

>

>

> *******

>

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Mon Nov 1 18:01:28 1999

Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net [207.69.200.246]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id SAA00292 for ; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 18:01:27 -0800 (PST)

Received: from default (user-38lcadf.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.41.175]) by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id VAA09547 for ; Mon, 1 Nov 1999 21:01:25 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991101202337.009df3a0@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Mon, 01 Nov 1999 20:30:16 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern Subject:

Re: Gramm-Summers and Privacy

In-Reply-To: Mime-Version: 1.0

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

If the Gramm-Summers bill is passed the implications for the invasion of personal privacy are far, far greater

and present more inherent dangers to citizens than any poll. I mention this because we do hear from time to time

complaints that surveys are too intrusive and that the results are not kept completely confidential.

. Dick Halpern

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology

3837 Courtyard Drive Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

rshalpern@mindspring.com

phone/fax 770 434 4121

>From pbraun@braunresearch.com Tue Nov 2 08:29:26 1999

Received: from futuna.netreach.net (futuna.netreach.net [207.106.22.5]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id IAA16210 for ; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 08:29:25 -0800 (PST)

Received: (qmail 18873 invoked from network); 2 Nov 1999 16:29:37 -0000

Received: from ppp-167255-077.netreach.net (HELO pbraun) (167.89.255.77) by futuna.netreach.net with SMTP; 2 Nov 1999 16:29:37 -0000 Message-ID: <014101bf2550$9c1e3520$5654fea9@pbraun>

From: "Paul Braun"

To:

Subject: Non response

Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 11:37:51 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="----=_NextPart_000_013E_01BF2526.B233FE00"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3 This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_013E_01BF2526.B233FE00

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

Can anyone in the New Jersey area who atteded or presented at the =

Portland Conference on Non-Response please contact me? We are =

attempting to build a NJ AAPOR chapter conference on this very important =

subject. Thanks to all

Pbraun@braunresearch.com

Paul Braun Braun Research, Inc.

271 Wall Street

Princeton NJ 08540

609-279-1600 phone

609-279-1318 fax

I am overseeing the design of a statewide HIV/AIDS general population telephone survey in California which will involve

an oversample of households in rural counties. The State is interested in examining urban-rural differences in knowledge,

attitudes, and behaviors. I've been concerned that using the county classification may be too crude to identify urban-rural

differences because many rural counties have substantial urban areas, and many urban counties have rural areas. If we had

Census Tract information we could make a finer distinction; however, due to concerns about confidentiality the only geographic

information we will have is county of residence and ZIP code. Thus, we are looking for a self-report item that is reliable

and valid which we could use to classify respondents as urban or rural. We've created one such item (see below) which has

face validity, but we would prefer to adopt an item that has been used successfully in previous research and are open to suggestions.

"Thinking about the community in which you live, would you say that you live in an urban or rural community?"

==

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D

Co-Director Center for Family and Community Health

School of Public Health

University of California, Berkeley

WWW: http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH

==

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com

Tue Nov 2 16:20:04 1999

Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.70]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id QAA23350 for ; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 16:20:04 -0800 (PST)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com by imo26.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5KIRa23737 (3706) for ; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 19:19:27 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.b453b6fb.2550d98e@aol.com>

Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1999 19:19:26 EST

Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 40

In a message dated 11/2/99 6:04:56 PM Eastern Standard Time, jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu writes:

I am overseeing the design of a statewide HIV/AIDS general population telephone survey in California which will involve

an oversample of households in rural counties. The State is interested in examining urban-rural differences in knowledge,

attitudes, and behaviors. I've been concerned that using the county classification may be too crude to identify urban-rural

differences because many rural counties have substantial urban areas, and many urban counties have rural areas. If we had

Census Tract information we could make a finer distinction; however, due to concerns about confidentiality the only geographic

information we will have is county of residence and ZIP code. Thus, we are looking for a self-report item that is reliable

and valid which we could use to classify respondents as urban or rural. We've created one such item (see below) which has

face validity, but we would prefer to adopt an item that has been used successfully in previous research and are open to suggestions.

"Thinking about the community in which you live, would you say that you live in an urban or rural community?"

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D

Co-Director Center for Family and Community Health

School of Public Health

University of California, Berkeley

Joel: I can understand the reasons you felt you had to resort to a self-report question here. My concern (unless someone does

deliver a tried and true self-report approach) is twofold: first, is there a likelihood that, in a general population survey, some

small but, for your purposes, meaningful proportion of your respondents -- urban or rural -- won't have a clue as to the meaning of

those two words? Second, and much dicier in my view: even if every respondent has some idea what the words mean (enough of one, anyway,

to preclude his or her asking the interviewer to explain them), you don't know how closely that idea is going to correspond with

what you mean. Especially since the object of the exercise is to find differences between urban and rural. Having dumped on self-reporting

as a reliable means to define the community, I feel obliged to suggest some other approach that won't violate confidentiality concerns.

Are there variables that can objectively and validly distinguish between the urban and rural identities of communities? Beats me...but I

haven't given that one a lot of thought; there are, of course, people who have. The point I wanted to make is that -- given the salience

of the urban-rural distinction to the purpose of the study -- I think it's asking for trouble to predicate ("trust" is maybe a better word)

the drawing of that distinction on respondents' replies to the question you've created. Everything else aside, to do so would mean a horrendous

hassle when the time came to worry about how to word your column headings. I wish you good luck, while recognizing that all I did was rain on your parade.

Phil Harding

paharding7@aol.com

>From tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu

Tue Nov 2 17:33:19 1999

Received: from mhub2.tc.umn.edu (IDENT:0@mhub2.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.42]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id RAA24138 for ; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 17:33:17 -0800 (PST)

From: tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu Received: from amethyst.tc.umn.edu by mhub2.tc.umn.edu with ESMTP for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 19:33:14 -0600 Received: from [207.58.29.156] by

Joel: While I would share some of Phil Harding's concerns about the dichotomous item you suggested, I would not necessarily abandon the idea of

using a self-report measure, especially since you have zip codes as at least a rough check. We had a similar concern in some studies a while back

in Minnesota, and we, too, used a self-report item. The lead-in question was similar to yours, but the categories we offered were:

__city __suburban __small town, or __rural At least in the midwest, I would expect that "urban" would equate in many minds with "big city," and

from experience in this research we learned that residents of towns of, say, 5,000 or so, do not think of themselves as "rural" at all. To many,

"rural" equates with "open country" or "farming country."

Phil Tichenor

Joel Moskowitz wrote: > > I am overseeing the design of a statewide HIV/AIDS general population > telephone survey in California which will involve an oversample of > households in rural counties. The State is interested in examining > urban-rural differences in knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. > > I've been concerned that using the county classification may be too > crude to identify urban-rural differences because many rural counties > have substantial urban areas, and many urban counties have rural > areas. If we had Census Tract information we could make a finer > distinction; however, due to concerns about confidentiality the only > geographic information we will have is county of residence and

ZIP > code. Thus, we are looking for a self-report item that is reliable > and valid which we could use to classify respondents as urban or > rural. We've created one such item (see below) which has face > validity, but we would prefer to adopt an item that has been used > successfully in previous research and are open to suggestions. > > "Thinking about the community in which you live, would you say that > you live in an urban or rural community?" > > === > Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D. > Co-Director > Center for Family and Community Health > School of Public Health > University of California, Berkeley > WWW: http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH > === >From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Tue Nov 2 18:57:18 1999 Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (IDENT:root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.150]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id SAA08578 for ; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 18:57:01 -0800 (PST) Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149]) by makalu.hp.ufl.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id WAA16994 for ; Tue, 2 Nov 1999 22:56:17 -0500 Received: from K2/SpoolDir by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44); 2 Nov 99 21:56:55 -0500 Received: from SpoolDir by K2 (Mercury 1.44); 2 Nov 99 21:56:43 -0500 Received: from hp.ufl.edu (128.227.163.168) by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44) with ESMTP; 2 Nov 99 21:56:41 -0500 Message-ID: <381FA76E.A1A58CC5@hp.ufl.edu> Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1999 23:09:47 -0400 From: "Colleen K. Porter" X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item References: <0.b453b6fb.2550d98e@aol.com> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D. writes: > > I am overseeing the design of a statewide HIV/AIDS general population > telephone survey in California which will involve an oversample of > households in rural counties. The State is interested in examining > urban-rural differences in knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. > > I've been concerned that using the county classification may be too > crude to identify urban-rural differences because many rural counties > have substantial urban areas, and many urban counties have rural > areas. If we had Census Tract information we could make a finer > distinction; however, due to concerns about confidentiality the only > geographic information we will have is county of residence and ZIP > code. Thus, we are looking for a self-report item that is reliable > and valid which we could use to classify respondents as urban or > rural. We've created one such item (see below) which has face > validity, but we would prefer to adopt an item that has been used > successfully in previous research and are open to suggestions. > > "Thinking about the community in which you live, would you say that > you live in an urban or rural community?" Since you're oversampling rural counties, one approach might be to use this item to identify rural dwellers, making the question, "Do you live in a rural community?" Yes-No, Rural-not Rural, the way we often do with Hispanic-not Hispanic. This avoids problems with a seeming false dichotomy. I was raised in Detroit, and I mean *in Detroit*, a block from Jefferson. That's what I think of as "urban." Later when we moved to a suburb, I would have laughed at your question--are those the only two choices? I certainly didn't consider our bedroom community to be urban, but our neighborhood did have sidewalks and sewers so it wasn't rural, either. I'd have no trouble saying that it wasn't rural. Choosing between urban and rural would be harder. The other alternative would be to ask a brief series that specifically addresses the attributes y'all consider indicative of an urban or rural setting--Are there any cow pastures within a mile of your home? How close is the nearest liquor store? How often do you hear sirens? How often are you stuck behind a slow tractor? Okay, I'm being silly. But why not try to communicate your definitions? Colleen K. Porter Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu Phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109 UF Department of Health Services Administration Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009 Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195 >From langley@pop.uky.edu Wed Nov 3 05:22:31

1999 Received: from smtp.uky.edu (smtp.uky.edu [128.163.2.17]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id FAA03433 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 05:22:30 -0800 (PST) Received: from pop.uky.edu (pop.uky.edu [128.163.2.16]) by smtp.uky.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id IAA75244 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 08:22:29 -0500 (EST) Received: from nc.gws.uky.edu (rgs51.gws.uky.edu [128.163.30.142]) by pop.uky.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id IAA29423 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 08:22:29 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <3.0.32.19991103082227.006f157c@pop.uky.edu> X-Sender: langley@pop.uky.edu X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32) Date: Wed, 03 Nov 1999 08:22:27 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: "Ronald E. Langley" Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Joel: I agree with those that suggest you need a more specific delineation of what your terms mean. A question we have used with success in statewide surveys in Kentucky is as follows: "Would you call the community in which you live a rural area, a small town, a suburb, or a city of 50,000 or more?" While it may not be necessary for your purposes, we also ask those who respond "rural" whether or not it is a farm. Sometimes, we also ask those who respond "small town" if more than 2,500 people live in their town. Comparing responses to the reported counties tracks very well, although we cannot tell whether those in counties with rural and urban areas are answering as we intend them to. Good Luck! Ron Langley At 03:01 PM 11/2/1999 -0800, you wrote: >I am overseeing the design of a statewide HIV/AIDS general population >telephone survey in California which will involve an oversample of >households in rural counties. The State is interested in examining >urban-rural differences in knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. > >I've been concerned that using the county classification may be too >crude >to identify urban-rural differences because many rural counties have >substantial urban areas, and many urban counties have rural areas. If we >had Census Tract information we could make a finer distinction; however, >due to concerns about confidentiality the only geographic information we >will have is county of residence and ZIP code. Thus, we are looking for a >self-report item that is reliable and valid which we could use to classify >respondents as urban or rural. We've created one such item (see below) >which has face validity, but we would prefer to adopt an item that has been >used successfully in previous research and are open to suggestions. > >"Thinking about the community in which you live, would you say that you >live in an urban or rural community?" > > > > >=== >Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D. >Co-Director >Center for Family and Community Health >School of Public Health >University of California, Berkeley >WWW: http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH >=== > > Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (606)257-4684 Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (606) 323-1972 University of Kentucky Pager: 288-5771 403 Breckinridge Hall langley@pop.uky.edu Lexington, KY 40506-0056 http://www.rgs.uky.edu/src/srchome.htm >From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Wed Nov 3 05:29:29 1999 Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id FAA05361 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 05:29:28 -0800 (PST) Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-8.tuckahoe.bestweb.net [209.94.107.217]) by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id IAA27534; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 08:29:26 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <382038BE.4C3920BA@troll.soc.qc.edu> Date: Wed, 03 Nov 1999 08:29:34 -0500 From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item References: <3.0.32.19991103082227.006f157c@pop.uky.edu> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit > >I've been concerned that using the county classification may be too > >crude to identify urban-rural differences because many rural counties > >have substantial urban areas, and many urban counties have rural > >areas. If we had Census Tract information we could make a finer >

>distinction; however, due to concerns about confidentiality the only > >geographic information we will have is county of residence and ZIP > >code. Why not use ZIP Code characteristics along with your rural/urban self-report. I think that would give you a real basis on which to define the knowledge. You would also have other characteristics of the zip codes. They are really not that large (some 35,000) in the US, I think 1,600 in CA. Also you could easily use a population density measure and a proximity to large city measure along with some rural/urban distinction. It seems to me that classifying something as rural/suburban/urban is hard enough for the Census to do. Why expect that respondents will do better. Another approach and one subject to IRB approval would be to use the those portions of your sample that have listed telephone numbers to precisely geocode and then add tract characteristics. You could also get a map of exchanges, but that is getting harder given electronic phones. Self-reports are nice, but classification of where people live is harder. Andy Beveridge Thus, we are looking for a > >self-report item that is reliable and valid which we could use to > >classify respondents as urban or rural. We've created one such item > >(see below) which has face validity, but we would prefer to adopt an > >item that has been used successfully in previous research and are > >open to suggestions. > > > >"Thinking about the community in which you live, would you say that > >you live in an urban or rural community?" > > > > > > > > > >====================================== > >Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D. > >Co-Director > >Center for Family and Community Health > >School of Public Health > >University of California, Berkeley > >WWW: http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH > >====================================== > > > > > Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (606)257-4684 > Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (606) 323-1972 > University of Kentucky Pager: 288-5771 > 403 Breckinridge Hall langley@pop.uky.edu > Lexington, KY 40506-0056 > > http://www.rgs.uky.edu/src/srchome.htm >From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Wed Nov 3 05:51:44 1999 Received: from mtiwmhc07.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc07.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.42]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id FAA11257 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 05:51:44 -0800 (PST) Received: from default ([12.75.198.93]) by mtiwmhc07.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134) with SMTP id <19991103135113.UQFC23762@default> for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 13:51:13 +0000 Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19991103085222.006a6520@postoffice.worldnet.att.net> X-Sender: Jim-Wolf@postoffice.worldnet.att.net X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.1 (32) Date: Wed, 03 Nov 1999 08:52:22 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: Jim Wolf Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item In-Reply-To: <382038BE.4C3920BA@troll.soc.qc.edu> References: <3.0.32.19991103082227.006f157c@pop.uky.edu> Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" I agree with Andy. Using the ZIP code classification would allow for much better quality control. Respondents can often be too creative in their interpretations of what the terms "urban" and "rural" mean. Even with clarification they may not truly know what the local population is or how close they are to the nearest city. Most folks know their ZIP code. Recode it to YOUR specifications and you won't be left wondering what to do when three people on the same street give you three different answers. =-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-= Jim Wolf Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net >From LCook@FGINC.com Wed Nov 3 06:09:03 1999 Received: from exchange.fginc.com (mail.fginc.com [199.72.128.4]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA15482 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 06:09:03 -0800 (PST) Received: by EXCHANGE with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0) id <4WRJMV08>; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 09:09:03 -0500 Message-ID: <60E6FEAC9464D3118D1800805F6509F91F888D@EXCHANGE> From: Lou Cook To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" Subject: RE: Urban-rural self-report item Date: Wed, 3 Nov 1999 09:09:00 -0500 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0) Joel, you can ask the respondent and you can get an Urban/Suburban/Rural code affixed to the sample you can purchase from Survey Sampling, Inc.

They can explain to you how they determine the designations. -----Original Message----- From: Joel Moskowitz [mailto:jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu] Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 1999 6:01 PM To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Urban-rural self-report item I am overseeing the design of a statewide HIV/AIDS general population telephone survey in California which will involve an oversample of households in rural counties. The State is interested in examining urban-rural differences in knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. I've been concerned that using the county classification may be too crude to identify urban-rural differences because many rural counties have substantial urban areas, and many urban counties have rural areas. If we had Census Tract information we could make a finer distinction; however, due to concerns about confidentiality the only geographic information we will have is county of residence and ZIP code. Thus, we are looking for a self-report item that is reliable and valid which we could use to classify respondents as urban or rural. We've created one such item (see below) which has face validity, but we would prefer to adopt an item that has been used successfully in previous research and are open to suggestions. "Thinking about the community in which you live, would you say that you live in an urban or rural community?" === Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D. Co-Director Center for Family and Community Health School of Public Health University of California, Berkeley WWW: http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH === >From SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu Wed Nov 3 06:26:49 1999 Received: from UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id GAA20552 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 06:26:48 -0800 (PST) Received: by UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id 8145 ; Wed, 03 Nov 1999 09:26:47 EST Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UCONNVM) by UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU (LMail V1.2c/1.8c) with BSMTP id 6073; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 09:26:47 -0500 Date: Wed, 03 Nov 99 09:16:03 EST From: Don Ferree Subject: RE: Urban-rural self-report item To: Members of AAPORNET In-Reply-To: <60E6FEAC9464D3118D1800805F6509F91F888D@EXCHANGE> X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000 Message-Id: <991103.092646.EST.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu> MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT A word of caution on using NNX information from sampling firms. While zip codes typically do not cross municipal boundaries, and most of us would PROBABLY be willing to class all residents of a given municipality the same in terms of "ruralness", the same is NOT true of the classifications of phone NNX's, which can cross such lines. Leaving aside the accuracy of record question (which also applies to zip code characteristics too) the classification of NNX's which cross zip or municipal lines depends on an average characteristic for NNX (derived from various sources, essentially "matching" -- imperfectly -- the NNX to geographic areas). This is not to argue that such information may not be helpful, merely to point out that persons who live in different zips or even different municipalities may well have the same NNX so the two methods would not necessarily produce the same results. (Of course, you have the "imputed" information for all respondents based on NNX, but anyone who refuses to give you their zip code (or simply doesn't recall it for any reason) is "missing"). Comparing the results from these methods (on an ongoing basis) would be interesting. Don

>From p-miller@nwu.edu Wed Nov 3 07:03:04 1999

Received: from casbah.acns.nwu.edu (casbah.acns.nwu.edu [129.105.16.52]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id HAA04860 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 07:03:04 -0800 (PST)

Here is information concerning two faculty position openings in the Department of Communication Studies at Northwestern. We would appreciate your

forwarding the information to suitable candidates.

Thanks and best wishes

Peter Miller

Northwestern University Department of Communication Studies Faculty positions in:

-Telecommunications and Information Technology Policy

-Communication Industries and Society

The Department of Communication Studies invites applications and nominations for two tenure track appointments beginning September 15, 2000. Rank is open

, although at least one position will be filled at the level of Assistant Professor. The individuals appointed to these professorships will be expected to

pursue a productive program of research as well as teach at both the undergraduate and graduate levels in a department that values interdisciplinary work

. They will be expected to hold the Ph.D. or J.D. degree by the starting date of the appointment. Senior rank will be considered for candidates whose record

of scholarship is truly distinguished and whose expertise will enhance and expand relationships between Communication Studies and other units of Northwestern

University. Appointment at junior rank will be considered for applicants with strong potential for interdisciplinary research and teaching. Telecommunications

and Information Technology Policy The individual appointed to this position will teach and conduct research on policy issues surrounding telecommunications and

information technology. Expertise may be grounded anywhere in a broad range of fields and disciplines including economics, law, management, international relations

and diplomacy, media studies, security studies, policy studies and/or public administration. Communication Industries and Society The individual appointed to this

position will teach and conduct research on the social and/or organizational implications of communication industries and technologies. Possible specializations

include media management, production and globalization of popular culture, media and comparative politics at the local, national or international levels, computer

mediated communication and electronic commerce, technology and organizational behavior, media effects and audience studies.

Northwestern University is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

Hiring is contingent upon ability to work in the United States. Consideration of applications will begin January 15, 2000 and continue until the positions are filled.

Please send a letter of application, curriculum vitae and three letters of recommendation to: James Schwoch, Search Committee Chair Department of Communication Studies 1815

Chicago Avenue Northwestern University Evanston IL 60208-1340 USA

--=====================_2956646==_.ALT Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

Here is information concerning two faculty position openings in the Department of Communication Studies at Northwestern.

We would appreciate your forwarding the information to suitable candidates.

Thanks and best wishes.

Peter Miller

Northwestern University   Department of Communication Studies

Faculty positions in:

-Telecommunications and Information Technology Policy

-Communication Industries and Society

The Department of Communication Studies invites applications and nominations for two tenure track appointments beginning September 15, 2000. Rank is open, although at least one position will be filled at the level of Assistant Professor. The individuals appointed to these professorships will be expected to pursue a productive program of research as well as teach at both the undergraduate and graduate levels in a department that values interdisciplinary work. They will be expected to hold the Ph.D. or J.D. degree by the starting date of the appointment. Senior rank will be considered for candidates whose record of scholarship is truly distinguished and whose expertise will enhance and expand relationships between Communication Studies and other units of Northwestern University. Appointment at junior rank will be considered for applicants with strong potential for interdisciplinary research and teaching.

Telecommunications and Information Technology Policy

The individual appointed to this position will teach and conduct research on policy issues surrounding telecommunications and information technology. Expertise may be grounded anywhere in a broad range of fields and disciplines including economics, law, management, international relations and diplomacy, media studies, security studies, policy studies and/or public administration.

Communication Industries and Society

The individual appointed to this position will teach and conduct research on the social and/or organizational implications of communication industries and technologies. Possible specializations include media management, production and globalization of popular culture, media and comparative politics at the local, national or international levels, computer mediated communication and electronic commerce, technology and organizational behavior, media effects and audience studies.

Northwestern University is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Hiring is contingent upon ability to work in the United States. Consideration of applications will begin January 15, 2000 and continue until the positions are filled. Please send a letter of application, curriculum vitae and three letters of recommendation to:

James Schwoch, Search Committee Chair

Department of Communication Studies

1815 Chicago Avenue

Northwestern University

Evanston IL 60208-1340 USA

--=====================_2956646==_.ALT-- >From ande271@attglobal.net Wed Nov 3 08:57:40 1999 Received: from prserv.net (out2.prserv.net [165.87.194.229]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA29455 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 08:57:39 -0800 (PST) Received: from default ([32.100.251.153]) by prserv.net (out2) with SMTP id <19991103165727229005u819e>; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 16:57:28 +0000 Message-ID: <382094AE.3526@attglobal.net> Date: Wed, 03 Nov 1999 12:01:50 -0800 From: Jeanne Anderson Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U) MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item References: <0.b453b6fb.2550d98e@aol.com> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit PAHARDING7@aol.com wrote: > > In a message dated 11/2/99 6:04:56 PM Eastern Standard Time, > jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu writes: > > I am overseeing the design of a statewide HIV/AIDS general population > telephone survey in California which will involve an oversample of > households in rural counties. The State is interested in examining > urban-rural differences in knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. > > I've been concerned that using the county classification may be too > crude to identify urban-rural differences because many rural counties > have substantial urban areas, and many urban counties have rural > areas. If we had Census Tract information we could make a finer > distinction; however, due to concerns about confidentiality the only > geographic information we will have is county of residence and ZIP > code. Thus, we are looking for a self-report item that is reliable > and valid which we could use to classify respondents as urban or > rural. We've created one such item (see below) which has face > validity, but we would prefer to adopt an item that has been used > successfully in previous research and are open to suggestions. > > "Thinking about the community in which you live, would you say that > you live in an urban or rural community?" > > Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D. > Co-Director > Center for Family and Community Health > School of Public Health > University of California, Berkeley > > > Joel: > > I can understand the reasons you felt you had to resort to a > self-report question here. My concern (unless someone does deliver a > tried and true self-report approach) is twofold: first, is there a > likelihood that, in a general population survey, some small but, for > your purposes, meaningful proportion of your respondents -- urban or > rural -- won't have a clue as to the meaning of those two words? > > Second, and much dicier in my view: even if every respondent has some > idea what the words mean (enough of one, anyway, to preclude his or > her asking the interviewer to explain them), you don't know how > closely that idea is going to correspond with what you mean. > Especially since the object of the exercise is to find differences > between urban and rural. > > Having dumped on self-reporting as a reliable means to define the > community, I feel obliged to suggest some other approach that won't > violate confidentiality concerns. Are there variables that can > objectively and validly distinguish between the urban and rural > identities of communities? Beats me...but I haven't given that one a > lot of thought; there are, of course, people who have. > > The point I wanted to make is that -- given the salience of the > urban-rural distinction to the purpose of the study -- I think it's > asking for

trouble to predicate ("trust" is maybe a better word) the > drawing of that distinction on respondents' replies to the question > you've created. Everything else aside, to do so would mean a > horrendous hassle when the time came to worry about how to word your > column headings. > > I wish you good luck, while recognizing that all I did was rain on > your parade. > > Phil Harding > paharding7@aol.com What is the basis for the hypothesis that there might be a difference in KAP by urban-rural residence? Proximity to a major medical center? Number of MD's within 1/2 hour's drive? Presence of a VNA in the community? If any of the above, you might omit consideration of the formal "urban-rural" dichotomy. Another possibility is to use population size categories (I assume most people will know if they live in a community of 5,000 or less, and it may not be too important to know whether the community is 250,000-999,999 or 300,000 plus). A combination of these two might be most useful. >From arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu Wed Nov 3 09:18:41 1999 Received: from mailer.fsu.edu (mailer.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA14853 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 09:18:40 -0800 (PST) Received: from localhost (arobbin@localhost) by mailer.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA09043 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 12:18:10 -0500 (EST) Date: Wed, 3 Nov 1999 12:18:10 -0500 (EST) From: ALICE R ROBBIN To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item In-Reply-To: <382094AE.3526@attglobal.net> Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII Yesterday eve, I wrote Joel M about potential use of a database called CENSUS-CD, which nows has a mapping supplement to it, a la a crude geographic information system. Of course, CensusCD is "old," derived from 1990 census data and TIGER files, and, consequently, does not reflect what turns out to be fairly significant growth/development changes in muncipalities (this is what we discovered when we mapped the addresses of students in my distance course in research methods course last Spring, based on 1990/1994 TIGER files). Various other mapping/gis software are available, however, produced by for-profit firms that have a real incentive to keep their stuff up-to-date. If you are trying to ascertain distance from the respondent's residence to nearest "medical center" or "skilled doctors," then you can get fairly good estimates of distance by using these types of software. There's also a web-based, commercial but free gis that allows you to determine distance from, let's say, your home to another point. We ran tests on a sample of student addresses, and found this web gis to be much better than other versions based on old TIGER data. I know Any B knows tons about this stuff. Alice Robbin/FSU > > paharding7@aol.com > > What is the basis for the hypothesis that there might be a difference > in KAP by urban-rural residence? Proximity to a major medical center? > Number of MD's within 1/2 hour's drive? Presence of a VNA in the > community? If any of the above, you might omit consideration of the > formal "urban-rural" dichotomy. Another possibility is to use > population size categories (I assume most people will know if they > live in a community of 5,000 or less, and it may not be too important > to know whether the community is 250,000-999,999 or 300,000 plus). A > combination of these two might be most useful. >

** * Alice Robbin * * School of Information Studies * * Florida State University * * 232 Louis Shores Building * * Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 * * Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 * * email: arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu * ** >From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Wed Nov 3 10:28:25 1999 Received: from mtiwmhc06.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc06.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.41]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA08376 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 10:28:25 -0800 (PST) Received: from default ([12.75.197.91]) by mtiwmhc06.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134) with SMTP id <19991103182753.BXNU24056@default>; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 18:27:53 +0000 Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19991103132903.006a6c40@postoffice.worldnet.att.net> X-

Please let us know where to find this free, web-based GIS software. At 12:18 PM 11/3/99 -0500, ALICE R ROBBIN wrote: > >...There's also a web-based, commercial but >free gis that allows you to determine distance from, let's say, your >home to another point. We ran tests on a sample of student addresses, >and found this web gis to be much better than other versions based on >old TIGER data. > =-= Jim Wolf Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

Dear All: If you go to Mapquest.com you can do this on a case by case basis. Mapquest, incidentally, uses the ETAK data base, which includes routing and direction along with the Tiger sort of attributes. ETAK and GDT are the two major vendors of maping software. If you want to get something to use for a fairly small project you can use MapPoint by Microsoft. Not bad, related directly to business users, and apparently uses both the ETAK data base and the GDT data base. The vendors have been purchasing one another. Yahoo actually links to Mapquest, etc. GDT bought BLR, etc. To do this work you need both the software (GIS system) and the data base, a digital map. The Tiger 1997 is actually quite good and is updated in part by GDT. For the most up to date most accurate stuff you need to buy it. GDT sells current Zipcodes for about $1,000. A version is also embedded in Mappoint (129 retail). They may be a version or two out of date. The Census is planning to massively upgrade their digital map data base this Census. They use ESRI products (ARCVIEW, ARCINFO), which now define the standard for data exchange. Other GIS products include, MapInfo, Maptitude (from Caliper), and Manifold from Manifold.net. The area is not as well developed as Statistical Software. Sorry if I ran on about this, but we recently Geocoded a survey of 47,000 respondents and added their tract attributes. Very revealing. Andy Beveridge Jim Wolf wrote: > > Please let us know where to find this free, web-based GIS software. > > At 12:18 PM 11/3/99 -0500, ALICE R ROBBIN wrote: > > > >...There's also a web-based, commercial but > >free gis that allows you to determine distance from, let's say, your > >home to another point. We ran tests on a sample of student addresses, > >and found this web gis to be much better than other versions based on > >old TIGER data. > > > > =-= > Jim Wolf Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net -- Andrew A. Beveridge Home Office 209 Kissena Hall 50 Merriam Avenue Department of Sociology Bronxville, NY 10708 Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237 Flushing, NY 11367-1597 Fax: 914-337-8210 Phone: 718-997-2837 E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Fax: 718-997-2820 Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

From: ALICE R ROBBIN To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item In-Reply-To: <3820826F.8752F758@troll.soc.qc.edu> Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII Yeah, for Andy B. Thank you for all the details. I think this is the way to go to produce the quality data that we need, even though it requires a (small) investment that not everyone can afford. The Mapquest data base is really easy to use, well done. It is, btw, also a super teaching tool, and students enjoy it a great deal. Very enlightening, as Andy notes. Alice Robbin/FSU On Wed, 3 Nov 1999, Andrew A. Beveridge wrote: > Dear All: > > If you go to Mapquest.com you can do this on a case by case basis. > > Mapquest, incidentally, uses the ETAK data base, which includes > routing and direction along with the Tiger sort of attributes. ETAK > and GDT are the two major vendors of maping software. If you want to > get something to use > for a fairly small project you can use MapPoint by Microsoft. Not bad, > related directly to business users, and apparently uses both the ETAK > data base and the GDT data base. The vendors have been purchasing one > another. Yahoo actually links to Mapquest, etc. GDT bought BLR, etc. > > To do this work you need both the software (GIS system) and the data > base, a digital map. The Tiger 1997 is actually quite good and is > updated in part by GDT. For the most up to date most accurate stuff > you need to buy it. > > GDT sells current Zipcodes for about $1,000. A version is also > embedded in Mappoint (129 retail). They may be a version or two out > of date. > > The Census is planning to massively upgrade their digital map data > base > this Census. They use ESRI products (ARCVIEW, ARCINFO), which now > define > the standard for data exchange. Other GIS products include, MapInfo, > Maptitude (from Caliper), and Manifold from Manifold.net. > > The area is not as well developed as Statistical Software. > > Sorry if I ran on about this, but we recently Geocoded a survey of > 47,000 respondents and added their tract attributes. Very revealing. > > Andy Beveridge > > Jim Wolf wrote: > > > Please let us know where to find this free, web-based GIS software. > > > > At 12:18 PM 11/3/99 -0500, ALICE R ROBBIN wrote: > > > > > >...There's also a web-based, commercial but > > >free gis that allows you to determine distance from, let's say, > > >your home to another point. We ran tests on a sample of student > > >addresses, and found this web gis to be much better than other > > >versions based on old TIGER data. > > > > > > =-= > > Jim Wolf Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net > > -- > Andrew A. Beveridge Home Office > 209 Kissena Hall 50 Merriam Avenue > Department of Sociology Bronxville, NY 10708 > Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237 > Flushing, NY 11367-1597 Fax: 914-337-8210 > Phone: 718-997-2837 E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu > Fax: 718-997-2820 Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps > ** * Alice Robbin * * School of Information Studies * * Florida State University * * 232 Louis Shores Building * * Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 * * Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 * * email: arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu * ** >From s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Wed Nov 3 11:18:35 1999 Received: from smtpmail1.csuohio.edu (smtpmail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.29]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id LAA20017 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 11:18:34 -0800 (PST) From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Received: by smtpmail1.csuohio.edu(Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2 (651.2 6-10-1998)) id 8525681E.00699C75 ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 14:13:33 -0500 X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU To: aapornet@usc.edu Message-ID: <8525681E.00699AF0.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu> Date: Wed, 3 Nov 1999 14:27:13 -0500 Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Disposition: inline Zip codes in Northern Ohio may be fairly accurate for your dicotomy. In the Southern Ohio (below Columbus) you will have to distinguish between rural and urban with some more sophisticated measure, even perhaps a response to a question. Best, Sid >From

Suzanne_Hart@umit.maine.edu Wed Nov 3 12:06:21 1999 Received: from MAINE.maine.edu (maine.maine.edu [130.111.2.1]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id MAA10520 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 12:06:17 -0800 (PST) Received: from voyager [130.111.71.9] by MAINE.maine.edu (IBM VM SMTP Level 310) via TCP with SMTP ; Wed, 03 Nov 1999 15:06:08 EST From: Suzanne_Hart@umit.maine.edu (Suzanne Hart) To: aapornet@usc.edu Date: Wed, 3 Nov 1999 10:52:40 -0400 Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item Message-ID: References: <4.2.0.58.19991102144158.009ede90@uclink4.berkeley.edu> MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit Content-ID: X-Gateway: NASTA Gate 2.0 beta 3 for FirstClass(R) For an urban-rural distinction that is related to population density, how about asking what the speed limit is in front of the respondent's residence? We've done that in Maine, where areas we consider "urban" (it's all relative) are designated "rural" by Census, ZIP code, and other definitions. Speed limits are set in part by analysis of traffic density and the number of opportunities for entrances and exits from the roadway,such as driveways for businesses, houses, etc., and these are related to population density. In Maine, there are speed limits of 15 (school zone), 25 (in-town, suburbs, etc.), 35 (major two-lane routes in populated areas); 45 (rural two-lane highway, few houses; also, the limit if the speed is not posted), 55 (usually a wider two-lane), and 65 (4+ lane Interstate 95 and the Maine Turnpike, a toll road). Speed limits of 35 and below are relatively urban, and above 35 are relatively rural. This measure can be refined by population, population density, distance from central cities, and, in Maine, distance from the major I-95 transportation corridor, if you want a measure that combines self-report with other data. (There are also those definitely rural dangerous curves that have a lower speed limit such as 35, so this measure isn't perfect.) However, we have had a good time thinking about questions such as distance to the nearest cow, and how many moose live near your house... .... Suzanne K. Hart Research Associate Margaret Chase Smith Center for Public Policy 5715 Coburn Hall University of Maine Orono, Maine Phone (207) 581-1631; Fax (207)581-1266; e-mail shart@maine.maine.edu .... >From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Wed Nov 3 12:48:30 1999 Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id MAA09796 for ; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 12:48:29 -0800 (PST) Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-8.tuckahoe.bestweb.net [209.94.107.217]) by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id PAA00695; Wed, 3 Nov 1999 15:48:23 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <38209FA4.24A9C809@troll.soc.qc.edu> Date: Wed, 03 Nov 1999 15:48:37 -0500 From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win95; U) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Urban-rural self-report item References: <4.2.0.58.19991102144158.009ede90@uclink4.berkeley.edu> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit If one can add tract or even zip code to one's data set one can use population density (real population density) as a variable. For things related to use and visibility of drugs it is strikingly predictive. I would really suggest using "real" geography and not the respondent's "mental map" at least exclusively. In my earlier e-mail I meant to say the ETAK and GDT were the premier data providers for GIS applications, while Microsoft, ESRI, MapInfo, Caliper (for Maptitude) and Manifold were the primary software systems in use. SAS also has a GIS by the way. I am not in the pay of any of these vendors, but have used software and data from all but one! In our case we used either address of respondant, gotten afterwords by using a computerized source for phone number by address, or a near intersection of two streets given by respondent. When then geocoded these to specific latitude and longitude and then attached Census Tract info. Seems to me either are less ambiguous than "Do you live

in an urban area?" By the way this is being done more and more. Dick Udry uses a GPS for his ADDHEALTH study, they have exact respondent location for the big Chicago Study of Earls, Raudenbusch and Sampson; Tract has been attached for the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, and NELs has zip codes. In all of these cases there are very strong effects for location or place. Andy Beveridge -- Andrew A. Beveridge Home Office 209 Kissena Hall 50 Merriam Avenue Department of Sociology Bronxville, NY 10708 Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237 Flushing, NY 11367-1597 Fax: 914-337-8210 Phone: 718-997-2837 E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Fax: 718-997-2820 Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps >From DMMerkle@aol.com Thu Nov 4 07:14:35 1999 Received: from imo27.mx.aol.com (imo27.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.71]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id HAA18559 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 07:14:34 -0800 (PST) From: DMMerkle@aol.com Received: from DMMerkle@aol.com by imo27.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5KBEa26614 (4334) for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 10:13:56 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.13159b2d.2552fcb4@aol.com> Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 10:13:56 EST Subject: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 49 Below is a comparison of two of Harris Interactive's pre-election polls as reported in Hotline right before the election. Their Mississippi results were poor. Harris had Parker leading by 14, but it appears that Musgrove won by 1 point (Musgrove has declared victory, Parker has not conceded). That is an error of 15 points on the difference. In Kentucky, Harris got the winner right, but was off by about the same margin. They predicted Patton would win by 26 - he actually won by 39: an error of 13 points on the difference. Is anyone aware of other Harris polls from 1999? MS Actual Harris Musgrove 50 39 Parker 49 53 Other 2 8 >(includes undecided) KY Actual Harris Patton 61 54 Martin 22 28 Galbraith 15 14 Other 1 4 >(includes undecided) Daniel Merkle >From rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu Thu Nov 4 07:18:57 1999 Received: from opinion (opinion.isi.uconn.edu [137.99.84.21]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id HAA20367 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 07:18:57 -0800 (PST) Received: from Marc1.isi.uconn.edu (mmaynard.isi.uconn.edu [137.99.84.24]) by opinion (SMI-8.6/8.6.9) with SMTP id KAA11914 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 10:18:43 -0500 Message-Id: <3.0.32.19991104101921.0070c270@opinion.isi.uconn.edu> X-Sender: rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32) Date: Thu, 04 Nov 1999 10:19:21 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: Rob Persons Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Was the same party overstated in these two polls? At 10:13 AM 11/4/99 EST, you wrote: >Below is a comparison of two of Harris Interactive's pre-election polls >as >reported in Hotline right before the election. > >Their Mississippi results were poor. Harris had Parker leading by 14, >but it >appears that Musgrove won by 1 point (Musgrove has declared victory, Parker >has not conceded). That is an error of 15 points on the difference. > >In Kentucky, Harris got the winner right, but was off by about the same >margin. They predicted Patton would win by 26 - he actually won by 39: an >error of 13 points on the difference. > >Is anyone aware of other Harris polls from 1999? > >MS > Actual Harris >Musgrove 50 39 >Parker 49 53 >Other 2 8 >(includes undecided) > >KY > Actual Harris >Patton 61 54 >Martin 22 28 >Galbraith 15 14 >Other 1 4 >(includes undecided) > > >Daniel Merkle > > **************************** The Roper Center rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu www.ropercenter.uconn.edu ph: (860) 486-4440 fax:(860) 486-6308 **************************** >From pbraun@braunresearch.com Thu Nov 4 07:26:17 1999 Received: from futuna.netreach.net (futuna.netreach.net [207.106.22.5]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id HAA23556 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 07:26:16 -0800 (PST) Received: (qmail 21337 invoked from network); 4 Nov 1999 15:26:28 -0000 Received: from ppp-207205-088.netreach.net (HELO pbraun) (207.29.205.88) by futuna.netreach.net with SMTP; 4 Nov 1999 15:26:28 -0000 Message-ID:

<024a01bf27a3$34c8f180$9557fea9@pbraun> From: "Paul Braun" To: Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls Date: Fri, 5 Nov 1999 10:34:06 -0500 MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Priority: 3 X-MSMail-Priority: Normal X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1 X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3 I guess we're not ready to close all the country's phone centers yet to start polling on line. Paul Braun ----- Original Message----- From: DMMerkle@aol.com To: aapornet@usc.edu Date: Thursday, November 04, 1999 10:14 AM Subject: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls >Below is a comparison of two of Harris Interactive's pre-election polls >as reported in Hotline right before the election. > >Their Mississippi results were poor. Harris had Parker leading by 14, >but it >appears that Musgrove won by 1 point (Musgrove has declared victory, >Parker has not conceded). That is an error of 15 points on the >difference. > >In Kentucky, Harris got the winner right, but was off by about the same >margin. They predicted Patton would win by 26 - he actually won by 39: >an error of 13 points on the difference. > >Is anyone aware of other Harris polls from 1999? > >MS > Actual Harris >Musgrove 50 39 >Parker 49 53 >Other 2 8 >(includes undecided) > >KY > Actual Harris >Patton 61 54 >Martin 22 28 >Galbraith 15 14 >Other 1 4 >(includes undecided) > > >Daniel Merkle > >From DMMerkle@aol.com Thu Nov 4 08:10:27 1999 Received: from imo-d01.mx.aol.com (imo-d01.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.33]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA13182 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 08:10:26 -0800 (PST) From: DMMerkle@aol.com Received: from DMMerkle@aol.com by imo-d01.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5ABR0MPyyl (4334) for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 11:09:36 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.a5eabb4f.255309c0@aol.com> Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 11:09:36 EST Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 49 A logical question is: How well did the telephone polls do in these same elections? I did a search and didn't find any KY phone polls less than a month old. The only phone poll right before the MS election was by Mason-Dixon: Musgrove 41 and Parker 47. Like Harris, they had the wrong winner, but Mason Dixon was off 7 points on the difference versus 15 for Harris. Daniel Merkle >From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Thu Nov 4 08:44:53 1999 Received: from imsety.oit.unc.edu (imsety.oit.unc.edu [152.2.21.99]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA00863 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 08:44:52 -0800 (PST) Received: from login5.isis.unc.edu (pmeyer@login5.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.135]) by imsety.oit.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA01428 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 11:44:57 -0500 (EST) Received: (from pmeyer@localhost) by login5.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) id LAA208954; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 11:44:55 -0500 Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 11:44:55 -0500 (EST) From: Philip Meyer X-Sender: pmeyer@login5.isis.unc.edu To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls In-Reply-To: <0.13159b2d.2552fcb4@aol.com> Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII Good that you are evaluating this new methodology. When using the difference between the winner and second-place finisher as the standard, we have to double the allowance for sampling error (because we're counting error twice.) So if the sample size was 600, we'd allow 8 points instead of the usual four. That makes the outcome still poor, but not as poor as it sounds.
=== Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085 CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549 University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425 Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
=== On Thu, 4 Nov 1999 DMMerkle@aol.com wrote: > Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 10:13:56 EST > From: DMMerkle@aol.com > Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu > To: aapornet@usc.edu > Subject: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls > >

Below is a comparison of two of Harris Interactive's pre-election > polls as > reported in Hotline right before the election. > > Their Mississippi results were poor. Harris had Parker leading by 14, > but it > appears that Musgrove won by 1 point (Musgrove has declared victory, Parker > has not conceded). That is an error of 15 points on the difference. > > In Kentucky, Harris got the winner right, but was off by about the > same > margin. They predicted Patton would win by 26 - he actually won by 39: an > error of 13 points on the difference. > > Is anyone aware of other Harris polls from 1999? > > MS > Actual Harris > Musgrove 50 39 > Parker 49 53 > Other 2 8 >(includes undecided) > > KY > Actual Harris > Patton 61 54 > Martin 22 28 > Galbraith 15 14 > Other 1 4 >(includes undecided) > > > Daniel Merkle > >From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Nov 4 09:04:10 1999 Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA12667 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 09:04:10 -0800 (PST) Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost) by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA24265 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 09:04:10 -0800 (PST) Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 09:04:10 -0800 (PST) From: James Beniger To: AAPORNET Subject: In the Mix: Media Literacy (fwd) Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII --- DO NOT REPLY TO THIS MESSAGE. Send replies to the email address of the original sender listed below. --- Reply To: Theinmix@aol.com "In the Mix", the PBS reality series for teens, will be re-broadcasting "Media Literacy: TV - What You Don't See" beginning Saturday, November 6, 1999. We invite viewers to tape the program off-air for use as an educational resource. Further information is as follows: FEED DATE: November 6, 1999 Media Literacy: TV - What You Don't See! By the time the average student graduates from high school, he or she will have watched 15,000 hours of television. Yikes! We'll show you what's behind the boob tube with a revealing look at video editing tricks and techniques, a lesson in how news stories are chosen and covered, some personal insights from veteran newsman Peter Jennings, and a close-up examination of images used in advertising and music videos. Learn ways to analyze and evaluate what you see on TV - and know whether or not to believe it. A discussion guide for this special is available on our website at www.IntheMix.org, or by calling (800) 597-9448. Please note that different PBS affiliates will air this show at different times during the week--please check your local listings or contact your local PBS station for exact airtimes in your city. Jennifer Castle Online Producer, In the Mix JenCastle@IntheMix.org www.IntheMix.org -- ******* >From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Thu Nov 4 10:16:22 1999 Received: from hejira.hunter.cuny.edu (hejira.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.97]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA03218 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 10:16:20 -0800 (PST) From: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Received: from social54 (social54.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.12.54]) by hejira.hunter.cuny.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id NAA01094 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 13:18:31 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.2.1.19991104124909.00a28520@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (Unverified) X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.1 Date: Thu, 04 Nov 1999 13:18:29 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls In-Reply-To: References: <0.13159b2d.2552fcb4@aol.com> Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed At 11:44 AM 11/4/99 -0500, Philip Meyer wrote: > ....When using the difference between the winner and second-place > finisher as the standard, >we have to double the allowance for sampling error (because we're counting >error twice.) So if the sample size was 600, we'd allow 8 points instead >of the usual four. That makes the outcome still poor, but not as poor as >it sounds. "We", of course, can allow whatever we want, but statistical theory does not suggest that the standard error of a difference of proportions (especially not a difference of proportions from the same distribution, as in this example) is the sum of the two standard errors computed separately. It is

smaller than simply the sum when we compare two independent proportions and even smaller yet in this example due to the non-zero covariance of the two proportions considered. However, using the "double up" rule is not a bad idea -- as the standard calculation rests on the -- highly unrealistic -- assumption of a simple random sample and any clustering in normal multi-stage RDD should take an additional 'design effect' into account. While this does not apply to the sampling strategy employed by Harris online -- which I would call a "randomized quota sample" for lack of a more fitting term -- the "sampling error" is just one part of the larger "survey error" (which unfortunately cannot be quantified easily). So, the only truly meaningful assessment of failure or success of these Harris polls is by comparison with conventional phone polls conducted at the same time. But, unfortunately, there does not seem to be much available. If this is true, we should postpone any bashing and wait for a better opportunity to make a fair comparison between Harris' online polls and conventional (RDD) phone polls. Unfortunately, the next elections are a year away and only with polls close to an election we have an objective validation criterion (the actual election results). So, Harris did not do great with these ones, but any emerging methodology is likely to have some problems and I know of many examples where the conventional methods have not done so great either. >From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Nov 4 10:23:20 1999 Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA08706 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 10:23:19 -0800 (PST) Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost) by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA04895 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 10:23:19 -0800 (PST) Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 10:23:19 -0800 (PST) From: James Beniger To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls In-Reply-To: <0.13159b2d.2552fcb4@aol.com> Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII To borrow Paul Braun's deadpan syntax: I guess we're not yet ready to weight up or oversample certain demographic categories, underrepresented online, according to their representation in the general (or adult, or likely voting) population. I guess that one reason for this caution might be that people online could possibly differ--substantially and decisively--from people not online, even after controlling for all of the demographic variables we have so long been in the habit of using. I guess that just one of the countless possible hypotheses to test, in our attempts to explain this phenomenon, might be that the mere fact of actually being online could directly change at least some people in behaviorally and socially significant ways. I guess that another such hypothesis to test might be that those who go online already differ--even before that fact--from those who do not go online, and that these differences might not be entirely reflected in the demographic data we have so long been in the habit of collecting. I guess it wasn't enough that only three or four hundred of us have been saying all this for the past three or four years... -- Jim ******* On Thu, 4 Nov 1999 DMMerkle@aol.com wrote: > Below is a comparison of two of Harris Interactive's pre-election > polls as > reported in Hotline right before the election. > > Their Mississippi results were poor. Harris had Parker leading by 14, > but it > appears that Musgrove won by 1 point (Musgrove has declared victory, Parker > has not conceded). That is an error of 15 points on the difference. > > In Kentucky, Harris got the winner right, but was off by about the > same > margin. They predicted Patton would win by 26 - he actually won by 39: an > error of 13 points on the difference. > > Is anyone aware of other Harris polls from 1999? > > MS > Actual Harris > Musgrove 50 39 > Parker 49 53 > Other 2 8 >(includes undecided) > > KY > Actual Harris > Patton 61 54 > Martin 22 28 > Galbraith 15 14 > Other 1 4 >(includes undecided) > > > Daniel Merkle > >From kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu Thu Nov 4 10:38:08 1999 Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA19869 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 10:38:07 -0800 (PST) Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (sph76-133.harvard.edu [128.103.76.133]) by hsph.harvard.edu (8.9.1b+Sun/8.9.1)

with ESMTP id NAA16988 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 13:37:38 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <3821D334.26FC3A45@hsph.harvard.edu> Date: Thu, 04 Nov 1999 13:40:53 -0500 From: Karen Donelan X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.05 [en] (Win95; I) MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls References: Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit I guess that when they miss the mark Harris Interactive could just hide all of their data and not give any of us the opportunity to comment, improve, challenge, berate, question, claim superiority.... or even learn. I guess I'd rather see more data, understand the method, understand the voter turnout, and withhold judgement for at least another moment. We all know the world is changing. Some of us have the luck and luxury to sit back and let others make the first mistakes. Karen Donelan Harvard School of Public Health James Beniger wrote: > To borrow Paul Braun's deadpan syntax: > > I guess we're not yet ready to weight up or oversample certain > demographic categories, underrepresented online, according to their > representation in the general (or adult, or likely voting) population. > I guess that one reason for this caution might be that people online > could possibly differ-- substantially and decisively--from people not > online, even after controlling for all of the demographic variables we > have so long been in the habit of using. I guess that just one of the > countless possible hypotheses to test, in our attempts to explain this > phenomenon, might be that the mere fact of actually being online could > directly change at least some people in behaviorally and socially > significant ways. I guess that another such hypothesis to test might > be that those who go online already differ--even before that > fact--from those who do not go online, and that these differences > might not be entirely reflected in the demographic data we have so > long been in the habit of collecting. I guess it wasn't enough that > only three or four hundred of us have been saying all this for the > past three or four years... > > -- Jim > > ******* > > On Thu, 4 Nov 1999 DMMerkle@aol.com wrote: > > > Below is a comparison of two of Harris Interactive's pre-election > > polls as reported in Hotline right before the election. > > > > Their Mississippi results were poor. Harris had Parker leading by > > 14, but it appears that Musgrove won by 1 point (Musgrove has > > declared victory, Parker has not conceded). That is an error of 15 > > points on the difference. > > > > In Kentucky, Harris got the winner right, but was off by about the > > same margin. They predicted Patton would win by 26 - he actually > > won by 39: an error of 13 points on the difference. > > > > Is anyone aware of other Harris polls from 1999? > > > > > MS > > Actual Harris > > Musgrove 50 39 > > Parker 49 53 > > Other 2 8 >(includes undecided) > > > > KY > > Actual Harris > > Patton 61 54 > > Martin 22 28 > > Galbraith 15 14 > > Other 1 4 >(includes undecided) > > > > > Daniel Merkle > > >From rshalpern@mindspring.com Thu Nov 4 11:49:09 1999 Received: from smtp4.mindspring.com (smtp4.mindspring.com [207.69.200.64]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id LAA14311 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 11:49:08 -0800 (PST) Received: from default (user-38ld6rb.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.155.107]) by smtp4.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id OAA02236 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 14:49:05 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991104144420.00a3aa00@mail.mindspring.com> X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58 Date: Thu, 04 Nov 1999 14:48:26 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: dick halpern Subject: Re: More Internet Polling In-Reply-To: <4.2.0.58.19991029011140.0097cf00@pop.mindspring.com> Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed Some weeks ago Warren Mitofsky posted this note. I followed it up and while it looked interesting and promising I was disappointed to find that it applies ONLY to those Internet users who live in Britain!. Some day, maybe, the rest of us will be able to participate. Dick Halpern At 12:14 AM 10/29/1999 , you wrote: >> From The Guardian, Manchester and London, October 28: >> >>"If you'd like to air your views online and get paid for it, note that >>MORI

(Market and Opinion Research International) is offering beenz to >>people who join its e-public research panel. You can fill in the >>registration form at www.e-public.co.uk. Beenz is a rewards system >>like supermarket points or Air Miles, and e-MORI plans to give away 15 >>million of them to people who register and complete surveys." >From SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu Thu Nov 4 11:55:36 1999 Received: from UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id LAA19817 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 11:55:35 -0800 (PST) Received: by UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id 1633 ; Thu, 04 Nov 1999 14:55:33 EST Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UCONNVM) by UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU (LMail V1.2c/1.8c) with BSMTP id 3194; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 14:55:34 -0500 Date: Thu, 04 Nov 99 14:37:12 EST From: Don Ferree Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls To: Members of AAPORNET In-Reply-To: <4.2.1.19991104124909.00a28520@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000 Message-Id: <991104.145519.EST.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu> MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT It is true that one cannot simply add the standard errors of two sample statistics which are even partially independent of one another. The general principle indeed is Var(A+B)=VAR(A)+VAR(B)+2*(COVAR(A,B)). However, what was being done quickly here was comparing the difference in two party vote, where for all intents and purposes the proportion for one candidate is 1.00 minus the proportion for the other, since they must sum to one. Using the traditional "p" and "q" (where q is 1-p), in other words, the spread (p - q) is identical with (p - (1 - p)) which (2p - 1). This has exactly twice the standard error of p. Don Ferree >From Joe@greenbergresearch.com Thu Nov 4 12:26:29 1999 Received: from wodc7mr3.ffx.ops.us.uu.net (wodc7mr3.ffx.ops.us.uu.net [192.48.96.19]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id MAA14600 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 12:26:28 -0800 (PST) Received: from greenbergresearch.com by wodc7mr3.ffx.ops.us.uu.net with ESMTP (peer crosschecked as: wk202.greenbergresearch.com [208.239.6.202]) id QQhnxq15309 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 20:30:13 GMT Message-ID: <3821EBFD.BD5A0D4C@greenbergresearch.com> Date: Thu, 04 Nov 1999 15:26:37 -0500 From: Joe Goode X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; I) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Survey Research Headhunters Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit Does anyone know of any reputable head hunters in the field of survey research? I manage a growing firm and am finding it increasingly difficult to identify experienced professionals in our field at virtually every level (especially writing and analysis and field). Please respond to me directly and I will post a summary of any findings. Thank You. -- Joe Goode Executive Director Greenberg-Quinlan Research 515 2nd Street NE Washington, DC 20002 >From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Thu Nov 4 12:31:01 1999 Received: from smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.138]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id MAA17438 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 12:31:01 -0800 (PST) Received: from login5.isis.unc.edu (pmeyer@login5.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.135]) by smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.1) with ESMTP id PAA19545 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 15:31:06 -0500 (EST) Received: (from pmeyer@localhost) by login5.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) id PAA178438; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 15:31:04 -0500 Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 15:31:03 -0500 (EST) From: Philip Meyer X-Sender: pmeyer@login5.isis.unc.edu To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls In-Reply-To: <4.2.1.19991104124909.00a28520@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII True === Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085 CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549 University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425 Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

== >From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Thu Nov 4 12:40:25 1999 Received: from imsety.oit.unc.edu (imsety.oit.unc.edu [152.2.21.99]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id MAA24323 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 12:40:24 -0800 (PST) Received: from login5.isis.unc.edu (pmeyer@login5.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.135]) by imsety.oit.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id PAA12581 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 15:40:29 -0500 (EST) Received: (from pmeyer@localhost) by login5.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) id PAA315452; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 15:40:27 -0500 Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 15:40:27 -0500 (EST) From: Philip Meyer X-Sender: pmeyer@login5.isis.unc.edu To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls In-Reply-To: <4.2.1.19991104124909.00a28520@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII True. But the proportions are not independent in a two-candidate race. Error on the winner is the same as error on the loser by definition. I've always been against using the spread as a comparison because it doubles the apparent error and makes us look worse than need be. I prefer the standard Gallup uses in its publications: comparing the winner's proportion in the poll to the proportion in the election after the undecideds have been allocated.

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

== On Thu, 4 Nov 1999 mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu wrote: > Date: Thu, 04 Nov 1999 13:18:29 -0500 > From: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu > Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu > To: aapornet@usc.edu > Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls > > At 11:44 AM 11/4/99 -0500, Philip Meyer wrote: > > ....When using the difference between the winner and second-place > > finisher as the standard, > >we have to double the allowance for sampling error (because we're counting > >error twice.) So if the sample size was 600, we'd allow 8 points instead > >of the usual four. That makes the outcome still poor, but not as poor as > >it sounds. > > "We", of course, can allow whatever we want, but statistical theory > does > not suggest that the standard error of a difference of proportions > (especially not a difference of proportions from the same distribution, as > in this example) is the sum of the two standard errors computed separately. > It is smaller than simply the sum when we compare two independent > proportions and even smaller yet in this example due to the non-zero > covariance of the two proportions considered. > > However, using the "double up" rule is not a bad idea -- as the > standard > calculation rests on the -- highly unrealistic -- assumption of a simple > random sample and any clustering in normal multi-stage RDD should take an > additional 'design effect' into account. While this does not apply to the > sampling strategy employed by Harris online -- which I would call a > "randomized quota sample" for lack of a more fitting term -- the "sampling > error" is just one part of the larger "survey error" (which unfortunately > cannot be quantified easily). > > So, the only truly meaningful assessment of failure or success of > these > Harris polls is by comparison with conventional phone polls conducted at > the same time. But, unfortunately, there does not seem to be much > available. If this is true, we should postpone any bashing and wait for a > better opportunity to make a fair comparison between Harris' online polls > and conventional (RDD) phone polls. > > Unfortunately, the next elections are a year away and only with polls > close > to an election we have an objective validation criterion (the actual > election results). So, Harris did not do great with these ones, but any > emerging methodology is likely to have some problems > and I know of many examples where the conventional methods have not done so > great either. > > >From LarryB@socialresearch.com Thu Nov 4 16:08:01 1999 Received: from mail.isp.net (psion.isp.net [216.38.129.30]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc)

with ESMTP id QAA27436 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 16:08:00 -0800 (PST) Received: from researchnt.socialresearch.com (mail.socialresearch.com [208.128.218.194]) by mail.isp.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id QAA12344 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 16:12:22 -0800 (PST) Message-Id: <199911050012.QAA12344@mail.isp.net> Received: by mail.socialresearch.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3) id ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 15:53:54 -0800 From: Larry Bye To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: RE: Survey Research Headhunters Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 16:05:31 -0800 MIME-Version: 1.0 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3) Content-Type: text/plain If anyone finds a personnel recruiting firm with our industry as a specialty please let us know. I have been looking for one for about 20 years! Larry Bye Communication Sciences Group Survey Methods Group San Francisco larryb@socialresearch.com -----Original Message----- From: Joe Goode [mailto:Joe@greenbergresearch.com] Sent: Thursday, November 04, 1999 12:27 PM To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Survey Research Headhunters Does anyone know of any reputable head hunters in the field of survey research? I manage a growing firm and am finding it increasingly difficult to identify experienced professionals in our field at virtually every level (especially writing and analysis and field). Please respond to me directly and I will post a summary of any findings. Thank You. -- Joe Goode Executive Director Greenberg-Quinlan Research 515 2nd Street NE Washington, DC 20002 >From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Thu Nov 4 18:30:19 1999 Received: from mail01-lax.pilot.net (mail-lax-1.pilot.net [205.139.40.18]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id SAA15941 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 18:30:18 -0800 (PST) Received: from mailgw.latimes.com (unknown-c-23-147.latimes.com [204.48.23.147] (may be forged)) by mail01-lax.pilot.net with ESMTP id SAA05824 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 18:30:17 -0800 (PST) Received: from pegasus.latimes.com (unknown-45-201.latimes.com [144.142.45.201]) by mailgw.latimes.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA05280 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 18:33:31 -0800 (PST) Received: from funk.news.latimes.com (lasp1e1.latimes.com [172.24.17.120]) by pegasus.latimes.com (Pro-8.9.3/Pro-8.9.3) with ESMTP id SAA18204 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 18:29:07 -0800 (PST) Received: (from pinkus@localhost) by funk.news.latimes.com (AIX4.2/UCB 8.7/8.7) id SAA41176; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 18:28:46 -0800 (PST) Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1999 18:28:45 -0800 (PST) From: Susan Pinkus X-Sender: pinkus@lasp1.latimes.com To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: RE: Survey Research Headhunters In-Reply-To: <199911050012.QAA12344@mail.isp.net> Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII I would also be very interested. Thanks, susan pinkus On Thu, 4 Nov 1999, Larry Bye wrote: > If anyone finds a personnel recruiting firm with our industry as a > specialty please let us know. I have been looking for one for about 20 > years! > > Larry Bye > Communication Sciences Group > Survey Methods Group > San Francisco > larryb@socialresearch.com > > -----Original Message----- > From: Joe Goode [mailto:Joe@greenbergresearch.com] > Sent: Thursday, November 04, 1999 12:27 PM > To: aapornet@usc.edu > Subject: Survey Research Headhunters > > > Does anyone know of any reputable head hunters in the field of survey > research? I manage a growing firm and am finding it increasingly > difficult to identify experienced professionals in our field at > virtually every level (especially writing and analysis and field). > Please respond to me directly and I will post a summary of any > findings. > > Thank You. > > -- > Joe Goode > Executive Director > Greenberg-Quinlan Research > 515 2nd Street NE > Washington, DC 20002 > > *** *************************************** Susan H. Pinkus Los Angeles Times Poll Internet:susan.pinkus@latimes.com American Online: spinkus@aol.com FAX: 213-237-2505 *** >From rshalpern@mindspring.com Thu Nov 4 20:37:08 1999 Received: from smtp4.mindspring.com

(smtp4.mindspring.com [207.69.200.64]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id UAA19589 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 20:37:06 -0800 (PST) Received: from default (user-38lcau3.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.43.195]) by smtp4.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id XAA15274 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 23:37:03 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991104231857.009e9b40@mail.mindspring.com> X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58 Date: Thu, 04 Nov 1999 23:36:48 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: dick halpern Subject: Dick Morris's new Web Site Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed Hi folks, Just want to call your attention to Dick Morris's new web site www.vote.com. Another wonderful example of the use of self selected samples. CNN's "write in" (also the Washington Post) poll is another good example with which most of you are familar. Only Morris goes one step further. Instead of just posting the findings, he sends them to your elected representative and to the White House. The difference between the CNN poll and Morris's poll, however, is that CNN states that the poll is not scientific and indicates how many people actually voted on a specific issue. Morris shows in graphic format the proportion who voted yes or no on a particular question. Percentages but no indication of the number of people voting. He displays the results in total, by your state and by your district. Again, percentages but no numbers. Very clever and probably profitable but not what I think we'd regard as meeting AAPOR's standards of representativeness. validity and reliability. Check it out! According to one news report the White House has blocked stuff coming from Morris's site. The cry is already going out (among certain right wing types) that Clinton doesn't really want to know what the people think!! We live in such an exciting world. Dick Halpern ---------- Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology 3837 Courtyard Drive Atlanta, GA 30339-4248 rshalpern@mindspring.com phone/fax 770 434 4121 ---------- >From mitofsky@mindspring.com Thu Nov 4 22:00:09 1999 Received: from smtp4.mindspring.com (smtp4.mindspring.com [207.69.200.64]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id WAA21889 for ; Thu, 4 Nov 1999 22:00:08 -0800 (PST) Received: from Wmitofsky.compuserve.com (sfr-tgn-sff-vty10.as.wcom.net [216.192.8.10]) by smtp4.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id BAA19180 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 01:00:05 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991105005332.0098d120@pop.mindspring.com> X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58 Date: Fri, 05 Nov 1999 00:58:39 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: Warren Mitofsky Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls In-Reply-To: <4.2.1.19991104124909.00a28520@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> References: <0.13159b2d.2552fcb4@aol.com> Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed If you want a comparison to the traditional polls for the same election check my article "Pollster.com" in Public Perspective a few months ago. I don't think the Harris polls did as well as the '98 preelection polls. The preelection polls had more wrong winners, but the size of the error margins were smaller for the preelection polls than the Internet polls. At 01:18 PM 11/4/99 -0500, you wrote: >At 11:44 AM 11/4/99 -0500, Philip Meyer wrote: >> ....When using the difference between the winner and second-place >> finisher as the standard, >>we have to double the allowance for sampling error (because we're counting >>error twice.) So if the sample size was 600, we'd allow 8 points instead >>of the usual four. That makes the outcome still poor, but not as poor as >>it sounds. > >"We", of course, can allow whatever we want, but statistical theory >does >not suggest that the standard error of a difference of proportions >(especially not a difference of proportions from the same distribution, as >in this example) is the sum of the two standard errors computed >separately. It is smaller than simply the sum when we compare two >independent proportions and even smaller yet in this example due to the >non-

zero covariance of the two proportions considered. > >However, using the "double up" rule is not a bad idea -- as the >standard >calculation rests on the -- highly unrealistic -- assumption of a simple >random sample and any clustering in normal multi-stage RDD should take an >additional 'design effect' into account. While this does not apply to the >sampling strategy employed by Harris online -- which I would call a >"randomized quota sample" for lack of a more fitting term -- the >"sampling error" is just one part of the larger "survey error" (which >unfortunately cannot be quantified easily). > >So, the only truly meaningful assessment of failure or success of these >Harris polls is by comparison with conventional phone polls conducted at >the same time. But, unfortunately, there does not seem to be much >available. If this is true, we should postpone any bashing and wait for a >better opportunity to make a fair comparison between Harris' online polls >and conventional (RDD) phone polls. > >Unfortunately, the next elections are a year away and only with polls >close to an election we have an objective validation criterion (the actual >election results). So, Harris did not do great with these ones, but any >emerging methodology is likely to have some problems >and I know of many examples where the conventional methods have not done >so great either. >From bthompson@directionsrsch.com Fri Nov 5 05:23:13 1999 Received: from proxy.directionsrsch.com (IDENT:root@dri74.directionsrsch.com [206.112.196.74]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id FAA28553 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 05:23:12 -0800 (PST) Received: from drione.directionsrsch.com by proxy.directionsrsch.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id HAA06425 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 07:34:57 -0500 Received: by drione.directionsrsch.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.3 (733.2 10-16-1998)) id 85256820.00493E7B ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 08:20:01 -0500 X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI From: "Bill Thompson" To: aapornet@usc.edu Message-ID: <85256820.00493DEE.00@drione.directionsrsch.com> Date: Fri, 5 Nov 1999 08:19:58 -0500 Subject: RE: Survey Research Headhunters Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Disposition: inline There is a company called Management Recruiters International that has a marketing/market research focus. They have lots of offices Iunderstand, but the only ones I know of for sure are in Silver Spring, Md. and in northern NJ, (I think it's Caldwell, but I'm not sure). I believe they have a website. >From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Fri Nov 5 06:28:44 1999 Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.156]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA15336 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 06:28:43 -0800 (PST) Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (client-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net [151.202.23.5]) by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id JAA23653; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 09:26:28 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.2.1.19991105081741.00a4de50@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.1 Date: Fri, 05 Nov 1999 09:26:20 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu From: Manfred Kuechler Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls In-Reply-To: <4.2.0.58.19991105005332.0098d120@pop.mindspring.com> References: <4.2.1.19991104124909.00a28520@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="=====================_135533250==_.ALT" --=====================_135533250==_.ALT Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed At 12:58 AM 11/5/99 -0500, Warren Mitofsky wrote: >If you want a comparison to the traditional polls for the same election >check my article "Pollster.com" in Public Perspective a few months ago. I >don't think the Harris polls did as well as the '98 preelection polls. The >preelection polls had more wrong winners, but the size of the error >margins were smaller for the preelection polls than the Internet polls. ... The full text (3 pages) of Warren Mitofsky's article is available at: http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pubper/pdf/pp104c.pdf The meta analyis presented includes 113 "state polls, 1998" and 22 "Harris Black Internet Polls, 1998" and uses the the "error in estimating the

margin between the first and second candidate (in percentage points)" grouped into three intervals ("<6%, 7-12%, >13%") as the sole criterion. In WM's initial judgment (p.25): "The performance of the internet polls was fair." And it would be hard to claim that the conventional phone polls are clearly superior given the data. Still, one page later (p.26), he concludes: "I can see no valid survey purpose to the current internet enterprise." Though, of course, we are not talking about entertainment (or nonsense) polls like the Harris/Excite polls (http://news.excite.com/news/poll/) which indeed have no valid survey purpose. WM and most of the AAPOR establishment largely refuse to consider that a. the *realized sample* may not be representative even if the *target sample* is perfectly random (e.g., using a sophisticated RDD approach) -- and that, by and large, the likelihood for this to happen increases as the response rate declines; and b. the statistical *sampling error* is just part of a significantly larger *survey error* (reflecting self-selection bias, sloppiness in responding, and various errors due to the wording, sequence, interviewer effects, etc., etc.). Even before the recent debate on Internet polls, some survey organizations did extremely well (using closeness of polls results to actual election returns as a measure) using *quota* sample -- including Elizabeth Noelle-Neumann's IfD in Germany. A very comprehensive meta-analysis of German polls some years ago, showed the IfD polls at least as much on target as the ones based on random sampling. (Not withstanding, some significant failures as well.) Given my own background in mathematics and statistics, these result troubled me greatly, but in the end they softened my statistical dogmatism. We need to give up the idea that political surveys are an exact science where a valid margin of error can be computed precisely (as long as probability sampling is used), and spend more effort on better understanding the part of the survey error coming from sources other than the selection of the *target* sample. Admitting to this may not be helpful for business in the short run, but if we (as AAPOR) are really concerned about the larger effect that polling may have on the political process, that (biased) published poll results may be shaping public opinion (rather than just being an obtrusive measure), then we need to focus our efforts, our creativity, and our imagination on finding better solutions -- including the use of the Internet -- and not be discouraged or disgusted by Dick Morris' vote.com and similar operations. MK. Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY) http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html Given the continuing problems with Internet service to/from Hunter and e-mail service in particular, you may want to use my private e-mail address (kathman@bellatlantic.net) for anything important. This is a new address, the previous address (kathman@asan.com) has been discontinued. --=====================_135533250==_.ALT Content-Type: text/html; charset="iso-8859-1" Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable At 12:58 AM 11/5/99 -0500, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

   If you want a comparison to the traditional polls for the same election check my article "Pollster.com" in Public Perspective a few months ago. I don't think the Harris polls did as well as the '98 preelection polls. The preelection polls had more wrong winners, but the size of the error margins were smaller for the preelection polls than the Internet polls. ...

The full text (3 pages) of Warren Mitofsky's article is available at:

http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pubper/pdf/pp104c.<= a
href=3D"http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pubper/pdf/pp104c.pdf"= eudora=3D"autourl">pdf

The meta analyis presented includes 113 "state polls, 1998" and 22 "Harris Black Internet Polls, 1998" and uses the the "error in estimating the margin between the first and second candidate (in percentage points)" grouped into three intervals ("<6%, 7-12%, >13%") as the sole criterion. In WM's initial judgment (p.25): "The performance of the internet polls was fair." And it would be hard to claim that the conventional phone polls are clearly superior given the data. Still, one page later (p.26), he concludes: "I can see no valid survey purpose to the current internet enterprise." Though, of course, we are not talking about entertainment (or nonsense) polls like the Harris/Excite polls (http://news= .excite.com/news/poll/) which indeed have no valid survey purpose.

WM and most of the AAPOR establishment largely refuse to consider that

a. the *realized sample* may not be representative even if the *target= sample* is perfectly random (e.g., using a sophisticated RDD approach) --= and that, by and large, the likelihood for this to happen increases as the= response rate declines; and

b. the statistical *sampling error* is just part of a significantly larger= *survey error* (reflecting self-selection bias, sloppiness in responding,= and various errors due to the wording, sequence, interviewer effects, etc.,= etc.).

Even before the recent debate on Internet polls, some survey organizations= did extremely well (using closeness of polls results to actual election= returns as a measure) using *quota* sample -- including Elizabeth= Noelle-Neumann's IfD in Germany. A very comprehensive meta-analysis of= German polls some years ago, showed the IfD polls at least as much on= target as the ones based on random sampling. (Not withstanding, some= significant failures as well.) Given my own background in mathematics and= statistics, these result troubled me greatly, but in the end they softened= my statistical dogmatism.

We need to give up the idea that political surveys are an exact science= where a valid margin of error can be computed precisely (as long as= probability sampling is used), and spend more effort on better= understanding the part of the survey error coming from sources other= than the selection of the *target* sample. Admitting to this may not be= helpful for business in the short run, but if we (as AAPOR) are really= concerned about the larger effect that polling may have on the political= process, that (biased) published poll results may be shaping public opinion= (rather than just being an obtrusive measure), then we need to focus our= efforts, our creativity, and our imagination on finding better solutions --= including the use of the Internet -- and not be discouraged or disgusted by= Dick Morris' vote.com and similar operations. MK.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)

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

Given the continuing problems with Internet service to/from Hunter and= e-mail service in particular, you may want to use my private e-mail address= (kathman@bellatlantic.net) for anything important. This is a new address,= the previous address (kathman@asan.com) has been discontinued.

--=====================_135533250==_.ALT-- >From market.probe.la@juno.com Fri Nov 5 06:56:52 1999 Received: from m12.boston.juno.com (m12.boston.juno.com [205.231.101.194]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA25349 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 06:56:51 -0800 (PST) Received: (from market.probe.la@juno.com) by m12.boston.juno.com (queuemail) id EQNWPWM4; Fri, 05 Nov 1999 09:56:50 EST To: aapornet@usc.edu Cc: market.probe.la@juno.com Date: Fri, 5 Nov 1999 06:46:52 -0600 Subject: Re: Survey Research Headhunters Message-ID: <19991105.065823.-258433.1.Market.Probe.LA@juno.com> X-Mailer: Juno 3.0.13 MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Juno-Att: 0 X-Juno-RefParts: 0 From: Jacquelyn B Schriber You might also investigate Smith Hanley Jacquie Schriber
=== Market Probe, Inc. - 1100 E. Alosta Ave., Glendora, CA 91740 Phone: 626.963.7662 Fax: 626.963.7663
=== >From mitofsky@mindspring.com Fri Nov 5 07:19:59 1999 Received: from smtp4.mindspring.com (smtp4.mindspring.com [207.69.200.64]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id HAA02880 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 07:19:58 -0800 (PST) Received: from Wmitofsky.compuserve.com (dal-qbu-zoi-vty98.as.wcom.net [216.192.241.98]) by smtp4.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id KAA07984 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 10:19:54 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991105100557.00999610@pop.mindspring.com> X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58 Date: Fri, 05 Nov 1999 10:18:26 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: Warren Mitofsky Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls In-Reply-To: <4.2.1.19991105081741.00a4de50@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> References: <4.2.0.58.19991105005332.0098d120@pop.mindspring.com> <4.2.1.19991104124909.00a28520@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed I applaud Manfred's willingness to keep an open mind about Internet polls. When he and others do they should consider two things: First, is there an empirical basis for interest and second, is there a theoretical basis. SO FAR, I do not see either basis for Internet polls. All I see is a cheap way to collect lots of data about obscure groups, and sometimes, like elections, not so obscure. As for his characterization of me and "the AAPOR establishment" as tied to probability sampling as the only criterion for evaluating survey research, that is just plain wrong. Evaluation is much broader than that, including, but not limited to, an understanding of response error and response bias (the are not the same thing). I will keep exploring new methods, even Internet polls, but I have some criteria for evaluation and then I follow them. Waiting for the next election is not one of my criteria. At 09:26 AM 11/5/99 -0500, you Manfred Kuechler wrote: >WM and most of the AAPOR establishment largely refuse to consider that >a. the *realized sample* may not be representative even if the *target >sample* is perfectly random (e.g., using a sophisticated RDD approach) -- >and that, by and large, the likelihood for this to happen increases as the >response rate declines; and >b. the statistical *sampling error* is just part of a significantly larger >*survey error* (reflecting self-selection bias, sloppiness in responding, >and various errors due to the wording, sequence, interviewer effects, >etc., etc.). > >Even before the recent debate on Internet polls, some survey organizations >did extremely well (using closeness of polls results to actual election >returns as a measure) using *quota* sample -- including Elizabeth >Noelle-Neumann's IfD in Germany. A very comprehensive meta-analysis of >German polls some years ago,

showed the IfD polls at least as much on >target as the ones based on random sampling. (Not withstanding, some >significant failures as well.) Given my own background in mathematics and >statistics, these result troubled me greatly, but in the end they softened >my statistical dogmatism. > >We need to give up the idea that political surveys are an exact science >where a valid margin of error can be computed precisely (as long as >probability sampling is used), and spend more effort on better >understanding the part of the survey error coming from sources other than >the selection of the *target* sample. Admitting to this may not be helpful >for business in the short run, but if we (as AAPOR) are really concerned >about the larger effect that polling may have on the political process, >that (biased) published poll results may be shaping public opinion (rather >than just being an obtrusive measure), then we need to focus our efforts, >our creativity, and our imagination on finding better solutions -- >including the use of the Internet -- and not be discouraged or disgusted >by Dick Morris' vote.com and similar operations. MK. > >Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY) > http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html >Given the continuing problems with Internet service to/from Hunter and >e-mail service in particular, you may want to use my private e-mail >address (kathman@bellatlantic.net) for anything important. This is a new >address, the previous address (kathman@asan.com) has been discontinued. >From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Fri Nov 5 07:42:04 1999 Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.32]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id HAA11158 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 07:42:03 -0800 (PST) Received: from oemcomputer (ts17-14.homenet.ohio-state.edu [140.254.113.101]) by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id KAA06596 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 10:42:01 -0500 (EST) Date: Fri, 5 Nov 1999 10:42:01 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <199911051542.KAA06596@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu> X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2 Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" To: aapornet@usc.edu From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." Subject: Re: Harris Interactive 1999 Election Polls Warren, Well spoken! At 10:18 AM 11/5/99 -0500, you wrote: >I applaud Manfred's willingness to keep an open mind about Internet polls. >When he and others do they should consider two things: First, is there an >empirical basis for interest and second, is there a theoretical basis. SO >FAR, I do not see either basis for Internet polls. All I see is a cheap way >to collect lots of data about obscure groups, and sometimes, like >elections, not so obscure. > >As for his characterization of me and "the AAPOR establishment" as tied to >probability sampling as the only criterion for evaluating survey research, >that is just plain wrong. Evaluation is much broader than that, including, >but not limited to, an understanding of response error and response bias >(the are not the same thing). > >I will keep exploring new methods, even Internet polls, but I have some >criteria for evaluation and then I follow them. Waiting for the next >election is not one of my criteria. > >> >From sullivan@fsc-research.com Fri Nov 5 09:21:45 1999 Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA02832 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 09:21:42 -0800 (PST) From: sullivan@fsc-research.com Received: from BECKY (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75]) by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id JAA05296; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 09:21:24 -0800 Message-Id: <199911051721.JAA05296@web2.tdl.com> To: aapornet@usc.edu Date: Fri, 5 Nov 1999 09:28:29 -0700 MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT Subject: Re: Survey Research Headhunters CC: market.probe.la@juno.com In-reply-to: <19991105.065823.-258433.1.Market.Probe.LA@juno.com> X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v3.01d) Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT These guys too. Date sent: Fri, 5 Nov 1999 06:46:52 -0600 Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu From: Jacquelyn B Schriber To: aapornet@usc.edu Copies to: market.probe.la@juno.com Subject: Re: Survey Research Headhunters You might also investigate Smith

Hanley Jacquie Schriber

>From berinsky@Princeton.EDU Fri Nov 5 09:24:17 1999 Received: from Princeton.EDU (postoffice.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA04869 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 09:24:16 -0800 (PST) Received: from mailserver.Princeton.EDU (mailserver.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.65]) by Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA02180 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 12:24:15 -0500 (EST) Received: from princeton.edu (pol-berinsky.Princeton.EDU [128.112.149.106]) by mailserver.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA05720 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 12:24:14 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <382312BE.D353F31B@princeton.edu> Date: Fri, 05 Nov 1999 12:24:14 -0500 From: Adam Berinsky Reply-To: berinsky@Princeton.EDU X-Sender: "Adam Berinsky" X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD Princeton University 05-99 (WinNT; I) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Survey Research Headhunters References: <199911051721.JAA05296@web2.tdl.com> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit sullivan@fsc-research.com wrote: > These guys too. > > Date sent: Fri, 5 Nov 1999 06:46:52 -0600 > Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu > From: Jacquelyn B Schriber > To: aapornet@usc.edu > Copies to: market.probe.la@juno.com > Subject: Re: Survey Research Headhunters > > You might also investigate Smith Hanley > > Jacquie Schriber >

=== > Market Probe, Inc. - 1100 E. Alosta Ave., Glendora, CA 91740 > Phone: 626.963.7662 Fax: 626.963.7663 > === > > The information contained in this communication is > confidential and is intended only for the use of the > addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. > If you have received this communication in error, > please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by > e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this > communication and all copies thereof, including > attachments. -- _____ Adam J. Berinsky Assistant Professor Politics Department Princeton University Corwin Hall Princeton, NJ 08544-10102 Tel: (609) 258-6601 Fax: (609) 258-4772 _____ >From berinsky@Princeton.EDU Fri Nov 5 09:28:18 1999 Received: from Princeton.EDU (postoffice.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA07789 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 09:28:17 -0800 (PST) Received: from mailserver.Princeton.EDU (mailserver.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.65]) by Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA02803 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 12:28:16 -0500 (EST) Received: from princeton.edu (pol-berinsky.Princeton.EDU [128.112.149.106]) by mailserver.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA09155 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 12:28:15 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <382313AF.CC98BA85@princeton.edu> Date: Fri, 05 Nov 1999 12:28:15 -0500 From: Adam Berinsky Reply-To: berinsky@Princeton.EDU X-Sender: "Adam Berinsky" X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD Princeton University 05-99 (WinNT; I) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: digest References: <4.2.1.19991104124909.00a28520@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> <4.2.1.19991105081741.00a4de50@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit ooops. sorry about that. I meant to ask if anyone knew how to get AAPORNET in the digest form. adam >From kneuman@cra.ca Fri Nov 5 09:28:39 1999 Received: from cclgroup.ca ([142.176.86.2]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA08094 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 09:28:37 -0800 (PST) Message-id: Date: Fri, 05 Nov 1999 13:37:48 -0400 Subject: Re: RE: Survey Research Headhunters To: LarryB@socialresearch.com Cc: aapornet@usc.edu From: kneuman@cra.ca (Keith Neuman) MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit One firm that specializes in placement of market research professionals is Ginger Lindzey & Associates. Their website is www.glindzey.com. >From Joe@greenbergresearch.com Fri Nov 5 12:22:25 1999 Received: from wodc7mr3.ffx.ops.us.uu.net (wodc7mr3.ffx.ops.us.uu.net [192.48.96.19]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id MAA22463 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 12:22:24 -0800 (PST) Received: from greenbergresearch.com by wodc7mr3.ffx.ops.us.uu.net with ESMTP (peer crosschecked as: wk202.greenbergresearch.com [208.239.6.202]) id QQhobh14462 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 20:26:16 GMT Message-ID: <38233C8B.C50D3C2A@greenbergresearch.com> Date: Fri, 05 Nov 1999 15:22:35 -0500 From: Joe Goode X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; I) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Placement Firms Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit Many thanks to all who responded to my inquiry for firms that specialize in the placement of survey research professionals. It seems that many of you have the same problems I have, so I thought it best to post this listing ASAP. Many responses had company names, but no contacts or phone numbers. I've included everything just the same for those of you who want to do the detective work. I hope this helps all who are both looking for hires and looking to be hired. Disclaimer: I know nothing about any of these firms and am not recommending anyone. I can't speak for AAPOR, but feel obliged to say that this is by no means an official list. THE LIST: Barbara Shorenstein of Ribolow Associates in NYC, 212-575-2700. I have posted on WorldOpinion.com (they have a job posting area) and gotten decent candidates, including experienced ones. I like to call Frank Black for my staffing needs - 301-589-5400 x 121 There is a company called Management Recruiters International that has a marketing/market research focus. They have lots of offices I understand, but the only ones I know of for sure are in Silver Spring, Md. and in northern NJ, (I think it's Caldwell, but I'm not sure). I believe they have a website. Smith Hanley Associates, NY (market research) www.smithhanley.com Analytic Recruiting Inc., NY Smith's 5th Ave, NY (also market research, don't know if they are still around) J. Carson and Assocs (just read about this one, www.jcarson.com) Sally Naetzker Brocklehurst; Cochran Cochran and Yale; Market Research Specialist 716-631-1300 Up here in NYC there is a firm called Smiths Fifth Avenue which targets marketing research and allied data driven fields. Also Cambridge Associates in Westport. www.marketinglink.com (For people with over 4 years experience) Wally Winslow has been a headhunter in this area for over 5 years now. He can be reached at wwins@theoffice.net Christine Brouwer TRAK Staffing (301) 941-1909 One firm that specializes in placement of market research professionals is Ginger Lindzey & Associates. Their website is www.glindzey.com. -- Joe Goode Executive Director Greenberg-Quinlan Research 515 2nd Street NE Washington, DC 20002 >From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Nov 5 13:56:25 1999 Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id NAA26035 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 13:56:25 -0800 (PST) Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost) by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id NAA11667 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 13:56:25 -0800 (PST) Date: Fri, 5 Nov 1999 13:56:25 -0800 (PST) From: James Beniger To: AAPORNET Subject: Translating Mitofsky into Excessive Verbiage Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII Who among us could disagree with Paul Lavrakas that Warren Mitofsky's remarks below are well spoken? > I applaud Manfred's willingness

to keep an open mind about > Internet polls. When he and others do they should consider > two things: First, is there an empirical basis for interest > and second, is there a theoretical basis. SO FAR, I do not > see either basis for Internet polls. All I see is a cheap > way to collect lots of data about obscure groups, and > sometimes, like elections, not so obscure. > > As for his characterization of me and "the AAPOR > establishment" as tied to probability sampling as the only > criterion for evaluating survey research, that is just > plain wrong. Evaluation is much broader than that, > including, but not limited to, an understanding of response > error and response bias (the are not the same thing). > > I will keep exploring new methods, even Internet polls, but > I have some criteria for evaluation and then I follow them. > Waiting for the next election is not one of my criteria. Since no one could say this as elegantly in fewer words, it's left for all the rest of us to say it less elegantly in many more words. Here are mine: One thing I like about AAPOR is that it doesn't have an establishment. As evidence, I can cite the fact that, until yesterday, I had never heard nor ever read the words "AAPOR establishment" juxtaposed as noun phrase. Some people in AAPOR may belong to various outside establishments, but they either know enough to use these only as a resource for the benefit of all of us members, or else they soon drop out, for lack of the deference they think we all owe them, and are not missed by many. [Warren might well be bright, wise beyond his years, knowledgeable, industrious, accomplished, urbane, witty, charming, and one big always huggable teddy bear, but I just can't picture him as part of any establishment--at least not with him managing to keep a straight face.] Second, I can only repeat what Warren has already said, and what ought to be obvious to anyone with only a single crash course in research methods: Probability sampling is but one of many criteria for evaluating survey research. In my last posting to AAPORNET, for example, in response to Dan Merkle's information about several Harris Interactive election polls, I criticized Internet polling methods on several criteria without mentioning nor alluding to probability sampling in any important way: I guess we're not yet ready to weight up or oversample certain demographic categories, underrepresented online, according to their representation in the general (or adult, or likely voting) population. I guess that one reason for this caution might be that people online could possibly differ--substantially and decisively-- from people not online, even after controlling for all of the demographic variables we have so long been in the habit of using. I guess that just one of the countless possible hypotheses to test, in our attempts to explain this phenomenon, might be that the mere fact of actually being online could directly change at least some people in behaviorally and socially significant ways. I guess that another such hypothesis to test might be that those who go online already differ--even before that fact--from those who do not go online, and that these differences might not be entirely reflected in the demographic data we have so long been in the habit of collecting. I guess it wasn't enough that only three or four hundred of us have been saying all this for the past three or four years... [The final sentence attests to my own belief that rather large numbers of us in AAPOR--far too many to constitute any "establishment"--still respect probability sampling as an important criterion for evaluating survey research.] Finally, I must say that I could not have possibly imagined, when I first joined AAPOR as a graduate student in both sociology and statistics in 1974, that I would ever hear discussions among AAPOR members in which so-called "belief" in probability sampling was said to be "clung to" as if something "mystical" or akin to a "religious belief" [all the words and phrases in quotation marks have appeared here on AAPORNET in this same context]. Rather than reduce myself to arguing that, in effect, my own religion is better than your religion, let me put it this way: We all appreciate the many considerable advantages of studying a part of a population--rather than the entire population--in order to understand more about that larger one. Each one of us is certainly free to choose to study a part--not only because to do so is usually cheaper, faster, and more convenient, but no matter what the reason--in

whatever way and by whatever criteria that we might choose. But when we do so, science--not to mention common sense--demand that we are responsible for answering but a single question: How can we claim to know something (or indeed anything) about the entire population using only that which we know about that part of it which we have actually studied? This question holds no less for ethnographic field research based largely on only a few local informants, for example, than it does for, say, the General Social Survey. Here I would myself usually resort to sampling and probability theory to make my claim. But I also know that the mind of Western science, at least, is open--and its ear is cocked--to any other type of claim that you might wish to make. All that you must do is to answer that simple question: How can you claim to know something (or indeed anything) about the entire population using only that which you know about the part of it that you have studied? Were I a candidate for elective office, for example, and I had hired you to assess my standing among the electorate, I could do no less than to insist upon Warren's simple conclusion: "Waiting for the next election is not one of my criteria." If you look through any issue of the AAAS's "Science," the most prominent general science journal in the United States, I think you will be struck--as I always am--by how universally applied are both probability theory and a simple basic set of statistical techniques, in virtually every empirical study claiming to know some whole by means of some part, across the widest and ever-growing range of disciplines throughout the physical, chemical, biological, behavioral, social and economic sciences. Why do so few theories and methods of probability and statistics gain such wide application across so many fields? I think because, although Western science (today all but global science) might well be a religion, it does not waffle on anything epistemological--it seeks always to know the objective "truth" about an empirical outside world. Would anyone among us really enjoy working for any client who demanded any less? As for Internet polls, I doubt that there could be anyone in AAPOR who could enjoy--more than I would--to see all of survey and market research and public opinion polling shift from the telephone to the Internet and World Wide Web (okay, perhaps excluding those of you who, unlike me, might actually increase your incomes as a result--I wish you nothing but good luck, believe me). But my mind, now hopelessly corrupted by 20 years of science and statistics courses, beginning in elementary school, keeps dragging me back from Net and Web to that single question: How might we claim to know something (or indeed anything) about the people who are not yet online using only that which we know about the people who already are? If those who wish to conduct Internet or Web polls and surveys can but satisfy me on this one question, they will have me as their strong advocate (wanted or not). Until they do, however, that little boy inside me who first began serious scientific research in Mrs. Warner's second grade classroom is standing with Warren as he writes: When we consider Internet polls, we > should consider two things: First, is there an empirical > basis for interest and second, is there a theoretical > basis. SO FAR, I do not see either basis for Internet > polls. All I see is a cheap way to collect lots of data > about obscure groups, and sometimes, like elections, not > so obscure. This isn't a pretty conclusion, perhaps, nor does it come easily, but it is today what I believe to be true. And it's not any kind of establishment saying this, just Mrs. Warner's most miserable science student, today one grownup who happens to think that survey and market research and public opinion and political polling are nothing whatsoever if they are not--above all else--accurately descriptive of some empirical outside world, or if those responsible for them cannot satisfy our every question about how and why they can claim to know something (or indeed anything) about that which they have purported to measure or otherwise describe. Those who continue to conduct Internet polls, while failing to satisfy these I think minimal requirements, do harm to the professional reputations of all who work in survey and market research and public opinion and political polling, I believe, and--by extension--also do harm to all of us in AAPOR, an organization founded and still

dedicated to every aspect and style of honest and collective understanding of public opinion, its formation and change, and its measurement and communication. Nothing less is at stake here, I believe, than the future of that subject of study, and the means by which it is studied, and the status of those who study it, and the impact that their studies have on the larger society, in our own separate communities no less than in the world at large. ------- Although I do hope that all this does not have to be said very often, I had come to the point--inspired by Warren Mitofsky's example--where I thought that we all ought to think about it, together, and at what I fear has become excruciating length, one more time. If you personally didn't need to do so at all, then I do at least feel better for that. -- Jim *******

>From BLACKJS@aol.com Fri Nov 5 18:21:00 1999 Received: from imo13.mx.aol.com (imo13.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.3]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id SAA03866 for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 18:20:59 -0800 (PST) From: BLACKJS@aol.com Received: from BLACKJS@aol.com by imo13.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5WWFa20757 (4203) for ; Fri, 5 Nov 1999 21:20:25 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.fb4007cd.2554ea69@aol.com> Date: Fri, 5 Nov 1999 21:20:25 EST Subject: Re: Translating Mitofsky into Excessive Verbiage To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 26 Thanks Jim--and Warren--for expressing so eloquently what many of us believe. Also thanks to Mike Kagay for his simple explanation of scientific surveys in his poll watch column in yesterday's New York Times: http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/110499poll-watch.html >From RFunk787@aol.com Sat Nov 6 06:47:39 1999 Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.5]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA01920 for ; Sat, 6 Nov 1999 06:47:38 -0800 (PST) From: RFunk787@aol.com Received: from RFunk787@aol.com by imo15.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5MPDa26723 (3925) for ; Sat, 6 Nov 1999 09:47:06 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.21b75c4d.25559969@aol.com> Date: Sat, 6 Nov 1999 09:47:05 EST Subject: Re:Translating Mitofsky into Excessive Verbiage To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 42 Jim -- Well said, right on, and I couldn't agree more with your case for scientific surveys. I am dismayed that after a 50+ year history during which scientific methodologies have proved their value, it still seems necessary to make that case. But is it? Or are you preaching to the choir? As far as I can tell, phony "polls" such as we AAPORians rightly abhor usually have non-scientific motives, for instance -- "Polls" conducted by media -- I'm thinking here of TV call-ins and magazine "reader surveys" -- whose purpose is to promote audience involvement and generate entertaining copy. Internet "surveys", whose purpose often is to sink hooks into prospective customers for marketed products and services. Call-in "polls" that charge participants a fee, whose purpose is to skim some quick bucks. Push-polls, whose purpose is to spread political propaganda. These, and other such so-called "polls", are (in most cases, at least) conducted by parties outside the survey research profession, who would be immune to whatever complaints or sanctions we might mount against them. But, what actual threat do they pose to what we do ? No doubt they create confusion in the minds of some undefined segment of "the public" as to the nature of polling and survey research, but is it a segment that really makes a difference to us ? Are serious buyers and users of survey research being bamboozled? If some genuine harm is being done to our interests, we certainly ought to home in it and defend ourselves appropriately. That's the logical next step to take, if indeed further steps are necessary. Ray Funkhouser >From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Sat Nov 6 09:31:42 1999 Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (IDENT:root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.150]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA02944 for ; Sat, 6 Nov 1999 09:31:41 -0800 (PST) Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149]) by makalu.hp.ufl.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id NAA00801 for ; Sat, 6 Nov 1999

RFunk787@aol.com wrote: [...] Some interesting stuff, including... > These, and other such so-called "polls", are (in most cases, at least) > conducted by parties outside the survey research profession, Well, unfortunately, there are those who do public opinion research for a living who don't act like "professionals." This is by no means intended as one of those blanket condemnations of non-academic researchers. Our current project has benefited immeasurably from the contributions of a top-flight Princeton firm, and there are any number of excellent private firms for whom I would be willing to work in a heartbeat. But in my experience, I've also had to deal with some pretty slimy subcontractors. Should I share some horror stories, or do y'all know what I'm talking about? The fact is that we are *not* a profession by any accepted definition of that word. The industry isn't regulated. There is no licensing board. There are no minimum educational requirements to hang out a shingle (although I personally find those who prostitute their PhDs more objectionable than those ignorami who are just clueless about the statistical details.) > But, what actual threat do they pose to what we do ? Well for starters, they can compete more effectively for contracts, since they are willing to cut corners that would not be acceptable to those of us with "professional" standards. > No doubt they create > confusion in the minds of some undefined segment of "the public" as to the > nature of polling and survey research, but is it a segment that really makes > a difference to us ? Well, yeah, to me it does. The public is who answers my questions. Unprofessional behavior contributes majorly to the number of folks who will not participate in a survey, any survey, because of past experience. I recently finished a non-response study where we sent letters to over 10,000 people who had refused or couldn't be reached by phone for an RDD project. We included a toll-free number, and I personally took many of the responses from people who had just been burned too many times. > Are serious buyers and users of survey research being > bamboozled? Yes, they are, in my experience. I think some buyers don't really understand the importance of certain accepted research procedures, and can be seduced by a fast-talking shyster in a good suit who promises to deliver for less. Colleen K. Porter Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu Phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109 UF Department of Health Services Administration Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009 Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

James Beniger wrote, in part: > If you look through any issue of the AAAS's "Science," the most prominent > general science journal in the United States, I think you will be > struck--as I always am--by how universally applied are both probability > theory and a simple basic set of statistical techniques, in virtually > every empirical study claiming to

know some whole by means of some part, > across the widest and ever-growing range of disciplines throughout the > physical, chemical, biological, behavioral, social and economic sciences. I don't hold a brief for Harris's "Interactive" nor for self-selected "samples" nor for Internet survey spam, but I cannot agree with all of my dear friend Jim Beniger's post that some other members of the AAPOR establishment chimed in to praise. In the above snippet, Jim is excessive not in verbiage (how could I object to that!) but in overstating the ubiquity of probability sampling in sciences. Since he endorses using a sample of just one issue of Science (however selected, presumably) as sufficient evidence for his theory, I'll take as my sample the latest one [286 (5441), 29 Oct] that my mail person has brought. Of the research findings the editors judged important (or sexy) enough for treatment in the "News of the Week" and "News Focus" sections at the front of the book, almost none involved sampling in the sense Jim has in mind. (Such sampling may have played a part in developing the state of the field on which some of these investigations depended, however.) The lead "News of the Week" item was on a one case sample: the one (and only) permafrosted Mammoth find. The next involving a research topic presents a structural modeling of the Y chromosome and an evolutionary explanation thereof; then comes an item on a clinical trial of Leptin which uses a convenience sample, stratified by obesity, taken from happenstance sub-populations of the implicit reference population (all adult human beings, alive or yet to be) with its probability statistics being those of such double blind experimental designs. Next is a study of the variability of radioactive decay rates (one facet of the problem is that beryllium-7 atoms have a "bias [my term]" in how they snag electrons that depends on their atomic form) . . . . I could go on through the several additional items. The "News Focus" section leads with a report of studies of neurostructures of rats and primates. It defines its topic with verbiage identical to that hallowed topic of opinion research, how are thoughts turned into actions (the actions here are muscle movements). It presume that you'll find the same essential structure if you have one rat or another or a rat or a monkey. That's followed by an account of how two skulls found at a spot in Turkey allow linkage to other Near East sites of a culture that did these touching-heads burials. Next is a report of a symposium on gamma ray bursts with a skymap of a time sample (from start up until time of writing, presumably) and identifying the most recent few bursts in red. OK, I'm being tediously excessive so look at the rest for yourself. Shylock had a universalistic perspective akin to that favored by most sciences : "If you prick us, do we not bleed? if you tickle us, do we not laugh?. . ." A pollster of Shylock's place and time might have done a good job on ways in which Jews differed from Christian Venetians and on why the distribution of attitudes toward the Doge differed by group, but the pollster would not have set out to elucidate the subject of Shylock's discourse, universal human structure and nature. Is there research, by the way, on Shylock's assumptions of the universality of ticklishness or of revenge-seeking when wronged? I've known survey researchers to chuck out results of what I found were intriguing items precisely because, unexpectedly, they had no discriminating value--practically everyone gave the same answer. During the period when Beniger and I were collaborators, very little of what we did involved probability sampling. It was more often like if you've seen one human cognitive system, you've seen them all. How do I know that this will be true of all issues of Science yet to go to press or on line or that were published in the recent past? Jim's saying "look through any issue" of the journal rests on his confidence in the limits to the variability of that population; my taking the most recent issue illustrates that common function of sampling which is to insure against witting or unwitting prejudicial selectivity in choosing objects for observation rather than for determining quantitatively expected values for the parameters of a population. >From mkshares@mcs.net Sun Nov 7 09:29:05 1999 Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA18879 for ; Sun, 7

http://www.chicago.tribune.com/news/metro/chicago/article/0,2669,SAV-9911070214,FF.html --------------CA934224A137F080831D9FBA Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii; name="0,2669,SAV-9911070214,FF.html" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit Content-Disposition: inline; filename="0,2669,SAV-9911070214,FF.html" Content-Base: "http://www.chicago.tribune.com/news/me tro/chicago/article/0,2669,SAV-9911 070214,FF.html" Content-Location: "http://www.chicago.tribune.com/news/me tro/chicago/article/0,2669,SAV-9911 070214,FF.html"

Chicago Tribune | Metro -- JACKSON UNVEILS PLAN FOR INTERNET VOTING "); } else { document.write(""); } } // --> Your Email: Home --- Web specials --- Main screen --- News --- Main screen Metro Daywatch Nation/World Obituaries Opinion Weather Columnists Print edition --- Sports --- Main screen Golf Bulls Cubs White Sox Bears Blackhawks Fire PrepsPlus College Columnists Print edition --- Business --- Main screen Top companies Stocks Small Business Chicago Insider Your Money Columnists Silicon Prairie Print edition --- Tech --- Business.Technology James Coates Final Debug Chicago Tech Scene Views Special Reports Calendar Reviews User Groups --- Leisure --- Movies Music Dining Art & Stage Home & Garden Travel Horoscopes Television Books Columnists Good Eating Kid News Tribune Magazine WomanNews Features Home Technology Education Print edition --- Health/Family --- Main screen Health Family --- Travel --- Main screen --- Classified --- Homes CareerPath.com Cars.com General Merchandise Personals Bookstore Menu Guide Print Edition --- Advertising --- Media kit --- Community --- Main screen Community publishing Message boards About the paper Letters to the editor E-mail the staff Phone numbers Questions/comments Other stories and features available LATEST NEWS Remembering Walter Payton Only Microsoft surprise is extent of U.S. victory Gov. Ryan approval rate drops Microsoft may take chance on appeal Search resumes for EgyptAir 'black boxes' Clinton announces anti-fraud project Australia votes to keep queen More Latest News MARKETS DOW: +64.8 10704.4 NASDAQ: +46.23 3102.18 S&P 500: +7.58 1370.22 GET QUOTE: Full market report WEB SPECIALS Destinations: Las Vegas Online auction: Bid on a cow Holiday happenings A Millennium of ... More specials JACKSON UNVEILS PLAN FOR INTERNET VOTING By Mike Dorning, Washington Bureau. Mark Stricherz of States News Service contributed to this column. November 7, 1999 WASHINGTON -- The cause of voting rights is almost a birthright for the South Side's Rep. Jesse Jackson Jr. His father was marching across Alabama's Edmund Pettus Bridge in the bloody peak of the civil rights movement's voting rights campaign the very week that Jackson was born in 1965. Now, the younger Jackson has taken up the issue of expanded access to the ballot in a way that befits a member of the technologically savvy Generation X. On Friday, Jackson introduced legislation to require a federal study of the potential use of the Internet and other on-line technologies to conduct elections. "Digital Democracy" he calls it. The Internet "presents a fantastic opportunity to reverse a 40-year decline in national voter turnout," Jackson said in a statement he made when he introduced the bill. "American families increasingly find it difficult to take time from their busy work schedules, child care and community activities to vote. I believe the Internet could make voting easier, more convenient and extremely efficient" he added. The idea already is beginning to

attract attention around the country. Iowa is conducting a test of on-line voting, using Internet connections alongside their polling stations but only after voters already have cast a traditional ballot. Washington state and Virginia also have conducted tests, which officials in those states consider a success because they detected no evidence of security breaches in the balloting. Surveys, including one done by ABC News in July, show high enthusiasm for Internet balloting among younger Americans, an age group that now votes in astonishingly low numbers. In the 1998 election, only 15 percent of people between 18 and 24 voted. However, only 42 percent of households own personal computers and wealthier, better educated Americans are most familiar with technology. So computer voting would seem to further tilt the electoral system against the poorer members of society that Jackson in the past has made his concern. But Frank Watkins, a Jackson spokesman, contends computer programs that would allow "audio buttons" to explain the ballot would make voting more comfortable for "40 million Americans" who are functionally illiterate. The legislation also includes a requirement that the government conduct a study on the "digital divide," the greater use of the Internet by richer and white Americans than by the poor and members of minority groups. Talking trash?: The retirement announcement of North Shore Republican Rep. John Porter and the prospect of an open seat in the suburban swing constituency has created plenty of excitement within Washington's political class. But what to make of an intriguing taunt a Hill source said National Republican Congressional Campaign Chairman Rep. Tom Davis (R-Va.) made to his Democratic counterpart last week while the two were on the House floor? "We're gonna get Porter back in the race," Davis is said to have boasted. Dream on, says a spokesman for Porter. The congressman is determined to follow through with his plans to retire, said press secretary Dave Kohn. No ankle bracelets, please: Count freshman Illinois Republican Peter Fitzgerald among those who are not buying the gimmickry that the GOP leadership is using to claim its budget package does not dip into the Social Security trust fund. Fitzgerald was among those deserting the Republican leadership in the tight 49-48 vote to pass its final appropriations bill through the Senate last week. "Any private corporation that is caught dipping into the employees' pension fund and spends it on other programs, the CEO of that corporation could be behind bars with ankle bracelets on," Fitzgerald explained. Mosquito patrol: Among the line items in the appropriations bills now winding their way through Congress is this intriguing earmark for the Southwest Side district of Democratic Rep. William Lipinski: $1 million for zoonotics research. That's right: zoonotics, the study of animal-borne diseases. Lipinski said the grant, which was to have gone to the Brookfield Zoo, would help combat such infections as the mosquito-carrying encephalitis. The appropriations bill since has been vetoed by President Clinton. But the zoonotics grant may prove hardy enough to live on in the final compromise spending package. Email this story to a friend More articles on the Metro Chicago home page Browse by: Category Auctions Computer Elctrncs Jewelry Pizza Ribs XmasTree FALL SPECIALShip authentic deep dish pizza anywhere in the USA this holiday season. Search Jewel's "Meals Made Easy" recipes: Poultry Seafood Beef Pork Veggie -STORE LOCATOR- Find the Jewel nearest you! Search by: Keyword Title Author Advertising information RETURN TO TOP | HOME Home --- Web specials --- Main screen --- News --- Main screen Metro Daywatch Nation/World Obituaries Opinion Weather Columnists Print edition --- Sports --- Main screen Golf Bulls Cubs White Sox Bears Blackhawks Fire PrepsPlus College Columnists Print edition --- Business --- Main screen Top companies Stocks Small Business Chicago Insider Your Money Columnists Silicon Prairie Print edition --- Tech --- Business.Technology James Coates Final Debug Chicago Tech Scene Views Special Reports Calendar Reviews User Groups --- Leisure --- Movies Music Dining Art & Stage Home & Garden Travel Horoscopes Television Books Columnists Good Eating Kid News Tribune Magazine WomanNews Features Home Technology Education Print edition --- Health/Family ---

CA934224A137F080831D9FBA-- >From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Nov 7 15:11:44 1999 Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id PAA22951 for ; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 15:11:43 -0800 (PST) Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost) by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id PAA25085 for ; Sun, 7 Nov 1999 15:11:44 -0800 (PST) Date: Sun, 7 Nov 1999 15:11:43 -0800 (PST) From: James Beniger To: AAPORNET Subject: POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII Date: Sun, 07 Nov 1999 15:31:38 -0600 From: James Seroka To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu, Listproc@usc.edu Position Announcement Manager, Survey Research Laboratory Center for Governmental Services Auburn University The Center for Governmental Services at Auburn University is seeking a growth-oriented professional to direct the operations and provide leadership and vision for Auburn University's Survey Research Laboratory. The SRL engages in contract research involving telephone and mail surveys, data entry projects, and focus groups for academic clients, public sector groups, trade associations, nonprofit groups, and private sector clients. Poised for significant growth, the SRL maintains 14 automated telephone carrels, using the CASES software. The successful candidate must possess a minimum Masters degree in a social science field and have at least 1 year experience in managing survey research projects and marketing these services. Please send a letter of interest, resume/vitae, list of three references, and sample of appropriate work related to survey research, by January 7, 2000 to: Dr. Jim Seroka, Director, Center for Governmental Services, 2236 Haley Center, Auburn University AL 36849. Auburn University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Minorities and women are encouraged to apply. ******* >From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Mon Nov 8 06:50:36 1999 Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA13828 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 06:50:35 -0800 (PST) Received: from pjl1 (pjl1.sbs.ohio-state.edu [128.146.93.67]) by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA29941 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 09:47:17 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <2.2.32.19991108144942.008bb1ac@pop.service.ohio-state.edu> X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32) Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Date: Mon, 08 Nov 1999 09:49:42 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." Subject: FYI --> New FCSM Web Site! >From: wendy.l.alvey@CCMAIL.CENSUS.GOV >Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part" >Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 08:02:19 -0500 >Reply-To: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA >Sender: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA >X-PH: V4.4@orb1 >Subject: New FCSM Web Site! >X-To: gsslist@inet.ed.gov, mfeil@helix.nih.gov, svm@mitre.org >To: SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU > > FCSM has a new Web site! Check it out -- www.fcsm.gov !!! > > The Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM) is an > interagency committee dedicated to improving the quality of Federal > statistics. FCSM's goals include > > o communicating and disseminating information on statistical practice > among all Federal statistical agencies; > > o recomending the introduction of new methodologies in Federal > statistical programs to improve data quality; and > > o provideing a mechanism for statisticians

in different Federal > agencies to meet and exchange ideas. > > Two ways FCSM carries out its mission is through > > o FCSM-sponsored seminars -- the latest of which is to be held Nov. > 15-17 in Roslyn, VA; and > > o the FCSM Statistical Policy Working Paper series. > > To find out more about FCSM and its efforts, check out the new Web > site: www.fcsm.gov . > > >From Adam.Safir@arbitron.com Mon Nov 8 07:02:08 1999 Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id HAA17932 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 07:02:08 -0800 (PST) Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id KAA20846; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 10:02:16 -0500 (EST) Received: from arbmdex.arbitron.com(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via smap (4.1) id xma020826; Mon, 8 Nov 99 10:02:13 -0500 Received: by arbmdex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0) id ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 10:03:38 -0500 Message-ID: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B3020AC20A@arbmdex.arbitron.com> From: "Safir, Adam" To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: New tactics Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 10:03:37 -0500 MIME-Version: 1.0 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0) Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1" I read some time ago about the Bush staff snapping domain names one or two characters different than the official Bush web-site in order to prevent voters from inadvertantly finding themselves at a similarly titled web-site, set up by rivals and dedicated to bashing the Bush campaign. Looks like this tactic is now hitting a little closer to home: Should an informant or potential respondent looking for more information on legitimate survey research type in http://www.casro.COM instead of casro.ORG, they would be directed to the Consumer Information Organization's "Consumer.net" web-site, which hawks various privacy-oriented wares, such as the official "Don't Annoy Me" Anti-Telemarketing Kit and "Easy Hang-Up" device. Explore this site a little further and you'll chance upon the page http://consumer.net/CASROinfo.asp which contains such baseless accusations as "CASRO is a tax-exempt industry organization that represents telemarketers involved in taking survey questions." Has anyone heard of this Consumer Information Organization? >From JayMattlin@aol.com Mon Nov 8 08:41:35 1999 Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA26282 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 08:41:34 -0800 (PST) From: JayMattlin@aol.com Received: from JayMattlin@aol.com by imo19.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5DJGa12208 (4339) for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 11:40:54 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.b05f8732.25585716@aol.com> Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 11:40:54 EST Subject: Re: Placement Firms To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 39 I'd like to add two names to the list: Susan Lusting Forum Personnel 212-687-4050, Extension 331 slustig@forumper.com Melissa Reitkopp Management Recruiters of MacLean Melreitkopp@mrmclean.com 1-800-291-0642, Ext. 208 Also, I believe that Smith's Fifth Avenue and Smith-Hanley are one and the same. Their phone number is 203-319-4300. Jay Mattlin >From JayMattlin@aol.com Mon Nov 8 09:38:06 1999 Received: from imo22.mx.aol.com (imo22.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.66]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA01355 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 09:38:05 -0800 (PST) From: JayMattlin@aol.com Received: from JayMattlin@aol.com by imo22.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5LYMa23065 (3978) for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 12:37:24 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.c4cacf29.25586454@aol.com> Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 12:37:24 EST Subject: Re: Placement Firms - Correction To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 39 Please note the following correction to my earlier posting. The recruiter at Forum Personnel is . . . Susan Lustig Forum Personnel 212-687-4050, extension 331 slustig@forumper.com My apologies. My entire family's been sick, and I'm a bit sleep-deprived. Jay >From PAHARDING7@aol.com Mon Nov 8 09:49:06 1999 Received: from

imo28.mx.aol.com (imo28.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.72]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA09060 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 09:49:05 -0800 (PST) From: PAHARDING7@aol.com Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com by imo28.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5HNBa28596 (4203) for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 12:48:21 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.67e1f691.255866e4@aol.com> Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 12:48:20 EST Subject: Re: New tactics To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part1_0.67e1f691.255866e4_boundary" X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 40 -- part1_0.67e1f691.255866e4_boundary Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit Adam: The attached will give everyone some sense of this operation. Phil Harding -- part1_0.67e1f691.255866e4_boundary Content-Type: text/html; name="Consumers.Net.htm" Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable Content-Disposition: inline; filename="Consumers.Net.htm" The Consumer Information Organization's Consumer.Net. Washington= Post: Consumer.Net monitors direct marketers and campaigns for consumer privacy Washington Times: [Consumer.Net] tracks = both the telemarketing and direct-mail industries NJ Law Network: [Consumer.Net is] a great resource for consumers, especially web users Telemarketing Laws | State Consumer Info= | = Contact | Media Coverage | Privacy-Policy.com | Shop Other Consumer.net sites:&n= bsp; Privacy.net<= /a> | Help.org | Network-Tools.com | Domainia.org | Santa.Claus.net | ChristmasTrees.com | = Santas-List.com = | Mummers.com= | Translat= eFree.com | GrandparentsDay.com | Native-Americans.c= om | Post= - Office.org | Alcatraz.San-Francisco.ca.us Free Listing for Consumer Assistance Organizations "Don't Annoy Me" Anti-Telemarketi= ng Kit - Tell over 1,500 telemarketers to stop calling! - $20.00 Easy Hangup - Stops high-pressure sales tactics politely but firmly - $20= .00 State consumer i= nformation pages being developed. See if your state sells personal information from mot= or vehicle records and find opt-out instructions. Other consumer information will= be added once all the states have been set up: = Alaska   Alabama   Arkansas<= /a>   Arizona   California   Colorado   Conn= ecticut   District-of-Columbia = ; Delaware   Florid= a   Georgia   <= a href=3D"Hawaii/">Hawaii   Iowa &n= bsp; Idaho   Illinois= Indiana   Kansas   Kentucky = Louisiana = Massachusetts   Maryland   Mai= ne   Michigan   Minnesota Missouri &n= bsp; Mississippi   Montana   Nebraska   North-Carolina   North-Dakota   New-Hampshire New-Jersey   New-Mexico   Nevada   New-= York   Ohio   Oklahoma   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island South-Carolina   South-Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah<= /a>   Virginia   Vermont   Washington State= West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming G= et your credit report Verify your records web@consumer.net<= /strong> Updated 23 October, 1999. =A9 Russell Smi= th. All rights reserved. -- part1_0.67e1f691.255866e4_boundary-- >From PAHARDING7@aol.com Mon Nov 8 15:03:53 1999 Received: from imo16.mx.aol.com (imo16.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.6]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id PAA15707 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 15:03:52 -0800 (PST) From: PAHARDING7@aol.com Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com by imo16.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5WRRa05510 (4262) for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 18:03:15 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.9c2dcf46.2558b0b3@aol.com> Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 18:03:15 EST Subject: Re: New Tactics To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part1_0.9c2dcf46.2558b0b3_boundary" X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 40 -- part1_0.9c2dcf46.2558b0b3_boundary Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit Adam: What I attached in reply to New Tactics was, as indicated, to give everyone a sense of the Consumer.net operation. But if it arrived in their mailboxes in the same shape as it was returned to me, that objective wasn't met. So, now that I've discovered this, let me give it another shot. It's identical to the one sent out earlier. Phil Harding --part1_0.9c2dcf46.2558b0b3_boundary Content-Type: text/html; name="Consumers.Net.htm" Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable Content-Disposition: inline; filename="Consumers.Net.htm" The Consumer Information Organization's

Consumer.Net. Washington= Post: Consumer.Net monitors direct marketers and campaigns for consumer privacy Washington Times: [Consumer.Net] tracks = both the telemarketing and direct-mail industries NJ Law Network: [Consumer.Net is] a great resource for consumers, especially web users Telemarketing Laws | State Consumer Info= | = Contact | Media Coverage | Privacy-Policy.com | Shop Other Consumer.net sites:&n= bsp; Privacy.net<= /a> | Help.org | Network-Tools.com | Domainia.org | Santa.Claus.net | ChristmasTrees.com | = Santas-List.com = | Mummers.com= | Translat= eFree.com | GrandparentsDay.com | Native-Americans.c= om | Post= -Office.org | Alcatraz.San-Francisco.ca.us Free Listing for Consumer Assistance Organizations "Don't Annoy Me" Anti-Telemarketi= ng Kit - Tell over 1,500 telemarketers to stop calling! - $20.00 Easy Hangup - Stops high-pressure sales tactics politely but firmly - $20= .00 State consumer i= nformation pages being developed. See if your state sells personal information from mot= or vehicle records and find opt-out instructions. Other consumer information will= be added once all the states have been set up: = Alaska   Alabama   Arkansas<= /a>   Arizona   California   Colorado   Conn= ecticut   District-of-Columbia = ; Delaware   Florid= a   Georgia   <= a href=3D"Hawaii/">Hawaii   Iowa &n= bsp; Idaho   Illinois=   Indiana   Kansas   Kentucky   = Louisiana   = Massachusetts   Maryland   Mai= ne   Michigan   Minnesota   Missouri &n= bsp; Mississippi   Montana   Nebraska   North-Carolina   North-Dakota   New-Hampshire   New-Jersey   New-Mexico   Nevada   New-= York   Ohio   Oklahoma   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South-Carolina   South-Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah<= /a>   Virginia   Vermont   Washington State=   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming G= et your credit report Verify your records web@consumer.net<= /strong> Updated 23 October, 1999. =A9 Russell Smi= th. All rights reserved. --part1_0.9c2dcf46.2558b0b3_boundary-- >From HOneill536@aol.com Mon Nov 8 15:31:44 1999 Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.4]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id PAA06670 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 15:31:44 -0800 (PST) From: HOneill536@aol.com Received: from HOneill536@aol.com by imo14.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5QFZa01036 (4257) for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 18:30:56 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.25dcaa5a.2558b72f@aol.com> Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 18:30:55 EST Subject: Re: New tactics To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 26 CASRO knows of and is dealing with this organization. For more information contact Diane Bowers at CASRO. Harry O'Neill >From HOneill536@aol.com Mon Nov 8 15:34:30 1999 Received: from imo16.mx.aol.com (imo16.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.6]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id PAA08637 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 15:34:30 -0800 (PST) From: HOneill536@aol.com Received: from HOneill536@aol.com by imo16.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5VAZa05510 (4257) for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 18:33:52 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.c93307bf.2558b7e0@aol.com> Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 18:33:52 EST Subject: Re: New tactics To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 26 Phil how will what yuo sent heip anyone with anything? >From abider@american.edu Mon Nov 8 17:31:02 1999 Received: from swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.123]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id RAA18334 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 17:31:02 -0800 (PST) Received: from american.edu (sdn-ar-001varestP211.dialsprint.net [168.191.218.123]) by swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id RAA25208 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 17:30:07 -0800 (PST) Message-ID: <38277A94.AE24F74C@american.edu> Date: Mon, 08 Nov 1999 20:36:20 -0500 From: Albert Biderman X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Translating Mitofsky into Excessive Verbiage References: <3824E899.D847DBDD@american.edu> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-

Encoding: 7bit To amend my previous post: It's Monday and there was a new issue of Science in the mailbox. It serves to confirm that part of Jim's post that was about the prevalence of probability sampling in sciences and to refute his contention that a sample of one issue of Science would serve for that comfirmation. This week's news sections had a very different selection of types of topics than last week's: many fewer items on research results. Sampling stats are more common to the papers in the Reports section of Science (a section I unstudiously avoided in the previous post) than in the topics of news items on researches. Well over half of last week's "Reports" had some probability theory to them if we count uses for estimating measurement error and curve-fitting . Albert Biderman wrote: > James Beniger wrote, in part: > > > > > If you look through any issue of the AAAS's "Science," the most prominent > > general science journal in the United States, I think you will be > > struck--as I always am-- by how universally applied are both probability > > theory and a simple basic set of statistical techniques, in virtually > > every empirical study claiming to know some whole by means of some part, > > across the widest and ever-growing range of disciplines throughout the > > physical, chemical, biological, behavioral, social and economic sciences. > > > > I don't hold a brief for Harris's "Interactive" nor for self-selected > "samples" nor for Internet survey spam, but I cannot agree with all of my dear > friend Jim Beniger's post that some other members of the AAPOR establishment > chimed in to praise. In the above snippet, Jim is excessive not in verbiage > (how could I object to that!) but in overstating the ubiquity of probability > sampling in sciences. Since he endorses using a sample of just one issue of > Science (however selected, presumably) as sufficient evidence for his theory, > I'll take as my sample the latest one [286 (5441), 29 Oct] that my mail > person has brought. > > How do I know that this will be true of all issues of Science yet to go to > press or on line or that were published in the recent past? Jim's saying > "look through any issue" of the journal rests on his confidence in the limits > to the variability of that population; my taking the most recent issue > illustrates that common function of sampling which is to insure against > witting or unwitting prejudicial selectivity in choosing objects for > observation rather than for determining quantitatively expected values for the > parameters of a population. Albert Biderman abider@american.edu >From PAHARDING7@aol.com Mon Nov 8 19:09:19 1999 Received: from imo16.mx.aol.com (imo16.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.6]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id TAA03502 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 19:09:18 -0800 (PST) From: PAHARDING7@aol.com Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com by imo16.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5FBLa05613 (4214) for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 22:08:25 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.4ec9a4c9.2558ea29@aol.com> Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 22:08:25 EST Subject: Re: New tactics To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 40 Harry: If your question refers to the readability of what I sent, no one will be helped in the least. I hadn't realized -- and this is my best guess as to what happened -- that when downloaded material makes its passage thru the listserv and on to the members it loses the capability to be downloaded. I'd never sent downloaded material to aapornet before and, after two disastrous tries, I don't intend to again. I do apologize for the inconvenience this must have caused; unless someone will do me the kindness of explaining whether and how what I was trying to do can in fact be done, I'll either stay with straight text or circulate only the address of the website. In this case, it's http://consumer.net./, the home page of the Consumer Information Organization's Consumer.Net. It makes interesting if irritating reading and contains lots of links for anyone who cares to know about this group in detail. In any case, Harry, to answer your question: that's what I was trying, but failing miserably, to do. Kind regards, Phil >From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Nov 8 20:14:32 1999 Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id UAA02829 for

; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 20:14:32 -0800 (PST) Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost) by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id UAA19232 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 20:14:31 -0800 (PST) Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 20:14:31 -0800 (PST) From: James Beniger To: AAPORNET Subject: Consumer.Net Homepage Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT Here's a straightforward E-mail version of the Consumer.Net homepage that Adam Safir and Phil Harding brought to our attention earlier today, and that Phil attempted unsuccessfully to post here on AAPORNET. This page might be reached either at www.consumer.net or--unfortunately--at www.casro.com. -- Jim ******* Subject: The Consumer Information Organization's Consumer.Net. http://www.casro.com/ Washington Post: Consumer.Net monitors direct marketers and campaigns for consumer privacy Washington Times: [Consumer.Net] tracks both the telemarketing and direct-mail industries NJ Law Network: [Consumer.Net is] a great resource for consumers, especially web users Privacy Analysis Consumer.Net Telemarketing Laws | State Consumer Info | Contact | Media Coverage | Privacy-Policy.com | Shop Other Consumer.net sites: Privacy.net | Help.org | Network-Tools.com | Domainia.org | Santa.Claus.net | ChristmasTrees.com | Santas-List.com | Mummers.com | TranslateFree.com | GrandparentsDay.com | Native-Americans.com | Post-Office.org | Alcatraz.San-Francisco.ca.us Help.org Free Listing for Consumer Assistance Organizations "Don't Annoy Me" Anti-Telemarketing Kit - Tell over 1,500 telemarketers to stop calling! - $20.00 Easy Hangup - Stops high-pressure sales tactics politely but firmly - $20.00 State consumer information pages being developed. See if your state sells personal information from motor vehicle records and find opt-out instructions. Other consumer information will be added once all the states have been set up: Alaska Alabama Arkansas Arizona California Colorado Connecticut District-of-Columbia Delaware Florida Georgia Hawaii Iowa Idaho Illinois Indiana Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Massachusetts Maryland Maine Michigan Minnesota Missouri Mississippi Montana Nebraska North-Carolina North-Dakota New-Hampshire New-Jersey New-Mexico Nevada New-York Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South-Carolina South-Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Virginia Vermont Washington State West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming Alcatraz Island Get your credit report CreditRreport Verify your records web@consumer.net Updated 23 October, 1999. ? Russell Smith. All rights reserved. ******* >From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Nov 8 21:09:34 1999 Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id VAA28567 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 21:09:33 -0800 (PST) Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost) by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id VAA28385 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 21:09:33 -0800 (PST) Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 21:09:33 -0800 (PST) From: James Beniger To: AAPORNET Subject: One Click from www.casro.com Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII Here's one page but a click away from www.consumer.net or www.casro.com at--in the case below--www.consumer.net/washtimes.asp It really must be read to be believed (or *not* believed, as it were). -- Jim ******* http://www.consumer.net/washtimes.asp Get your Credit Report in Seconds! Telemarketing control - "Don't Annoy Me" Kit, Easy Hangup, and CallAudit. Consumer.Net home. Reprinted by permission (Copyright 1998) February 10, 1998 Washington Times Firms help Disconnect `Telenuisances' Illustration by Ron Saikowski/The Washington Times Beatrice Hohmann burst into tears when the phone rang and, for the 16th time, it was a telemarketing company asking for a man who had the same first name as her recently deceased husband. "My husband passed away in August," says the Clifton, Colo., woman. "I kept telling them there was nobody here by that name. I asked them to stop, but they just kept calling and asking for Ed, and it would make me get so emotional again." Mrs. Hohmann says her telephone company advised her to get a new phone number - at her own expense - which she didn't want to do. So

she turned to consumer activist Robert Bulmask, whose company, Private Citizen Inc., is dedicated to silencing the intrusions of unwanted telemarketing calls. "As hideous as {her story} is, it's common," Mr. Bulmask says. "That's the nature of the `telenuisance' industry" as he calls the dreaded phone-solicitation business. His advice: Don't hang up - take down the company's name and ask to be put on its "Do Not Call" list. If the company calls again, revenge could be yours for the cost of filing suit in small claims court. In Mrs. Hohmann's case, Mr. Bulmask contacted the offending telemarketing company and told it that Mrs. Hohmann wanted to be put on the "Do Not Call" list and that further calls would result in a lawsuit. Mr. Bulmask is one of a growing group of consumer activists who are fighting back at telemarketing firms that repeatedly call people who have asked to be removed from call lists. Harnessing the communications power of the Internet, these anti-telemarketing crusaders have spurred dozens of lawsuits against the industry. Based in Naperville, Ill., Mr. Bulmask's Private Citizen has collected $130,000 in judgments in the past two years against telemarketing firms that have violated federal laws protecting consumers from unwanted phone-sales calls. He founded the firm in 1988 and has 2,000 members across the country. He charges a one-time fee of $20 to circulate a customer's no-calls request to hundreds of telemarketing firms. Fellow crusader Russell Smith of Alexandria says he has collected nearly $25,000 from 20 telemarketing firms that he has taken to court for violating consumer laws. His organization, Consumer.net (www.consumer-info.org), provides information about the 1992 Telephone Consumer Protection Act, which gives consumers the right to collect damages from telemarketing firms that violate the law. The law essentially sets out the following rules: * Telemarketers may not call a household between 9 p.m. and 8 a.m. in the time zone of the person being called. * The firm must identify the name of the caller and the name of the organization on behalf of whom the call is being made and provide a phone number where the person can be contacted. * A consumer has the right to request that the telemarketing firm put his name on the "Do Not Call" list; the firm is bound to keep track of the person's name and, if asked, must send a copy of the company's "Do Not Call" policy to the consumer. Repeat calls after this request is made are considered a violation of the law, which is punishable by fines. "I haven't gotten any calls lately," says Mr. Smith, who began his battle against phone sales four years ago after one too many companies tried to sell him credit cards and mortgage loans. "I have filed four or five suits in small claims court," he says, adding that it costs only $30 and most companies do not want to spend the money to mount a defense. Telemarketing firms are feeling the pain of the legal attacks. "Buoyed by sympathetic judges, these suits are increasing at an alarming rate," says an Aug. 4, 1997, article in the industry's newletter, Direct Marketing News. "These full-time plaintiffs dispensing advice on how to sue . . . are not simply individuals who are frustrated by telemarketing calls but rather people who have a true hatred of telemarketing." Imagine! Does anyone like to receive telemarketing calls? Apparently, there are enough people who actually bite on sales pitches to make the industry profitable. After all, it is cheaper to bug people on the phone than to send junk mail. I tried the "Do Not Call" strategy on a recent junk phone call and was greeted with a sharp "click" in my ear. Other firms have been cooperative - although the flood of nuisance calls hasn't stopped. Somehow, the word is out that I work at home and a live human being will answer the phone (the savvy firms block Caller ID). I have gotten calls from people selling aluminum siding, roof repairs, chimney cleaning, heat pumps, credit cards and mortgage loans. I blame myself because I shop from catalogs, and I know those people trade lists back and forth. But watch out, you boiler-room phone pitchers - I am starting my own campaign now. Do not call. * Have a question about family finances? Get in touch with Anne Veigle at 202/636-3014, fax 703/524-2528 or e-mail her at evie1@wt.infi.net. MORE INFO: BOOKS * "Privacy for Sale," by Jeffrey Rothfeder, Simon & Schuster, 1992. Describes the type of personal information that is

collected on people and traded from one company to another. Gives advice on how to safeguard one's privacy. * "Complete Guide to Financial Privacy," by Mark Skousen, Alexandria House, 1982. Offers numerous suggestions for limiting the amount of information collected by credit bureaus; also offers guidelines for correcting erroneous data. * "Back Off! The Definitive Guide to Stopping Collection Agency Harassment," by Benjamin F. Dover, Equitable Media Services, 1994. Gives advice on how to get rid of unwanted phone calls from bill collectors. Tells you what legal rights are at your disposal. ON LINE * To become a member of Private Citizen Inc., which assists consumers who want to be removed from telemarketing lists, call 800/CUT-JUNK or visit the company's Web site (www.privatecitizen.com). * For information on rules governing telephone solicitations, see the Consumer.net Web site (www.consumer-info.org). This site tracks both the telemarketing and direct-mail industries, including lawsuits and the latest telemarketing phone tactics. Also monitors telemarketing scams. * The Anti-Telemarketer's Source (www.izzy.net/~vnestico) collects jokes and clever responses to telemarketing sales pitches. * Free information on eliminating telemarketing calls is available from Junkbusters (www.junkbusters.com). The company says it will provide information to you about companies that you like - with your approval. * Information on limiting junk mail and phone calls is collected at (privacyrights.org) and (www.cns.net/~felbel/jnkmail.htm). * Want to link to anti-telemarketing sites? Visit Karen's Koncepts (www.netmegs.com/koncepts/telemark.htm). ORGANIZATIONS * To approach the industry directly about getting your name removed from telemarketing phone lists, write to the Telephone Preference Service of the Direct Marketing Association, PO Box 9014, Farmingdale, N.Y. 11735-9014. * For information about telemarketing fraud and nuisance phone calls, contact the National Consumers League, 1704 K St. NW, Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006, 202/835-2223 or visit the group's Web site (www.natlconsumersleague.org) web@consumer.net Telemarketing Laws | State Consumer Info | Contact | Media Coverage | Privacy-Policy.com | Shop Other Consumer.net sites: Privacy.net | Help.org | Network-Tools.com | Domainia.org | Santa.Claus.net | ChristmasTrees.com | Santas-List.com | Mummers.com | TranslateFree.com | GrandparentsDay.com | Native-Americans.com | Post-Office.org | Alcatraz.San-Francisco.ca.us Get your Credit Report in Seconds! Get your credit report Verify your records - $8 ******* >From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Nov 8 21:31:12 1999 Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id VAA08995 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 21:31:11 -0800 (PST) Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost) by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id VAA02281 for ; Mon, 8 Nov 1999 21:31:11 -0800 (PST) Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 21:31:11 -0800 (PST) From: James Beniger To: AAPORNET Subject: Consumer.Net's "Sites in the News" Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT Here's another and final page--at least for now--but a click away from www.consumer.net or www.casro.com , this one found at consumer.net/media.asp , and it's pretty devastating--just scanning the titles listed will give you the general idea. I note that, if the list here is to be believed, Inter@ctive Week apparently broke the CASRO.com dispute story as early as its June 14, 1999 issue. -- Jim ******* http://consumer.net/media.asp Get your Credit Report in Seconds! Telemarketing control - "Don't Annoy Me" Kit, Easy Hangup, and CallAudit. Consumer.Net home. Consumer.Net Group of Sites in the News 1999 * ZDnet Anchor Desk. The Big Privacy Lie. Also in Japanese. October 13. * Newsweek. We're Running Out of Dot.coms - Internet domain issues. October 3 * Houston Chronicle. Telemarketing and opt-out lists. September 20 * Wall Street Journal Texas - Texas driver's license information privacy. September 22. * Internet Radio - Russ Smith interviewed for a discussion of upcoming Internet domain dispute policy and the PriorityMail.com. August 27. * InternetNews.com and Internet Radio - Hijacking of Hate Site a Warning to Domain Holders. | Audio -

August 20 * PC Mike - Privacy.net web site of the day. August 3 * Mundo Digital - Brasil - Privacy.net site of the day. July 30 * MCOT - Thailand - Privacy Analyzer. July 30 * Minnesota 9 News. Stop phone solicitors. July 26 * Internet News Radio. Cybersquatters Battle Back. July 6 * Cyberspot They've Got Your Number June 27 * CNN Privacy on the Line. June 20 * Hva slags informasjon kan webserveren fange opp om deg? June 17 * Inter@ctive Week. CASRO.com dispute. June 14. * BBC New Rules to Cut Cold Calls. June 1 * National Geographic - Electronic Explorer. Hype at the Speed of Light. June. * CNET Topic Center : Privacy and Security June. * About.com. Naked in Cyberspace. April 2. * Seattle Weekly. IPeekaboo. March 25. * Democracy Now, Pacifica Radio Network. Privacy and Monopoly. March 12. * Internet World. Newsmakers, Mary Culnan. March 8 * CNET. Domain Speculation Crackdow Draws Fire. February 18. * KVUE News, Austin, Texas. Interesting Links. February 18. * Privacy Times. Crumblin' Cookies Causing Web Data Leaks. February 15. * InfoWorld. Netscape, Microsoft investigate Cookie Corruption. February 11. * MacInTouch. Mysterious Cookie Bug. February 11. * CNET. Open Cookie Files not due to Browsers. February 10. * Computerworld. Microsoft, Netscape Probe Cookie Glitch. February 10. * Internet.com. Browser Bug Exposes Cookie Data. February 10. * CNET. Browser bug opens cookie files. February 9. * Tech Week. Identity Crisis: The Pentium III&# serial number feature is the latest flash point in the debate over privacy. February 8. * CL Online. Charlotte, NC. Telemarketers Driving You Nuts? February 6. * PC Magazine Middle and Near East. Privacy article in Arabic. Copy February 6. * Time Digital. Going Private. February 6. * Privacy Times. CASRO vs. Russ Smith? February 1. * KNBC, Los Angeles. Weaving the Internet: A Founder Remembers. January 15. * MSNBC 4 Milwaukee, Wisconsin - 4 On Your Side Consumer Watch. January. * Festivals.com - Mummer's Parade is the Festival of the Day - Links to Mummers.com. January 1. * Chester County Net (PA), DJ Bill's Pick of the Day. Coverage of the Philadelphia Mummer's New Year's Day Parade - Links to Mummers.com. January 1. 1998 * NBC 10 - Coverage of the Philadelphia Mummer's New Year's Day Parade - Links to Mummers.com. December 28. * Teleservices News Service Bureau Responsibility Related to Do-Not-Call Requests. December 14. * News 2, San Francisco; News 4 Minneapolis/St. Paul; News 3 Madison, Wisconsin; News 6 Portland, Oregon; and News 5 Cleveland. Thanksgiving: It's Not Just For Eating Anymore. Links to Comparison-Shopping.com. November 18. * PacBell and SWBell newsletter. Links to privacy analysis. November. * KNSD, San Diego. Stop Junk Phone Calls. October 14. * Direct Marketing News DMA's Ethics Committee Leaves Unanswered Questions. October 12 * TeleServices News At Issue with Letter from Telequest. September 7. * Woman's World: 6 Surefire Ways to Stop Telemarketers from Ruining Your Dinner Hour. August 18. * Privacy Times AT&T & Junk Calls. August 14 * Good Morning America August (3823 bytes) * Eye on the Web: "Give 'em an 'A' for thoroughness. Loads of information geared toward the consumer on a variety of subjects. Content is king here. Offers to analyze your Internet privacy for free -- the results surprise and startle!" August 4 * Access Atlanta Long-distance firms banned from Georgia July 23 * Access Atlanta, Cox News Service FTC wants to stamp out spam July 15 * Privacy Times Telemarketers Accused of Ignoring Junk Phone Law. June 12. * TeleProfessional Magazine. I'm Not Killing This Dog. I'm Trying To Save Its Life! June. * Privacy Times Senate commercial e-mail legislation coverage. May 15. * Teleservices News Complaints, Requests to Associations Go Unheeded May 4 * Sacramento, California Bee Tired of unwanted phone pitches? You're not alone. April 12 * Searcher Frauds, Hoaxes, Myths, and Chain Letters: or, What's This Doing in My E-Mail Box? April * Inter@ctive Week NSI Database Outdated. March 27. * Computerworld mentions cyberpromo.org. March 23 issue. * Computer Valley Magazine Privacy in Rete Ecco come possiamo difenderla March issue. * NBC17 Raleigh/Durham/The Triangle North Carolina. Consumer links: "[Consumer.Net is] one stop shopping for all sorts of useful consumer stuff." March * PC World. You've Got Junk Mail. March 2. * MSNBC KNBC4 Los Angeles. Experts Warn of

Email Perils. February 26. * Ethical Spectacle. Cyber Patrol and Deja News. February 17. * KXAN TV Austin, TX. Department of Public Safety and BBB Warn About Donation Solicitation. February 12. * Washington Times. Firms help Disconnect 'Telenuisances' February 11. * New Media News. Spam Wars. January 23. * Daily Republican. Readers links of the week January 3. 1997 * San Jose Mercury News. Deluge of Junk E-mail Spawns Spambusters December 31. * Orange County, California Register. Taking Aim at Spam December 21. * Endangered Liberties TV show. Appeared with an FTC attorney to discuss telemarketing laws. December 18. * Washington Post. "Consumer.Net monitors direct marketers and campaigns for consumer privacy" according to the December 7 Post. * NBC4 NewsLinks December 1997. * Web Master and Web Moron November 20. * Direct Marketing News. Consumer Activist Files DMA Ethics Complaint Against AOL. November 3. * Philadelphia Business Journal. Expiration Date Near for Spam? November 3. * Connected-Online live Interview October. * Los Angeles Times Times Pick. October 16. * NetTalk Live. Brother Can You Spare the Spam? October 5. * Information Week. Make Money Fast! Promote Your Web Site! Talk To A Live Naked Woman! September 29. * Inter@ctive Week. Crusader Fights Direct Marketers. September 8 * Court TV Legal Cafe September. * Direct Marketing News editor prints letter from this site discussing junk e-mail and the Direct Marketing Association. September 8. * Interop commentary: Spam, Spam Spam August 22. * Bland County West Virginia news Extension Answers - What to do to stop telemarketing calls. July 10. * PC Magazine Fighting Junk E-mail June 9. * Rutgers Magazine note about testimony at FTC hearings Summer edition. * Williamsport Area Computer Club June. * Direct Marketing News editor prints letter from this site discussing junk e-mail. May 26. * PGP Magazine en Espa?ol (Spain) Premiere Issue April. Evitar email no deseado. * Privacy Journal War Stories Volume II. 1997 * WBIS+ TV New York. Russ Smith appears to discuss telemarketing. March. * San Jose Mercury News. Readers' tricks for ridding line of telemarketers, March 14. * KNZR Radio, Los Angeles. Russ Smith appeared on The Law and You January 25. * Newsday. Site Mentioned in January Online Issue of Garbage In, Garbage Out. Buried under junk e-mail, 'Net subscribers are fighting back. * Los Angeles Times. Putting Junk E-Mail in Its Place. January 20 1996 * Fort Worth Star Telegram. Savvy Consumers use Regulations to Ring Up Court Awards Against Telephone Marketers. December. * Direct Marketing News. Privacy-Rights Fighter Sues Warrantech, CompUSA. December. * Privacy Times. CompUSA/Warrantech News Release, December. * Discovery Channel Canada. Weekly Webster Feature on Junk E-mail. September. * NBC4 News Consumer Watch, Washington, DC. Rerun nationally on... * CNBC Steals and Deals. May. web@consumer.net Telemarketing Laws | State Consumer Info | Contact | Media Coverage | Privacy-Policy.com | Shop Other Consumer.net sites: Privacy.net | Help.org | Network-Tools.com | Domainia.org | Santa.Claus.net | ChristmasTrees.com | Santas-List.com | Mummers.com | TranslateFree.com | GrandparentsDay.com | Native-Americans.com | Post-Office.org | Alcatraz.San-Francisco.ca.us Alcatraz Island Get your credit report Verify your records - $8 Updated October 13, 1999. ?Russell Smith. All rights reserved. ******* >From agrosse@umich.edu Tue Nov 9 08:57:50 1999 Received: from vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.35]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA14743 for ; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 08:57:49 -0800 (PST) Received: from cirksena (isr-40-159.isr.umich.edu [141.211.40.168]) by vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.9.1/3.1r) with SMTP id LAA05329 for ; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 11:57:48 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.1.19991109115603.01649e60@a.imap.itd.umich.edu> X-Sender: agrosse@a.imap.itd.umich.edu X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1 Date: Tue, 09 Nov 1999 11:57:43 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: Ashley Grosse Subject: JOB ANNOUNCEMENT Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" University of Michigan, National Election Studies Job Description: NES Research Associate I Duties: Assist in data and documentation processing, archival operations, and study

preparation for the National Election Studies (NES). NES is a national resource program of survey research located in the Center for Political Studies at the Institute for Social Research; NES also serves as the secretariat for the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES), a cross-national research effort focused on the study of electoral systems in their various stages and settings. Responsibilities include: conduct complex data and documentation processing, in the SAS and Microsoft Access software packages in order to create the study datasets and codebooks; help develop and coordinate dataset parameters throughout all study phases; propose and implement quality control procedures for data processing operations; create and maintain various databases and create products as output from those databases (html-marked up codebooks, frequency tables to be served on the NES web site, etc.); assist in the review and testing of the survey instruments (computer-assisted interviewing programs); provide thorough documentation for the data and the data processing operations; serve as a liaison to members of the NES research community by responding to requests for routine data runs and special access datasets; provide technical support to the research community for questions related to data quality; assist in the development and maintenance of the NES archive of studies and study materials (hardcopy and electronic); assist in the creation of Technical Reports which analyze NES survey operations and data quality; assist in the creation of new NES resources and products; provide other data support services as needed. NOTE: Position could be filled between 30 40 hours per week, depending on candidate's needs. Necessary Qualifications: Bachelor's degree in a social science or other relevant field or an equivalent combination of education and experience; at least one year of experience in data processing or archiving of a complex nature; experience using a major social science data processing software package, preferably SAS; extensive computing skills in the Windows environment, particularly with database applications (preferably Microsoft Access); excellent communication skills, both oral and written, in the English language; attention to detail; strong organizational skills; excellent interpersonal skills; and the ability to work both as part of a team and individually while meeting deadlines in a multi-tasking environment. Desired Qualifications: Two to three years experience processing complex survey data, including the cleaning and merging of datasets from multiple sources; knowledge of survey research principles and practices; knowledge of political science, including the electoral and comparative fields; experience with data analysis and report writing; extensive knowledge of the SAS and Access computer programs; knowledge of html; knowledge of respondent confidentiality regulations; experience providing technical assistance to academic researchers. Applicants should submit a cover letter, resume and references to Thomas Ivacko, National Election Studies, Room 4136, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248. We will begin reviewing applications on November 5, 1999 and continue until positions are filled. The University of Michigan is an AA/EO employer and strongly encourages applications from women and minority candidates. ** Ashley Grosse Director of Studies, National Election Studies & Comparative Study of Electoral Systems Center for Political Studies-University of Michigan 4118 Institute for Social Research Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248 USA email: agrosse@umich.edu Voice: 734.936.1774 FAX: 734.764.3341 *** >From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Nov 9 09:03:12 1999 Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA18366 for ; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 09:03:11 -0800 (PST) Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost) by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA09833 for ; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 09:03:11 -0800 (PST) Date: Tue, 9 Nov 1999 09:03:11 -0800 (PST) From: James Beniger To: AAPORNET Subject: Government Moves on Internet Privacy Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII FTC STUDIES 'PROFILING' BY WEB SITES The

FTC is meeting today to examine the use of consumer profiling tactics by Web sites. The FTC may determine that new laws are necessary to protect users from such tactics, which take information about consumers' online surfing habits and incorporate the data as part of a company's marketing strategy. Consumer privacy groups are assailing consumer profiling as an affront to online users' privacy. Meanwhile, Web retailers argue that consumer profiling is a necessary component of a healthy e-commerce economy. During today's hearing, the FTC will look at the kind of information Web sites collect from Internet users, how the information is used, and whom the information is shared with. Ninety-three percent of Internet users say the personal information collected by Web sites jeopardizes their privacy, while 63 percent say the federal government should defer to the online industry in regulating collection practices, according to a recent report from @Plan. (USA Today 11/08/99) WEB SPINNING IN WASHINGTON Congress has introduced more than 60 bills that regulate the Internet, and as many as six of those that have backing from the business industry will likely be passed before the year is out. Technology companies are pushing for stronger contract laws as well as legislation that would protect copyrights and trademarks. The Center for Responsive Politics says technology companies have earmarked $18 million for lobbying efforts in next year's elections. Congress has failed to address issues that affect online consumers, such as privacy and security. Mark Rottenberg, director of the Electronic Privacy Information Center, says the Internet industry makes sure its needs are heard first when Congress addresses Internet issues. Rep. Christopher Cox (R-Newport Beach), says Congress has become overzealous in its efforts to regulate the Internet. Consumer privacy groups are "outmanned" by organized industry efforts to reduce online privacy, according to David Moulton, an aide to Rep. Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.). (Los Angeles Times 11/08/99) -- News abstracts Copyright 1999, Information Inc., Bethesda, MD Edupage Copyright 1999, EDUCAUSE --- ******* >From RoniRosner@aol.com Tue Nov 9 09:29:16 1999 Received: from imo17.mx.aol.com (imo17.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.7]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA03945 for ; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 09:29:15 -0800 (PST) From: RoniRosner@aol.com Received: from RoniRosner@aol.com by imo17.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5METa27645 (4556) for ; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 12:28:31 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.2b95c0ca.2559b3bf@aol.com> Date: Tue, 9 Nov 1999 12:28:31 EST Subject: HIP JOB OPENING To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 219 PLEASE RESPOND TO: Survey Research Unit, Medical and Quality Informatics Dept., HIP Health Plan of New York, 7 West 34th Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10001. Fax: (212) 630-8292. E-mail: cpatel@hipusa.com HIP Health Plan of New York is seeking an organized, detailed oriented Survey Research Analyst with excellent analytical, oral and written communication skills. Responsibilities include: analyzing survey research data, writing reports, and designing mail questionnaires/telephone interviewing scripts. We require a Bachelor's degree and a minimum of 2 years work experience in marketing research or survey analysis. Working knowledge of Word, Excel, and Access software a must; familiarity with SPSS and/or SAS a plus. We offer a comprehensive, company-paid benefits package. For immediate consideration, please forward your resume with salary history and requirements to: Survey Research Unit, Medical and Quality Informatics Dept., HIP Health Plan of New York, 7 West 34th Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10001. Fax: (212) 630-8292. E-mail: cpatel@hipusa.com >From rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu Tue Nov 9 10:44:35 1999 Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA12081 for ; Tue, 9 Nov 1999 10:44:34 -0800 (PST) Received: from [128.104.48.52] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu id MAA278964 (8.9.1/50); Tue, 9 Nov 1999 12:44:31 -0600 Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-

ascii" X-Sender: rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu Message-Id: In-Reply-To: Date: Tue, 9 Nov 1999 12:44:22 -0600 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: Robert Godfrey Subject: Clinton and telemarketing fraud http://detnews.com/1999/nation/9911/07/11070076.htm Clinton denounces phone scams WASHINGTON - Announcing a new mail campaign to thwart telemarketing fraud, President Clinton said Saturday that many older Americans face a greater threat from "a scam artist on the phone" than from a mugger on the street. 11/7/99 >From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Wed Nov 10 05:04:00 1999 Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id FAA13206 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 05:03:59 -0800 (PST) Received: from pjl1 (pjl1.sbs.ohio-state.edu [128.146.93.67]) by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id IAA26499 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:00:42 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <2.2.32.19991110130303.008acd24@pop.service.ohio-state.edu> X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32) Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:03:03 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." Subject: Today's Page One NY Times article You might find the article "Poll Finds Greater Confidence in Democrats" on today's Page 1 of the NY Times of interest. I, for one, will be curious what partisan volleys from conservative poll-bashers this will generate -- the Huffington-types who may react to this story/poll as another example of public media polls that are biased/invalid because of a final sample that has a "low" response rate and thus is too liberal/Democratic. I hope the Times and CBS News are ready to speak out strongly about the accuracy of their survey. >From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Wed Nov 10 05:41:00 1999 Received: from smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net [199.45.39.156]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id FAA28177 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 05:40:41 -0800 (PST) Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com (client-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net [151.202.23.5]) by smtp-out1.bellatlantic.net (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id IAA16231 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:37:56 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.2.1.19991110081632.00ae5020@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.1 Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:38:04 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: Manfred Kuechler Subject: Re: Today's Page One NY Times article In-Reply-To: <2.2.32.19991110130303.008acd24@pop.service.ohio-state.edu> Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed At 08:03 AM 11/10/99 -0500, Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. wrote: >I, for one, will be curious what partisan volleys from conservative >poll-bashers this will generate -- the Huffington-types who may react to >this story/poll as another example of public media polls that are >biased/invalid because of a final sample that has a "low" response rate and >thus is too liberal/Democratic. I hope the Times and CBS News are ready to >speak out strongly about the accuracy of their survey. And I, for another, am very curious what the "response rate" actually is and what operational definition of "response rate" was used to compute this figure -- but this probably makes me a "Huffington type" (on the whacko right-wing fringe). As always, the box accompanying the story in the NYT titled "How the survey was done" avoids this issue -- and so did Michael Kagay in his full story about sampling for the NYT polls (which was very informative and well written otherwise -- I use it in my methods class) on Nov 4. If you missed it: http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/110499poll-watch.html I find it very unfortunate that it seems to be impossible to have a scholarly discussion of a very important problem in survey research (low response rates and the *possible* threat to the representativity of the realized sample -- even if the target sample was strictly a probability sample) on AAPORNET without accusations of being "liberal", "conservative", or of whatever political conviction. MK. Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY) http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html Given the continuing

problems with Internet service to/from Hunter and e-mail service in particular, you may want to use my private e-mail address (kathman@bellatlantic.net) for anything important. This is a new address, the previous address (kathman@asan.com) has been discontinued. >From bthompson@directionsrsch.com Wed Nov 10 05:54:01 1999 Received: from proxy.directionsrsch.com (IDENT:root@dri74.directionsrsch.com [206.112.196.74]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id FAA06605 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 05:54:00 -0800 (PST) Received: from drione.directionsrsch.com by proxy.directionsrsch.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id IAA14647 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:06:55 -0500 Received: by drione.directionsrsch.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.3 (733.2 10-16-1998)) id 85256825.004C1095 ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:50:49 -0500 X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI From: "Bill Thompson" To: aapornet@usc.edu Message-ID: <85256825.004C0F03.00@drione.directionsrsch.com> Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:50:44 -0500 Subject: Re: Today's Page One NY Times article Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Disposition: inline Manfred's comments are well founded. Mud can be slung both ways, yet it seems only the "right" gets blamed on AAPORnet. Political preference has no place on our list. Manfred Kuechler on 11/10/99 08:38:04 AM Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu To: aapornet@usc.edu cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI) Subject: Re: Today's Page One NY Times article At 08:03 AM 11/10/99 -0500, Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. wrote: >I, for one, will be curious what partisan volleys from conservative >poll-bashers this will generate -- the Huffington-types who may react to >this story/poll as another example of public media polls that are >biased/invalid because of a final sample that has a "low" response rate and >thus is too liberal/Democratic. I hope the Times and CBS News are ready to >speak out strongly about the accuracy of their survey. And I, for another, am very curious what the "response rate" actually is and what operational definition of "response rate" was used to compute this figure -- but this probably makes me a "Huffington type" (on the whacko right-wing fringe). As always, the box accompanying the story in the NYT titled "How the survey was done" avoids this issue -- and so did Michael Kagay in his full story about sampling for the NYT polls (which was very informative and well written otherwise -- I use it in my methods class) on Nov 4. If you missed it: http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/110499poll-watch.html I find it very unfortunate that it seems to be impossible to have a scholarly discussion of a very important problem in survey research (low response rates and the *possible* threat to the representativity of the realized sample -- even if the target sample was strictly a probability sample) on AAPORNET without accusations of being "liberal", "conservative", or of whatever political conviction. MK. Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY) http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html Given the continuing problems with Internet service to/from Hunter and e-mail service in particular, you may want to use my private e-mail address (kathman@bellatlantic.net) for anything important. This is a new address, the previous address (kathman@asan.com) has been discontinued. >From mtrau@umich.edu Wed Nov 10 06:01:24 1999 Received: from laciotat.ifs.umich.edu (smtp@laciotat.ifs.umich.edu [141.211.168.47]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA29834 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 06:01:23 -0800 (PST) Received: from stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.154]) by laciotat.ifs.umich.edu (8.9.1a/) with ESMTP id JAA22585 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:01:23 -0500 (EST) Received: from localhost (mtrau@localhost) by stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id JAA05659 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:01:22 -0500 (EST) Precedence: first-class Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:01:22 -0500 (EST) From: Michael W Traugott X-Sender: mtrau@stargate.gpcc.itd.umich.edu To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Today's New York Times Article Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII Before this particular version of this conversation gets very much farther, I want to use it as an opportunity to resend a message I sent about 10 days ago from Portland.

The issue of response rates and the reporting of them is a very important one that the AAPOR Council has decided to take up. We will be meeting on Friday in New York. Some of you may have addressed comments to Warren Mitofsky about feasibility, but there has no general discussion of the proposal on AAPORNET. Since I sent this message, I have received only 1 response. So I am giving you all another chance. Mike Traugott Dear AAPORNET Subscriber: Greetings from Portland and the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse. This is an exciting and stimulating gathering of almost 500 survey researchers interested in such issues of unit and item nonresponse, techniques for increasing response rates, and imputation methods for nonresponse adjustment. There are many AAPOR members here, including several Council members. And there has actually been a meeting of two AAPOR committees that are dealing with issues of the standards for disclosure and possible revisions to the AAPOR Standard Definitions. The committee members who convened were Janice Ballou, Paul Lavrakas, Betsy Martin, Tom Smith, and Warren Mitofsky; Rob Daves has been serving as well but is not in Portland. These committees are working toward a conversation at our January Council meeting that will be based upon the attached memo from Tom Smith to the Council. The Council will give this proposal very serious consideration, and then it may ask the membership to vote on it as well. However, as a prelude to our conversation, the Council is interested in receiving comments and reactions to the proposal, as well as in obtaining information about the feasibility of requiring conformity to the proposed standard definitions. For that reason, I have been asked to post the Smith proposal on AAPORNET for comment and to solicit information on the feasibility of applying the standard definitions. We are interested 1) in whether or not anyone has tried to apply the standard definitions to compute response rates for their own surveys or 2) whether anyone would be interested in trying to apply the standard definitions to their own work. If so, would you be willing to communicate the results of such an effort to Warren Mitofsky (mitofsky@mindspring.com). Warren is the current Standards Chair and the Council member who will lead the discussion at the January Council meeting. He will also assume responsibility for communicating any comments or reactions he receives to the other members of the committee. I also hope there will be vigorous discussion of the proposal on AAPORNET. If the Council and the membership adopt this recommendation, this will be one of the most important decisions we have taken in recent years. We want to know what you think. Mike Traugott A Note on the AAPOR Code Tom W. Smith NORC, University of Chicago May, 1999 Revised June, 1999 The AAPOR Standards of Minimal Disclosure require the distribution of... "5. Size of sample and ,if applicable, completion rates and information on eligibility criteria and screening procedures." 1. "Completion rates" is not mentioned in the Standard Definition publication, nor is it used in a dozen major works on survey methods and sampling that I consulted. But from two sources that do use it, we can determine what AAPOR's code is calling for. a. The CASRO Response Rates report (p. 8) says that "Completion Rate is to be considered as a collective term that is used to designate how well a task has been accomplished. In general, completion rates are used to measure how well the various components involved in a sample survey are accomplished." The CASRO report adds, "In determining a response rate, completion rates are used to evaluate the component steps. These component steps are then combined to form the response rate." b. Lessler and Kalsbeek (1992, p. 368-369), in Nonsampling Error is Surveys note 11 definitions of completion rates, including 8 cited in the CASRO report. These cover a range of meanings and include both cooperation and response rates as defined in Standard Definitions as well as others things such as eligibility rate. I believe that the "completion rates" in the AAPOR code should be understood to cover all outcome rates as defined in Standard Definitions. That is, "completion rates" is the same as "outcome rates" in that document and refers to the family of distinct rates (response, nonresponse, cooperation, refusal, etc.) that may be

calculated based on the final disposition of sample cases. I propose that a) Council adopt this understanding of the term "completion rates" and b) in the next edition of Standard Definition a line be added saying that completion rates are the range of figures herein referred to as outcome rates. 2. "if applicable" is a potentially dangerous loophole. It is my understanding that it was added to cover convenience samples and other non-probability designs for which completion rates could not be calculated. What AAPOR means is illustrated by a similar passage in Best Practices... "12. Disclose all methods of the survey to permit evaluation and replication...A comprehensive list of the elements proposed for disclosure...includes... documentation and a full description, if applicable, of any response or completion rates cited (for quota designs, the number of refusals)..." Thus, completion rates should be reported for all surveys using designs that are open to the calculation of such rates and even for designs that don't permit the calculation of all such rates (e.g. quota samples), appropriate rates should be presented. The danger is that "if applicable" could be interpreted in other ways such as, "if they exist" or "if available." I propose that AAPOR Council adopt an interpretation of "if applicable" that (as a first cut) says something like... Completion rates should be disclosed in all cases in which a survey design is open to the calculation of such rates. This would typically include all random or full-probability samples (e.g. RDD telephone surveys). For sample designs that do not employ such a design (e.g. block quota samples), appropriate outcome figures such as the number of attempted cases, the number of completed cases, and the number of refusals should be routinely reported. >From ratledge@UDel.Edu Wed Nov 10 06:03:24 1999 Received: from copland.udel.edu (copland.udel.edu [128.175.13.92]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA02724 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 06:03:24 -0800 (PST) Received: from murphy2.udel.edu (exchange.chep.udel.edu [128.175.63.18]) by copland.udel.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA09457 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:03:24 -0500 (EST) Received: by murphy2.udel.edu with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63) id <01BF2B5A.79363570@murphy2.udel.edu>; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:03:37 -0500 Message-ID: From: "Ratledge, Edward" To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" Subject: RE: Today's Page One NY Times article Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:03:35 -0500 X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63 I concur and I also agree the Times article skates around the response issue. Given the time frame, I would bet at best they achieved a contact rate of 70%-80% of the "good numbers" in the RDD sample and interviewed at best 70-80% of the randomly selected respondents which would put them at best in the range of 49% to 64% for a response rate. Any other guesses since they won't tell? >----- Original Message----- >From: Bill Thompson [SMTP:bthompson@directionsrsch.com] >Sent: Wednesday, November 10, 1999 8:51 AM >To: aapornet@usc.edu >Subject: Re: Today's Page One NY Times article > > > >Manfred's comments are well founded. Mud can be slung both ways, yet it >seems >only the "right" gets blamed on AAPORnet. Political preference has no place >on >our list. > > > > > >Manfred Kuechler on 11/10/99 08:38:04 AM > >Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu > >To: aapornet@usc.edu >cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI) > >Subject: Re: Today's Page One NY Times article > > > > >At 08:03 AM 11/10/99 -0500, Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. wrote: >>I, for one, will be curious what partisan volleys from conservative >>poll-bashers this will generate -- the Huffington-types who may react to >>this story/poll as another example of public media polls that are >>biased/invalid because of a final sample that has a "low" response rate and >>thus is too liberal/Democratic. I hope the Times and CBS News are ready to >>speak out strongly about the accuracy of their survey. > >And I, for another, am very curious what the "response rate" actually is >and what operational definition of "response rate" was used to compute this >figure -- but this probably makes me a "Huffington type" (on the whacko >right-wing fringe). As always, the box accompanying the story in the NYT >titled "How the survey was done" avoids this issue -- and so

did Michael >Kagay in his full story about sampling for the NYT polls (which was very >informative and well written otherwise -- I use it in my methods class) on >Nov 4. If you missed it: >http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/110499poll-watch.html > >I find it very unfortunate that it seems to be impossible to have a >scholarly discussion of a very important problem in survey research (low >response rates and the *possible* threat to the representativity of the >realized sample -- even if the target sample was strictly a probability >sample) on AAPORNET without accusations of being "liberal", "conservative", >or of whatever political conviction. MK. > >Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY) > http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html >Given the continuing problems with Internet service to/from Hunter and >e-mail service in particular, you may want to use my private e-mail address >(kathman@bellatlantic.net) for anything important. This is a new address, >the previous address (kathman@asan.com) has been discontinued. > > > > > > > >From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Wed Nov 10 06:16:25 1999 Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA14065 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 06:16:24 -0800 (PST) Received: from pjl1 (pjl1.sbs.ohio-state.edu [128.146.93.67]) by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA24435 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:13:05 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <2.2.32.19991110141525.008efce0@pop.service.ohio-state.edu> X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32) Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:15:25 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." Subject: Re: Today's Page One NY Times article >To: aapornet@usc.edu >Subject: Re: Today's Page One NY Times article >Content-Disposition: inline >X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI >X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN At 08:50 AM 11/10/99 -0500, you wrote: > > >Manfred's comments are well founded. Mud can be slung both ways, yet it seems >only the "right" gets blamed on AAPORnet. Political preference has no place on >our list. > > Bill, Currently, to my knowledge, it is only partisan conservative elements that are publicly attacking the credibility of public political polls by challenging their methods (e.g., low response rates). If I am incorrect please let me/us know. Noting that there appears to be a partisan effort to discredit public polls, does not mean my comments are partisan -- I am an Independent and have been for years, voting both Republican and Democratic (and third party) when I thought best. If I knew/believed liberal or Democratic forces were doing this nowadays, I would be noting that in my messages. What we do know is that many partisans who do not find support for their positions in public polls don't like the message, and therefore are prone to attack the messenger. Since it's conservatives whose positions have not been well supported by many polls in the past two years, it's not surprising that they are displeased with the message and the messengers. In 1988 when Bush was run strong against Dukakis, it was liberal/Democrats who were most likely to be displeased with the poll "message," but I don't recall that these partisans attacked the methods/credibility of the polls themselves as being biased (e.g., disproportionately sampling Republicans)... >From Simonetta@artsci.com Wed Nov 10 06:52:13 1999 Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA23550 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 06:52:13 -0800 (PST) Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8) id <4Y6GNB81>; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:47:49 -0500 Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA9206E3F@AS_SERVER> From: Leo Simonetta To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" Subject: RE: Today's Page One NY Times article Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:47:47 -0500 X-Priority: 3 MIME-Version: 1.0 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8) Content-Type: text/plain > What we do know is that many partisans who do not find support for their > positions in public polls don't like the message, and therefore are prone to > attack the messenger. Since it's

conservatives whose positions have not > been well supported by many polls in the past two years, it's not surprising > that they are displeased with the message and the messengers. In 1988 when > Bush was run strong against Dukakis, it was liberal/Democrats who were most > likely to be displeased with the poll "message," but I don't recall that > these partisans attacked the methods/credibility of the polls themselves as > being biased (e.g., disproportionately sampling Republicans)... Or the survey or the surveyor itself being biased! When I was at the University of New Hampshire I had to explain several times (much like Paul did above in the protion that I snipped) that that I was not a Democrat or a Republican and that I had crossed all sorts of voting lines in my voting career. However, when I asked the reporter who was asking me all these questions what his part affilation was he responded that it was none of my business and that he was a unbiased reporter of fact! I responded that this was how I saw myself and the non-partisan survey industry. And this was before the Union-Leader called me a "shill" for the Democratic governor of New Hampshire! (I've got to get that article framed.) -- Leo G. Simonetta http://www.artsci.com Art & Science Group simonetta@artsci.com >From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Wed Nov 10 07:37:25 1999 Received: from hejira.hunter.cuny.edu (hejira.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.97]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id HAA09256 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 07:37:24 -0800 (PST) From: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Received: from social54 (social54.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.12.54]) by hejira.hunter.cuny.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA13188 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:39:39 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.2.1.19991110100207.00a22d20@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu> X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (Unverified) X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.1 Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:35:04 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Traugott's request In-Reply-To: Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed As Mike Traugott renewed his invitation to comment on a proposal currently under consideration by the AAPOR council, here are a few comments: 1. Yes, in principle, I concur with Tom Smith that the ambiguity in the standards should be eliminated and the reporting of response rates not be left as an option. And I think that the proposed new wording serves this purpose well. 2. At the same time, I am concerned that a reported "response rate" (if it really gets reported -- setting standards is one issue, enforcing them is another) could become the litmus test for the quality of a survey (at least for the lay public or people with a political agenda). In many cases, surveys with a response rate of some 50 percent are *not* significantly biased (if you start out with a decent target sample), and there is no mono-causal relationship of the form that the higher response rate, the better (more valid) the survey. The response rate (together with the various completion rates as discussed in Tom Smith's memo) is one important piece of information to assess the validity of a survey, but it is just *one* piece and it needs to be evaluated in the context of quite a bit of other information. 3. For the most part, response rates do not "look pretty" and, by and large, they are not getting better. And, yes, there are people out there (and there always have been) who attack the methodology because they don't like the substance of results. And this puts us (as professionals) in a predicament: do we inflict more harm on our profession by making information available that can be abused by people with a purely political agenda or do we inflict more harm by withholding information and by restricting a necessary professional and scholarly debate? I tend towards the latter position, but I do understand the legitimate concerns of others. And, maybe, at least on this list, we can refrain from political name calling. MK. Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY) http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html Given continuing problems with the e-mail service at Hunter, use my private address (kathman@bellatlantic.net) for anything important. The previous private address (kathman@asan.com) has been discontinued October 1, 1999. >From

Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Wed Nov 10 08:06:20 1999 Received: from fw ([63.71.157.115]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA21256 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:06:19 -0800 (PST) From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Received: from exchng1.gallup.com (gallup.com [198.175.140.73]) by fw (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id KAA02258; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:05:46 -0600 (CST) Received: by gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0) id ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:05:47 -0600 Message-ID: To: aapornet@usc.edu Cc: mbednarz@umich.edu Subject: "AAPOR News" Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:05:36 -0600 MIME-Version: 1.0 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0) Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1" Greetings: If you are an AAPOR Member in good standing, you should have received the Fall issue of our newsletter "AAPOR News" about a month ago. The cover page was headlined "A Look Back at Conference." It included articles about POQ/JSTOR, response rates, Warren Miller, in addition to several articles recapping conference events in St. Pete. If you did not receive the newsletter, Marlene Bednarz and I need to know that in order to evaluate the quality of a new mailhouse we used this time. Please reply directly to us, ONLY IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE THE NEWSLETTER! Please send your notification to: mbednarz@umich.edu and lydia_saad@gallup.com Many thanks. Lydia Saad 1999-2000 Publications and Information Chair AAPOR

_____ Lydia Saad, Managing Editor, The Gallup Poll The Gallup Organization 47 Hulfish Street, Suite 200, Princeton, NJ 08542 (o) 609-279-2219 (fax) 609-924-1857 lydia_saad@gallup.com >From KTedin@UH.EDU Wed Nov 10 08:08:18 1999 Received: from Bayou.UH.EDU (root@Bayou.UH.EDU [129.7.1.7]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA22718 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:08:17 -0800 (PST) Received: from Kent (POLS1.PolSci.UH.EDU [129.7.7.84]) by Bayou.UH.EDU (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id KAA09921 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:08:15 -0600 (CST) Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19991110085109.00802b10@bayou> X-Sender: pols2c@bayou X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32) Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:51:09 -0600 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: Kent Tedin Subject: Re: "AAPOR News" In-Reply-To: Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" I did not receive the newsletter. Kent Tedin, University of Houston. At 10:05 AM 11/10/1999 -0600, you wrote: >Greetings: > >If you are an AAPOR Member in good standing, you should have received the >Fall issue of our newsletter "AAPOR News" about a month ago. > >The cover page was headlined "A Look Back at Conference." It included >articles about POQ/JSTOR, response rates, Warren Miller, in addition to >several articles recapping conference events in St. Pete. > >If you did not receive the newsletter, Marlene Bednarz and I need to know >that in order to evaluate the quality of a new mailhouse we used this time. > >Please reply directly to us, ONLY IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE THE NEWSLETTER! > >Please send your notification to: mbednarz@umich.edu and >lydia_saad@gallup.com > >Many thanks. > >Lydia Saad >1999-2000 Publications and Information Chair >AAPOR > >_____ >Lydia Saad, Managing Editor, The Gallup Poll >The Gallup Organization >47 Hulfish Street, Suite 200, Princeton, NJ 08542 >(o) 609-279-2219 (fax) 609-924-1857 >lydia_saad@gallup.com > > > > >From dkb@casro.org Wed Nov 10 08:19:32 1999 Received: from mail.saturn5.net (mail.saturn5.net [207.122.105.6]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA28028 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:19:28 -0800 (PST) Received: from diane ([207.122.105.195]) by mail.saturn5.net (Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-59533U600L2S100V35) with SMTP id net for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:15:40 -0500 Message-ID: <002a01bf2b97$2ca489e0$c3697acf@diane> From: dkb@casro.org ((CASRO) Diane Bowers) To: Subject: Re: Consumer.Net's "Sites in the News" Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:18:04 -0500 MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit X-Priority: 3 X-MSMail-Priority: Normal X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1 X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft

MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3 All research colleagues should know and understand fully how some individuals and groups may misuse and abuse our good name. The efforts put forth by Consumer.net in the guise of helping consumers understand privacy, have been misleading and harmful to the opinion and marketing research industry. Over the years, CASRO have worked sincerely with such individuals to try and persuade them of our good intentions to protect the public's privacy, while helping society, the economy, etc. through survey research. When we at long last became assertive about our rights to contact (not to abuse personal privacy, but to simply ask an individual for his/her opinion) the public to conduct research--a right which has been upheld by federal law, then Russell Smith and Consumer.net went after CASRO in an aggressive, abusive fashion. They sent out emails to the full CASRO membership demanding my dismissal, they registered casro.com and proceeded to blast research and CASRO via their website consumer.net, and they also registered my personal name dbowers at casro.com aand received, opened, read, and responded to mail specifically mis-directed to me. In the postal system, this would be illegal, but not on the net. We are studying how to respond to Russell Smith's abuses of privacy (his concerns about privacy are so paradoxical, don't you think), but certainly, please be aware of his aggressive blasts at and intolerance of survey research. As evidence of this (and as a small comfort that indeed we are not the only focus of his abusiveness) please read the following article from the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 9, Marketplace, by Michael Moss. Hijacking of Errant E-Mails Grows, Leading to Some Embarrassing Tales By MICHAEL MOSS Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL On Oct. 15, New York telemarketing consultant Geri Gantman resigned in protest from her trade association and fired off an angry e-mail that detailed her gripes. The message fell into the hands of Russell Smith, a consumer activist and arch-foe of telemarketers, and Ms. Gantman figured someone leaked it. In fact, she sent it to him herself. The group's e-mail address is ataconnect.org. But she typed ataconnect.com -- which is a spot on the Internet that belongs to Mr. Smith. He acquired the look-alike address last winter and set it up to accept any e-mail that comes in. Since then, he says, he has received a pile of messages intended for people at the telemarketing association. "Even their own staff types .com," Mr. Smith crows. Already, the Internet is awash in Web sites that trick people into clicking on by using addresses that vary only slightly from the sites being mimicked: an extra letter here, a dropped hyphen there. Now, in near secrecy, some of these same look-alike Web sites are grabbing e-mail as well. A convenience of the Internet makes this easy to do: Most firms and organizations run their e-mail systems from the same addresses they use for their Web sites. E-mail pirates don't even need to know software code. For an extra $3, the outfits that set up Web sites will throw a few switches so the sites collect e-mail, too. Then all it takes is a sender who mistakenly types the look-alike address, and the message gets snagged. This trickery is so new that it isn't yet clear whether it can be stopped. Nor is it easy to avoid getting tripped up. Lawyers are e-mailing memos to the very people they are writing about. Voters are sending offers of money to their candidate's foe. Companies are losing customers, and perhaps even more. The technique is so seamless that computer experts assume that some firms use hijacked e-mail to snoop on competitors. Not all misdirected e-mail is being pirated. The proliferation of Web sites has made innocent confusion commonplace. Adams Capital Management Inc., a venture-capital firm based in Sewickley, Pa., evidently shares a look-alike address with a mutual fund, whose clients occasionally e-mail Adams by mistake. "I write back and say you've got us confused," says office manager Lynn Patterson. Some people trying to reach the mayor of New York are getting a different reply. Rudolph Giuliani's senatorial campaign had snapped up a bunch of Internet names before settling on RudyYes.com for his campaign site. Then he let his registration on the others expire. In July, a free-spirited group that lampoons companies and public officials picked up one address it says the mayor let go: YesRudy.com. Now, half of the 30 e-mail

messages that the group, RtMark, receives each day at this and another look-alike Giuliani site are intended for the mayor, says the group's spokesman, Frank Guerrero. "Wanted to send a contribution," one e-mailer wrote last month. Mr. Guerrero says he generally fires off a mischievous reply. "It is not often that one barrels headlong into a difficult race full of unanswered questions, even less often that one barrels headlong into a difficult race full of unasked questions. I am doing both," reads one such reply, signed "Rudy." Bruce Teitelbaum, spokesman for the mayor's political committee, says he didn't know the YesRudy site garnered e-mail intended for the mayor. "There is nothing we can do," he says, citing the group's right to free speech. Is e-mail snagging legal? It's murky. Some pirates liken their act to picking up the phone when the caller has dialed a wrong number. They also point fingers at the e-mail sender for not being careful enough. Those who get snatched say it is more like a toll-free number that has been created to resemble another, in hopes of siphoning off calls. They also point out that it is already a crime merely to open regular mail that is sent to the wrong address and that other criminal statutes might apply to misdirected e-mail. Some companies have successfully argued that their Web names are trademarks and that anyone who uses a look-alike address is creating confusion by being deceptive. "Regardless of whether it's a violation of electronic espionage law, I do think you can make a case for trademark violation if you can show that someone hijacking e-mails is causing real confusion," says David Bernstein, a Debevoise & Plimpton attorney who chairs the American Bar Association panel on Internet law. "One element of damage," Mr. Bernstein adds, "is that the sender never knows their e-mail is missing." Neither does the intended receiver. For months, Jews for Jesus had lost e-mail to a New Jersey man named Steven Brodsky who opposed the San Francisco religious group. He received the messages through an Internet name that was identical to the group's Jews-for-Jesus.org -- except his didn't have any hyphens. "I was blessed when one of your people came to our church," wrote a Baptist man from Portland, Ore., who left out the hyphens. Mr. Brodsky hadn't intended to hijack the group's e-mail, says his attorney, Ronald Coleman. Rather, in creating his Web site, Mr. Brodsky purchased software that automatically included the feature of accepting e-mail, Mr. Coleman says. The group discovered about a dozen lost messages when it sued Mr. Brodsky last year for trademark infringement. Then, in battling Mr. Brodsky, the group's own lawyers failed to use the hyphens on one e-mail they intended to send to the group. "In the middle of the litigation I get an interoffice communication from the San Francisco office of my adversary," says Mr. Coleman. "It was to his client, but he used the wrong address, and it went to my client." "That is true," sighs attorney Paul Winick, whose colleague actually sent the errant e-mail, which Mr. Coleman returned. "It is really a cautionary tale." In court, Mr. Coleman argued that Mr. Brodsky's acerbic site could not be mistaken for the religious group. But Jews for Jesus prevailed last year when a federal judge in New Jersey ruled that Mr. Brodsky deceived the public through trickery. Still, fending off look-alike Internet names can be so costly no matter who wins in court that Mr. Coleman advises his corporate clients to buy up all the names they can. "You have to register 60 paces in every direction," he says. "Even the likely typos. With hyphen and without hyphen. It's absurd." E-mail hijacking has added new urgency to the game of stockpiling Internet names. A southern California firm that sells goods through an Internet catalog says it is struggling with the owner of a similar name, who is seeking to sell it for a six-figure sum. For now, the look-alike name's owner is replying to the firm's customers who misdirect their e-mail to him -- without disclosing that they have reached the wrong place, says the catalog firm's attorney, Neil Smith of San Francisco. "He insults them," says Mr. Smith. "He is driving the customers away." He declined to name either firm because of possible legal action. Russell Smith, the consumer activist based in Alexandria, Va., says he has registered as many as 600 Internet names, which he swaps or sells or links to his own Web site that promotes consumerism. Most of his

stock is generic, like Merrychristmas.org, which he hopes will prove valuable someday. He also has Web names resembling those used by three telemarketing groups, including American Teleservices Association, of North Hollywood, from which Ms. Gantman -- a senior partner with the consultant firm Oetting & Co. of New York -- resigned last month. "This smacks of Big Brother," says Ms. Gantman, who had not known how her e-mail strayed to Mr. Smith until she was contacted by this newspaper. "We're going to be real careful with those dot-orgs from now on." Donna Bryce, a telemarketer and the association's communications director, says she also was unaware of Mr. Smith's e-mail system. "It would concern me when things go astray," she says. But, she adds, "it's a free country, and he has a right to his Web mail." She declined to discuss Ms. Gantman's letter. Mr. Smith says he routinely sets up all his sites to receive e-mail and did not target the telemarketers. But when their messages began streaming in, he decided to keep them coming as a weapon in his battle for consumer rights. "I want the messages," he says. "They sc- me, and I want to sc- them. It's revenge." Much of the telemarketers' e-mail, he adds, consists of jokes being passed around. "It's mostly a waste of time," he says. One exception arrived in January. It was an e-mail from attorney Roger Kirkpatrick, a consumer marketing specialist with Time Warner Inc., with whom Mr. Smith had been fighting. Mr. Smith had been pressing Time Warner to detail its consumer-privacy policies, and Mr. Kirkpatrick wrote an e-mail to his legal colleagues and an official at the Direct Marketing Association, a New York trade group to which Time Warner belongs. Mr. Kirkpatrick in the e-mail laid out his strategy to curb Mr. Smith's inquiries. "This guy is EXTREMELY obnoxious," he wrote. "We ... have nothing more to say or send to him." The e-mail went straight to Mr. Smith, when it was mistakenly addressed to his look-alike Direct Marketing name. "Clearly the e-mail was not intended to go to him," says Mr. Kirkpatrick, adding that he had not known how Mr. Smith had obtained his e-mail. Mr. Smith, for his part, replied to Mr. Kirkpatrick's misdirected e-mail, refuting some matters, agreeing with others. "One final thing," Mr. Smith wrote. "I would like to take this opportunity to welcome both you and the DMA to the Internet." -----Original Message----- From: James Beniger To: AAPORNET Date: Tuesday, November 09, 1999 12:29 AM Subject: Consumer.Net's "Sites in the News" Here's another and final page--at least for now--but a click away from www.consumer.net or www.casro.com , this one found at consumer.net/media.asp , and it's pretty devastating--just scanning the titles listed will give you the general idea. I note that, if the list here is to be believed, Inter@ctive Week apparently broke the CASRO.com dispute story as early as its June 14, 1999 issue. -- Jim *******
http://consumer.net/media.asp Get your Credit Report in Seconds! Telemarketing control - "Don't Annoy Me" Kit, Easy Hangup, and CallAudit. Consumer.Net home. Consumer.Net Group of Sites in the News 1999 * ZDnet Anchor Desk. The Big Privacy Lie. Also in Japanese. October 13. * Newsweek. We're Running Out of Dot.coms - Internet domain issues. October 3 * Houston Chronicle. Telemarketing and opt-out lists. September 20 * Wall Street Journal Texas - Texas driver's license information privacy. September 22. * Internet Radio - Russ Smith interviewed for a discussion of upcoming Internet domain dispute policy and the PriorityMail.com. August 27. * InternetNews.com and Internet Radio - Hijacking of Hate Site a Warning to Domain Holders. | Audio - August 20 * PC Mike - Privacy.net web site of the day. August 3 * Mundo Digital - Brasil - Privacy.net site of the day. July 30 * MCOT - Thailand - Privacy Analyzer. July 30 * Minnesota 9 News. Stop phone solicitors. July 26 * Internet News Radio. Cybersquatters Battle Back. July 6 * Cyberspot They've Got Your Number June 27 * CNN Privacy on the Line. June 20 * Hva slags informasjon kan webserveren fange opp om deg? June 17 * Inter@ctive Week. CASRO.com dispute. June 14. * BBC New Rules to Cut Cold Calls. June 1 * National Geographic - Electronic Explorer. Hype at the Speed of Light. June. * CNET Topic Center : Privacy and Security June. * About.com. Naked in Cyberspace. April 2. * Seattle Weekly. IPeekaboo. March 25. * Democracy Now,

Pacifica Radio Network. Privacy and Monopoly. March 12. * Internet World. Newsmakers, Mary Culnan. March 8 * CNET. Domain Speculation Crackdow Draws Fire. February 18. * KVUE News, Austin, Texas. Interesting Links. February 18. * Privacy Times. Crumblin' Cookies Causing Web Data Leaks. February 15. * InfoWorld. Netscape, Microsoft investigate Cookie Corruption. February 11. * MacInTouch. Mysterious Cookie Bug. February 11. * CNET. Open Cookie Files not due to Browsers. February 10. * Computerworld. Microsoft, Netscape Probe Cookie Glitch. February 10. * Internet.com. Browser Bug Exposes Cookie Data. February 10. * CNET. Browser bug opens cookie files. February 9. * Tech Week. Identity Crisis: The Pentium III&# serial number feature is the latest flash point in the debate over privacy. February 8. * CL Online. Charlotte, NC. Telemarketers Driving You Nuts? February 6. * PC Magazine Middle and Near East. Privacy article in Arabic. Copy February 6. * Time Digital. Going Private. February 6. * Privacy Times. CASRO vs. Russ Smith? February 1. * KNBC, Los Angeles. Weaving the Internet: A Founder Remembers. January 15. * MSNBC 4 Milwaukee, Wisconsin - 4 On Your Side Consumer Watch. January. * Festivals.com - Mummer's Parade is the Festival of the Day - Links to Mummers.com. January 1. * Chester County Net (PA), DJ Bill's Pick of the Day. Coverage of the Philadelphia Mummer's New Year's Day Parade - Links to Mummers.com. January 1. 1998 * NBC 10 - Coverage of the Philadelphia Mummer's New Year's Day Parade - Links to Mummers.com. December 28. * Teleservices News Service Bureau Responsibility Related to Do-Not-Call Requests. December 14. * News 2, San Francisco; News 4 Minneapolis/St. Paul; News 3 Madison, Wisconsin; News 6 Portland, Oregon; and News 5 Cleveland. Thanksgiving: It's Not Just For Eating Anymore. Links to Comparison-Shopping.com. November 18. * PacBell and SWBell newsletter. Links to privacy analysis. November. * KNSD, San Diego. Stop Junk Phone Calls. October 14. * Direct Marketing News DMA's Ethics Committee Leaves Unanswered Questions. October 12 * TeleServices News At Issue with Letter from Telequest. September 7. * Woman's World: 6 Surefire Ways to Stop Telemarketers from Ruining Your Dinner Hour. August 18. * Privacy Times AT&T & Junk Calls. August 14 * Good Morning America August (3823 bytes) * Eye on the Web: "Give 'em an 'A' for thoroughness. Loads of information geared toward the consumer on a variety of subjects. Content is king here. Offers to analyze your Internet privacy for free -- the results surprise and startle!" August 4 * Access Atlanta Long-distance firms banned from Georgia July 23 * Access Atlanta, Cox News Service FTC wants to stamp out spam July 15 * Privacy Times Telemarketers Accused of Ignoring Junk Phone Law. June 12. * TeleProfessional Magazine. I'm Not Killing This Dog. I'm Trying To Save Its Life! June. * Privacy Times Senate commercial e-mail legislation coverage. May 15. * Teleservices News Complaints, Requests to Associations Go Unheeded May 4 * Sacramento, California Bee Tired of unwanted phone pitches? You're not alone. April 12 * Searcher Frauds, Hoaxes, Myths, and Chain Letters: or, What's This Doing in My E-Mail Box? April * Inter@ctive Week NSI Database Outdated. March 27. * Computerworld mentions cyberpromo.org. March 23 issue. * Computer Valley Magazine Privacy in Rete Ecco come possiamo difenderla March issue. * NBC17 Raleigh/Durham/The Triangle North Carolina. Consumer links: "[Consumer.Net is] one stop shopping for all sorts of useful consumer stuff." March * PC World. You've Got Junk Mail. March 2. * MSNBC KNBC4 Los Angeles. Experts Warn of Email Perils. February 26. * Ethical Spectacle. Cyber Patrol and Deja News. February 17. * KXAN TV Austin, TX. Department of Public Safety and BBB Warn About Donation Solicitation. February 12. * Washington Times. Firms help Disconnect 'Telenuisances' February 11. * New Media News. Spam Wars. January 23. * Daily Republican. Readers links of the week January 3. 1997 * San Jose Mercury News. Deluge of Junk E-mail Spawns Spambusters December 31. * Orange County, California Register. Taking Aim at Spam December 21. * Endangered Liberties TV show. Appeared with an FTC attorney to discuss telemarketing laws. December 18. * Washington Post. "Consumer.Net monitors direct marketers and campaigns for consumer privacy"

according to the December 7 Post. * NBC4 NewsLinks December 1997. * Web Master and Web Moron November 20. * Direct Marketing News. Consumer Activist Files DMA Ethics Complaint Against AOL. November 3. * Philadelphia Business Journal. Expiration Date Near for Spam? November 3. * Connected-Online live Interview October. * Los Angeles Times Times Pick. October 16. * NetTalk Live. Brother Can You Spare the Spam? October 5. * Information Week. Make Money Fast! Promote Your Web Site! Talk To A Live Naked Woman! September 29. * Inter@ctive Week. Crusader Fights Direct Marketers. September 8 * Court TV Legal Cafe September. * Direct Marketing News editor prints letter from this site discussing junk e-mail and the Direct Marketing Association. September 8. * Interop commentary: Spam, Spam Spam August 22. * Bland County West Virginia news Extension Answers - What to do to stop telemarketing calls. July 10. * PC Magazine Fighting Junk E-mail June 9. * Rutgers Magazine note about testimony at FTC hearings Summer edition. * Williamsport Area Computer Club June. * Direct Marketing News editor prints letter from this site discussing junk e-mail. May 26. * PGP Magazine en Espa?ol (Spain) Premiere Issue April. Evitar email no deseado. * Privacy Journal War Stories Volume II. 1997 * WBIS+ TV New York. Russ Smith appears to discuss telemarketing. March. * San Jose Mercury News. Readers' tricks for ridding line of telemarketers, March 14. * KNZR Radio, Los Angeles. Russ Smith appeared on The Law and You January 25. * Newsday. Site Mentioned in January Online Issue of Garbage In, Garbage Out. Buried under junk e-mail, 'Net subscribers are fighting back. * Los Angeles Times. Putting Junk E-Mail in Its Place. January 20 1996 * Fort Worth Star Telegram. Savvy Consumers use Regulations to Ring Up Court Awards Against Telephone Marketers. December. * Direct Marketing News. Privacy-Rights Fighter Sues Warrantech, CompUSA. December. * Privacy Times. CompUSA/Warrantech News Release, December. * Discovery Channel Canada. Weekly Webster Feature on Junk E-mail. September. * NBC4 News Consumer Watch, Washington, DC. Rerun nationally on... * CNBC Steals and Deals. May. web@consumer.net Telemarketing Laws | State Consumer Info | Contact | Media Coverage | Privacy-Policy.com | Shop Other Consumer.net sites: Privacy.net | Help.org | Network-Tools.com | Domainia.org | Santa.Claus.net | ChristmasTrees.com | Santas-List.com | Mummers.com | TranslateFree.com | GrandparentsDay.com | Native-Americans.com | Post-Office.org | Alcatraz.San-Francisco.ca.us Alcatraz Island Get your credit report Verify your records - $8 Updated October 13, 1999. ?Russell Smith. All rights reserved. ******* >From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Wed Nov 10 08:34:30 1999 Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA05600 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:34:29 -0800 (PST) Received: from default (mxusw4x5.chesco.com [209.195.227.6]) by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA07602 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:34:22 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <002501bf2b99$2a70f620$06e3c3d1@default> From: "James P. Murphy" To: Subject: Re: Today's Page One NY Times article Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:32:12 -0500 MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Priority: 3 X-MSMail-Priority: Normal X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1 X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3 Polling and Liberal Partisanship Polling is most strongly associated with the political process -- i.e. elections. Major print and electronic media have produced highly accurate exit poll election outcome predictions for decades. Exit polls are not typical sample surveys with high levels of refusal and little access to non-responders. Raw data from exit polls can be post-calibrated by precinct in building predictive models for future elections. Exit polls are the centerpieces of the election reporting process and are themselves the subject of policy debates and even attempts at legislation. Their notoriety would not exist without widespread acknowledgement of their accuracy. Exit polls give ALL TYPES of major media polls high credibility and contribute to the perceived authority of their publishers. Unfortunately,

the media do nothing to inform the public of important differences in types of surveys. The standard "How the Poll Was Conducted" sidebar, often printed with results from regular sample surveys, is intellectual dishonesty. "In theory..." and "the practical difficulties of conducting any survey" don't quite tell the average reader that, well, 50 or 60 percent of the people we wanted to talk with refused to participate. Instead, what registers from these carefully worded smokescreens is the statistical m.o.e. Since most major media writers and publishers are left-leaning, it's not surprising that occasionally someone from the opposition will grasp the limitations of the sample surveys the media conduct and interpret, and launch into an attack. James P. Murphy, Ph.D. Voice (610) 408-8800 Fax (610) 408-8802 jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com -----Original Message----- From: Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. To: aapornet@usc.edu Date: Wednesday, November 10, 1999 8:04 AM Subject: Today's Page One NY Times article >You might find the article "Poll Finds Greater Confidence in Democrats" on >today's Page 1 of the NY Times of interest. > >I, for one, will be curious what partisan volleys from conservative >poll-bashers this will generate -- the Huffington-types who may react to >this story/poll as another example of public media polls that are >biased/invalid because of a final sample that has a "low" response rate and >thus is too liberal/Democratic. I hope the Times and CBS News are ready to >speak out strongly about the accuracy of their survey. > > >From daves@startribune.com Wed Nov 10 08:52:26 1999 Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com [132.148.80.211]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id IAA14875 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 08:52:09 -0800 (PST) Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id LAA23728; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:00:14 -0600 Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by firewall2.startribune.com via smap (V4.2) id xma023046; Wed, 10 Nov 99 10:59:14 -0600 Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:47:53 -0600 Message-Id: X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2 Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:47:31 -0600 From: "Rob Daves" To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Pummeling Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-7 Content-Disposition: inline Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id IAA15019 A look at elections throughout this century will teach us that partisan pummeling of pollsters ? and the media that sponsor the polls ? is nothing new, and nothing confined to the right, left, center, up or down. Right now, people like Ross Perot (lie to pollsters) and Arianna Huffington (hang up on pollsters) appear to be in the spotlight. Not too many years ago, New Jersey Republicans tried to take a public poll to task, and the Republicans in Minnesota have made outright misstatement characterizing a media polls because they believed that the published results hurt them and hurt their fund-raising efforts. But it's certainly not limited to Republicans, as a study of history would show. Democrats pummeled the Chicago Record in 1900 by telling the party faithful to ignore the newspaper's postcard poll. (Shades of Arianna, huh?) As one candidate pollster told me (she generally works for the Democrats, by the way), your job is to report the news as you see it, and with a poll I'm sure you try to be as accurate as you can. If my candidate is behind, she goes on, then my job is to make sure you're wrong! She politely didn't go into how that's accomplished. The 1998 gubernatorial campaign in Minnesota was an equal opportunity event for pummelers. At one point the Democrats said we couldn't be right in the primary election because we had the endorsed candidate so far behind to Hubert Humphrey III. They blamed our likely voter treatment. (Humphrey won, the endorsed candidate lost big time, and we were right on the money.) At another point the Republican criticized us for having too many Democrats in the sample. And in every election here ? at least since 1992 ? the Reform Party folks always say the media polls can't be right because so many folks show up at their rallies. Is it partisan? You bet. Is it confined to one particular party. Nope, it's generally confined to those who need tactics to change their place in the race, whatever

that place or race is. Robert P. Daves, Director Polling & News ResearchI Star Tribune 425 Portland Av. S. Minneapolis MN 55419 USA >From gjokeefe@facstaff.wisc.edu Wed Nov 10 09:02:36 1999 Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA20973 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:02:35 -0800 (PST) Received: from [144.92.181.123] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu id LAA250878 (8.9.1/50); Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:02:30 -0600 Message-Id: <199911101702.LAA250878@mail1.doit.wisc.edu> X-Sender: gjokeefe@facstaff.wisc.edu X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2 Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:02:03 -0600 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: "Garrett O'Keefe" Subject: Re: Today's New York Times Article Agreed. But I think the only way this constant interplay on nonresponse will get close to resolution is to turn to our roots--gathering more data on nonresponse reasons and who nonrespondents are compared to respondents. No arguing over formulae and procedures will do much good otherwise, as well intentioned as such debate is. Empirical evidence is sorely needed, and it needs to be tied to the various nonresponse definitions. That obviously will take money, and time. At 09:01 AM 11/10/99 -0500, you wrote: > >Before this particular version of this conversation gets very much >farther, I want to use it as an opportunity to resend a message I sent >about 10 days ago from Portland. The issue of response rates and the >reporting of them is a very important one that the AAPOR Council has >decided to take up. We will be meeting on Friday in New York. Some >of you may have addressed comments to Warren Mitofsky about >feasibility, but there has no general discussion of the proposal on >AAPORNET. Since I sent this message, I have received only 1 response. So >I am giving you all another chance. Mike Traugott > > > > >Dear AAPORNET Subscriber: > >Greetings from Portland and the International Conference on Survey >Nonresponse. This is an exciting and stimulating gathering of almost 500 >survey researchers interested in such issues of unit and item nonresponse, >techniques for increasing response rates, and imputation methods for >nonresponse adjustment. > >There are many AAPOR members here, including several Council members. And >there has actually been a meeting of two AAPOR committees that are dealing >with issues of the standards for disclosure and possible revisions to the >AAPOR Standard Definitions. The committee members who convened were >Janice Ballou, Paul Lavrakas, Betsy Martin, Tom Smith, and Warren >Mitofsky; Rob Daves has been serving as well but is not in Portland. These >committees are working toward a conversation at our January Council >meeting that will be based upon the attached memo from Tom Smith to the >Council. The Council will give this proposal very serious consideration, >and then it may ask the membership to vote on it as well. > >However, as a prelude to our conversation, the Council is interested in >receiving comments and reactions to the proposal, as well as in obtaining >information about the feasibility of requiring conformity to the proposed >standard definitions. For that reason, I have been asked to post the >Smith proposal on AAPORNET for comment and to solicit information on the >feasibility of applying the standard definitions. > >We are interested 1) in whether or not anyone has tried to apply the >standard definitions to compute response rates for their own surveys or 2) >whether anyone would be interested in trying to apply the standard >definitions to their own work. If so, would you be willing to communicate >the results of such an effort to Warren Mitofsky >(mitofsky@mindspring.com). Warren is the current Standards Chair and the >Council member who will lead the discussion at the January Council >meeting. He will also assume responsibility for communicating any >comments or reactions he receives to >the other members of the committee. > >I also hope there will be vigorous discussion of the proposal on AAPORNET. >If the Council and the membership adopt this recommendation, this will be >one of the most important decisions we have taken in recent years. We want >to know what you think. > >Mike Traugott > > > > > > > > > A Note on the AAPOR Code > > Tom W. Smith > > NORC, University of

Chicago > > May, 1999 > Revised June, 1999 > > > The AAPOR Standards of Minimal Disclosure require the distribution >of... > > "5. Size of sample and ,if applicable, completion rates and >information on eligibility criteria and screening procedures." > >1. "Completion rates" is not mentioned in the Standard Definition >publication, nor is it used in a dozen major works on survey methods and >sampling that I consulted. But from two sources that do use it, we can >determine what AAPOR's code is calling for. > > a. The CASRO Response Rates report (p. 8) says that "Completion >Rate >is to be considered as a collective term that is used to designate how >well >a task has been accomplished. In general, completion rates are used to >measure how well the various components involved in a sample survey are >accomplished." The CASRO report adds, "In determining a response rate, >completion rates are used to evaluate the component steps. These component >steps are then combined to form the response rate." > > b. Lessler and Kalsbeek (1992, p. 368-369), in Nonsampling Error >is >Surveys note 11 definitions of completion rates, including 8 cited in the >CASRO report. These cover a range of meanings and include both cooperation >and response rates as defined in Standard Definitions as well as others >things such as eligibility rate. > > I believe that the "completion rates" in the AAPOR code should be >understood to cover all outcome rates as defined in Standard Definitions. >That is, "completion rates" is the same as "outcome rates" in that >document >and refers to the family of distinct rates (response, nonresponse, >cooperation, refusal, etc.) that may be calculated based on the final >disposition of sample cases. > I propose that a) Council adopt this understanding of the term >"completion rates" and b) in the next edition of Standard Definition a >line >be added saying that completion rates are the range of figures herein >referred to as outcome rates. > >2. "if applicable" is a potentially dangerous loophole. It is my >understanding that it was added to cover convenience samples and other >non-probability designs for which completion rates could not be >calculated. >What AAPOR means is illustrated by a similar passage in Best Practices... > > "12. Disclose all methods of the survey to permit evaluation and >replication...A comprehensive list of the elements proposed for >disclosure...includes... > > documentation and a full description, if applicable, of any >response >or completion rates cited (for quota designs, the number of refusals)..." > >Thus, completion rates should be reported for all surveys using designs >that >are open to the calculation of such rates and even for designs that don't >permit the calculation of all such rates (e.g. quota samples), appropriate >rates should be presented. > The danger is that "if applicable" could be interpreted in other >ways such as, "if they exist" or "if available." > I propose that AAPOR Council adopt an interpretation of "if >applicable" that (as a first cut) says something like... > > Completion rates should be disclosed in all cases in which a >survey >design is open to the calculation of such rates. This would typically >include all random or full-probability samples (e.g. RDD telephone >surveys). >For sample designs that do not employ such a design (e.g. block quota >samples), appropriate outcome figures such as the number of attempted >cases, >the number of completed cases, and the number of refusals should be >routinely reported. > > > >

_____ Garrett J. O'Keefe, Ph.D. Professor of Agricultural Journalism and Environmental Studies 440 Henry Mall University of Wisconsin-Madison Madison, Wisconsin 53706 Tel: (608) 262-1843 FAX: (608) 265-3042 E-mail: gjokeefe@facstaff.wisc.edu >From rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu Wed Nov 10 09:55:24 1999 Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA11112 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 09:55:23 -0800 (PST) Received: from [128.104.54.32] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu id LAA216566 (8.9.1/50); Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:55:19 -0600 Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" X-Sender: rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu Message-Id: In-Reply-To: Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:55:05 -0600 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: Robert Godfrey Subject:

CFP - Survey design/data collection--DOL Survey design/data collection--DOL RESEARCH IN SURVEY DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES - DOL COMMERCE BUSINESS DAILY ISSUE OF OCTOBER 25,1999 PSA#2461 U.S. Department of Labor, Procurement Services Center, Business Operations Center, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Room N-5416, Washington, DC 20210 RESEARCH IN SURVEY DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES SOL RFI TN 00-02 DUE 110499 POC Leonard L. Bednar, Contract Negotiator, (202) 219-6445, Phyllis R. McMeekin, Contracting Officer. This is a market survey to locate qualified sources to perform survey methods research in support of the data collection activities of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) and to determine if the proposed work could be performed by small business. The full call may be read at http://www.usalert.com/htdoc/usoa/dol/any/any/proc/any/10259907.htm >From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed Nov 10 10:00:51 1999 Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA15845 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 10:00:48 -0800 (PST) Received: from jwdp.com (plp44.vgernet.net [205.219.186.144]) by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id NAA06349 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 13:42:54 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <3829B2C9.630B33D0@jwdp.com> Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 13:00:41 -0500 From: Jan Werner Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Pummeling References: Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit I own a copy of the first (and probably only) printing, dated November 1972, of a delightful little paperback book by someone named Arthur Tobier. The title is "How McGovern Won The Presidency & Why the Polls Were Wrong." The chapter on "Sampling Distortion" is particularly illuminating: Political opinion surveys developed a dependency for their sampling on householders and telephone users. In other words, polls measured preferences mainly of those people who were an active part of the social system. Even today, this is still pretty much the polls' bias, even though the vote of the previously disenfranchised, as well as others who are clearly not functioning in the social system, such as college students, has become critical to the final results. Substitute "Christian believers" for "college students" in the above and you pretty much have the same argument from the other side of the fence. Unfortunately, the lack of candor on behalf of virtually all news media polling organizations in reporting non-response and other technical information fuels this argument, concealing the fact that most polls conducted today do not suffer from systematic bias and are therefore not affected by this kind of distortion. As far as I know, the Star Tribune is still the only newspaper poll that gives any information at all on response rates. Jan Werner _____ Rob Daves wrote: > > A look at elections throughout this century will teach us that partisan pummeling of pollsters ? and the media that sponsor the polls ? is nothing new, and nothing confined to the right, left, center, up or down. Right now, people like Ross Perot (lie to pollsters) and Arianna Huffington (hang up on pollsters) appear to be in the spotlight. Not too many years ago, New Jersey Republicans tried to take a public poll to task, and the Republicans in Minnesota have made outright misstatement characterizing a media polls because they believed that the published results hurt them and hurt their fund-raising efforts. But it's certainly not limited to Republicans, as a study of history would show. Democrats pummeled the Chicago Record in 1900 by telling the party faithful to ignore the newspaper's postcard poll. (Shades of Arianna, huh?) > > As one candidate pollster told me (she generally works for the Democrats, by the way), your job is to report the news as you see it, and with a poll I'm sure you try to be as accurate as you can. If my candidate is behind, she goes on, then my job is to make sure you're wrong! She politely didn't go into how that's accomplished. > The 1998 gubernatorial campaign in Minnesota was an equal opportunity event for pummelers. At one point the Democrats said we couldn't be right in the primary election

because we had the endorsed candidate so far behind to Hubert Humphrey III. They blamed our likely voter treatment. (Humphrey won, the endorsed candidate lost big time, and we were right on the money.) At another point the Republican criticized us for having too many Democrats in the sample. And in every election here ? at least since 1992 ? the Reform Party folks always say the media polls can't be right because so many folks show up at their rallies. > > Is it partisan? You bet. Is it confined to one particular party. Nope, it's generally confined to those who need tactics to change their place in the race, whatever that place or race is. > > > > Robert P. Daves, Director > Polling & News Researchl > Star Tribune > 425 Portland Av. S. > Minneapolis MN 55419 USA >From Simonetta@artsci.com Wed Nov 10 11:27:27 1999 Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id LAA20271 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:27:12 -0800 (PST) Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8) id <4Y6GNB0T>; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 14:22:52 -0500 Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA9206E42@AS_SERVER> From: Leo Simonetta To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" Subject: RE: Traugott's request Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 14:22:52 -0500 X-Priority: 3 MIME-Version: 1.0 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8) Content-Type: text/plain I generally agree with Manfred Kuechler on his comments on the proposed amendments to the Standards. And I am going to use them as a springboard for some additional comments. SNIPPED > 2. At the same time, I am concerned that a reported "response > rate" (if it really gets reported -- setting standards is one > issue, enforcing them is another) could become the litmus test > for the quality of a survey (at least for the lay public or > people with a political agenda). In many cases, surveys with > a response rate of some 50 percent are *not* significantly > biased (if you start out with a decent target sample), and > there is no mono-causal relationship of the form that the > higher response rate, the better (more valid) the survey. > The response rate (together with the various completion rates > as discussed in Tom Smith's memo) is one important piece of > information to assess the validity of a survey, but it is just > *one* piece and it needs to be evaluated in the context of > quite a bit of other information. My biggest area of concern is with whether response rates or completion rates will, in fact, be reported. Will there be resistance to the reporting to this kind of data from a large number of survey organizations? How much resistance? What can and should AAPOR do in this case? What about non-AAPOR members? While I do think this will hand opponents of any given poll a weapon with which to pummel us, as Rob noted people with an agenda are going to attack surveys that contradict their desires or beliefs regardless of the response or completion rate. And as someone at St. Pete noted - they can do just fine beating us about the head and shoulders when we refuse to tell them what our response rates are for any given survey. -- Leo G. Simonetta http://www.artsci.com Art & Science Group simonetta@artsci.com >From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Nov 10 11:47:33 1999 Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.110]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id LAA05523 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 11:47:32 -0800 (PST) Received: from default (user-38ld7hm.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.158.54]) by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id OAA23346 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 14:47:30 -0500 (EST) Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991110140242.00a2d820@mail.mindspring.com> X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58 Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 14:42:39 -0500 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: dick halpern Subject: Re: Today's Page One NY Times article In-Reply-To: <2.2.32.19991110141525.008efce0@pop.service.ohio-state.edu> Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed There is no question that efforts to better understand the implications of non response and finding ways to correct the possible biases introduced must continue, However, I think it also prudent to remember the comment of Paul J. Lavrakas when he said that "...... many partisans who do not find support for their positions in public

polls don't like the message, and therefore are prone to attack the messenger" I have the doubtful pleasure of living in an ultra conservative Cobb County, Georgia, where many of my neighbors would make Ghengis Khan look like a liberal. Many of these people, (mostly well educated) refuse to believe the findings from any poll which reports negatives about Republicans or conservatives in general. Sadly, I think we must live with that fact despite continued and hopefully successful efforts to correct biases along with the reporting of sampling methodology in greater detail. It won't change much. In talking with many of them informally, their view is that either the polls are wrong (unrepresentative, biased question wording, etc.) or that the respondents simply don't have sufficient information to arrive at "a proper point of view." Reporting "reality" is rarely totally "win-win". Attempts to shoot the messenger will undoubtedly become more pronounced as the 2000 campaign speeds up. Despite this reality, efforts to improve survey research methodology become more important than ever. But take solace. If my memory serves me correctly, it was not until 1992 that Pope John Paul II established the Galileo commission to reinvestigate the Galileo affair, finally endorsing his view about the solar system. To the best of my knowledge, the Flat Earth Society still exists....and until the early 70's had an office in London. Dick Halpern ---------- Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology 3837 Courtyard Drive Atlanta, GA 30339-4248 rshalpern@mindspring.com phone/fax 770 434 4121 ---------- >From s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Wed Nov 10 12:50:44 1999 Received: from smtpmail1.csuohio.edu (smtpmail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.29]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id MAA26073 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 12:50:43 -0800 (PST) From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Received: by smtpmail1.csuohio.edu(Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2 (651.2 6-10-1998)) id 85256825.00720732 ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 15:45:29 -0500 X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU To: aapornet@usc.edu Message-ID: <85256825.007206B3.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu> Date: Wed, 10 Nov 1999 15:59:25 -0500 Subject: Re: Today's Page One NY Times article Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Disposition: inline In this discussion today, I support much of what has been said. But, I believe our responses should not be on the subject of ideologies, right, left, moderate, up, down, or sideways. Our position should be that public opinion surveys on election variables, done well, are impotant indicators of people's views on issues as they perceive them. There will always be recalcitrant and renegade individuals, not willing to accept reliable poll results, even from the most experienced and reputable individuals and organizations. In my 40 years association with public opinion in the business as well the academic sectors, I have not been able to go to a party or meeting where I haven't been asked the question, "How can you assess the opinion of 150 million Americans by asking questions of only 1200?" If reasonable, informed answers can't satisfy the critic-inquirer of the basic assuptions that underlie probability theory, certainly dealing with questions about ideology with vested individuals won 't satisfy either! Let's do what we do well and save our energies for improving the process. >From WeiofOlym@aol.com Wed Nov 10 22:28:38 1999 Received: from imo16.mx.aol.com (imo16.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.6]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id WAA00216 for ; Wed, 10 Nov 1999 22:28:37 -0800 (PST) From: WeiofOlym@aol.com Received: from WeiofOlym@aol.com by imo16.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5BVHa00890 (4392) for ; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 01:28:04 -0500 (EST) Message-ID: <0.bfb47d05.255bbbf4@aol.com> Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1999 01:28:04 EST Subject: Re: "AAPOR News" To: aapornet@usc.edu MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 41 I am a AAPOR member and I have never received messages through the e-mail. I did not receive the newsletter you mentioned in this message either. Please put me on your e-mail list. My address is: duc@dshs.wa.gov My mailing address is: Can Du

Department of Social & Health Services P O Box 45506 Olympia, WA 98504-5506 Thanks. Can Du >From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Thu Nov 11 05:18:29 1999 Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (IDENT:root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.150]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id FAA00485 for ; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 05:18:28 -0800 (PST) Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149]) by makalu.hp.ufl.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id JAA30460 for ; Thu, 11 Nov 1999 09:19:56 -0500 Received: from K2/SpoolDir by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44); 11 Nov 99 08:18:22 -0500 Received: from SpoolDir by K2 (Mercury 1.44); 11 Nov 99 08:18:19 -0500 Received: from hp.ufl.edu (128.227.163.115) by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44) with ESMTP; 11 Nov 99 08:18:08 -0500 Message-ID: <382AC369.40A58E82@hp.ufl.edu> Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1999 09:23:56 -0400 From: "Colleen K. Porter" X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: Traugott's request References: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA9206E42@AS_SERVER> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit Leo Simonetta wrote: > [...] > My biggest area of concern is with whether response rates or > completion rates will, in fact, be reported. And the follow-up question is, "Reported to whom?" Most of us report our data to a variety of audiences. For my projects, output ranges from the multi-volume/lots-of-Greek-symbols full academic report, to the 32-page glossy color summary for state legislators, to the press release for media consumption. As a reader of research, I can tell what's going on if I have a multi-page "technical notes" section that lists the totals for each disposition code, the formulae and percentages for response rates, cooperation rates, etc. But the daily newspaper ain't gonna print that. I think people on the street are just barely starting to catch on to the concept of margins of error in surveys. So as an industry we really would have to agree on one standard number and what it means before we can ask folks to pay attention to it. And I can only echo Manfred's observations about the danger of response rates becoming a litmus test. Frankly, I feel like we don't really have that much control over response rates, even after doing everything "right" according to the literature. My husband is a biologist specializing in ants (fire ants), and those critters behave much more predictably than the humans that are my subjects. Which is why this work utterly fascinates me, of course:) Beyond the myriad reasons that people come up with for not doing the survey, there are so many other factors that influence response rate over which we have no control, even though we may attempt to control for it in the statistical sense.... Some local phone companies are better than others at rigging a recording for disconnected numbers--and there's a profound difference between a disconnect and a chronic no answer when you go to plug it into a response rate formula. In Florida, we have a fair number of part-time residences, either seasonal snow birds or folks with a weekend getaway at the beach, who can't be reached in the usual number of attempts. Then there's the whole issue of "magic questions." Okay, they're really called screening questions, but as an interviewer who was only allowed a certain number of refusals before getting into Big Trouble, I thought of them as magic. If I was attempting to interview in apartments near campus, and a young person did not want to answer questions about what they were doing last week, I'd skip to the issue of age and school status. If they were a 19-year old full-time college student, they were ineligible and I wasn't in trouble. Or I'd be on the phone for a study about mammograms and the guy is grumping at me, probably cuz the pregame show is beginning. Quick, ask if there are any women over 40 in the household. No? Thank you!! My good record for this month is still intact. But of course we don't all agree about the use of magic questions. Some purists insist that the interview should be conducted exactly in the order it is written; the IRB disclosure must be read and the informant's residency verified before asking that screener. Let me be clear, if there was a woman in the house over 40, I would have then read the IRB stuff and verified

residency--or eaten the refusal. All the ineligibles I ever claimed really were ineligible and did answer the appropriate screening item. It's just that my brain was hardwired to jump to the magic question if an interview started to fade, so that I left less refusals of undetermined eligibility in my wake. And I never abused the principle by, for example, deciding that there were only women in the house based on the answering machine message. Anyway, I didn't mean to get off on a tangent, but this is one of so many little details that can impact response rates. If Survey Shop A has interviewers trained and motivated to jump to magic questions and Survey Shop B does not, the response rates will vary--perhaps vary a lot if the target is a specific group. And no real way to quantify the difference. Sure, you'll see different numbers of ineligibles, but won't really know why. This is such a complex issue, and yet it is imperative that we work toward some kind of standards, or we risk becoming as those at the Tower of Babel, with our rates being meaningless to others outside our own organization. Colleen K. Porter Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu Phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109 UF Department of Health Services Administration Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009 Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195 >From cmilstei@isr.umich.edu Thu Nov 11 05:30:33 1999 Received: from vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu (vivalasvegas.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.35]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id FAA03574 for