
Date: Fri, 1 Nov 2002 11:09:30 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Voters Like Debates They Seldom Watch
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Survey: Voters Like Debates They Seldom Watch
Friday, November 01, 2002
By Liza Porteus

NEW YORK - Many voters may not catch any of the televised political debates between candidates but constituents say the highlights filtered through the media offer enough detail for them to make their choice at the polls.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,68686,00.html>

Poll Highlights

"According to a nationwide poll released by the Debate Advisory Standards Project, 84 percent of those polled rejected the idea that debates are a waste of time. On the contrary, 74 percent said they would watch one or more of the debates for statewide office if the candidates got together three or more times. Of course, the majority also said candidates should limit the number of debates to four or fewer.

In that same poll, by a nearly 4-to-1 ratio, voters say they think more debates should be aired. This survey also revealed that the higher the office, the more helpful debates are. About 70 percent said debates for major statewide offices such as governor or U.S. senator are important, while 59 percent said more local elections such as those for the U.S. House or state legislature are very helpful."

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Fri, 1 Nov 2002 19:04:16 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.

Subject: FW: Ipsos-Reid/Cook Political Report: It's All Tied Up and
There's Nothing Bush Can Do About It
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Interesting report. I wonder what political pollsters are thinking
about related to methodology during this apparently tight election
season? Mark Richards

For analysis of the Ipsos-Reid/Cook Political Report...
with table, visit:

<http://www.ipsospa.com/polls.cfm>

Subject: Ipsos-Reid/Cook Political Report: It's All Tied Up and
There's Nothing Bush Can Do About It

Ipsos-Reid/Cook Political Report Poll
It's All Tied Up and There's Nothing Bush Can Do About It
Congressional Party Control Preference is 45% Democrats, 44% Republicans
Among Likely Voters.
Bush is a Weak Force Affecting Vote Decisions Heading Into Final Weekend
To view the full release online, with accompanying tables, go to:
For more information on this release, please contact:
Thomas Riehle
President
Ipsos-Reid US Public Affairs
202.463.7300
thomas.riehle@ipsospa.com <<mailto:thomas.riehle@ipsospa.com>>

Between and October 25 and 31, 2002, Ipsos-Reid US Public Affairs
interviewed a representative sample of 2,000 adults nationwide,
including
1,533 registered voters and 1,014 likely voters. The margin of error
for
the combined surveys is +/-2.2% for all adults, +/-2.6% for registered
voters and +/-3.1% for likely voters.
WASHINGTON, D.C., November 1, 2002 - The voters who are the most likely
to
participate on Election Day Tuesday approach the polls evenly divided on
the
question of which party they would like to see control Congress,
according
to the most recent Ipsos-Reid/Cook Political Report Poll.
And if the election for Congress were held today, would you want to see
the
Republicans or Democrats win control of Congress?
(To view summary table for this question go to full release online at
link
above.)
Three patterns dominate attitudes heading into the final campaign
weekend.

* Bush is a weak force. Republicans do not benefit from the fact that a majority continue to approve of Bush's handling of the job of President and the economy. Even though 63% of all likely voters (although only 48% of the oldest likely voters born in 1929 or earlier, our most faithful voting group) approve of Bush's handling of the job as President, and majorities of likely voters also approve of his handling of the economy (54%), other domestic issues (54%) and foreign policy and the war on terrorism (64%), far fewer than half (44%) want to see Republicans in control of Congress. It is probably too late for Republicans to recapture those who approve of Bush but not enough to give him a Republican congress.

* Women are voting the war, and they don't like it. Women are as likely as men to approve of the way Bush is handling the economy and other domestic issues, but slightly less likely than men to approve of his handling of the job of President overall and much less likely to approve of his handling of foreign policy and the war on terrorism. As a result, likely voters who are men favor Republican control of Congress by 50%-41%, while likely voters who are women favor Democrats by 49%-39%.

* The Depression-Era Babies are not happy, and they vote. Voters born in 1929 or earlier (age 73 or older on Election Day) are less likely to approve of anything Bush is doing as President, and a majority of our elder voters would like to see Democrats take charge of Congress (52% of likely voters over age 73 prefer Democrats, 38% Republicans). For these older voters, it's the economy - they are significantly less likely than any other age group to approve of Bush's economic policies.

At this stage, undecided voters are more women than men, and Bush has less appeal to women than men. Voters most likely to participate are older voters, rather than Baby Boomers or younger voters, and again, Bush's appeal is limited when it comes to voters age 73 or older, the most faithful participants on Election Day. And overall, the story of Election 2002 seems to be a failure of Bush to translate high approval ratings into support for a Republican Congress, just as much as it is a failure of Democrats to translate high anxiety about the economy into opposition to Bush's economic policies. The result of those two failures-a standoff, a tie, another close election.

Editors Note: Stay Tuned

Ipsos-Reid/Cook Political Report Poll final pre-election results will be released on November 4, based on polls conducted Oct 28-31 and Nov 1-3.

About Ipsos-Reid US Public Affairs

The survey was conducted by Ipsos-Reid US Public Affairs, the Washington,

D.C.-based division of Ipsos, which is the world's fourth largest polling

and market research organization, based in Paris. Ipsos-Reid US Public Affairs is a non-partisan, objective public affairs research organization

made up of Democratic and Republican campaign and political polling veterans. It was established in Washington in August 2001, and it is led by

Thomas Riehle, who has more than 15 years of experience as a political pollster in Washington. The Ipsos-Reid/Cook Political Report poll and the

Ipsos-Reid Consumer Attitudes and Spending by Household (CASH) Index poll

are conducted the first and third week of every month, as part of Ipsos-Reid

US Public Affairs weekly omnibus polling service.

Visit Ipsos-Reid US Public Affairs online at:

<http://www.ipsos-na.com/pubaff.cfm> <<http://www.ipsos-na.com/pubaff.cfm>>

The political survey is designed in conjunction with Charlie Cook of the Cook Political Report. Founded in 1984, The Cook Political Report is an independent, non-partisan newsletter that analyzes elections for the U.S.

House, Senate, governor and President as well as domestic American political

trends. The New York Times has called the publication, "a newsletter that

both parties consider authoritative" while the dean of the Washington political press corps, the Washington Post's David Broder has called Charlie

Cook, its editor and publisher, "perhaps the best political handicapper in

the nation." Cook also writes two weekly columns that appear in National

Journal magazine and CongressDaily/AM and on nationaljournal.com, and serves

as a political analyst for Cable News Network's show "Inside Politics." Researched and written by a staff of five based in Washington, D.C., the

Cook Political Report's subscribers are primarily the lobbyists and managers

for the political acti!

on committees of the nation's major corporations, trade associations and labor unions as well as by news organizations, foreign governments and others with an interest in detailed, impartial information and analysis of

Congressional, gubernatorial and presidential elections.

View all Ipsos-Reid/Cook Political Report surveys at:

http://www.ipsos-na.com/pubaff/dsp_cook.cfm

<http://www.ipsos-na.com/pubaff/dsp_cook.cfm>

Thank you for your time and interest. If you no longer wish to receive News

Alerts from Ipsos-Reid US Public Affairs, please reply to this email with REMOVE in the subject field.

Because e-mail can be altered electronically,
the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.
=====

Date: Sun, 3 Nov 2002 10:51:30 -0600
Reply-To: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>
Subject: Minnesota Poll news
Comments: To: Catherine.L.Upin@abc.com, Gary.E.Langer@abc.com,
aeikensdp@aol.com, Pixy412@aol.com, tsilver@capaccess.org,
sschier@carleton.edu, 75227.173@compuserve.com,
rwickers@dresner-wickers.com, reide@email.usps.gov,
dana.blanton@foxnews.com, jeff.goldblatt@foxnews.com,
djleary@iname.com, glen_cameron@jmail.jour.missouri.edu,
bhanley@ktca.org, bhenehan@ktca.org, Pat Kessler
<wcco.mhs.compuserve.com.pkessler@mail.startribune.com>,
dskipper@marketsolutionsgroup.com, b.olson@mn-politics.com,
dspacp@msn.com, michelle.jaconi@nbc.com, jgasper@pclink.com,
jmillier@polisci.umn.edu, wyspano@politicsinminnesota.com,
glen@pos.org, srg@regen.com, newb0032@tc.umn.edu,
txjones@tribune.com, theplayer514@yahoo.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Fellow pollwatchers...

This morning the Star Tribune published the results of its most recent Minnesota Poll on the gubernatorial and U.S. Senate races. You can access those news articles at

<http://www.startribune.com>

and find more on the polling methods at

<http://www.startribune.com/poll>

If you're not interested in this, please accept my apologies for this e-mail intrusion, and hit your delete button.

All best wishes,

Rob Daves, director
The Minnesota Poll

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 4 Nov 2002 13:15:54 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: Article: From Citizens To Customers, Losing Our Collective Voice
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A55407-2002Nov2.html>

By Matthew A. Crenson and Benjamin Ginsberg

Matthew Crenson and Benjamin Ginsberg are professors of political science at Johns Hopkins University. This article is adapted from their new book, "Downsizing Democracy: How America Sidelined Its Citizens and Privatized Its Public" (Johns Hopkins University Press).

The Washington Post
Sunday, November 3, 2002; Page B01

Little more than a year ago, Americans rose up in outrage and grief to affirm their national solidarity in the face of a murderous attack on their fellow citizens. In Tuesday's midterm elections, most of us won't bother to show up. Not even al Qaeda's galvanizing assault can reverse a half-century of declining interest -- especially among younger voters -- in choosing our leaders.

We are watching the slow-motion collapse of American citizenship. For more than two centuries, ordinary citizens were important actors on this country's stage. Their vanguard entered political life with a bang in the 18th century, rising up to fire the shot heard 'round the world. Over the ensuing decades, tens of millions more served their revolutionary republic as citizen-soldiers, jurors, taxpayers and citizen-administrators who helped to extend government authority and services across a sparsely populated continent. At the same time, government extended voting rights to citizens once excluded from the electorate.

Now our government no longer needs us. The citizen-soldiers have given way to the professional all-volunteer military and its armada of smart bombs and drone aircraft. The citizen-administrators have disappeared, too, replaced long ago by professional bureaucrats. Americans may still regard each other as fellow citizens with common causes and commitments.

But the candidates seeking votes on Tuesday see us as something less: not a coherent public with a collective identity but a swarm of disconnected individuals out to satisfy our personal needs in the political marketplace. We see them, in turn, as boring commercials to be tuned out.

It would be a mistake to conclude, as many commentators do, that Americans are apathetic citizens gone AWOL. But there's no question that the fundamental relationship between citizen and government has changed. Increasingly, public officials regard us as "customers" rather than as citizens, and there are crucial differences between the two. Citizens own the government. Customers just receive services from it. Citizens belong to a political community with a collective existence and public purposes. Customers are individual purchasers seeking the best deal. Customers may receive courteous service, but they do not own the store.

Evidence of the customer mind-set in American politics is everywhere. Take, for example, then-Vice President Gore's report on reinventing government, one of the few Clinton-era efforts to receive praise from business-minded Republicans. The report avoids the word "citizen," quoting Gore as saying: "A lot of people don't realize that the federal government has customers. We have customers. The American people." Similarly, in President Bush's call to action in the aftermath of Sept. 11, he did not ask for sacrifices from the aroused citizenry. He asked us to show our resolve by having the courage to shop. The democracy that began with the shot heard 'round the world would now show its resolve by slapping down credit cards accepted around the world.

This transformation of citizens into customers is not the result of some conscious campaign by the political class to restrict access to public decision-making. On the contrary, ostensibly democratic reforms have lowered the barriers to citizen participation. Freedom of information statutes, sunshine laws, mandatory public hearings, public notice and comment requirements, public agency hotlines and access to the courts through class action suits -- all these and other arrangements would seem to have enhanced the public's opportunity to engage in the formation of public policy.

But that didn't happen. Instead, our customer-friendly government made it possible for private citizens to play politics on their own, without hitching their interests to those of like-minded citizens. The new political order is a "personal" rather than a popular democracy. Personal democracy lowers the barriers that citizens once breached only by collective assault. But the reality of personal democracy is less benign than it sounds. For ordinary citizens, the most potent political resource is the power of numbers. When they deal with government one by one, they lose their leverage.

The new avenues of democratic access were not designed for ordinary citizens in the first place. Ordinary citizens rarely look at the Federal Register for opportunities to comment on new regulations, attend public hearings or litigate on behalf of the public interest. The new channels of access to public decision-makers permit political and economic elites -- with the aid of the lobbyists and lawyers on K Street -- to get what they want from government without the nuisance of mobilizing a constituency of citizens to support them.

Rather than take issues to the electorate for resolution, they litigate and pose as "stakeholders" for diffuse interests such as the disabled, the elderly, children or endangered species -- or they exploit bureaucratic procedures to remove the making of policy from the sight of the public. In the process, millions of citizens who might once have been called to the aid of their parties remain passive bystanders. These are the people who will not show up to vote on Tuesday, because no one has sent them a sufficiently compelling invitation.

Today there are even some movements that don't take on the traditional form of a movement. The large number of groups associated with consumerism, for example, hides the fact that most of these groups never had many active members. Michael Pertschuk, former chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, argued that the term "movement" mischaracterized the character of consumerism. According to Pertschuk, consumer advocacy has been the product of a small number of groups and Washington policy entrepreneurs rather than the result of grass-roots efforts. The absence of a mobilized popular base has narrowed the movement's agenda to issues that interest the fortunate few for whom consumption is a way of life. Those would include "consumers" who look to Consumer Reports for advice on choosing everything from toasters and CD players to home gyms and SUVs.

The consumer movement should not be singled out for scorn. These days, Washington is full of "citizen" groups whose membership is nothing more than a mailing list. A so-called "advocacy explosion" of the past 30 years has doubled or tripled the number of organizations with offices in Washington. But the percentage of Americans belonging to organizations has not increased, because today's citizen groups rarely mobilize citizens. They litigate, they respond to notice and comment announcements in the Federal Register, they testify at congressional and administrative hearings, they network -- but they seldom turn out the troops. Personal democracy provides them with other means to reach their political objectives.

A show of citizen support used to be a trump card in American politics, and politicians were almost always trying to accumulate more evidence of their ability to bring out the masses -- especially when they got into fights with rivals. The established wisdom of political science says that the more politicians compete with one another, the more citizens will become politically active. But it hasn't worked that way in recent elections. In 1998, for example, the partisan rancor surrounding the election could not have been more intense. A president was under impeachment, the parties were locked in mortal combat. Yet, slightly more than a third of the eligible voters went to the polls. And the 2000 election, one of the most closely fought presidential contests in recent history, managed to turn out only about 51 percent of the electorate.

The truth is that neither major political party makes much effort to mobilize the millions of Americans of modest means and education who stand outside the electorate. Neither major party supports electoral reforms such as the elimination of voter registration requirements or a shift to weekend voting. Both practices are standard in Western Europe, and the European experience suggests that these two changes alone would appreciably boost turnout.

One of the undemocratic unmentionables of American politics is that most

elected politicians are not eager to see an expansion of the electorate. Boosting the number of voters is a risky strategy seldom undertaken lightly. Lord Derby famously called the increase of Britain's electorate under the Reform Bill of 1867 a "leap into the dark."

Today, both political parties seem more afraid of the dark than ever. Republicans fear that enlarging the electorate will lead to an influx of poor and minority voters who are less likely to favor the GOP. The Democrats, meanwhile, fear that millions of new voters might be less than friendly to some of the party's traditional allies, such as anti-smoking activists and environmentalists. It's not that poor and working-class people favor damaged lungs or dirty air, but that they might have political priorities inconsistent with the "post-materialist" values of some liberal interest groups. They lack the material resources needed to feel post-materialistic. This demobilization of the American left may help to explain the rightward drift of American politics since the 1970s.

The new order of personal democracy extends even to the way we educate our children. In the 1950s, civic education was about electing leaders -- class officers, student government presidents, team captains. We had debates about public issues. Schools had mock elections that paralleled real elections. (One of the authors of this essay represented Adlai Stevenson in a 1952 elementary school contest, and lost badly to the student who represented Dwight Eisenhower.) Civic education was organized around the processes by which citizens asserted their ownership of government and expressed their collective views about what the government should be doing.

Think about the difference between that kind of civic education and the kind we have now. Today, civic education is about community service. On the federal level, Congress spends \$43 million a year to fund community service programs around the country. In Maryland, the first state to make volunteer work a graduation requirement, students must log 60 hours of service; Chicago's schools require 40 hours for their graduates, and as do many of California's public high schools.

The goal of "service learning" is to get students involved in their communities. This is an admirable goal. But two studies by educational researchers showed that a majority of service learning projects are environmental or beautification efforts in which students may never encounter another human being. The students aren't engaging with their governments as citizens; indeed, they often operate outside of the government.

This kind of volunteerism, although altruistic in purpose, is another symptom of the rise of personal democracy. Producing a public service yourself yields almost immediate personal gratification -- a perfectly justifiable impulse. But it doesn't encourage or stimulate the younger generation to express, in a collective way, its views or aspirations. More young people than ever are "volunteering" for community service projects, according to various studies. But since 18-year-olds got the right to vote in 1972, turnout among voters under 25 has been dropping. Fewer than one-third voted in the last presidential election and, if the trend for midterm elections holds, fewer than 20 percent will cast ballots on Tuesday. (One positive note: Turnout does rise for these voters as they get older.)

The selfless volunteer and the self-centered customer seem unlikely soul mates, but they are both products of a political system that has less and less use for real citizens -- citizens who dare to ask both what our government can do for us, and what we can do for our government.

Matthew Crenson and Benjamin Ginsberg are professors of political science at Johns Hopkins University. This article is adapted from their new book, "Downsizing Democracy: How America Sidelined Its Citizens and Privatized Its Public" (Johns Hopkins University Press).

© 2002 The Washington Post Company

Mark David Richards

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 4 Nov 2002 10:54:26 -0800
Reply-To: leoralawton@fsc-research.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSC-RESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Research analyst position
In-Reply-To: <000101c281c1\$128a7410\$130a010a@LEO>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

If interested, please reply to: researchanalyst@fsc-research.com. Thanks!

Leora Lawton
Consultant/Director of Research
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

Freeman, Sullivan & Co., a growing statistical and survey research services firm, is currently interviewing candidates for a Research Analyst position within its survey research division.

Candidates for the Research Analyst position should have a Ph.D. in sociology or in a related discipline with a strong quantitative research orientation. Qualitative research skills are a plus. We are seeking individuals with at least two years of post-doctoral experience in a quantitatively-oriented consulting organization including an academic or research institution setting. Client interface experience highly desirable.

Candidates should have experience in questionnaire design and proficiency in

statistical software such as SAS, SPSS, STATA or similar packages, as well as with the Microsoft Office Suite.

Responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

- . Data management - creating, modifying, and merging datasets using spreadsheet and/or statistical packages.
- . Data analysis - calculating forecasts and trends, basic frequencies, and crosstabs; creating behavioral or predictive models using multivariate methods such as OLS and logistic regression.
- . Project management - acquiring sample; overseeing data collection process; training telephone interviewers; preparing datasets; keeping client apprised of project status; documenting the research process.
- . Research - preparing research plans; designing questionnaires and preparing analysis reports; executing data calculations; conducting structured and semi-structured interviews.

Salary range for this position is competitive, based on experience, skills and credentials. Benefits (health, dental, and life insurance) begin after a 3-month probationary period. Freeman, Sullivan & Co. is centrally located in the financial district, convenient to the Embarcadero Bart, MUNI, and ferries.

To be considered for this position, please submit a cover letter explaining your interest in the position and your resume by fax to:

(415) 777-2420, or by email to: researchanalyst@fsc-research.com. PHONE CALLS REGARDING THIS POSITION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED! Unfortunately, we are unable to respond individually to all applicants.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 4 Nov 2002 16:21:19 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: commentary from the New Republic about the 2002 elections
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Interesting commentary from the New Republic about the 2002 elections.

TRB FROM WASHINGTON
Backfire
by Peter Beinart

Post date: 10.25.02
Issue date: 11.04.02

If there's one thing everyone knows about the 2002 elections, it's that Iraq helps the Republicans. "Democrats desperately need to erase Iraq as an issue," insisted election guru Charlie Cook in National Journal on September 21. "The prospect of war with Iraq is dealing Democratic

candidates a triple blow," warned The Washington Post's Thomas B. Edsall on October 10.

But what if it's not true? On October 16 Gallup released a poll showing that likely voters who cited Iraq as their most important issue favored Democrats by a whopping 16 points. Five days later a poll by Democrat Stanley Greenberg and Republican Bill McInturff for National Public Radio found that voters were six points more likely to vote for a "Democrat who shows more caution about attacking Iraq" than a "Republican who supports President Bush's Iraq policy." The Senate race in Minnesota, which until Paul Wellstone's tragic death featured the war more prominently than did any other campaign, suggests the same thing. Pollster John Zogby released one survey on September 22, three weeks before Wellstone voted against authorizing unilateral force, and another on October 13, two days after: In the interim, Wellstone shot up 15 points. "The Iraq debate has boomeranged," says Larry Jacobs, professor of political science at the University of Minnesota. "Far from providing unequivocal help to Republicans, it's created a new problem that's bedeviling Republicans, at least out in Minnesota." No one can confidently predict what will happen at the polls on November 5.

But it's just possible that the punditocracy is as wrong today about the political impact of the war as it was about the political impact of impeachment in 1998.

Two key assumptions have led the commentariat astray. The first is that this campaign is a struggle between "the economy," which favors Democrats, and "national security," which favors Republicans. That's misleading because "national security" lumps the war on terrorism and the prospective war on Iraq together. And politically, they couldn't be more different. In the Gallup poll, voters who cite the war on terrorism as their most important issue back Republicans by a massive 48 percent. Similarly, in a recent Minnesota Star Tribune poll, voters who cared most about the war on terrorism favored Republican Norm Coleman by 31 points. But voters who cited war with Iraq as their primary issue favored Democrats by 16 points in the Gallup poll and Wellstone by 32 points in the Star Tribune poll. The media is treating "national security" as one pro-Republican issue when, in fact, it's two-one pro-Republican and one, apparently, pro-Democratic.

The second reason the media assumes that Iraq favors the Republicans is that in national polls most Americans support the war. But for most war supporters, Iraq is not a voting issue. In the Gallup poll, 47 percent of respondents favor war, and 46 percent oppose it. When you limit the question to people who consider Iraq their primary issue, however, the numbers flip: 66 percent oppose war, and only 33 percent support it. In other words, pro-war feeling is broad, but it's not very intense. When you push war supporters a little-Do you support unilateral action? Do you support war if it means significant American casualties?-pro-war sentiment plummets.

The Democrats' Iraq strategy-raising concerns but ultimately backing the president-may have been intellectually incoherent, but it seems to have helped the party both with hardcore war opponents and nervous war supporters. Edsall and others have speculated that the party's me-too stance on the war will depress core Democratic turnout. But by emphasizing their reservations, the Democrats seem to be holding on to their base. Gallup estimates that the turnout gap between Republican and Democratic

voters (Republicans always turn out in higher numbers) will be smaller this year than in 1998, when Democrats picked up five House seats. And reluctant support for the war (even Wellstone voted for an alternative resolution authorizing force in conjunction with the United Nations) also resonates with many soft pro-war voters. Polling by Democracy Corps, the Stanley Greenberg-James Carville-Robert Shrum consortium, shows that a Democrat who supports the war with reservations not only beats an unambiguously pro-war Republican 77 to eleven among Democratic voters, but 55 to 27 among Independents.

Iraq helps the Democrats in another way as well: It bolsters their argument for divided government. The more aggressive a president's agenda, the more inclined voters are to balance it by supporting the other party for Congress. That's partly why voters favored Republicans in 1994, after President Clinton overreached with health care, but not in 1998, when Clinton was on the defensive over impeachment. Bush's agenda seems aggressive today because of Iraq. Most Americans support the war, but not as strongly as the president, and divided government reflects their ambivalence. A September 29 Washington Post poll found that 56 percent of voters wanted Democrats to control Congress in order to balance President Bush, while only 34 percent wanted to elect Republicans to support Bush's agenda. Says Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Spokeswoman Tovah Ravitz-Meehan, "In almost every state, our strongest arguments are for divided government."

So if Iraq favors the Democrats, why aren't they doing better overall? One answer is that they are. During September and October, when the Iraq debate supposedly put the GOP on the offensive, Democratic prospects actually improved. The October 21 Greenberg-McInturff poll gave Democratic candidates a generic four-point advantage, the largest they've had all year. And conventional wisdom among political insiders-according to ABC's "The Note," which tracks it more closely than anyone-now holds that the Democrats will retain the Senate, something very much in doubt several weeks ago.

The Democrats probably won't win big because there aren't a lot of places to win big. Gerrymandering has only left between 30 and 45 competitive House seats, which means that even if Democrats won two-thirds of them, they still might fail to retake the House. They probably won't win big because the president with the highest-sustained approval ratings in American history is making a historically unprecedented push for Republican candidates. And they probably won't win big because they haven't developed a compelling message on the economy, the issue on which Republicans are most vulnerable. (Most polls show the Democrats with a slim to nonexistent lead on the issue.)

But, however well the Democrats do on November 5, Iraq is more likely to have helped than hurt. As someone who thinks the party's performance on the issue has veered between pitiful and pathetic, that doesn't fill me with partisan pride. But then, Bill Clinton's 1998 tryst with Monica Lewinsky didn't fill me with partisan pride either. And to the astonishment of almost everyone in Washington, it helped Democrats in that year's midterms too.

tml?i=20021104&s=trb110402showBio.mhtml?pid=14">Peter Beinart is the editor of TNR.

Copyright 2002, The New Republic

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 4 Nov 2002 16:16:39 -0600
Reply-To: MFrihart@GOAMP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Monica Frihart <MFrihart@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: FW: Position Available: Research Coordinator,
Child Passenger Safety, TraumaLink
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

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

From: David INDEST [mailto:INDEST@email.chop.edu]
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2002 3:29 PM
To: mfrihart@goamp.com
Subject: Position Available: Research Coordinator, Child Passenger
Safety, TraumaLink

Coordinator, TraumaLink, The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (CHOP)

Join a nationally renowned interdisciplinary team researching and preventing childhood injuries. TraumaLink is seeking a Coordinator for its national study of child passenger safety. This is a collaborative study with a high public presence. The position coordinates all aspects of survey design and surveillance data collection, fosters positive relationships with funders and data sources, and liaises with consultants and subcontractors for technical work. The individual will also be responsible for coordination of smaller grant- and contract-funded studies.

Bachelors required, Masters preferred, in Public Health, Health Education, or a related field. Research coordination experience required.

Please submit a Resume and the names and contact information for three references to E. Mayo, The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, HR Department, 34th Street & Civic Center Boulevard, Philadelphia, PA 19104, email: mayoe@email.chop.edu or fax information to 215.590.4644. Reference ID#57 on all correspondence.

We offer competitive compensation packages: medical, vision, dental and life insurance; discounts on public transportation and employee parking; tuition assistance, training and staff development; generous paid time off; employer contribution retirement plan and work/life benefits.

The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia and the Joseph Stokes Jr. Research Institute are proud to be Equal Opportunity Employers.

David Indest, Psy.D.
Administrative Director, TraumaLink
3405 Civic Center Blvd.
3535 Market, TraumaLink, 10th Fl.
Philadelphia PA 19104
ph: 215-590-6873
fax: 215-590-5425
<http://traumalink.chop.edu>

David Indest, Psy.D.
Administrative Director, TraumaLink
3405 Civic Center Blvd.
3535 Market, TraumaLink, 10th Fl.
Philadelphia PA 19104
ph: 215-590-6873
fax: 215-590-5425
<http://traumalink.chop.edu>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 09:16:33 -0500
Reply-To: "Mulrow, Jeri M." <jmulrow@NSF.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Mulrow, Jeri M." <jmulrow@NSF.GOV>
Subject: ASA/SRS-NSF Fellowship Program announcement
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

The American Statistical Association (ASA) and the Division of Science Resources Statistics (SRS) of the National Science Foundation are pleased to announce the 2003 ASA/SRS-NSF Research Fellowship Program. The researcher/fellow will conduct research using SRS data onsite at the National Science Foundation for a 3-month period plus support for 10 percent of the researcher's time at their home institutions.

Topic areas of interest include but are not limited to:

- * Challenges related to the collection of establishment data
- * Methodological research in survey mode differences
- * Analytic research related to education, workforce, and innovation data
- * Issues relating to longitudinal analysis, trend estimation, or estimates of change
- * Innovative graphical displays and analyses of data
- * Novel approaches to questionnaire development, evaluation, and testing

Compensation is commensurate with the qualifications and experience. Fringe benefits and travel allowances are negotiable. SRS will provide administrative support, office space, computer equipment, and access to SRS staff and data (<<http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/start.htm>>).

The researcher/fellow will be selected through a rigorous, competitive application process. Researchers are invited to send a curriculum vita and a short research proposal (maximum 20 pages) describing the nature and goal of the work and the benefits to SRS. Send to American Statistical Association, ASA/SRS-NSF Research Program, 1429 Duke Street, Alexandria VA 22314-3402.

All qualified applicants are encouraged to apply. Further details available at <http://www.amstat.org/news/asa_srs-nsf.html>.

Deadline for 2003 program is March 15, 2003.

Jeri Mulrow
Science Resources Statistics
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 965
Arlington, VA 22230
Tel: 703-292-4784
Fax: 703-292-9092

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 08:02:41 -0700
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: NYT: Cellphones and Caller ID Are Making Pollsters' Jobs Harder
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Interesting story in New York Times today:
<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/05/politics/campaigns/05VOTE.html>

Discusses problem of rising use of call-screening and prevalence of cell-only households. (AAPOR members Mark Schulman and Tom Smith are also quoted.)

One quote puzzles me (it wasn't attributed):
"Several pollsters said the rise in the number of unlisted telephone numbers was more pronounced in minority and low-income neighborhoods."

First, does anyone have a source for this rise?

Second, why is this a problem? Because it hampers geo-targeted RDD samples, which use the proportion of listed numbers in 100-blocks with addresses in a desired geography to screen into a sample? I understood that the changes in phone company number assignment practices were making this a less-viable procedure anyway.

Comments welcome. Please remember to hit 'reply to all' to send your message to AAPORNET.

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

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 14:11:17 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: NY Times on difficulties in telephone polling
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

The following article by Adam Nagourney appears in today's NY Times.

Mark Schulman is quoted and identified as president of AAPOR.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

November 5, 2002

Cellphones and Caller ID Are Making Pollsters' Jobs Harder

By ADAM NAGOURNEY

A rapid rise in the use of cellphones and caller identification technology, along with telemarketing calls that are chasing Americans from their telephones, is making political polling more difficult and increasingly less reliable, pollsters say. A result this Election Day is that it is harder than ever for pollsters to find voters and to get them to say how they intend to vote.

Pollsters say a problem that they first began noting 10 years ago, as Americans realized that answering machines could be used to screen out unwanted solicitations, is today forcing a re-examination of the methods by which they question voters.

In interviews, several pollsters said they now discussed ways to change how they approached a fundamental procedure in politics that has, over 75 years, moved from the mail to door-to-door canvassing to the telephone.

"At some point, there's going to be a crash between what's happening in the country and what's picked up on the phone," Stanley Greenberg, President Bill Clinton's pollster in the White House, said yesterday.

Whit Ayres, a veteran Republican pollster, said: "I can't fathom 20 years from now the telephone remaining the primary means of data collection. This industry is in a transition from telephone data collection to Internet data collection."

"In the meantime," Mr. Ayres said, with a note of frustration in his voice, "we've got to get people to answer the phone."

Pollsters said the increasing difficulty in reaching people was undercutting their efforts to assemble a pool of voters that was scientifically large enough and diverse enough upon which to draw reliable conclusions. While some pollsters said they could compensate for that by staying in the field longer or calling more people, that kind of effort takes time and costs money, two things that are often in short supply at the end of a campaign.

Pollsters said they had tried to respond to the problem with various time-consuming and costly remedies. They have increased the time they spend in the field, employed teams of specialists to methodically call back numbers that are answered by machines, and mathematically adjusted their findings at the end of the survey period to make up for voters they might have missed.

But several described these as stop-gap measures that have been only partly successful. Pollsters are under intense pressure to move quickly and hold down costs. They are uncomfortable with the kind of statistical adjustments used to compensate for missed or refused calls.

In particular, pollsters said they might be undercounting the growing number of younger voters who only have cellphones, as well as elderly voters who, they said, tend to be especially wary of any call that sounds like a solicitation. Several pollsters said the rise in the number of unlisted telephone numbers was more pronounced in minority and low-income neighborhoods.

In a case that drew much notice over the weekend, two polls trying to measure the Senate contest in Minnesota produced opposite results: one had Walter F. Mondale with a six-point lead, while the other had Norm Coleman with a six-point lead.

Howard Wolfson, the executive director of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, said he had seen instances this year where two polls by different pollsters in the same district had produced findings so different that it was as if they had come from different states.

"There is a lot of evidence that all of this is making our life more difficult and hurting our efforts," Mark A. Schulman, the president of the American Association of Public Opinion Research, said yesterday.

But, Mr. Schulman added, "I'm not ready to run up the white flag and concede defeat."

Matthew Dowd, a Republican pollster who advises the White House, said: "Right now, I'd still make the argument that polling is the best way to find things out. You haven't gotten to a point where you can't trust it, but you have gotten to a point you have to weigh it."

One prominent pollster said the number of telephone calls that were not completed — either because no one answers the telephone or because they answer and refuse to participate — had jumped in recent years, to about 30 percent from 10 percent. The number is even higher in New York and in South Florida.

"Response rates are falling," said Tom W. Smith of the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. "Either you spend a lot more time and money doing your survey or you end up being stuck with a much lower response rate than is traditionally acceptable."

As a rule, political polls are done by candidates, political committees or news media outlets. There was some debate yesterday which of these conductors of polls would prove to be most affected by mounting difficulties.

The technological burdens facing the pollsters are expanding. Telephone answering machines and caller ID make it easy for potential respondents to screen out calls — something that is more likely in urban and suburban areas, where people are more likely to be the target of aggressive commercial telephone solicitations.

Mr. Smith said that to complicate things for people in his profession, new screening machinery had been developed that can, in theory, identify calls that are being made by a mass dialer or can refuse calls from any unknown number.

Cellphones have posed another complication for pollsters. There is no directory of cellphone numbers, and an increasing number of people use cellphones as their home telephones. Mr. Schulman said federal regulations barred pollsters from calling people on their cellphones without permission, because the recipients of the calls are obliged to pay the cost.

Several pollsters said yesterday that they would prefer, if possible, not to conduct interviews with people on cellphones. These interviews typically take 20 minutes or so, and were intended to be done with people sitting at home rather than chatting on a cellphone from a car or restaurant.

"We haven't come to grips with the cellphone issue yet, I'll be honest with you about that," Mr. Schulman said. "Up to this point, the cellphone has generally been the second phone for the hard-wire phone in the household. In the future, we've got to figure out a strategy to deal with this."

Copyright The New York Times Company

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 11:19:57 -0800
Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Subject: Call for papers
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

A few weeks ago, a call for papers was sent to aapornet for a conference in
England in 2003 about technology and surveys. Like an idiot, I seem to
have misplaced the announcement. Does anyone still have it? If so, could
you please send it to me or repost it to the list? Thanks.

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford Alumni Association
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 12:43:30 -0700
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Call for papers
Comments: cc: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0

Ah hah! A chance to tout the new features of our new listserv!

AAPORNET archives are easily accessible via a web page now:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

The article you're looking for was posted 15 October, the title was
"CONFERENCE - Impact of Technology on the Survey Process - Call for Papers"

The archive page can be sorted by date, topic, or sender. Please email me
directly with any questions; I'm putting together a FAQ about the archives.

Shap Wolf
Survey Research University

Arizona State University
AAPORNET volunteer coordinator

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

>From: Jerold Pearson Sent: Tuesday, 05 November, 2002 12:20 PM

A few weeks ago, a call for papers was sent to aapornet for a conference in England in 2003 about technology and surveys. Like an idiot, I seem to have misplaced the announcement. Does anyone still have it? If so, could you please send it to me or repost it to the list? Thanks.

>Jerold Pearson, '75
>Director of Market Research
>Stanford Alumni Association
>650-723-9186
>jpearson@stanford.edu
><http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 14:43:28 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: NY Times on difficulties in telephone polling
Comments: To: "jwerner@jwdp.com" <jwerner@jwdp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

In my opinion, we need to re-think the concept of response rate as the best measure of the worth of a survey. Regardless of the mode of data collection, all we are doing in any survey is estimating a proportion of individuals who endorse a particular view, or candidate, or report some behavior.

Good old fashioned classical statistics, or even older but never fashionable Bayesian statistics, can tell us when we've gathered enough data to stop - or if we're in a situation that we know that we be unable to predict a result accurately no matter how much data we collect.

A stochastic analysis of mean and standard deviation value fluctuations will provide a reasonable stopping rule, and we can start coming up with hypotheses about how stable a result has to be before we quit sampling, rather than trying to achieve an arbitrary response rate.

The counter-argument will remain: perhaps non-respondents are fundamentally different from respondents. But most of the literature I've encountered in the past decade points the other way [see especially Curtin et al., The Effects of Response Rate Changes on the Index of Consumer Sentiment, POQ 64:413-428 copyright 2000].

Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248

Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 2:11 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: NY Times on difficulties in telephone polling

The following article by Adam Nagourney appears in today's NY Times.

Mark Schulman is quoted and identified as president of AAPOR.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

November 5, 2002

Cellphones and Caller ID Are Making Pollsters' Jobs Harder

By ADAM NAGOURNEY

A rapid rise in the use of cellphones and caller identification technology, along with telemarketing calls that are chasing Americans from their telephones, is making political polling more difficult and increasingly less reliable, pollsters say. A result this Election Day is that it is harder than ever for pollsters to find voters and to get them to say how they intend to vote.

Pollsters say a problem that they first began noting 10 years ago, as Americans realized that answering machines could be used to screen out unwanted solicitations, is today forcing a re-examination of the methods by which they question voters.

In interviews, several pollsters said they now discussed ways to change how they approached a fundamental procedure in politics that has, over 75 years, moved from the mail to door-to-door canvassing to the telephone.

"At some point, there's going to be a crash between what's happening in the country and what's picked up on the phone," Stanley Greenberg, President Bill Clinton's pollster in the White House, said yesterday.

Whit Ayres, a veteran Republican pollster, said: "I can't fathom 20 years from now the telephone remaining the primary means of data collection. This industry is in a transition from telephone data collection to Internet data collection."

"In the meantime," Mr. Ayres said, with a note of frustration in his voice, "we've got to get people to answer the phone."

Pollsters said the increasing difficulty in reaching people was undercutting their efforts to assemble a pool of voters that was scientifically large enough and diverse enough upon which to draw reliable conclusions. While some pollsters said they could compensate for that by staying in the field longer or calling more people, that kind of effort takes time and costs money, two things that are often in short supply at the end of a campaign.

Pollsters said they had tried to respond to the problem with various time-consuming and costly remedies. They have increased the time they spend in the field, employed teams of specialists to methodically call back numbers that are answered by machines, and mathematically adjusted their findings at the end of the survey period to make up for voters they might have missed.

But several described these as stop-gap measures that have been only partly successful. Pollsters are under intense pressure to move quickly and hold down costs. They are uncomfortable with the kind of statistical adjustments used to compensate for missed or refused calls.

In particular, pollsters said they might be undercounting the growing number of younger voters who only have cellphones, as well as elderly voters who, they said, tend to be especially wary of any call that sounds like a solicitation. Several pollsters said the rise in the number of unlisted telephone numbers was more pronounced in minority and low-income neighborhoods.

In a case that drew much notice over the weekend, two polls trying to measure the Senate contest in Minnesota produced opposite results: one had Walter F. Mondale with a six-point lead, while the other had Norm Coleman with a six-point lead.

Howard Wolfson, the executive director of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, said he had seen instances this year where two polls by different pollsters in the same district had produced findings so different that it was as if they had come from different states.

"There is a lot of evidence that all of this is making our life more difficult and hurting our efforts," Mark A. Schulman, the president of the American Association of Public Opinion Research, said yesterday.

But, Mr. Schulman added, "I'm not ready to run up the white flag and concede defeat."

Matthew Dowd, a Republican pollster who advises the White House, said: "Right now, I'd still make the argument that polling is the best way to find things out. You haven't gotten to a point where you can't trust it, but you have gotten to a point you have to weigh it."

One prominent pollster said the number of telephone calls that were not completed - either because no one answers the telephone or because they answer and refuse to participate - had jumped in recent years, to about 30 percent from 10 percent. The number is even

higher in New York and in South Florida.

"Response rates are falling," said Tom W. Smith of the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. "Either you spend a lot more time and money doing your survey or you end up being stuck with a much lower response rate than is traditionally acceptable."

As a rule, political polls are done by candidates, political committees or news media outlets. There was some debate yesterday which of these conductors of polls would prove to be most affected by mounting difficulties.

The technological burdens facing the pollsters are expanding. Telephone answering machines and caller ID make it easy for potential respondents to screen out calls - something that is more likely in urban and suburban areas, where people are more likely to be the target of aggressive commercial telephone solicitations.

Mr. Smith said that to complicate things for people in his profession, new screening machinery had been developed that can, in theory, identify calls that are being made by a mass dialer or can refuse calls from any unknown number.

Cellphones have posed another complication for pollsters. There is no directory of cellphone numbers, and an increasing number of people use cellphones as their home telephones. Mr. Schulman said federal regulations barred pollsters from calling people on their cellphones without permission, because the recipients of the calls are obliged to pay the cost.

Several pollsters said yesterday that they would prefer, if possible, not to conduct interviews with people on cellphones. These interviews typically take 20 minutes or so, and were intended to be done with people sitting at home rather than chatting on a cellphone from a car or restaurant.

"We haven't come to grips with the cellphone issue yet, I'll be honest with you about that," Mr. Schulman said. "Up to this point, the cellphone has generally been the second phone for the hard-wire phone in the household. In the future, we've got to figure out a strategy to deal with this."

Copyright The New York Times Company

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your

main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 17:31:45 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Exit Polls
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Didn't expect to see the Drudge Report (5.2 million visits past 24 hours) reporting, at 3:09 EST in the afternoon, that "Based on early exit polls, (party) is set to win . . ." after the fiasco of 2000.

What exit polls would those be? VNS?

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

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 16:19:19 -0600
Reply-To: "Kropf, Martha E." <kropfm@UMKC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Kropf, Martha E." <kropfm@UMKC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Cellphones and Caller ID Are Making Pollsters' Jobs Harder
Comments: To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Colleagues:

I'm just curious about the legality of calling cell phones...the article = says it's illegal. Does that mean that somehow we cannot obtain cell = phone numbers when we order sample? Even for RDD samples?

Thanks for clarifying!
Martha Kropf

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

From: Shapard Wolf [mailto:shap.wolf@asu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 9:03 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: NYT: Cellphones and Caller ID Are Making Pollsters' Jobs Harder

Interesting story in New York Times today:
<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/05/politics/campaigns/05VOTE.html>

Discusses problem of rising use of call-screening and prevalence of cell-only households. (AAPOR members Mark Schulman and Tom Smith are also quoted.)

One quote puzzles me (it wasn't attributed):
"Several pollsters said the rise in the number of unlisted telephone numbers was more pronounced in minority and low-income neighborhoods."

First, does anyone have a source for this rise?

Second, why is this a problem? Because it hampers geo-targeted RDD samples, which use the proportion of listed numbers in 100-blocks with addresses in a desired geography to screen into a sample? I understood that the changes in phone company number assignment practices were making this a less-viable procedure anyway.

Comments welcome. Please remember to hit 'reply to all' to send your message to AAPORNET.

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

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: =
aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 14:27:48 -0800
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: Re: Exit Polls
Comments: To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
In-Reply-To: <00b301c2851b\$209a75c0\$73fac3d1@default>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Josh Marshall (<http://talkingpointsmemo.com>) also lists some (with more

appropriate caution) and also mentions that VNS seems to be having some very serious problems>.

```
*****
Joel David Bloom                      Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of Oregon
Telephone: 541-346-0891                Eugene, OR 97403-5245
jbbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu          Facsimile: 541-346-0388
http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbbloom  http://osrl.uoregon.edu
*****
```

On Tue, 5 Nov 2002, James P. Murphy wrote:

```
> Didn't expect to see the Drudge Report (5.2 million visits past 24 hours)
> reporting, at 3:09 EST in the afternoon, that "Based on early exit polls,
> (party) is set to win . . ." after the fiasco of 2000.
>
> What exit polls would those be? VNS?
>
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
```

```
-----
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====
```

```
Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 18:11:35 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Exit Polls
Comments: To: Joel Bloom <jbbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
```

From the drudge report...

```
**17:31**Voter News Service says it will not be able to provide results
tonight of state and national exit poll surveys of voter attitudes...VNS
said the exit poll information was being collected but not being properly
analyzed by the organization's new computer system....
```

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

From: Joel Bloom [mailto:jbbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU]

Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 5:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Exit Polls

Josh Marshall (<http://talkingpointsmemo.com>) also lists some (with more appropriate caution) and also mentions that VNS seems to be having some very serious problems>.

```
*****
Joel David Bloom                Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate      5245 University of Oregon
Telephone: 541-346-0891                Eugene, OR 97403-5245
jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu            Facsimile: 541-346-0388
http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbloom     http://osrl.uoregon.edu
*****
```

On Tue, 5 Nov 2002, James P. Murphy wrote:

```
> Didn't expect to see the Drudge Report (5.2 million visits past 24 hours)
> reporting, at 3:09 EST in the afternoon, that "Based on early exit polls,
> (party) is set to win . . ." after the fiasco of 2000.
>
> What exit polls would those be? VNS?
>
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
```

```
-----
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
```

```
-----
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====
```

```
Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 18:03:08 -0500
Reply-To: Jane Sheppard <jsheppard@cmor.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jane Sheppard <jsheppard@CMOR.ORG>
```

Organization: CMOR
Subject: Re: Cellphones and Caller ID Are Making Pollsters' Jobs Harder
Comments: To: "Kropf, Martha E." <kropfm@UMKC.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The following is information from CMOR regarding survey research calls to cellular phones:

Calling a cell phone, in and of itself, is not illegal. What is prohibited by the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA):

1. ALL calls made to a cellular phone, without the prior consent of the person called
2. IF the call is made using an automatic telephone dialing system (defined as equipment which has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator and to dial such numbers) or an artificial or prerecorded voice
3. AND IF the party is charged for the call

Since the language in this section of the TCPA is not specific to sales calls, but instead regulates any such calls using an autodialer or recorded message, these provisions regulate survey research calls. The section, however, does not seek to ban all autodialer/recorded message calls to cell phones, but only those where the party is charged for the call and there is no consent of the called party. However, the difficulty in complying with this law/regulation is in the ability to determine if you are placing a call to a cell phone, and furthermore, whether the called party is being charged for the call.

There are, various ways that survey researchers can comply with the TCPA. Researchers can place calls to cell phones within the scope of the TCPA if, for example, the calls are placed manually by telephone interviewers (instead of using an automatic telephone dialing system). Under such circumstances, a survey research call could be placed to a cell phone where the party is charged for the call. In addition, survey research calls to cell phones using an automatic telephone dialing system are permissible, as long as the cell phone number called is not charged for the call (but determining if the party is charged with the call is difficult, if not impossible to determine). Also, an automatic dialing systems may be used to place a survey research call, where the person is charged for the call, if you have consent of the person called.

A recent article regarding this section of the TCPA is available on the CMOR website at http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0802.htm. A general fact sheet on the TCPA is also available at http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_trr2.htm.

The FCC is currently reviewing the TCPA Rules, including this section that impacts survey research calls. To that end, it recently published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the Federal Register, asking for public comments in regard possible changes to the TCPA Rules (see http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-02-250A1.pdf). CMOR is reviewing the materials to determine if there is an opportunity of clarifying those provisions in which survey research is implicitly exempt and/or whether it is appropriate and beneficial to survey research for CMOR to provide public comment seeking an exemption from those provisions that

currently implicate survey research calls or possible future FCC
TCPA-related regulations.

CMOR will be discussing our role in the FCC TCPA review at the November 14th
CMOR Board Meeting (which occurs prior to the conclusion of the formal
comment period). We welcome any thoughts or comments you may have regarding
the current TCPA or the modifications proposed by the FCC. If you have any
thoughts/comments/suggestions or would like further information on CMOR's
efforts regarding the FCC review of the TCPA, please contact CMOR's Director
of Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org or 631-696-2544.

Jane M. Sheppard
Director Respondent Cooperation
CMOR
'Promoting and Advocating Survey Research'

Ohio Office:
2012 Penhurst Circle N.E.
North Canton, OH 44720
Phone: (330) 244-8616
Fax: (330) 244-8626

Visit CMOR's website www.cmor.org for your research resources.

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

From: "Kropf, Martha E." <kropfm@UMKC.EDU>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 5:19 PM
Subject: Re: Cellphones and Caller ID Are Making Pollsters' Jobs Harder

> Colleagues:
> I'm just curious about the legality of calling cell phones...the article
says it's illegal. Does that mean that somehow we cannot obtain cell phone
numbers when we order sample? Even for RDD samples?
>
> Thanks for clarifying!
> Martha Kropf
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Shapard Wolf [mailto:shap.wolf@asu.edu]
> Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 9:03 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: NYT: Cellphones and Caller ID Are Making Pollsters' Jobs Harder
>
>
> Interesting story in New York Times today:
> <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/05/politics/campaigns/05VOTE.html>
>
> Discusses problem of rising use of call-screening and prevalence of
> cell-only households. (AAPOR members Mark Schulman and Tom Smith are also

> quoted.)
>
> One quote puzzles me (it wasn't attributed):
> "Several pollsters said the rise in the number of unlisted telephone
numbers
> was more pronounced in minority and low-income neighborhoods."
>
> First, does anyone have a source for this rise?
>
> Second, why is this a problem? Because it hampers geo-targeted RDD
samples,
> which use the proportion of listed numbers in 100-blocks with addresses in
a
> desired geography to screen into a sample? I understood that the changes
in
> phone company number assignment practices were making this a less-viable
> procedure anyway.
>
> Comments welcome. Please remember to hit 'reply to all' to send your
message
> to AAPORNET.
>
> Shap Wolf
> Survey Research Laboratory
> Arizona State University
> shap.wolf@asu.edu
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 5 Nov 2002 12:27:28 -0500
Reply-To: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>
Organization: Adirondack Communications
Subject: Re: Exit Polls
In-Reply-To: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E09D198C5@isr.umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

From MSNBC:
<http://www.msnbc.com/news/828124.asp>

Flawed exit polling data abandoned

Voter News Service won't provide some information Tuesday

Voter News Service abandoned its state and national exit poll results of voter attitudes Tuesday after determining the data was unreliable, depriving media organizations of information to help analyze the vote on Election Night.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nathaniel Ehrlich
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 6:12 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Exit Polls

>From the drudge report...

17:31Voter News Service says it will not be able to provide results tonight of state and national exit poll surveys of voter attitudes...VNS said the exit poll information was being collected but not being properly analyzed by the organization's new computer system....

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

From: Joel Bloom [mailto:jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 5:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Exit Polls

Josh Marshall (<http://talkingpointsmemo.com>) also lists some (with more appropriate caution) and also mentions that VNS seems to be having some very serious problems>.

**

Joel David Bloom	Oregon Survey Research
Laboratory	
Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate	5245 University of
Oregon	
Telephone: 541-346-0891	Eugene, OR
97403-5245	
jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu	Facsimile:
541-346-0388	
http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbloom	
http://osrl.uoregon.edu	

**

On Tue, 5 Nov 2002, James P. Murphy wrote:

> Didn't expect to see the Drudge Report (5.2 million visits past 24
> hours)
> reporting, at 3:09 EST in the afternoon, that "Based on early exit
> polls,
> (party) is set to win . . . " after the fiasco of 2000.
>
> What exit polls would those be? VNS?
>
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at
> your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 08:57:49 -0800
Reply-To: "Dr. Judy Calder" <calder@SCS.UNR.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Dr. Judy Calder" <calder@SCS.UNR.EDU>
Subject: Re: Surveys on personal health issues
Comments: To: Michael Newman <mnewman@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS) -- the largest and oldest monthly surveillance of health in the U.S. -- has optional modules on sexual behavior as well as questions on HIV knowledge (the latter in the rotating "core"). You can access that data through CDC's web site. We have found that item response on "potentially embarrassing" medical questions is not very much lower than on less intrusive questions (AAPOR, RR4 at 43%). Differences were less than 1/10 of 1%. The key is simply well trained, verbally fluent, intelligent interviewers.

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

From: "Michael Newman" <mnewman@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2002 8:28 AM

Subject: Surveys on personal health issues

> Dear AAPOR,

>

> I am looking for sources of information that support the validity of data
> collected through telephone interviews on personal health issues.

> Specifically, can anyone provide insight (or direct me to research) on
> respondents' willingness to answer questions on potentially embarrassing
> medical problems (e.g., impotence)?

>

> Many thanks.

>

> -----

> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> then click on 'Join or leave the list'

> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 11:57:23 -0500

Reply-To: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>

Subject: Re: Exit Polls

MIME-version: 1.0

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

May we see VNS's official response to the exit poll
problems, before ungrounded criticisms would spread out?

Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist
American Institutes for Research
Education Statistics Services Institute
1990 K Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006

> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 12:07:04 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Exit Polls
In-Reply-To: <[000701c284f0\\$a043a380\\$6501a8c0@Ward](mailto:000701c284f0$a043a380$6501a8c0@Ward)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The New York Times has a fairly detailed article on the VNS troubles.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/06/politics/campaigns/06POLL.html>

A couple of highlights:

"The executive director of the Voter News Service, Ted Savaglio, said the problem was in the elaborate computer programs intended to weigh and analyze polling information from randomly elected precincts in each state. That was not the sole flaw. At one point in the afternoon, the system broke down while field workers were feeding it the results of their local polls, worsening the larger problems, Mr. Savaglio said."

"The Voter News Service computer system was supposed to use complicated equations and information about the precincts to assess voters' views and the outcomes.

The team of statisticians who supervise the work determined that the results were off and probably inaccurate, Mr. Savaglio said. But he

added that he did not know how the statisticians knew that the output could not be trusted."

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ward Kay
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 12:27 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Exit Polls

From MSNBC:
<http://www.msnbc.com/news/828124.asp>

Flawed exit polling data abandoned

Voter News Service won't provide some information Tuesday

Voter News Service abandoned its state and national exit poll results of voter attitudes Tuesday after determining the data was unreliable, depriving media organizations of information to help analyze the vote on Election Night.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nathaniel Ehrlich
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 6:12 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Exit Polls

>From the drudge report...

17:31Voter News Service says it will not be able to provide results tonight of state and national exit poll surveys of voter attitudes...VNS said the exit poll information was being collected but not being properly analyzed by the organization's new computer system....

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

From: Joel Bloom [mailto:jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 5:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Exit Polls

Josh Marshall (<http://talkingpointsmemo.com>) also lists some (with more appropriate caution) and also mentions that VNS seems to be having some very serious problems>.

```
*****
**
Joel David Bloom                Oregon Survey Research
Laboratory                      5245 University of
Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate      Eugene, OR
Oregon
Telephone: 541-346-0891          Eugene, OR
97403-5245
jdbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu      Facsimile:
541-346-0388
http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jdbloom
http://osrl.uoregon.edu
*****
**
```

On Tue, 5 Nov 2002, James P. Murphy wrote:

```
> Didn't expect to see the Drudge Report (5.2 million visits past 24
hours)
> reporting, at 3:09 EST in the afternoon, that "Based on early exit
polls,
> (party) is set to win . . ." after the fiasco of 2000.
>
> What exit polls would those be? VNS?
>
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at
your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
```

```
-----
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
```

```
-----
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
-----
```

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 13:36:25 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Exit Polls
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The operational difficulties of VNS, while unfortunate, are otherwise
unremarkable -- unless they indicate potential error in past or future
reporting by them.

What WAS significant was release to the media of information indicating
winners five hours before the end of voting. Wasn't there an understanding
that pollsters and media were going keep hands off until polls were closed?
Intentional or not, these acts interfere with the electoral process.

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

From: Chun, Young <YChun@AIR.ORG>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 12:18 PM
Subject: Re: Exit Polls

> May we see VNS's official response to the exit poll
> problems, before ungrounded criticisms would spread out?
>
>

>Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist
>American Institutes for Research
>Education Statistics Services Institute
>1990 K Street, NW, Suite 500
>Washington, DC 20006
>
>

>*****
>This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain privileged or
>confidential information. It is solely for use by the individual for whom
>it is intended, even if addressed incorrectly. If you received this e-mail

>in error, please notify the sender; do not disclose, copy, distribute, or
>take any action in reliance on the contents of this information; and delete
>it from your system. Any other use of this e-mail is prohibited. Thank you
>for your compliance.

>
>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]
>Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 6:12 PM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Re: Exit Polls

>
>

>From the drudge report...

>***17:31**Voter News Service says it will not be able to provide results
>tonight of state and national exit poll surveys of voter attitudes...VNS
>said the exit poll information was being collected but not being properly
>analyzed by the organization's new computer system....

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Joel Bloom [mailto:jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU]
>Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 5:28 PM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Re: Exit Polls

>
>

>Josh Marshall (<http://talkingpointsmemo.com>) also lists some (with more
>appropriate caution) and also mentions that VNS seems to be having some
>very serious problems>.

>
>

>*****

>Joel David Bloom	Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
>Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate	5245 University of Oregon
>Telephone: 541-346-0891	Eugene, OR 97403-5245
>jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu	Facsimile: 541-346-0388
> http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbloom	http://osrl.uoregon.edu

>*****

>On Tue, 5 Nov 2002, James P. Murphy wrote:

>

>> Didn't expect to see the Drudge Report (5.2 million visits past 24 hours)
>> reporting, at 3:09 EST in the afternoon, that "Based on early exit polls,
>> (party) is set to win . . ." after the fiasco of 2000.

>>

>> What exit polls would those be? VNS?

>>

>> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

>> Voice (610) 408-8800

>> Fax (610) 408-8802

>> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>>

>>

>> -----
>> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your

>> main email address.

>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>

>-----
>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>main email address.
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

>-----
>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>main email address.
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

>-----
>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 13:10:21 -0600
Reply-To: rsantos@NUSTATS.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Robert Santos <rsantos@NUSTATS.COM>
Subject: Re: Exit Polls
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

On a brighter note, at around 8:30 pm Eastern it was fun seeing
AAPOR members Warren Mitofsky & Joe Waksberg hacking away
at laptops behind CNN correspondent Cokie Roberts while she
reported on methodology issues related to exit polls.

Hopefully, there were other AAPOR members shown (whom I did
not recognize)...

Rob Santos
NuStats

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 14:11:47 -0500

Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Exit Polls
Comments: To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
In-Reply-To: <006301c285c3\$6eaf62e0\$9cc6c3d1@default>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Winners were announced when all the polls in a state closed, just like congress wanted. There were no premature announcements. I have no idea what the five hours you are talking about refers to.

Second, it may be your opinion that projections influence voters and interfere with elections, but is there some study you are basing this conclusion upon? I'm not asking for apocryphal stories that fit your conclusion, but some real studies. The ones I have read conclude no such thing.

warren mitofsky

At 01:36 PM 11/6/02 -0500, James P. Murphy wrote:

>The operational difficulties of VNS, while unfortunate, are otherwise
>unremarkable -- unless they indicate potential error in past or future
>reporting by them.

>
>What WAS significant was release to the media of information indicating
>winners five hours before the end of voting. Wasn't there an understanding
>that pollsters and media were going keep hands off until polls were closed?
>Intentional or not, these acts interfere with the electoral process.

>
>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
>Voice (610) 408-8800
>Fax (610) 408-8802
>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Chun, Young <YChun@AIR.ORG>
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
>Date: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 12:18 PM
>Subject: Re: Exit Polls

>
>
>> May we see VNS's official response to the exit poll
>> problems, before ungrounded criticisms would spread out?

>>
>>
>>Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist
>>American Institutes for Research
>>Education Statistics Services Institute
>>1990 K Street, NW, Suite 500
>>Washington, DC 20006

>>
>>
>>*****
>>This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain privileged or
>>confidential information. It is solely for use by the individual for whom
>>it is intended, even if addressed incorrectly. If you received this e-mail
>>in error, please notify the sender; do not disclose, copy, distribute, or

> >take any action in reliance on the contents of this information; and delete
> >it from your system. Any other use of this e-mail is prohibited. Thank you
> >for your compliance.

> >
> >

> >-----Original Message-----

> >From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]
> >Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 6:12 PM
> >To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> >Subject: Re: Exit Polls

> >
> >

> >From the drudge report...

> >***17:31**Voter News Service says it will not be able to provide results
> >tonight of state and national exit poll surveys of voter attitudes...VNS
> >said the exit poll information was being collected but not being properly
> >analyzed by the organization's new computer system....

> >

> >-----Original Message-----

> >From: Joel Bloom [mailto:jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU]
> >Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 5:28 PM
> >To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> >Subject: Re: Exit Polls

> >
> >

> >Josh Marshall (<http://talkingpointsmemo.com>) also lists some (with more
> >appropriate caution) and also mentions that VNS seems to be having some
> >very serious problems>.

> >
> >

> >*****

> >Joel David Bloom	Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
> >Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate	5245 University of Oregon
> >Telephone: 541-346-0891	Eugene, OR 97403-5245
> >jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu	Facsimile: 541-346-0388
> > http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbloom	http://osrl.uoregon.edu

> >*****

> >On Tue, 5 Nov 2002, James P. Murphy wrote:

> >

> >> Didn't expect to see the Drudge Report (5.2 million visits past 24
hours)

> >> reporting, at 3:09 EST in the afternoon, that "Based on early exit
polls,

> >> (party) is set to win . . . " after the fiasco of 2000.

> >>

> >> What exit polls would those be? VNS?

> >>

> >> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

> >> Voice (610) 408-8800

> >> Fax (610) 408-8802

> >> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

> >>

> >> -----

> >> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

> >> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> >> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >> main email address.
> >> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-
request@asu.edu
> >>
> >
> >-----
> >View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >main email address.
> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >
> >-----
> >View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >main email address.
> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >
> >-----
> >Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >
>
>-----
>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Warren J. Mitofsky
140 Riverside Drive, Apt 18N
New York, NY 10024

212 496-2945
212 496-0846 FAX

email: mitofsky@mindspring.com
<http://www.mitofskyinternational.com>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 15:07:33 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Exit Polls
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Refer to

http://www.drudgereportarchives.com/data/2002/11/05/20021105_201532.htm

for the Drudge Report page that appeared at 20:15 GMT yesterday, which is 15:15, or 3:15 PM, EDT. Read all the way through the red headlines.

The polls in Pennsylvania were open until 8 PM so there you have about 5 hours.

There were other reports prior to 20:15 but this one was particularly explicit.

The conclusions of whatever studies may have been done are irrelevant to a decision arrived at on other grounds.

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

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

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 2:33 PM
Subject: Re: Exit Polls

>Winners were announced when all the polls in a state closed, just like
>congress wanted. There were no premature announcements. I have no idea what
>the five hours you are talking about refers to.

>

>Second, it may be your opinion that projections influence voters and
>interfere with elections, but is there some study you are basing this
>conclusion upon? I'm not asking for apocryphal stories that fit your
>conclusion, but some real studies. The ones I have read conclude no such
>thing.

>warren mitofsky

>

>At 01:36 PM 11/6/02 -0500, James P. Murphy wrote:

>>The operational difficulties of VNS, while unfortunate, are otherwise
>>unremarkable -- unless they indicate potential error in past or future
>>reporting by them.

>>

>>What WAS significant was release to the media of information indicating
>>winners five hours before the end of voting. Wasn't there an understanding
>>that pollsters and media were going keep hands off until polls were
closed?

>>Intentional or not, these acts interfere with the electoral process.

>>

>>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

>>Voice (610) 408-8800

>>Fax (610) 408-8802

>>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

>>-----Original Message-----

>>From: Chun, Young <YChun@AIR.ORG>

>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
>>Date: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 12:18 PM
>>Subject: Re: Exit Polls
>>
>>
>> > May we see VNS's official response to the exit poll
>> > problems, before ungrounded criticisms would spread out?
>> >
>> >
>> >Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist
>> >American Institutes for Research
>> >Education Statistics Services Institute
>> >1990 K Street, NW, Suite 500
>> >Washington, DC 20006
>> >
>> >
>>
>*****
>> >This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain privileged or
>> >confidential information. It is solely for use by the individual for
whom
>> >it is intended, even if addressed incorrectly. If you received this
e-mail
>> >in error, please notify the sender; do not disclose, copy, distribute,
or
>> >take any action in reliance on the contents of this information; and
delete
>> >it from your system. Any other use of this e-mail is prohibited. Thank
you
>> >for your compliance.
>> >
>> >
>> >-----Original Message-----
>> >From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]
>> >Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 6:12 PM
>> >To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> >Subject: Re: Exit Polls
>> >
>> >
>> >From the drudge report...
>> >**17:31**Voter News Service says it will not be able to provide results
>> >tonight of state and national exit poll surveys of voter attitudes...VNS
>> >said the exit poll information was being collected but not being
properly
>> >analyzed by the organization's new computer system....
>> >
>> >-----Original Message-----
>> >From: Joel Bloom [mailto:jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU]
>> >Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 5:28 PM
>> >To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> >Subject: Re: Exit Polls
>> >
>> >
>> >Josh Marshall (<http://talkingpointsmemo.com>) also lists some (with more
>> >appropriate caution) and also mentions that VNS seems to be having some
>> >very serious problems>.
>> >

>> >
>>
>*****
>> >Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research
Laboratory
>> >Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of
Oregon Eugene, OR
>> >Telephone: 541-346-0891 97403-5245
>> >jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu Facsimile:
541-346-0388
>> >http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbloom
http://osrl.uoregon.edu
>>
>*****
>> >
>> >On Tue, 5 Nov 2002, James P. Murphy wrote:
>> >
>> >> Didn't expect to see the Drudge Report (5.2 million visits past 24
hours)
>> >> reporting, at 3:09 EST in the afternoon, that "Based on early exit
polls,
>> >> (party) is set to win . . . " after the fiasco of 2000.
>> >>
>> >> What exit polls would those be? VNS?
>> >>
>> >> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
>> >> Voice (610) 408-8800
>> >> Fax (610) 408-8802
>> >> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
>> >>
>> >> -----
>> >> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
>> >> http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
>> >> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at
your
>> >> main email address.
>> >> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
>> >>
>> >
>> >-----
>> >View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
>> >http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
>> >You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>> >main email address.
>> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
>> >
>> >-----
>> >View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
>> >http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
>> >You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>> >main email address.
>> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
>> >

>> >-----

>> >Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> >then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

>> >

>>

>>-----

>>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

>Warren J. Mitofsky
>140 Riverside Drive, Apt 18N
>New York, NY 10024
>

>212 496-2945
>212 496-0846 FAX
>

>email: mitofsky@mindspring.com
><http://www.mitofskyinternational.com>
>

>

>-----

>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 15:42:35 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Re: Exit Polls
Comments: To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I don't Drudge is responsible fof the "release to the media of [exit poll] information indicating winners?"

"James P. Murphy" wrote:

>

> Refer to

> http://www.drudgereportarchives.com/data/2002/11/05/20021105_201532.htm

>

> for the Drudge Report page that appeared at 20:15 GMT yesterday, which is

> 15:15, or 3:15 PM, EDT. Read all the way through the red headlines.
>
> The polls in Pennsylvania were open until 8 PM so there you have about 5
> hours.
>
> There were other reports prior to 20:15 but this one was particularly
> explicit.
>
> The conclusions of whatever studies may have been done are irrelevant to a
> decision arrived at on other grounds.
>
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
> Date: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 2:33 PM
> Subject: Re: Exit Polls
>
> >Winners were announced when all the polls in a state closed, just like
> >congress wanted. There were no premature announcements. I have no idea
what
> >the five hours you are talking about refers to.
> >
> >Second, it may be your opinion that projections influence voters and
> >interfere with elections, but is there some study you are basing this
> >conclusion upon? I'm not asking for apocryphal stories that fit your
> >conclusion, but some real studies. The ones I have read conclude no such
> >thing.
> >warren mitofsky
> >
> >At 01:36 PM 11/6/02 -0500, James P. Murphy wrote:
> >>The operational difficulties of VNS, while unfortunate, are otherwise
> >>unremarkable -- unless they indicate potential error in past or future
> >>reporting by them.
> >>
> >>What WAS significant was release to the media of information indicating
> >>winners five hours before the end of voting. Wasn't there an
understanding
> >>that pollsters and media were going keep hands off until polls were
> >closed?
> >>Intentional or not, these acts interfere with the electoral process.
> >>
> >>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> >>Voice (610) 408-8800
> >>Fax (610) 408-8802
> >>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> >>-----Original Message-----
> >>From: Chun, Young <YChun@AIR.ORG>
> >>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
> >>Date: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 12:18 PM
> >>Subject: Re: Exit Polls
> >>
> >>

> Laboratory
> >> >Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of
> Oregon Eugene, OR
> >> >Telephone: 541-346-0891
> 97403-5245
> >> >jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu Facsimile:
> 541-346-0388
> >> >http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbloom
> http://osrl.uoregon.edu
> >>
> >*****
> >> >
> >> >On Tue, 5 Nov 2002, James P. Murphy wrote:
> >> >
> >> >> Didn't expect to see the Drudge Report (5.2 million visits past 24
> hours)
> >> >> reporting, at 3:09 EST in the afternoon, that "Based on early exit
> polls,
> >> >> (party) is set to win . . . " after the fiasco of 2000.
> >> >>
> >> >> What exit polls would those be? VNS?
> >> >>
> >> >> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> >> >> Voice (610) 408-8800
> >> >> Fax (610) 408-8802
> >> >> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> >> >>
> >> >> -----
> >> >> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> >> >> http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
> >> >> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at
> your
> >> >> main email address.
> >> >> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> -----
> >> >> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> >> >> http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
> >> >> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >> >> main email address.
> >> >> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >> >>
> >> >> -----
> >> >> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> >> >> http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
> >> >> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >> >> main email address.
> >> >> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >> >>
> >> >> -----
> >> >> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> >> >> http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
> >> >> then click on 'Join or leave the list'

> >> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >> >
> >> >
> >>-----
> >>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> >><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> >>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >
> >Warren J. Mitofsky
> >140 Riverside Drive, Apt 18N
> >New York, NY 10024
> >
> >212 496-2945
> >212 496-0846 FAX
> >
> >email: mitofsky@mindspring.com
> ><http://www.mitofskyinternational.com>
> >
> >-----
> >Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >
> >
> >-----
> >Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 16:58:56 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Exit Polls
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

NOT ENGLISH - "I don't Drudge is responsible fof the "release to the media of [exit poll] information indicating winners?"
What do you mean? You don't doubt? You don't believe? And if Drudge "is responsible" where did he get the info? or are you saying that Drudge made up the leak?

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]

Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 3:43 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Exit Polls

I don't Drudge is responsible for the "release to the media of [exit poll] information indicating winners?"

"James P. Murphy" wrote:

>
> Refer to
> http://www.drudgereportarchives.com/data/2002/11/05/20021105_201532.htm
>
> for the Drudge Report page that appeared at 20:15 GMT yesterday, which is
> 15:15, or 3:15 PM, EDT. Read all the way through the red headlines.
>
> The polls in Pennsylvania were open until 8 PM so there you have about 5
> hours.
>
> There were other reports prior to 20:15 but this one was particularly
> explicit.
>
> The conclusions of whatever studies may have been done are irrelevant to a
> decision arrived at on other grounds.
>
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
> Date: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 2:33 PM
> Subject: Re: Exit Polls
>
> >Winners were announced when all the polls in a state closed, just like
> >congress wanted. There were no premature announcements. I have no idea
> what
> >the five hours you are talking about refers to.
> >
> >Second, it may be your opinion that projections influence voters and
> >interfere with elections, but is there some study you are basing this
> >conclusion upon? I'm not asking for apocryphal stories that fit your
> >conclusion, but some real studies. The ones I have read conclude no such
> >thing.
> >warren mitofsky
> >
> >At 01:36 PM 11/6/02 -0500, James P. Murphy wrote:
> >>The operational difficulties of VNS, while unfortunate, are otherwise
> >>unremarkable -- unless they indicate potential error in past or future
> >>reporting by them.
> >>
> >>What WAS significant was release to the media of information indicating
> >>winners five hours before the end of voting. Wasn't there an
> understanding
> >>that pollsters and media were going keep hands off until polls were

> closed?
> >>Intentional or not, these acts interfere with the electoral process.
> >>
> >>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> >>Voice (610) 408-8800
> >>Fax (610) 408-8802
> >>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> >>-----Original Message-----
> >>From: Chun, Young <YChun@AIR.ORG>
> >>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
> >>Date: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 12:18 PM
> >>Subject: Re: Exit Polls
> >>
> >>
> >> > May we see VNS's official response to the exit poll
> >> > problems, before ungrounded criticisms would spread out?
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist
> >> >American Institutes for Research
> >> >Education Statistics Services Institute
> >> >1990 K Street, NW, Suite 500
> >> >Washington, DC 20006
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
>
>*****
> >> >This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain privileged
> or
> >> >confidential information. It is solely for use by the individual for
> whom
> >> >it is intended, even if addressed incorrectly. If you received this
> e-mail
> >> >in error, please notify the sender; do not disclose, copy, distribute,
> or
> >> >take any action in reliance on the contents of this information; and
> delete
> >> >it from your system. Any other use of this e-mail is prohibited. Thank
> you
> >> >for your compliance.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >-----Original Message-----
> >> >From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]
> >> >Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 6:12 PM
> >> >To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> >> >Subject: Re: Exit Polls
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >From the drudge report...
> >> >***17:31**Voter News Service says it will not be able to provide
> results
> >> >tonight of state and national exit poll surveys of voter
> attitudes...VNS
> >> >said the exit poll information was being collected but not being
> properly

> > >analyzed by the organization's new computer system....
> > >
> > >-----Original Message-----
> > >From: Joel Bloom [mailto:jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU]
> > >Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2002 5:28 PM
> > >To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> > >Subject: Re: Exit Polls
> > >
> > >
> > >Josh Marshall (<http://talkingpointsmemo.com>) also lists some (with
more
> > >appropriate caution) and also mentions that VNS seems to be having
some
> > >very serious problems>.
> > >
> > >
> > >
>
>*****
> > >Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research
> Laboratory 5245 University of
> > >Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate Eugene, OR
> Oregon
> > >Telephone: 541-346-0891
> 97403-5245
> > >jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu Facsimile:
> 541-346-0388
> > ><http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbloom>
> <http://osrl.uoregon.edu>
> > >
>
>*****
> > >
> > >On Tue, 5 Nov 2002, James P. Murphy wrote:
> > >
> > >> Didn't expect to see the Drudge Report (5.2 million visits past 24
> hours)
> > >> reporting, at 3:09 EST in the afternoon, that "Based on early exit
> polls,
> > >> (party) is set to win . . ." after the fiasco of 2000.
> > >>
> > >> What exit polls would those be? VNS?
> > >>
> > >> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> > >> Voice (610) 408-8800
> > >> Fax (610) 408-8802
> > >> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> > >>
> > >> -----
> > >> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> > >> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> > >> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at
> your
> > >> main email address.
> > >> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
> > >>

> >> >
> >> >-----
> >> >View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> >> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >> >You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at
your
> >> >main email address.
> >> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >> >
> >> >-----
> >> >View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> >> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >> >You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at
your
> >> >main email address.
> >> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >> >
> >> >-----
> >> >Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> >> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >> >then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> >> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >> >
> >>
> >>-----
> >>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> >>><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >>>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> >>>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >
> >Warren J. Mitofsky
> >140 Riverside Drive, Apt 18N
> >New York, NY 10024
> >
> >212 496-2945
> >212 496-0846 FAX
> >
> >email: mitofsky@mindspring.com
> ><http://www.mitofskyinternational.com>
> >
> >-----
> >Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >
> >
> >-----
> >Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 17:48:55 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: More on Exit Polls
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In my comment yesterday on Exit Polls I only obliquely stated that Drudge did not mention VNS by name. That should have been explicit. Since the results were not attributed to VNS, but to unspecified "exit polls," VNS is arguably not accountable in the same manner as if they had been. While the episode reflects an electoral and reporting process in disarray, it's not clear who's to blame.

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

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 18:16:14 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: List question
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

On the Exit Polls thread I have noticed that some people were responding to emails that I have not yet received (Rob Santos and Warren Mitofsky among others) while I have received other postings that are from a couple of hours later. I check the archives and all the posts are there.

Is this just me? Or are others having this problem as well?

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 16:43:22 -0700
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Re: List question
Comments: cc: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0

> Leo G. Simonetta wrote:
> some people were responding to emails that I have not yet
> received (Rob Santos and Warren Mitofsky among others)
> while I have received other postings that are from a
> couple of hours later.

There are many variables that influence mail distribution. One new twist is anti-spam/adult content filters. We had a couple of user's servers reject a message last week that had a reference to "Mon_ca Lew__sky"--said it trigged "adult content filter." ('_' so this gets through)

Another message was rejected as spam because it had the phrases "for more information" "guaranteed" "no longer wish" and "thank you" in the text.

One university's server rejects all email with a message that requires a specific response; we have to see this and respond or the user never sees the message.

We catch some of these in error messages to the list owners, but I'm sure there are other instances where email is being filtered that we don't know about.

You might check with your IT staff, and ask that the AAPORNET@asu.edu address be added to an "accepted source/white hat" list.

One other problem is that Listserv examines each message for certain fields, to be sure it doesn't get into an endless loop of messages. When you quote an entire message in your reply it can look to Listserv as if there is a loop. The solution is to cut out the headers, footers, and any extra text---just quote the part of the message to which you're replying.

And as Leo just illustrated, all of the messages are easily accessible at the archives. You can sort them by topic and easily read all the replies.

Shap Wolf
Survey Research Laboratory/Arizona State University

AAPORNET volunteer host

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 6 Nov 2002 19:46:56 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Re: List question
Comments-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
In-Reply-To: <000001c285ea\$84351cf0\$130a010a@LEO>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I, too, have not received any messages posted by Mitofsky or Santos -- my computer is at home and is single use with only Norton virus checker operating.

Dick Halpern

At 06:16 PM 11/6/02, you wrote:

>On the Exit Polls thread I have noticed that some people were responding
>to emails that I have not yet received (Rob Santos and Warren Mitofsky
>among others) while I have received other postings that are from a
>couple of hours later. I check the archives and all the posts are
>there.

>

>Is this just me? Or are others having this problem as well?

>

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta
>Art & Science Group, LLC
>6115 Falls Road Suite 101
>Baltimore, MD 21209
>410-377-7880 ext. 14
>410-377-7955 fax
>

>

>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 09:06:22 -0500
Reply-To: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth_Steve@TVRATINGS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth_Steve@TVRATINGS.COM>
Subject: Re: List question
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I'm on a company network with McAfee virus scan. I received Murphy's initial post on this thread a second time this morning. I think we have a poltergeist.

Ken Steve
Lead Research Analyst
Nielsen Media Research
(727)773-4317

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

From: dick halpern [mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 7:47 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: List question

I, too, have not received any messages posted by Mitofsky or Santos -- my computer is at home and is single use with only Norton virus checker operating.

Dick Halpern

At 06:16 PM 11/6/02, you wrote:

>On the Exit Polls thread I have noticed that some people were responding
>to emails that I have not yet received (Rob Santos and Warren Mitofsky
>among others) while I have received other postings that are from a
>couple of hours later. I check the archives and all the posts are
>there.

>

>Is this just me? Or are others having this problem as well?

>

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta
>Art & Science Group, LLC
>6115 Falls Road Suite 101
>Baltimore, MD 21209
>410-377-7880 ext. 14
>410-377-7955 fax

>

>-----
>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 04:43:31 -0800
Reply-To: mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Slate Article
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

hey, wait a minute
Don't Blame the Exit Polls
They didn't cause Election Night problems on Tuesday or in 2000.
By Martin Plissner
Posted Wednesday, November 6, 2002, at 4:42 PM PT

Since the 2000 election fiasco, exit polls have been singled out as the chief villain in television's Election Night coverage. The crash of Voter News Service's exit poll computers on Tuesday only confirmed the bad reputation of exit polls. But let's get something straight about what went wrong on Tuesday and two years ago. In spite of what you may have read or heard, exit polls had hardly anything to do with either disaster.

The networks called Florida for Al Gore two years ago not based just on VNS polls of voters but largely on real election returns as well. When the networks reversed themselves late in the night and called Florida for Bush, exit polls were again irrelevant. The second call was also based on real votes, close to 6 million of them. Even so, exit polls have been front and center in the soul-searching about Election Night reform. (The source of these exit polls=E2=80=94and most other Election = Night data=E2=80=94was and remains VNS, which is jointly owned by the networks = and the Associated Press.)

So Tuesday night, three broadcast and three cable networks, having declared their commitment to reform and having put up more than \$10 million dollars for improving VNS, put the 2002 model on display. Most of the money was spent to rewrite the computer programs for counting votes and estimating winners. The system in use in 2000 was old and creaky, and the rewrite was long overdue. By midsummer, however, it became obvious that the company being paid to write the new programs was far behind schedule. When VNS officials and the network managers were asked about this on the record, they offered only serene confidence that the new system would work. Off the record, fear of another disaster was easy to find.=20

On Tuesday night, VNS realized its spanking-new operating system didn't work as well as it hoped. Like a crew facing a possible shipwreck, it looked for cargo to throw overboard. The most obvious thing to jettison was some of the exit polling data. It takes a lot of computer hardware and operators to process the huge amount of data=E2=80=94why did black = women in Arkansas over 35 vote for that candidate=E2=80=94that goes into an exit = poll. Dumping that data would allow VNS to keep churning out basic horserace numbers from the polls.=20

For polling analysts at the networks and academics who thrive on postelection studies of the exit polls, this may be a huge loss (though one network executive is pretty sure the data can eventually be retrieved for the cause of scholarship).=20

But that lost data did not have any impact on the fundamental question of calling the election. For the purpose of declaring winners and losers, the networks appear to have had all the data they normally have.

That is not, however, the impression you got in reading the morning papers. Writing of "TV's Slow Motion Election," Howard Kurtz in the Washington Post recounts the dismay of network anchormen because a "computerized fiasco had blown up their exit poll data. They looked like their favorite toy had been taken away." The New York Times announced the return of an old "Election Ritual-Awaiting votes."

The networks may have been a bit slower than in the past to call close races, but that had nothing to do with a breakdown in technology. It had everything to do with a breakdown in the decades-old zeal to be the first to "call" winners. Not everyone in TV news management has cared that much in the past about being first, and since 2000, those who don't want the aggravation (and don't want to get it wrong) are in the ascendant.=20

More important, exit polls would never have been used to call any of Tuesday's tight contests. Given the large sampling error in the surveys, no one would ever consider calling an election on an exit poll reading that was closer than seven points: Five Senate contests were decided by four points or less. "If we had exit polls that were the most perfectly designed and executed possible," says Bill Wheatley, the NBC vice president who sits on the VNS board of managers, "it would not have enabled us to announce the shift in control of the Senate any sooner that we did last night."

Article URL: <http://slate.msn.com/?id=3D2073608>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 07:32:17 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Martin Plissner on VNS and exit polls
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

The following commentary on the role of VNS exit polling in calling elections appears in the online magazine Slate (<http://slate.msn.com>) today. Martin Plissner was for many years in charge of election coverage for CBS News.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Don't Blame the Exit Polls

They didn't cause Election Night problems on Tuesday or in 2000.

By Martin Plissner

Posted Wednesday, November 6, 2002, at 4:42 PM PT

Since the 2000 election fiasco, exit polls have been singled out as the chief villain in television's Election Night coverage. The crash of Voter News Service's exit poll computers on Tuesday only confirmed the bad reputation of exit polls. But let's get something straight about what went wrong on Tuesday and two years ago. In spite of what you may have read or heard, exit polls had hardly anything to do with either disaster.

The networks called Florida for Al Gore two years ago not based just on VNS polls of voters but largely on real election returns as well. When the networks reversed themselves late in the night and called Florida for Bush, exit polls were again irrelevant. The second call was also based on real votes, close to 6 million of them. Even so, exit polls have been front and center in the soul-searching about Election Night reform. (The source of these exit polls—and most other Election Night data—was and remains VNS, which is jointly owned by the networks and the Associated Press.)

So Tuesday night, three broadcast and three cable networks, having declared their commitment to reform and having put up more than \$10 million dollars for improving VNS, put the 2002 model on display. Most of the money was spent to rewrite the computer programs for counting votes and estimating winners. The system in use in 2000 was old and creaky, and the rewrite was long overdue. By midsummer, however, it became obvious that the company being paid to write the new programs was far behind schedule. When VNS officials and the network managers were asked about this on the record, they offered only serene confidence that the new system would work. Off the record, fear of another disaster was easy to find.

On Tuesday night, VNS realized its spanking-new operating system didn't work as well as it hoped. Like a crew facing a possible shipwreck, it looked for cargo to throw overboard. The most obvious thing to jettison was some of the exit polling data. It takes a lot

of computer hardware and operators to process the huge amount of data—why did black women in Arkansas over 35 vote for that candidate—that goes into an exit poll. Dumping that data would allow VNS to keep churning out basic horserace numbers from the polls.

For polling analysts at the networks and academics who thrive on postelection studies of the exit polls, this may be a huge loss (though one network executive is pretty sure the data can eventually be retrieved for the cause of scholarship).

But that lost data did not have any impact on the fundamental question of calling the election. For the purpose of declaring winners and losers, the networks appear to have had all the data they normally have.

That is not, however, the impression you got in reading the morning papers. Writing of "TV's Slow Motion Election," Howard Kurtz in the Washington Post recounts the dismay of network anchormen because a "computerized fiasco had blown up their exit poll data. They looked like their favorite toy had been taken away." The New York Times announced the return of an old "Election Ritual-Awaiting votes."

The networks may have been a bit slower than in the past to call close races, but that had nothing to do with a breakdown in technology. It had everything to do with a breakdown in the decades-old zeal to be the first to "call" winners. Not everyone in TV news management has cared that much in the past about being first, and since 2000, those who don't want the aggravation (and don't want to get it wrong) are in the ascendant.

More important, exit polls would never have been used to call any of Tuesday's tight contests. Given the large sampling error in the surveys, no one would ever consider calling an election on an exit poll reading that was closer than seven points: Five Senate contests were decided by four points or less. "If we had exit polls that were the most perfectly designed and executed possible," says Bill Wheatley, the NBC vice president who sits on the VNS board of managers, "it would not have enabled us to announce the shift in control of the Senate any sooner that we did last night."

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 09:28:45 -0500
Reply-To: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
Organization: Center for the Study of Services
Subject: Re: More on Exit Polls
Comments: To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

If Drudge released proprietary information without authorization, then VNS or whoever may rightfully look for someone to blame for this infringement of its intellectual property rights. But I don't agree that the incident reflects a system in disarray. If a media source released timely and interesting information about public affairs, I'd say the system is working well.

Chris

James P. Murphy wrote:

> In my comment yesterday on Exit Polls I only obliquely stated that Drudge
> did not mention VNS by name. That should have been explicit. Since the
> results were not attributed to VNS, but to unspecified "exit polls," VNS is
> arguably not accountable in the same manner as if they had been. While the
> episode reflects an electoral and reporting process in disarray, it's not
> clear who's to blame.
>
>

Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
Survey Director
Center for the Study of Services
733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
Washington, DC 20005

Voice: 202-454-3031
Fax: 202-347-4000

E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 08:32:43 -0600
Reply-To: "Hogan, Sean" <Hogan.Sean@UIS.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Hogan, Sean" <Hogan.Sean@UIS.EDU>
Subject: Voodoo
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

From this morning's Chicago Tribune:

"We try to portray polling as a science, but it's a witchcraft kind of art," said Norm Ornstein, a political scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. "When it comes to the midterm elections, we're trying to predict how 35% of the electorate will vote, but we don't know which 35% will turn

out. It's beyond embarrassing."

Sean O. Hogan
Assistant Director
Survey Research Office
Abraham Lincoln Presidential Center for Governmental Studies
University of Illinois at Springfield
One University Plaza, HRB 120
Springfield, IL 62703-5407
217/206-6591
hogan.sean@uis.edu
http://sro.uis.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 08:41:10 -0500
Reply-To: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman_Trussell@TVRATINGS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman_Trussell@TVRATINGS.COM>
Subject: Re: List question
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Leo/Shap:

I to have experienced this on a fairly regular basis. A recent example was a posting by Mike Margolis (Sent: Friday, October 25, 2002 9:33 AM Subject: More on the Dillman Dollar) that was sent on Friday morning but never made it to my mailbox until Sunday afternoon. Shap's explanation was appreciated and contained valuable information, but I don't know that it explains this phenomenon.

Norm Trussell

> Leo G. Simonetta wrote:
> some people were responding to emails that I have not yet
> received (Rob Santos and Warren Mitofsky among others)
> while I have received other postings that are from a
> couple of hours later.

There are many variables that influence mail distribution. One new twist is anti-spam/adult content filters. We had a couple of user's servers reject a message last week that had a reference to "Mon_ca Lew__sky"--said it trigged "adult content filter." ('_' so this gets through)

Another message was rejected as spam because it had the phrases "for more information" "guaranteed" "no longer wish" and "thank you" in the text.

One university's server rejects all email with a message that requires a specific response; we have to see this and respond or the user never sees the message.

We catch some of these in error messages to the list owners, but I'm sure there are other instances where email is being filtered that we don't know about.

You might check with your IT staff, and ask that the AAPORNET@asu.edu address be added to an "accepted source/white hat" list.

One other problem is that Listserv examines each message for certain fields, to be sure it doesn't get into an endless loop of messages. When you quote an entire message in your reply it can look to Listserv as if there is a loop. The solution is to cut out the headers, footers, and any extra text---just quote the part of the message to which you're replying.

And as Leo just illustrated, all of the messages are easily accessible at the archives. You can sort them by topic and easily read all the replies.

Shap Wolf
Survey Research Laboratory/Arizona State University
AAPORNET volunteer host

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 12:14:47 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Re: More on Exit Polls
Comments: To: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

1. VNS clients do receive exit poll results during the day before the poll is completed. They are cautioned against releasing and they abide by this rule.
2. VNS clients are cautioned against using the numbers even after the poll is complete.
3. However, there is some unauthorized trafficking of this data in during the day. A few years ago, Slate was releasing bootlegged data. As I recall, VNS was successful in halting this practice by Slate.
4. Given that Drudge is not a VNS client, he surely is releasing proprietary information without authorization.

5. Clearly, VNS can not be responsible for unauthorized release of data.

Nick

Christopher Fleury wrote:

>
> *If* Drudge released proprietary information without authorizationn,
> then VNS or whoever may rightfully look for someone to blame for this
> infringement of its intellectual property rights. But I don't agree that
> the incident reflects a system in disarray. If a media source released
> timely and interesting information about public affairs, I'd say the
> system is working well.

>
> Chris

> James P. Murphy wrote:

>
> > In my comment yesterday on Exit Polls I only obliquely stated that Drudge
> > did not mention VNS by name. That should have been explicit. Since the
> > results were not attributed to VNS, but to unspecified "exit polls," VNS
is
> > arguably not accountable in the same manner as if they had been. While
the
> > episode reflects an electoral and reporting process in disarray, it's not
> > clear who's to blame.

> >
> >

>
> _____
> Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
> Survey Director
> Center for the Study of Services
> 733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
> Washington, DC 20005

> Voice: 202-454-3031
> Fax: 202-347-4000

> E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org

> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 14:11:34 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Subject: Dick Morris Blames Dems loss on . . . Mondale
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

WHAT I MISSED
Dick Morris

Highlights (such as they are)

TODAY, I have egg on my face, for predicting a Democratic win. Pardon me while I wipe it off. In politics, you are either right or wrong, and when you're wrong, you need to understand why so you don't make the same mistake again - you make new ones.

The repositioning of the '90s vanished in a nod of his gray head and, like twice-cooked pork in a Chinese restaurant, he led his party to a second defeat.

But, in a deeper sense, voters abandoned their traditional desire for split government in their desire to quiet the partisan bickering in Washington.

<http://nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/61569.htm>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 14:21:59 -0500
Reply-To: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth_Steve@TVRATINGS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth_Steve@TVRATINGS.COM>
Subject: Re: List question
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

If you haven't received a post from a given AAPORNet thread, don't worry it's on it's way. The duplicate I thought I received was an error on my part. I received the initial post from James Murphy after reading Warren's response which had his initial post copied at the bottom, one day later.

The way I've heard it explained, the web between or computers contains nodes/junctions that become clogged with traffic. When this occurs, the email will seek a free node to continue on it's way, kind of like taking a right at a red light rather than waiting for it to change when your going somewhere in your car. Because of this the path between the ASU server and

our own PCs is not necessarily the same for any two emails. This is probably why we just had the same article posted by two members.

For me personally, this phenomena has increased since AAPORNet was switched to the ASU server. I would assume this has something to do with differences in traffic patterns/levels between this server and the previous server. Norm sits in the cube next to me, and it took 5 hours for his AAPOR post to get here. It should make it interesting to try to follow threads (not that it wasn't already).

Anyway, I just wanted to dispel any possible myth I created with my last post.

Ken Steve

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

From: Trussell, Norman [mailto:Norman_Trussell@TVRATINGS.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 8:41 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: List question

Leo/Shap:

I to have experienced this on a fairly regular basis. A recent example was a posting by Mike Margolis (Sent: Friday, October 25, 2002 9:33 AM Subject: More on the Dillman Dollar) that was sent on Friday morning but never made it to my mailbox until Sunday afternoon. Shap's explanation was appreciated and contained valuable information, but I don't know that it explains this phenomenon.

Norm Trussell

> Leo G. Simonetta wrote:
> some people were responding to emails that I have not yet
> received (Rob Santos and Warren Mitofsky among others)
> while I have received other postings that are from a
> couple of hours later.

There are many variables that influence mail distribution. One new twist is anti-spam/adult content filters. We had a couple of user's servers reject a message last week that had a reference to "Mon_ca Lew__sky"--said it triggered "adult content filter." ('_' so this gets through)

Another message was rejected as spam because it had the phrases "for more information" "guaranteed" "no longer wish" and "thank you" in the text.

One university's server rejects all email with a message that requires a specific response; we have to see this and respond or the user never sees the message.

We catch some of these in error messages to the list owners, but I'm sure there are other instances where email is being filtered that we don't know about.

You might check with your IT staff, and ask that the AAPORNET@asu.edu address be added to an "accepted source/white hat" list.

One other problem is that Listserv examines each message for certain fields, to be sure it doesn't get into an endless loop of messages. When you quote an entire message in your reply it can look to Listserv as if there is a loop. The solution is to cut out the headers, footers, and any extra text---just quote the part of the message to which you're replying.

And as Leo just illustrated, all of the messages are easily accessible at the archives. You can sort them by topic and easily read all the replies.

Shap Wolf
Survey Research Laboratory/Arizona State University
AAPORNET volunteer host

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 14:32:40 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Dick Morris Blames Dems loss on . . . Mondale
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Talk about selective reporting! Read the whole piece.
<http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/61569.htm>
Morris is quite properly pointing the finger at himself for being
out-of-touch with what real voters care about.
Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 2:12 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Dick Morris Blames Dems loss on . . . Mondale

WHAT I MISSED
Dick Morris

Highlights (such as they are)

TODAY, I have egg on my face, for predicting a Democratic win. Pardon me while I wipe it off. In politics, you are either right or wrong, and when you're wrong, you need to understand why so you don't make the same mistake again - you make new ones.

The repositioning of the '90s vanished in a nod of his gray head and, like twice-cooked pork in a Chinese restaurant, he led his party to a second defeat.

But, in a deeper sense, voters abandoned their traditional desire for split government in their desire to quiet the partisan bickering in Washington.

<http://nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/61569.htm>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 14:35:01 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: List question
Comments: To: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth_Steve@TVRATINGS.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Just struck me - the address is aa PORN et. Some content filters are probably locking onto those four letters in CAPS!

NJE

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

From: Steve, Kenneth [mailto:Kenneth_Steve@TVRATINGS.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 2:22 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: List question

If you haven't received a post from a given AAPORNet thread, don't worry it's on it's way. The duplicate I thought I received was an error on my part. I received the initial post from James Murphy after reading Warren's response which had his initial post copied at the bottom, one day later.

The way I've heard it explained, the web between or computers contains nodes/junctions that become clogged with traffic. When this occurs, the email will seek a free node to continue on it's way, kind of like taking a right at a red light rather than waiting for it to change when your going somewhere in your car. Because of this the path between the ASU server and our own PCs is not necessarily the same for any two emails. This is probably why we just had the same article posted by two members.

For me personally, this phenomena has increased since AAPORNet was switched to the ASU server. I would assume this has something to do with differences in traffic patterns/levels between this server and the previous server. Norm sits in the cube next to me, and it took 5 hours for his AAPOR post to get here. It should make it interesting to try to follow threads (not that it wasn't already).

Anyway, I just wanted to dispel any possible myth I created with my last post.

Ken Steve

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

From: Trussell, Norman [mailto:Norman_Trussell@TVRATINGS.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 8:41 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: List question

Leo/Shap:

I to have experienced this on a fairly regular basis. A recent example was a posting by Mike Margolis (Sent: Friday, October 25, 2002 9:33 AM Subject: More on the Dillman Dollar) that was sent on Friday morning but never made it to my mailbox until Sunday afternoon. Shap's explanation was appreciated and contained valuable information, but I don't know that it explains this phenomenon.

Norm Trussell

> Leo G. Simonetta wrote:
> some people were responding to emails that I have not yet
> received (Rob Santos and Warren Mitofsky among others)

> while I have received other postings that are from a
> couple of hours later.

There are many variables that influence mail distribution. One new twist is anti-spam/adult content filters. We had a couple of user's servers reject a message last week that had a reference to "Mon_ca Lew__sky"--said it triggered "adult content filter." ('_' so this gets through)

Another message was rejected as spam because it had the phrases "for more information" "guaranteed" "no longer wish" and "thank you" in the text.

One university's server rejects all email with a message that requires a specific response; we have to see this and respond or the user never sees the message.

We catch some of these in error messages to the list owners, but I'm sure there are other instances where email is being filtered that we don't know about.

You might check with your IT staff, and ask that the AAPORNET@asu.edu address be added to an "accepted source/white hat" list.

One other problem is that Listserv examines each message for certain fields, to be sure it doesn't get into an endless loop of messages. When you quote an entire message in your reply it can look to Listserv as if there is a loop. The solution is to cut out the headers, footers, and any extra text---just quote the part of the message to which you're replying.

And as Leo just illustrated, all of the messages are easily accessible at the archives. You can sort them by topic and easily read all the replies.

Shap Wolf
Survey Research Laboratory/Arizona State University
AAPORNET volunteer host

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read

the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 12:05:58 -0800
Reply-To: paul@goodwinsimon.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paul Goodwin <paul@GOODWINSIMON.COM>
Organization: Goodwin Simon Strategic Research
Subject: FW: Dispatch Poll v. Actual
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The Columbus Dispatch took time out from its busy day to toot its own horn on the results of its pre-election survey by mail. In the wake of yesterday's comments about low response rates throwing telephone pollsters off, maybe we should all start buying lots of stamps and envelopes.

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

Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 11:51 AM
To: paul@goodwinsimon.com
Subject: Dispatch Poll v. Actual

F Y I

<<http://www.dispatch.com/images/triangle2.gif>>
<<http://www.dispatch.com/indexes/newsindex.php>> Local/State News
DISPATCH SURVEY
Poll predicted statewide sweep, victory margins

Thursday, November 7, 2002
<<mailto:drowland@dispatch.com>> Darrel Rowland
THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH

<<http://www.dispatch.com/news/news02/nov02/1477491-584833.jpg>>

Every winner in the final Dispatch Poll published Sunday was also a winner in Tuesday's election. Except in the volatile contest for the Ohio Supreme Court, the outcome for every candidate -- as well as State Issue 1 -- fell within the mail survey's margin of sampling error, 2 percentage points. The poll matched Gov. Bob Taft's winning percentage of 58 points -- the fifth straight gubernatorial election in which the poll accurately forecast the victor's share of the vote. Taft led a Republican sweep Tuesday of all seven statewide offices on the ballot. The survey also was within a single percentage point of the actual results of the candidates for attorney general and treasurer, as well as State Issue 1. The biggest differences were in the pair of races for the Supreme Court. The poll varied 2.2 points from the totals of Maureen O'Connor and Tim Black in one matchup, and was 3.3 points off the results of Evelyn Lundberg Stratton and Janet R. Burnside in the other face-off. The mail survey of 2,048 randomly selected registered voters was conducted from Oct. 25 through last Thursday. The Dispatch mailed

more than 12,000 poll ballots across the state to voters chosen by a computer. The Dispatch Poll is different from most other surveys, which typically use phone calls to determine their results.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.
=====

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 15:06:20 -0500
Reply-To: Peyton Craighill <craighillp@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Peyton Craighill <craighillp@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>
Subject: FW: training video
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Does anyone have a recommendation for a training video for face-to-face and phone interviews? Please respond to the email listed below.

many thanks

Peyton M. Craighill

Project Director

The Pew Research Center For The People & The Press

1150 18th Street, NW, Suite 975

Washington, DC 20036

202-293-3126x21

202-293-2569 fax

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

From: Dr. Bryan L. Williams [mailto:bryanw@u.arizona.edu]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 2:42 PM
To: mailprc@people-press.org
Subject:

I am looking for a training video for face-to-face and phone interviews. Can you point me to one that is available?

Bryan L. Williams, PhD
Associate Professor
University of Arizona
Phone: 626-3362
Homepage: <http://ebr-lab.ahsc.arizona.edu>
E-mail: bryanw@u.arizona.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 12:10:36 -0800
Reply-To: paul@goodwinsimon.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paul Goodwin <paul@GOODWINSIMON.COM>
Organization: Goodwin Simon Strategic Research
Subject: FW: Dispatch Poll v. Actual
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The Columbus Dispatch is tooting its own horn about the results of its pre-election survey by mail. In the wake of yesterday's comments about low response rates throwing telephone pollsters off, maybe we should all start buying lots of stamps and envelopes.

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

Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 11:51 AM
To: paul@goodwinsimon.com
Subject: Dispatch Poll v. Actual

F Y I

<<http://www.dispatch.com/images/triangle2.gif>>
<<http://www.dispatch.com/indexes/newsindex.php>> Local/State News
DISPATCH SURVEY
Poll predicted statewide sweep, victory margins

Thursday, November 7, 2002
<<mailto:drowland@dispatch.com>> Darrel Rowland
THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH

<<http://www.dispatch.com/news/news02/nov02/1477491-584833.jpg>>

Every winner in the final Dispatch Poll published Sunday was also a winner in Tuesday's election. Except in the volatile contest for the Ohio Supreme Court, the outcome for every candidate -- as well as State

Issue 1 -- fell within the mail survey's margin of sampling error, 2 percentage points. The poll matched Gov. Bob Taft's winning percentage of 58 points -- the fifth straight gubernatorial election in which the poll accurately forecast the victor's share of the vote. Taft led a Republican sweep Tuesday of all seven statewide offices on the ballot. The survey also was within a single percentage point of the actual results of the candidates for attorney general and treasurer, as well as State Issue 1. The biggest differences were in the pair of races for the Supreme Court. The poll varied 2.2 points from the totals of Maureen O'Connor and Tim Black in one matchup, and was 3.3 points off the results of Evelyn Lundberg Stratton and Janet R. Burnside in the other face-off. The mail survey of 2,048 randomly selected registered voters was conducted from Oct. 25 through last Thursday. The Dispatch mailed more than 12,000 poll ballots across the state to voters chosen by a computer. The Dispatch Poll is different from most other surveys, which typically use phone calls to determine their results.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 15:58:24 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: List question
Comments: To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Don't ever try e-mailing anybody tables or other stuff with columns headed "Cum." or you'll get your wrist slapped, as I did. (Let's see if this goes through.)

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

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

From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Thursday, November 07, 2002 2:46 PM
Subject: Re: List question

>Just struck me - the address is aa PORN et. Some content filters are
>probably locking onto those four letters in CAPS!
>NJE

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Steve, Kenneth [mailto:Kenneth_Steve@TVRATINGS.COM]
>Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 2:22 PM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Re: List question

>
>
>If you haven't received a post from a given AAPORNet thread, don't worry
>it's on it's way. The duplicate I thought I received was an error on my
>part. I received the initial post from James Murphy after reading Warren's
>response which had his initial post copied at the bottom, one day later.
>
>The way I've heard it explained, the web between or computers contains
>nodes/junctions that become clogged with traffic. When this occurs, the
>email will seek a free node to continue on it's way, kind of like taking a
>right at a red light rather than waiting for it to change when your going
>somewhere in your car. Because of this the path between the ASU server and
>our own PCs is not necessarily the same for any two emails. This is
>probably why we just had the same article posted by two members.
>
>For me personally, this phenomena has increased since AAPORNet was switched
>to the ASU server. I would assume this has something to do with
differences
>in traffic patterns/levels between this server and the previous server.
>Norm sits in the cube next to me, and it took 5 hours for his AAPOR post to
>get here. It should make it interesting to try to follow threads (not that
>it wasn't already).
>
>Anyway, I just wanted to dispel any possible myth I created with my last
>post.
>
>Ken Steve
>
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Trussell, Norman [mailto:Norman_Trussell@TVRATINGS.COM]
>Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 8:41 AM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Re: List question
>
>
>Leo/Shap:
>
>I to have experienced this on a fairly regular basis. A recent example was
>a posting by Mike Margolis (Sent: Friday, October 25, 2002 9:33 AM Subject:
>More on the Dillman Dollar) that was sent on Friday morning but never made
>it to my mailbox until Sunday afternoon. Shap's explanation was
appreciated
>and contained valuable information, but I don't know that it explains this
>phenomenon.
>
>Norm Trussell
>
>
>> Leo G. Simonetta wrote:
>> some people were responding to emails that I have not yet
>> received (Rob Santos and Warren Mitofsky among others)
>> while I have received other postings that are from a
>> couple of hours later.
>
>There are many variables that influence mail distribution. One new twist is
>anti-spam/adult content filters. We had a couple of user's servers reject a

>message last week that had a reference to "Mon_ca Lew__sky"--said it
>triggered
>"adult content filter." ('_' so this gets through)
>
>Another message was rejected as spam because it had the phrases "for more
>information" "guaranteed" "no longer wish" and "thank you" in the text.
>
>One university's server rejects all email with a message that requires a
>specific response; we have to see this and respond or the user never sees
>the message.
>
>We catch some of these in error messages to the list owners, but I'm sure
>there are other instances where email is being filtered that we don't know
>about.
>
>You might check with your IT staff, and ask that the AAPORNET@asu.edu
>address be added to an "accepted source/white hat" list.
>
>One other problem is that Listserv examines each message for certain
>fields,
>to be sure it doesn't get into an endless loop of messages. When you quote
>an entire message in your reply it can look to Listserv as if there is a
>loop. The solution is to cut out the headers, footers, and any extra
>text---just quote the part of the message to which you're replying.
>
>And as Leo just illustrated, all of the messages are easily accessible at
>the archives. You can sort them by topic and easily read all the replies.
>
>Shap Wolf
>Survey Research Laboratory/Arizona State University
>AAPORNET volunteer host
>
>-----
>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>-----
>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.
>
>-----
>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.
>
>-----
>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.
>
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 15:49:22 -0500
Reply-To: Kenwinneg@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Kenneth M. Winneg" <Kenwinneg@AOL.COM>
Subject: Survey Coordinator Position at Children's Hospital of
Philadelphia (CHOP)
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

I am posting the following on behalf of CHOP.

Coordinator, TraumaLink, The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (CHOP)

Join a nationally renowned interdisciplinary team researching and preventing childhood injuries. TraumaLink is seeking a Coordinator for its premiere study of child passenger safety. This is a collaborative study with a high public presence. The position coordinates all aspects of surveillance data collection, fosters positive relationships with funders and data sources, and liaises with consultants and subcontractors for technical work. The research involves a large national telephone survey, in-depth crash investigations, and interdisciplinary analyses. The individual will also be responsible for coordination of smaller grant- and contract-funded studies.

For information on TraumaLink: www.traumalink.chop.edu.

Bachelors required, Masters preferred, in Public Health, Health Education, or a related field. Research coordination experience required.

Please submit a Resume and the names and contact information for three references to E. Mayo, The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, HR Department, 34th Street & Civic Center Boulevard, Philadelphia, PA 19104, email: mayoe@email.chop.edu or fax information to 215.590.4644. Reference ID#57 on all correspondence.

We offer competitive compensation packages: medical, vision, dental and life insurance; discounts on public transportation and employee parking; tuition assistance, training and staff development; generous paid time off; employer contribution retirement plan and work/life benefits.

The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia and the Joseph Stokes Jr. Research Institute are proud to be Equal Opportunity Employers.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.
=====

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 15:48:41 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Dick Morris Blames Dems loss on . . . Mondale
In-Reply-To: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E09D198EB@isr.umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

While I was somewhat flip in my characterization of what exactly Dick Morris had to say in his NYPost article - I think that, while I could have been more complete in my listing of what Dick Morris missed (I listed 2 out of 3), I did not materially mischaracterize his arguments.

Nathaniel is correct that Morris ends up in saying his predictions (of the Democrats picking up seats) were wrong because:

" Unfortunately, I missed many of these developments as they were unfolding. The hardest thing to do in politics is to be an insider and think like an outsider - like a real, live voter.

To an insider, of course the Dems nominated Mondale: He's been a presence in the party for decades. But he reminded outsiders of a past they would rather forget.

The conflict endemic to Washington becomes normal to an insider. Like a mother of an unruly child, she doesn't really hear the crying and screaming anymore. But to outsiders, terrified of terrorism, the raucous display of partisanship is threatening and offensive.

To paraphrase Rudyard Kipling, you've got to walk with kings but keep the common touch. It's hard to do."

So Morris does point the finger at himself for being out of touch - but that is not why he says the Democrats lost. He predicted they would win because he wasn't following these developments:

The first development he tells us about is what I will call for lack of a better name - the Mondale effect

Quoting again

"Here's why I think the Democrats lost:

The closing week of the election featured old Walter Mondale as the poster boy for the Democrats. Having led them to defeat in 1984, he came back for an encore in 2002 with the same result. Not only did the has-been liberal go down to defeat in his home state of Minnesota, but he dragged the party's Senate candidates down with him.

Looking like an aging member of Brezhnev's Politburo, he seemed the ghost of liberalism past as he emerged as his party's best-known Senate candidate. His very appearance told one volumes about the Democratic Party's embrace of his tax-and-spend past. The repositioning of the '90s vanished in a nod of his gray head and, like twice-cooked pork in a Chinese restaurant, he led his party to a second defeat. "

Next he goes on to talk about a distaste for partisan bickering and closes his list of un-noticed changes with:

"Finally, the 2002 election adds to the copious evidence that the economy is no longer the central issue on which electoral fortunes hinge. In 1992, Bill Clinton was able to power his way to the presidency by focusing on the economy (although other issues like his pledges to "end welfare as we know it" and to embrace a middle class tax cut also played a key role)."

To my reading of the article - these are the three developments (Mondale and his baggage, a distaste for bickering, and changes in how we view the economy) that Morris did not see that led him to predict that the Democrats would win.

Of course, I encourage everyone to read the entire article.

<http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/61569.htm>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nathaniel Ehrlich
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 2:33 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Dick Morris Blames Dems loss on . . . Mondale

Talk about selective reporting! Read the whole piece.

<http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/61569.htm>

Morris is quite properly pointing the finger at himself for being

out-of-touch with what real voters care about.
Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 13:42:06 -0700
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Re: List question (our name)
Comments: cc: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0

> From: Nathaniel Ehrlich
> Just struck me - the address is aaPORNet. Some content
> filters are probably locking onto those four letters in CAPS! NJE
(Separating our name into its offensive parts did trigger a few filters--I
removed the spaces above so this gets through.)

This was raised a few years ago, and at the time no one could find any
instances where this was the problem.

On the site that filtered the post with Monica Lewinsky, all I had to do was
replace some letters of her name with spaces or '_' and it went through--so
our list name wasn't the trigger.

Thanks to Norm for pointing out the varied paths email can take. It turns
out that this morning, mail directed to ASU through one of our three main
internet connections was delayed. This has been resolved, but may cause
apparent out-of-sequence messages for a few more hours.

Please let me know if you are notified AAPORNET messages are being screened
based on our name.

Shap Wolf

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 16:21:00 -0500
Reply-To: "Downing, Kim (DOWNINK)" <DOWNINK@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Downing, Kim (DOWNINK)" <DOWNINK@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>
Subject: Re: The Ohio Poll (was: Dispatch Poll v. Actual)

Comments: To: "paul@goodwinsimon.com" <paul@goodwinsimon.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

The Ohio Poll, a statewide telephone survey conducted by the University of Cincinnati Institute for Policy Research, also made projections in the same races with the same level of accuracy.

A press release discussing some of these results is attached.

Kim Downing and Eric Rademacher

PS For those interested in The Ohio Poll, this and other releases are available at www.ipr.uc.edu .

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

From: Paul Goodwin [mailto:paul@GOODWINSIMON.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 3:06 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: FW: Dispatch Poll v. Actual

The Columbus Dispatch took time out from its busy day to toot its own horn on the results of its pre-election survey by mail. In the wake of yesterday's comments about low response rates throwing telephone pollsters off, maybe we should all start buying lots of stamps and envelopes.

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

Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 11:51 AM
To: paul@goodwinsimon.com
Subject: Dispatch Poll v. Actual

F Y I

<<http://www.dispatch.com/images/triangle2.gif>>
<<http://www.dispatch.com/indexes/newsindex.php>> Local/State News
DISPATCH SURVEY
Poll predicted statewide sweep, victory margins

Thursday, November 7, 2002
<<mailto:drowland@dispatch.com>> Darrel Rowland
THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH

<<http://www.dispatch.com/news/news02/nov02/1477491-584833.jpg>>

Every winner in the final Dispatch Poll published Sunday was also a winner in Tuesday's election. Except in the volatile contest for the Ohio Supreme Court, the outcome for every candidate -- as well as State Issue 1 -- fell within the mail survey's margin of sampling error, 2 percentage points. The poll matched Gov. Bob Taft's winning percentage of 58 points -- the fifth straight gubernatorial election in which the poll accurately forecast the victor's share of the vote. Taft led a Republican sweep Tuesday of all seven statewide offices on the ballot. The survey also was within a single percentage point of the actual results of the candidates for attorney general and treasurer, as well as State Issue 1. The biggest differences were in the pair of races for the Supreme Court. The poll varied 2.2 points from the totals of Maureen O'Connor and Tim Black in one matchup, and was 3.3 points off the results of Evelyn Lundberg Stratton and Janet R. Burnside in the other face-off. The mail survey of 2,048 randomly selected registered voters was conducted from Oct. 25 through last Thursday. The Dispatch mailed more than 12,000 poll ballots across the state to voters chosen by a computer. The Dispatch Poll is different from most other surveys, which typically use phone calls to determine their results.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 16:45:54 -0500
Reply-To: RFunk787@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>
Subject: VNS, exit polls, etc
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I believe Warren Mitofsky raised the question of studies showing that early calls of elections had any effect on subsequent voting. Re the VNS/Network fluctuating calls on Florida, I read somewhere that calling the state for Gore BEFORE the Panhandle polls closed (because of being in a later time zone) cost GWB as many as 10,000 votes, certainly sufficient to put rants about dimpled chads etc to rest once and for all. But I have no idea what "studies" supported this claim, so am only passing along what I heard. Perhaps someone can identify such studies, if any. This is a side of the issue of the VNS/2000 debacle we haven't heard much about in the aftermath, as for example in the present discussion.

Ray Funkhouser

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 14:54:01 -0800
Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Subject: Re: Dick Morris Blames Dems loss on . . . Mondale
In-Reply-To: <000501c2869f\$111f9640\$130a010a@LEO>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

>To paraphrase Rudyard Kipling, you've got to walk with kings but keep
>the common touch. It's hard to do."

I no longer do political polling, so I may not have Dick Morris' expertise
(for whatever that's worth), but I am less of an insider and have certainly
walked with fewer kings (none, actually) than he has. And I think he's
wrong about why the Dems lost.

I don't know about the state races, but for the US House and Senate races,
my take is that many of the Dems who lost (with exceptions like Mondale)
were defeated because they were too cowed or gutless to draw clear
distinctions between themselves and their Republican opponents. They were
trying to run as Bush Lites. Therefore much of their base constituencies
stayed home. Unless I'm mistaken, large numbers of Democratic voters
didn't vote Republican this time, they just saw no reason to vote at all.

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford Alumni Association
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 18:23:59 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Dick Morris Blames Dems loss on . . . Mondale
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dick Morris was never a pollster and doesn't have much expertise in
polling. He calls himself a political consultant, but he is basically a
shrewd con artist exploiting his notoriety for all that it is worth. If
he does have any real insight as to why the Dems lost so many races this

year, he is most surely not giving that away for free.

Anything Morris writes for public consumption should not be taken seriously.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Jerold Pearson wrote:

>
> >To paraphrase Rudyard Kipling, you've got to walk with kings but keep
> >the common touch. It's hard to do."
>
> I no longer do political polling, so I may not have Dick Morris' expertise
> (for whatever that's worth), but I am less of an insider and have certainly
> walked with fewer kings (none, actually) than he has. And I think he's
> wrong about why the Dems lost.
>
> I don't know about the state races, but for the US House and Senate races,
> my take is that many of the Dems who lost (with exceptions like Mondale)
> were defeated because they were too cowed or gutless to draw clear
> distinctions between themselves and their Republican opponents. They were
> trying to run as Bush Lites. Therefore much of their base constituencies
> stayed home. Unless I'm mistaken, large numbers of Democratic voters
> didn't vote Republican this time, they just saw no reason to vote at all.
>
> Jerold Pearson, '75
> Director of Market Research
> Stanford Alumni Association
> 650-723-9186
> jpearson@stanford.edu
> <http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 17:39:28 -0600
Reply-To: Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lydia Saad <Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Voodoo
Comments: To: Hogan.Sean@UIS.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Ornstein is quite wrong.

As all of my Gallup Poll colleagues, and any former Gallup Poll staffer can tell you, the Gallup Poll has a half century track record of predicting the national two party vote for Congress within a whisker. See Moore, David W. and Saad, Lydia. 1997. "The Generic Ballot in Midterm Congressional Elections; It's Accuracy and Relationship to House Seats." Public Opinion Quarterly, 61:603-614.

There is no difference in predicting how all Americans will vote for Congress than in predicting how all Americans will vote for president -- except that the congressional prediction may be somewhat easier. That's quite different than predicting what the result will be in each of the 435 districts, but Gallup's generic ballot, based on likely voters, can tell you what the aggregate total will be. Up through 1994, that aggregate could also accurately predict what the seat distribution would be, based on a regression analysis using data from the 1950-1990 midterms. (The metric changed with the GOP takeover since 1994, so modeling seats is a bit dicier now.)

This year Gallup's final pre-election generic ballot for Congress, with undecideds allocated proportionally, showed 53% of likely voters nationwide favoring the Republican candidate in their district; 47% favoring the Democrat.

That is EXACTLY the same as the early calculations of the actual two-party vote.

<http://www.upi.com/view.cfm?StoryID=20021106-014531-8274r>

A large part of Gallup's success in achieving this accuracy is the science of defining likely voters that we inherited from Dr. Gallup and his long time methodologist, Paul Perry.

Anyone interested in more information can contact myself, David Moore, Frank Newport, or Jeff Jones at the Gallup Poll in Princeton.

Lydia Saad
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll
609-924-9600

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

From: Hogan, Sean [mailto:Hogan.Sean@UIS.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 9:33 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Voodoo

From this morning's Chicago Tribune:

"We try to portray polling as a science, but it's a witchcraft kind of art," said Norm Ornstein, a political scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. "When it comes to the midterm elections, we're trying to predict how 35% of the electorate will vote, but we don't know which 35% will turn out. It's beyond embarrassing."

Sean O. Hogan
Assistant Director

Survey Research Office
Abraham Lincoln Presidential Center for Governmental Studies
University of Illinois at Springfield
One University Plaza, HRB 120
Springfield, IL 62703-5407
217/206-6591
hogan.sean@uis.edu
<http://sro.uis.edu>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 16:07:20 -0800
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <hank@surveysystem.com>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I, too, would be interested in any studies that show projecting winners before the polls close affects votes. In the Florida case, why posit that Bush voters in the Panhandle stayed home, but Gore voters did not - or is the idea that the Panhandle is Republican, so any lower turnout there would affect Bush disproportionately? Also, weren't the calls only about 15 minutes before the polls closed in the Panhandle? If so, how many people could they even have potentially affected? How many would have had to stay home to give Gore a 10,000 vote advantage?

While I do not have any data on the Panhandle, I did look into the issue of projecting winners depressing turnout in an informal way in the early 80's by comparing 1980, when Regan won before the polls closed in the West, compared to 1976, when Carter did not win early. If I recall correctly, California's 1980 turnout was at least as high as 1976. Despite this, many politicians at the time got lots of media coverage decrying the evil networks for not keeping the winner secret until the polls closed in CA. Of course the politicians in CA never mentioned AK or HI.

Hank Zucker

----- Original Message -----
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 1:45 PM
Subject: VNS, exit polls, etc

> I believe Warren Mitofsky raised the question of studies showing that
early
> calls of elections had any effect on subsequent voting. Re the
VNS/Network
> fluctuating calls on Florida, I read somewhere that calling the state
for
> Gore BEFORE the Panhandle polls closed (because of being in a later time
> zone) cost GWB as many as 10,000 votes, certainly sufficient to put rants
> about dimpled chads etc to rest once and for all. But I have no idea
what
> "studies" supported this claim, so am only passing along what I heard.
> Perhaps someone can identify such studies, if any. This is a side of the
> issue of the VNS/2000 debacle we haven't heard much about in the
aftermath,
> as for example in the present discussion.
>
> Ray Funkhouser
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.
>
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 16:39:27 -0800
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
In-Reply-To: <[013901c286bb\\$ce097d90\\$03c8a8c0@SMAX](mailto:013901c286bb$ce097d90$03c8a8c0@SMAX)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

That whole Florida panhandle thing was a complete crock of ****. (Notice that I have self-censored to fool the filters ;)) When the networks infamously called Florida for Gore, it was around 15 minutes before the polls closed in the panhandle. Anyone who was going to vote was already in line attempting to do so (and having a lot more success in those attempts, by the way than those elsewhere in the state). 10,000 votes? Please! This was just part of a very well-orchestrated Republican misinformation campaign that a credulous "liberal media" bought hook, line and sinker. (Another example was the idea that a chad could somehow GET poked out part way without actually BEING poked by someone, an assertion more comfortable in the field of theology than science.)

-- Joel

Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research Laboratory

Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate
Telephone: 541-346-0891
jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu
http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbloom

5245 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5245
Facsimile: 541-346-0388
http://osrl.uoregon.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 19:39:29 -0500
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments: To: Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>
In-Reply-To: <013901c286bb\$ce097d90\$03c8a8c0@SMAX>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

There were some studies triggered by Jimmy Carter's early concession in 1980. See John E. Jackson, "Election Night Reporting and Voter Turnout," American Journal of Political Science, 27 (1983) 615-635. Also Michael X. Delli Carpini, "Scooping the Voters? Consequences of the Networks' Early Call of the 1980 Presidential Race," Journal of Politics, 7 (1984) 48-50.

Both show some effect, but it's benign because voters appear to use the information rationally. I have used them to support an argument that there should be no restrictions on any kind of voting information at any time.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 17:11:57 -0800
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <hank@surveysystem.com>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments: To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thanks for the references, Philip.

Thanks also for the comment about voters using the information rationally. I very much agree. I would like to see AAPOR take a formal position that democracy is not served by keeping information from the voters, but I do not know how many of our colleagues agree with us.

Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
Creative Research Systems
www.surveysystem.com
(707) 765-1001

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

From: "Philip Meyer" <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
To: "Hank Zucker" <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>
Cc: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 4:39 PM
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc

> There were some studies triggered by Jimmy Carter's early concession in
> 1980. See John E. Jackson, "Election Night Reporting and Voter Turnout,"
> American Journal of Political Science, 27 (1983) 615-635. Also Michael X.
> Delli Carpini, "Scooping the Voters? Consequences of the Networks' Early
> Call of the 1980 Presidential Race," Journal of Politics, 7 (1984) 48-50.

> Both show some effect, but it's benign because voters appear to use the
> information rationally. I have used them to support an argument that there
> should be no restrictions on any kind of voting information at any time.

> =====
> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
> University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
> Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
> Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
> =====

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 21:20:54 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: European Economy and French Political Climate
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

In the spirit of Internationalism, here are some polls that have been reported in French, in my rough translation (others with French language skills please feel free to add...). Mark Richards

SOFRES conducted telephone interviews for Soci=E9t=E9 G=E9n=E9rale Asset Management et La Vie Francaise with 230 financial experts in eight European nations--France (40), United Kingdom (40), Germany (40), Switzerland (30), Belgium and Netherlands (40), Italy and Spain (40).

http://www.sofres.com/etudes/comfi/cf_eurobaro_102002.htm=20

SOFRES found a high level of pessimism: 60% somewhat pessimistic--but only 3% very pessimistic. Only 1% were very optimistic, but 35% were somewhat optimistic. Investors were most optimistic about the financial sector. When asked about the country with the most potential for growth, 39% said U.S., 21% Great Britain, 15% Asia, 14% France, 8% Germany, 8% emerging countries/markets, and 3% Japan. =20

Another study was undertaken by SOFRES Oct. 23-24 for le Figaro-Magazine among a national sample of 1,000 adults, and apparently repeated in November--but I cannot determine the dates.

http://www.sofres.com/etuds/pol/041102_barofig_r.htm

In November, SOFRES found, from a list of priorities the government should undertake, 44% prioritized the fight against violence and criminality; 33% the fight against unemployment, 10% maintaining social peace, 8% fighting rising prices, 5% maintaining the buying power.

More questions:

Question: When you look at the manner in which France is evolving, do you have the impression that things will likely get better/work themselves out or, on the contrary, things have a tendency to get worse?

Things will get better/work themselves out - 17%
Things have a tendency to get worse - 64%
Nothing changes - 17%
No opinion - 2%

Question: Do you think that in the next two or three months there will be many or few social conflicts?

Many - 72%
Few - 21%
No opinion - 7%

Question: In your opinion, in the next two or three months, do you think the principle problems in France (LIST)...

Can be solved by negotiation and compromise - 46%
Risk leading to aggression and violence - 46%

Question: do you think that the role of France in the world is getting stronger or weaker?

Stronger - 35%
Weaker - 38%
No change - 19%
No opinion - 8%

Question: Do you have complete confidence, some confidence, very little confidence, or no confidence in Jacques Chirac to resolve the problems that France is actually dealing with?

Very confident - 7%
Somewhat confident - 42%
Not too confident - 29%
Not at all confident - 19%
No opinion - 3%

Question: And do you have complete confidence, some confidence, very little confidence, or no confidence in Jean-Pierre Raffarin to resolve the problems that France is actually dealing with?

Very confident - 11%
Somewhat confident - 45%
Not too confident - 22%
Not at all confident - 15%
No opinion - 7%

Opinions of Political Parties:

Communist: Good, 22%; Bad, 63%
Socialist: Good, 45%; Bad, 45% (FYI: They're going through a crisis)
Greens: Good 44%, Bad, 46%
UDF: Good, 39%; Bad, 46%
RPR: Good, 40%; Bad, 49% (FYI: Chirac's party)
Front National: Good, 10%; Bad, 85% (FYI: Le Pen's party, which sent voters who would never imagined they could vote Chirac, rushing to the polls to vote for him...)

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 01:14:07 -0500
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: VNS, exit polls, etc
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

These are the two studies Phil Meyer recommended. John Jackson re-interviewed people originally interviewed by Michigan for their post election survey. He did it two months after the election. Jackson's conclusion is based on reports from 11 people who claimed they were influenced not to vote because of projections. Of the 11, some were not registered and other voted when Michigan checked their registration and

voting. Delli Carpini is a macro analysis not based on personal reports.
Good luck drawing conclusions from those two studies.
warren mitofsky

At 07:39 PM 11/7/02 -0500, you wrote:

There were some studies triggered by Jimmy Carter's early concession in 1980. See John E. Jackson, "Election Night Reporting and Voter Turnout," American Journal of Political Science, 27 (1983) 615-635. Also Michael X. Delli Carpini, "Scooping the Voters? Consequences of the Networks' Early Call of the 1980 Presidential Race," Journal of Politics, 7 (1984) 48-50.

Both show some effect, but it's benign because voters appear to use the information rationally. I have used them to support an argument that there should be no restrictions on any kind of voting information at any time.

=====
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
=====

Warren Mitofsky

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

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

email: mitofsky@mindspring.com
http://www.mitofskyinternational.com

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 06:40:54 -0500
Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Isn't this a cost benefit problem? Are there offsetting benefits to the public generated by exit polls that are clearly greater than the potential costs? Frankly I am unwilling to make plays in the futures market overnight based on my assessment of the impact of the predictions of exit polls. I can barely do it when I know the "real" results.

Don't the benefits largely accrue to the networks and their ratings?
I enjoy the exit polls for their entertainment value not for their
information content.
If I go to the track, I read the sheets, place my bets, and then enjoy the
race.
The exit polls attempt to provide a description of the race as its going on
but
should never under any circumstance be able to impact the final result.

Here in Delaware, the polls closed at 8pm and the 100% of the votes were
reported on the internet by 10pm. If the elapsed time of the race is short
enough, who needs exit polls at all.

Ed Ratledge

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

From: G. Ray Funkhouser [mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 4:46 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: VNS, exit polls, etc

I believe Warren Mitofsky raised the question of studies showing that early
calls of elections had any effect on subsequent voting. Re the VNS/Network
fluctuating calls on Florida, I read somewhere that calling the state for
Gore BEFORE the Panhandle polls closed (because of being in a later time
zone) cost GWB as many as 10,000 votes, certainly sufficient to put rants
about dimpled chads etc to rest once and for all. But I have no idea what
"studies" supported this claim, so am only passing along what I heard.
Perhaps someone can identify such studies, if any. This is a side of the
issue of the VNS/2000 debacle we haven't heard much about in the aftermath,
as for example in the present discussion.

Ray Funkhouser

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 08:59:51 -0500
Reply-To: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
Organization: Center for the Study of Services
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments: To: Hank Zucker <hank@surveysystem.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I agree, too. I am more troubled by the embargo on exit polling news than I am by the possibility that some voters may choose to act on such information if it were released. It is disappointing that all of the major networks have joined a cartel to keep the public from knowing what the public has told pollsters until it is too late for the public to do anything with this information. It is further disappointing that the public opinion research community is not more assertive on this point.

Chris

Hank Zucker wrote:

> Thanks for the references, Philip.
>
> Thanks also for the comment about voters using the information rationally.
> I very much agree. I would like to see AAPOR take a formal position that
> democracy is not served by keeping information from the voters, but I do
> not
> know how many of our colleagues agree with us.
>
>
> Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
> Creative Research Systems
> www.surveysystem.com
> (707) 765-1001

Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
Survey Director
Center for the Study of Services
733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
Washington, DC 20005

Voice: 202-454-3031
Fax: 202-347-4000

E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 09:19:17 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments: To: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Who really knows what influences voters? Perhaps we should do a survey...
Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: Christopher Fleury [mailto:cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG]
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 9:00 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc

I agree, too. I am more troubled by the embargo on exit polling news than I am by the possibility that some voters may choose to act on such information if it were released. It is disappointing that all of the major networks have joined a cartel to keep the public from knowing what the public has told pollsters until it is too late for the public to do anything with this information. It is further disappointing that the public opinion research community is not more assertive on this point.

Chris

Hank Zucker wrote:

> Thanks for the references, Philip.
>
> Thanks also for the comment about voters using the information rationally.
> I very much agree. I would like to see AAPOR take a formal position that
> democracy is not served by keeping information from the voters, but I do
> not
> know how many of our colleagues agree with us.
>
>
> Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
> Creative Research Systems
> www.surveysystem.com
> (707) 765-1001

Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
Survey Director
Center for the Study of Services
733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
Washington, DC 20005

Voice: 202-454-3031
Fax: 202-347-4000

E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 09:32:29 -0500
Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

So the purpose of the exit polls is to provide information that would
influence
voters in the current election? I hope not.

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

From: Christopher Fleury [<mailto:cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>]
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 9:00 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc

I agree, too. I am more troubled by the embargo on exit polling news
than I am by the possibility that some voters may choose to act on such
information if it were released. It is disappointing that all of the
major networks have joined a cartel to keep the public from knowing what
the public has told pollsters until it is too late for the public to do
anything with this information. It is further disappointing that the
public opinion research community is not more assertive on this point.

Chris

Hank Zucker wrote:

> Thanks for the references, Philip.
>
> Thanks also for the comment about voters using the information rationally.
> I very much agree. I would like to see AAPOR take a formal position that
> democracy is not served by keeping information from the voters, but I do
> not
> know how many of our colleagues agree with us.
>
>
> Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
> Creative Research Systems

> www.surveysystem.com
> (707) 765-1001

Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
Survey Director
Center for the Study of Services
733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
Washington, DC 20005

Voice: 202-454-3031
Fax: 202-347-4000

E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 09:54:03 -0500
Reply-To: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
Organization: Center for the Study of Services
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments: To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

No, that is not their purpose. However, many people are apparently
concerned that that may be their effect. My point is that if the
release of exit poll data does have some effect on some voters, so be
it. This prospect is not a sufficient justification for withholding the
information from the public.

Chris

Ratledge, Edward wrote:

> So the purpose of the exit polls is to provide information that would
> influence
> voters in the current election? I hope not.
>

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Christopher Fleury [mailto:cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG]
> Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 9:00 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
>
>
> I agree, too. I am more troubled by the embargo on exit polling news
> than I am by the possibility that some voters may choose to act on such
> information if it were released. It is disappointing that all of the
> major networks have joined a cartel to keep the public from knowing what
> the public has told pollsters until it is too late for the public to do
> anything with this information. It is further disappointing that the
> public opinion research community is not more assertive on this point.
>
> Chris
>
> Hank Zucker wrote:
>
>
>>Thanks for the references, Philip.
>>
>>Thanks also for the comment about voters using the information rationally.
>>I very much agree. I would like to see AAPOR take a formal position that
>>democracy is not served by keeping information from the voters, but I do
>>
> not
>
>>know how many of our colleagues agree with us.
>>
>>
>>Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
>>Creative Research Systems
>>www.surveysystem.com
>>(707) 765-1001
>>
>
>
>
>
> _____
> Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
> Survey Director
> Center for the Study of Services
> 733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
> Washington, DC 20005
>
> Voice: 202-454-3031
> Fax: 202-347-4000
>
> E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

--

Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
Survey Director
Center for the Study of Services
733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
Washington, DC 20005

Voice: 202-454-3031

Fax: 202-347-4000

E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 10:18:16 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Michael Kinsley on exit poll restrictions
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

The following is Michael Kinsley's commentary on the networks'
restrictions on exit polls as published in Slate today
(<http://slate.msn.com/?id=2073637&device=>).

A version omitting the reference to Marty Plissner's Slate article
yesterday also appears in today's Washington Post
(<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A25748-2002Nov7.html>).

Note that Kinsley was the editor of Slate a few years back when they
tried to circumvent the networks' blackout on publishing exit poll
results before the polls had closed.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Election Night Ignorance

By Michael Kinsley

Posted Thursday, November 7, 2002, at 2:11 PM PT

Why is this night different from all other nights? On all other nights, the media go after the big story, find out as much as they can about it, and report what they know. But on Election Night, the media strenuously avoid the big story, try not to find out too much about it, and are careful not to reveal what they know.

On all other nights journalists try to get the story before anyone else does. This is called a "scoop" and is generally regarded in the profession as a good thing. But on Election Night journalists forswear scoops and brag about their self-restraint.

On all other nights citizens prefer that journalists tell them the truth and become quite agitated if they believe they are being kept in the dark or lied to. But on Election Night citizens demand to be kept in the dark and become agitated if they are told the truth.

There is only one big story Election Night: Who won? Even under the best of circumstances, this is a problem for the TV folk. Never is there more time to fill and less material to fill it with. Party conventions are as narratively rich as *The Sopranos* in comparison. And thanks to exit polls, the people reporting the election generally know the likely outcome many hours before they report it. But journalists, politicians, commissions of high-minded worthies, and many ordinary citizens are under the delusion that it corrupts the electoral process for the media to report what they know.

So, every election cycle the self-imposed rules get tighter about when the networks may "call" an election. At three seconds past the appointed hour, the result is announced as if the heavens had suddenly opened to reveal it. A decade ago the Voter News Service was formed to monopolize the exit-poll business and make it harder for any one network to get the story first. (By no coincidence, doing it jointly also saves them pots of money.)

After the Florida double-miscall disaster of 2000, the networks spent millions revamping the VNS computer system and vowed extra-special caution about calling any race too soon. A couple of them went so far as to "cloister" their exit-poll analysts (as the *New York Times* put it) to prevent the information everyone wants to hear from leaking onto the airwaves prematurely. When I worked at CNN in the 1990s, there were special terminals on Election Night where you could punch in any major race and get the probable result. But you not only could not reveal this information to viewers—you could not even acknowledge that you had it. Oh, what tangled webs we weave when first we practice to deceive.

In any event, the new VNS computers didn't work. As Marty Plissner explained Wednesday in *Slate*, the networks did have the raw exit-poll numbers, which they were not supposed to use until polls closed, but they didn't have the rich demographic data, which is

what the exit polls are supposed to be for. ("Women under 5 feet, 2 inches who drink gin more than once a week are tilting Democratic tonight, Dan.") I don't know about you, but the election-night punditry struck me as no more or less Delphic than in earlier years, when more data was available and the rules about using it were looser.

After all, even without exit polls, there still are polls of all sorts conducted right up to the day before the election. And there is no anathema on using these—indeed they are the basis for most election-night commentary. The main difference between a poll taken the day before an election and a poll taken as people exit the voting booth is that the exit poll is probably more accurate. So, the net effect of keeping exit-poll results off the air for hours is to make election coverage less accurate on average, not more so.

Of course it is generally felt that people can be trusted to understand that a non-exit poll is just a sampling and may not be accurate. And no one seems to feel that his or her vote has somehow been "stolen" by a regular poll showing that a particular race is a foregone conclusion. But about exit polls, people are regarded—and millions apparently regard themselves—as incapable of such understanding.

Arguing with superstition is generally futile, but let me try one more time.

Look, despite pious civic propaganda, it's just not true that your one vote could determine the result. That never happens, even in Florida. Individually, our votes don't matter, but cumulatively they do. That is a logical conundrum, and you can decide for yourself if it makes voting worthwhile. But whatever you may decide about that is just as true (or just as false) no matter what time you vote. And it is just as true (or false) whether you know how others have voted or you don't. Exit polls, in short, have nothing to do with it. They cannot steal your vote.

Fairness to individual late voters aside, does reporting of exit polls while people are still voting sometimes affect the result? There is no logical reason why this should happen—are you more likely to drop out of line if you hear that your candidate is projected to lose or to win?—and no evidence that it does happen. But isn't it bad if people don't vote, even if it doesn't change the result? Well, maybe. But promoting superstition, ignorance, and deceit seems worse, and restrictions on exit polls involve all three.

Now that VNS has blown it for the second time in a row, maybe some network will say, "Screw this. From now on we're going to find out the one thing people want to know, we're going to find it out as soon as we can, and we're going to tell people as soon as we find out." What did they used to call that? Oh, yes: news.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your

main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

```
=====
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 09:18:37 -0600
Reply-To: Don Ferree <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Don Ferree <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments-To: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
In-Reply-To: <3DCBD00B.4000301@cssresearch.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
```

Two points. From my standpoint, the exit polls have two quite legitimate (and related but not identical) values.

First, is better to inform news coverage on election night (both directly in reporting the results) and by guiding stories to inform the public. This includes how the "races" are going but is by no means limited to it, extending rather to issue coalitions, apparent differential turnout, etc., etc.

Second is to provide the best and indeed close to only source of information for analyzing the election afterward, covering the same sort of concerns, llsted above, with a lesser weight on the horserace aspect.

Another point. Most of us are probably NOT in the habit of releasing partial results of surveys while they are still in the field, and certainly not when potential respondents could easily hear of them. When exit poll results are released -- at least before the polls in a given state are closed -- this is akin to making such a partial release while a survey is ongoing. If a respondent were to ask, "how do most people answer that question", how many of us would want to inform them, let alone volunteering the information before it was asked for, even in their were no studies showing that such knowledge would influence the answers.

Don

At 09:54 AM 11/08/2002 -0500, Christopher Fleury wrote:

>No, that is not their purpose. However, many people are apparently
>concerned that that may be their effect. My point is that if the
>release of exit poll data does have some effect on some voters, so be
>it. This prospect is not a sufficient justification for withholding the
>information from the public.

>
> Chris

>
>
>
>Ratledge, Edward wrote:

>
>> So the purpose of the exit polls is to provide information that would
>> influence
>> voters in the current election? I hope not.

>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Christopher Fleury [mailto:cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG]
>> Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 9:00 AM
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
>>
>>
>> I agree, too. I am more troubled by the embargo on exit polling news
>> than I am by the possibility that some voters may choose to act on such
>> information if it were released. It is disappointing that all of the
>> major networks have joined a cartel to keep the public from knowing what
>> the public has told pollsters until it is too late for the public to do
>> anything with this information. It is further disappointing that the
>> public opinion research community is not more assertive on this point.
>>
>> Chris
>>
>> Hank Zucker wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Thanks for the references, Philip.
>>>
>>>Thanks also for the comment about voters using the information rationally.
>>>I very much agree. I would like to see AAPOR take a formal position that
>>>democracy is not served by keeping information from the voters, but I do
>>>
>> not
>>
>>>know how many of our colleagues agree with us.
>>>
>>>
>>>Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
>>>Creative Research Systems
>>>www.surveysystem.com
>>>(707) 765-1001
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> _____
>> Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
>> Survey Director
>> Center for the Study of Services
>> 733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
>> Washington, DC 20005
>>
>> Voice: 202-454-3031
>> Fax: 202-347-4000
>>
>> E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org
>>
>> -----
>> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>> main email address.

>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>> -----
>> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>> main email address.
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>>
>
>
>--
>

>Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
>Survey Director
>Center for the Study of Services
>733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
>Washington, DC 20005
>
>Voice: 202-454-3031
>Fax: 202-347-4000
>
>E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org
>

>-----
>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>main email address.
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705
608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 09:28:27 -0600
Reply-To: Scott Althaus <salthaus@UIUC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Scott Althaus <salthaus@UIUC.EDU>
Subject: Analysis of Florida's County-Level Voting Patterns in 2000
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

In response to the discussion thread about potential Panhandle problems
stemming from the early call in 2000, I examined county-level data from

Florida to see if they might shed some light on this controversy. The results are mixed, but most measures suggest that Bush was not hurt by an early call. Detailed results of this inquiry are reported below, but the main findings can be summarized briefly.

FINDING ONE: IMPACT ON REPUBLICAN VOTE SHARE

Compared to the average Republican vote share for the 1988, 1992, and 1996 presidential elections, in 2000 the Republican vote share increased by 8.4 percentage points in the ten central-zone Panhandle counties, and by 4.4 points in the other 57 Florida counties. A similar pattern is found if we compare 2000 to 1996 only. It appears that Bush did much better than usual in all Florida counties, but this gain was two times as large in Panhandle counties as in the rest of the state. This would seem to contradict the idea that Bush's vote share was hurt by an early call, but of course there is no way to tell how high it might have been if the early call was never made.

FINDING TWO: IMPACT ON TURNOUT

Compared to the average turnout across the 1988, 1992, and 1996 presidential elections, in 2000 turnout levels were 2.2 percentage points higher than usual in the Panhandle counties and 2.0 points higher than usual in all the other 57 counties. This comparison suggests that turnout was even higher in Panhandle counties than for the rest of the state, though this difference was rather small. However, if we compare 2000 turnout levels only to 1996 turnout levels, we find Panhandle turnout rising by 2.9 percentage points in 2000 compared to a 4.0-point gain for all the other counties in Florida. On this measure, the growth in turnout for 2000 was lower in Panhandle counties than for the rest of the state, which is consistent with the idea that the early call had a depressing effect on turnout in Panhandle counties.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTES AND DETAILED ANALYSIS

As best as I can tell from time zone maps, there seem to be ten Panhandle counties in the central time zone (listed below). If I am incorrect in my categorization, correction would be appreciated!

I compared mean Republican shares of the total vote and mean turnout levels across election years, running separate analyses for Panhandle and non-Panhandle counties in Florida. Two comparisons are used for this purpose: 2000 presidential election results versus 1996 presidential election results (since 1996 was the most recent election before 2000), and 2000 election results versus the average results for 1988, 1992, and 1996 (in case 1996 is an aberration in county-level voting tendencies).

Note that the average Republican vote share in all of these counties is quite higher than the final vote share for the entire state of Florida in 2000. The reason is that my analysis takes the county as its unit of analysis, rather than the number of votes in each county. The 2000 vote totals reported below exaggerate the Republican share of the vote because there are a larger number of Florida counties that vote Republican, but these counties contain smaller numbers of eligible voters than the major (and more urban) Democratic-leaning counties.

REPUBLICAN SHARE OF THE TOTAL VOTE BY COUNTY

	Mean%Rep00	Mean%AvgRep	T (sig)
Panhandle (n=10)	.642	.558	-10.25 (p<.001)
Non-Panhandle (n=57)	.533	.489	-6.54 (p<.001)

	Mean %Rep00	Mean %Rep96	T (sig)
Panhandle (n=10)	.642	.508	-9.41 (p<.001)
Non-Panhandle (n=57)	.533	.433	-15.43 (p<.001)

Panhandle Counties	%Rep00	%Rep96	%AvgRep
BAY	0.66	0.55	0.59
CALHOUN	0.56	0.41	0.48
ESCAMBIA	0.63	0.56	0.58
GULF	0.58	0.40	0.49
HOLMES	0.68	0.48	0.56
JACKSON	0.56	0.46	0.51
OKALOOSA	0.74	0.65	0.66
SANTA ROSA	0.72	0.62	0.64
WALTON	0.67	0.50	0.54
WASHINGTON	0.62	0.45	0.53

TURNOUT BY COUNTY

	Mean%Turn00	Mean%AvgTurn	T (sig)
Panhandle (n=10)	.564	.542	-1.73 (p=.11)
Non-Panhandle (n=57)	.523	.503	-3.39 (p=.001)

	Mean%Turn00	Mean%Turn96	T (sig)
Panhandle (n=10)	.564	.535	-2.54 (p=.03)
Non-Panhandle (n=57)	.523	.483	-6.58 (p<.001)

Panhandle Counties	%Turn00	%Turn96	%AvgTurn
BAY	0.51	0.47	0.47
CALHOUN	0.53	0.45	0.49
ESCAMBIA	0.51	0.50	0.51
GULF	0.61	0.63	0.62
HOLMES	0.55	0.54	0.53
JACKSON	0.49	0.47	0.46
OKALOOSA	0.54	0.51	0.52
SANTA ROSA	0.66	0.59	0.52
WALTON	0.70	0.63	0.59
WASHINGTON	0.54	0.56	0.57

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Department of Speech Communication
702 S. Wright St., Rm. 244
Urbana, IL 61801 USA

Office 217.333.8968
Fax 217.244.1598
Email salthaus@uiuc.edu
Web www.uiuc.edu/~salthaus

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 10:52:57 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments: To: Don Ferree <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The point that Don makes below regarding release of partial exit data
during election day is an important issue. And, the release of final
exit poll percentages is also problematic given state sample sizes.

We have been down this road before. Check the AAPORnet archives. This
issue was discussed in February, 2000.

Nick

Don Ferree wrote:

>
> Two points. From my standpoint, the exit polls have two quite legitimate
> (and related but not identical) values.
>
> First, is better to inform news coverage on election night (both directly
> in reporting the results) and by guiding stories to inform the public.
> This includes how the "races" are going but is by no means limited to it,
> extending rather to issue coalitions, apparent differential turnout, etc.,
> etc.
>
> Second is to provide the best and indeed close to only source of
> information for analyzing the election afterward, covering the same sort of
> concerns, listed above, with a lesser weight on the horserace aspect.
>
> Another point. Most of us are probably NOT in the habit of releasing
> partial results of surveys while they are still in the field, and certainly

> not when potential respondents could easily hear of them. When exit poll
> results are released -- at least before the polls in a given state are
> closed -- this is akin to making such a partial release while a survey is
> ongoing. If a respondent were to ask, "how do most people answer that
> question", how many of us would want to inform them, let alone volunteering
> the information before it was asked for, even in their were no studies
> showing that such knowledge would influence the answers.
>
> Don
>
> At 09:54 AM 11/08/2002 -0500, Christopher Fleury wrote:
> >No, that is not their purpose. However, many people are apparently
> >concerned that that may be their effect. My point is that if the
> >release of exit poll data does have some effect on some voters, so be
> >it. This prospect is not a sufficient justification for withholding the
> >information from the public.
> >
> > Chris
> >
> >
> >Ratledge, Edward wrote:
> >
> >> So the purpose of the exit polls is to provide information that would
> >> influence
> >> voters in the current election? I hope not.
> >>
> >> -----Original Message-----
> >> From: Christopher Fleury [mailto:cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG]
> >> Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 9:00 AM
> >> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> >> Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
> >>
> >> I agree, too. I am more troubled by the embargo on exit polling news
> >> than I am by the possibility that some voters may choose to act on such
> >> information if it were released. It is disappointing that all of the
> >> major networks have joined a cartel to keep the public from knowing what
> >> the public has told pollsters until it is too late for the public to do
> >> anything with this information. It if further disappointing that the
> >> public opinion research community is not more assertive on this point.
> >>
> >> Chris
> >>
> >> Hank Zucker wrote:
> >>
> >>>Thanks for the references, Philip.
> >>>
> >>>Thanks also for the comment about voters using the information
> rationally.
> >>>I very much agree. I would like to see AAPOR take a formal position
> that
> >>>democracy is not served by keeping information from the voters, but I do
> >>>
> >> not
> >>
> >>>know how many of our colleagues agree with us.

> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
> >>>Creative Research Systems
> >>>www.surveysystem.com
> >>>(707) 765-1001
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> _____
> >> Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
> >> Survey Director
> >> Center for the Study of Services
> >> 733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
> >> Washington, DC 20005
> >>
> >> Voice: 202-454-3031
> >> Fax: 202-347-4000
> >>
> >> E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org
> >>
> >> -----
> >> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> >> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >> main email address.
> >> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-
request@asu.edu
> >>
> >> -----
> >> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> >> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >> main email address.
> >> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-
request@asu.edu
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
> >--
> >
> > _____
> > Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
> > Survey Director
> > Center for the Study of Services
> > 733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
> > Washington, DC 20005
> >
> > Voice: 202-454-3031
> > Fax: 202-347-4000
> >
> > E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org
> >
> > -----
> > View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> >You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >main email address.
> >Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
> Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
> University of Wisconsin Survey Center
> 1800 University Avenue
> Madison WI 53705
> 608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
> gferree@ssc.wisc.edu
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 10:59:32 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Re: Voodoo
Comments: To: Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Lydia-

This story - which actually ran in the LA Times - included the following:

"But pollsters did much better on a national barometer of public opinion called generic national polling. Calculated to take the national pulse, the ballot asks voters, without naming names, whether they would prefer a Republican or a Democrat in Congress. A Gallup Poll over the weekend for USA Today and CNN found that in House races, likely voters preferred Republicans to Democrats, 51% to 45%."

The complete story - which actually ran in the LA Times - can be found by doing a search at their site:
[Looking to History, Pundits Never Saw This One Coming; November 7, 2002.](#)

Nick

Lydia Saad wrote:

>
> Ornstein is quite wrong.

>
> As all of my Gallup Poll colleagues, and any former Gallup Poll staffer can
> tell you, the Gallup Poll has a half century track record of predicting the
> national two party vote for Congress within a whisker. See Moore, David W.
> and Saad, Lydia. 1997. "The Generic Ballot in Midterm Congressional
> Elections; It's Accuracy and Relationship to House Seats." Public Opinion
> Quarterly, 61:603-614.
>
> There is no difference in predicting how all Americans will vote for
> Congress than in predicting how all Americans will vote for president --
> except that the congressional prediction may be somewhat easier. That's
> quite different than predicting what the result will be in each of the 435
> districts, but Gallup's generic ballot, based on likely voters, can tell
> you
> what the aggregate total will be. Up through 1994, that aggregate could
> also accurately predict what the seat distribution would be, based on a
> regression analysis using data from the 1950-1990 midterms. (The metric
> changed with the GOP takeover since 1994, so modeling seats is a bit dicier
> now.)
>
> This year Gallup's final pre-election generic ballot for Congress, with
> undecideds allocated proportionally, showed 53% of likely voters nationwide
> favoring the Republican candidate in their district; 47% favoring the
> Democrat.
>
> That is EXACTLY the same as the early calculations of the actual two-party
> vote.
> <http://www.upi.com/view.cfm?StoryID=20021106-014531-8274r>
>
> A large part of Gallup's success in achieving this accuracy is the science
> of defining likely voters that we inherited from Dr. Gallup and his long
> time methodologist, Paul Perry.
>
> Anyone interested in more information can contact myself, David Moore,
> Frank
> Newport, or Jeff Jones at the Gallup Poll in Princeton.
>
> Lydia Saad
> Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll
> 609-924-9600
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Hogan, Sean [mailto:Hogan.Sean@UIS.EDU]
> Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2002 9:33 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Voodoo
>
> >From this morning's Chicago Tribune:
>
> "We try to portray polling as a science, but it's a witchcraft kind of
> art,"
> said Norm Ornstein, a political scholar at the American Enterprise
> Institute. "When it comes to the midterm elections, we're trying to predict
> how 35% of the electorate will vote, but we don't know which 35% will turn
> out. It's beyond embarrassing."
>
> Sean O. Hogan

> Assistant Director
> Survey Research Office
> Abraham Lincoln Presidential Center for Governmental Studies
> University of Illinois at Springfield
> One University Plaza, HRB 120
> Springfield, IL 62703-5407
> 217/206-6591
> hogan.sean@uis.edu
> http://sro.uis.edu
>

> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.
>

> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 12:22:47 -0500
Reply-To: berinsky@Princeton.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Adam Berinsky <berinsky@PRINCETON.EDU>
Organization: Princeton University
Subject: Digest Version
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Could someone please remind me how to get the digest version of AAPORNET?

thanks,

ab

--

Adam J. Berinsky
Assistant Professor of Politics
Princeton University

-----Fall 2002 Address-----
National Election Studies
Center for Political Studies
Room 4132, Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248

Tel: (734) 615-3625
Fax: (734) 764-3341

-----Permanent Address-----

Department of Politics
Princeton University
041 Corwin Hall
Princeton, NJ 08544-1012
Tel: (609) 258-6601
Fax: (609) 258-1110

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

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 11:03:50 -0700
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Digest Version
Comments: cc: "berinsky@Princeton.EDU" <berinsky@Princeton.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0

>Adam J. Berinsky wrote:
>Could someone please remind me how to get the digest
>version of AAPORNET?

Listserv gives several choices:
--DIGEST gives you one email a day, with all of that day's messages.
--INDEX gives you a list of the topics and their authors, with a link to
read them in the archives.

Each of these can be received in plain-text, MIME, or HTML format. The
INDEX-HTML sends you the shortest daily message, and you can just click on a
link by each message to read it in the archives.

Index & Digest are sent out at midnight EST daily.

You can control these settings easily by browsing to the archive page:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on "Join or leave the list or change your settings." There is
more help on the meanings of the settings there also.

Best,
Shap Wolf
AAPORNET volunteer host
ASU Survey Research Laboratory

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 13:11:04 -0500
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments: To: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
In-Reply-To: <3DCBD00B.4000301@cssresearch.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The interesting subtext of this conversation is about what our strategy should be when the public and/or politicians accuse polls of affecting voter decisions.

Denial, in my opinion, is not a good strategy. A better argument is that even if there is an effect, it doesn't matter. The public does not need to be protected from this or any other kind of information.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 14:07:16 -0500
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Florida Panhandle Counties that close one hour later than the res
t of the state
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

According to information collected from the Florida Election Officials there are nine counties in Florida where all of the polls are in the Central Time Zone and close one hour later than the rest of the state:
Calhoun, Jackson, Bay, Washington, Holmes, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa & Escambia.

A 10th, Gulf County, is in both ET and CT so some polls in that county close at each time.

Joe Lenski
edison media research

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 15:28:58 -0500
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Subject: Progress Report: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear AAPORNETers,=20

I'm very pleased (and relieved) to report that the transition to AAPORNET@a=
su.edu, starting October 23, has been a smooth one. Here are some =
details: =20

- * We now have about a thousand members on AAPORNET
- * Because the new ASU Listserv software allows members to access
AAPORNET in many ways, we've added about 100 members to AAPORNET since the =
transition
- * We've had some lively discussions on topics ranging from the "Dillman
Dollar" to VNS exit polling. You can access these discussion threads on =
the AAPORNET web site.
- * We've had 120 postings since October 23.

Just as a reminder, you can now choose to get messages in your regular
email, by digest, or not to get them at all--just go to the web site
(<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>) to read them or choose which =
way to receive them. You can also post from the web site. The web =
interface also allows for easy searching of the archives, a rich source of =
information.

Also, please report any problems to aapornet-request@asu.edu.

Many thanks to all AAPORNET subscribers. You continue to make AAPORNET a =
valuable asset to members! Keep the list vital and active!

Also, many thanks again to our volunteer host, Shap Wolf, and to Arizona =
State University for making this all possible. Also thanks to those who =
helped beta test the site before we went public.

Best wishes,
Mark Schulman

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 15:31:58 -0500
Reply-To: Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM>
Subject: Question
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

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

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 17:45:44 -0800
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <hank@surveysystem.com>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>
Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Certainly no one should release partial results, if they do not have sufficient confidence in the results. But what constitutes partial results in elections? In the case of presidential elections, releasing any information at all from either exit polls or actual returns before the polls close in Hawaii could theoretically influence some peoples' votes. Do we really want to suggest that no one release any information on presidential races until after the polls close in Hawaii? If not, then why limit any reliable information about other races, even if some people may still be voting?

I, for one, would actually have appreciated information on how the recent governor's race was going before casting my vote. I disliked both major party's nominees, but I did see an important difference. If I was sure the "lesser of the two evils" was going to win anyway, I would have voted for a third candidate, who was more palatable, but had no chance of winning. But I did not want to take the chance that a vote for the third party would give the "greater of the two evils" the race. Was democracy really best served by my ignorance of the current results of the race? I do not think it is a given that it was.

I think Phil said it well "The public does not need to be protected from

this or any other kind of information."

Hank

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

From: "Don Ferree" <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 7:18 AM

Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc

> Two points. From my standpoint, the exit polls have two quite legitimate
> (and related but not identical) values.

>

> First, is better to inform news coverage on election night (both directly
> in reporting the results) and by guiding stories to inform the public.

> This includes how the "races" are going but is by no means limited to it,
> extending rather to issue coalitions, apparent differential turnout, etc.,
etc.

>

> Second is to provide the best and indeed close to only source of
> information for analyzing the election afterward, covering the same sort
of

> concerns, listed above, with a lesser weight on the horserace aspect.

>

> Another point. Most of us are probably NOT in the habit of releasing
> partial results of surveys while they are still in the field, and
certainly

> not when potential respondents could easily hear of them. When exit poll
> results are released -- at least before the polls in a given state are

> closed -- this is akin to making such a partial release while a survey is
> ongoing. If a respondent were to ask, "how do most people answer that

> question", how many of us would want to inform them, let alone
volunteering

> the information before it was asked for, even in their were no studies
> showing that such knowledge would influence the answers.

>

> Don

>

>

>

>

> At 09:54 AM 11/08/2002 -0500, Christopher Fleury wrote:

> >No, that is not their purpose. However, many people are apparently

> >concerned that that may be their effect. My point is that if the

> >release of exit poll data does have some effect on some voters, so be

> >it. This prospect is not a sufficient justification for withholding the
> >information from the public.

>>

>> Chris

>>

>>

>>

>>Ratledge, Edward wrote:

>>

>>> So the purpose of the exit polls is to provide information that would

> >> influence
> >> voters in the current election? I hope not.
> >>
> >> -----Original Message-----
> >> From: Christopher Fleury [mailto:cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG]
> >> Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 9:00 AM
> >> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> >> Subject: Re: VNS, exit polls, etc
> >>
> >>
> >> I agree, too. I am more troubled by the embargo on exit polling news
> >> than I am by the possibility that some voters may choose to act on such
> >> information if it were released. It is disappointing that all of the
> >> major networks have joined a cartel to keep the public from knowing
> >> what
> >> the public has told pollsters until it is too late for the public to do
> >> anything with this information. It is further disappointing that the
> >> public opinion research community is not more assertive on this point.
> >>
> >> Chris
> >>
> >> Hank Zucker wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Thanks for the references, Philip.
> >>>
> >>>Thanks also for the comment about voters using the information
> >>>rationaly.
> >>>I very much agree. I would like to see AAPOR take a formal position
> >>>that
> >>>democracy is not served by keeping information from the voters, but I
> >>>do
> >>>
> >> not
> >>
> >>>know how many of our colleagues agree with us.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
> >>>Creative Research Systems
> >>>www.surveysystem.com
> >>>(707) 765-1001
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> _____
> >> Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
> >> Survey Director
> >> Center for the Study of Services
> >> 733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
> >> Washington, DC 20005
> >>
> >> Voice: 202-454-3031
> >> Fax: 202-347-4000
> >>
> >> E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org

> >>
> >> -----
> >> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> >> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >> main email address.
> >> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >>
> >> -----
> >> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> >> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >> main email address.
> >> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
> >--
> >
> >Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
> >Survey Director
> >Center for the Study of Services
> >733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
> >Washington, DC 20005
> >
> >Voice: 202-454-3031
> >Fax: 202-347-4000
> >
> >E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org
> >
> >-----
> >>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> >><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >>You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> >>main email address.
> >>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
> Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
> University of Wisconsin Survey Center
> 1800 University Avenue
> Madison WI 53705
> 608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
> gferree@ssc.wisc.edu
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 8 Nov 2002 20:20:19 -0700
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: 2000 Elections -- AAPORNET archives uploaded
MIME-version: 1.0

I've now indexed and uploaded September through December 2000, when AAPORNETers were very busy discussing the 2000 elections and their aftermath. Very active months--1,131 messages in all!

From the archives page, <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> you can browse each month by author, topic, or date.

I had fun reading through these as I formatted them; hope you will also.

Now all of our messages, from 22 November 1994 through today, are available on our web archives. Only about a dozen months have been reformatted so that Listserv can deliver individual messages, but you can search all of them.

Shap Wolf
ASU Survey Research Laboratory
AAPORNET volunteer host
shap.wolf@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sat, 9 Nov 2002 09:02:25 -0500
Reply-To: RFunk787@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>
Subject: more on VNS, exit polls, etc
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The gap between what I'd heard about the effects of the premature call of Florida for Gore, and Warren Mitofsky's brush-off of the issue, intrigued me, so I did a little quick-and-dirty research to get a better perspective. Alas, the only data I have at hand are from the 1996 election, but I think they're good enough to permit posing some hypotheses.

Based on county-by-county returns for the 1996 election, the Central Time Zone Panhandle counties accounted for about 5.5% of the Florida population

that year and voted about 2 to 1 against Clinton. This means that, ON AVERAGE, somewhere in the ball park of 24,000 votes per hour throughout the day were cast in those counties, or about 6,000 votes per average 15 minute period (Yes, I know that there are ebbs and surges in voting patterns throughout the day -- rather than excoriate me, supply accurate figures). Extrapolating proportionately from the 1996 results, If the early call of the state for Gore occurred 15 minutes before the Panhandle polls closed, that means that potentially 6,000 votes -- 2,000 net Bush votes -- could have been affected. Were just 10% of these hypothetical 2,000 votes discouraged by the early call, that would have diminished the total Bush take by 200 votes. Not 10,000 votes, to be sure, yet in that context a very meaningful number, as they would have increased his final net margin by about 50%.

Of course, if those polls were filled with last-minute voters, the number would be higher, and if pretty much everyone who wanted to vote had already done so, the number would be lower. Perhaps someone can supply facts about the actual situation in 2000. But there is no disputing that the premature and erroneous call would have had some effect on the number of votes cast -- otherwise we'd be claiming that information does not affect behavior, which would invalidate what many of us do for livings. The question is, how much effect?

So we get to Phil Meyers' point -- what harm could disclosing early projections do? I personally don't see what good it does, but that's neither here nor there. Phil and others claim that such information helps voters to act rationally (whatever that might mean). If those estimates had been accurate, the networks -- provided they didn't decently hold off until the Panhandle precincts had closed -- should have said something like: "While Gore appears to have an edge in the eastern counties, the polls are still open in the western counties." This might have energized Panhandle last-minute voters, leading to more votes for GWB,. but who can say? However, the projection released was NOT accurate. Phil, do only ACCURATE figures do no harm? That seems reasonable to me. But there is no way to determine, at the time, how accurate exit poll results and projections are. We only find out later. The only FACT involved is that statistical analysis of survey data yielded some figure. The figure itself is not a fact, but an estimate bounded by confidence limits. At least actual returns -- "with X% of precincts reporting, the votes are thus-and-so," are pretty-close-to-accurate facts.

I found nothing wrong with how the news reported returns this year, and I appreciated their circumspectness in avoiding early conjecturing. Thus they avoided the kinds of embarrassments that Zogby, Dick Morris, et al are now having to explain.

Ray Funkhouser

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sat, 9 Nov 2002 11:44:41 -0500
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>

Subject: Re: more on VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments: To: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@aol.com>
In-Reply-To: <19c.bac632b.2afe6f71@aol.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Here's a try at answering Ray's good questions:

Rational use by voters of exit-poll data. In a multi-candidate race where your preferred choice is running last and your second choice is near the top, you can make your vote more effective by voting for the latter. If polls show the election is close, you might go to more effort to vote. If polls show it is not close, you can save yourself the trouble. If polls show who's winning the White House, you can vote for the same party for Congress (or the opposite if you prefer divided government.)

If you want to jump on the winner's bandwagon, that's good, because democracy needs consensus and those willing to go along with the majority just because it is a majority should be encouraged. If you want to vote for the underdog out of sympathy, that's your right.

All of this information is available in the absence of polls, through journalistic speculation, talk on the street, wishful thinking of politicians, but it's not very accurate. Sometimes polls aren't accurate either, but they are more accurate than all the alternatives.

=====
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
=====

On Sat, 9 Nov 2002, G. Ray Funkhouser wrote:

> Date: Sat, 09 Nov 2002 09:02:25 -0500
> From: G. Ray Funkhouser <RFunk787@aol.com>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: more on VNS, exit polls, etc
>
> The gap between what I'd heard about the effects of the premature call of
> Florida for Gore, and Warren Mitofsky's brush-off of the issue, intrigued
> me,
> so I did a little quick-and-dirty research to get a better perspective.
> Alas, the only data I have at hand are from the 1996 election, but I think
> they're good enough to permit posing some hypotheses.
>
> Based on county-by-county returns for the 1996 election, the Central Time
> Zone Panhandle counties accounted for about 5.5% of the Florida population
> that year and voted about 2 to 1 against Clinton. This means that, ON
> AVERAGE, somewhere in the ball park of 24,000 votes per hour throughout
> the
> day were cast in those counties, or about 6,000 votes per average 15 minute
> period (Yes, I know that there are ebbs and surges in voting patterns

> throughout the day -- rather than excoriate me, supply accurate figures).
> Extrapolating proportionately from the 1996 results, If the early call of
the
> state for Gore occurred 15 minutes before the Panhandle polls closed, that
> means that potentially 6,000 votes -- 2,000 net Bush votes -- could have
> been affected. Were just 10% of these hypothetical 2,000 votes
discouraged
> by the early call, that would have diminished the total Bush take by 200
> votes. Not 10,000 votes, to be sure, yet in that context a very
meaningful
> number, as they would have increased his final net margin by about 50%.
>
> Of course, if those polls were filled with last-minute voters, the number
> would be higher, and if pretty much everyone who wanted to vote had already
> done so, the number would be lower. Perhaps someone can supply facts
about
> the actual situation in 2000. But there is no disputing that the premature
> and erroneous call would have had some effect on the number of votes cast -
-
> otherwise we'd be claiming that information does not affect behavior, which
> would invalidate what many of us do for livings. The question is, how much
> effect?
>
> So we get to Phil Meyers' point -- what harm could disclosing early
> projections do? I personally don't see what good it does, but that's
neither
> here nor there. Phil and others claim that such information helps voters
to
> act rationally (whatever that might mean). If those estimates had been
> accurate, the networks -- provided they didn't decently hold off until the
> Panhandle precincts had closed -- should have said something like: "While
> Gore appears to have an edge in the eastern counties, the polls are still
> open in the western counties." This might have energized Panhandle
> last-minute voters, leading to more votes for GWB,. but who can say?
> However, the projection released was NOT accurate. Phil, do only ACCURATE
> figures do no harm? That seems reasonable to me. But there is no way to
> determine, at the time, how accurate exit poll results and projections are.
> We only find out later. The only FACT involved is that statistical
analysis
> of survey data yielded some figure. The figure itself is not a fact, but
an
> estimate bounded by confidence limits. At least actual returns -- "with
> X% of precincts reporting, the votes are thus-and-so," are
> pretty-close-to-accurate facts.
>
> I found nothing wrong with how the news reported returns this year, and I
> appreciated their circumspectness in avoiding early conjecturing. Thus
they
> avoided the kinds of embarrassments that Zogby, Dick Morris, et al are now
> having to explain.
>
> Ray Funkhouser
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'

> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Sat, 9 Nov 2002 12:36:55 -0500
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: more on VNS, exit polls, etc
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0211091129340.49634-100000@login7.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Philip Meyer wrote:

>If you want to jump on the winner's bandwagon, that's good,
>because democracy needs consensus and those willing to go along with the
>majority just because it is a majority should be encouraged.

Is this observation offered in the spirit of Jonathan Swift, or is it serious? I thought the whole point of the U.S. political structure devised by Madison et al to was to inhibit the tyranny of the majority. What Madison did, VNS should undo, if it ever gets its act back together?

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
voice +1-212-741-9852
fax +1-212-807-9152
cell +1-917-865-2813
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Sat, 9 Nov 2002 16:12:42 -0600
Reply-To: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Subject: Re: more on VNS, exit polls, etc
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

If you want to approach this from a rational-voter perspective, here's an additional consideration. So far, we have voters' pre-election information (polls to rumors) and during-election information (exit polls, ongoing turnout rates, etc). In certain cases, there is also *post-election* information. There are runoffs under certain conditions. There could be election irregularities or even a recount that produces no winner - which might result in an invalid election and holding a new one.

From the rational-voter perspective, the post-election cases are also cases where voters have information about the intention of other voters. And there are often settled laws or court decisions that govern these post-election cases. You could apply rational-voter arguments as uniformly as possible to all three cases (pre-, during, and post-election). And/or you could adapt the more settled laws governing the post-election cases to the pre- and during-election cases: voter-information may be one of the considerations that went into making the laws or precedents.

(Of course, this whole thing is reminiscent of the biased-juror debate, which gets a little silly at the extremes. Only the voter who is totally ignorant of previous election outcomes, public discussion, etc., is going to be "unbiased" by other voters' intent - and probably not a very good citizen!)

Rick Weil, LSU

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

From: "Philip Meyer" <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2002 10:44 AM

Subject: Re: more on VNS, exit polls, etc

Here's a try at answering Ray's good questions:

Rational use by voters of exit-poll data. In a multi-candidate race where your preferred choice is running last and your second choice is near the top, you can make your vote more effective by voting for the latter. If polls show the election is close, you might go to more effort to vote. If polls show it is not close, you can save yourself the trouble. If polls show who's winning the White House, you can vote for the same party for Congress (or the opposite if you prefer divided government.)

If you want to jump on the winner's bandwagon, that's good, because democracy needs consensus and those willing to go along with the majority just because it is a majority should be encouraged. If you want to vote for the underdog out of sympathy, that's your right.

All of this information is available in the absence of polls, through journalistic speculation, talk on the street, wishful thinking of politicians, but it's not very accurate. Sometimes polls aren't accurate either, but they are more accurate than all the alternatives.

=====
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

On Sat, 9 Nov 2002, G. Ray Funkhouser wrote:

> Date: Sat, 09 Nov 2002 09:02:25 -0500
> From: G. Ray Funkhouser <RFunk787@aol.com>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: more on VNS, exit polls, etc
>
> The gap between what I'd heard about the effects of the premature call of
> Florida for Gore, and Warren Mitofsky's brush-off of the issue, intrigued
me,
> so I did a little quick-and-dirty research to get a better perspective.
> Alas, the only data I have at hand are from the 1996 election, but I
think
> they're good enough to permit posing some hypotheses.
>
> Based on county-by-county returns for the 1996 election, the Central Time
> Zone Panhandle counties accounted for about 5.5% of the Florida population
> that year and voted about 2 to 1 against Clinton. This means that, ON
> AVERAGE, somewhere in the ball park of 24,000 votes per hour throughout
the
> day were cast in those counties, or about 6,000 votes per average 15
minute
> period (Yes, I know that there are ebbs and surges in voting patterns
> throughout the day -- rather than excoriate me, supply accurate figures).
> Extrapolating proportionately from the 1996 results, If the early call of
the
> state for Gore occurred 15 minutes before the Panhandle polls closed, that
> means that potentially 6,000 votes -- 2,000 net Bush votes -- could have
> been affected. Were just 10% of these hypothetical 2,000 votes
discouraged
> by the early call, that would have diminished the total Bush take by 200
> votes. Not 10,000 votes, to be sure, yet in that context a very
meaningful
> number, as they would have increased his final net margin by about 50%.
>
> Of course, if those polls were filled with last-minute voters, the number
> would be higher, and if pretty much everyone who wanted to vote had
already
> done so, the number would be lower. Perhaps someone can supply facts
about
> the actual situation in 2000. But there is no disputing that the
premature
> and erroneous call would have had some effect on the number of votes
cast --
> otherwise we'd be claiming that information does not affect behavior,
which
> would invalidate what many of us do for livings. The question is, how
much
> effect?
>
> So we get to Phil Meyers' point -- what harm could disclosing early

> projections do? I personally don't see what good it does, but that's
neither
> here nor there. Phil and others claim that such information helps voters
to
> act rationally (whatever that might mean). If those estimates had been
> accurate, the networks -- provided they didn't decently hold off until the
> Panhandle precincts had closed -- should have said something like:
"While
> Gore appears to have an edge in the eastern counties, the polls are still
> open in the western counties." This might have energized Panhandle
> last-minute voters, leading to more votes for GWB,. but who can say?
> However, the projection released was NOT accurate. Phil, do only
ACCURATE
> figures do no harm? That seems reasonable to me. But there is no way to
> determine, at the time, how accurate exit poll results and projections
are.
> We only find out later. The only FACT involved is that statistical
analysis
> of survey data yielded some figure. The figure itself is not a fact, but
an
> estimate bounded by confidence limits. At least actual returns --
"with
> X% of precincts reporting, the votes are thus-and-so," are
> pretty-close-to-accurate facts.
>
> I found nothing wrong with how the news reported returns this year, and I
> appreciated their circumspectness in avoiding early conjecturing. Thus
they
> avoided the kinds of embarrassments that Zogby, Dick Morris, et al are
now
> having to explain.
>
> Ray Funkhouser
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Sat, 9 Nov 2002 14:58:23 -0700
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>

Subject: Re: more on VNS, exit polls, etc--WHY THE FUSS?
Comments: To: RFunk787@AOL.COM
In-Reply-To: <19c.bac632b.2afe6f71@aol.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm missing something in this argument.

SO WHAT?

Elections are influenced by, at a minimum, the following:

every action taken by every candidate in every campaign

the actions of all manner of interested parties, often involving
immense
expenditures

newspaper endorsements

negative, often patently false, advertising and other forms of gross
misinformation

and, any number of other things.

Why, then, is there this huge concern about speculation that a reported poll result MIGHT have had some influence in an election somewhere. In deciding how and whether to vote, people are free to factor in what they think are poll results if they so choose. Just as they are free to consider -- or ignore -- any of the above items, all of which are DESIGNED to influence them. Polls are not designed to influence. If they have done so somewhere (and the evidence is weak, at best) such influence surely has been random and not systematic. (If it were systematic, we would all be applying a "correction factor" to adjust). And individual voters decided if they choose to be influenced.

So I don't understand what all the fuss is about.

(At the same time, let me also concur with the observation that value of slightly quicker election night projections is non-existent. Certainly the "why" analyses contribute to public understanding. But quicker projections of winners? Fun for those involved, but what is the hurry? I have done election night TV analysis for most of the elections over the last 20 years. The suspension of VNS exit poll reporting clearly delayed projections this year. So we stayed up a bit longer. Actually made it a bit more fun. I doubt most casual viewers (the vast majority) cared or even noticed. And for the political junkies it extended the party. Like sex, election night is usually more fun when it lasts longer.)

Here in Arizona, were still counting ballots for Governor. (50% of the vote was by "early" ballot, only half of which was counted on election night. So every night I check the election web site to see the day's counts and re-evaluate the projection I made on election night. Probably not as good as Florida, but we should get a week's entertainment out of it. (FYI, I called for the Democrat, still think I am right, the margin is shrinking (as expected), and it is getting just a little dicey).

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of G. Ray Funkhouser
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2002 7:02 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: more on VNS, exit polls, etc

The gap between what I'd heard about the effects of the premature call of Florida for Gore, and Warren Mitofsky's brush-off of the issue, intrigued me, so I did a little quick-and-dirty research to get a better perspective. Alas, the only data I have at hand are from the 1996 election, but I think they're good enough to permit posing some hypotheses.

Based on county-by-county returns for the 1996 election, the Central Time Zone Panhandle counties accounted for about 5.5% of the Florida population that year and voted about 2 to 1 against Clinton. This means that, ON AVERAGE, somewhere in the ball park of 24,000 votes per hour throughout the day were cast in those counties, or about 6,000 votes per average 15 minute period (Yes, I know that there are ebbs and surges in voting patterns throughout the day -- rather than excoriate me, supply accurate figures). Extrapolating proportionately from the 1996 results, if the early call of the state for Gore occurred 15 minutes before the Panhandle polls closed, that means that potentially 6,000 votes -- 2,000 net Bush votes -- could have been affected. Were just 10% of these hypothetical 2,000 votes discouraged by the early call, that would have diminished the total Bush take by 200 votes. Not 10,000 votes, to be sure, yet in that context a very meaningful number, as they would have increased his final net margin by about 50%.

Of course, if those polls were filled with last-minute voters, the number would be higher, and if pretty much everyone who wanted to vote had already done so, the number would be lower. Perhaps someone can supply facts about the actual situation in 2000. But there is no disputing that the premature and erroneous call would have had some effect on the number of votes cast -- otherwise we'd be claiming that information does not affect behavior, which would invalidate what many of us do for livings. The question is, how much effect?

So we get to Phil Meyers' point -- what harm could disclosing early projections do? I personally don't see what good it does, but that's neither here nor there. Phil and others claim that such information helps voters to act rationally (whatever that might mean). If those estimates had been accurate, the networks -- provided they didn't decently hold off until the Panhandle precincts had closed -- should have said something like: "While Gore appears to have an edge in the eastern counties, the polls are still open in the western counties." This might have energized Panhandle last-minute voters, leading to more votes for GWB, . but who can say? However, the projection released was NOT accurate. Phil, do only ACCURATE figures do no harm? That seems reasonable to me. But there is no way to determine, at the time, how accurate exit poll results and projections are.

We only find out later. The only FACT involved is that statistical analysis of survey data yielded some figure. The figure itself is not a fact, but an estimate bounded by confidence limits. At least actual returns -- "with X% of precincts reporting, the votes are thus-and-so," are pretty-close-to-accurate facts.

I found nothing wrong with how the news reported returns this year, and I appreciated their circumspectness in avoiding early conjecturing. Thus they avoided the kinds of embarrassments that Zogby, Dick Morris, et al are now having to explain.

Ray Funkhouser

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of G. Ray Funkhouser
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2002 7:02 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: more on VNS, exit polls, etc

The gap between what I'd heard about the effects of the premature call of Florida for Gore, and Warren Mitofsky's brush-off of the issue, intrigued me, so I did a little quick-and-dirty research to get a better perspective. Alas, the only data I have at hand are from the 1996 election, but I think they're good enough to permit posing some hypotheses.

Based on county-by-county returns for the 1996 election, the Central Time Zone Panhandle counties accounted for about 5.5% of the Florida population that year and voted about 2 to 1 against Clinton. This means that, ON AVERAGE, somewhere in the ball park of 24,000 votes per hour throughout the day were cast in those counties, or about 6,000 votes per average 15 minute period (Yes, I know that there are ebbs and surges in voting patterns throughout the day -- rather than excoriate me, supply accurate figures). Extrapolating proportionately from the 1996 results, If the early call of the state for Gore occurred 15 minutes before the Panhandle polls closed, that means that potentially 6,000 votes -- 2,000 net Bush votes -- could have been affected. Were just 10% of these hypothetical 2,000 votes discouraged by the early call, that would have diminished the total Bush take by 200 votes. Not 10,000 votes, to be sure, yet in that context a very meaningful number, as they would have increased his final net margin by about 50%.

Of course, if those polls were filled with last-minute voters, the number would be higher, and if pretty much everyone who wanted to vote had already done so, the number would be lower. Perhaps someone can supply facts about the actual situation in 2000. But there is no disputing that the premature and erroneous call would have had some effect on the number of votes cast -- otherwise we'd be claiming that information does not affect behavior, which

would invalidate what many of us do for livings. The question is, how much effect?

So we get to Phil Meyers' point -- what harm could disclosing early projections do? I personally don't see what good it does, but that's neither here nor there. Phil and others claim that such information helps voters to act rationally (whatever that might mean). If those estimates had been accurate, the networks -- provided they didn't decently hold off until the Panhandle precincts had closed -- should have said something like: "While Gore appears to have an edge in the eastern counties, the polls are still open in the western counties." This might have energized Panhandle last-minute voters, leading to more votes for GWB,. but who can say? However, the projection released was NOT accurate. Phil, do only ACCURATE figures do no harm? That seems reasonable to me. But there is no way to determine, at the time, how accurate exit poll results and projections are. We only find out later. The only FACT involved is that statistical analysis of survey data yielded some figure. The figure itself is not a fact, but an estimate bounded by confidence limits. At least actual returns -- "with X% of precincts reporting, the votes are thus-and-so," are pretty-close-to-accurate facts.

I found nothing wrong with how the news reported returns this year, and I appreciated their circumspectness in avoiding early conjecturing. Thus they avoided the kinds of embarrassments that Zogby, Dick Morris, et al are now having to explain.

Ray Funkhouser

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sat, 9 Nov 2002 22:02:17 -0500
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: more on VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
In-Reply-To: <[p05100305b9f2f735642f@\[192.168.1.100\]](mailto:p05100305b9f2f735642f@[192.168.1.100])>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Reply to Doug Henwood:

You are quite right that Madison worried about the tyranny of the majority (Federalist No. 10). He wanted even the losers in any particular political conflict to retain their faith in the legitimacy of the system.

His solution (Federalist No. 51) was to provide many different routes to power by distributing it vertically (federalism) and horizontally (checks and balances.) If you lose in one place, you can carry your fight to another.

Behind that design was recognition that any form of government needs some minimum level of consensus to survive over the long haul. One of polling's little-understood benefits is that learning what other people are thinking helps a citizen make up his or her own mind. In the New England town meeting, it was the open give-and-take that led to consensus or what Dan Yankelovich has called public judgment. Polls help, in a small way, to replicate that process on a national scale.

That's why I don't worry about bandwagon effects.

pmeyer

=====
On Sat, 9 Nov 2002, Doug Henwood wrote:

> Date: Sat, 09 Nov 2002 12:36:55 -0500
> From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: more on VNS, exit polls, etc
>
> Philip Meyer wrote:
>
> >If you want to jump on the winner's bandwagon, that's good,
> >because democracy needs consensus and those willing to go along with the
> >majority just because it is a majority should be encouraged.
>
> Is this observation offered in the spirit of Jonathan Swift, or is it
> serious? I thought the whole point of the U.S. political structure
> devised by Madison et al to was to inhibit the tyranny of the
> majority. What Madison did, VNS should undo, if it ever gets its act
> back together?
> --
>
> Doug Henwood
> Left Business Observer
> Village Station - PO Box 953
> New York NY 10014-0704 USA
> voice +1-212-741-9852
> fax +1-212-807-9152
> cell +1-917-865-2813
> email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
> web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sat, 9 Nov 2002 21:59:58 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: more on VNS, exit polls, etc
Comments: To: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Actually, there is no reason for anyone to vote from a rational-voter perspective, since the chances of affecting the outcome of an election are so small in nearly all cases (Florida in 2000 aside). Survey researchers have long since established that the strongest influence on voting is a sense of citizen duty, and I have not really seen any evidence that says this motivation is affected even by who will win, since it really derives from the sense that one has a duty to express one's opinion at the polls regardless of such factors as closeness of the election, etc.

Rick Weil wrote:

> If you want to approach this from a rational-voter perspective, here's an
> additional consideration. So far, we have voters' pre-election information
> (polls to rumors) and during-election information (exit polls, ongoing
> turnout rates, etc). In certain cases, there is also *post-election*
> information. There are runoffs under certain conditions. There could be
> election irregularities or even a recount that produces no winner - which
> might result in an invalid election and holding a new one.

>
> From the rational-voter perspective, the post-election cases are also cases
> where voters have information about the intention of other voters. And
> there are often settled laws or court decisions that govern these
> post-election cases. You could apply rational-voter arguments as uniformly
> as possible to all three cases (pre-, during, and post-election). And/or
> you could adapt the more settled laws governing the post-election cases to
> the pre- and during-election cases: voter-information may be one of the
> considerations that went into making the laws or precedents.

>
> (Of course, this whole thing is reminiscent of the biased-juror debate,
> which gets a little silly at the extremes. Only the voter who is totally
> ignorant of previous election outcomes, public discussion, etc., is going
> to
> be "unbiased" by other voters' intent - and probably not a very good
> citizen!)

>
> Rick Weil, LSU

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: "Philip Meyer" <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>

> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

> Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2002 10:44 AM

> Subject: Re: more on VNS, exit polls, etc

>

> Here's a try at answering Ray's good questions:

>

> Rational use by voters of exit-poll data. In a multi-candidate
> race where your preferred choice is running last and your second choice is
> near the top, you can make your vote more effective by voting for the
> latter. If polls show the election is close, you might go to more effort
> to vote. If polls show it is not close, you can save yourself the trouble.
> If polls show who's winning the White House, you can vote for the same
> party for Congress (or the opposite if you prefer divided government.)

>

> If you want to jump on the winner's bandwagon, that's good,
> because democracy needs consensus and those willing to go along with the
> majority just because it is a majority should be encouraged. If you want
> to vote for the underdog out of sympathy, that's your right.

>

> All of this information is available in the absence of polls,
> through journalistic speculation, talk on the street, wishful thinking of
> politicians, but it's not very accurate. Sometimes polls aren't accurate
> either, but they are more accurate than all the alternatives.

>

> =====
> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
> University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
> Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
> Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
> =====

>

>

> On Sat, 9 Nov 2002, G. Ray Funkhouser wrote:

>

> > Date: Sat, 09 Nov 2002 09:02:25 -0500
> > From: G. Ray Funkhouser <RFunk787@aol.com>
> > To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> > Subject: more on VNS, exit polls, etc

> >

> > The gap between what I'd heard about the effects of the premature call of
> > Florida for Gore, and Warren Mitofsky's brush-off of the issue, intrigued
> me,

> > so I did a little quick-and-dirty research to get a better perspective.
> > Alas, the only data I have at hand are from the 1996 election, but I
> think

> > they're good enough to permit posing some hypotheses.

> >

> > Based on county-by-county returns for the 1996 election, the Central Time
> > Zone Panhandle counties accounted for about 5.5% of the Florida
population

> > that year and voted about 2 to 1 against Clinton. This means that, ON
> > AVERAGE, somewhere in the ball park of 24,000 votes per hour throughout
> the

> > day were cast in those counties, or about 6,000 votes per average 15
> minute

> > period (Yes, I know that there are ebbs and surges in voting patterns

> > throughout the day -- rather than excoriate me, supply accurate figures).
> > Extrapolating proportionately from the 1996 results, If the early call of
> the
> > state for Gore occurred 15 minutes before the Panhandle polls closed,
that
> > means that potentially 6,000 votes -- 2,000 net Bush votes -- could have
> > been affected. Were just 10% of these hypothetical 2,000 votes
> discouraged
> > by the early call, that would have diminished the total Bush take by 200
> > votes. Not 10,000 votes, to be sure, yet in that context a very
> meaningful
> > number, as they would have increased his final net margin by about 50%.
> >
> > Of course, if those polls were filled with last-minute voters, the number
> > would be higher, and if pretty much everyone who wanted to vote had
> already
> > done so, the number would be lower. Perhaps someone can supply facts
> about
> > the actual situation in 2000. But there is no disputing that the
> premature
> > and erroneous call would have had some effect on the number of votes
> cast --
> > otherwise we'd be claiming that information does not affect behavior,
> which
> > would invalidate what many of us do for livings. The question is, how
> much
> > effect?
> >
> > So we get to Phil Meyers' point -- what harm could disclosing early
> > projections do? I personally don't see what good it does, but that's
> neither
> > here nor there. Phil and others claim that such information helps voters
> to
> > act rationally (whatever that might mean). If those estimates had been
> > accurate, the networks -- provided they didn't decently hold off until
the
> > Panhandle precincts had closed -- should have said something like:
> "While
> > Gore appears to have an edge in the eastern counties, the polls are still
> > open in the western counties." This might have energized Panhandle
> > last-minute voters, leading to more votes for GWB,. but who can say?
> > However, the projection released was NOT accurate. Phil, do only
> ACCURATE
> > figures do no harm? That seems reasonable to me. But there is no way
to
> > determine, at the time, how accurate exit poll results and projections
> are.
> > We only find out later. The only FACT involved is that statistical
> analysis
> > of survey data yielded some figure. The figure itself is not a fact, but
> an
> > estimate bounded by confidence limits. At least actual returns --
> "with
> > X% of precincts reporting, the votes are thus-and-so," are
> > pretty-close-to-accurate facts.
> >

> > I found nothing wrong with how the news reported returns this year, and I
> > appreciated their circumspectness in avoiding early conjecturing. Thus
> they
> > avoided the kinds of embarrassments that Zogby, Dick Morris, et al are
> now
> > having to explain.
> >
> > Ray Funkhouser
> >
> > -----
> > Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> > then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> > Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >
> >
> > -----
> > Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> > then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> > Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
> >
> > -----
> > Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> > then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> > Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 11 Nov 2002 12:23:39 -0600
Reply-To: "Arthur H. Miller" <arthur-miller@uiowa.edu>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Arthur H. Miller" <arthur-miller@UIOWA.EDU>
Subject: Attitudes toward tobacco industry
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I need some advice. Other than the Roper Center or the CDC can any of =
you suggest either published sources or raw data dealing with public =
perception of the tobacco industry or attitudes toward smoking? The =
period I am trying to cover is the 1950s to the present time.

Thanks in advance for any help you can give.

Arthur H. Miller
Professor - Political Science
The University of Iowa
341 Schaeffer Hall
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

ph: 319/ 335-2328, fax: 319/ 335-3400
email: arthur-miller@uiowa.edu
=20

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 11 Nov 2002 13:45:20 -0500
Reply-To: David.Sylvia@US.PM.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: David Sylvia <David.Sylvia@US.PM.COM>
Subject: Re: Attitudes toward tobacco industry
Comments: To: arthur-miller@uiowa.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Both Gallup and Roper run a series of questions each year. Check the Gallup
site. Also, Roper has done the Virginia Slims study of women for a number of
years. I believe this data set is housed at the Roper Center up at UConn.

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

From: Arthur H. Miller <arthur-miller@UIOWA.EDU>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Mon Nov 11 13:23:39 2002
Subject: Attitudes toward tobacco industry

I need some advice. Other than the Roper Center or the CDC can any of you
suggest either published sources or raw data dealing with public perception
of the tobacco industry or attitudes toward smoking? The period I am trying
to cover is the 1950s to the present time.

Thanks in advance for any help you can give.

Arthur H. Miller
Professor - Political Science
The University of Iowa
341 Schaeffer Hall
Iowa City, Iowa 52242
ph: 319/ 335-2328, fax: 319/ 335-3400
email: arthur-miller@uiowa.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 11 Nov 2002 16:26:02 -0600
Reply-To: Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Newport <Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Attitudes toward tobacco industry
Comments: To: arthur-miller@uiowa.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

This link is to a comprehensive summary of attitudes towards smoking written
by Gallup's Lydia Saad:

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/analysis/ia020815.asp>

Thanks,

Frank Newport
The Gallup Poll

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

From: Arthur H. Miller [<mailto:arthur-miller@UIOWA.EDU>]
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2002 1:24 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Attitudes toward tobacco industry

I need some advice. Other than the Roper Center or the CDC can any of you
suggest either published sources or raw data dealing with public perception
of the tobacco industry or attitudes toward smoking? The period I am trying
to cover is the 1950s to the present time.

Thanks in advance for any help you can give.

Arthur H. Miller
Professor - Political Science
The University of Iowa
341 Schaeffer Hall
Iowa City, Iowa 52242
ph: 319/ 335-2328, fax: 319/ 335-3400
email: arthur-miller@uiowa.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

```
=====
Date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 07:19:40 -0700
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Subject: Real Response Rates
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
```

I recently received a request for a proposal for a job to be conducted immediately.

Our field operations are solidly booked for the rest of the calendar year. So, for the first time in 20+ years, I made an inquiry to a field and tab house that has been soliciting our business.

When I got back the bid, one thing really jumped out at me. The sample was RDD. If we were to provide the sample, they requested to be sent 15x the sample size in numbers. I was shocked. There was no screening. This translates to a response rate of 6.6% if the sample is fully used. Even if one allows for an Rdd hit rate of residential numbers of 70%, it increases the projected response rate to only 9.5%.

Now the real shocker.

I asked the account rep whether anyone had EVER questioned this before. He said, no, in the years he had worked there, NO ONE HAD EVER QUESTIONED THIS RATIO BEFORE.

(When pushed, he did offer that if we insisted, they could live with 10x sample (pushing the rr up to 14.2%!)). A little higher if you allow for unused sample, but I bet there isn't any.

So what response rates are firms really getting?

I think the only people who can tell us are Survey Sampling and the other firms who sell samples.

I would love to hear from them. What ratios of estimated actual residential numbers to desired sample sizes do you recommend? What ratio do you actually sell?

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

```
-----
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====
```

Date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 08:35:58 -0600
Reply-To: smitht@NORCMail.UCHICAGO.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Tom Smith <smitht@NORCMail.UCHICAGO.EDU>
Subject: Re: Real Response Rates
Comments: To: mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The rates you refer to are not much lower than the average RDD rates that CMOR reports:

http://www.mra-net.org/docs/resources/coop_rates/coop_rates_avg.cfm

(WARNING: this link was not working this morning.)

Reply Separator

Subject: Real Response Rates
Author: "Mike O'Neil" <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU> at INTERNET
Date: 11/12/02 7:19 AM

I recently received a request for a proposal for a job to be conducted immediately.

Our field operations are solidly booked for the rest of the calendar year. So, for the first time in 20+ years, I made an inquiry to a field and tab house that has been soliciting our business.

When I got back the bid, one thing really jumped out at me. The sample was RDD. If we were to provide the sample, they requested to be sent 15x the sample size in numbers. I was shocked. There was no screening. This translates to a response rate of 6.6% if the sample is fully used. Even if one allows for an Rdd hit rate of residential numbers of 70%, it increases the projected response rate to only 9.5%.

Now the real shocker.

I asked the account rep whether anyone had EVER questioned this before. He said, no, in the years he had worked there, NO ONE HAD EVER QUESTIONED THIS RATIO BEFORE.

(When pushed, he did offer that if we insisted, they could live with 10x sample (pushing the rr up to 14.2%!)). A little higher if you allow for unused sample, but I bet there isn't any.

So what response rates are firms really getting?

I think the only people who can tell us are Survey Sampling and the other firms who sell samples.

I would love to hear from them. What ratios of estimated actual residential numbers to desired sample sizes do you recommend? What ratio do you actually sell?

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 10:13:36 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Real Response Rates
Comments: To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The problem is widespread -- particularly for telephone surveys in the commercial sector. It results in part from overcompartmentalization of functional departments, some of which are actually subcontractors and sub-subcontractors. Possibly it's different among institutional survey organizations and others with captive call centers and more methodological integrity. But as long as there is a structure like: owner-account executive-inside project manager-inside field department-outside sample supplier-outside call center-overflow subcontractor to the outside call center, etc., the bad news has a habit of evaporating.

The same phenomenon exists in list recruiting for focus groups. While there is no pretense of projectability there, it's still discouraging to have services ask for multiples of 20-30x in names of prospective attendees.

Don't believe it when somebody says, "Gee, nobody ever asked that before."

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2002 9:24 AM
Subject: Real Response Rates

>I recently received a request for a proposal for a job to be conducted
>immediately.
>
>Our field operations are solidly booked for the rest of the calendar year.

>So, for the first time in 20+ years, I made an inquiry to a field and tab
>house that has been soliciting our business.
>
>When I got back the bid, one thing really jumped out at me. The sample was
>RDD. If we were to provide the sample, they requested to be sent 15x the
>sample size in numbers. I was shocked. There was no screening. This
>translates to a response rate of 6.6% if the sample is fully used. Even if
>one allows for an Rdd hit rate of residential numbers of 70%, it increases
>the projected response rate to only 9.5%.
>
>Now the real shocker.
>
>I asked the account rep whether anyone had EVER questioned this before. He
>said, no, in the years he had worked there, NO ONE HAD EVER QUESTIONED THIS
>RATIO BEFORE.
>
>(When pushed, he did offer that if we insisted, they could live with 10x
>sample (pushing the rr up to 14.2%!)). A little higher if you allow for
>unused sample, but I bet there isn't any.
>
>So what response rates are firms really getting?
>
>I think the only people who can tell us are Survey Sampling and the other
>firms who sell samples.
>
>I would love to hear from them. What ratios of estimated actual
residential
>numbers to desired sample sizes do you recommend? What ratio do you
>actually sell?
>
>Mike O'Neil
>www.oneilresearch.com
>
>-----
>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 10:03:42 -0500
Reply-To: Bquarles@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: B Quarles <Bquarles@AOL.COM>
Subject: Real Response Rates
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Granted, response rates are not what they used to be, but the ratio of sample
to completes is not the same as the response rate.

In many cases, the sample is divided into sample replicates, which are worked until all are most of the numbers are "dead." Then another replicate is used. Some replicates are never used. Also, the unit of analysis for a response rate should be the household (or the eligible respondent), not the telephone number. Some households have multiple numbers, some of which are never answered, or are not answered during evenings and weekends. These might include fax, data, or home business lines.

So although response rates are low, they are not as low as they would appear to be.

Rebecca C. Quarles, PhD
President, QSA Research & Strategy
4920 John Ticer Drive
Alexandria, VA 22304
voice (703) 567-7655 fax (703) 567-6156
bquarles@aol.com
URL qsaresearch.com

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 10:35:17 -0500
Reply-To: "Ratlledge, Edward" <ratlledge@UDEL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ratlledge, Edward" <ratlledge@UDEL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Real Response Rates
Comments: To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Our typical RDD surveys use a 5x ratio and that has held for a number of years. That works with 15-20 call backs. With as few as 3 callbacks 15x would probably be required.

Ed Ratlledge

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

From: Mike O'Neil [<mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2002 9:20 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Real Response Rates

I recently received a request for a proposal for a job to be conducted immediately.

Our field operations are solidly booked for the rest of the calendar year. So, for the first time in 20+ years, I made an inquiry to a field and tab

house that has been soliciting our business.

When I got back the bid, one thing really jumped out at me. The sample was RDD. If we were to provide the sample, they requested to be sent 15x the sample size in numbers. I was shocked. There was no screening. This translates to a response rate of 6.6% if the sample is fully used. Even if one allows for an Rdd hit rate of residential numbers of 70%, it increases the projected response rate to only 9.5%.

Now the real shocker.

I asked the account rep whether anyone had EVER questioned this before. He said, no, in the years he had worked there, NO ONE HAD EVER QUESTIONED THIS RATIO BEFORE.

(When pushed, he did offer that if we insisted, they could live with 10x sample (pushing the rr up to 14.2%!)). A little higher if you allow for unused sample, but I bet there isn't any.

So what response rates are firms really getting?

I think the only people who can tell us are Survey Sampling and the other firms who sell samples.

I would love to hear from them. What ratios of estimated actual residential numbers to desired sample sizes do you recommend? What ratio do you actually sell?

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 12:21:50 -0500
Reply-To: Jane Sheppard <jsheppard@cmor.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jane Sheppard <jsheppard@CMOR.ORG>
Organization: CMOR
Subject: Re: Real Response Rates
Comments: To: smitht@NORCMAIL.UCHICAGO.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thanks for letting us know that the link is not working. MRA who hosts the site for us redesigned their website recently and now the new link should be http://www.mra-net.org/resources/respondent_cooperation/index.cfm

I'm in the process of getting this changed.

Jane Sheppard
CMOR
Director Respondent Cooperation
330-244-8616

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

From: "Tom Smith" <smitht@NORCMAIL.UCHICAGO.EDU>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2002 9:35 AM
Subject: Re: Real Response Rates

> The rates you refer to are not much lower than the average RDD rates
> that CMOR reports:
>
> http://www.mra-net.org/docs/resources/coop_rates/coop_rates_avg.cfm
>
> (WARNING: this link was not working this morning.)
>
>
>

> _____ Reply Separator

> Subject: Real Response Rates
> Author: "Mike O'Neil" <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU> at INTERNET
> Date: 11/12/02 7:19 AM
>
>

> I recently received a request for a proposal for a job to be conducted
> immediately.
>
> Our field operations are solidly booked for the rest of the calendar year.
> So, for the first time in 20+ years, I made an inquiry to a field and tab
> house that has been soliciting our business.
>
> When I got back the bid, one thing really jumped out at me. The sample
was
> RDD. If we were to provide the sample, they requested to be sent 15x the
> sample size in numbers. I was shocked. There was no screening. This
> translates to a response rate of 6.6% if the sample is fully used. Even
if
> one allows for an Rdd hit rate of residential numbers of 70%, it increases
> the projected response rate to only 9.5%.
>
> Now the real shocker.
>
> I asked the account rep whether anyone had EVER questioned this before.
He
> said, no, in the years he had worked there, NO ONE HAD EVER QUESTIONED
THIS
> RATIO BEFORE.
>
> (When pushed, he did offer that if we insisted, they could live with 10x
> sample (pushing the rr up to 14.2%!)). A little higher if you allow for
> unused sample, but I bet there isn't any.
>

> So what response rates are firms really getting?
>
> I think the only people who can tell us are Survey Sampling and the other
> firms who sell samples.
>
> I would love to hear from them. What ratios of estimated actual
residential
> numbers to desired sample sizes do you recommend? What ratio do you
> actually sell?
>
> Mike O'Neil
> www.oneilresearch.com
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 13:59:56 -0500
Reply-To: tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Thomas Guterbock <tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>
Subject: Real Response Rates
Comments: To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Comments: cc: "hollen, larry" <ldh3q@virginia.edu>,
"hubbard, ryan" <rh9k@virginia.edu>,
"Meekins, Brian" <bjm5k@virginia.edu>,
"schroeder, paul" <pbs7v@virginia.edu>
In-Reply-To: <CDEAJOODPEAJFKJABHJJIEJLCKAA.mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Hi Mike:

At UVa (where we have our own calling center and yes, still do have research integrity), we order about 7 to 1 sample for RDD studies and about 5 to 1 on directory-listed samples. Some of these studies have geographic qualifications with perhaps 90% of households qualified. After the sampling company completes the business and non-working number screens, we end up with more like 6 to 1 phone numbers that we actually attempt in order to complete an RDD study.

The thing that has changed the most, as you undoubtedly know already, is the proportion of numbers that appear to be 'working' but are never answered. This affects the number of numbers you need to purchase. The

recent article in POQ by Tucker, Lepkowski, and Piekarski (of SSI) [POQ Fall 2002] has revealing figures on the changing density of working numbers in the last decade.

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 13:53:26 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Most favor GOP on economy,
 war on terrorism: Mood may have swung elections
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

<http://www.usatoday.com/usatonline/20021112/4613281s.htm>

WASHINGTON -- A majority of Americans support President Bush's push for war against Iraq and say Democrats are not tough enough in dealing with terrorism, a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll shows.

The poll over the weekend also found that most surveyed believe that Republicans have a clearer plan for managing foreign affairs and the economy. Even a majority of Democrats in the survey say their party is too liberal.

The poll suggests that public support for Bush's leadership on Iraq and terrorism, and the Democrats' perceived lack of a plan for the economy, may have been significant factors in the GOP election sweep that gave it control of Congress.

.....

Overall, 57% of those polled said Democrats are not tough enough on terrorism, while 64% said Republicans are. And 54% of Democrats polled said the party needs to moderate its liberal message.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14

410-377-7955 fax

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 12 Nov 2002 14:23:50 -0500
Reply-To: tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Thomas Guterbock <tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>
Subject: Postion announcement--UVa Senior Research Analyst
Comments: cc: csr-staff@virginia.edu, "granger, frances" <fhg8t@virginia.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Position Announcement
Senior Research Analyst
(Research Assistant)
Center for Survey Research

Growing academic survey research center seeks an experienced research analyst to serve as Senior Research Analyst. Position and qualifications are described below. We anticipate the position to be available on or before January 1, 2003. Target date for applications is November 22, 2002.

The senior analyst:

- 1) Supervises part-time and student research assistants, assigning tasks and monitoring quality of their work.
- 2) Coordinates with Associate Director and project staff to define analysis and programming needs for projects, set schedules, and ensure project research needs are met in a timely manner.
- 3) Trains part-time and student research assistants in CSR practices, procedures, and documentation conventions.
- 4) Contributes to written research reports, oral presentations, and CSR publications.
Prepares written methods reports for projects as assigned.
- 5) Advises clients and project staff on research design and survey process issues.
- 6) Performs programming and analysis tasks using SPSS, WinCati, Excel, Access, and other software as appropriate. Some of these tasks are delegated to assistants under incumbent's supervision.
 - a) Programs questionnaires in Ci3.
 - b) Sets up telephone interview studies in WinCATI.
 - c) Analyzes data using SPSS, and SAS as needed.

- d) Sets up data bases in Access.
- e) Processes, loads, and manages sample for use in WinCATI or in mail-out surveys.
- f) Prepares graphs and tables in Excel, Quattro, Word, and WordPerfect as appropriate.
- g) Merges, modifies, and edits data files as needed for analysis or for use as sampling data bases.
- 7) Provides Level I computer support for CSR. Coordinates with Level II support as needed to ensure CSR's computer needs are met.

Qualifications: The competitive candidate will have at least a Master's degree in the social sciences, with several years experience in programming and data analysis. Familiarity with WinCati software and knowledge of SPSS required. Understanding of statistical techniques for the social sciences required.

Our organization: The Center for Survey Research is a unit of the Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service at the University of Virginia. We have a CATI-lab of 23 stations running Sawtooth WinCATI. The staff consists of 7 full-time staff members, including the Director and Associate Director, the Senior Analyst, a Research Analyst, Research specialist, CATI-lab manager, and Fiscal Technician. In addition, CSR employs a part-time Senior Research Director and consults regularly with members of the University of Virginia faculty. We employ several part-time research analysts and project assistants, as well as a roster of trained CATI interviewers.

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

Applicants should send, by November 22, 2002, a cover letter, c.v. or resume, and list of three references to:

Search Committee
Senior Analyst Position
Center for Survey Research
Postal address: P.O. Box 400767
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767
Express deliveries: 2205 Fontaine Ave, Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22903

or by e-mail to
Thomas M. Guterbock, Director

>
> I would love to hear from them. What ratios of estimated
> actual residential
> numbers to desired sample sizes do you recommend? What ratio do you
> actually sell?
>
> Mike O'Neil
> www.oneilresearch.com
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 00:00:35 -0500
Reply-To: Roger Tourangeau <rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Roger Tourangeau <rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Digest - 11 Nov 2002 to 12 Nov 2002 (#2002-35)
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'll be out of the office until Monday, November 18, and may not be able to reply to your message until then.

--Roger

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 10:31:50 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: The Election
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

[Not mentioned below is another election which was given undue significance was the 1998 election when Dems picked up 4 seats in the House.]

OFF TO THE RACES

Election 2002: No Tidal Wave

By Charlie Cook
Tuesday, Nov. 12, 2002

Perhaps the most pertinent question in American politics today is: What did last Tuesday's midterm elections really mean? In my judgment, the 2002 midterm election is one of the most over-interpreted, or perhaps even misinterpreted, elections I have ever seen. I should add that my strong competitor and close friend Stu Rothenberg, editor and publisher of the Rothenberg Political Report, feels very much the same.

We both have seen "wave" elections. In the 1974 Watergate midterm election, when Democrats gained 49 House and four Senate seats, that was a wave. In 1980, when former California Gov. Ronald Reagan led Republicans to a sweep, netting 12 Senate seats, control of the Senate for the first time since 1955 and 34 House seats, that was a wave. In 1982, when a recession hit and unemployment reached 10 percent just weeks before the midterm election, Democrats won 26 House seats, recaptured more than two-thirds of their losses in the previous election and came within 34,000 votes of capturing five Senate seats and retaking control of the Senate -- that was a smaller wave. In 1994, when Republicans took 52 House seats and control of the House for the first time in 40 years, along with eight Senate seats, that was a wave.

The common characteristic of these "wave" elections was that the winning party not only virtually won all of the races expected to be close, but they also pulled off upsets, impressive upsets. Some of their own incumbents, who had seemed destined to be defeated, actually survived, while long-shot challengers and open-seat candidates, facing enormous odds in very difficult districts, won or came very close as well.

That did not happen last Tuesday. Not one House seat in the country that had been rated leaning, likely or solidly Democratic in the Oct. 20, final post-election issue of the Cook Political Report went Republican. (For that matter, no leaning, likely or solidly Republican seat went Democratic, either.) Republicans simply won seven out of 11 of the toss-up races. Only one Senate seat that was leaning, likely or solidly Democratic in our final issue went Republican, and that was freshman Georgia Sen. Max Cleland's. We had moved his race to the toss-up column on our Web site and in speech handouts during the week before the election, as polls indicated that his challenger, GOP Rep. Saxby Chambliss, had begun to surge. We also had moved the Republican North Carolina open-seat race and freshman Louisiana Democratic Sen. Mary Landrieu to toss-up status during that final full week.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 09:29:21 -0700
Reply-To: Lonna Atkeson <atkeson@UNM.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lonna Atkeson <atkeson@UNM.EDU>
Subject: Re: Postion announcement--UVa Senior Research Analyst

Comments: To: tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU
In-Reply-To: <SIMEON.10211121450.A@tmglp.config.mail.virginia.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This would be an under placement for you.

Lonna.

On 11/12/02 12:23 PM, "Thomas Guterbock" <tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:

> Position Announcement
> Senior Research Analyst
> (Research Assistant)
> Center for Survey Research
>
>
> Growing academic survey research center seeks an experienced research
analyst
> to serve
> as Senior Research Analyst. Position and qualifications are described
below.
> We
> anticipate the position to be available on or before January 1, 2003.
Target
> date for
> applications is November 22, 2002.
>
> The senior analyst:
>
> 1) Supervises part-time and student research assistants, assigning
tasks
> and monitoring
> quality of their work.
> 2) Coordinates with Associate Director and project staff to define
> analysis and
> programming needs for projects, set schedules, and ensure project research
> needs are
> met in a timely manner.
> 3) Trains part-time and student research assistants in CSR practices,
> procedures, and
> documentation conventions.
> 4) Contributes to written research reports, oral presentations, and
CSR
> publications.
> Prepares written methods reports for projects as assigned.
> 5) Advises clients and project staff on research design and survey
> process issues.
> 6) Performs programming and analysis tasks using SPSS, WinCati, Excel,
> Access, and
> other software as appropriate. Some of these tasks are delegated to
> assistants under
> incumbent's supervision.
> a) Programs questionnaires in Ci3.
> b) Sets up telephone interview studies in WinCATI.

> c) Analyzes data using SPSS, and SAS as needed.
> d) Sets up data bases in Access.
> e) Processes, loads, and manages sample for use in WinCATI or in mail-out surveys.
> f) Prepares graphs and tables in Excel, Quattro, Word, and WordPerfect as appropriate.
> g) Merges, modifies, and edits data files as needed for analysis or for use as sampling data bases.
> 7) Provides Level I computer support for CSR. Coordinates with Level II support as needed to ensure CSR's computer needs are met.
>
> Qualifications: The competitive candidate will have at least a Master's degree in the social sciences, with several years experience in programming and data analysis.
> Familiarity with WinCati software and knowledge of SPSS required.
> Understanding of statistical techniques for the social sciences required.
>
> Our organization: The Center for Survey Research is a unit of the Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service at the University of Virginia. We have a CATI-lab of 23 stations running Sawtooth WinCATI. The staff consists of 7 full-time staff members, including the Director and Associate Director, the Senior Analyst, a Research Analyst, Research specialist, CATI-lab manager, and Fiscal Technician. In addition, CSR employs a part-time Senior Research Director and consults regularly with members of the University of Virginia faculty. We employ several part-time research analysts and project assistants, as well as a roster of trained CATI interviewers.
>
> The University of Virginia is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer.
>
> Applicants should send, by November 22, 2002, a cover letter, c.v. or resume, and list of three references to:
>
> Search Committee
> Senior Analyst Position
> Center for Survey Research
> Postal address: P.O. Box 400767

> Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767
> Express deliveries: 2205 Fontaine Ave, Suite 303
> Charlottesville, VA 22903
>
> or by e-mail to
> Thomas M. Guterbock, Director
> TomG@virginia.edu
>
> Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434) 243-5223
> NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
> Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
> University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
> P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
> Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

--
Lonna Rae Atkeson
Associate Professor
University of New Mexico
Department of Political Science
2043 Social Sciences
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121
Phone: 505-277-7592 (work) 505-277-2821 (FAX)
--

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 11:02:51 -0600
Reply-To: Don Ferree <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Don Ferree <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>
Subject: Re: The Election
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
In-Reply-To: <3DD27068.4D0BC4B6@marketsharescorp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Often missed in these discussions of midterm elections is that one of the reasons for the historic loss by the presidential party is that it used to be that winning the Presidency was accompanied by an "abnormally high" vote for that party in Congressional races. The next election, without the President at the top of the ticket, things often "reverted back". In 1996 and 2000, despite winning the Presidency, there was no "abnormal surge" up for the President's party, and hence little to "snap back" from. Redistricting and special circumstances also undoubtedly play a part, but this part of the explanation gets less attention than I think it deserves.

At 10:31 AM 11/13/2002 -0500, Nick Panagakis wrote:
>[Not mentioned below is another election which was given undue
>significance was the 1998 election when Dems picked up 4 seats in the
House.]
>
>OFF TO THE RACES
>Election 2002: No Tidal Wave
>
>snip, snip...

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705
608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 12:17:55 -0500
Reply-To: Raghavan Mayur <mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Raghavan Mayur <mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM>
Subject: Attitudes On Economy Take A Turn For Better In The Week That
Was:

Confidence Index Rebounds
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY
Feature Story
Wednesday, November 13, 2002

Attitudes On Economy Take A Turn For Better In The
Week That Was

Confidence Index Rebounds
.....
Fear lifts, suspense fades with the snipers in
custody and election in the books
.....
By IBD STAFF

Americans' faith in the economy has improved
slightly after the midterm election, and
the outlook for the next six months has turned
positive again after a downbeat October.

These are the main findings of the latest IBD/TIPP

Poll, which ended Monday and surveyed Americans throughout an eventful week that included not only the election, but also a big interest-rate cut by the Federal Reserve.

The IBD/TIPP Economic Optimism Index ticked up 1 point to 54.4 in November after slipping the month before to its lowest mark since September 2001. The index is still 8.5 points off its March 2002 high. A score above 50 shows optimism, below 50 pessimism and 50 is neutral.

"The improvement, though modest, is a welcome change and could potentially gain much-needed traction," concluded Raghavan Mayur, president of TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence, IBD's polling partner.

"At present, it's fair to describe U.S. consumer confidence as stronger than in October, with 13 of the 21 key groups improving."

The best gains were in the East, where earlier concerns over the snipers may have had an outsized impact. Other gainers were Republicans, women, 18- to 24-year-olds and investors. Declines were notable among Democrats, blacks and Hispanics.

Cut The Suspense

"The conclusion of (the) elections cut the suspense factor out," said Mayur. "Americans now have better visibility of what they may expect from Washington.

"They hope for less gridlock and more economic initiatives. The job situation is clearly the most worrisome variable. Americans expect Washington to roll out initiatives for job creation."

The Fed rate cut "helped improve a weakened consumer psyche," said Mayur. "But a lot is going to depend on stock market performance. Typically any divergences between the market and consumers are quickly corrected."

The market bottomed and rallied in October, with the Nasdaq adding 13.5%, the Dow industrials 10.6% and the S&P 500 8.6%. Consumer sentiment is catching up.

Consumer Factor

Consumer spending accounts for two-thirds of U.S. economic activity, and a high level of consumer confidence is essential to keep

the recovery on track.

All three components of the optimism index gained in November.

Most of the improvement was due to the component that measures how consumers feel about the economy's prospects six months from now. After slicing through the neutral level of 50, to 48.3 in October from 50.5 in September, it recovered back to 50.4.

"The improvement in the outlook component lowers the risk of the economy falling into a second recession," according to Mayur.

Of the other two components, one that gauges how Americans feel about their personal finances improved to 58.9 in November from 58.3 in October. The component measuring how government economic policies are working edged up to 54.0 from 53.6.

Investors' attitudes took a turn up, with their optimism index rising by 2.1 points to 54.8 from 52.7. Republicans rallied from a score of 63.2 to 68.5. Democrats dropped from 46.9 to 43.9.

Optimism among respondents in the East jumped to 57.9 from 51.3 while other regions were little changed. "The sniper attacks took a toll in October, nearly paralyzing the economy in the Washington area," Mayur said. "Catching the snipers ended that paralysis."

The six-month economic outlook now is much stronger than it was a year ago (50.4 vs. 47.4 in November 2001), and the personal financial component is a tad higher (58.9 vs. 58.1).

© Investor's Business Daily, Inc. 2002. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction or redistribution is prohibited without prior authorization permission from Investor's Business Daily. For information on reprints, webprints, permissions or back issue orders, go to www.investors.com/terms/reprints.asp.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read

the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 13:18:22 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: The Election
Comments: To: Don Ferree <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Don's right according to Campbell's "Surge and Decline" Theory-- the idea being that Presidential elections draw out voters who would not vote in midterm elections. These voters generally tend to vote for the winning Presidential candidate and, lacking a basis for choice on other offices, vote the straight ticket thereby giving the winning Presidential candidate "coattails." The problem at midterm is that those voters are not present, and the President's party loses the coattails, and hence, the seats, they gained in the Presidential election. Many years ago (we're talking now about 1983) I gave a paper that operationalized this theory by predicting House seat loss by the size of the Presidential win. The result? Big win, big House seat loss at midterm; close win, small House seat loss at midterm. This formula predicted House losses with an R squared of .8 for races between 1950 and 1980.

This logic only holds, of course, IF THE CANDIDATE WINS THE POPULAR VOTE FOR PRESIDENT. Bush did not, so we might expect a sort of "reverse" surge and decline, where the candidate's party who won the popular vote (i.e. the Democrats) would actually lose seats in the midterm elections.

Finally, according to this logic, the really historic election would have been the 1998 midterm race, since Clinton won seats but also won the popular vote.

Frank Rusciano

Don Ferree wrote:

> Often missed in these discussions of midterm elections is that one of the
> reasons for the historic loss by the presidential party is that it used to
> be that winning the Presidency was accompanied by an "abnormally high" vote
> for that party in Congressional races. The next election, without the
> President at the top of the ticket, things often "reverted back". In 1996
> and 2000, despite winning the Presidency, there was no "abnormal surge" up
> for the President's party, and hence little to "snap back" from.

> Redistricting and special circumstances also undoubtedly play a part, but
> this part of the explanation gets less attention than I think it deserves.
>

> At 10:31 AM 11/13/2002 -0500, Nick Panagakis wrote:
> >[Not mentioned below is another election which was given undue
> >significance was the 1998 election when Dems picked up 4 seats in the
House.]

> >
> >OFF TO THE RACES
> >Election 2002: No Tidal Wave
> >
> >snip, snip...

>
> G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
> Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
> University of Wisconsin Survey Center
> 1800 University Avenue
> Madison WI 53705
> 608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
> gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 14:09:56 -0500
Reply-To: Keith Neuman <kneuman@DECIMA.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Keith Neuman <kneuman@DECIMA.CA>
Subject: Research on Organ and Tissue Donation
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Does anyone know of any recent studies, surveys or experts on the topic of
organ and tissue donations? This would cover public awareness, education
initiatives, evaluation of social marketing or studies focusing on
determinants/obstacles to voluntary donations.

Please respond either to AAPORNET or to me personally by e-mail
(kneuman@decima.ca).

Thanks in advance.

> Keith Neuman, Ph.D
> Senior Vice President
> Decima Research Inc.
> Ottawa, Ontario

> 613-230-2013
> email: kneuman@decima.ca
>
>
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 15:52:31 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: [Fwd: Re: The Election]
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

> This formula predicted House losses with an R squared of .8 for
> races between 1950 and 1980.

However, 1980 was the last year when a huge gain (+34 GOP gain in the House) could be attributed to the presidential candidate's coattails. And then, 26 seats were given back in the mid-term 1982; i.e., a "Surge and Decline".

Since 1980, there have been no coattails.

See end of this page link - Congressional outcomes going back to 1867:
<http://clerkweb.house.gov/elections/2000/Table.htm>

The huge 54 Dem loss in 1994 actually followed a *loss* by Dems of 9 seats when Clinton was first elected. (Clinton got off to a bad start.) Dems started picking up a few House seats in Clinton's second term, +3 in 1996 and +4 in 1998. Was it the economy?

George H.W. Bush lost 2 GOP seats in the House when first elected in 1988 - and then lost *8 more* in 1990. Another decline *not* preceded by a surge. Was it the economy?

Is a new trend beginning? No surges - with declines due to other factors.

Nick

----- Original Message -----
Subject: Re: The Election
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 13:18:22 -0500
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
References: <4.1.20021113105859.022a0b40@ssc.wisc.edu>

Don's right according to Campbell's "Surge and Decline" Theory-- the idea being that Presidential elections draw out voters who would not vote in midterm elections. These voters generally tend to vote for the winning Presidential candidate and, lacking a basis for choice on other offices, vote the straight ticket thereby giving the winning Presidential candidate "coattails." The problem at midterm is that those voters are not present, and the President's party loses the coattails, and hence, the seats, they gained in the Presidential election. Many years ago (we're talking now about 1983) I gave a paper that operationalized this theory by predicting House seat loss by the size of the Presidential win. The result? Big win, big House seat loss at midterm; close win, small House seat loss at midterm. This formula predicted House losses with an R squared of .8 for races between 1950 and 1980.

This logic only holds, of course, IF THE CANDIDATE WINS THE POPULAR VOTE FOR PRESIDENT. Bush did not, so we might expect a sort of "reverse" surge and decline, where the candidate's party who won the popular vote (i.e. the Democrats) would actually lose seats in the midterm elections.

Finally, according to this logic, the really historic election would have been the 1998 midterm race, since Clinton won seats but also won the popular vote.

Frank Rusciano

Don Ferree wrote:

> Often missed in these discussions of midterm elections is that one of the
> reasons for the historic loss by the presidential party is that it used to
> be that winning the Presidency was accompanied by an "abnormally high" vote
> for that party in Congressional races. The next election, without the
> President at the top of the ticket, things often "reverted back". In 1996
> and 2000, despite winning the Presidency, there was no "abnormal surge" up
> for the President's party, and hence little to "snap back" from.
> Redistricting and special circumstances also undoubtedly play a part, but
> this part of the explanation gets less attention than I think it deserves.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 17:07:49 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Re: The Election]
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Actually, Nick, I made a mistake; the formula predicted 26 seats exactly in 1982 which was the actual final date of the study. Two points, though-- first, presidents in their second terms are less predictable in terms of seat loss; and second, I haven't revisited this work since 1983, so I'm not sure how it plays out now. The regression equation was

$Y_i = 1.65 X + 9$, where X= vote total of the candidate winning the White House minus the vote total of the candidate losing the White House/the total of these two candidates' votes.

The equation may have changed over the years; as I said, I haven't played around with this since the 80s, but it does predict that the Republicans would pick up some seats in Congress. Anyway, I'll leave this for others to experiment with.

All the best,

Frank

Nick Panagakis wrote:

> > This formula predicted House losses with an R squared of .8 for
> > races between 1950 and 1980.
>
> However, 1980 was the last year when a huge gain (+34 GOP gain in the
> House) could be attributed to the presidential candidate's coattails.
> And then, 26 seats were given back in the mid-term 1982; i.e., a "Surge
> and Decline".
>
> Since 1980, there have been no coattails.
>
> See end of this page link - Congressional outcomes going back to 1867:
> <http://clerkweb.house.gov/elections/2000/Table.htm>
>
> The huge 54 Dem loss in 1994 actually followed a *loss* by Dems of 9
> seats when Clinton was first elected. (Clinton got off to a bad start.)
> Dems started picking up a few House seats in Clinton's second term, +3
> in 1996 and +4 in 1998. Was it the economy?
>
> George H.W. Bush lost 2 GOP seats in the House when first elected in
> 1988 - and then lost *8 more* in 1990. Another decline *not* preceded by
> a surge. Was it the economy?
>
> Is a new trend beginning? No surges - with declines due to other factors.
>
> Nick
>
> ----- Original Message -----

> Subject: Re: The Election
> Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 13:18:22 -0500
> From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
> Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
> Organization: Rider University
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> References: <4.1.20021113105859.022a0b40@ssc.wisc.edu>
>
> Don's right according to Campbell's "Surge and Decline" Theory-- the
> idea being that Presidential elections draw out voters who would not
> vote in midterm
> elections. These voters generally tend to vote for the winning
Presidential
> candidate and, lacking a basis for choice on other offices, vote the
straight
> ticket thereby giving the winning Presidential candidate "coattails."
> The problem
> at midterm is that those voters are not present, and the President's
> party loses
> the coattails, and hence, the seats, they gained in the Presidential
election.
> Many years ago (we're talking now about 1983) I gave a paper that
> operationalized this theory by predicting House seat loss by the size of
> the Presidential win.
> The result? Big win, big House seat loss at midterm; close win, small
> House seat loss at midterm. This formula predicted House losses with an
> R squared of .8 for races between 1950 and 1980.
>
> This logic only holds, of course, IF THE CANDIDATE WINS THE POPULAR VOTE
> FOR PRESIDENT. Bush did not, so we might expect a sort of "reverse"
> surge and decline, where the candidate's party who won the popular vote
> (i.e. the Democrats) would actually lose seats in the midterm elections.
>
> Finally, according to this logic, the really historic election would
> have been the
> 1998 midterm race, since Clinton won seats but also won the popular vote.
>
> Frank Rusciano
>
> Don Ferree wrote:
>
> > Often missed in these discussions of midterm elections is that one of the
> > reasons for the historic loss by the presidential party is that it used
to
> > be that winning the Presidency was accompanied by an "abnormally high"
vote
> > for that party in Congressional races. The next election, without the
> > President at the top of the ticket, things often "reverted back". In
1996
> > and 2000, despite winning the Presidency, there was no "abnormal surge"
up
> > for the President's party, and hence little to "snap back" from.
> > Redistricting and special circumstances also undoubtedly play a part, but
> > this part of the explanation gets less attention than I think it
deserves.
>
> -----

> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.
=====

Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 22:45:04 -0500
Reply-To: cporter@hp.ufl.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Kay Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>
Subject: child labor
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Gee, tonight was one of those times that I was really grateful for the support of colleagues, and to know that I am not alone out here.

I am trying to get a data set and documentation delivered to a client so that I can get off to the QDET conference. So I drafted my children to help me with one of those tedious proofreading jobs that goes faster with two people.

The nine year old was quite grumpy. "Why do I have to do this?" she demanded.

"Well, you like going on vacations and eating, right? My job pays for those things. If we were on a farm, you'd have to get up and milk the cow before school every day."

For once, I was glad for television news--right at that moment, they ran a piece about farm kids!

So she did it, and was a trooper. When the timer went off, we were in the middle of a page, and she voluntarily finished the page.

But it was also nice to know that from conversations with some of you, it's not uncommon for researchers' kids to be expected to pitch in and help with stuffing envelopes and designing web pages, etc. So I am not being the meanest mommy in the world.

Although I did miss the opening weekend of Star Wars II because of AAPOR last May, and will miss the opening weekend of Harry Potter 2 due to QDET, so I guess she has some room for complaint:)

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter, Project Coordinator
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. G1-016
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 23:30:26 -0500
Reply-To: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: child labor
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain
Content-transfer-encoding: binary

To my absolute shock, my 14 year old decided he wanted to replicate some of the questions from the nsf surveys of public understanding of science and technology for his science fair project this year. I did NOT put him up to it!

Maybe he decided he could get more help from Mom that way.

So now we have 124 surveys from 6, 7, and 8 graders, 1 gifted and 1 regular science class at each level.

Oh, and by the way, one-third of ADULT Americans don't know the father determines the gender of the child (and aaporneters, don't tell me you didn't know this one!)

Susan

On Wed, 13 Nov 2002 22:45:04 -0500 Colleen Kay Porter wrote:

> Gee, tonight was one of those times that I was really
> grateful for the support of colleagues, and to know
> that I am not alone out here.
>
> I am trying to get a data set and documentation
> delivered to a client so that I can get off to the QDET
> conference. So I drafted my children to help me with
> one of those tedious proofreading jobs that goes faster
> with two people.
>
> The nine year old was quite grumpy. "Why do I have to
> do this?" she demanded.
>
> "Well, you like going on vacations and eating, right? My
> job pays for those things. If we were on a farm, you'd
> have to get up and milk the cow before school every day."
>

> For once, I was glad for television news--right at that
> moment, they ran a piece about farm kids!
>
> So she did it, and was a trooper. When the timer went
> off, we were in the middle of a page, and she voluntarily
> finished the page.
>
> But it was also nice to know that from conversations
> with some of you, it's not uncommon for researchers'
> kids to be expected to pitch in and help with stuffing
> envelopes and designing web pages, etc. So I am not
> being the meanest mommy in the world.
>
> Although I did miss the opening weekend of Star Wars II
> because of AAPOR last May, and will miss the opening
> weekend of Harry Potter 2 due to QDET, so I guess she has
> some room for complaint:)
>
> Colleen
>
> Colleen K. Porter, Project Coordinator
> 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. G1-016
> Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
Program Leader, Learning and Cognition
Department of Educational Psychology
and Learning Systems
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

VOICE: 850-644-8778
FAX: 850-644-8776

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 10:51:31 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it wrong
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

JOHN FUND'S POLITICAL DIARY -Wall Street Journal

Polling Isn't Perfect
Why voter surveys so often get it wrong.

Thursday, November 14, 2002 12:01 a.m. EST

America has too many political polls, and Americans pay too much attention=20
to them. Many people have believed that for a long time. What's different=20
now is that some pollsters are starting to agree.

"We have falsely raised expectations about polling," says John Zogby, who=20
is famous for having called Bill Clinton's margin in the 1996 presidential=20
race almost exactly and having been virtually the only pollster to give Al=20
Gore a slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. But this year Mr.=20
Zogby saw three of his final 11 statewide polls indicate the wrong winner.=20
He says it would be helpful if people discovered the limitations of=20
polling. In a speech and interview in Washington yesterday he described=20
some of the problems his profession faces:

=95 The nightly tracking polls that both candidates and reporters fixate on=
=20
are less reliable than larger polls taken over a longer period of time. "I=
=20
probably should have used larger samples," admits Mr. Zogby, who thought=20
that Democrat Jeanne Shaheen would win an open New Hampshire Senate seat=20
and that Republican Jim Ryan was tied for the governor's race in Illinois.=20
=20
(She lost by four points and he by seven.)

Dave Winston, a Republican pollster, says one problem with nightly tracking=
=20
polls is that a pollster doing them doesn't have the time to make=20
innumerable repeat calls to people who won't pick up the phone. Mr. Zogby=20
says that he now has to make an average of seven calls to get just one=20
person willing to spend the 20 minutes or so it takes to answer his polling=
=20
questions.

=95 Pollsters can't poll on Election Day. Surveys this year found that=20
between 4% and 12% of voters in key states made up their mind who to vote=20
for on Election Day. Although challengers tend up pick up most of the=20
undecided vote, it doesn't always work out that way--making last-minute=20
votes impossible to predict.

=95 Voter turnout is highly variable and difficult to predict. Mr. Zogby=20 spent a great deal of time determining what the likely voter turnout among=20 African-American and Latinos would be. He spent less time guessing at the=20 turnout of white Republicans--that boring but large group that can swing=20 elections. "I and other pollsters missed the incredible get-out-the-vote=20 effort the Republicans made," he says.

The only pollster who accurately predicted that Republican Sen. Wayne=20 Allard would win re-election in Colorado was David Hill, director of Hill=20 Research, who said he determined who to call by looking at lists of past=20 voters, because they have the highest propensity of any group to vote.=20 Other pollsters surveyed a random selection of people and then asked them=20 how likely they were to vote.

=95 Answering machines, caller ID and other screening devices make pollsters=20 easier to avoid. Some phones won't even ring unless they recognize the=20 number of the caller. Scott Adler, University of Colorado political=20 scientist, says pollsters are now concerned that the people who do finally=20 agree to answer a pollster's questions are no longer representative of the=20 voters as a whole.

Whit Ayres, a GOP pollster, told the Atlanta Journal-Constitution that "I=20 can't fathom 20 years from now the telephone remaining the primary means of=20 data collection. This industry is in a transition from telephone data=20 collection to Internet data collection." In the meantime, look for polls to=20 be more variable and less reliable than ever. Perhaps it's time that we=20 spend more time listening to the candidates and having people make up their=20 own mind who's doing well.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 11:18:04 -0500
Reply-To: jleve@surveyusa.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jay Leve <jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM>
Subject: Re: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it
wrong
Comments: To: [dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>](mailto:dick_halpern@dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)
In-Reply-To: <5.1.1.6.2.20021114104931.035388a0@pop3.norton.antivirus>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Fund writes: "The only pollster who accurately predicted that Republican
Sen. Wayne Allard would win re-election in Colorado was David Hill."

False.

SurveyUSA had Allard by 4.

A scorecard is posted to our website, www.surveyusa.com.

Jay Leve
Editor
SurveyUSA
15 Bloomfield Ave.
Verona, NJ 07044

800-786-8000 x 551
jleve@surveyusa.com
www.surveyusa.com

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of dick halpern
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2002 10:52 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it wrong

JOHN FUND'S POLITICAL DIARY -Wall Street Journal

Polling Isn't Perfect
Why voter surveys so often get it wrong.

Thursday, November 14, 2002 12:01 a.m. EST

America has too many political polls, and Americans pay too much attention to them. Many people have believed that for a long time. What's different now is that some pollsters are starting to agree.

"We have falsely raised expectations about polling," says John Zogby, who is famous for having called Bill Clinton's margin in the 1996 presidential race almost exactly and having been virtually the only pollster to give Al Gore a slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. But this year Mr. Zogby saw three of his final 11 statewide polls indicate the wrong winner. He says it would be helpful if people discovered the limitations of polling. In a speech and interview in Washington yesterday he described some of the problems his profession faces:

- The nightly tracking polls that both candidates and reporters fixate on are less reliable than larger polls taken over a longer period of time. "I probably should have used larger samples," admits Mr. Zogby, who thought that Democrat Jeanne Shaheen would win an open New Hampshire Senate seat and that Republican Jim Ryan was tied for the governor's race in Illinois. (She lost by four points and he by seven.)

Dave Winston, a Republican pollster, says one problem with nightly tracking polls is that a pollster doing them doesn't have the time to make innumerable repeat calls to people who won't pick up the phone. Mr. Zogby says that he now has to make an average of seven calls to get just one

person willing to spend the 20 minutes or so it takes to answer his polling questions.

- Pollsters can't poll on Election Day. Surveys this year found that between 4% and 12% of voters in key states made up their mind who to vote for on Election Day. Although challengers tend to pick up most of the undecided vote, it doesn't always work out that way--making last-minute votes impossible to predict.

- Voter turnout is highly variable and difficult to predict. Mr. Zogby spent a great deal of time determining what the likely voter turnout among African-American and Latinos would be. He spent less time guessing at the turnout of white Republicans--that boring but large group that can swing elections. "I and other pollsters missed the incredible get-out-the-vote effort the Republicans made," he says.

The only pollster who accurately predicted that Republican Sen. Wayne Allard would win re-election in Colorado was David Hill, director of Hill Research, who said he determined who to call by looking at lists of past voters, because they have the highest propensity of any group to vote. Other pollsters surveyed a random selection of people and then asked them how likely they were to vote.

- Answering machines, caller ID and other screening devices make pollsters easier to avoid. Some phones won't even ring unless they recognize the number of the caller. Scott Adler, University of Colorado political scientist, says pollsters are now concerned that the people who do finally agree to answer a pollster's questions are no longer representative of the voters as a whole.

Whit Ayres, a GOP pollster, told the Atlanta Journal-Constitution that "I can't fathom 20 years from now the telephone remaining the primary means of data collection. This industry is in a transition from telephone data collection to Internet data collection." In the meantime, look for polls to be more variable and less reliable than ever. Perhaps it's time that we spend more time listening to the candidates and having people make up their own mind who's doing well.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 10:43:05 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation

Subject: Re: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it wrong
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

The tunnel vision displayed in the post-mortem accounts of poll performance this year has been simply extraordinary. There was another WSJ piece last week and a column in a the Chicago Tribune today.

All of these commentaries focus on one pollster and/or one poll in only 3-4 races and then go on to give all kinds of reasons why the End Is Near for polling. There were probably a hundred polls conducted in the final week of the campaigns which appeared in the media.

In Illinois for example, one would never know that there were *six other media polls* showing Blagojevich ahead by 6 to 10 points; i.e., bracketing his win of 7 points.

Media: Get A Grip.

Nick

P.S. Again, Zogby was not "virtually the only pollster to give Al Gore a slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. It was CBS, Harris, and Harris Interactive who were closest to his 0.5 win - check it out at ncpp.org

Incumbency may have been a factor in Georgia. The Tribune's story of our final poll ended with this sentence: "Past election results have shown that a majority of those who haven't made up their mind within days of casting a ballot end up voting for the challenger in a race against an incumbent."

dick halpern wrote:

>
> JOHN FUND'S POLITICAL DIARY -Wall Street Journal
>
> Polling Isn't Perfect
> Why voter surveys so often get it wrong.
>
> Thursday, November 14, 2002 12:01 a.m. EST
>
> America has too many political polls, and Americans pay too much attention
> to them. Many people have believed that for a long time. What's different
> now is that some pollsters are starting to agree.
>
> "We have falsely raised expectations about polling," says John Zogby, who
> is famous for having called Bill Clinton's margin in the 1996 presidential
> race almost exactly and having been virtually the only pollster to give Al
> Gore a slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. But this year Mr.
> Zogby saw three of his final 11 statewide polls indicate the wrong winner.
> He says it would be helpful if people discovered the limitations of
> polling. In a speech and interview in Washington yesterday he described
> some of the problems his profession faces:
>

> • The nightly tracking polls that both candidates and reporters fixate on
> are less reliable than larger polls taken over a longer period of time. "I
> probably should have used larger samples," admits Mr. Zogby, who thought
> that Democrat Jeanne Shaheen would win an open New Hampshire Senate seat
> and that Republican Jim Ryan was tied for the governor's race in Illinois.
> (She lost by four points and he by seven.)
>
> Dave Winston, a Republican pollster, says one problem with nightly tracking
> polls is that a pollster doing them doesn't have the time to make
> innumerable repeat calls to people who won't pick up the phone. Mr. Zogby
> says that he now has to make an average of seven calls to get just one
> person willing to spend the 20 minutes or so it takes to answer his polling
> questions.
>
> • Pollsters can't poll on Election Day. Surveys this year found that
> between 4% and 12% of voters in key states made up their mind who to vote
> for on Election Day. Although challengers tend to pick up most of the
> undecided vote, it doesn't always work out that way--making last-minute
> votes impossible to predict.
>
> • Voter turnout is highly variable and difficult to predict. Mr. Zogby
> spent a great deal of time determining what the likely voter turnout among
> African-American and Latinos would be. He spent less time guessing at the
> turnout of white Republicans--that boring but large group that can swing
> elections. "I and other pollsters missed the incredible get-out-the-vote
> effort the Republicans made," he says.
>
> The only pollster who accurately predicted that Republican Sen. Wayne
> Allard would win re-election in Colorado was David Hill, director of Hill
> Research, who said he determined who to call by looking at lists of past
> voters, because they have the highest propensity of any group to vote.
> Other pollsters surveyed a random selection of people and then asked them
> how likely they were to vote.
>
> • Answering machines, caller ID and other screening devices make pollsters
> easier to avoid. Some phones won't even ring unless they recognize the
> number of the caller. Scott Adler, University of Colorado political
> scientist, says pollsters are now concerned that the people who do finally
> agree to answer a pollster's questions are no longer representative of the
> voters as a whole.
>
> Whit Ayres, a GOP pollster, told the Atlanta Journal-Constitution that "I
> can't fathom 20 years from now the telephone remaining the primary means of
> data collection. This industry is in a transition from telephone data
> collection to Internet data collection." In the meantime, look for polls to
> be more variable and less reliable than ever. Perhaps it's time that we
> spend more time listening to the candidates and having people make up their
> own mind who's doing well.
>
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 12:39:49 -0500
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it
wrong
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
In-Reply-To: <3DD3C480.C599627D@marketsharescorp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN
Content-transfer-encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE

The Carolina Poll at UNC called the Elizabeth Dole win within 1
percentage point. Maybe in self-defense, we should compile a listing of as
many pre-election polls for this past election as we can and publish a
summary of the successes and failures.

Who will volunteer to be the collection center? Chances are that
somebody already has the job at least half done.

=3D=
=3D=
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
=3D=
=3D=

On Thu, 14 Nov 2002, Nick Panagakis wrote:

> Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 10:43:05 -0500
> From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it wron=
> g
>
> The tunnel vision displayed in the post-mortem accounts of poll
> performance this year has been simply extraordinary. There was another
> WSJ piece last week and a column in a the Chicago Tribune today.
>
> All of these commentaries focus on one pollster and/or one poll in only
> 3-4 races and then go on to give all kinds of reasons why the End Is
> Near for polling. There were probably a hundred polls conducted in the
> final week of the campaigns which appeared in the media.
>
> In Illinois for example, one would never know that there were *six other
> media polls* showing Blagojevich ahead by 6 to 10 points; i.e.,
> bracketing his win of 7 points.
>

> Media: Get A Grip.
>
> Nick
>
> P.S. Again, Zogby was not "virtually the only pollster to give Al Gore a
> slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. It was CBS, Harris,
> and Harris Interactive who were closest to his 0.5 win - check it out at =
ncpp.org
>
> Incumbency may have been a factor in Georgia. The Tribune's story of our
> final poll ended with this sentence: "Past election results have shown
> that a majority of those who haven't made up their mind within days of
> casting a ballot end up voting for the challenger in a race against an in=
cumbent."
>
>
> dick halpern wrote:
> >
> > JOHN FUND'S POLITICAL DIARY -Wall Street Journal
> >
> > Polling Isn't Perfect
> > Why voter surveys so often get it wrong.
> >
> > Thursday, November 14, 2002 12:01 a.m. EST
> >
> > America has too many political polls, and Americans pay too much attent=
ion
> > to them. Many people have believed that for a long time. What's differe=
nt
> > now is that some pollsters are starting to agree.
> >
> > "We have falsely raised expectations about polling," says John Zogby, w=
ho
> > is famous for having called Bill Clinton's margin in the 1996 president=
ial
> > race almost exactly and having been virtually the only pollster to give=
Al
> > Gore a slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. But this year =
Mr.
> > Zogby saw three of his final 11 statewide polls indicate the wrong winn=
er.
> > He says it would be helpful if people discovered the limitations of
> > polling. In a speech and interview in Washington yesterday he described
> > some of the problems his profession faces:
> >
> > =95 The nightly tracking polls that both candidates and reporters fixat=
e on
> > are less reliable than larger polls taken over a longer period of time.=
"I
> > probably should have used larger samples," admits Mr. Zogby, who though=
t
> > that Democrat Jeanne Shaheen would win an open New Hampshire Senate sea=
t
> > and that Republican Jim Ryan was tied for the governor's race in Illino=
is.
> > (She lost by four points and he by seven.)
> >

> > Dave Winston, a Republican pollster, says one problem with nightly tracking polls is that a pollster doing them doesn't have the time to make innumerable repeat calls to people who won't pick up the phone. Mr. Zogby says that he now has to make an average of seven calls to get just one person willing to spend the 20 minutes or so it takes to answer his polling questions.

> > =95 Pollsters can't poll on Election Day. Surveys this year found that between 4% and 12% of voters in key states made up their mind who to vote for on Election Day. Although challengers tend to pick up most of the undecided vote, it doesn't always work out that way--making last-minute votes impossible to predict.

> > =95 Voter turnout is highly variable and difficult to predict. Mr. Zogby spent a great deal of time determining what the likely voter turnout among African-American and Latinos would be. He spent less time guessing at the turnout of white Republicans--that boring but large group that can swing elections. "I and other pollsters missed the incredible get-out-the-vote effort the Republicans made," he says.

> > The only pollster who accurately predicted that Republican Sen. Wayne Allard would win re-election in Colorado was David Hill, director of Hill Research, who said he determined who to call by looking at lists of past voters, because they have the highest propensity of any group to vote. Other pollsters surveyed a random selection of people and then asked them how likely they were to vote.

> > =95 Answering machines, caller ID and other screening devices make pollsters easier to avoid. Some phones won't even ring unless they recognize the number of the caller. Scott Adler, University of Colorado political scientist, says pollsters are now concerned that the people who do finally agree to answer a pollster's questions are no longer representative of the voters as a whole.

> > Whit Ayres, a GOP pollster, told the Atlanta Journal-Constitution that = "I can't fathom 20 years from now the telephone remaining the primary means of data collection. This industry is in a transition from telephone data collection to Internet data collection." In the meantime, look for pollsters to be more variable and less reliable than ever. Perhaps it's time that we

> > spend more time listening to the candidates and having people make up their
heir
> > own mind who's doing well.
> >
> > -----
> > View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> > You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> > main email address.
> > Problems?--don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> > -----
> > View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> > You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> > main email address.
> > Problems?--don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?--don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 12:28:18 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it
wrong
In-Reply-To: <3DD3C480.C599627D@marketsharescorp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I was wondering about this myself (the supposed inaccuracy of polls in
this election) and I was thinking what a wonderful resource it would be
if someone or some organization would take it upon themselves to after
the elections to go through and compare the publicly available polling
data to the actual outcomes.

Of course it would be a lot of work and would lead to grouching about
from those whose results were cast in a bad light.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis

Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2002 10:43 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it wrong

The tunnel vision displayed in the post-mortem accounts of poll performance this year has been simply extraordinary. There was another WSJ piece last week and a column in a the Chicago Tribune today.

All of these commentaries focus on one pollster and/or one poll in only 3-4 races and then go on to give all kinds of reasons why the End Is Near for polling. There were probably a hundred polls conducted in the final week of the campaigns which appeared in the media.

In Illinois for example, one would never know that there were *six other media polls* showing Blagojevich ahead by 6 to 10 points; i.e., bracketing his win of 7 points.

Media: Get A Grip.

Nick

P.S. Again, Zogby was not "virtually the only pollster to give Al Gore a slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. It was CBS, Harris, and Harris Interactive who were closest to his 0.5 win - check it out at ncpp.org

Incumbency may have been a factor in Georgia. The Tribune's story of our final poll ended with this sentence: "Past election results have shown that a majority of those who haven't made up their mind within days of casting a ballot end up voting for the challenger in a race against an incumbent."

dick halpern wrote:

>
> JOHN FUND'S POLITICAL DIARY -Wall Street Journal
>
> Polling Isn't Perfect
> Why voter surveys so often get it wrong.
>
> Thursday, November 14, 2002 12:01 a.m. EST
>
> America has too many political polls, and Americans pay too much attention
> to them. Many people have believed that for a long time. What's different
> now is that some pollsters are starting to agree.
>
> "We have falsely raised expectations about polling," says John Zogby, who
> is famous for having called Bill Clinton's margin in the 1996 presidential
> race almost exactly and having been virtually the only pollster to give Al
> Gore a slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. But this year
Mr.

> Zogby saw three of his final 11 statewide polls indicate the wrong winner.

> He says it would be helpful if people discovered the limitations of polling. In a speech and interview in Washington yesterday he described

> some of the problems his profession faces:

>

> . The nightly tracking polls that both candidates and reporters fixate on

> are less reliable than larger polls taken over a longer period of time. "I

> probably should have used larger samples," admits Mr. Zogby, who thought

> that Democrat Jeanne Shaheen would win an open New Hampshire Senate seat

> and that Republican Jim Ryan was tied for the governor's race in Illinois.

> (She lost by four points and he by seven.)

>

> Dave Winston, a Republican pollster, says one problem with nightly tracking

> polls is that a pollster doing them doesn't have the time to make

> innumerable repeat calls to people who won't pick up the phone. Mr. Zogby

> says that he now has to make an average of seven calls to get just one

> person willing to spend the 20 minutes or so it takes to answer his polling

> questions.

>

> . Pollsters can't poll on Election Day. Surveys this year found that

> between 4% and 12% of voters in key states made up their mind who to vote

> for on Election Day. Although challengers tend up pick up most of the

> undecided vote, it doesn't always work out that way--making

last-minute

> votes impossible to predict.

>

> . Voter turnout is highly variable and difficult to predict. Mr. Zogby

> spent a great deal of time determining what the likely voter turnout among

> African-American and Latinos would be. He spent less time guessing at the

> turnout of white Republicans--that boring but large group that can swing

> elections. "I and other pollsters missed the incredible

get-out-the-vote

> effort the Republicans made," he says.

>

> The only pollster who accurately predicted that Republican Sen. Wayne

> Allard would win re-election in Colorado was David Hill, director of Hill

> Research, who said he determined who to call by looking at lists of past

past

> voters, because they have the highest propensity of any group to vote.

> Other pollsters surveyed a random selection of people and then asked them

them

> how likely they were to vote.

>
> . Answering machines, caller ID and other screening devices make
pollsters
> easier to avoid. Some phones won't even ring unless they recognize the
> number of the caller. Scott Adler, University of Colorado political
> scientist, says pollsters are now concerned that the people who do
finally
> agree to answer a pollster's questions are no longer representative of
the
> voters as a whole.
>
> Whit Ayres, a GOP pollster, told the Atlanta Journal-Constitution that
"I
> can't fathom 20 years from now the telephone remaining the primary
means of
> data collection. This industry is in a transition from telephone data
> collection to Internet data collection." In the meantime, look for
polls to
> be more variable and less reliable than ever. Perhaps it's time that
we
> spend more time listening to the candidates and having people make up
their
> own mind who's doing well.
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at
your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 12:13:15 -0600
Reply-To: rsantos@NUSTATS.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Robert Santos <rsantos@NUSTATS.COM>
Subject: Re: child labor -- an idea?
In-Reply-To: <200211140430.gAE4UQH07371@fire2.fsu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

greetings, AAPORNetters

in chatting offline with SusanL about he son's wonderful experience, it got me to think that it would be nice to somehow identify several exemplary survey/opinion projects conducted by kids and recognize them -- not to the level of "student paper awards" (which we already have), but something less than that - maybe post them in a "kids corner" web page that would be a new part of our AAPOR web site.

If we could get some diverse entries (different topics, different ages, different areas of the country), it might promote interest in (1) teachers looking to AAPOR for educational projects for their kids; (2) kids looking to AAPOR for fun school projects they can use for their own work; (3) promote AAPOR to the "little people" to grow appreciation for our industry and even increase professional ranks in our beloved industry... if needed, we could start with entries from -- you guessed it -- the kids of our own AAPOR members!! (why not?)

just a silly idea to contemplate...

Rob Santos
NuStats

Date sent: Wed, 13 Nov 2002 23:30:26 -0500
From: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: child labor
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Send reply to: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>

To my absolute shock, my 14 year old decided he wanted to replicate some of the questions from the nsf surveys of public understanding of science and technology for his science fair project this year. I did NOT put him up to it!

Maybe he decided he could get more help from Mom that way.

So now we have 124 surveys from 6, 7, and 8 graders, 1 gifted and 1 regular science class at each level.

Oh, and by the way, one-third of ADULT Americans don't know the father determines the gender of the child (and aaporneters, don't tell me you didn't know this one!)

Susan

On Wed, 13 Nov 2002 22:45:04 -0500 Colleen Kay Porter wrote:

> Gee, tonight was one of those times that I was really
> grateful for the support of colleagues, and to know

> that I am not alone out here.
>
> I am trying to get a data set and documentation
> delivered to a client so that I can get off to the QDET
> conference. So I drafted my children to help me with
> one of those tedious proofreading jobs that goes faster
> with two people.
>
> The nine year old was quite grumpy. "Why do I have to
> do this?" she demanded.
>
> "Well, you like going on vacations and eating, right? My
> job pays for those things. If we were on a farm, you'd
> have to get up and milk the cow before school every day."
>
> For once, I was glad for television news--right at that
> moment, they ran a piece about farm kids!
>
> So she did it, and was a trooper. When the timer went
> off, we were in the middle of a page, and she voluntarily
> finished the page.
>
> But it was also nice to know that from conversations
> with some of you, it's not uncommon for researchers'
> kids to be expected to pitch in and help with stuffing
> envelopes and designing web pages, etc. So I am not
> being the meanest mommy in the world.
>
> Although I did miss the opening weekend of Star Wars II
> because of AAPOR last May, and will miss the opening
> weekend of Harry Potter 2 due to QDET, so I guess she has
> some room for complaint:)
>
> Colleen
>
> Colleen K. Porter, Project Coordinator
> 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. G1-016
> Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
Program Leader, Learning and Cognition
Department of Educational Psychology
and Learning Systems
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

VOICE: 850-644-8778
FAX: 850-644-8776

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 14:14:43 -0500
Reply-To: Mike.Donatello@MarketDataAnalysis.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Donatello <Mike.Donatello@MARKETDATAANALYSIS.COM>
Subject: Re: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it
wrong
In-Reply-To: <[000201c28c03\\$3bbfa0c0\\$130a010a@LEO](mailto:000201c28c03$3bbfa0c0$130a010a@LEO)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Sounds to me like the foundation of a great dissertation. Too bad I don't
have the time...

--

Mike Donatello
Senior Partner, Vice President of Research
Borrell Associates Inc.
Digital Direction for Media Companies
2902 Mother Well Ct., Oak Hill, VA 20171-4065
V 703.582.5680 F 703.832.8630
MDonatello@borrellassociates.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta
Sent: 14 November, 2002 12:28
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it wrong

I was wondering about this myself (the supposed inaccuracy of polls in
this election) and I was thinking what a wonderful resource it would be
if someone or some organization would take it upon themselves to after
the elections to go through and compare the publicly available polling
data to the actual outcomes.

Of course it would be a lot of work and would lead to grousing about
from those whose results were cast in a bad light.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2002 10:43 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it wrong

The tunnel vision displayed in the post-mortem accounts of poll performance this year has been simply extraordinary. There was another WSJ piece last week and a column in the Chicago Tribune today.

All of these commentaries focus on one pollster and/or one poll in only 3-4 races and then go on to give all kinds of reasons why the End Is Near for polling. There were probably a hundred polls conducted in the final week of the campaigns which appeared in the media.

In Illinois for example, one would never know that there were *six other media polls* showing Blagojevich ahead by 6 to 10 points; i.e., bracketing his win of 7 points.

Media: Get A Grip.

Nick

P.S. Again, Zogby was not "virtually the only pollster to give Al Gore a slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. It was CBS, Harris, and Harris Interactive who were closest to his 0.5 win - check it out at ncpp.org

Incumbency may have been a factor in Georgia. The Tribune's story of our final poll ended with this sentence: "Past election results have shown that a majority of those who haven't made up their mind within days of casting a ballot end up voting for the challenger in a race against an incumbent."

dick halpern wrote:

>
> JOHN FUND'S POLITICAL DIARY -Wall Street Journal
>
> Polling Isn't Perfect
> Why voter surveys so often get it wrong.
>
> Thursday, November 14, 2002 12:01 a.m. EST
>
> America has too many political polls, and Americans pay too much attention
> to them. Many people have believed that for a long time. What's

different

> now is that some pollsters are starting to agree.

>

> "We have falsely raised expectations about polling," says John Zogby, who

> is famous for having called Bill Clinton's margin in the 1996

presidential

> race almost exactly and having been virtually the only pollster to

give Al

> Gore a slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. But this year Mr.

> Zogby saw three of his final 11 statewide polls indicate the wrong winner.

> He says it would be helpful if people discovered the limitations of

> polling. In a speech and interview in Washington yesterday he

described

> some of the problems his profession faces:

>

> . The nightly tracking polls that both candidates and reporters fixate on

> are less reliable than larger polls taken over a longer period of time. "I

> probably should have used larger samples," admits Mr. Zogby, who thought

> that Democrat Jeanne Shaheen would win an open New Hampshire Senate seat

> and that Republican Jim Ryan was tied for the governor's race in Illinois.

> (She lost by four points and he by seven.)

>

> Dave Winston, a Republican pollster, says one problem with nightly tracking

> polls is that a pollster doing them doesn't have the time to make

> innumerable repeat calls to people who won't pick up the phone. Mr.

Zogby

> says that he now has to make an average of seven calls to get just one

> person willing to spend the 20 minutes or so it takes to answer his

polling

> questions.

>

> . Pollsters can't poll on Election Day. Surveys this year found that

> between 4% and 12% of voters in key states made up their mind who to vote

> for on Election Day. Although challengers tend to pick up most of the

> undecided vote, it doesn't always work out that way--making

last-minute

> votes impossible to predict.

>

> . Voter turnout is highly variable and difficult to predict. Mr. Zogby

> spent a great deal of time determining what the likely voter turnout

among

> African-American and Latinos would be. He spent less time guessing at the

> turnout of white Republicans--that boring but large group that can swing

> elections. "I and other pollsters missed the incredible

get-out-the-vote

> effort the Republicans made," he says.
>
> The only pollster who accurately predicted that Republican Sen. Wayne
> Allard would win re-election in Colorado was David Hill, director of
Hill
> Research, who said he determined who to call by looking at lists of
past
> voters, because they have the highest propensity of any group to vote.
> Other pollsters surveyed a random selection of people and then asked
them
> how likely they were to vote.
>
> . Answering machines, caller ID and other screening devices make
pollsters
> easier to avoid. Some phones won't even ring unless they recognize the
> number of the caller. Scott Adler, University of Colorado political
> scientist, says pollsters are now concerned that the people who do
finally
> agree to answer a pollster's questions are no longer representative of
the
> voters as a whole.
>
> Whit Ayres, a GOP pollster, told the Atlanta Journal-Constitution that
"I
> can't fathom 20 years from now the telephone remaining the primary
means of
> data collection. This industry is in a transition from telephone data
> collection to Internet data collection." In the meantime, look for
polls to
> be more variable and less reliable than ever. Perhaps it's time that
we
> spend more time listening to the candidates and having people make up
their
> own mind who's doing well.
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at
your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 17:51:28 -0500
Reply-To: Ktedin100@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Kent Tedin <Ktedin100@AOL.COM>
Subject: Augusta National
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Today's Los Angeles Times reports on a survey commissioned by the Augusta County Club designed to determine support or opposition for its male only membership policy. As almost everyone in the public opinion community knows, questions of the sort asked in the survey (conducted by the Polling Co., Inc. and WomanTrend of Washington, D.C.) are highly misleading, and can in no way be used to set the level of public opinion. The agree-disagree questions giving comfort to the Augusta County Club are shown below.

"Private clubs and organizations should change their rules when their members or leadership decides to, not when one person who is not part of their organization criticizes them or pressures them to so."

Agree: 75% (men) 74% (women)

"The Augusta National Golf Club was correct in its decision not to give in to Martha Burk's demand. They should review and change their policies on their own time and in their own way."

Agree: 72% (men) 73% (womne)

We know that questions of this sort suffer from two sorts of biases. First, general acquiescence bias (then tendency to agree with vague or general statements). Second, the bias induced by the fact only one side of the issue is presented. When only one side is presented, people tend to agree with side presented, given the absence of a counter-argument (which, for many people, cannot be immediately retrieved from short term memory). What is needed at a minimum to reasonably set the opinion level, beyond these two questions, is either (1) items that require the respondent to disagree in order to set the level of opinion, or (2) an item where both sides of the issue are presented. For a dramatic example of the effect of offering both sides of an issue as opposed to presenting only one side, see Robert Erikson and Kent Tedin, *American Public Opinion*, p. 37. There is a 22% difference between an agree-disagree statement regarding whether "any able-bodied person can find a job and make ends meet" and the version where both sides of the issue are presented.

My guess is that if respondents had to disagree with a statement to set the level of opinion regarding Augusta's all-male policy, or if respondents were presented both sides of the issue, we would get very different results.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?--don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 20:26:03 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: 2002 Election -- the age gap
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

TRB FROM WASHINGTON
Age Gap
by Peter Beinart, New Republic

Post date: 11.04.02
Issue date: 11.11.02

A great deal has happened in the two years since America last went to the polls: a global war on terrorism, a pending war on Iraq, a meltdown on Wall Street, a huge tax cut, the proposed reorganization of large chunks of the federal bureaucracy, an ambitious new education bill, an overhauled system of campaign finance. But you would hardly know it on the campaign trail. Sure, Enron and WorldCom star in a thousand political ads. But in these waning days of the 2002 campaign, the biggest issue on the stump is the same one that dominated in 1982: Social Security. And the second biggest is the same one Al Gore and George W. Bush flogged in 2000: prescription drugs.

Are Americans so intellectually inert that their concerns haven't changed even as the world around them has turned upside down? No, it's just that most Americans don't vote in midterm elections; most older Americans do.

Every two years pundits fret about America's dismally low turnout rates. Yet, in a sense, the problem is that voting rates aren't uniformly low. If Americans of all age groups were equally disconnected from the political process, the small number of voters would at least reasonably approximate the population as a whole--and politicians would discuss a cross section of issues that appealed to people at different stages of life. But that isn't the case. In 1998, only 17 percent of Americans ages 18 to 24 went to the polls, compared with 59 percent of Americans 65 and older. Because the elderly vote at such massively disproportionate rates, politicians devote massively disproportionate attention to their issues. And when they return to Washington, those politicians massively redistribute wealth from young to old.

Most polls show that the public as a whole is far more concerned with the economy--in particular the availability of jobs--than with anything else. Education and health care (excluding prescription drugs) generally follow,

along with Social Security and prescription drugs. Yet jobs are primarily an issue for Americans of working age. Education mostly concerns parents with children. And "health care" refers to problems with HMOs and the plight of the uninsured. So although more important to the population as a whole, these issues garner less campaign-trail attention than Social Security and prescription drugs, which mostly concern seniors.

The result is a vicious cycle, most acute in midterm elections, in which younger voters don't hear their concerns addressed and therefore don't vote, leading politicians to ignore their concerns even more. Since 1966, turnout among 21- to 34-year-olds is down roughly 40 percent. Among 35- to 44-year-olds, it's down 30 percent. But among 65- to 74-year-olds, it's up 8 percent. And among people 75 and older, it's up 25 percent. No wonder Republican congressional pollster Glen Bolger told Robin Toner of The New York Times this January that he asks every candidate the same question: "What is our message, and how are we going to communicate with seniors?"

Part of the problem is cultural. Older Americans--because they came of age at a time when politics seemed more vital--just care more about politics than younger people do. But there's another aspect to the problem that is a lot less abstract and a lot more amenable to governmental reform: Our election system makes it harder for younger people to vote. First of all, young people are more likely to be outside the country, particularly in the military. And as Florida showed in 2000, it's much harder than it should be to procure--and legally fill out--an overseas absentee ballot. Secondly, young people are more likely to be felons. In 36 states that means they temporarily lose their voting rights; in twelve states it means they lose them for good (even after they have served their time). Thirdly, young people are more mobile, and, since most states disallow voter registration in the weeks or months immediately before an election, that mobility often leaves them ineligible on Election Day. According to the Census Bureau, only 41 percent of Americans who had lived in their homes less than one month were registered in 1998, compared with 76 percent of those who had lived in their homes for more than five years. And lastly, young Americans are more likely to hold jobs or be in school. That makes it harder for them to get to the polls on Tuesdays, when the United States holds its elections.

In July 2001, a commission headed by former Presidents Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford proposed doing something about this. The commission, created in the wake of the 2000 Florida debacle, proposed enfranchising felons who had served their time, simplifying overseas ballot procedures, and making Election Day a national holiday--perhaps by merging it with Veterans Day. President Bush, eager to be seen as reforming a broken system, said he supported the commission's recommendations in principle. In practice, however, he buried them. White House spokesman Ari Fleischer said the president would have to consult with veterans' groups before endorsing the Election Day merger. Predictably, they objected, and in a mindless bit of pandering, the House last December voted overwhelmingly to keep Veterans Day separate. Although there was an obvious alternative--holding elections on the weekend--the White House let the issue die. The Help America Vote Act--signed with much fanfare last week by President Bush--modestly improves procedures for overseas absentee balloting but otherwise ignores most of the Carter-Ford commission's proposals.

This fall California and Colorado will vote on the one valuable reform the Carter-Ford commission didn't propose: allowing people to register on Election Day. In the six states that allow same-day registration, 68

percent of the eligible population voted in the 2000 election, compared with 53 percent in the rest of the country. And same-day registration particularly benefits the mobile young. But conservatives generally oppose the reform, and liberals haven't made it a priority. What's more, the electorate that determines the proposal's fate will be disproportionately elderly. No wonder the referendum's prospects look dubious in Colorado and dismal in California.

In fact, one of the few voting reforms that states do seem interested in enacting--increased voting by mail--actually makes the generational imbalance worse. In Oregon and parts of Washington state, voters can only vote by mail; there are no polling places. Colorado is considering following suit. But it's not clear that mail-in voting increases turnout; some studies suggest that it simply makes voting easier for people who would have cast ballots anyway. And mail-in voting specifically benefits people who would have difficulty traveling to a voting booth--the elderly and infirm.

Politicians are fond of urging the young not to be so apathetic. But their admonitions would carry more weight if they addressed the structural barriers that feed that indifference. When a high-profile commission gives Congress and the White House an opportunity to do something about the problem and they refuse, you have to wonder whether political cynicism might not be limited to the slackers watching MTV.

Peter Beinart is the editor of TNR.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 14 Nov 2002 22:40:57 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: [Fwd: HUFFINGTON: The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority]
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Bandwagon - from the person whose intellectual ability to handle polling issues has been questioned. Predictable.

HUFFINGTON: The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority
Arianna Huffington, AlterNet
November 14, 2002

I'm still trying to figure out who had a more wretched Election Night 2002, the Democratic Party or America's pollsters. While Democrats lost control of the Senate, they will live to fight another election day. Pollsters, on the

other hand, in losing what scraps of credibility they had, may -- with a little help from the public -- find their entire profession obsolete, gone the way of chimney sweeps, organ pumpers, and those guys who used to make buggy whips.

For years now, the accuracy of political polls has been -- in the parlance of the trade -- "trending downward." Last week it hit bottom. The Voter News Service admitted on Election Night that due to "technical difficulties" its exit polls weren't to be trusted, forcing the networks to rely on actual votes. And in race after race, pre-election polls proved as reliable as the iceberg spotter on the Titanic.

In Georgia, pollsters had predicted Democratic Gov. Roy Barnes would beat challenger Sonny Perdue handily -- a Mason-Dixon poll had Barnes leading by 9 points, while one conducted by the Atlanta Constitution had him up by 11. Once the votes were counted, however, it was Perdue beating Barnes by 5 points -- a humiliating 16-point airball for the pollsters.

They were just as prescient in Colorado where an MSNBC/Zogby poll had Democratic challenger Tom Strickland trouncing incumbent Sen. Wayne Allard 53 percent to 44 percent. In reality, Allard strolled to a relatively stress-free 5-point win -- a 14-point blunder.

And in Illinois, another Zogby poll had the governor's race pitting Republican Jim Ryan against Democrat Rod Blagojevich as a statistical dead heat -- a finding that was, statistically, dead wrong. Blagojevich won and Ryan and Zogby lost by 7 percentage points.

The pollsters' numbers were so off the mark that even they were forced to admit the obvious. "There was a lot of bad polling this year," acknowledged Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster. "We blew it," said John Zogby.

As a rule, pollsters come equipped with more excuses than a married man with lipstick on his collar, and this year was no different. And whom did they point the finger of blame at most frequently? Why you and me, naturally. It seems we just didn't turn out at the polls in exactly the configurations the pollsters thought we would -- what Mr. Zogby delicately referred to as "poor turnout models." In other words, the problems aren't polls, it's those damn voters who say one thing then do another. Like show up on Election Day.

In truth, the problem isn't with us, dear voters, or even with you, dear nonvoters. The problem is with the pollsters' inability to account for an increasingly uncooperative public. Thanks to cell phones, answering machines, caller ID, a surfeit of polls, and a growing distaste for telephonic intrusions into our homes, it's getting harder and harder for pollsters to find Americans willing to answer their questions. Twenty years ago, polling response rates were over 60 percent; now they are closer to 30 percent -- and in some cases even lower. It's pretty tough to get an accurate reading of the public's opinion when the most frequent response you receive is a "click" followed by a dial tone.

So here we are in the middle of a vicious vortex. Pollsters conduct their increasingly inaccurate polls, the media then report the results as if Moses has just brought them down from the mountaintop, and our politicians tailor their messages to suit phantom voters. All the players involved in this charade understand they are acting on the flimsiest of pretenses; it's just that relying on polls is so much easier than actually reporting or leading.

Even President Bush, who charged into office trumpeting his disdain for polls -- don't they all? -- has proven to be a chronic poll watcher and poll taker. In fact, this schizophrenic stance has actually become something of an in-joke at the White House: Bush brags about not looking at polls and everyone laughs, knowing the president doesn't have to look because Karl Rove has already whispered the results in his ear.

But allowing polling data to become a substitute for thinking has become a very wobbly crutch indeed. Just ask the Democrats who, after consulting their pollsters' tea leaves, decided not to take on the president on tax cuts or on invading Iraq. They were forced to pay for their slavish devotion to the numbers with their political lives. Pollsters, on the other hand, are allowed to tiptoe away from the carnage their handiwork has wrought and still keep their jobs.

As long as you can sagely and entertainingly spin your numbers on the tube, there is no penalty for being wrong. As Norm Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute wryly puts it, "It's the sin of broadcasting in the modern age. No matter how wrong you are, the punishment is you get your own show on cable television."

I think it's time to change that equation -- to attach some downside to the political prognosticators' game. Perhaps we should fine pollsters \$100,000 for every percentage point they are off (and create a retirement fund for pollsters who agree to leave their discredited profession). Or attach a large letter "I" (for "Inaccurate") to the lapels of those who are wrong more than they are right. Or perhaps we can follow the lead of English soccer leagues, which regularly consign teams with losing records to second tier divisions. And, if all else fails, there is always the option of a little reverse Pavlovian training -- let's say, by attaching electrodes to pollsters' sensitive areas on Election Night and sending a charge through them anytime a poll-based prediction proves erroneous. It would give a whole new meaning to the term "political buzz."

If you, like me, are one of the many millions who hang up on callers wanting to know what kind of toothpaste I prefer, what TV shows I watch, or what candidates I'm going to vote for, you'll be proud to know that you are part of a rapidly expanding segment of the population known as the "margin of error." And if you're not, now is the perfect time to join us and make anti-Democratic polling a thing of the past.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 07:45:34 -0500
Reply-To: RFunk787@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>
Subject: South Dakota election
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Yesterday's lead Wall Street Journal editorial spoke to the possibility that Johnson retained his senate seat via "Chicago style" vote fraud (actually, it's the same mechanism Lyndon Johnson used when he stole his Senate seat in 1948 -- ref Caro, The Means of Ascent). I've not seen this discussed anywhere else in my admittedly fragmentary daily scan of the news. Has anyone seen any stories about this presumably newsworthy issue, anywhere in the press besides the WSJ?

Ray Funkhouser

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 09:12:20 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: South Dakota election
Comments: To: RFunk787@AOL.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Actually, the question I have is if there was even the possibility of vote fraud, why didn't Thune challenge the result when the Johnson's margin of victory was so small. I would have at least expected a recount. Does anyone know the answer?

"G. Ray Funkhouser" wrote:

> Yesterday's lead Wall Street Journal editorial spoke to the possibility that
> Johnson retained his senate seat via "Chicago style" vote fraud (actually,
> it's the same mechanism Lyndon Johnson used when he stole his Senate seat
in
> 1948 -- ref Caro, The Means of Ascent). I've not seen this discussed
> anywhere else in my admittedly fragmentary daily scan of the news. Has
> anyone seen any stories about this presumably newsworthy issue, anywhere in
> the press besides the WSJ?

>
> Ray Funkhouser

>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 09:05:53 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: [Fwd: HUFFINGTON: The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority]
In-Reply-To: <3DD46CC8.7246E524@marketsharescorp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

This is another reason why what Philip Meyer and I independently suggested is such a good idea.

If there was a website where anyone could look to see exactly how polls had done over all the allegations of Ms Huffington and her compatriots could easily be refuted or confirmed.

Now where would discredited pundits get their scarlet I's, I wonder?

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2002 10:41 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: [Fwd: HUFFINGTON: The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority]

Bandwagon - from the person whose intellectual ability to handle polling issues has been questioned. Predictable.

HUFFINGTON: The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority
Arianna Huffington, AlterNet
November 14, 2002

I'm still trying to figure out who had a more wretched Election Night 2002, the Democratic Party or America's pollsters. While Democrats lost control of the Senate, they will live to fight another election day. Pollsters, on the other hand, in losing what scraps of credibility they had, may -- with a little help from the public -- find their entire profession obsolete, gone the way of chimney sweeps, organ pumpers, and those guys who used to make buggy whips.

For years now, the accuracy of political polls has been -- in the parlance of the trade -- "trending downward." Last week it hit bottom. The Voter News Service admitted on Election Night that due to "technical difficulties" its exit polls weren't to be trusted, forcing the networks to rely on actual votes. And in race after race, pre-election polls proved as reliable as the iceberg spotter on the Titanic.

In Georgia, pollsters had predicted Democratic Gov. Roy Barnes would beat challenger Sonny Perdue handily -- a Mason-Dixon poll had Barnes leading by 9 points, while one conducted by the Atlanta Constitution had him up by 11. Once the votes were counted, however, it was Perdue beating Barnes by 5 points -- a humiliating 16-point airball for the pollsters.

They were just as prescient in Colorado where an MSNBC/Zogby poll had Democratic challenger Tom Strickland trouncing incumbent Sen. Wayne Allard 53 percent to 44 percent. In reality, Allard strolled to a relatively stress-free 5-point win -- a 14-point blunder.

And in Illinois, another Zogby poll had the governor's race pitting Republican Jim Ryan against Democrat Rod Blagojevich as a statistical dead heat -- a finding that was, statistically, dead wrong. Blagojevich won and Ryan and Zogby lost by 7 percentage points.

The pollsters' numbers were so off the mark that even they were forced to admit the obvious. "There was a lot of bad polling this year," acknowledged Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster. "We blew it," said John Zogby.

As a rule, pollsters come equipped with more excuses than a married man with lipstick on his collar, and this year was no different. And whom did they point the finger of blame at most frequently? Why you and me, naturally. It seems we just didn't turn out at the polls in exactly the configurations the pollsters thought we would -- what Mr. Zogby delicately referred to as "poor turnout models." In other words, the problems aren't polls, it's those damn voters who say one thing then do another. Like show up on Election Day.

In truth, the problem isn't with us, dear voters, or even with you, dear nonvoters. The problem is with the pollsters' inability to account for an increasingly uncooperative public. Thanks to cell phones, answering

machines, caller ID, a surfeit of polls, and a growing distaste for telephonic intrusions into our homes, it's getting harder and harder for pollsters to find Americans willing to answer their questions. Twenty years ago, polling response rates were over 60 percent; now they are closer to 30 percent -- and in some cases even lower. It's pretty tough to get an accurate reading of the public's opinion when the most frequent response you receive is a "click" followed by a dial tone.

So here we are in the middle of a vicious vortex. Pollsters conduct their increasingly inaccurate polls, the media then report the results as if Moses has just brought them down from the mountaintop, and our politicians tailor their messages to suit phantom voters. All the players involved in this charade understand they are acting on the flimsiest of pretenses; it's just that relying on polls is so much easier than actually reporting or leading.

Even President Bush, who charged into office trumpeting his disdain for polls -- don't they all? -- has proven to be a chronic poll watcher and poll taker. In fact, this schizophrenic stance has actually become something of an in-joke at the White House: Bush brags about not looking at polls and everyone laughs, knowing the president doesn't have to look because Karl Rove has already whispered the results in his ear.

But allowing polling data to become a substitute for thinking has become a very wobbly crutch indeed. Just ask the Democrats who, after consulting their pollsters' tea leaves, decided not to take on the president on tax cuts or on invading Iraq. They were forced to pay for their slavish devotion to the numbers with their political lives. Pollsters, on the other hand, are allowed to tiptoe away from the carnage their handiwork has wrought and still keep their jobs.

As long as you can sagely and entertainingly spin your numbers on the tube, there is no penalty for being wrong. As Norm Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute wryly puts it, "It's the sin of broadcasting in the modern age. No matter how wrong you are, the punishment is you get your own show on cable television."

I think it's time to change that equation -- to attach some downside to the political prognosticators' game. Perhaps we should fine pollsters \$100,000 for every percentage point they are off (and create a retirement fund for

pollsters who agree to leave their discredited profession). Or attach a large letter "I" (for "Inaccurate") to the lapels of those who are wrong more than they are right. Or perhaps we can follow the lead of English soccer leagues, which regularly consign teams with losing records to second tier divisions. And, if all else fails, there is always the option of a little reverse Pavlovian training -- let's say, by attaching electrodes to pollsters' sensitive areas on Election Night and sending a charge through them anytime a poll-based prediction proves erroneous. It would give a whole new meaning to the term "political buzz."

If you, like me, are one of the many millions who hang up on callers wanting to know what kind of toothpaste I prefer, what TV shows I watch, or what candidates I'm going to vote for, you'll be proud to know that you are part of a rapidly expanding segment of the population known as the "margin of error." And if you're not, now is the perfect time to join us and make anti-Democratic polling a thing of the past.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 09:22:30 -0500
Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Subject: Re: South Dakota election
Comments: To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

The speculation in the press was that he wanted to preserve his options in 2004 in case Daschle runs for president or decides not to run. He did not want to leave the impression of being a sore loser. The evidence of fraud the WSJ cited was circumstantial but powerful.

Ed Ratledge

-----Original Message-----
From: Frank Rusciano [<mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU>]
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2002 9:12 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: South Dakota election

Actually, the question I have is if there was even the possibility of vote fraud, why didn't Thune challenge the result when the Johnson's margin of victory was so small. I would have at least expected a recount. Does anyone know the answer?

"G. Ray Funkhouser" wrote:

> Yesterday's lead Wall Street Journal editorial spoke to the possibility that
> Johnson retained his senate seat via "Chicago style" vote fraud (actually,
> it's the same mechanism Lyndon Johnson used when he stole his Senate seat in
> 1948 -- ref Caro, The Means of Ascent). I've not seen this discussed
> anywhere else in my admittedly fragmentary daily scan of the news. Has
> anyone seen any stories about this presumably newsworthy issue, anywhere in
> the press besides the WSJ?
>
> Ray Funkhouser
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 09:30:35 -0500
Reply-To: Steve Raabe <sraabe@POTOMACINC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steve Raabe <sraabe@POTOMACINC.COM>
Subject: Re: South Dakota election
Comments: To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

It's because Tim Johnson is a man of high personal integrity who would never engage in vote fraud. I know him personally -- used to work for him. John Thune knows that about him, too.

Steve Raabe
OpinionWorks
Cooperstown, NY

----- Original Message -----
From: "Frank Rusciano" <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2002 9:12 AM
Subject: Re: South Dakota election

> Actually, the question I have is if there was even the possibility of vote
> fraud, why didn't Thune challenge the result when the Johnson's margin of
> victory was so small. I would have at least expected a recount. Does
anyone
> know the answer?

> "G. Ray Funkhouser" wrote:

>> Yesterday's lead Wall Street Journal editorial spoke to the possibility
that

>> Johnson retained his senate seat via "Chicago style" vote fraud
(actually,

>> it's the same mechanism Lyndon Johnson used when he stole his Senate
seat in

>> 1948 -- ref Caro, The Means of Ascent). I've not seen this discussed
>> anywhere else in my admittedly fragmentary daily scan of the news. Has
>> anyone seen any stories about this presumably newsworthy issue, anywhere
in

>> the press besides the WSJ?

>> Ray Funkhouser

>> -----

>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'

>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

>> -----

>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'

>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 09:47:35 -0500

Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>

Subject: Re: [Fwd: HUFFINGTON: The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent

Majority]

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The improbable co-occurrence of majorly unexpected election results (in predictable directions) and the complete shut-down of VNS on election day suggest the possibility of multiple cases of large-scale election fraud this year.

Weren't we taught to seek the most parsimonious explanations?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Date: Thursday, November 14, 2002 11:42 PM

Subject: [Fwd: HUFFINGTON: The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority]

>Bandwagon - from the person whose intellectual ability to handle polling
>issues has been questioned. Predictable.

>

>HUFFINGTON: The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority

>Arianna Huffington, AlterNet

>November 14, 2002

>

>I'm still trying to figure out who had a more wretched Election Night 2002,
>the Democratic Party or America's pollsters. While Democrats lost
>control of

>the Senate, they will live to fight another election day. Pollsters, on the
>other hand, in losing what scraps of credibility they had, may -- with a
>little help from the public -- find their entire profession obsolete, gone
>the way of chimney sweeps, organ pumpers, and those guys who used to make
>buggy whips.

>

>For years now, the accuracy of political polls has been -- in the parlance
>of the trade -- "trending downward." Last week it hit bottom. The Voter
News

>Service admitted on Election Night that due to "technical difficulties" its
>exit polls weren't to be trusted, forcing the networks to rely on actual
>votes. And in race after race, pre-election polls proved as reliable as the
>iceberg spotter on the Titanic.

>

>In Georgia, pollsters had predicted Democratic Gov. Roy Barnes would beat
>challenger Sonny Perdue handily -- a Mason-Dixon poll had Barnes leading by
>9 points, while one conducted by the Atlanta Constitution had him up by 11.
>Once the votes were counted, however, it was Perdue beating Barnes by 5
>points -- a humiliating 16-point airball for the pollsters.

>

>They were just as prescient in Colorado where an MSNBC/Zogby poll had
>Democratic challenger Tom Strickland trouncing incumbent Sen. Wayne Allard
>53 percent to 44 percent. In reality, Allard strolled to a relatively
>stress-free 5-point win -- a 14-point blunder.

>
>And in Illinois, another Zogby poll had the governor's race pitting
>Republican Jim Ryan against Democrat Rod Blagojevich as a statistical dead
>heat -- a finding that was, statistically, dead wrong. Blagojevich won and
>Ryan and Zogby lost by 7 percentage points.
>
>The pollsters' numbers were so off the mark that even they were forced to
>admit the obvious. "There was a lot of bad polling this year," acknowledged
>Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster. "We blew it," said John Zogby.
>
>As a rule, pollsters come equipped with more excuses than a married man
with
>lipstick on his collar, and this year was no different. And whom did they
>point the finger of blame at most frequently? Why you and me, naturally. It
>seems we just didn't turn out at the polls in exactly the configurations
the
>pollsters thought we would -- what Mr. Zogby delicately referred to as
"poor
>turnout models." In other words, the problems aren't polls, it's those damn
>voters who say one thing then do another. Like show up on Election Day.
>
>In truth, the problem isn't with us, dear voters, or even with you, dear
>nonvoters. The problem is with the pollsters' inability to account for an
>increasingly uncooperative public. Thanks to cell phones, answering
>machines, caller ID, a surfeit of polls, and a growing distaste for
>telephonic intrusions into our homes, it's getting harder and harder for
>pollsters to find Americans willing to answers their questions. Twenty
years
>ago, polling response rates were over 60 percent; now they are closer to 30
>percent -- and in some cases even lower. It's pretty tough to get an
>accurate reading of the public's opinion when the most frequent response
you
>receive is a "click" followed by a dial tone.
>
>So here we are in the middle of a vicious vortex. Pollsters conduct their
>increasingly inaccurate polls, the media then report the results as if
Moses
>has just brought them down from the mountaintop, and our politicians tailor
>their messages to suit phantom voters. All the players involved in this
>charade understand they are acting on the flimsiest of pretenses; it's just
>that relying on polls is so much easier than actually reporting or leading.
>
>Even President Bush, who charged into office trumpeting his disdain for
>polls -- don't they all? -- has proven to be a chronic poll watcher and
poll
>taker. In fact, this schizophrenic stance has actually become something of
>an in-joke at the White House: Bush brags about not looking at polls and
>everyone laughs, knowing the president doesn't have to look because Karl
>Rove has already whispered the results in his ear.
>
>But allowing polling data to become a substitute for thinking has become a
>very wobbly crutch indeed. Just ask the Democrats who, after consulting
>their pollsters' tea leaves, decided not to take on the president on tax
>cuts or on invading Iraq. They were forced to pay for their slavish
devotion
>to the numbers with their political lives. Pollsters, on the other hand,
are

>allowed to tiptoe away from the carnage their handiwork has wrought and
>still keep their jobs.

>

>As long as you can sagely and entertainingly spin your numbers on the tube,
>there is no penalty for being wrong. As Norm Ornstein of the American
>Enterprise Institute wryly puts it, "It's the sin of broadcasting in the
>modern age. No matter how wrong you are, the punishment is you get your own
>show on cable television."

>

>I think it's time to change that equation -- to attach some downside to the
>political prognosticators' game. Perhaps we should fine pollsters \$100,000
>for every percentage point they are off (and create a retirement fund for
>pollsters who agree to leave their discredited profession). Or attach a
>large letter "I" (for "Inaccurate") to the lapels of those who are wrong
>more than they are right. Or perhaps we can follow the lead of English
>soccer leagues, which regularly consign teams with losing records to second
>tier divisions. And, if all else fails, there is always the option of a
>little reverse Pavlovian training -- let's say, by attaching electrodes to
>pollsters' sensitive areas on Election Night and sending a charge through
>them anytime a poll-based prediction proves erroneous. It would give a
whole

>new meaning to the term "political buzz."

>

>If you, like me, are one of the many millions who hang up on callers
wanting

>to know what kind of toothpaste I prefer, what TV shows I watch, or what
>candidates I'm going to vote for, you'll be proud to know that you are part
>of a rapidly expanding segment of the population known as the "margin of
>error." And if you're not, now is the perfect time to join us and make
>anti-Democratic polling a thing of the past.

>

>-----

>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>main email address.

>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 09:57:46 -0500

Reply-To: nancybelden@brspoll.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>

Subject: Re: Augusta National

Comments: To: Ktedin100@AOL.COM

In-Reply-To: <f9.2546ac20.2b0582f0@aol.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hopefully everyone saw the timely and on target response from Our Leader

Mark Schulman in the New York Times -- you do have to read the sports pages. Right on. Mark -- you should post it here!

Nancy Belden
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

202.822.6090

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Kent Tedin
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2002 5:51 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Augusta National

Today's Los Angeles Times reports on a survey commissioned by the Augusta County Club designed to determine support or opposition for its male only membership policy. As almost everyone in the public opinion community knows, questions of the sort asked in the survey (conducted by the Polling Co., Inc. and WomanTrend of Washington, D.C.) are highly misleading, and can in no way be used to set the level of public opinion. The agree-disagree questions giving comfort to the Augusta County Club are shown below.

"Private clubs and organizations should change their rules when their members or leadership decides to, not when one person who is not part of their organization criticizes them or pressures them to so."

Agree: 75% (men) 74% (women)

"The Augusta National Golf Club was correct in its decision not to give in to Martha Burk's demand. They should review and change their policies on their own time and in their own way."

Agree: 72% (men) 73% (womne)

We know that questions of this sort suffer from two sorts of biases. First, general acquiescence bias (then tendency to agree with vague or general statements). Second, the bias induced by the fact only one side of the issue is presented. When only one side is presented, people tend to agree with side presented, given the absence of a counter-argument (which, for many people, cannot be immediately retrieved from short term memory). What is needed at a minimum to reasonably set the opinion level, beyond these two questions, is either (1) items that require the respondent to disagree in order to set the level of opinion, or (2) an item where both sides of the issue are presented. For a dramatic example of the effect of offering both sides of an issue as opposed to presenting only one side, see Robert Erikson and Kent Tedin, American Public Opinion, p. 37. There is a 22% difference

between an agree-disagree statement regarding whether "any able-bodied person can find a job and make ends meet" and the version where both sides of the issue are presented.

My guess is that if respondents had to disagree with a statement to set the level of opinion regarding Augusta's all-male policy, or if respondents were presented both sides of the issue, we would get very different results.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 10:50:48 -0500
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Subject: Re: Augusta National
Comments: To: nancybelden@brspoll.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Nancy, thanks for the kind words. Below is the article to which Nancy = refers in the NY Times yesterday. We need to continue to build bridges to = the journalism community so that they call us before running poll stories, = particularly on advocacy polls. Fortunately the Times did call. =20

I'm unaccustomed to seeing polling news on the Sports pages of the NY = Times, but that's where it ran. That's probably why it received little = notice on AAPORNET. =20

Here's the story in yesterday's Times (c):

November 14, 2002

Expert Questions Augusta's Poll

By THE NEW YORK TIMES

As Augusta National Golf Club released the findings of a national survey = that it said supported its position against admitting women, a national = expert on polling questioned the validity of its results yesterday.

The polling expert, Mark Schulman, president of the American Association = of Public Opinion Research, noted that the first four questions of the = poll mentioned the First Amendment, and he said the poll tended to lead = the respondents "into a trap."

"Respondents were never asked up front about what they think of single-gend= er golf clubs," said Schulman, who deals with hundreds of surveys a year. = "This tells me this was an effort to slant the findings. It violates every = rule of questionnaire design."

Augusta National commissioned the 48-question survey in response to a controversy generated after Martha Burk, president of the National Council of Women's Organizations, privately asked the club to consider admitting a woman before next year's Masters Tournament, which is held at the club. The club publicly refused.

Kellyanne Conway, president of the Polling Company Inc. of Washington, which did the poll, defended it. "If this poll was loaded, then why would I have demanded that my client release it in its entirety?" she said. Respondents were asked whether they agreed with statements such as: "The Augusta National Golf Club was correct in its decision not to give in to Martha Burk's demand. They should review and change their policies on their own time, and in their own way."

>>> Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM> 11/15 9:57 AM >>>
Hopefully everyone saw the timely and on target response from Our Leader Mark Schulman in the New York Times -- you do have to read the sports pages. Right on. Mark -- you should post it here!

Nancy Belden
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

202.822.6090

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Kent Tedin
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2002 5:51 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20
Subject: Augusta National

Today's Los Angeles Times reports on a survey commissioned by the Augusta County Club designed to determine support or opposition for its male only membership policy. As almost everyone in the public opinion community knows, questions of the sort asked in the survey (conducted by the Polling Co., Inc. and WomanTrend of Washington, D.C.) are highly misleading, and can in no way be used to set the level of public opinion. The agree-disagree questions giving comfort to the Augusta County Club are shown below.

"Private clubs and organizations should change their rules when their members or leadership decides to, not when one person who is not part of their organization criticizes them or pressures them to so."

Agree: 75% (men) 74% (women)

"The Augusta National Golf Club was correct in its decision not to give in to

Martha Burk's demand. They should review and change their policies on their own time and in their own way."

Agree: 72% (men) 73% (womne)

We know that questions of this sort suffer from two sorts of biases. First, general acquiescence bias (then tendency to agree with vague or general statements). Second, the bias induced by the fact only one side of the issue is presented. When only one side is presented, people tend to agree with side presented, given the absence of a counter-argument (which, for many people, cannot be immediately retrieved from short term memory). What is needed at a minimum to reasonably set the opinion level, beyond these two questions, is either (1) items that require the respondent to disagree in order to set the level of opinion, or (2) an item where both sides of the issue are presented. For a dramatic example of the effect of offering both sides of an issue as opposed to presenting only one side, see Robert Erikson and Kent Tedin, American Public Opinion, p. 37. There is a 22% difference between an agree-disagree statement regarding whether "any able-bodied person can find a job and make ends meet" and the version where both sides of the issue are presented.

My guess is that if respondents had to disagree with a statement to set the level of opinion regarding Augusta's all-male policy, or if respondents were presented both sides of the issue, we would get very different results.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu=20

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 10:00:08 -0600
Reply-To: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>
Subject: Re: Augusta National
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Colleagues...

It also ran as an Associated Press story. We also picked it up in our Wednesday sports pages. Unfortunately, the editors didn't check up on the names of the organizations, which are close but not quite right.

Rob Daves
Star Tribune

In a national public opinion survey commissioned by the Augusta National Golf Club and released to the public Wednesday, the results show wide support for the club's position of not changing its policy and inviting a female member. The 48-question sampling, conducted by the Polling Co. Inc. and WomanTrend of Washington, a market research, public affairs and political consulting firm, was hailed by Augusta National chairman Hootie Johnson as an important document. "We have received an outpouring of letters, e-mails and phone calls encouraging us to stand up for our traditions," Johnson said in a prepared statement. Respondents answered a series of questions concerning Augusta National's right as a private club and how it might be affected by the campaign of Martha Burk, chair of the National Council of Women's Organizations. Burk is spearheading a campaign to pressure the club to admit a woman as a member before the Masters tournament in April. Johnson reiterated last week that the club has no timetable to invite a female member. The survey is the second part of a new campaign by Johnson and Augusta National to seize the public relations initiative. Harry O'Neill, chairman of the polling review board of the National Council of Public Polls, said the survey included "terribly loaded questions" with "emotionally loaded words." "They would serve themselves much better if they had done a more succinct survey without any questions that were obviously biased," O'Neill said. Burk dismissed the poll as a "sort of an amateurish attempt to bolster their position against women. "It's a push poll. You push the respondent to a certain answer by the way the question is worded," she said. "It's often used in political campaigns. It's considered a highly unethical practice." Another polling expert, Mark Schulman, president of the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers, noted that the first

four questions of the poll mentioned the First Amendment, and he said the poll tended to lead the respondents into a trap. "Respondents were never asked up front about what they think of single-gender golf clubs," said Schulman. "This tells me this was an effort to slant the findings. It violates every rule of questionnaire design." Burk said she wants to discover what effect Augusta National's campaign will have on club members, especially those such as Lloyd Ward of the U.S. Olympic Committee, Kenneth Chenault of American Express and Sanford Weill of Citigroup, who wrote public letters in support of Burk's position. "I heard from someone on the inside these coded words: `They want to get rid of those New York CEOs anyway,' " Burk said. "This could be calculated as a move to gradually filter out those who disagree with Hootie. I'd like to know what kind of position this puts the members in, the ones who have taken a stand against discriminating against women."

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 11:02:14 -0500
Reply-To: allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Allen Barton <allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Dispatch Poll v. Actual
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Columbus Dispatch (www.dispatch.com) boast of the accuracy of its "mail survey of 2048 randomly selected registered voters" forwarded to us by Paul Goodwin on November 7 suffers from one problem: they got the prediction right from a self-selected sample of 2048 members of a random sample of 12,000 registered voters. The fact that self-selected samples of a small fraction of some random sample to which a mailing is sent "get it right" is a piece of luck, not a triumph of scientific procedure. That this can happen results from the fact that sometimes the motivation to cooperate in a survey has almost a 0 correlation with the attitudes being studied. How much evidence have we from experience that this 0 correlation can be relied on in any given study? In any case we should not claim a fractional return from a random sample as a random sample. We should be saying something like, "In surveys on Subject X in populations of this type it has been found that those who return questionnaires/answer telephone surveys are representative of the whole population about Y percent of the time within Z percentage points." Who has the data for this?

Allen Barton, Chapel Hill, NC

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 11:38:40 -0500
Reply-To: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>
Subject: Fwd: Dispatch Poll v. Actual
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

To all:

Before concluding that the Dispatch Poll got it right by chance alone, readers may want to note that the average error of that poll in predicting the vote share of a candidate in all statewide Ohio elections between 1980 and 1994 was 1.6 percentage points, and that level of accuracy has continued since then as well. Telephone polls between 1980 and 1984 predicting the same races had an average error of about 5 percentage points.

Details on all this and some reasons for the Dispatch Poll's success are described in: Penny Visser et al. (1996) Mail surveys for election forecasting? An evaluation of the Columbus Dispatch poll. Public Opinion Quarterly, 60, 181-227.

Jon Krosnick
Professor
Ohio State University

>Delivered-To: orb-krosnick@osu.edu
>Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 11:02:14 -0500
>From: Allen Barton <allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>
>Subject: Dispatch Poll v. Actual
>Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Reply-to: allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM
>X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
>

>The Columbus Dispatch (www.dispatch.com) boast of the accuracy of its "mail survey of 2048 randomly selected registered voters" forwarded to us by Paul Goodwin on November 7 suffers from one problem: they got the prediction right from a self-selected sample of 2048 members of a random sample of 12,000 registered voters. The fact that self-selected samples of a small fraction of some random sample to which a mailing is sent "get it right" is a piece of luck, not a triumph of scientific procedure. That this can happen results from the fact that sometimes the motivation to cooperate in a survey has almost a 0 correlation with the attitudes being studied. How much evidence have we from experience that this 0 correlation can be relied on in any given study? In any case we should not claim a fractional return from a random sample as a random sample. We should be saying something like, "In surveys on Subject X in populations of this type it has been found that those who return questionnaires/answer telephone surveys are representative of the whole population about Y percent of the time within Z percentage points." Who has the data for this?

> Allen Barton, Chapel Hill, NC

>

>-----

>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>then click on 'Join or leave the list'

>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 12:02:39 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Augusta National
In-Reply-To: <sdd4c5b6.082@ngwgatel.startribune.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

A quick search of Google News indicates that the AP story got picked up pretty widely. There are also a number of other stories which incorporate quotes from the AP story.

For example:

<http://newsobserver.com/24hour/sports/story/620032p-4766867c.html>

http://www.pga.com/Newsline/Tour_News/tournews_detail.cfm?ID=10921

http://www.zwire.com/site/news.cfm?BRD=2131&dept_id=363777&newsid=6060774&PAG=461&rfi=9

<http://chicagosports.chicagotribune.com/sports/printedition/cs-0211140373nov14,0,4363359.story?coll=cs-sports-print>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Rob Daves

Sent: Friday, November 15, 2002 11:00 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Augusta National

Colleagues...

It also ran as an Associated Press story. We also picked it up in our Wednesday sports pages. Unfortunately, the editors didn't check up on the names of the organizations, which are close but not quite right.

Rob Daves
Star Tribune

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 11:57:27 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: South Dakota election
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Actually, what appears to have sparked the WSJ article, and was widely reported in South Dakota before the election, is the following:
Democrats in SD had mounted a campaign to register Native Americans on reservations. One woman hired as an independent contractor was fired after they (the Democrats) found that she had faked 15 signatures.

The Thune campaign tried to make this into a negative campaign issue and fliers were distributed with pictures of newspaper headlines about fraud. One of these turned out to refer to a completely different subject (another was from the Washington Times) and the RNC had to apologise, although they kept up the "massive fraud" negative campaign right through the election.

The matter was thoroughly investigated by the SD Attorney General and no additional evidence of fraud was found, although the woman involved will be prosecuted.

You can read the details (from before the election) in the Argus Leader at:

<http://www.southdakotaelections.com/Story.cfm?Type=Election&ID=1198>

and

<http://www.southdakotaelections.com/Story.cfm?Type=Election&ID=1238>

All in all, the WSJ article sounds like one more case of charges of "voter fraud" being used to intimidate minorities, in the fine tradition established several decades ago in Arizona by the current Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

"G. Ray Funkhouser" wrote:

>
> Yesterday's lead Wall Street Journal editorial spoke to the possibility
that
> Johnson retained his senate seat via "Chicago style" vote fraud (actually,
> it's the same mechanism Lyndon Johnson used when he stole his Senate seat
in
> 1948 -- ref Caro, The Means of Ascent). I've not seen this discussed
> anywhere else in my admittedly fragmentary daily scan of the news. Has
> anyone seen any stories about this presumably newsworthy issue, anywhere in
> the press besides the WSJ?
>
> Ray Funkhouser
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 15:25:43 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: Two articles on Homeland Security bill
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

'A supersnoop's dream'
By Audrey Hudson
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Language tucked inside the Homeland Security bill will allow the federal government to track the e-mail, Internet use, travel, credit-card purchases, phone and bank records of foreigners and U.S. citizens in its hunt for terrorists.

In what one critic has called "a supersnoop's dream," the Defense Department's Total Information Awareness program would be authorized to collect every type of available public and private data in what the Pentagon describes as one "centralized grand database."

Computers and analysts are supposed to use all this available information to determine patterns of people's behavior in order to detect and identify terrorists, decipher plans and enable the United States to pre-empt terrorist acts.

The project first appeared in the Senate Democratic proposal for

the new Homeland Security Department, which was defeated Wednesday in a 50-47 vote. However it was included in the Republican-brokered agreement that passed the House later that night in a 299-121 vote and is on the fast track to pass the Senate by next week.

The computer-generated project of raw data will "help identify promising technologies and quickly get them into the hands of people who need them," according to a congressional leadership memo outlining the legislation.

In a blistering op-ed piece in yesterday's New York Times titled "You Are A Suspect," columnist William Safire compared the database to George Orwell's Big Brother government in the novel "1984."

"To this computerized dossier on your private life from commercial sources, add every piece of information that government has about you - passport application, driver's license and bridge toll records, judicial and divorce records, complaints from nosy neighbors to the FBI, your lifetime paper trail plus the latest hidden camera surveillance - and you have the supersnoop's dream: a 'Total Information Awareness' about every U.S. citizen," Mr. Safire wrote.

"There is a great danger in this provision. It gives carte blanche to eavesdrop on Americans on the flimsiest of evidence, if any evidence at all," said Phil Kent, president of the Southeastern Legal Foundation.

Mr. Kent called the provision "an unprecedented electronic dragnet."

"I think it's the most sweeping threat to civil liberties since Japanese-American internment," Mr. Kent said.

Mr. Kent and outgoing Rep. Bob Barr, Georgia Republican, are lobbying the Senate to remove this and other provisions they say are a threat to civil liberties and restrict the public's right to know of government activities.

"In defense of members of Congress, many don't read the whole legislation and very few people read the fine print," said Mr. Barr. "You would think the Pentagon planning a system to peek at personal data would get a little more attention.

"It's outrageous, it really is outrageous," Mr. Barr said.

The bill establishes the Total Information Awareness program within a new agency - the Security Advanced Research Projects Agency (SARPA), which would be modeled on the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), the central research office for the Defense Department that pursues research and technology, and led to the creation of the Internet. DARPA and SARPA both would be under the supervision of Adm. John Poindexter.

Neither Adm. Poindexter nor a spokesman at his current agency, DARPA, could be reached for comment. The phone number listed for Adm. Poindexter in the government directory reaches a recording that says incoming calls are not accepted. A recording reached in the media relations office states that Adm. Poindexter is "not accepting any interview requests at this time."

Adm. Poindexter first hit the public eye as national security adviser for President Reagan during the Iran-Contra scandal. He was convicted in 1990 on five felonies including lying to Congress and destroying evidence.

At a DARPA conference in Anaheim, Calif., Adm. Poindexter made his first public appearance since taking the post in February.

"During the years I was in the White House, it was relatively simple to identify our intelligence collection targets," Adm. Poindexter was quoted as saying in Government Executive magazine.

However, the United States now faces "asymmetrical" threats that

are loosely organized and difficult to find, and require new, technology-driven defenses, he said. The goal of his new office is to consider every source of information available worldwide to uncover terrorists, the magazine said.

Marc Rotenberg, director of the Electronic Privacy Information Center, said the computer system would capture the data and analyze it to find patterns that match terrorist activity.

Authorizing the project would require amending the Privacy Act of 1974. The language contained in the homeland security bill does not address the act directly, but authorizes the creation of the agency.

Mr. Rotenberg said the database takes a convergence of various factors to a system of public surveillance.

"They think the technology is about catching terrorists and bad guys, but these systems can capture a lot of data at different levels without oversight, judicial review, public reporting or congressional investigations. I can't think of a good countermeasure that would be good to safeguard civil liberties in the United States," Mr. Rotenberg said.

Homeland Bill Rider Aids Drugmakers
Measure Would Block Suits Over Vaccines; FBI Powers Also Would Grow

By Dan Morgan
Washington Post Staff Writer
Friday, November 15, 2002; Page A07

Riding along on legislation to create a new federal Department of Homeland Security is a White House-backed provision that could head off dozens of potential lawsuits against Eli Lilly and Co. and other pharmaceutical giants.

Elsewhere in the sprawling measure is language that would help the FBI obtain customer information from Internet service providers and increase the penalties for computer hacking. These and other last-minute additions to the bill by Republican leaders could have implications well beyond the measure's immediate goal of protecting the homeland, congressional officials said yesterday.

Lawyers for parents of autistic children suing pharmaceutical companies over childhood vaccines charged yesterday that a new section in the homeland bill -- passed on Wednesday by the House and now before the Senate -- would keep the lawsuits out of state courts, ruling out huge judgments and lengthy litigation. Complaints, instead, would be channeled to a federal program set up 14 years ago to provide liability protection for vaccine manufacturers. The program, funded through a surcharge on vaccines, compensates persons injured by such vaccines, to a maximum of \$250,000.

"The industry has seized the opportunity presented by a Republican House and Senate to immediately pass legislation to get the industry off the hook," said Dallas lawyer Andrew Waters. "To me, it looks like payback for the fact that the industry spent millions bankrolling Republican campaigns."

GOP officials said the provisions are merely aimed at protecting

companies working on life-saving products from being dragged into costly litigation by trial lawyers. Pharmaceutical companies were among the largest contributors to Republicans in this year's elections, while trial lawyers heavily backed Democrats.

In the past several years, some families have alleged a connection between their children's autism and vaccines using the preservative Thimerosal, which contains mercury. Medical studies have not proven a connection between Thimerosal and autism, but companies stopped using the preservative several years ago.

Eli Lilly, once the largest maker of Thimerosal, is a major target in a spate of lawsuits filed since 2000. The company stopped making the product in 1980 but continued to buy it from other manufacturers and to resell it for another decade.

Company spokesman Edward Sagebiel said Lilly was "surprised when the language was inserted" because it had not actively lobbied for it in recent months. But he said the company "believes it is a positive step to help assure that manufacturers are protected from lawsuits that are without merit or scientific evidence."

Richard Diamond, a spokesman for retiring House Majority Leader Richard K. Armey (R-Tex.), said the provision was inserted because "it was something the White House wanted. It wasn't [Armey's] idea." But Diamond said the principle is good. "We don't want companies to be steered away from the business of making things that can save lives," he said.

Elsewhere in the bill, Republicans incorporated the entire Cyber Security Enhancement Act, which the House passed overwhelmingly in July but which made little progress in the Democratic-controlled Senate. To strengthen law enforcement's hand in protecting the security of computer communications, the legislation would increase penalties for hacking and other malicious computing. Privacy advocates have criticized some provisions, particularly those that would lower the threshold for Internet service providers to give law enforcement agencies customer communications without a court order.

The bill would make hacking punishable by as much as life in prison if the offender "knowingly or recklessly causes or attempts to cause death."

Cut from the bill was a Democratic-backed provision that would have prevented the new federal agency from giving contracts to U.S.-based companies that use offshore addresses to avoid corporate taxes.

GOP aides said the language originally offered by Rep. Tom DeLay (R-Tex.), and now incorporated in the bill, gives Texas A&M the inside track in hosting the first university center on homeland security, to be established within one year. DeLay was elected Wednesday to serve as the House majority leader in the 108th Congress.

Yesterday, Senate Democrats were considering trying to strip non-relevant provisions from the homeland security bill during the final debate. If successful, such a move could derail Congress's timetable for adjourning, by forcing a new round of House-Senate negotiations to resolve differences in the legislation.

Staff writer Jonathan Krim contributed to this report.

© 2002 The Washington Post Company

Mark Richards

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 16:18:55 -0500
Reply-To: RFunk787@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>
Subject: WSJ editorial
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Apparently, this got scant coverage outside the Wall Street Journal. For whatever it's worth, here is the editorial in question

The Oglala Sioux's Senator
The Democrats stole two Senate seats--and still it wasn't enough.

Thursday, November 14, 2002 12:01 a.m. EST
Republican John Thune threw in the towel on his South Dakota Senate race yesterday, notwithstanding the suspicious circumstances under which he lost by a mere 524 votes. We think that at a minimum he owed his many supporters a recount.
If nothing else, a recount would have put on the public record the dubious details of how he lost, if that's the word for what happened. Under state law the close margin entitled him to a recount, and these have been common in South Dakota's closely fought elections. Democrats Tom Daschle and George McGovern both used them to secure victories to Congress.
Moreover, Mr. Thune clearly thinks there was something fishy about last week's vote. "Are there questions that need to be answered about the outcome of this election? I believe there are," he noted in yesterday's statement. "Did things happen that shouldn't have in some polling places around the state? I believe they did. Some of these issues would be resolved through a recount. However, others, though unethical, would not be righted through a recount."

Allow us to translate: Yes, Mr. Thune thinks the election was probably stolen, but he'll have a hard time proving it, won't win in the end anyway and along the way he'll be so beat up by Tom Daschle's political machine that he'd never be able to run for statewide office again. He's only 41 years old, so better to walk than fight. That may sound cynical, but what else are his supporters to make of that ripe phrase, "though unethical"?
We know, for example, that Mr. Thune was leading all during Election Night,

until late Wednesday morning when results flowed in from Shannon County; suddenly he trailed by about 500 votes. Last minute landslide precincts are suspicious on their face, a legendary practice in places like Chicago. But Michael New, a post-doctoral fellow at the Harvard-MIT Data Center, has inspected the South Dakota Secretary of State's Web site to discover other striking facts: While Democrat Tim Johnson ran statewide about 12 percentage points behind what Mr. Daschle got in his 1998 Senate victory, in Shannon County Mr. Johnson ran about 12 percentage points ahead. He got 92% of the vote compared with Mr. Daschle's 80%. Nowhere else in the state did Mr. Johnson improve his vote share relative to Mr. Daschle. Senate voter turnout was up 27% statewide for this year's close contest compared with 1998, but in Shannon County turnout increased by 89%. Again, no other county in the state showed comparable turnout increases. Shannon County is largely Indian country, home to the Oglala Sioux nation, and is heavily Democratic. But Mr. Thune managed to receive only nine more votes there than did Mr. Daschle's opponent in 1998, notwithstanding the much larger turnout. Mr. New points out that this is just a 4% increase in GOP votes over 1998. In the other three South Dakota counties where Indians constitute more than two-thirds of the population, Mr. Thune gained between 23% and 43% more votes than the GOP candidate in 1998. The Oglala Sioux would seem to give new meaning to the phrase "bloc voting." As Mr. New concedes, "this could all be a coincidence." But "this trifecta of late results, high turnout and unusually strong support for the Democratic nominee should, if nothing else, arouse suspicion." By the way, we're told that Mr. Thune's lawyers have affidavits from about 50 people attesting to voting irregularities, including from four Indians saying they were each paid \$10 to vote. Then there's this week's report of the pending arrest of Becky Red Earth-Villeda, also known as Maka Duta, for allegedly forging absentee-ballot applications. She'd been hired by the South Dakota Democratic Party to recruit voters and denies the charges. But how many smoke signals does it take to wonder if there's also fire?

We understand Mr. Thune is reluctant to risk his future career by seeming ungracious, but he also an obligation to his thousands of donors and volunteers and especially to the principle of honest elections. Every phony ballot is one that cancels someone else's franchise. And we doubt Mr. Johnson would have turned the same cheek. Virtually at the moment Shannon County's results were reported Wednesday, Mr. Johnson was declaring that the election was over and that "every vote was counted, every vote was counted correctly." Happy simply to have regained Senate control, Republicans are letting Mr. Thune walk away from an election challenge, much as John Ashcroft did in 2000. But the world should know that Democrats won at least two seats in highly suspicious, if not crooked, fashion. First they changed the election rules in New Jersey to throw Bob Torricelli over the side once he fell behind in the polls. And now we have Tim Johnson's miraculously large and last-minute Oglala Sioux turnout. And the Democrats still lost the Senate.

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 14:56:29 -0800
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>

Subject: Re: Polling Isn't Perfect Why voter surveys so often get it wrong
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0211141237090.42590-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN
Content-transfer-encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE

Phil et al.,

I am in the process of putting together a database of as many statewide polls as I can for this election. (I may also add presidential polls from 2000.) I have proposed a panel for next year's APSA meeting on methodological challenges in election polling and plan to propose a similar panel for AAPOR (the AAPOR conference is sooner, but the APSA deadline is sooner; anyone interested in joining the AAPOR panel should let me know).

The paper I'll be proposing for myself at AAPOR will basically examine whether election polls behave as if the published margins of error are accurate. I have the sense that there are so many factors beyond sample size that are problematic for election polls that actual margins of error are probably higher than claimed. However, I hasten to add that I'll be simply testing a hypothesis and if the polls do turn out to behave as if the reported margins of error are accurate, that is what I will report.

I have found several web sites that have tons of polls. You can find the links on my laughably wrong Senate picks page at <http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbbloom/picks.html> (roughly one page down).

If anyone knows of other such sources of polls, please let me know. Once I have my data set together by late Winter, I will post it on-line and e-mail AAPORnet with the link.

Thanks!

-- Joel, reporting from QDET :)

Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of Oregon
Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR 97403-5245
jbbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu Facsimile: 541-346-0388
<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbbloom> <http://osrl.uoregon.edu>

On Thu, 14 Nov 2002, Philip Meyer wrote:

> The Carolina Poll at UNC called the Elizabeth Dole win within 1
> percentage point. Maybe in self-defense, we should compile a listing of a=
> s
> many pre-election polls for this past election as we can and publish a
> summary of the successes and failures.
>
> Who will volunteer to be the collection center? Chances are that
> somebody already has the job at least half done.
>

> > > Thursday, November 14, 2002 12:01 a.m. EST
> > >
> > > America has too many political polls, and Americans pay too much attention
> > > to them. Many people have believed that for a long time. What's different
> > > now is that some pollsters are starting to agree.
> > >
> > > "We have falsely raised expectations about polling," says John Zogby, who
> > > is famous for having called Bill Clinton's margin in the 1996 presidential
> > > race almost exactly and having been virtually the only pollster to give Al
> > > Gore a slight popular-vote edge on election eve in 2000. But this year Mr.
> > > Zogby saw three of his final 11 statewide polls indicate the wrong winner.
> > > He says it would be helpful if people discovered the limitations of
> > > polling. In a speech and interview in Washington yesterday he described
> > > some of the problems his profession faces:
> > >
> > > =95 The nightly tracking polls that both candidates and reporters fixate on
> > > are less reliable than larger polls taken over a longer period of time. "I
> > > probably should have used larger samples," admits Mr. Zogby, who thought
> > > that Democrat Jeanne Shaheen would win an open New Hampshire Senate seat
> > > and that Republican Jim Ryan was tied for the governor's race in Illinois.
> > > (She lost by four points and he by seven.)
> > >
> > > Dave Winston, a Republican pollster, says one problem with nightly tracking
> > > polls is that a pollster doing them doesn't have the time to make
> > > innumerable repeat calls to people who won't pick up the phone. Mr. Zogby
> > > says that he now has to make an average of seven calls to get just one
> > > person willing to spend the 20 minutes or so it takes to answer his polling
> > > questions.
> > >
> > > =95 Pollsters can't poll on Election Day. Surveys this year found that
> > > between 4% and 12% of voters in key states made up their mind who to vote
> > > for on Election Day. Although challengers tend to pick up most of the
> > > undecided vote, it doesn't always work out that way--making last-minute
> > > votes impossible to predict.
> > >
> > > =95 Voter turnout is highly variable and difficult to predict. Mr. Zogby

> > > spent a great deal of time determining what the likely voter turnout =
among
> > > African-American and Latinos would be. He spent less time guessing at=
the
> > > turnout of white Republicans--that boring but large group that can sw=
ing
> > > elections. "I and other pollsters missed the incredible get-out-the-v=
ote
> > > effort the Republicans made," he says.
> > >
> > > The only pollster who accurately predicted that Republican Sen. Wayne
> > > Allard would win re-election in Colorado was David Hill, director of =
Hill
> > > Research, who said he determined who to call by looking at lists of p=
ast
> > > voters, because they have the highest propensity of any group to vote=
=2E
> > > Other pollsters surveyed a random selection of people and then asked =
them
> > > how likely they were to vote.
> > >
> > > =95 Answering machines, caller ID and other screening devices make po=
llsters
> > > easier to avoid. Some phones won't even ring unless they recognize th=
e
> > > number of the caller. Scott Adler, University of Colorado political
> > > scientist, says pollsters are now concerned that the people who do fi=
nally
> > > agree to answer a pollster's questions are no longer representative o=
f the
> > > voters as a whole.
> > >
> > > Whit Ayres, a GOP pollster, told the Atlanta Journal-Constitution tha=
t "I
> > > can't fathom 20 years from now the telephone remaining the primary me=
ans of
> > > data collection. This industry is in a transition from telephone data
> > > collection to Internet data collection." In the meantime, look for po=
lls to
> > > be more variable and less reliable than ever. Perhaps it's time that =
we
> > > spend more time listening to the candidates and having people make up=
their
> > > own mind who's doing well.
> > >
> > > -----
> > > View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> > > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> > > You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at yo=
ur
> > > main email address.
> > > Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu=
=2Eedu
> >
> > -----
> > > View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> > > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> > You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> > main email address.
> > Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.e=
du
> >
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 15 Nov 2002 22:03:42 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: Two articles on Homeland Security bill
Comments: To: mark@BISCONTI.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

It's interesting that, in a deft piece of timing, Safire waited until after the midterm elections to write this column, after the Bush administration finished beating Democrats over the head with their failure to pass it. This also shows the Democrats' inability to focus on issues that even conservatives would find attractive in their opposition to the bill.

Mark David Richards wrote:

> 'A supersnoop's dream'
> By Audrey Hudson
> THE WASHINGTON TIMES
>
> Language tucked inside the Homeland Security bill will allow the
> federal government to track the e-mail, Internet use, travel,
> credit-card purchases, phone and bank records of foreigners and U.S.
> citizens in its hunt for terrorists.
> In what one critic has called "a supersnoop's dream," the Defense
> Department's Total Information Awareness program would be authorized to
> collect every type of available public and private data in what the
> Pentagon describes as one "centralized grand database."
> Computers and analysts are supposed to use all this available
> information to determine patterns of people's behavior in order to
> detect and identify terrorists, decipher plans and enable the United
> States to pre-empt terrorist acts.
> The project first appeared in the Senate Democratic proposal for
> the new Homeland Security Department, which was defeated Wednesday in a

> 50-47 vote. However it was included in the Republican-brokered agreement
> that passed the House later that night in a 299-121 vote and is on the
> fast track to pass the Senate by next week.

> The computer-generated project of raw data will "help identify
> promising technologies and quickly get them into the hands of people who
> need them," according to a congressional leadership memo outlining the
> legislation.

> In a blistering op-ed piece in yesterday's New York Times titled
> "You Are A Suspect," columnist William Safire compared the database to
> George Orwell's Big Brother government in the novel "1984."

> "To this computerized dossier on your private life from commercial
> sources, add every piece of information that government has about you -
> passport application, driver's license and bridge toll records, judicial
> and divorce records, complaints from nosy neighbors to the FBI, your
> lifetime paper trail plus the latest hidden camera surveillance - and
> you have the supersnoop's dream: a 'Total Information Awareness' about
> every U.S. citizen," Mr. Safire wrote.

> "There is a great danger in this provision. It gives carte blanche
> to eavesdrop on Americans on the flimsiest of evidence, if any evidence
> at all," said Phil Kent, president of the Southeastern Legal Foundation.

> Mr. Kent called the provision "an unprecedented electronic
> dragnet."

> "I think it's the most sweeping threat to civil liberties since
> Japanese-American internment," Mr. Kent said.

> Mr. Kent and outgoing Rep. Bob Barr, Georgia Republican, are
> lobbying the Senate to remove this and other provisions they say are a
> threat to civil liberties and restrict the public's right to know of
> government activities.

> "In defense of members of Congress, many don't read the whole
> legislation and very few people read the fine print," said Mr. Barr.
> "You would think the Pentagon planning a system to peek at personal data
> would get a little more attention.

> "It's outrageous, it really is outrageous," Mr. Barr said.

> The bill establishes the Total Information Awareness program within
> a new agency - the Security Advanced Research Projects Agency (SARPA),
> which would be modeled on the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
> (DARPA), the central research office for the Defense Department that
> pursues research and technology, and led to the creation of the
> Internet. DARPA and SARPA both would be under the supervision of Adm.
> John Poindexter.

> Neither Adm. Poindexter nor a spokesman at his current agency,
> DARPA, could be reached for comment. The phone number listed for Adm.
> Poindexter in the government directory reaches a recording that says
> incoming calls are not accepted. A recording reached in the media
> relations office states that Adm. Poindexter is "not accepting any
> interview requests at this time."

> Adm. Poindexter first hit the public eye as national security
> adviser for President Reagan during the Iran-Contra scandal. He was
> convicted in 1990 on five felonies including lying to Congress and
> destroying evidence.

> At a DARPA conference in Anaheim, Calif., Adm. Poindexter made his
> first public appearance since taking the post in February.

> "During the years I was in the White House, it was relatively
> simple to identify our intelligence collection targets," Adm. Poindexter
> was quoted as saying in Government Executive magazine.

> However, the United States now faces "asymmetrical" threats that
> are loosely organized and difficult to find, and require new,

> technology-driven defenses, he said. The goal of his new office is to
> consider every source of information available worldwide to uncover
> terrorists, the magazine said.

> Marc Rotenberg, director of the Electronic Privacy Information
> Center, said the computer system would capture the data and analyze it
> to find patterns that match terrorist activity.

> Authorizing the project would require amending the Privacy Act of
> 1974. The language contained in the homeland security bill does not
> address the act directly, but authorizes the creation of the agency.

> Mr. Rotenberg said the database takes a convergence of various
> factors to a system of public surveillance.

> "They think the technology is about catching terrorists and bad
> guys, but these systems can capture a lot of data at different levels
> without oversight, judicial review, public reporting or congressional
> investigations. I can't think of a good countermeasure that would be
> good to safeguard civil liberties in the United States," Mr. Rotenberg
> said.

>

> -----

>

> Homeland Bill Rider Aids Drugmakers
> Measure Would Block Suits Over Vaccines; FBI Powers Also Would Grow

>

> By Dan Morgan

> Washington Post Staff Writer

> Friday, November 15, 2002; Page A07

>

> Riding along on legislation to create a new federal Department of
> Homeland Security is a White House-backed provision that could head off
> dozens of potential lawsuits against Eli Lilly and Co. and other
> pharmaceutical giants.

>

> Elsewhere in the sprawling measure is language that would help the FBI
> obtain customer information from Internet service providers and increase
> the penalties for computer hacking. These and other last-minute
> additions to the bill by Republican leaders could have implications well
> beyond the measure's immediate goal of protecting the homeland,
> congressional officials said yesterday.

>

> Lawyers for parents of autistic children suing pharmaceutical companies
> over childhood vaccines charged yesterday that a new section in the
> homeland bill -- passed on Wednesday by the House and now before the
> Senate -- would keep the lawsuits out of state courts, ruling out huge
> judgments and lengthy litigation. Complaints, instead, would be
> channeled to a federal program set up 14 years ago to provide liability
> protection for vaccine manufacturers. The program, funded through a
> surcharge on vaccines, compensates persons injured by such vaccines, to
> a maximum of \$250,000.

>

> "The industry has seized the opportunity presented by a Republican House
> and Senate to immediately pass legislation to get the industry off the
> hook," said Dallas lawyer Andrew Waters. "To me, it looks like payback
> for the fact that the industry spent millions bankrolling Republican
> campaigns."

>

> GOP officials said the provisions are merely aimed at protecting
> companies working on life-saving products from being dragged into costly

> litigation by trial lawyers. Pharmaceutical companies were among the
> largest contributors to Republicans in this year's elections, while
> trial lawyers heavily backed Democrats.
>
> In the past several years, some families have alleged a connection
> between their children's autism and vaccines using the preservative
> Thimerosal, which contains mercury. Medical studies have not proven a
> connection between Thimerosal and autism, but companies stopped using
> the preservative several years ago.
>
> Eli Lilly, once the largest maker of Thimerosal, is a major target in a
> spate of lawsuits filed since 2000. The company stopped making the
> product in 1980 but continued to buy it from other manufacturers and to
> resell it for another decade.
>
> Company spokesman Edward Sagebiel said Lilly was "surprised when the
> language was inserted" because it had not actively lobbied for it in
> recent months. But he said the company "believes it is a positive step
> to help assure that manufacturers are protected from lawsuits that are
> without merit or scientific evidence."
>
> Richard Diamond, a spokesman for retiring House Majority Leader Richard
> K. Armey (R-Tex.), said the provision was inserted because "it was
> something the White House wanted. It wasn't [Armey's] idea." But Diamond
> said the principle is good. "We don't want companies to be steered away
> from the business of making things that can save lives," he said.
>
> Elsewhere in the bill, Republicans incorporated the entire Cyber
> Security Enhancement Act, which the House passed overwhelmingly in July
> but which made little progress in the Democratic-controlled Senate. To
> strengthen law enforcement's hand in protecting the security of computer
> communications, the legislation would increase penalties for hacking and
> other malicious computing. Privacy advocates have criticized some
> provisions, particularly those that would lower the threshold for
> Internet service providers to give law enforcement agencies customer
> communications without a court order.
>
> The bill would make hacking punishable by as much as life in prison if
> the offender "knowingly or recklessly causes or attempts to cause
> death."
>
> Cut from the bill was a Democratic-backed provision that would have
> prevented the new federal agency from giving contracts to U.S.-based
> companies that use offshore addresses to avoid corporate taxes.
>
> GOP aides said the language originally offered by Rep. Tom DeLay
> (R-Tex.), and now incorporated in the bill, gives Texas A&M the inside
> track in hosting the first university center on homeland security, to be
> established within one year. DeLay was elected Wednesday to serve as the
> House majority leader in the 108th Congress.
>
> Yesterday, Senate Democrats were considering trying to strip
> non-relevant provisions from the homeland security bill during the final
> debate. If successful, such a move could derail Congress's timetable for
> adjourning, by forcing a new round of House-Senate negotiations to
> resolve differences in the legislation.
>

> Staff writer Jonathan Krim contributed to this report.
>
> C 2002 The Washington Post Company
>
> -----
>
> Mark Richards
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Sat, 16 Nov 2002 11:08:43 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Two articles on Homeland Security bill
Comments: To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Pentagon seems to have first revealed the existence of the Total Information Awareness (TIA) program in August, but there was little notice taken outside of high-tech circles until a Nov. 9 article by John Markoff in the New York Times pulled together much of the information and revealed the extent of Poindexter's involvement and the scope of the initiative.

Since everybody was focused on the election results, this got minimal attention until Safire's column. I'm no fan of Safire's, but in this case, he should be given credit for giving this story maximum exposure as soon as he became aware of it. Without him, the Bush administration would have been able to sneak this one through without anyone noticing at all.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Frank Rusciano wrote:

>
> It's interesting that, in a deft piece of timing, Safire waited until after
> the midterm elections to write this column, after the Bush administration
> finished beating Democrats over the head with their failure to pass it.
This
> also shows the Democrats' inability to focus on issues that even

> conservatives would find attractive in their opposition to the bill.
>
> Mark David Richards wrote:
>
>> 'A supersnoop's dream'
>> By Audrey Hudson
>> THE WASHINGTON TIMES
>>
>> Language tucked inside the Homeland Security bill will allow the
>> federal government to track the e-mail, Internet use, travel,
>> credit-card purchases, phone and bank records of foreigners and U.S.
>> citizens in its hunt for terrorists.
>> In what one critic has called "a supersnoop's dream," the Defense
>> Department's Total Information Awareness program would be authorized to
>> collect every type of available public and private data in what the
>> Pentagon describes as one "centralized grand database."
>> Computers and analysts are supposed to use all this available
>> information to determine patterns of people's behavior in order to
>> detect and identify terrorists, decipher plans and enable the United
>> States to pre-empt terrorist acts.
>> The project first appeared in the Senate Democratic proposal for
>> the new Homeland Security Department, which was defeated Wednesday in a
>> 50-47 vote. However it was included in the Republican-brokered agreement
>> that passed the House later that night in a 299-121 vote and is on the
>> fast track to pass the Senate by next week.
>> The computer-generated project of raw data will "help identify
>> promising technologies and quickly get them into the hands of people who
>> need them," according to a congressional leadership memo outlining the
>> legislation.
>> In a blistering op-ed piece in yesterday's New York Times titled
>> "You Are A Suspect," columnist William Safire compared the database to
>> George Orwell's Big Brother government in the novel "1984."
>> "To this computerized dossier on your private life from commercial
>> sources, add every piece of information that government has about you -
>> passport application, driver's license and bridge toll records, judicial
>> and divorce records, complaints from nosy neighbors to the FBI, your
>> lifetime paper trail plus the latest hidden camera surveillance - and
>> you have the supersnoop's dream: a 'Total Information Awareness' about
>> every U.S. citizen," Mr. Safire wrote.
>> "There is a great danger in this provision. It gives carte blanche
>> to eavesdrop on Americans on the flimsiest of evidence, if any evidence
>> at all," said Phil Kent, president of the Southeastern Legal Foundation.
>> Mr. Kent called the provision "an unprecedented electronic
>> dragnet."
>> "I think it's the most sweeping threat to civil liberties since
>> Japanese-American internment," Mr. Kent said.
>> Mr. Kent and outgoing Rep. Bob Barr, Georgia Republican, are
>> lobbying the Senate to remove this and other provisions they say are a
>> threat to civil liberties and restrict the public's right to know of
>> government activities.
>> "In defense of members of Congress, many don't read the whole
>> legislation and very few people read the fine print," said Mr. Barr.
>> "You would think the Pentagon planning a system to peek at personal data
>> would get a little more attention.
>> "It's outrageous, it really is outrageous," Mr. Barr said.
>> The bill establishes the Total Information Awareness program within
>> a new agency - the Security Advanced Research Projects Agency (SARPA),

> > which would be modeled on the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
> > (DARPA), the central research office for the Defense Department that
> > pursues research and technology, and led to the creation of the
> > Internet. DARPA and SARPA both would be under the supervision of Adm.
> > John Poindexter.

> > Neither Adm. Poindexter nor a spokesman at his current agency,
> > DARPA, could be reached for comment. The phone number listed for Adm.
> > Poindexter in the government directory reaches a recording that says
> > incoming calls are not accepted. A recording reached in the media
> > relations office states that Adm. Poindexter is "not accepting any
> > interview requests at this time."

> > Adm. Poindexter first hit the public eye as national security
> > adviser for President Reagan during the Iran-Contra scandal. He was
> > convicted in 1990 on five felonies including lying to Congress and
> > destroying evidence.

> > At a DARPA conference in Anaheim, Calif., Adm. Poindexter made his
> > first public appearance since taking the post in February.

> > "During the years I was in the White House, it was relatively
> > simple to identify our intelligence collection targets," Adm. Poindexter
> > was quoted as saying in Government Executive magazine.

> > However, the United States now faces "asymmetrical" threats that
> > are loosely organized and difficult to find, and require new,
> > technology-driven defenses, he said. The goal of his new office is to
> > consider every source of information available worldwide to uncover
> > terrorists, the magazine said.

> > Marc Rotenberg, director of the Electronic Privacy Information
> > Center, said the computer system would capture the data and analyze it
> > to find patterns that match terrorist activity.

> > Authorizing the project would require amending the Privacy Act of
> > 1974. The language contained in the homeland security bill does not
> > address the act directly, but authorizes the creation of the agency.

> > Mr. Rotenberg said the database takes a convergence of various
> > factors to a system of public surveillance.

> > "They think the technology is about catching terrorists and bad
> > guys, but these systems can capture a lot of data at different levels
> > without oversight, judicial review, public reporting or congressional
> > investigations. I can't think of a good countermeasure that would be
> > good to safeguard civil liberties in the United States," Mr. Rotenberg
> > said.

> >

> > -----

> >

> > Homeland Bill Rider Aids Drugmakers
> > Measure Would Block Suits Over Vaccines; FBI Powers Also Would Grow

> >

> > By Dan Morgan

> > Washington Post Staff Writer

> > Friday, November 15, 2002; Page A07

> >

> > Riding along on legislation to create a new federal Department of
> > Homeland Security is a White House-backed provision that could head off
> > dozens of potential lawsuits against Eli Lilly and Co. and other
> > pharmaceutical giants.

> >

> > Elsewhere in the sprawling measure is language that would help the FBI
> > obtain customer information from Internet service providers and increase
> > the penalties for computer hacking. These and other last-minute

> > additions to the bill by Republican leaders could have implications well
> > beyond the measure's immediate goal of protecting the homeland,
> > congressional officials said yesterday.

> >
> > Lawyers for parents of autistic children suing pharmaceutical companies
> > over childhood vaccines charged yesterday that a new section in the
> > homeland bill -- passed on Wednesday by the House and now before the
> > Senate -- would keep the lawsuits out of state courts, ruling out huge
> > judgments and lengthy litigation. Complaints, instead, would be
> > channeled to a federal program set up 14 years ago to provide liability
> > protection for vaccine manufacturers. The program, funded through a
> > surcharge on vaccines, compensates persons injured by such vaccines, to
> > a maximum of \$250,000.

> >
> > "The industry has seized the opportunity presented by a Republican House
> > and Senate to immediately pass legislation to get the industry off the
> > hook," said Dallas lawyer Andrew Waters. "To me, it looks like payback
> > for the fact that the industry spent millions bankrolling Republican
> > campaigns."

> >
> > GOP officials said the provisions are merely aimed at protecting
> > companies working on life-saving products from being dragged into costly
> > litigation by trial lawyers. Pharmaceutical companies were among the
> > largest contributors to Republicans in this year's elections, while
> > trial lawyers heavily backed Democrats.

> >
> > In the past several years, some families have alleged a connection
> > between their children's autism and vaccines using the preservative
> > Thimerosal, which contains mercury. Medical studies have not proven a
> > connection between Thimerosal and autism, but companies stopped using
> > the preservative several years ago.

> >
> > Eli Lilly, once the largest maker of Thimerosal, is a major target in a
> > spate of lawsuits filed since 2000. The company stopped making the
> > product in 1980 but continued to buy it from other manufacturers and to
> > resell it for another decade.

> >
> > Company spokesman Edward Sagebiel said Lilly was "surprised when the
> > language was inserted" because it had not actively lobbied for it in
> > recent months. But he said the company "believes it is a positive step
> > to help assure that manufacturers are protected from lawsuits that are
> > without merit or scientific evidence."

> >
> > Richard Diamond, a spokesman for retiring House Majority Leader Richard
> > K. Armey (R-Tex.), said the provision was inserted because "it was
> > something the White House wanted. It wasn't [Armey's] idea." But Diamond
> > said the principle is good. "We don't want companies to be steered away
> > from the business of making things that can save lives," he said.

> >
> > Elsewhere in the bill, Republicans incorporated the entire Cyber
> > Security Enhancement Act, which the House passed overwhelmingly in July
> > but which made little progress in the Democratic-controlled Senate. To
> > strengthen law enforcement's hand in protecting the security of computer
> > communications, the legislation would increase penalties for hacking and
> > other malicious computing. Privacy advocates have criticized some
> > provisions, particularly those that would lower the threshold for
> > Internet service providers to give law enforcement agencies customer

> > communications without a court order.
> >
> > The bill would make hacking punishable by as much as life in prison if
> > the offender "knowingly or recklessly causes or attempts to cause
> > death."
> >
> > Cut from the bill was a Democratic-backed provision that would have
> > prevented the new federal agency from giving contracts to U.S.-based
> > companies that use offshore addresses to avoid corporate taxes.
> >
> > GOP aides said the language originally offered by Rep. Tom DeLay
> > (R-Tex.), and now incorporated in the bill, gives Texas A&M the inside
> > track in hosting the first university center on homeland security, to be
> > established within one year. DeLay was elected Wednesday to serve as the
> > House majority leader in the 108th Congress.
> >
> > Yesterday, Senate Democrats were considering trying to strip
> > non-relevant provisions from the homeland security bill during the final
> > debate. If successful, such a move could derail Congress's timetable for
> > adjourning, by forcing a new round of House-Senate negotiations to
> > resolve differences in the legislation.
> >
> > Staff writer Jonathan Krim contributed to this report.
> >
> > C 2002 The Washington Post Company
> >
> > -----
> >
> > Mark Richards
> >
> > -----
> > Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> > then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> > Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Sat, 16 Nov 2002 12:46:09 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: Wash Post Editorial--Total Information Awareness
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In print, The Post published the Information Awareness Office logo with the editorial--I don't see it on the .com address. Mark

EDITORIAL
The Washington Post

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A61653-2002Nov15.html>

Total Information Awareness
Saturday, November 16, 2002; Page A20

ANYONE WHO deliberately set out to invent a government program with the specific aim of terrifying the Orwell-reading public could hardly have improved on the Information Awareness Office. Tucked away in the outer reaches of the Defense Department, brandishing an eerie and cryptic logo -- an all-seeing eye atop a pyramid and the slogan "Scientia Est Potentia" ("Knowledge Is Power") -- the office is headed by retired Rear Adm. John M. Poindexter, the Reagan administration official who was convicted in the wake of the Iran-contra scandal of five felony counts of lying to Congress, destroying official documents and obstructing the congressional inquiry into the affair. Not surprisingly, there have already been some fast-breathing reactions to recently published information about the office, including allegations that it is funded by the Homeland Security Bill (it isn't) and that Adm. Poindexter has compiled a computer dossier on every American (he hasn't, or not yet).

In fact, the program is still a research project of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), the high-tech innovators who helped create the Internet -- and who claim that this project is equally benign. Among other things, the Information Awareness Office is trying to find ways of better identifying potentially dangerous people by using video cameras and biometrics, and of processing large amounts of data from different sources so as to predict and prevent terrorist attacks (the "Total Information Awareness System"). Police tracking the Washington sniper suspects might, for example, have caught them more quickly with the help of a computer program that could simultaneously search their motel records, their immigration and police histories, and the traffic violations tied to their Chevrolet Caprice.

Yet, given both the context and the content of the program, DARPA should hardly have been surprised by the bad publicity. For however revolutionary and innovative it may be, this is not neutral technology, and the potential for abuse is enormous. If information that once took five people a week to find will now take one person 15 minutes to find, then instant -- and instantly updatable -- computer dossiers on everyone really do cease to be science fiction. If computers can learn to identify a person through a video camera, then constant surveillance of society becomes possible, too. Because the legal system designed to protect privacy has yet to catch up with this technology, Congress needs to take a direct interest in this project, and the defense secretary should appoint an outside committee to oversee it before it proceeds. Privacy concerns need to be built into the technology from the beginning -- if the public decides, after being fully acquainted with the possibilities, that it is to be built at all.

Finally, everyone involved might also want to consider whether Adm. Poindexter is the best person to direct this extremely sensitive project. Though his criminal convictions were overturned on appeal, his record of lying to Congress hardly makes him an ideal protector of the legal system, and his conduct of Iran-contra hardly makes him an advertisement for government competence. Even his choice of logo calls into question his tact and taste. Adm. Poindexter's presence on this project, the lack of clear public information about it and the absence of any real oversight already indicate a serious lapse of judgment.

C 2002 The Washington Post Company

Mark Richards

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Sat, 16 Nov 2002 13:29:50 -0600
Reply-To: MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Genetics and Public Policy Center RFP
Comments: cc: akalfoglou@jhu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

The following Request for Proposal is posted as information for the AAPOR list serv. Interested parties should reply directly to Andrea L. Kalfoglou at akalfoglou@jhu.edu

Michael P. Flanagan, CAE
Executive Coordinator
American Association for Public Opinion Research
P. O. Box 14263
Lenexa, KS 66285-4263
(913) 495-4470
FAX: (913) 599-5340

Genetics and Public Policy Center
Johns Hopkins University
The Berman Bioethics Institute
1717 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Suite 530
Washington, DC 20036

November 14, 2002

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Genetics and Public Policy Center (GPPC) has been established to be an independent and objective source of credible information on genetic technologies and policies for the public, media and policymakers. It is

funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts. The goal of the GPPC is to create the environment and tools needed by key decision makers in both the private and public sectors to carefully consider and respond to the challenges and opportunities that arise from scientific advances in genetics.

The GPPC is looking for a contractor that can help us conduct qualitative research (focus groups, interviews, etc.) to investigate the public's knowledge and beliefs around genetic technologies and reproduction. Data will be collected in numerous sites throughout the United States. We anticipate approximately 25-30 focus groups with some additional in depth interviews. This contractor will work collaboratively with GPPC staff and a team of qualitative researchers to execute this research. Specific we are looking for a contractor who can:

- * Recruit participants
- * Manage all facilities requirements
- * Provide manpower to administer the project
- * Moderate focus groups and conduct interviews (GPPC researchers will likely want to moderate some of the groups)
- * Clean transcripts of all personal identifiers
- * Ensure the confidentiality of data
- * Develop a coding strategy
- * Coded data
- * Prepare a final report

Background

Advances in genetic testing and manipulation technologies are changing the way some people plan for and have children. These technologies include but are not limited to, carrier testing, preimplantation and prenatal genetic diagnosis, and newborn screening.

When a couple begins to think about having a child, they may consider having genetic tests to find out whether they are a carrier of a genetic disease such as Cystic Fibrosis (CF).

If the couple knows that a genetic disease runs in the family, either because they already have an affected child or other affected relatives, the couple may choose to use pre-implantation genetic diagnosis (PGD) or prenatal genetic testing to eliminate or reduce the chances of having an affected child. PGD is a very new technique in which embryos are created through in vitro fertilization (IVF) and a single cell is biopsied and genetically tested. Only embryos free of the genetic disease are then implanted into the woman's uterus. There have been approximately 1000 children born in the world resulting from IVF with PGD testing, and the use of this technology is growing rapidly. In addition, PGD to detect chromosomal abnormalities is being offered to women of advanced maternal age who are using IVF for infertility. In prenatal genetic testing, such as chorionic villi sampling or amniocentesis, cells from the fetus are tested for genetic disease. If tests show that the fetus has the genetic disease, the couple has the option to terminate the pregnancy.

Finally, testing after a baby is born may identify children who carry genetic disease. In some cases, it is possible to intervene, for instance with special diet, in ways that can keep these children from becoming ill.

Other technologies (such as gene therapy and cloning) are still in the

experimental phase but have the potential to affect the ways in which people have children.

Research Goals and Topics

The GPPC is developing a robust set of policy options to guide the development and use of reproductive genetic technologies. It advocates neither for, nor against, reproductive genetic technologies or policies affecting their development and use. Instead, the GPPC is committed to providing objective information and analysis and facilitating dialogue so that the public, scientists, medical professionals, community groups, religious organizations and policymakers can make their own informed decisions on these issues. The public's reflected preferences and beliefs must be considered and incorporated in to this process. To this end, the GPPC will conduct social science research to discern what people know and how they feel about reproductive genetic technologies. This research will include special populations that may have unique perspectives. The goals of the research are to:

- * Explore the extent to which the public understands genetic testing, and its use in informing reproductive decision-making, particularly in the areas of carrier screening, preimplantation genetic diagnosis, prenatal diagnosis, and newborn screening.

- * Identify the key areas of public misperception around these issues.

- * Identify where the public is obtaining information about reproductive genetics.

- * Uncover the areas of public concern - and optimism - around the research and application of reproductive genetics.

- * Assess how/when the public thinks reproductive genetics technologies ought to be used and when they should be limited.

- * Gauge public perception of current oversight of this research and its applications, and the extent to which the public supports regulatory and other safeguards to ensure the safety and ethical application of reproductive genetics.

- * Identify who the public believes should be responsible for decision-making about reproductive genetics research and its applications, including (or excluding) individuals and families, government, the biomedical research establishment, medical professionals, patients/consumers, the biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries, and other interest groups.

- * Identify the vocabulary, messages, messengers, and symbols the public (and various subsets of the public) is using to discuss reproductive genetic technologies and the concepts around reproductive genetics.

Study Populations

We are interested in learning about the views of the public. Clearly there is significant heterogeneity within the general public that may influence

knowledge and attitudes about reproductive genetic policy; consequently, we may want to stratify these groups by race/ethnicity, religion, geography, gender, age, socioeconomic status, parent/non-parent, and other factors.

In addition, there are important special populations that are likely to have a higher level of knowledge about reproductive genetic technologies and may be more engaged and vocal conversation partners in the public policy debate. We would like to learn about these special populations' knowledge and attitudes as well. Potential special populations include:

- * individuals with a known genetic disease or with a family history of genetic disease
- * persons with personal experience using reproductive technologies
- * scientists (basic, clinical, genetic)
- * health care providers
- * insurance company medical decision makers

The research goals for these populations will be similar to those listed above, but will include additional issues of special relevance or importance to the subgroup. Data collection with these special populations may also require a different research methodology.

Research Process

Because this is very specialized research with a very fast time line, GPPC intends to contract with a company that can efficiently and effectively provided all of the research logistics and support, such as focus group facilities, data management, and coding. We have also solicited co-investigators who are experts in qualitative research and experienced with many of the special populations we wish to reach. These co-investigators will develop the research instruments, help recruit the special populations, create the coding structure, and write the publications. The contractor will be expected to work closely with this research team throughout the research process. Most communication will take place through conference calls and e-mails, though in person meetings may also be needed. Any data gathered as part of this research effort will be owned by the GPPC.

Application Procedures

This contract will be awarded in December 2002 and the research completed in March 2003, so contractors interested in bidding on this project are asked to contact Andrea Kalfoglou at the GPPC as soon as possible to discuss the research plan, budget, and timeline. We'd specifically like to know your capabilities and your routine costs for 25-30 focus groups with diverse populations across the U.S.

Andrea L. Kalfoglou, Ph.D.
Research Analyst
akalfoglou@jhu.edu <mailto:akalfoglou@jhu.edu>

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hudson, Ph.D.
Director

SOLITATION FOR CO-INVESTIGATORS

TITLE: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Public's Knowledge, Beliefs, and Attitudes about Reproductive Genetics

ISSUED BY: Genetics and Public Policy Center (GPPC)
Phoebe R. Berman Bioethics Institute
Johns Hopkins University
1717 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Suite 530
Washington, DC 20036

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Kathy Hudson, Ph.D.

TIMELINE:

Date Issued: November 12, 2002
E-mail Application Due: November 27, 2002
Notification of contract: December 2002
Contract start date: December 2002
Data analysis complete: Spring 2003

PURPOSE

The Genetics and Public Policy Center (GPPC) has been established to be an independent and objective source of credible information on genetic technologies and policies for the public, media and policymakers. It is funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts. The goal of the GPPC is to create the environment and tools needed by key decision makers in both the private and public sectors to carefully consider and respond to the challenges and opportunities that arise from scientific advances in genetics.

The GPPC is looking for four to six co-investigators to be a part of an interdisciplinary, collaborative research team to investigate "the public's" knowledge and beliefs around reproductive genetic technologies. The GPPC intends to collect qualitative data through focus groups, interviews, and other appropriate research methods. In collaboration with GPPC staff and other research team members, co-investigators will:

- * Develop the research plan
- * Address human research protections issues
- * Develop the data collection instrument (interview/focus group guide)
- * Develop educational materials to prepare participants
- * Participate in recruiting special populations
- * Moderate and/or observe some of the data collection
- * Review transcripts
- * Develop coding strategy
- * Review coded data
- * Provide data analysis
- * Write publication(s)

Co-investigators will be financially supported and have co-authorship on the primary publication as well as some of the publications focused on subsets of the data. Financial support and publication credit will be commensurate with contribution to the research.

The GPPC will coordinate and facilitate this research and, through a separate contract, provide research and logistics support. This collaborative arrangement - social science researchers working with a contractor who has the existing infrastructure to conduct national research - will enable the GPPC to reach its research goals quickly, maintain consistency in the research (data collection, coding, and analysis), and ensure protection of human research participants. The GPPC will provide co-investigators with funds for facilities, personnel, travel, and logistics if that becomes part of the research plan. Researchers will be expected to provide their own qualitative research software.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Background

Advances in genetic testing and manipulation technologies are changing the way some people plan for and have children. These technologies include but are not limited to, carrier testing, preimplantation and prenatal genetic diagnosis, and newborn screening.

When a couple begins to think about having a child, they may consider having genetic tests to find out whether they are a carrier of a genetic disease such as Cystic Fibrosis (CF).

If the couple knows that a genetic disease runs in the family, either because they already have an affected child or other affected relatives, the couple may choose to use pre-implantation genetic diagnosis (PGD) or prenatal genetic testing to eliminate or reduce the chances of having an affected child. PGD is a very new technique in which embryos are created through in vitro fertilization (IVF) and a single cell is biopsied and genetically tested. Only embryos free of the genetic disease are then implanted into the woman's uterus. There have been approximately 1000 children born in the world resulting from IVF with PGD testing, and the use of this technology is growing rapidly. In addition, PGD to detect chromosomal abnormalities is being offered to woman of advanced maternal age who are using IVF for infertility. In prenatal genetic testing, such as chorionic villi sampling or amniocentesis, cells from the fetus are tested for genetic disease. If tests show that the fetus has the genetic disease, the couple has the option to terminate the pregnancy.

Finally, testing after a baby is born may identify children who carry genetic disease. In some cases, it is possible to intervene, for instance with special diet, in ways that can keep these children from becoming ill.

Other technologies (such as gene therapy and cloning) are still in the experimental phase but have the potential to affect the ways in which people have children.

Research Goals and Topics

The GPPC is developing a robust set of policy options to guide the development and use of reproductive genetic technologies. It advocates

neither for, nor against, reproductive genetic technologies or policies affecting their development and use. Instead, the GPPC is committed to providing objective information and analysis and facilitating dialogue so that the public, scientists, medical professionals, community groups, religious organizations and policymakers can make their own informed decisions on these issues. The public's reflected preferences and beliefs must be considered and incorporated in to this process. To this end, the GPPC will conduct social science research to discern what people know and how they feel about reproductive genetic technologies. This research will include special populations that may have unique perspectives. The goals of the research are to:

- * Explore the extent to which the public understands genetic testing, and its use in informing reproductive decision-making, particularly in the areas of carrier screening, preimplantation genetic diagnosis, prenatal diagnosis, and newborn screening.

- * Identify the key areas of public misperception around these issues.

- * Identify where the public is obtaining information about reproductive genetics.

- * Uncover the areas of public concern - and optimism - around the research and application of reproductive genetics.

- * Assess how/when the public thinks reproductive genetics technologies ought to be used and when they should be limited.

- * Gauge public perception of current oversight of this research and its applications, and the extent to which the public supports regulatory and other safeguards to ensure the safety and ethical application of reproductive genetics.

- * Identify who the public believes should be responsible for decision-making about reproductive genetics research and its applications, including (or excluding) individuals and families, government, the biomedical research establishment, medical professionals, patients/consumers, the biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries, and other interest groups.

- * Identify the vocabulary, messages, messengers, and symbols the public (and various subsets of the public) is using to discuss reproductive genetic technologies and the concepts around reproductive genetics.

Study Populations

We are interested in learning about the views of the public. Clearly there is significant heterogeneity within the general public that may influence knowledge and attitudes about reproductive genetic policy; consequently, we may want to stratify these groups by race/ethnicity, religion, geography, gender, age, socioeconomic status, parent/non-parent, and other factors.

In addition, there are important special populations that are likely to have a higher level of knowledge about reproductive genetic technologies and may be more engaged and vocal conversation partners in the public policy debate.

We would like to learn about these special populations' knowledge and attitudes as well. Potential special populations include:

- * individuals with a known genetic disease or with a family history of genetic disease
- * persons with personal experience using reproductive technologies
- * scientists (basic, clinical, genetic)
- * health care providers
- * insurance company medical decision makers

The research goals for these populations will be similar to those listed above, but will include additional issues of special relevance or importance to the subgroup. Data collection with these special populations may also require a different research methodology.

Research Process

GPPC will help coordinate the relationships between co-investigators. Communication will be primarily through conference calls and e-mail, though in person meetings may also be needed. The research team will work together to discuss the research plan, draft the research instruments, analyze the data, and prepare a final report. Each co-investigator will be responsible for a defined piece of the research. These pieces will be based on the research population being studied. For instance, one researcher may be responsible for data on "the public," while another is responsible for "people with genetic diseases." While we are striving for consistency in data collection, there will be flexibility in the research instrument and research methods depending on the population that is being studied.

Any data gathered as part of this research effort is owned by the GPPC; however, co-investigators will have publication rights. Co-investigators will contribute to the data analysis and preparation of a final report. This report will be co-authored by all the co-investigators and GPPC staff. Each co-investigator will then be free to prepare individual publications based on their subset of the data. The co-investigator will be the primary author, and will include GPPC research staff as co-authors.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Researchers interested in becoming co-investigators in this research process are asked to submit a letter of interest that is no longer than three pages, a CV, and one sample publication no later than November 27, 2002. The letter should describe the researcher's:

1. availability to commit to a fast-paced research project between Dec 2002-March 2003;
2. knowledge and experience in social science research, particularly qualitative research;
3. familiarity with reproductive genetics technology and policy; and
4. knowledge or experience with any of the special populations listed above or other groups that may be important subpopulations such as racial/ethnic or religious groups. This discussion might include ideas for recruiting these special populations and suggestions for research methodology most appropriate to gather data from these groups.

Applications and all inquiries should be submitted via e-mail to:

Andrea L. Kalfoglou, Ph.D.
Research Analyst
akalfoglou@jhu.edu <mailto:akalfoglou@jhu.edu>

REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

Upon receipt, GPPC will review letters of interest. Applicants will be reviewed on the following criteria:

1. Ability to commit to research time schedule between December 2002-March 2003;
2. Demonstrated knowledge of and experience with social science research methodology;
3. Familiarity with the special populations described above including racial/ethnic minorities and religious groups (specific plans for recruiting this population and ideas about how research methodology may need to be adapted to collect data from these groups); and
4. Knowledge and experience with reproductive genetics technology and policy issues.

Following the review, selected applicants will be invited to enter into a collaborative research agreement with GPPC. Time commitment will be negotiated with each researcher. Financial support will be commensurate with contribution. We anticipate having a team of between four and six co-investigators.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Sun, 17 Nov 2002 21:30:10 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Mid East and the Human Rights Challenge.
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

By now all of you have read or heard about what happened on Saturday in=20
HEBRON on the West Bank, when Palestinian snipers ambushed Jewish settlers=
=20
walking home from Sabbath prayers and then attacked the policemen, security=
=20
guards and soldiers who rushed to the rescue.

Putting aside for the moment whether the attack was justified, the=20
challenge we face with regard to minimizing or preventing human rights=20
violations (on both sides!) is becoming increasingly difficult if not=20
impossible.

Why do I say this? I'm basing my view on an article that appeared in=20
yesterday's NY Times which covered the incident in detail. Contained in=20
the article was the following, and I quote:

>"We're going to continue resistance everywhere," Sheik Abdallah al-Shami,=
=20
>a political leader of Islamic Jihad, said by telephone from hiding in the=
=20
>Gaza Strip. "We are not committed to any kind of agreements."
>
>He said of the Hebron attack, "We are congratulating the Islamic world =97=
=20
>all Muslims =97 for such a successful operation."
>
>Even Palestinians who oppose attacks in pre-1967 Israel overwhelmingly=20
>support attacks on settlers and soldiers in the West Bank, regarding such=
=20
>violence as lawful resistance to occupation.

And it is these sentences which I found especially troubling:

>"..... Jihad and Hamas consider all of Israel as occupied territory.
>
>One of the most hard-line political leaders of Hamas, Abdel Aziz Rantisi,=
=20
>said on Friday night that Hamas would reject even a limited ban on=20
>killing. "All of it is Palestinian land, and all of the land is occupied,"=
=20
>he said. "We're going to hit everywhere."

We continually hear talk about the possibility and the need for a "plan" to=
=20
settle the Israeli-Palestinian conflict -- or at least bring some kind of=20
peace along with pleas to negotiate. But, what options are open when one=20
side refuses to even consider the matter? It is true that Islamic Jihad=20
and Hamas are not in charge of the Palestinian territory, but then who is=20
-- and who is really running the show? And who could or should one=20
negotiate with? Very troubling.

The full article appeared on the front page of the New York Times, November=
=20
16, 2002,
Israel Weighs Response After 12 Killed in Hebron Ambush -- James Bennet

Dick Halpern
AIUSA

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sun, 17 Nov 2002 23:00:29 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Mid East and the Human Rights Challenge.

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I goofed --- I posted a message entitled "Mid East and the Human Rights Challenge" in error to AAPORNET when it should have been posted to AIUSA.

My mistake -- so please accept my apologies since the message was not especially relevant to AAPOR's primary concerns or interests.

Dick Halpern

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2002 11:02:06 -0500
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: Mid East and the Human Rights Challenge.
In-Reply-To: <5.1.1.6.2.20021117210225.033a0480@pop3.norton.antivirus>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

dick halpern wrote:

>By now all of you have read or heard about what happened on Saturday
>in HEBRON on the West Bank, when Palestinian snipers ambushed Jewish
>settlers walking home from Sabbath prayers and then attacked the
>policemen, security guards and soldiers who rushed to the rescue.

This is a bit off topic for this list, but the record should be corrected. Ha'aretz reported the other day:

>IDF: Gunmen fired at security forces, not worshippers
>According to an initial investigation by the army, in contrast to a
>version of events given by the foreign ministry, the Islamic Jihad
>fire was not directed at worshippers but at the security forces
>escorting them. All of the dead were from the IDF, Border Police or
>emergency security team of the settlers of Kiryat Arba and Hebron,
>who came to help evacuate the wounded.

and today's NYT reports:

>The ambush on Friday took place along an exposed road between those
>two settlements, in the Israeli-controlled section of the city. The
>Israeli Army initially said the attack was on Jewish worshippers, but
>it appears to have been directed at security forces who guard
>settlers. Three security guards from Qiryat Arba were killed, along
>with five members of the border police and four soldiers, including
>the commander of forces in Hebron.

A settlement has already sprung up on the site of a former
Palestinian olive orchard which was bulldozed by the Israelis after

the attack.

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
voice +1-212-741-9852
fax +1-212-807-9152
cell +1-917-865-2813
email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2002 11:40:30 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Comment on Richard Morin: The Ol' Bush Magic
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

This kind of prestige experiment goes back at least to the FDR era, as reported in Cantril's "Gauging Public Opinion" (1944), --sometimes retitled by students at the time as "Gouguing Public Opinion"--and also appears in a still earlier POQ article by Cantril in 1940. However, the effects did not always replicate and in one experiment the inclusion of FDR's name seemed to have a negative effect. Howard

Howard Fienberg wrote:

><http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A61791-2002Nov15.html>
>
>As if the Democrats don't already know it, George W. Bush is a magic man.
>Merely mentioning Dubya's name seems to be enough to sweeten the otherwise
>sour mood of the country, though his mojo still pales in comparison with the
>power that Bill Clinton once had to brighten the public's view.
>
>At least that's one way to interpret the results of an experiment conducted
>by The Washington Post, the Henry J. Kaiser Foundation and Harvard
>University as part of a recent national poll.
>
>The survey of 2,886 randomly selected Americans included two standard poll
>questions. The first asked whether people thought the country was headed in
>the right direction or was "seriously off on the wrong track." The second
>asked whether those interviewed approved or disapproved of the job Bush was
>doing as president.
>
>To measure the "Bush effect," the interviewers varied the order of the
>questions. Half of the respondents were first asked what they thought about
>Bush's performance. Then they were asked about the direction of the country.

>For the other half, the order was reversed.
>
>And voilà: Asking first about Bush boosted the proportion that saw the
>country headed in the right direction by eight percentage points -- from 34
>percent to 42 percent.
>
>
>+++++
>Howard Fienberg
>Columnist, Editor, Analyst
>2776 Grovemore Ln
>Vienna, VA 22180
>EMAIL: h@hfienberg.com
>PH: (703) 698-1953
>CELL: (202) 251-1585
>WEB: http://www.hfienberg.com
>
>
>
>
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2002 12:03:54 -0500
Reply-To: Jane Sheppard <jsheppard@cmor.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jane Sheppard <jsheppard@CMOR.ORG>
Organization: CMOR
Subject: SNEAK PEAK CMOR Respondent Cooperation Workshop Program
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

We=92ve provided you a =93Sneak Peak=94 at the program for the upcoming =
Second Annual =93Protecting Our Assets=94 Respondent Cooperation =
Workshop to be held February 3-4, 2003 in Orlando, Florida. The line-up =
of presenters is impressive, including topics that attendees of the =
first workshop said are important to improve respondent cooperation, AND =
updates from the Task Forces that were created as a result of their hard =
work and input at the first workshop.

Preliminary Agenda

Monday, February 3

8 :00 AM Registration/ Continental Breakfast

8:45 AM Welcome/ Opening Remarks Jane Sheppard, CMOR Kathy Pilhuj, =
Scarborough Research

9:00 AM Industry Trends, Research, Statistics

"Refusals: Past, Present, Future" Mariana Schafer, Field Facts Worldwide

"Respondent Satisfaction Modeling" Bill MacElroy, Socratic Technologies

10:15 AM Break

10:45 AM Finding an Industry Identity: Qualitative and Quantitative =
Survey Results

Rich Boone, EJ Gallo Winery and Paul Lavrakas, Nielsen Media Research

12:00 PM Luncheon Program

1:30 PM Attacking the Respondent Cooperation Problem - Organizations' =
Perspective

"Behind the Scene Effors to Improve Respondent Cooperation" Robie =
Sangster, Bureau of Labor

"Leveraging Relationships in Solving Industry Problems" Andy Garfinkel, =
AT&T=20

"Utilizing Incentives " Theresa Hamilton, Westat=20

3:00 PM Break

3:30 PM Attacking the Respondent Cooperation Problem - Associations' =
Perspective

"Taking a Grassroots Approach" Betsy Peterson, MRA

"Establishing Survey Performance Standards Using CAMRO Model" Diane =
Bowers, CASRO

"Creating Global Guidelines for Research" Gabe Samuels, ARF=20

5:00 PM Networking Reception

Tuesday, February 4

8:00 AM Continental Breakfast

9:00 AM CMOR Task Force Reports

"Uncovering Interviewer Recruitment/ Satisfaction: Survey Results of =
Interviewers Nationwide" Ellen Gregory, MRSI and Morris Davis, M Davis =
Company

10:15 AM Break

10:45 AM CMOR Task Force Reports (Cont'd)

"Improving Survey Introductions/Scripts" Kathy Pilhuj, Scarborough =

Research

"Educating Clients & the Industry" Karl Feld, Western Wats .Center

12:00 PM Luncheon Program

1:30 PM Sharing Experiences for Improvement

"Can You Trust Your Data When Telephone Response Rates Are So Low?" Ann =
Selzer, Selzer & Co

"Pre-notification Efforts for Phone & Mail Surveys" Jane Traub, =
Scarborough Research

"Identifying Barriers to Survey Cooperation among 18 -34 Year Olds" Paul =
Lavrakas, Nielsen Media

3:00 PM Break

3:15 PM Respondent Cooperation: A Company Approach

"Improving Interviewer Satisfaction: An Issue of Morlae Building" Pete =
Mondfrans, Western Wats Center

"Improving Time/Day Calling Sequence" Brandon Rogers, Western Wats =
Center

4:30PM Closing Jane Sheppard, CMOR Kathy Pilhuj, Scarborough Research

SIGN UP TODAY! Visit www.cmor.org for details and updates.

Jane M. Sheppard
Director Respondent Cooperation
CMOR
'Promoting and Advocating Survey Research'

Ohio Office: =20
2012 Penhurst Circle N.E.
North Canton, OH 44720
Phone: (330) 244-8616
Fax: (330) 244-8626

Visit CMOR's website www.cmor.org for your research resources.

=20

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 19 Nov 2002 14:58:43 -0800
Reply-To: Albert & Susan Cantril <ascantril@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Albert & Susan Cantril <ascantril@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Accuracy of Pre-election Polls
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Before any efforts to compare poll results and electoral outcomes, it would be a good idea to look at Irving Crespi's book, "Pre-Election Polling: Sources of Accuracy and Error" (Russell Sage Foundation, 1988).

His study did such a comparison with respect to 423 races from 1980 through 1984. Races included the presidential level (primaries and general election), statewide offices (senate and gubernatorial), and Congressional Districts.

The study surveyed news organizations that had conducted pre-election polls, asking about various aspects of methods used.

The study also included a qualitative side: interviews with polling veterans on the challenges of pre-election surveys.

The project found that (given adequate sample size) two critical correlates of polling accuracy were (a) the time that had elapsed between final interviewing and the election and (b) the care with which likely voters had been identified, especially in low-turnout elections.

An update of Crespi's study would be timely. We hope someone will rise to the challenge of not only comparing polls and outcomes but also exploring the correlates of accuracy in today's polling and political environment.

Albert & Susan Cantril

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2002 15:07:54 -0500
Reply-To: s.kraus@CSUOHIO.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Sidney Kraus <s.kraus@CSUOHIO.EDU>
Subject: Augusta
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

I'm looking for polling data on the current issue of women membership in Augusta National Golf Club. I've seen several AP wire stories and other publicity about the issue, but no polling information. Thanks for the help.

Sid Kraus

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2002 15:37:19 -0500
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <skeeter@GMU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Scott Keeter <skeeter@GMU.EDU>
Organization: George Mason University
Subject: Re: Augusta
Comments: To: s.kraus@CSUOHIO.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Take a look at the Polling Company's survey (which got blasted by experts including Mark Schulman and Harry O'Neill):

<http://www.pollingcompany.com/>

Click on "Topline data for Augusta National Golf Club"

Sidney Kraus wrote:

>
> I'm looking for polling data on the current issue of women membership in
> Augusta National Golf Club. I've seen several AP wire stories and other
> publicity about the issue, but no polling information. Thanks for the
> help.
>
> Sid Kraus
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

--
Scott Keeter
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
1150 18th Street, NW, Suite 975
Washington, DC 20036
Voice 202-293-3126 extension 16
Personal fax 703 832 0209
E-mail keeters@people-press.org
Web site <http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2002 15:57:24 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: ODD EMAIL ALERT
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Good afternoon, everyone

Early this morning I opened my email and found a message that purported to be from myself. I didn't recognize it, and the subject line was "Fact or fiction: You can carry ALL your data in your pocket.." [sic]

I opened it, and was immediately transported into a world of computer goo...couldn't shut down, took three tries and a 20-minute wait to restart.

Just a repeat of the usual warning: if you see something that you don't understand [like a message from yourself that you don't remember sending] hitting DELETE is prudent, or you might forward it to your help desk.

Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2002 16:50:11 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: Re: Mid East and the Human Rights Challenge.
In-Reply-To: <5.1.1.6.2.20021117210225.033a0480@pop3.norton.antivirus>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Certainly a challenge. I assume the parties that must negotiate are Israel and the Palestinian Authority. Neither side seems to think the other is interested at present, do they. This is a touchy subject, I hesitate to speak, and I wonder if AAPORnet is the proper forum... that said...

Statement on Crisis in Israel by Rabbis for Human Rights Israel and endorsed
by Rabbis for Human Rights North America
<http://www.rhr.israel.net/statement.shtml>

Here is an article from The Washington Post with Israeli Prime Minister Sharon's response to the attack on border patrolmen and Jewish settlement security officers: "Sharon Urges Enlarging Hebron Settlements

Linking Sites Seen as Way to Boost Security After Attack; Plan at Odds With U.S. Stance"

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A3043-2002Nov17.html>

Location of Hebron:

http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/middle_east_and_asia/westbank_judaea92.jpg

http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/middle_east_and_asia/israel_pol01.jpg

The UN has spoken clearly to the issue of settlements. Example: In Feb. 1999 -- before intifada in Sept. 2000 <http://intifadaonline.com/> -- the UN General Assembly adopted ES-10/6--Illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory <http://domino.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/5ba47a5c6cef541b802563e000493b8c/e29f7195c53cdda905256729005035e4!OpenDocument>

"...Aware that Israel, the occupying Power, has not heeded the demands made in the resolutions of the tenth emergency special session and that it continues to carry out illegal actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory, in particular settlement activity, including the construction of the new Israeli settlement at Jebel Abu Ghneim, the building of other new settlements and the expansion of existing settlements, the construction of bypass roads and the confiscation of lands ..."

In April 2000, The Commission on Human Rights... "Expresses its grave concern: (a) At the continuing Israeli settlement activities, in spite of the Government's moratorium on new construction permits, including the expansion of the settlements, the installation of settlers in the occupied territories, the expropriation of land, the demolition of houses, the confiscation of property, the expulsion of local residents and the construction of bypass roads, which change the physical character and demographic composition of the occupied territories, including East Jerusalem, since all these actions are illegal, constitute a violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and are a major obstacle to peace;..."

2002/90. The situation of human rights in the occupied Palestinian territory

<http://domino.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/98edce37e189625b85256c40005da81b/c350221dc32e541385256bb4006a2718!OpenDocument>

Again, December 20, 2001: ES-10/9 Illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory:

<http://domino.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/a06f2943c226015c85256c40005d359c/d3ee72d2fe9be00c85256b30004f28e4!OpenDocument>

Does the government of Israel have more of an interest in a fair two state settlement than those on the other side?

UN Resolutions on the Question of Palestine -- look at the list...

http://www.un.org/Depts/dpa/qpalnew/resolutions_new_qpal.htm

Until Palestinian "freedom fighters/terrorists" (pick a word, depending on your view) stop using armed aggression in their resistance, Israel says it will not remove itself from occupied territories or stop using its military might. Palestinians won't stop using force until Israel withdraws from occupied territories. How to break a vicious cycle?

As for the role of the U.S. ("we"), it should encourage dialogue and negotiation between the two parties and press toward a solution. Easy to say and getting more difficult. And the U.S. is not a neutral party.

Another article: P.A.: It May Be Too Late for Two States
Pact 'Pre-empted By Settlements'

<http://www.forward.com/issues/2002/02.10.25/news1.html>

"... In a little-noticed memo and a letter handed earlier this month to top American officials, the P.A. states that Israeli settlement expansion is eliminating the possibility of a viable Palestinian state and thus forcing the Palestinian leadership to reconsider the two-state concept that has been the basis of negotiations during the last decade. While Israel and its supporters here have accused the P.A. of de facto abandoning the two-state solution by launching the intifada in September 2000, the Palestinian leadership has never officially renounced the Oslo process. The P.A. messages suggest the deepest deterioration yet of the diplomatic process since the outbreak of the intifada, and come as the Bush administration is pushing a three-year roadmap toward two states."

...

This is a difficult and frustrating--and tragic--issue, and hard to sort out. Discussion can lead to accusations about taking sides and a struggle over the "facts." How the public can be expected to sort this out I don't know. I expect most remain silent and hope somebody knows what they're doing. Meanwhile, Palestinian children are dying of malnutrition.

US AID: http://www.usaid.gov/wbg/focus_01082002_3.htm

CARE: <http://www.worldhunger.org/articles/global/carepalestine.htm>

Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, Nutrition Survey-2002

<http://www.pcbs.org/nutirt/presse.htm>

Mark Richards

OTHER RESOURCES

The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs -

The Israeli- Palestinian Conflict

http://www.wrmea.com/html/palestine_fact.htm

UN Information System on the Question of Palestine:

<http://domino.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/test.htm!OpenPage>

Current and recent UN documents:

<http://domino.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/22f431edb91c6f548525678a0051be1d!OpenView>

UNSCO (Office of the United Nations Special Coordinator in the Occupied Territories)

<http://www.arts.mcgill.ca/mepp/unsco/unfront.html>

The Impact of Closure and Other Mobility Restrictions on Palestinian Productive Activities, 1 January 2002 - 30 June 2002
<http://www.un.org/News/dh/mideast/econ-report-final.pdf>

Rabbis for Human Rights
<http://www.rhr.israel.net/overview.shtml>

PROMISED LAND

A ZNet Photo Essay by Robert Appleby
Ethnic cleansing in the South Hebron hills. The Hebron district, in the south of the West Bank, Israel, is the stage for some of the most extreme forms of collective punishment in the occupation of the Palestinian Territories. The city itself has long been contested by both Arabs and Jews as the burial place of Abraham and other figures central to both religions, while the countryside is the setting for a longstanding conflict between the Arab farmers and landowners and the settlers who both claim an exclusive right to the land.
<http://www.zmag.org/meastwatch/appleby1.htm>
<http://www.robertappleby.com/portfolio/promised.pdf>

The Expulsion of the Palestinian Population in South Hebron
<http://www.southebron.com/index.asp>

BBC History of Conflict
http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/in_depth/world/2001/israel_and_palestinians/timeline/

Maps from BBC News:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/in_depth/world/2001/israel_and_palestinians/key_maps/

Palestine maps: <http://www.palestineremembered.com/Maps/>

PEACE NOW - <http://www.peacenow.org.il/English.asp?Redirect=2> is mentioned in the Washington Post article. It describes itself as follows:

"PEACE NOW - the Israeli Peace Movement - was founded in 1978 by 348 reserve officers and soldiers of the Israel Defense Forces. The first and only mass peace movement in Israel, PEACE NOW rapidly became the single most important extra-parliamentary force for peace in the country, attracting hundreds of thousands to its mass rallies and activities."

Here is the link to Americans for Peace Now: <http://www.peacenow.org/>

Jews Against the Occupation
Facts about the 35-year occupation of Palestine:
<http://www.jewsagainsttheoccupation.org/fact.htm>

More Viewpoints...

Truth in the Middle East: The United Nations - An Enemy of Israel
<http://www.middleeastfacts.com/UNresolutions.html>

Christian Action for Israel:
<http://www.cdn-friends-icej.ca/index.html>

Biblical Reasons for Christian Support of Israel:
<http://www.cdn-friends-icej.ca/judeochr/biblical.html>

Mark Richards

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of dick halpern
Sent: Sunday, November 17, 2002 9:30 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Mid East and the Human Rights Challenge.

By now all of you have read or heard about what happened on Saturday in
HEBRON on the West Bank, when Palestinian snipers ambushed Jewish
settlers
walking home from Sabbath prayers and then attacked the policemen,
security
guards and soldiers who rushed to the rescue.

Putting aside for the moment whether the attack was justified, the
challenge we face with regard to minimizing or preventing human rights
violations (on both sides!) is becoming increasingly difficult if not
impossible.

Why do I say this? I'm basing my view on an article that appeared in
yesterday's NY Times which covered the incident in detail. Contained in

the article was the following, and I quote:

>"We're going to continue resistance everywhere," Sheik Abdallah
al-Shami,
>a political leader of Islamic Jihad, said by telephone from hiding in
the
>Gaza Strip. "We are not committed to any kind of agreements."
>
>He said of the Hebron attack, "We are congratulating the Islamic world
-
>all Muslims - for such a successful operation."
>
>Even Palestinians who oppose attacks in pre-1967 Israel overwhelmingly
>support attacks on settlers and soldiers in the West Bank, regarding
such
>violence as lawful resistance to occupation.

And it is these sentences which I found especially troubling:

>"..... Jihad and Hamas consider all of Israel as occupied territory.
>
>One of the most hard-line political leaders of Hamas, Abdel Aziz
Rantisi,
>said on Friday night that Hamas would reject even a limited ban on
>killing. "All of it is Palestinian land, and all of the land is
occupied,"
>he said. "We're going to hit everywhere."

We continually hear talk about the possibility and the need for a "plan" to settle the Israeli-Palestinian conflict -- or at least bring some kind of peace along with pleas to negotiate. But, what options are open when one side refuses to even consider the matter? It is true that Islamic Jihad and Hamas are not in charge of the Palestinian territory, but then who is -- and who is really running the show? And who could or should one negotiate with? Very troubling.

The full article appeared on the front page of the New York Times, November 16, 2002, Israel Weighs Response After 12 Killed in Hebron Ambush -- James Bennet

Dick Halpern
AIUSA

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2002 17:00:50 -0500
Reply-To: David.Sylvia@US.PM.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: David Sylvia <David.Sylvia@US.PM.COM>
Subject: Re: Augusta
Comments: To: s.kraus@CSUOHIO.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Here it is
<http://www.pollingcompany.com/News.asp?FormMode=ViewReleases&ID=57>

Be prepared to laugh.

-----Original Message-----
From: Sidney Kraus [mailto:s.kraus@CSUOHIO.EDU]
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2002 3:08 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Augusta

I'm looking for polling data on the current issue of women membership in Augusta National Golf Club. I've seen several AP wire stories and other publicity about the issue, but no polling information. Thanks for the help.

Sid Kraus

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 18 Nov 2002 18:34:34 -0500
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Mid East and the Human Rights Challenge.
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

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

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Tue, 19 Nov 2002 11:09:56 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Politicians, put away those polls
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Mmmmm, fresh poll data!

(From today's Baltimore Sun)

Politicians, put away those polls

By Steve Chapman
Originally published November 19, 2002

CHICAGO -- When a reporter for The New York Times Magazine asked White House political adviser Karl Rove if President Bush is too closely identified with big business at a time of corporate scandal, Mr. Rove began reciting the latest poll findings.

"Forty-five percent of the people think Bush's proposals for reforming accounting go too far or are about right," he noted, "vs. 39 percent who say they do not go far enough. Now that's compared to 39 percent who said they go too far or are about right a month ago, and 43 who said they do not go far enough."

Then Mr. Rove stopped, realizing he was making his boss look like a human windsock. "Not that we spend a lot of time on these," he assured.

Mr. Bush is hardly the first president to keep a close eye on such data. Bill Clinton commissioned a poll to find out if he should come clean about the entire Monica Lewinsky scandal. He was told Americans could forgive adultery but not perjury and obstruction of justice, and -- well, you know the rest.

Once upon a time, politicians had to rely on their own sense of what was right and what was appealing to voters. Today, officeholders and candidates are all hooked up to IVs that continuously drip fresh poll data directly into their veins. An entire industry has grown up to tell them what every demographic group thinks about every conceivable issue and how each segment of the electorate may be won over by tweaking the candidate's message.

But the Nov. 5 election outcomes left some pollsters resembling contestants trying to catch a greased pig -- with their quarry escaping and their faces splattered with mud. A late Zogby poll had Republican Jim Ryan a hair ahead of Rod Blagojevich in the Illinois governor's race, but the Democrat won by seven points. An Atlanta Journal-Constitution/WSB-TV survey a week before Election Day had

Republican Sonny Perdue trailing incumbent Georgia Gov. Roy Barnes by 11 points. When the votes were counted, Mr. Perdue won by five points.

The last polls in Minnesota couldn't be wrong, because one of them had Democrat Walter Mondale with a five-point lead in the U.S. Senate race, while another had Republican Norm Coleman ahead by six. (Mr. Coleman won.)

Failures like these are not the product of bad luck or incompetence but of changes that pollsters have not been able to cope with. One is that a lot of people simply refuse to pick up the phone and answer questions. About the only public sentiment that pollsters can vouch for is that cold calls are about as popular as West Nile virus.

The rise of cell phones, which generally don't get called, has added another hurdle. Karlyn Bowman, a polling expert at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington, says, "I expect that in 10 years, phone interviews will be a thing of the past, replaced by Internet polling."

Political polls also have to make adjustments to reflect how likely people are to vote, since Candidate A won't win if he has lots of supporters who stay home on Election Day. Such adjustments have become harder as American society grows more diverse because new ethnic groups may not follow the same patterns as older ones. Even if you can get people to tell you whom they plan to vote for, you may have no idea which candidate is ahead.

Surveys can still yield lots of useful information, if the pollster has the time and money to keep going back to non-responders to make sure the sample is representative. In the heat of a campaign, that option doesn't exist. So polls often mislead. But politicians and campaign managers continue to use them for lack of anything better.

Most people go into politics with some clear ideas of what they want to accomplish, but most end up parroting poll-tested slogans that some consultant says will charm (or fool) voters. They'll change their approach only if they learn that the polls are unreliable.

That development might put a lot of consultants out of business. But it wouldn't be a bad thing if our leaders spent less time trying to figure out what the citizenry believes and more figuring out what they believe.

Steve Chapman is a columnist for the Chicago Tribune, a Tribune Publishing newspaper. His column appears Tuesdays in The Sun.

Copyright C 2002, The Baltimore Sun

Link to the article: <http://www.sunspot.net/bal-op.chapman19nov19.story>

Visit <http://www.sunspot.net>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.
=====

Date: Tue, 19 Nov 2002 09:49:33 -0800
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Comments: RFC822 error: <W> Incorrect or incomplete address field found
and
ignored.
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Subject: UC Berkeley Statistician Position
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Center for Family and Community Health
School of Public Health
University of California, Berkeley
<http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH/>
A CDC Center for Chronic Disease Prevention
and Health Promotion Research

Statistician Position Announcement

The UC Berkeley Center for Family and Community Health is seeking a full-time statistician to conduct data analysis for the Center's primary demonstration research study and other projects.

Duties: Manage and document datasets; design, conduct and interpret data analyses using SAS and SUDAAN and/or Stata on an IBM-compatible personal computer. Participate in study design development, sample size calculations, questionnaire development, data entry and data cleaning plans/procedures. Participate in proposal writing and writing for publication.

Required Qualifications: Advanced degree in epidemiology, biostatistics, or statistics. Training and experience in quantitative research methods including multivariate statistics (contingency table analysis, multiple logistic regression) and factor analysis and at least one year of data management experience using SAS and/or Stata. Ability to work both

independently and collaboratively in an academic environment and with community members who participate in Center projects.

The job description is available at
<http://hrweb.berkeley.edu/jvl/search.php?ohrjvlid=14699>
and more information on our Center can be found at
<http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH/> .

Please submit with your application a sample of your code and two writing samples to:

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D., Director
University of California, Berkeley
Center for Family and Community Health
School of Public Health
140 Warren Hall, #7360
Berkeley, Ca 94720-7360

We will review applications beginning 12/3/02.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2002 10:16:58 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Iran - Real Polling Dangers
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Families of imprisoned polling officials complain of jail conditions

Tehran, Nov 20, IRNA -- Family members of Abbas Abdi, Behrouz Geranpayeh and Hossein Qazian, detained recently over a controversial polling, have complained of prison conditions in which their relatives are held.

In a meeting with members of an Iranian parliamentary committee here Wednesday, they requested to contact and meet with their relatives and asked for a probe into where the detainees are held.

Geranpayeh was arrested last month and his National Institute for Research and Opinion Polls was closed on spying charges.

Tehran's Justice Department has accused him of secretly selling information to foreign embassies. His institute had published the results of a survey, claiming that two-thirds of citizens in Tehran favored resumption of talks with the US.

Qazian and Abdi, both working at the Ayandeh (Future) Research Institute, were detained early this month and their center was ordered closed on similar charges.

Abdi's arrest came on a day which marked 23rd anniversary of US embassy's takeover by Students Following the Line of Imam in Tehran in 1979. Iran and the US have held no diplomatic relations since

then.

Abdi, now a member of the Islamic Iran Participation Front, was one of the hostage takers.

BH/RR

End

BACK

<http://www.irna.com/en/head/021120174746.ehe.shtml>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2002 11:14:03 -0500
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Research in Austria
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

AAPORNET:

We are looking for a local research partner in Austria to conduct a research project there on media usage. Does anyone have any experience with market research companies in Austria? Any suggestions for contacts would be greatly appreciated.

Joe Lenski
Executive Vice President
edison media research
6 West Cliff Street
Somerville, NJ 08876
908-707-4707
jlenski@edisonresearch.com

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2002 12:56:49 -0500

Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: Iran - Real Polling Dangers
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I assume that AAPOR and WAPOR have already drafted resolutions condemning the Iranian government for imprisoning pollsters whose results they did not like. Is this the case? I know the polls in question revealed a desire, particularly among younger people, for better relations with the United States.

"Leo G. Simonetta" wrote:

> Families of imprisoned polling officials complain of jail conditions
>
> Tehran, Nov 20, IRNA -- Family members of Abbas Abdi, Behrouz
> Geranpayeh and Hossein Qazian, detained recently over a controversial
> polling, have complained of prison conditions in which their relatives
> are held.
> In a meeting with members of an Iranian parliamentary committee
> here Wednesday, they requested to contact and meet with their
> relatives and asked for a probe into where the detainees are held.
> Geranpayeh was arrested last month and his National
> Institute for Research and Opinion Polls was closed on spying
> charges.
> Tehran's Justice Department has accused him of secretly selling
> information to foreign embassies. His institute had published the
> results of a survey, claiming that two-thirds of citizens in Tehran
> favored resumption of talks with the US.
> Qazian and Abdi, both working at the Ayandeh (Future) Research
> Institute, were detained early this month and their center was
> ordered closed on similar charges.
> Abdi's arrest came on a day which marked 23rd anniversary of US
> embassy's takeover by Students Following the Line of Imam in Tehran
> in 1979. Iran and the US have held no diplomatic relations since
> then.
> Abdi, now a member of the Islamic Iran Participation Front, was
> one of the hostage takers.
> BH/RR
> End
>
> BACK
>
> <http://www.irna.com/en/head/021120174746.ehe.shtml>
>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, LLC
> 6115 Falls Road Suite 101
> Baltimore, MD 21209
> 410-377-7880 ext. 14
> 410-377-7955 fax

>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2002 13:51:29 -0500
Reply-To: Susan Sprachman <SSsprachman@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Sprachman <SSsprachman@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>
Subject: Re: Iran - Real Polling Dangers
Comments: To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>

A web site www.mellimazhabi.org/news/112002%20news/1311khabar_01afe.b.htm
lists regular addresses and email addresses (in English) to which people can
send protests

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

From: Frank Rusciano [<mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2002 12:57 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Iran - Real Polling Dangers

I assume that AAPOR and WAPOR have already drafted resolutions condemning
the
Iranian government for imprisoning pollsters whose results they did not
like. Is this the case? I know the polls in question revealed a desire,
particularly among younger people, for better relations with the United
States.

"Leo G. Simonetta" wrote:

> Families of imprisoned polling officials complain of jail conditions
>
> Tehran, Nov 20, IRNA -- Family members of Abbas Abdi, Behrouz
> Geranpayeh and Hossein Qazian, detained recently over a controversial
> polling, have complained of prison conditions in which their relatives
> are held.
> In a meeting with members of an Iranian parliamentary committee
> here Wednesday, they requested to contact and meet with their
> relatives and asked for a probe into where the detainees are held.
> Geranpayeh was arrested last month and his National
> Institute for Research and Opinion Polls was closed on spying
> charges.
> Tehran's Justice Department has accused him of secretly selling
> information to foreign embassies. His institute had published the
> results of a survey, claiming that two-thirds of citizens in Tehran

> favored resumption of talks with the US.
> Qazian and Abdi, both working at the Ayandeh (Future) Research
> Institute, were detained early this month and their center was
> ordered closed on similar charges.
> Abdi's arrest came on a day which marked 23rd anniversary of US
> embassy's takeover by Students Following the Line of Imam in Tehran
> in 1979. Iran and the US have held no diplomatic relations since
> then.
> Abdi, now a member of the Islamic Iran Participation Front, was
> one of the hostage takers.
> BH/RR
> End
>
> BACK
>
> <http://www.irna.com/en/head/021120174746.ehe.shtml>
>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, LLC
> 6115 Falls Road Suite 101
> Baltimore, MD 21209
> 410-377-7880 ext. 14
> 410-377-7955 fax
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2002 13:19:42 -0700
Reply-To: Steve Farkas <sfarkas@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steve Farkas <sfarkas@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG>
Subject: position open - senior-level

11/14/02
Position Open - Senior Level Public Opinion Researcher

Public Agenda is seeking a senior level public opinion researcher with at
least 5-7 years experience in the survey field. Management experience, a

graduate degree and a policy/social issues background are required. Suitable candidates must be: 1) expert at writing questionnaires 2) excellent writers who can make survey data come alive 3) experienced managers who can design and price studies, and supervise survey fielding organizations. Qualitative research experience is a plus.

Based in New York City, Public Agenda is a strictly nonpartisan organization nationally recognized for conducting in-depth public opinion studies on a host of issues from education, to children and families, to public life. This is a full-time, in-office position. Salary is competitive; benefits are excellent.

Send cover letter and resume to:
E-mail: Positions@publicagenda.org
Fax: 212 889-3461
Mail: Public Agenda
6 East 39th Street
New York, NY 10016
Attention: Positions

All responses will be held in strict confidence. No phone calls please. Our apologies in advance - we will not be able to respond to all applicants.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2002 13:14:59 -0800
Reply-To: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Subject: Re: Two articles on Homeland Security bill
Comments: To: mark@BISCONTI.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Ferretting out terrorists and spies get press (and reader) attention. But similar procedures are more often put to use for security clearance and hiring in a wide range of government agencies. Rotenburg is thus right that the database has much broader implications. It may ultimately have quite frequent use, from travel visas to... tenure review?

- Ellis Godard

> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>]On Behalf Of Mark David Richards
> Sent: Friday, November 15, 2002 12:26 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Two articles on Homeland Security bill
>
>
> 'A supersnoop's dream'
> By Audrey Hudson

> THE WASHINGTON TIMES

>

> Language tucked inside the Homeland Security bill will allow the
> federal government to track the e-mail, Internet use, travel,
> credit-card purchases, phone and bank records of foreigners and U.S.
> citizens in its hunt for terrorists.

> In what one critic has called "a supersnoop's dream," the Defense
> Department's Total Information Awareness program would be authorized to
> collect every type of available public and private data in what the
> Pentagon describes as one "centralized grand database."

> Computers and analysts are supposed to use all this available
> information to determine patterns of people's behavior in order to
> detect and identify terrorists, decipher plans and enable the United
> States to pre-empt terrorist acts.

> The project first appeared in the Senate Democratic proposal for
> the new Homeland Security Department, which was defeated Wednesday in a
> 50-47 vote. However it was included in the Republican-brokered agreement
> that passed the House later that night in a 299-121 vote and is on the
> fast track to pass the Senate by next week.

> The computer-generated project of raw data will "help identify
> promising technologies and quickly get them into the hands of people who
> need them," according to a congressional leadership memo outlining the
> legislation.

> In a blistering op-ed piece in yesterday's New York Times titled
> "You Are A Suspect," columnist William Safire compared the database to
> George Orwell's Big Brother government in the novel "1984."

> "To this computerized dossier on your private life from commercial
> sources, add every piece of information that government has about you -
> passport application, driver's license and bridge toll records, judicial
> and divorce records, complaints from nosy neighbors to the FBI, your
> lifetime paper trail plus the latest hidden camera surveillance - and
> you have the supersnoop's dream: a 'Total Information Awareness' about
> every U.S. citizen," Mr. Safire wrote.

> "There is a great danger in this provision. It gives carte blanche
> to eavesdrop on Americans on the flimsiest of evidence, if any evidence
> at all," said Phil Kent, president of the Southeastern Legal Foundation.

> Mr. Kent called the provision "an unprecedented electronic
> dragnet."

> "I think it's the most sweeping threat to civil liberties since
> Japanese-American internment," Mr. Kent said.

> Mr. Kent and outgoing Rep. Bob Barr, Georgia Republican, are
> lobbying the Senate to remove this and other provisions they say are a
> threat to civil liberties and restrict the public's right to know of
> government activities.

> "In defense of members of Congress, many don't read the whole
> legislation and very few people read the fine print," said Mr. Barr.
> "You would think the Pentagon planning a system to peek at personal data
> would get a little more attention.

> "It's outrageous, it really is outrageous," Mr. Barr said.

> The bill establishes the Total Information Awareness program within
> a new agency - the Security Advanced Research Projects Agency (SARPA),
> which would be modeled on the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
> (DARPA), the central research office for the Defense Department that
> pursues research and technology, and led to the creation of the
> Internet. DARPA and SARPA both would be under the supervision of Adm.
> John Poindexter.

> Neither Adm. Poindexter nor a spokesman at his current agency,

> DARPA, could be reached for comment. The phone number listed for Adm.
> Poindexter in the government directory reaches a recording that says
> incoming calls are not accepted. A recording reached in the media
> relations office states that Adm. Poindexter is "not accepting any
> interview requests at this time."
> Adm. Poindexter first hit the public eye as national security
> adviser for President Reagan during the Iran-Contra scandal. He was
> convicted in 1990 on five felonies including lying to Congress and
> destroying evidence.
> At a DARPA conference in Anaheim, Calif., Adm. Poindexter made his
> first public appearance since taking the post in February.
> "During the years I was in the White House, it was relatively
> simple to identify our intelligence collection targets," Adm. Poindexter
> was quoted as saying in Government Executive magazine.
> However, the United States now faces "asymmetrical" threats that
> are loosely organized and difficult to find, and require new,
> technology-driven defenses, he said. The goal of his new office is to
> consider every source of information available worldwide to uncover
> terrorists, the magazine said.
> Marc Rotenberg, director of the Electronic Privacy Information
> Center, said the computer system would capture the data and analyze it
> to find patterns that match terrorist activity.
> Authorizing the project would require amending the Privacy Act of
> 1974. The language contained in the homeland security bill does not
> address the act directly, but authorizes the creation of the agency.
> Mr. Rotenberg said the database takes a convergence of various
> factors to a system of public surveillance.
> "They think the technology is about catching terrorists and bad
> guys, but these systems can capture a lot of data at different levels
> without oversight, judicial review, public reporting or congressional
> investigations. I can't think of a good countermeasure that would be
> good to safeguard civil liberties in the United States," Mr. Rotenberg
> said.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2002 16:48:44 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Augusta National
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I'm having trouble reconciling Mark Schulman's statement published in =
the New York Times ("Expert Questions Augusta's Poll") --

"This (a review of the questionnaire) tells me this was an effort to =
slant the findings. It violates every rule of questionnaire design."=20

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/14/sports/golf/14GOLF.html>=20

with his subsequent letter to Kellyanne Conway, president of The Polling Company, stating:

"Please be assured that I remain highly respectful of your skills."

<http://www.pollingcompany.com/News.asp?FormMode=3DViewReleases&ID=3D58>

Schulman's letter, posted at the company's web site, is =
thought-provoking:=20

- since when does not knowing who did a survey provide an excuse for =
trashing it in a public forum?=20

- and, tangentially, what does it mean to say "message testing =
studies...are not meant for public release"? What are message testing =
studies? Why aren't they "meant" for public release?

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

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2002 17:21:17 -0500
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Subject: Re: Augusta National
Comments: To: jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

James, thanks for the opportunity to shed some light on a side of our =
polling industry to which many in AAPOR may not understand and that others =
find repulsive, to be honest.

Message testing surveys are often used in the political world to determine =
which messages resonate best with the public. For example, what's the =
best way that a candidate can position a stance. What's the best way that =
Augusta can explain it's position? Put another way, they identify the "hot =
buttons." They sometimes have a series of questions that ask, "What if =
you knew that....., how would that influence your vote?"=20

They are not meant for public release because they are not general public =
opinion surveys. They are highly partisan and intended to guide strategy. =
It is highly misleading to publicly release them, since their intent is =
not really to measure public opinion, but rather how to influence it. The =
Augusta survey was really a message testing survey and should not have =
been released.=20

There is a whole side of the polling industry that specializes in message = strategy, particularly for political candidates, but also for issues as = well. These surveys are what they are.

We need to be vigilant to make sure that the media understands that "not = all polls are created equal." I hope that our exchanges in the media over = the Augusta survey will help to distinguish between the two types of = surveys. I also hope it will alert the media not to publish message = testing surveys whose objective is to find out how to "lead the witness," = so to speak.

Again, thanks for the opportunity to clarify.

Best wishes,
Mark

>>> "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM> 11/20 4:48 PM >>>
I'm having trouble reconciling Mark Schulman's statement published in the = New York Times ("Expert Questions Augusta's Poll") --

"This (a review of the questionnaire) tells me this was an effort to slant = the findings. It violates every rule of questionnaire design."=20

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/14/sports/golf/14GOLF.html>=20

with his subsequent letter to Kellyanne Conway, president of The Polling = Company, stating:

"Please be assured that I remain highly respectful of your skills."

<http://www.pollingcompany.com/News.asp?FormMode=3DViewReleases&ID=3D58>=20

Schulman's letter, posted at the company's web site, is thought-provoking:=
=20

- since when does not knowing who did a survey provide an excuse for = trashing it in a public forum?=20

- and, tangentially, what does it mean to say "message testing studies...ar=
e not meant for public release"? What are message testing studies? Why = aren't they "meant" for public release?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com=20

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2002 17:30:38 -0500
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: Augusta National
In-Reply-To: <014301c290de\$9a45cb80\$e1fac3d1@default>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

James P. Murphy wrote:

>I'm having trouble reconciling Mark Schulman's statement published
>in the New York Times ("Expert Questions Augusta's Poll") --
>
>"This (a review of the questionnaire) tells me this was an effort to
>slant the findings. It violates every rule of questionnaire design."
>
><http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/14/sports/golf/14GOLF.html>
>
>with his subsequent letter to Kellyanne Conway, president of The
>Polling Company, stating:
>
>"Please be assured that I remain highly respectful of your skills."
>
><http://www.pollingcompany.com/News.asp?FormMode=ViewReleases&ID=58>

I hope not of her skills as a speller:

>AAPOR President Mark Schulman's explanation of critique in the New York Times

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
voice +1-212-741-9852
fax +1-212-807-9152
cell +1-917-865-2813
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 20 Nov 2002 15:15:35 -0800
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: Re: Augusta National
Comments: To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
In-Reply-To: <sddbc4b9.034@srbi.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

For an insightful description of pervasive "message testing" polling, see Joshua Green's excellent report on the Bush White House from April's Washington Monthly, "The Other War Room: President Bush doesn't believe in polling---just ask his pollsters.":

<http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0204.green.html>

Lawrence Jacobs and Robert Shapiro describe in great detail the pre-Bush prevalence of message testing polling in American politics in their book, "Politicians Don't Pander: Political Manipulation and the Loss of Democratic Responsiveness" (U of Chicago, 2000). Their premise is that far from being too responsive to public opinion (i.e., pandering) politicians all too often simply conduct polls in order to figure out how best to sell to the public the ideas or programs that they favored anyway. The preface and other materials are available at:

<http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/389839.html>

Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of Oregon
Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR 97403-5245
jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu Facsimile: 541-346-0388
<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jbloom> <http://osrl.uoregon.edu>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 21 Nov 2002 08:42:29 -0600
Reply-To: MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Announcement
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

The Behavioral Surveillance Branch at CDC is recruiting a senior survey methodologist. The position is located in the Division of Adult and Community Health (DACH), National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (NCCDPHP). The purpose of this position is to function as

a senior survey methodologist for the Branch, providing consultative oversight and technical assistance with all survey and data collection activities. The incumbent will be mainly working on the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, a large telephone survey (details on BRFSS are available at www.cdc.gov/brfss). For further information about the position please contact Ali Mokdad at the address below.

Ali Mokdad, Ph.D.
Chief, Behavioral Surveillance Branch
CDC/NCCDPHP/DACH
4770 Buford Highway, N.E., MS-K66
Atlanta, GA 30341-3724
voice: 770-488-2524
fax: 770-488-8150
email:amokdad@cdc.gov

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 21 Nov 2002 08:44:51 -0700
Reply-To: Donald DeLuca <don.deluca@US.IBM.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Donald DeLuca <don.deluca@US.IBM.COM>
Subject: A new name, address,
and telephone number for the PricewaterhouseCoopers Survey
Research Center

As some of you may know, IBM acquired PricewaterhouseCoopers Consulting (PWCC) on October 1, 2002. A new operating division of IBM named Business Consulting Services was created from the former 30,000 PWCC staff. The PricewaterhouseCoopers Survey Research Center has a new name and location (too late for this year's AAPOR Blue Book or Directory of Members):

Donald R. DeLuca
Managing Director

IBM Business Consulting Services
Survey Research Center
12902 Federal Systems Park Drive
Fairfax, Virginia 22033

Tel: (703) 633-4623
Fax: (703) 322-3152

don.deluca@us.ibm.com

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 21 Nov 2002 11:18:42 -0500
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Accuracy of Pre-election Polls
Comments: To: Albert & Susan Cantril <ascantril@mindspring.com>
In-Reply-To: <3DDAC223.2A54@mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The Cantril's suggestion to re-do the Crespi book on polling accuracy is a good one. Hopefully, if someone re-does Crespi's book they will do a better job than Irv did. His book looks at a number of variables, each of which may have a bearing on a poll's accuracy in forecasting elections. Unfortunately, he looked at each variable one at a time. He did not control for any variable while looking at a variable. For example, when he looks at the effect of sample size on accuracy he did not control for time between the poll and the election, or any other variable for that matter. This is just one example. One could make up a textbook of things not to do in analysis from the way this book was done. When Irv finally puts all his variables together at the end he has a regression equation that has an error in it. This book keeps getting cited, but I think there is lots of room for improvement over the way Irv went about his analysis of the polls.
warren mitofsky

At 02:58 PM 11/19/02 -0800, Albert & Susan Cantril wrote:

>Before any efforts to compare poll results and electoral outcomes, it
>would be a good idea to look at Irving Crespi's book, "Pre-Election
>Polling: Sources of Accuracy and Error" (Russell Sage Foundation, 1988).
>
>His study did such a comparison with respect to 423 races from 1980
>through 1984. Races included the presidential level (primaries and
>general election), statewide offices (senate and gubernatorial), and
>Congressional Districts.
>
>The study surveyed news organizations that had conducted pre-election
>polls, asking about various aspects of methods used.
>
>The study also included a qualitative side: interviews with polling
>veterans on the challenges of pre-election surveys.
>
>The project found that (given adequate sample size) two critical
>correlates of polling accuracy were (a) the time that had elapsed
>between final interviewing and the election and (b) the care with which
>likely voters had been identified, especially in low-turnout elections.
>
>An update of Crespi's study would be timely. We hope someone will rise
>to the challenge of not only comparing polls and outcomes but also
>exploring the correlates of accuracy in today's polling and political
>environment.
>
>
>Albert & Susan Cantril
>
>-----
>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>then click on 'Join or leave the list'

>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Warren J. Mitofsky
140 Riverside Drive, Apt 18N
New York, NY 10024

212 496-2945
212 496-0846 FAX

email: mitofsky@mindspring.com
http://www.mitofskyinternational.com

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 21 Nov 2002 12:01:24 -0500
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Newspapers' reports on polls other than their own
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For those of you who manage polls for newspapers, I'm wondering about policy and practice of reporting on other public polls covering the same issues as yours. I'm guessing some newspapers only report their own polls and some report everything that comes along. I'm just trying to get a feel for how these decisions are made. You can reply to me privately if this seems too narrow a question for the list. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
515.271.5700

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com; otherwise, contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 21 Nov 2002 23:31:08 -0500
Reply-To: allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Allen Barton <allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Sampling bias against invertebrates
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Survey researchers aren't the only people accused of sampling bias. The AAAS journal Science for July 12 contained a letter, "Taxonomic bias in conservation research," which used content analysis of journal articles to show that vertebrates were "grossly overrepresented" in conservation research, while invertebrates were underrepresented. A writer in the October 25 issue points out that the earlier letter ignored a far worse bias in sampling: "they considered only plant and animal taxa, ignoring other groups, particularly microorganisms." In five years of articles in three scholarly conservation journals they found that microbes were rarely studied at all in spite of their important roles in the functioning of ecosystems: the fungi and lichens were covered in only 0.024 of the articles, protists in 0.007, and bacteria and viruses in 0.006, "even though microbes may arguably represent the majority of the taxonomic diversity in natural ecosystems."

This is obviously UNFAIR TO FUNGI and even more UNFAIR TO PROTISTS (whatever they are). If each single organism were sampled in ecological research with equal probability, we vertebrates would hardly appear at all! It's the old story -- the species that write the history leave out the invertebrate masses. But the functioning of the ecosystem demands equal representation if not affirmative action.

Allen Barton, Chapel Hill, NC

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 22 Nov 2002 09:21:27 -0500
Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Elizabeth Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: Re: Sampling bias against invertebrates
Comments: To: allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Are you trying to instigate a PROTIST PROTEST, perhaps??

Betsy Martin

Allen Barton
<allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sent by: AAPORNET
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
cc:
Subject: Sampling bias
against
invertebrates
<AAPORNET@asu.edu>
>

11/21/2002 11:31

PM
Please respond to
allenbarton

Survey researchers aren't the only people accused of sampling bias. The AAAS journal Science for July 12 contained a letter, "Taxonomic bias in conservation research," which used content analysis of journal articles to show that vertebrates were "grossly overrepresented" in conservation research, while invertebrates were underrepresented. A writer in the October 25 issue points out that the earlier letter ignored a far worse bias in sampling: "they considered only plant and animal taxa, ignoring other groups, particularly microorganisms." In five years of articles in three scholarly conservation journals they found that microbes were rarely studied at all in spite of their important roles in the functioning of ecosystems: the fungi and lichens were covered in only 0.024 of the articles, protists in 0.007, and bacteria and viruses in 0.006, "even though microbes may arguably represent the majority of the taxonomic diversity in natural ecosystems."

This is obviously UNFAIR TO FUNGI and even more UNFAIR TO PROTISTS (whatever they are). If each single organism were sampled in ecological research with equal probability, we vertebrates would hardly appear at all! It's the old story -- the species that write the history leave out the invertebrate masses. But the functioning of the ecosystem demands equal representation if not affirmative action.

Allen Barton, Chapel Hill, NC

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Fri, 22 Nov 2002 14:37:12 +0000
Reply-To: Nick Moon <N.Moon@NOPWORLD.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Moon <N.Moon@NOPWORLD.COM>
Subject: Re: Sampling bias against invertebrates
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

> Are you trying to instigate a PROTIST PROTEST, perhaps??
>

It's a multidominational protest too, combining Protestants and Papists

Any views or opinions are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of NOP World or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please do not read, copy, use or disclose this communication and notify the sender immediately. It should be noted that any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that NOP World cannot guarantee that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, or contain viruses

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Fri, 22 Nov 2002 09:17:12 -0500
Reply-To: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@AFB.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@AFB.NET>
Subject: Re: Sampling bias against invertebrates
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

This obviously is a discussion that will sort the spineless from those with the courage of their convictions.
Corinne

At 02:37 PM 11/22/2002 +0000, you wrote:

> > Are you trying to instigate a PROTIST PROTEST, perhaps??
> >

>It's a multidenominational protest too, combining Protestants and Papists

>

>

>

>

>-----
>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Fri, 22 Nov 2002 10:27:52 -0500
Reply-To: "Caplan, James R , ,DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Caplan, James R , ,DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>
Subject: Re: Sampling bias against invertebrates
Comments: To: Nick Moon <N.Moon@NOPWORLD.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

And your own adherents, the Moonies.
Jim

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

From: Nick Moon [mailto:N.Moon@NOPWORLD.COM]
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2002 9:37 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Sampling bias against invertebrates

> Are you trying to instigate a PROTIST PROTEST, perhaps??

>

It's a multidenominational protest too, combining Protestants and Papists

Any views or opinions are solely those of the
author and do not necessarily represent those of
NOP World or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for
the person or entity to which it is addressed
and may contain confidential and/or privileged
material. If you are not the intended recipient of
this message, please do not read, copy, use or
disclose this communication and notify the
sender immediately. It should be noted that
any review, retransmission, dissemination or
other use of, or taking action in reliance
upon, this information by persons or entities
other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that NOP World cannot guarantee
that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free
as information could be intercepted, corrupted,
or contain viruses

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Fri, 22 Nov 2002 17:44:11 -0500
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: Census Data Adusted for the Undercount Apparently To Be
Released
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

November 22, 2002

Contact:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Ben Chevat

202.225-7944

VICTORY FOR OPEN GOVERNMENT

Census Data to Finally be Made Public

Washington, DC - Today, Congresswoman Carolyn B. Maloney (D-NY), the former ranking Democrat of the House Census Subcommittee, hailed the Justice Department's announcement that the government will not seek an appeal of the 9th Circuit decision to uphold a FOIA request for corrected 2000 Census data.

"This is a victory for open government. This decision affirms how wrong the Census Bureau has been in denying access to information that was taxpayer funded. The results of a government survey costing nearly \$300 million should be made available to the taxpayers," said Congresswoman Maloney in a statement today.

She continued, "Now that these data will be made available, the public and scientists can finally judge for themselves which data was more accurate. Openness, not secrecy, is simply the best way to make good decisions for the country's future."

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Sun, 24 Nov 2002 10:58:28 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Re: Augusta National
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Have any other polls been published regarding the Augusta issue. If so, please forward.

Thanks.

Nick

Doug Henwood wrote:

>
> James P. Murphy wrote:
>
> >I'm having trouble reconciling Mark Schulman's statement published
> >in the New York Times ("Expert Questions Augusta's Poll") --
> >
> >"This (a review of the questionnaire) tells me this was an effort to
> >slant the findings. It violates every rule of questionnaire design."
> >
> ><http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/14/sports/golf/14GOLF.html>
> >
> >with his subsequent letter to Kellyanne Conway, president of The
> >Polling Company, stating:
> >
> >"Please be assured that I remain highly respectful of your skills."
> >
> ><http://www.pollingcompany.com/News.asp?FormMode=ViewReleases&ID=58>
> >
> I hope not of her skills as a speller:
>
> >AAPOR President Mark Schulman`s explanation of critique in the New York
Times
>
> --
>
> Doug Henwood
> Left Business Observer
> Village Station - PO Box 953
> New York NY 10014-0704 USA
> voice +1-212-741-9852
> fax +1-212-807-9152
> cell +1-917-865-2813
> email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>
> web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 10:28:13 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Augusta National More survey results on the sports page
Comments: cc: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/25/sports/golf/25MAST.html>

In today's New York Times

November 25, 2002
CBS Silent in Debate on Women Joining Augusta
By ALESSANDRA STANLEY and BILL CARTER

SNIP

So far, at least, public pressure on CBS to take a stand has been glancing. Two-thirds of the men and half of the women interviewed in a New York Times Poll conducted Wednesday through Saturday said they did not believe that the PGA Tour, the governing body of men's professional golf, should withdraw its recognition of the Masters, even though a majority of men and women said they thought men-only private clubs were wrong.

The survey of 846 adults nationwide, which had a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points, indicated that a plurality of Americans think it is unfair to force a private club to accept women. Men feel more strongly: 55 percent of the men said they opposed any requirement that a private club change its policies. Among women, the result was a statistical dead heat: 44 percent said it would be unfair, 43 percent said it would not, and 13 percent had no opinion.

SNIP

Copyright The New York Times Company | Permissions | Privacy Policy

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 11:27:34 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Re: Augusta National More survey results on the sports page
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
In-Reply-To: <002001c29497\$4810fa80\$130a010a@LEO>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Ultimately, the lack of sufficient advertising will have it's effect. May take a while. Be good to have a lady sportscaster report on the happenings -- but as I understand it that is against the Club's rules. But there's nothing to stop TV stations from doing that when reporting the news later on.

Dick Halpern

At 10:28 AM 11/25/02, you wrote:

><http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/25/sports/golf/25MAST.html>

>

>In today's New York Times

>

>November 25, 2002

>CBS Silent in Debate on Women Joining Augusta

>By ALESSANDRA STANLEY and BILL CARTER

>

>SNIP

>

>So far, at least, public pressure on CBS to take a stand has been
>glancing. Two-thirds of the men and half of the women interviewed in a
>New York Times Poll conducted Wednesday through Saturday said they did
>not believe that the PGA Tour, the governing body of men's professional
>golf, should withdraw its recognition of the Masters, even though a
>majority of men and women said they thought men-only private clubs were
>wrong.

>

>The survey of 846 adults nationwide, which had a margin of sampling
>error of plus or minus three percentage points, indicated that a
>plurality of Americans think it is unfair to force a private club to
>accept women. Men feel more strongly: 55 percent of the men said they
>opposed any requirement that a private club change its policies. Among
>women, the result was a statistical dead heat: 44 percent said it would
>be unfair, 43 percent said it would not, and 13 percent had no opinion.

>

>SNIP

>

>Copyright The New York Times Company | Permissions | Privacy Policy

>

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta

>Art & Science Group, LLC

>6115 Falls Road Suite 101

>Baltimore, MD 21209

>410-377-7880 ext. 14

>410-377-7955 fax

>

>-----

>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.
=====

Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 11:52:04 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Augusta National More survey results on the sports page
Comments: To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

All very tip of the iceberg, or last straw, depending on your viewpoint. Augusta National is perhaps the last bastion of the Old South Values. The founder of the Masters Tournament, Robert Tyre Jones II, aka "Bobby", was quoted as saying that no black man would ever play at Augusta, and no white man would ever caddy there. They've come a ways since then, but they were dragged into compliance.

The best suggestion I've read is for the club to honor the tradition of the tournament's founder, who never became a professional golfer [although he lost his amateur status by accepting money for writing about golf and making movies about golf instruction] and stop offering prize money to the competitors, some of whom have been vocal about playing for the honor of participating in the tournament, not the money.

Of all the majors, it has the weakest field: amateurs and past winners under the age of 65 are included, and only about 90 are invited to start, as compared with 156 in a regular PGA Tour event.

Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: dick halpern [<mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>]
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2002 11:28 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Augusta National More survey results on the sports page

Ultimately, the lack of sufficient advertising will have it's effect. May take a while. Be good to have a lady sportscaster report on the happenings -- but as I understand it that is against the Club's rules. But there's nothing to stop TV stations from doing that when reporting the news later on.

Dick Halpern

At 10:28 AM 11/25/02, you wrote:

><http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/25/sports/golf/25MAST.html>

>

>In today's New York Times

>

>November 25, 2002

>CBS Silent in Debate on Women Joining Augusta

>By ALESSANDRA STANLEY and BILL CARTER

>

>SNIP

>

>So far, at least, public pressure on CBS to take a stand has been
>glancing. Two-thirds of the men and half of the women interviewed in a
>New York Times Poll conducted Wednesday through Saturday said they did
>not believe that the PGA Tour, the governing body of men's professional
>golf, should withdraw its recognition of the Masters, even though a
>majority of men and women said they thought men-only private clubs were
>wrong.

>

>The survey of 846 adults nationwide, which had a margin of sampling
>error of plus or minus three percentage points, indicated that a
>plurality of Americans think it is unfair to force a private club to
>accept women. Men feel more strongly: 55 percent of the men said they
>opposed any requirement that a private club change its policies. Among
>women, the result was a statistical dead heat: 44 percent said it would
>be unfair, 43 percent said it would not, and 13 percent had no opinion.

>

>SNIP

>

>Copyright The New York Times Company | Permissions | Privacy Policy

>

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta

>Art & Science Group, LLC

>6115 Falls Road Suite 101

>Baltimore, MD 21209

>410-377-7880 ext. 14

>410-377-7955 fax

>

>-----

>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read

>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read

the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 12:04:20 -0500
Reply-To: DivaleBill@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: William Divale <DivaleBill@AOL.COM>
Subject: Speaker Request
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues:

I am looking for someone in the New York metropolitan area to speak at my college on Tuesday afternoon, Feb. 11, 2003 as part of the Black History Month celebrations. The topic would be "How Polling Affects our Lives." It would be about a 45 min presentation with time for questions. Issues could be on how polling affects us politically, in market research, etc. I can pay an honorarium of \$250. I would like to have someone with experience in the "polling world" from outside of the academy but professors are also welcome.

The talk would be following by a short presentation by myself of a poll on minority issues from our new Survey Research Laboratory.

Thanks, Bill Divale

William Divale, Ph.D.,
Professor of Anthropology
Director, MARC (Minority Access to Research Careers) Honors Program
Director, Social Science Survey Research Laboratory
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
718-262-2982
845-528-0237

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 11:32:34 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Augusta National
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Richard Day's comments below.

<http://chicagosports.chicagotribune.com/sports/printedition/cs-0211140373nov14,0,4363359.story>

ON GOLF
Augusta poll a grand sham
Ed Sherman

November 14, 2002

Both sides believe they have public opinion on their side in the ongoing fight over whether all-male Augusta National should have women in the club. However, don't go looking for answers from a poll commissioned by the club, which was released Wednesday. If anything, it was a blatant, perhaps even desperate, attempt to distort how the public feels on the matter.

According to the poll, prepared by WomenTrend out of Washington, D.C., 72 percent of the respondents agreed that Augusta National is correct in its decision not to change its membership policies in light of pressure coming from the National Council of Women's Organizations, headed by Martha Burk.

Augusta National now believes it can say, "Told you we were right, now buzz off, Martha."

But wait a minute. The poll and the questions were so skewed in Augusta National's favor, it is remarkable that the club didn't get a 99 percent approval rating.

Those in the polling business reacted to Augusta National's effort with a mixture of amusement and disgust.

"It's a sham," said Robert Shulman of Connecticut-based Markitecture, whose firm did a poll on the issue for ESPN in August.

"It doesn't just border on the absurd. It crossed over the line.

"The members of Augusta (many of whom are corporate chief executive officers) would never, ever use this kind of research in their work."

"These are the kind of polls that give our business a bad name," said Richard Day of Richard Day Research in Evanston.

The first 16 questions were general in nature, relating to the First Amendment, priorities for women and discrimination matters. The 800 people polled actually were read the First Amendment at the opening of the survey, and then were asked questions about whether it should protect "the rights of the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts and NAACP to exist." Here's an example of one agree-disagree question in the poll:

"Private clubs that have members only of the same gender are simply a harmless way for similar individuals to get together and associate with each other."

Seventy-one percent agreed.

It is clear where the survey is going by the time the Masters is first brought up in Question 17.

"It's like, 'All those that agree with the Constitution, stand up,'" Day said. "'OK, now that you agree with the Constitution, here's an issue that's related to it.' It's pretty obvious what their intentions were."

The poll did not ask respondents whether they view Augusta National as a symbol of golf, and whether the club has a moral responsibility to bring in women members.

It also didn't inquire about whether people thought Augusta was being held to a different standard than other PGA Tour venues, which require host clubs to have diverse memberships.

In his poll, Shulman said more direct questions were used. The results were remarkably different. Only 12 percent were in favor of Augusta National's policy. Expect ESPN to do another poll in the wake of this effort. Kelly Anne Conway, who oversaw the Augusta survey, defended the methods. She said asking general questions before specific ones is a cardinal

rule in polling.

"We wanted to establish what people's opinions are on the rights of public clubs," Conway said. "There was tremendous agreement in that principle."

Conway also said she went out of her way to phrase questions that would include Burk's original statements in her letter to club Chairman Hootie Johnson.

"I erred on the side of protecting her," Conway said.

Burk didn't see it that way. There were repeated questions about whether Burk and her organization were "wasting their time on the issue."

One statement was phrased, "In a way, Ms. Burk's actions are insulting to women because it makes it seem that getting admitted to a golf club is a big priority to all women."

With that kind of protection, Burk should wear a helmet to work.

"It seems like a great orchestrated attempt to discredit me personally and my organization," Burk said. "It seems more like a referendum on Martha Burk."

The poll found that 68 percent of the respondents believe Burk is spending too much time on the issue.

One of the misconceptions is that she is working 24/7 to bring a woman member to Augusta.

Just the contrary. Last week she spoke at a forum for workplace diversity, appeared at a news conference regarding United Nations family-planning money, did a news conference on the international women's rights treaty and attended a breakfast for a women's health survey, among other matters.

"I wish those issues got the attention [Augusta National does]," Burk said.

The poll created news Wednesday. Conway thought Augusta's effort showed that Burk doesn't have support for her cause. However, she conceded opinions could change, especially because 67 percent of those questioned were familiar with the issue.

"Polls cover a snapshot in time," Conway said.

Hopefully, there will be better snapshots. Next time Augusta National decides to do a poll, it should make sure the shutter is open.

Copyright © 2002, The Chicago Tribune

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read

the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 13:28:41 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Augusta National & Chicago Tribune
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The one item Ed Sherman quotes verbatim, with a result, is grossly out =
of context and destroys his credibility for anyone making the effort to =
check the actual questionnaire. The ridiculed item ("Private clubs that =
have members only of the same gender are simply a harmless way for =
similar individuals to get together and associate with each other") is =

mischaracterized as an Agree-Disagree question and Sherman omits the =
paired alternative, which articulates an opposing viewpoint ("Private =
clubs and organizations that offer membership only to people of the same =
gender are unfair, because they do not allow everyone the same chance to =
become a member"). The overblown, orchestrated, and downright nasty way =
in which some people have attacked this survey is revealing.

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

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

From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Monday, November 25, 2002 12:43 PM
Subject: Augusta National

Richard Day's comments below.

=

<http://chicagosports.chicagotribune.com/sports/printedition/cs-0211140373-nov14,0,4363359.story>

ON GOLF
Augusta poll a grand sham
Ed Sherman

November 14, 2002

Both sides believe they have public opinion on their side in the =
ongoing
fight over whether all-male Augusta National should have women in the =
club.
However, don't go looking for answers from a poll commissioned by the
club, which was released Wednesday. If anything, it was a blatant,
perhaps even desperate, attempt to distort how the public feels on the =
matter.
According to the poll, prepared by WomenTrend out of Washington, D.C.,
72 percent of the respondents agreed that Augusta National is correct =
in
its decision not to change its membership policies in light of =
pressure
coming from the National Council of Women's Organizations, headed by
Martha Burk.
Augusta National now believes it can say, "Told you we were right, now
buzz off, Martha."
But wait a minute. The poll and the questions were so skewed in =
Augusta
National's favor, it is remarkable that the club didn't get a 99 =
percent
approval rating.
Those in the polling business reacted to Augusta National's effort =
with
a mixture of amusement and disgust.
"It's a sham," said Robert Shulman of Connecticut-based Markitecture,
whose firm did a poll on the issue for ESPN in August.

"It doesn't just border on the absurd. It crossed over the line.

"The members of Augusta (many of whom are corporate chief executive officers) would never, ever use this kind of research in their work."

"These are the kind of polls that give our business a bad name," said Richard Day of Richard Day Research in Evanston.

The first 16 questions were general in nature, relating to the First Amendment, priorities for women and discrimination matters. The 800 people polled actually were read the First Amendment at the opening of the survey, and then were asked questions about whether it should protect "the rights of the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts and NAACP to = exist."

Here's an example of one agree-disagree question in the poll:

"Private clubs that have members only of the same gender are simply a harmless way for similar individuals to get together and associate = with each other."

Seventy-one percent agreed.

It is clear where the survey is going by the time the Masters is first brought up in Question 17.

"It's like, 'All those that agree with the Constitution, stand up,'" = Day

said. "'OK, now that you agree with the Constitution, here's an issue that's related to it.' It's pretty obvious what their intentions = were."

The poll did not ask respondents whether they view Augusta National as = a

symbol of golf, and whether the club has a moral responsibility to = bring in women members.

It also didn't inquire about whether people thought Augusta was being held to a different standard than other PGA Tour venues, which require host clubs to have diverse memberships.

In his poll, Shulman said more direct questions were used. The results were remarkably different. Only 12 percent were in favor of Augusta National's policy. Expect ESPN to do another poll in the wake of this = effort.

Kelly Anne Conway, who oversaw the Augusta survey, defended the = methods.

She said asking general questions before specific ones is a cardinal rule in polling.

"We wanted to establish what people's opinions are on the rights of public clubs," Conway said. "There was tremendous agreement in that = principle."

Conway also said she went out of her way to phrase questions that = would

include Burk's original statements in her letter to club Chairman = Hootie Johnson.

"I erred on the side of protecting her," Conway said.

Burk didn't see it that way. There were repeated questions about = whether

Burk and her organization were "wasting their time on the issue."

One statement was phrased, "In a way, Ms. Burk's actions are insulting to women because it makes it seem that getting admitted to a golf club is a big priority to all women."

With that kind of protection, Burk should wear a helmet to work.

"It seems like a great orchestrated attempt to discredit me personally and my organization," Burk said. "It seems more like a referendum on

Martha Burk."

The poll found that 68 percent of the respondents believe Burk is spending too much time on the issue.

One of the misconceptions is that she is working 24/7 to bring a woman member to Augusta.

Just the contrary. Last week she spoke at a forum for workplace diversity, appeared at a news conference regarding United Nations family-planning money, did a news conference on the international women's rights treaty and attended a breakfast for a women's health survey, among other matters.

"I wish those issues got the attention [Augusta National does]," Burk = said.

The poll created news Wednesday. Conway thought Augusta's effort = showed

that Burk doesn't have support for her cause. However, she conceded opinions could change, especially because 67 percent of those = questioned

were familiar with the issue.

"Polls cover a snapshot in time," Conway said.

Hopefully, there will be better snapshots. Next time Augusta National decides to do a poll, it should make sure the shutter is open.

Copyright =A9 2002, The Chicago Tribune

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 13:04:47 -0600
Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Augusta National
In-Reply-To: <3DE2509F.BAE6D0A1@marketsharescorp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

One of the most astute comments I've read regarding the Augusta imbroglio is by Bob Rosburg, former PGA champion, in Golf Digest's December issue:

"Hootie Johnson made one key mistake in responding to the demand of Martha Burk that Augusta National admit women. He proceeded as though it were a legal issue, when in fact it is a moral issue. You can't win a battle over a moral issue, and it isn't hard to tell where the public's sentiments lie. The PGA Tour made a similar mistake on the Casey Martin case. When will they all learn?"

Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.
=====

Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 14:53:34 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Augusta National
Comments: To: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

As usual, Rossie is not afraid to state his opinions. Or to miss the point. The Martin case was a legal issue, based on the ADA. The Augusta case is one of a clash of values: old school southern, rural, conservative vs. modern egalitarian. The Supreme Court decided that Casey Martin was being denied an opportunity to earn a living, in violation of the law of the land, and ordered the Tour to allow him to use a golf cart. The Tour lost its case when the Court noted that the same ruling body, the PGA Tour, allows Senior players the option of using a cart, thereby negating its own argument that walking is an integral part of the game.

The Augusta issue has nothing to do with the PGA Tour, which doesn't run the Masters Tournament. Hootie Johnson didn't make 'one key mistake' - he chose to react to Ms. Burk, rather than ignore her; he chose to refuse sponsorship for the telecast; he chose to make statements that harken back to George Wallace in the early 1960s. In the long run, anyone fighting to keep things as they are "forever" can never win, only forestall losing.

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

From: Robert Godfrey [mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU]
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2002 2:05 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Augusta National

One of the most astute comments I've read regarding the Augusta imbroglio is by Bob Rosburg, former PGA champion, in Golf Digest's December issue:

"Hootie Johnson made one key mistake in responding to the demand of Martha Burk that Augusta National admit women. He proceeded as though it were a legal issue, when in fact it is a moral issue. You can't win a battle over a moral issue, and it isn't hard to tell where the public's sentiments lie. The PGA Tour made a similar mistake on the Casey Martin case. When will they all learn?"

Robert Godfrey
UW-Madison

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 14:10:37 -0600
Reply-To: MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Focus Group Facility
Comments: cc: kdebelle@bellatlantic.net
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I am looking for a focus group facility in Brooklyn, NY - any suggestions -
please respond to: kdebelle@bellatlantic.net - I'm looking to do some focus
groups December 2nd....

Respond directly to: kim de Belle [kdebelle@bellatlantic.net]

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 15:20:00 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: George Horace Gallup
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

FYI--I was searching The Washington Post archives for something and
randomly came across this editorial written at the time of George
Gallup's death in 1984. Mark Richards

The Washington Post

George Horace Gallup

July 30, 1984; Page A10

PUBLIC OPINION polling, taken for granted now as part of modern life, is

an invention so recent that its whole history is contained in the active professional life of a single man, George Gallup, who died Thursday at the age of 82. Mr. Gallup had the idea that just as you could determine the purity of a water supply or the grade of a wheat crop by assaying samples selected on a scientifically random basis, so you could understand public opinion by surveying 1,500 members of the public if they were chosen on a scientifically random basis. Working in the 1930s, along with other brilliant pioneers, Mr. Gallup developed the sampling techniques and many of the basic questions pollsters all over the world are still using today.

Public opinion polling owes much of its success not only to Mr. Gallup's insights but to his character. He conducted his first political poll for the Democratic candidate for state treasurer of Iowa -- his mother-in-law -- in 1932. But he never worked for politicians again, and was so determined to remain scrupulously neutral that he refrained from voting. When he was right, he was brash enough to call attention to himself, as when he criticized the Literary Digest mail-in poll in 1936 and correctly forecast Franklin D. Roosevelt's reelection. The result was that polls based on non-random samples have not played a serious role in American public life since. When he was wrong, as he was when he quit polling in October 1948 and predicted the victory of Thomas E. Dewey, he owned up to his mistakes and went vigorously to work improving his techniques so that polling could be considered reliable, and would be reliable, in the future. In this he largely succeeded. As early as 1937, Gallup organizations were created abroad, and Gallup has become a synonym for public opinion polls in several languages. In the United States he was criticized sometimes for caution in methods and questions. But the Gallup Organization's persistence in asking successive generations the same questions over and over and charting the results gives a picture of public opinion over time which historians will find invaluable. Mr. Gallup was ready to concede the limitations of polling: it cannot forecast the future; it does not reliably indicate the extent of prejudice or unpopular feeling (and therefore is especially unreliable in authoritarian countries); it has difficulty measuring the intensity of feelings. But he did not claim to have all the answers -- or, rather, all the questions. He was a pioneer whose insights and integrity helped people around the world understand their societies and themselves better.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 14:25:48 -0600
Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU>
Subject: Augusta National
In-Reply-To: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E09D19989@isr.umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I understood Bob Rosburg's comment in a different light. I thought it was a plain and simple iteration of "do the right thing." Sure, the

Casey Martin episode was ultimately a legal issue, but the rhetoric surrounding it was certainly more tied the PGA's actions bordering on the side of being cruel. And yes, to a point, Augusta is not controlled by the PGA tour, but the earnings are counted towards a player's rankings. The PGA could back out of that arrangement any time they want. As several postings have shown, Ms. Conway and co., regardless of whether it was a "message testing survey" or just a survey, they've clearly framed this issue as one of legal rights.

At 2:53 PM -0500 11/25/02, Nathaniel Ehrlich wrote:

>As usual, Rossie is not afraid to state his opinions. Or to miss the point.
>The Martin case was a legal issue, based on the ADA. The Augusta case is one
>of a clash of values: old school southern, rural, conservative vs. modern
>egalitarian. The Supreme Court decided that Casey Martin was being denied an
>opportunity to earn a living, in violation of the law of the land, and
>ordered the Tour to allow him to use a golf cart. The Tour lost its case
>when the Court noted that the same ruling body, the PGA Tour, allows Senior
>players the option of using a cart, thereby negating its own argument that
>>walking is an integral part of the game.
>The Augusta issue has nothing to do with the PGA Tour, which doesn't run the
>Masters Tournament. Hootie Johnson didn't make 'one key mistake' - he chose
>to react to Ms. Burk, rather than ignore her; he chose to refuse sponsorship
>for the telecast; he chose to make statements that harken back to George
>Wallace in the early 1960s. In the long run, anyone fighting to keep things
>as they are "forever" can never win, only forestall losing.

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Robert Godfrey [mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU]

>Sent: Monday, November 25, 2002 2:05 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: Augusta National

>

>

>One of the most astute comments I've read regarding the Augusta
>imbroglio is by Bob Rosburg, former PGA champion, in Golf Digest's
>December issue:

>

>"Hootie Johnson made one key mistake in responding to the demand of
>Martha Burk that Augusta National admit women. He proceeded as though
>it were a legal issue, when in fact it is a moral issue. You can't
>win a battle over a moral issue, and it isn't hard to tell where the
>public's sentiments lie. The PGA Tour made a similar mistake on the
>Casey Martin case. When will they all learn?"

>

>

>

>Robert Godfrey

>UW-Madison

>

>-----

>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

>

>-----

>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 15:45:28 -0500
Reply-To: Ken Winneg <kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ken Winneg <kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU>
Subject: ABC News/ESPN Poll on Augusta
MIME-version: 1.0

This ABC News/ESPN poll on the public's opinion of Augusta's membership poll has just been released.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 15:59:02 -0500
Reply-To: Ken Winneg <kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ken Winneg <kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU>
Subject: ABC News/ESPN Poll on Augusta
MIME-version: 1.0

Here is the attached data. Apologies.

ABC NEWS/ESPN POLL: AUGUSTA NATIONAL - 11/24/02

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE Monday, Nov. 25, 2002

Augusta National's Men-Only Policy:

Most Oppose the Rule, Support the Right

Most Americans oppose the Augusta National Golf Club's men-only membership policy, but most also say it's within the private club's rights to exclude women - and the PGA Tour should continue to recognize the club's annual Masters tournament.

Behind these views are deep divisions among groups, ones that potentially could bedevil golf's efforts to appeal to a more diverse audience. Augusta's men-only membership is particularly objectionable to women, young adults and nonwhites, among others.

Also, the number of Americans who describe themselves as fans of the sport is down in this ABC News/ESPN poll, to 16 percent, compared to 24 percent last spring. That could be a seasonal effect, however; it'll take springtime polling for real comparability. (The Masters is played in April, most other major golf tournaments in the summer.)

POLICY - In all, 54 percent of adults oppose Augusta's membership policy, while 39 percent support it. While men and retirement-aged Americans divide evenly on the policy, women and 18- to 34-year-olds oppose it by about a 2-1 margin, as do nonwhites.

Intensity is greater on the opponents' side: Thirty-seven percent of Americans "strongly" oppose Augusta's policy, compared to 21 percent who "strongly" support it.

	Augusta policy	
	Support	Oppose
All	39%	54
Men	47	48
Women	32	60
18-34	32	63
65+	44	45

White	41	52
Nonwhite	31	63

Regardless of their opinion of the policy, however, 56 percent say Augusta should have the right to admit only men as members; even a bare majority of women, 51 percent, say so. And 59 percent say the PGA Tour should continue to sanction the Masters.

	Augusta's right		Should PGA recognize	
	to admit only men?		the Masters?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
All	56%	41	59%	34
Men	62	35	65	29
Women	51	47	53	39
18-34	52	47	56	35
65+	59	38	58	34
White	61	37	60	32
Nonwhite	37	60	51	43

FANS - Augusta is on firmest ground with golf fans: They support its policy by a 20-point margin, while non-fans oppose the policy by 24 points. Fans also are much more apt to say Augusta should have the right to that policy, and to favor continued PGA Tour recognition of the Masters.

	Augusta policy		Augusta's right		PGA recognize	
	Support	Oppose	Yes	No	Yes	No
Fans	58%	38	72%	27	76%	23
Not fans	34	58	52	45	54	37

As noted, 16 percent of Americans - disproportionately men - describe themselves as fans of the sport, a number that ranged from 24 to 27 percent in four Gallup polls since April 2000. Three of those polls were done in the spring, one in February. (The fan question in this poll was asked apart from questions on the Augusta National issue.)

POLITICS and REGIONS - There also are political and regional divisions on this issue. Democrats oppose Augusta's policy by a huge 67-29 percent, independents by 58-35 percent, but Republicans favor it by 15 points, 54 to 39 percent. (Republicans also are more apt to be golf fans.)

Regionally, six in 10 Northeasterners and Westerners alike oppose Augusta's policy, while opposition declines to about 50 percent in the South and Midwest.

Augusta National's membership policy has been under sharp criticism since last summer, led by Martha Burk, chairwoman of the National Council of Women's Organizations.

METHODOLOGY - This ABC News/ESPN poll was conducted by telephone Nov. 20-24, 2002, among a random national sample of 1,042 adults. The results have a three-point error margin. Fieldwork by TNS Intersearch of Horsham, PA.

Analysis by Gary Langer.

ABC News polls can be found at ABCNEWS.com on the Internet at:

<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/PollVault/PollVault.html>

Media contact: Cathie Levine, (212) 456-4934

Full results follow. *= less than 0.5 percent

1. As you may know, the Augusta National Golf Club hosts the Masters Tournament each year. Augusta is a private club that only allows men to become members, not women. Do you support or oppose Augusta's men-only membership policy?

Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?

	-----Support-----			-----Oppose-----			No
	NET	Strongly	Somewhat	NET	Strongly	Somewhat	opin.
11/24/02	39	21	18	54	37	17	7

2. Regardless of whether you support or oppose this policy, do you think the Augusta National Golf Club should or should not have the right to admit only men as members?

	Should	Should not	No opin.
11/24/02	56	41	2

3. Assuming Augusta keeps its men-only membership policy, do you think the Professional Golfer's Association Tour should or should not continue to recognize the Masters as an official PGA Tour event?

	Should	Should not	No opin.
11/24/02	59	34	8

4. Are you a fan of professional golf, or not?

	Yes	Somewhat (vol.)	No	No opin.
11/24/02	16	7	78	0
3/24/02*	24	8	68	0
3/28/01	27	9	64	*
2/11/01	26	5	69	*
4/2/00	26	8	66	*

*3/02 and previous, Gallup

END

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 16:24:27 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: George Horace Gallup
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Unfortunately, this is yet another example of journalistic mythology, unencumbered by factual research.

Gallup was certainly a pioneer and probably the dominant figure in the history of polling, but his methodology was based on the use of quotas to obtain "representative" samples, not on probability-based random samples. The latter were pioneered by statisticians trained in the physical sciences, like Deming and Kish, and became widespread in public opinion surveys only after the 1948 Dewey/Truman debacle.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Mark David Richards wrote:

>

> FYI--I was searching The Washington Post archives for something and

> randomly came across this editorial written at the time of George

> Gallup's death in 1984. Mark Richards

>

> -----

>

> The Washington Post

>

> George Horace Gallup

>

> July 30, 1984; Page A10

>

> PUBLIC OPINION polling, taken for granted now as part of modern life, is
> an invention so recent that its whole history is contained in the active
> professional life of a single man, George Gallup, who died Thursday at
> the age of 82. Mr. Gallup had the idea that just as you could determine
> the purity of a water supply or the grade of a wheat crop by assaying
> samples selected on a scientifically random basis, so you could
> understand public opinion by surveying 1,500 members of the public if
> they were chosen on a scientifically random basis. Working in the 1930s,
> along with other brilliant pioneers, Mr. Gallup developed the sampling
> techniques and many of the basic questions pollsters all over the world
> are still using today.

>

> Public opinion polling owes much of its success not only to Mr. Gallup's
> insights but to his character. He conducted his first political poll for
> the Democratic candidate for state treasurer of Iowa -- his
> mother-in-law -- in 1932. But he never worked for politicians again, and
> was so determined to remain scrupulously neutral that he refrained from
> voting. When he was right, he was brash enough to call attention to
> himself, as when he criticized the Literary Digest mail-in poll in 1936
> and correctly forecast Franklin D. Roosevelt's reelection. The result was
> that polls based on non-random samples have not played a serious role
> in American public life since. When he was wrong, as he was when he quit
> polling in October 1948 and predicted the victory of Thomas E. Dewey, he
> owned up to his mistakes and went vigorously to work improving his
> techniques so that polling could be considered reliable, and would be
> reliable, in the future. In this he largely succeeded. As early as 1937,
> Gallup organizations were created abroad, and Gallup has become a
> synonym for public opinion polls in several languages. In the United
> States he was criticized sometimes for caution in methods and questions.
> But the Gallup Organization's persistence in asking successive
> generations the same questions over and over and charting the results
> gives a picture of public opinion over time which historians will find
> invaluable. Mr. Gallup was ready to concede the limitations of polling:
> it cannot forecast the future; it does not reliably indicate the extent
> of prejudice or unpopular feeling (and therefore is especially
> unreliable in authoritarian countries); it has difficulty measuring the
> intensity of feelings. But he did not claim to have all the answers --
> or, rather, all the questions. He was a pioneer whose insights and
> integrity helped people around the world understand their societies and
> themselves better.

>

> -----

> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read

> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 16:49:58 -0800
Reply-To: Albert & Susan Cantril <ascantril@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Albert & Susan Cantril <ascantril@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Gallup Editorial
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Although the piece has no by-line, I am quite sure the principal author of these thoughtful words was Barry Sussman, then manager of polling for the Washington Post and always appreciative of the magnitude of Gallup's contribution.

Albert H. Cantril

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 16:48:32 -0500
Reply-To: Patricia Gallagher <Patricia.Gallagher@UMB.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Patricia Gallagher <Patricia.Gallagher@UMB.EDU>
Subject: Re: Augusta National More survey results on the sports page
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Just FYI: there is some feeling among feminist scholars that terms like = "lady sportscaster" are inherently sexist. The issue is the imposition = of role limitations; things that are appropriate for a sportscaster may = be outside the constraints of "ladylike" behavior. [Doing the tasks = required of physicians used to be considered exceedingly unladylike.]

One quick test of whether a term is sexist or not is to try it out the = "other" way. We hardly ever hear anyone refer to a "gentleman = sportscaster". =20

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

From: dick halpern [<mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>]
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2002 11:28 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Augusta National More survey results on the sports page

Ultimately, the lack of sufficient advertising will have it's effect. =
May

take a while. Be good to have a lady sportscaster report on the =
happenings
-- but as I understand it that is against the Club's rules. But there's
nothing to stop TV stations from doing that when reporting the news =
later on.

Dick Halpern

At 10:28 AM 11/25/02, you wrote:

><http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/25/sports/golf/25MAST.html>

>

>In today's New York Times

>

>November 25, 2002

>CBS Silent in Debate on Women Joining Augusta

>By ALESSANDRA STANLEY and BILL CARTER

>

>SNIP

>

>So far, at least, public pressure on CBS to take a stand has been
>glancing. Two-thirds of the men and half of the women interviewed in a
>New York Times Poll conducted Wednesday through Saturday said they did
>not believe that the PGA Tour, the governing body of men's professional
>golf, should withdraw its recognition of the Masters, even though a
>majority of men and women said they thought men-only private clubs were
>wrong.

>

>The survey of 846 adults nationwide, which had a margin of sampling
>error of plus or minus three percentage points, indicated that a
>plurality of Americans think it is unfair to force a private club to
>accept women. Men feel more strongly: 55 percent of the men said they
>opposed any requirement that a private club change its policies. Among
>women, the result was a statistical dead heat: 44 percent said it would
>be unfair, 43 percent said it would not, and 13 percent had no opinion.

>

>SNIP

>

>Copyright The New York Times Company | Permissions | Privacy Policy

>

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta

>Art & Science Group, LLC

>6115 Falls Road Suite 101

>Baltimore, MD 21209

>410-377-7880 ext. 14

>410-377-7955 fax

>

>-----

>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read

>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 16:30:57 -0600
Reply-To: MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: SMUC RFP
Comments: cc: ASpark1@smud.org
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Posted for your information. Please respond directly to Mr. Sparks

From: Alan Sparks [mailto:ASpark1@smud.org]

Alan Sparks
SMUD Supply Chain Services
(916) 732-5301
fax (916) 732-5601

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 15:41:01 -0800
Reply-To: "Doherty, Joseph" <Doherty@MAIL.LAW.UCLA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Doherty, Joseph" <Doherty@MAIL.LAW.UCLA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Gallup Editorial
MIME-version: 1.0

A few years ago I put some post-election (1948) pages of Life Magazine on the internet, to illustrate the immediate reaction to "Dewey Defeats Truman."

<http://www.veldaandjoe.net/truman/indexpage1.htm>

Jan Werner thought that some members of the list might enjoy them.

This is fair use, right?

The top-middle page includes Gallup, Roper and a smiling Wilfred Funk.

The top-left page foreshadows "The American Voter."

Joe

Joseph W. Doherty
Associate Director
Empirical Research Group
UCLA School of Law
voice 310-206-2675
fax 310-206-6489

doherty@law.ucla.edu
http://www1.law.ucla.edu/~erg/

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.
=====

Date: Mon, 25 Nov 2002 20:47:48 -0500
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: George Horace Gallup
Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com
In-Reply-To: <3DE2950B.BB478599@jwdp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Jan,

It is hard to talk about pioneers of sampling without including Morris Hansen and the work done by his people at the Census Bureau. Hansen beat Deming out in the struggle for leadership at the Census Bureau and Deming left. This was about 1940. Hansen led a very talented group of sampling statisticians consisting of Bill Hurwitz, Joe Daly, Marge Gurney, Ben Tepping, Max Bershad, Joe Waksberg and Joe Steinberg and Bill Madow. A number of them were known as the class of 1940, which is when they arrived at the bureau. Many of them came out of NYC. They probably did more to advance the field of sampling than all the academics of their day combined. Kish was a significant figure at Michigan and nationally, as were other people at other universities. They were mostly doing demographic or agricultural studies.

At Gallup the methodologist was Paul Perry, who is still alive. Any advances can be attributed more to Perry than Gallup. Still, Gallup deserves a lot of the credit. He promoted the public opinion survey and did come around to methodological developments after getting shown a better way. Morris Hansen tried to do that at the Central City and Williamstown meetings of AAPOR and met with a lot of resistance. It's in the AAPOR History, if you are interested.
warren

At 04:24 PM 11/25/02 -0500, you wrote:

>Unfortunately, this is yet another example of journalistic mythology,
>unencumbered by factual research.

>

>Gallup was certainly a pioneer and probably the dominant figure in the
>history of polling, but his methodology was based on the use of quotas
>to obtain "representative" samples, not on probability-based random
>samples. The latter were pioneered by statisticians trained in the
>physical sciences, like Deming and Kish, and became widespread in public
>opinion surveys only after the 1948 Dewey/Truman debacle.

>

>Jan Werner
>jwerner@jwdp.com

>

>

>Mark David Richards wrote:

> >

> > FYI--I was searching The Washington Post archives for something and
> > randomly came across this editorial written at the time of George
> > Gallup's death in 1984. Mark Richards

> >

> > -----

> >

> > The Washington Post

> >

> > George Horace Gallup

> >

> > July 30, 1984; Page A10

> >

> > PUBLIC OPINION polling, taken for granted now as part of modern life, is
> > an invention so recent that its whole history is contained in the active
> > professional life of a single man, George Gallup, who died Thursday at
> > the age of 82. Mr. Gallup had the idea that just as you could determine
> > the purity of a water supply or the grade of a wheat crop by assaying
> > samples selected on a scientifically random basis, so you could
> > understand public opinion by surveying 1,500 members of the public if
> > they were chosen on a scientifically random basis. Working in the 1930s,
> > along with other brilliant pioneers, Mr. Gallup developed the sampling
> > techniques and many of the basic questions pollsters all over the world
> > are still using today.

> >

> > Public opinion polling owes much of its success not only to Mr. Gallup's
> > insights but to his character. He conducted his first political poll for
> > the Democratic candidate for state treasurer of Iowa -- his
> > mother-in-law -- in 1932. But he never worked for politicians again, and
> > was so determined to remain scrupulously neutral that he refrained from
> > voting. When he was right, he was brash enough to call attention to
> > himself, as when he criticized the Literary Digest mail-in poll in 1936
> > and correctly forecast Franklin D. Roosevelt's reelection. The result was
> > that polls based on non-random samples have not played a serious role
> > in American public life since. When he was wrong, as he was when he quit
> > polling in October 1948 and predicted the victory of Thomas E. Dewey, he
> > owned up to his mistakes and went vigorously to work improving his
> > techniques so that polling could be considered reliable, and would be
> > reliable, in the future. In this he largely succeeded. As early as 1937,
> > Gallup organizations were created abroad, and Gallup has become a
> > synonym for public opinion polls in several languages. In the United
> > States he was criticized sometimes for caution in methods and questions.
> > But the Gallup Organization's persistence in asking successive
> > generations the same questions over and over and charting the results
> > gives a picture of public opinion over time which historians will find
> > invaluable. Mr. Gallup was ready to concede the limitations of polling:
> > it cannot forecast the future; it does not reliably indicate the extent
> > of prejudice or unpopular feeling (and therefore is especially
> > unreliable in authoritarian countries); it has difficulty measuring the
> > intensity of feelings. But he did not claim to have all the answers --
> > or, rather, all the questions. He was a pioneer whose insights and
> > integrity helped people around the world understand their societies and
> > themselves better.

> >

> > -----

> > View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

> > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> > You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> > the messages from the web page above, for instance.
>

>-----
>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Warren J. Mitofsky
140 Riverside Drive, Apt 18N
New York, NY 10024

212 496-2945
212 496-0846 FAX

email: mitofsky@mindspring.com
<http://www.mitofskyinternational.com>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 2002 10:00:50 -0500
Reply-To: Jack Elinson <jelinson@JUNO.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jack Elinson <jelinson@JUNO.COM>
Subject: Re: George Horace Gallup
Comments: To: mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Warren et al

Re probability sampling vs quota sampling (a la Gallup)
See my chapter in AAPOR: A Meeting Place where the confrontation took
place, at Central City in 1946, between area probability sampling,
represented by Morris Hansen, and the quota folks represented by the
social psychologist Norman Meier.

Other greats in probability sampling were J. Stevens Stock and Lester
Frankel, who taught a course (which I took) at the U.S. Department of
Agriculture Graduate School (I don't remember exactly when - it may
have been in the immediate post WWII period. - one could check with
Frankel's son, Martin, also a sampling expert, for NORC for a while. . I
believe Stock and Frankel showed their mettle in applied probability
sampling in estimating unemployment for the Dept of Labor in 1940?. Fred
Stephan advertised their wares at AAPOR meetings and in his consulting
for NORC, among others. Deming also used to promote Mahalanobis, the
Indian statistician. Our sampling advisers in the Morale Attitude
Research Branch during WWII in the War Department were the statisticians:
Fred Mosteller on theory and Abram J. Jaffe, on practical applications.
in sampling military populations. Sampling advisers to the US
National Health Interview Survey, which got under way in 1957, were:

Morris Hansen, Bill Hurwitz, and Harold Nisselson. Kish before he went to Michigan with Likert at al, was the sampling man for Likert in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Program Surveys, This was also in the 40s., contemporaneous with Stouffer's group in the War Department.
Regards, Jack Elinson

On Mon, 25 Nov 2002 20:47:48 -0500 Warren Mitofsky
<mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM> writes:

> Jan,
> It is hard to talk about pioneers of sampling without including
> Morris
> Hansen and the work done by his people at the Census Bureau. Hansen
> beat
> Deming out in the struggle for leadership at the Census Bureau and
> Deming
> left. This was about 1940. Hansen led a very talented group of
> sampling
> statisticians consisting of Bill Hurwitz, Joe Daly, Marge Gurney,
> Ben
> Tepping, Max Bershad, Joe Waksberg and Joe Steinberg and Bill Madow.
> A
> number of them were known as the class of 1940, which is when they
> arrived
> at the bureau. Many of them came out of NYC. They probably did more
> to
> advance the field of sampling than all the academics of their day
> combined.
> Kish was a significant figure at Michigan and nationally, as were
> other
> people at other universities. They were mostly doing demographic or
> agricultural studies.
>
> At Gallup the methodologist was Paul Perry, who is still alive. Any
> advances can be attributed more to Perry than Gallup. Still, Gallup
> deserves a lot of the credit. He promoted the public opinion survey
> and did
> come around to methodological developments after getting shown a
> better
> way. Morris Hansen tried to do that at the Central City and
> Williamstown
> meetings of AAPOR and met with a lot of resistance. It's in the
> AAPOR
> History, if you are interested.
> warren
>
> At 04:24 PM 11/25/02 -0500, you wrote:
> >Unfortunately, this is yet another example of journalistic
> mythology,
> >unencumbered by factual research.
> >
> >Gallup was certainly a pioneer and probably the dominant figure in
> the
> >history of polling, but his methodology was based on the use of
> quotas
> >to obtain "representative" samples, not on probability-based
> random
> >samples. The latter were pioneered by statisticians trained in the

> >physical sciences, like Deming and Kish, and became widespread in
> public
> >opinion surveys only after the 1948 Dewey/Truman debacle.
> >
> >Jan Werner
> >jwerner@jwdp.com
> >_____

> >
> >Mark David Richards wrote:
> > >
> > > FYI--I was searching The Washington Post archives for something
> > and
> > > randomly came across this editorial written at the time of
> > George
> > > Gallup's death in 1984. Mark Richards
> > >
> > > -----
> > >
> > > The Washington Post
> > >
> > > George Horace Gallup
> > >
> > > July 30, 1984; Page A10
> > >
> > > PUBLIC OPINION polling, taken for granted now as part of modern
> > > life, is
> > > an invention so recent that its whole history is contained in
> > > the active
> > > professional life of a single man, George Gallup, who died
> > > Thursday at
> > > the age of 82. Mr. Gallup had the idea that just as you could
> > > determine
> > > the purity of a water supply or the grade of a wheat crop by
> > > assaying
> > > samples selected on a scientifically random basis, so you could
> > > understand public opinion by surveying 1,500 members of the
> > > public if
> > > they were chosen on a scientifically random basis. Working in
> > > the 1930s,
> > > along with other brilliant pioneers, Mr. Gallup developed the
> > > sampling
> > > techniques and many of the basic questions pollsters all over
> > > the world
> > > are still using today.
> > >
> > > Public opinion polling owes much of its success not only to Mr.
> > > Gallup's
> > > insights but to his character. He conducted his first political
> > > poll for
> > > the Democratic candidate for state treasurer of Iowa -- his
> > > mother-in-law -- in 1932. But he never worked for politicians
> > > again, and
> > > was so determined to remain scrupulously neutral that he
> > > refrained from
> > > voting. When he was right, he was brash enough to call attention
> > > to
> > > himself, as when he criticized the Literary Digest mail-in poll

> in 1936
> > > and correctly forecast Frankin D. Roosevelt's reelection. The
> result was
> > > that polls based on non- random samples have not played a
> serious role
> > > in American public life since. When he was wrong, as he was when
> he quit
> > > polling in October 1948 and predicted the victory of Thomas E.
> Dewey, he
> > > owned up to his mistakes and went vigorously to work improving
> his
> > > techniques so that polling could be considered reliable, and
> would be
> > > reliable, in the future. In this he largely succeeded. As early
> as 1937,
> > > Gallup organizations were created abroad, and Gallup has become
> a
> > > synonym for public opinion polls in several languages. In the
> United
> > > States he was criticized sometimes for caution in methods and
> questions.
> > > But the Gallup Organization's persistence in asking successive
> > > generations the same questions over and over and charting the
> results
> > > gives a picture of public opinion over time which historians
> will find
> > > invaluable. Mr. Gallup was ready to concede the limitations of
> polling:
> > > it cannot forecast the future; it does not reliably indicate the
> extent
> > > of prejudice or unpopular feeling (and therefore is especially
> > > unreliable in authoritarian countries); it has difficulty
> measuring the
> > > intensity of feelings. But he did not claim to have all the
> answers --
> > > or, rather, all the questions. He was a pioneer whose insights
> and
> > > integrity helped people around the world understand their
> societies and
> > > themselves better.
> > >
> > > -----
> > > View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> > > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> > > You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> > > the messages from the web page above, for instance.
> >
> >-----
> >View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> ><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> >You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> >the messages from the web page above, for instance.
>
> Warren J. Mitofsky
> 140 Riverside Drive, Apt 18N
> New York, NY 10024
>

> 212 496-2945
> 212 496-0846 FAX
>
> email: mitofsky@mindspring.com
> http://www.mitofskyinternational.com
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.
>
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 26 Nov 2002 11:02:47 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: Re: Gallup Editorial and article by Barry Sussman
In-Reply-To: <3DE2C535.49AA@mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Here is an article by Barry Sussman which preceded the Post editorial by
two days. It contains observations by members of this list ...
Mark Richards

George Gallup Dies

Barry Sussman, Washington Post Staff Writer
July 28, 1984; Page A1
George Horace Gallup, the pollster, died Thursday, apparently of a heart
attack, at his summer home in Tschingel, Switzerland, at the age of 82.

Mr. Gallup's name has so dominated the field of scientific public
opinion polling since its inception about 50 years ago, that in some
nations survey research findings are referred to not as polls but as
"Gallups." "When it comes to polling, he is it," said political pollster
Robert Teeter yesterday. Others in the field agreed.

Albert H. Cantril of the Bureau of Social Science Research in
Washington, whose father pioneered in polling work along with Mr.
Gallup, said that Mr. Gallup's true mark was as "a small-d democrat. His
faith and good sense of the public was unstinting, and he saw the public
opinion poll as a powerful tool for bringing that good sense to bear on

the affairs of state."

Mr. Gallup first saw the possibilities for public opinion sampling while he was a student at the University of Iowa in the 1920s, realizing, as he later put it, that he could use the same techniques as "government inspectors in testing wheat, or cotton, or by public health men in testing the water supply. They take a sample here, another there, and by choosing the samples properly are able to judge the quality of the whole amount from what the sample shows."

It was a while before he was to practice, or one might say invent, political polling. The young Gallup, a hard-working farm youth, later told associates that he had arrived at the University of Iowa with \$6 in his pocket and that by the time he graduated was earning more than the college president. He ran a towel concession at the locker room of the school's swimming pool, operated a laundry, and, as an editor, turned the campus newspaper into a profit-making community newspaper.

From 1923 to 1932, he taught journalism and worked to develop his sampling techniques by doing readership surveys for newspapers. Then, in 1932, his mother-in-law, Ola Babcock Miller, a Democrat, ran for the position of secretary of state of Iowa, leading Mr. Gallup to do his first political surveys. He predicted that she would win, and she did.

Also in 1932, a newly created New York advertising agency, Young and Rubicam, invited Mr. Gallup to create a research department and evaluate the effectiveness of advertising.

Mr. Gallup remained associated with Young and Rubicam until 1947, but soon after he joined the firm he branched out into political polling, forming the American Institute of Public Opinion, better known as the Gallup Poll. By 1934, he later wrote, he had developed his techniques to the point where he was able that year to predict the outcome of the congressional races "with an error of only six tenths of one percent."

In October, 1935, Mr. Gallup began writing his syndicated column. It was titled, "America Speaks," and appeared in 42 newspapers from the start. One of those newspapers was The Washington Post, which said in an editorial at the time that the new polling technique, while experimental, had the promise of serving as a "continuous check on public opinion" in a political system whose "lack of official responsiveness to public opinion . . . may be a very serious defect in a democracy."

The Gallup Poll has been going strong ever since.

Paul Perry, who joined the Gallup firm in December, 1935, said in an interview yesterday that "there were just a few of us, five or six, and we were hand-tabulating ballots, that was our principal task." Today, The Gallup Organization, located in Princeton, N.J., has affiliates in 35 nations, is syndicated in about 110 U.S. newspapers, and has a staff of 110 full-time employes and 200 to 300 part-time workers, not including field interviewers.

If people are suspicious about polls today, they were more suspicious at the outset. The question most often asked is, how can a small sample of 1,500 or so really describe how the public feels? Mr. Gallup answered

that question resoundingly in the 1936 presidential election, when Franklin D. Roosevelt ran successfully against Republican Alf Landon.

One of the main surveys at the time was that run by the magazine, *Literary Digest*, which asked its readers how they would vote. The magazine got many thousands of people to respond, but they formed what is known as a "self-selecting" sample, and not a random sample at all. The result was flawed because the magazine's respondents were much more Republican than the voting public.

Mr. Gallup, grounded in newspaper and magazine readership research, knew the *Digest's* poll would be a bad one even before the numbers were collected. Audaciously, he predicted that it would show Landon ahead, with a majority of 55 or 56 percent of the voters. He said his own surveys showed Roosevelt the winner. He was, of course, right on both counts.

That performance gave early credibility to Mr. Gallup's work. But the question as to how he could analyze public opinion through only 1,500 interviews never did die out, and when Mr. Gallup gave lectures, people often would say, skeptically, that they had never been polled and did not know anyone who had been.

"Madam," Mr. Gallup once said to a woman after a lecture, "Your chances of being interviewed in a poll are about the same as your chances of being hit by lightning."

"But Mr. Gallup," the woman replied, "I have been hit by lightning. Twice."

Perhaps the worst point in the long history of the Gallup Poll came in 1948, when it and most other surveys saw Republican Thomas E. Dewey far ahead of incumbent Harry Truman in the race for the presidency. Dewey was so far ahead, in fact, that the last Gallup Poll was conducted in mid-October. When Truman won in November, Mr. Gallup and other pollsters were humiliated.

"The outcome of the 1948 election came to all of us poll-takers as a shock," Mr. Gallup was to say. "The reasons, as disclosed by a number of post-mortem studies, were many. Chiefly it was a failure to poll up to Election Day."

On another occasion, Mr. Gallup was more direct about his feelings. "I have the greatest admiration for President Truman because he fights for what he believes," the pollster said. "I propose to do the same thing."

For a number of years, Mr. Gallup has spent parts of the summer in Switzerland and parts of the winter at his home in the Bahamas, living in Princeton and going to the office almost daily the rest of the year. "I'll never retire," he said, and at his death he held the title chairman of the board of the Gallup Organization.

According to Andrew Kohut, the firm's president, Mr. Gallup was in touch from Switzerland only a few days ago, commenting on conflicts that have been showing up in recent presidential polls done by Gallup and other polling organizations.

In addition, according to Kohut, Gallup continued to be especially active on polling projects dealing with views on education. "He was a presence here," Kohut said.

Public opinion pollsters tend to be highly critical of each other's work, but few have ever been critical of Mr. Gallup, who was regarded as scrupulous and totally unbiased, a man who voted for the socialist candidate, Norman Thomas, before he went into polling -- and who then refrained from voting for anyone lest it give the impression he was taking sides.

Mervin Field, the California pollster, said that Mr. Gallup "is the patron saint, the daddy of them all, the guy that to his dying day was a methodologist. He was interested in all the aspects of the research profession, always inquiring and curious, a help to everybody else. I met him when I was a high school junior and my whole life was charted after that."

Mr. Gallup is survived by his wife, Ophelia, and two sons, a daughter, and five grandchildren.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Albert & Susan Cantril

Sent: Monday, November 25, 2002 7:50 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Gallup Editorial

Although the piece has no by-line, I am quite sure the principal author of these thoughtful words was Barry Sussman, then manager of polling for the Washington Post and always appreciative of the magnitude of Gallup's contribution.

Albert H. Cantril

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read

the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 2002 11:40:36 -0500

Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>

Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.

Subject: Wash. Post: Rating a College's Intellectual Intangibles

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Rating a College's Intellectual Intangibles

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A39214-2002Nov25.html>

Rating a College's Intellectual Intangibles
National Survey Offers Applicants Data on Interaction With Faculty,
Campus Environment, Academic Challenge

By Jay Mathews
Washington Post Staff Writer
Tuesday, November 26, 2002; Page A12

The University of Vermont came alive for Carly Lehrer, a visiting high school senior, during a lecture this month on environmental science. It was 8 a.m., and Lehrer was half asleep, but the room buzzed with energy and interest. That told her, in a way no college guide had, that Vermont was a school she would love to attend.

It was the kind of observation that college applicants, their parents and their high school counselors want to quantify, so they can compare the quality of teaching and learning on undergraduate campuses -- just as they compare SAT averages, graduation rates and many other indirect measures.

Until a few years ago, the task was impossible. But next month, an unusual organization based at the University of Indiana will celebrate the third anniversary of its effort to turn intellectual excitement and campus ferment into a set of statistics.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE, pronounced "Nessie") has collected more than 285,000 student surveys from 618 four-year colleges and universities. Even its for-profit counterpart, U.S. News & World Report's "America's Best Colleges" list, has begun to use some of the data, which is akin to Coca-Cola billboards displaying ads for Pepsi.

"NSSE is a window into areas of student and institutional performance that virtually all colleges and universities espouse to be important, but about which few have solid information," said George D. Kuh, the Indiana professor of higher education who directs the effort.

The surveys of undergraduate freshmen and seniors aim to measure a college's level of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, educational enrichment and supportive campus environment. Questions include: How many papers of five to 19 pages were you asked to write this year? How often did you discuss ideas with faculty outside of class? Did you study abroad? How do you rate the quality of your relationships with other students?

The third annual report, released this month, says that although 87 percent of undergraduates rated their college experience good or excellent, 26 percent of seniors reported that they never discussed ideas from their reading or classes with faculty members outside of class. Forty percent of undergraduates indicated they spend 10 or fewer

hours a week preparing for class, much less time than their professors say is necessary.

Many high school students say they like this inside look at colleges, but they complain that it does not cover enough schools and that most participating colleges do not publicize their results.

When U.S. News asked colleges for some of their NSSE data this year, the magazine was able to publish information for only some schools -- 86 in the print version, 116 online -- because so many refused to make it public.

With some exceptions, such as the University of Virginia and Rice University, the better known and more selective a college is, the less likely it is to allow NSSE on its campus.

Alan Blickenstaff, a senior at Catalina Foothills High School in Tucson, examined the NSSE Web site last week and said, "I was disappointed. It had none of the eight colleges I am applying to -- Harvard, Dartmouth, Carleton, Claremont McKenna, Williams, Whitman, Pomona and the University of Arizona."

Some college officials say they remain uncertain about NSSE because it does not fit with their own assessment schemes. The schools say the data are useful in quietly identifying problems that need to be fixed. But they resist releasing the survey results because, although NSSE refuses to use the information to rank colleges, such publications as U.S. News might do so.

NSSE was born because many college officials said they felt U.S. News and other guides failed to measure the teaching and learning that is essential to higher education. Some pioneering researchers, such as C. Robert Pace of the University of California at Los Angeles, developed ways to ask students how well they were taught in classes and engaged in the rest of college life. Russell Edgerton, director of the Pew Forum on Undergraduate Learning, and Lee Shulman, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, pushed the idea of a national survey that would involve as many institutions as possible.

In December 1999, the Pew Charitable Trusts provided a \$3.3 million grant to get the project started until it could be sustained by fees paid by colleges.

The first survey was conducted at 276 colleges and universities, and the effort is still growing, recently adding an Institute for Effective Educational Practice to help colleges and universities fix what the surveys show is broken.

"The NSSE database now includes information from institutions that represent more than half [52 percent] of all undergraduates attending four-year colleges and universities," Kuh said.

But it is a very mixed collection of schools. In the Washington region, the University of Virginia and the University of Maryland campuses at College Park, Baltimore County and the Eastern Shore participate, but Georgetown University and Johns Hopkins University do not.

Even those schools that have NSSE data and agree to release the information vary greatly in their efforts to make it easy to find.

Type "NSSE" into the University of Virginia Web site, steer your way to the "reports" link, and a long column of data appears. Virginia provides both good news (U-Va. students rate their educational experience far above national averages) and bad (U-Va. freshmen are not happy with academic adviser services).

George Mason University and Longwood University also provide substantial information, but only seven other local colleges provide such data -- and their Web site entries are hard to find or very brief.

Lehrer, a student at Sidwell Friends School in the District, said she was not familiar with NSSE but thinks the idea has promise. Following her recent visit to the University of Vermont, she applied. The university's provost, John Bramley, said the school plans to put its survey data on its Web site soon.

"That's the kind of information I need," Lehrer said. "If I had known about it, I would have looked at it."

© 2002 The Washington Post Company

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 2002 13:45:48 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Re: Positive Ratings for the G.O.P., if Not Its Policy
Comments: To: dhenwood@panix.com
In-Reply-To: <p05100308ba0950b2bab1@[192.168.1.100]>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Many, many years ago on the early 50's when NORC was doing polls for the State Dept we created a split sample and asked half about who was the secretary of State and the job he is doing and the other half asking about Dulles (did they know who he was) and the job he is doing. The majority of Americans had no idea of who the secretary of state was or who Dulles was. In both cases he got a favorable rating. Wish I had the exact figures.

Another example: when the public was asked whether they supported the Taft Hartley Act, a majority said yes. But when asked about specific provisions, a majority, if I remember correctly, were not supportive.

Yet another example from years back: When Americans were asked whether they fully supported the Bill of Rights a majority did. Yet when asked about specific provisions....the support in many cases was not one of enthusiasm.

Again, I wish I had the figures better describing these examples. And. of course, these studies were conducted many years ago with a much less sophisticated or learned public. But I think it still possible for people to support an image of a person, service or brand but be less than enthusiastic about many of the particulars.

Dick Halpern

, 11:25 AM 11/26/02, you wrote:

>Could all you public opinion experts explain how the GOP is popular but
>its policies aren't? Is this disconnect an innovation in American
>politics, or does it have a long history?

>

>--

>

>Doug Henwood

>Left Business Observer

>Village Station - PO Box 953

>New York NY 10014-0704 USA

>voice +1-212-741-9852

>fax +1-212-807-9152

>cell +1-917-865-2813

>email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>

>web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

>

>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 26 Nov 2002 14:07:30 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Positive Ratings for the G.O.P., if Not Its Policy
Comments: To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

In the period between the end of the 2000 conventions and the elections, I kept track of the daily polls comparing the percentage saying they favored the Democratic ticket of Gore & Lieberman vs. the Republican ticket of Bush & Cheney. Up until the night of the first debate, the Democratic ticket held a small but steady plurality. After the first debate, until the Friday before the election, when the news of Mr. Bush's 1976 DUI came out, the Republican ticket held a slightly smaller, steady plurality. The last pre-election poll was a virtual dead heat, owing to a drop in support of the Republican ticket but no increase in support of the Democratic ticket.

My simple-minded analysis was, and remains, that the first debate showed Mr. Bush to be more likeable than Mr. Gore, and the news of the DUI lowered his

likeability enough to produce the virtual dead heat that occurred on the first Tuesday in November. It didn't, however, make Gore more likeable.

Policies? Not important. Our elections are about personality. The same electorate that voted convincingly for Ronald Reagan voted just as convincingly for Bill Clinton, two handsome, comfortable in the public eye, smooth-talkin' guys. Now, if Nixon had been able to get Henry Fonda to deliver his speeches...

But I digress. Happy Thanksgiving!

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

From: dick halpern [mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2002 1:46 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Positive Ratings for the G.O.P., if Not Its Policy

Many, many years ago on the early 50's when NORC was doing polls for the State Dept we created a split sample and asked half about who was the secretary of State and the job he is doing and the other half asking about Dulles (did they know who he was) and the job he is doing. The majority of Americans had no idea of who the secretary of state was or who Dulles was. In both cases he got a favorable rating. Wish I had the exact figures.

Another example: when the public was asked whether they supported the Taft Hartley Act, a majority said yes. But when asked about specific provisions, a majority, if I remember correctly, were not supportive.

Yet another example from years back: When Americans were asked whether they fully supported the Bill of Rights a majority did. Yet when asked about specific provisions....the support in many cases was not one of enthusiasm.

Again, I wish I had the figures better describing these examples. And, of course, these studies were conducted many years ago with a much less sophisticated or learned public. But I think it still possible for people to support an image of a person, service or brand but be less than enthusiastic about many of the particulars.

Dick Halpern

, 11:25 AM 11/26/02, you wrote:

>Could all you public opinion experts explain how the GOP is popular but
>its policies aren't? Is this disconnect an innovation in American
>politics, or does it have a long history?

>

>--

>

>Doug Henwood

>Left Business Observer

>Village Station - PO Box 953

>New York NY 10014-0704 USA

>voice +1-212-741-9852

>fax +1-212-807-9152

>cell +1-917-865-2813

>email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>

>web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>
>
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 26 Nov 2002 11:11:48 -0800
Reply-To: "Uyeda, Mary" <Muyel107@HCA.WA.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Uyeda, Mary" <Muyel107@HCA.WA.GOV>
Subject: Re: Positive Ratings for the G.O.P., if Not Its Policy
Comments: To: [dick halpern <dick_halpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>](mailto:dick_halpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

More recent, I think, is people thinking that Congress is doing a terrible
job but "my" Members are just great!
I think this has something to do with the perceived distance from the object
being scrutinized -- maybe a behavioral psychologist type would know more?

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

From: [dick halpern \[mailto:dick_halpern@BELLSOUTH.NET\]](mailto:dick_halpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2002 10:46 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Positive Ratings for the G.O.P., if Not Its Policy

Many, many years ago on the early 50's when NORC was doing polls for the
State Dept we created a split sample and asked half about who was the
secretary of State and the job he is doing and the other half asking about
Dulles (did they know who he was) and the job he is doing. The majority of
Americans had no idea of who the secretary of state was or who Dulles was.
In both cases he got a favorable rating. Wish I had the exact figures.

Another example: when the public was asked whether they supported the Taft
Hartley Act, a majority said yes. But when asked about specific provisions,
a majority, if I remember correctly, were not supportive.

Yet another example from years back: When Americans were asked whether they
fully supported the Bill of Rights a majority did. Yet when asked about
specific provisions....the support in many cases was not one of enthusiasm.

Again, I wish I had the figures better describing these examples. And. of
course, these studies were conducted many years ago with a much less
sophisticated or learned public. But I think it still possible for people

to support an image of a person, service or brand but be less than enthusiastic about many of the particulars.

Dick Halpern

, 11:25 AM 11/26/02, you wrote:

>Could all you public opinion experts explain how the GOP is popular but
>its policies aren't? Is this disconnect an innovation in American
>politics, or does it have a long history?

>

>--

>

>Doug Henwood

>Left Business Observer

>Village Station - PO Box 953

>New York NY 10014-0704 USA

>voice +1-212-741-9852

>fax +1-212-807-9152

>cell +1-917-865-2813

>email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>

>web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

>

>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 27 Nov 2002 16:49:51 -0700
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Happy Birthday to AAPORNET

Dear AAPORNETters,

On the day before Thanksgiving in 1994, 290 AAPOR members became the initial AAPORNET subscribers. Jim Beniger and USC started and hosted AAPORNET, at the direction of AAPOR Council.

AAPORNET has had an active life over the past eight years. Many of us have found it a premier resource for getting information on survey methods, public opinion, jobs, conference information, and much more.

One impetus for founding AAPORNET was the upcoming 50th anniversary of AAPOR, as a way of continuing our tradition as a "meeting place" (as our

official history is titled) in the then-new world of the Internet. Well, our physical conferences have continued to grow, and so has participation on AAPORNET. There are now almost 1,000 subscribers.

This year AAPORNET hosting moved to Arizona State University, which offered us new Listserv software that has made our archives more accessible, and made it easier for subscribers to manage their settings. Many thanks to all of you for your patience as we went through the conversion. AAPOR's new Executive Office does the day-to-day management of AAPORNET; my role is just to sponsor the list at ASU and solve the occasional problem.

I'm grateful to Jim for starting and hosting AAPORNET, and to everyone who participates here. AAPORNET feels very much like a community, a meeting place, to me--and I hope to you also.

And so as we start our 9th year online together, a very Happy Thanksgiving to all,

Shap Wolf
ASU Survey Research Laboratory

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu