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

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

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

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

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9610.
Part 1/1, total size 153181 bytes:
------------------------- Cut here -------------------------

Have you set out a questionnaire by mail that was designed for optical scanning? If so, I would really appreciate your help. I'd like to know

1) the population
2) the response rate
3) number of contacts including replacement questionnaires
4) Your impressions of any influence of layout on response rates
5) Length of survey
I plan to summarize experiences as grouped data so will not reveal response information for individual surveys.

My phone, fax and e-mail address are below.

Also, if there is someone else you know who I should contact for their experience please let me know that as well.

During the last two months I have been collecting as many experiences as I can in an effort to ascertain the influence of typical opscan layouts on questionnaires and want to get more, so am casting the net a little further. I don't have as many as I think would be desirable for the analysis I am doing. Thus, I would really appreciate your help.

Thankyou!

Don Dillman

Don A. Dillman, Deputy Director
for Research and Development
Social and Economic Sciences Research Center
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-4014
phone: 509-335-1511
fax: 509-335-0116
e-mail: dillman@wsu.edu

>From caspar@rti.org Thu Oct 3 05:54:21 1996
Return-Path: caspar@rti.org
Received: from cscnts3.rti.org (cscnts3.rti.org [152.5.128.49])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id FAA26140 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Oct 1996 05:54:16 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: by cscnts3.rti.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.993.5)
    id <01BBB108.62551B20@cscnts3.rti.org>; Thu, 3 Oct 1996 08:53:43 -0400
Message-ID:
    <c=US%=_%a=_%p=Research_Triangl%l=CSCNTS3-961003125343Z-57908@cscnts3.rti.org>
From: "Caspar, Rachel A." <caspar@rti.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Pate, D. Kirk" <dkp@rti.org>, "Biemer, Paul P." <ppb@rti.org>
Subject: Job Openings at RTI
Date: Thu, 3 Oct 1996 08:53:43 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.993.5
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

SURVEY SPECIALISTS

The Research Triangle Institute, a leading contract research organization located in Research Triangle Park, NC, currently has several entry-level and advanced openings for Survey Specialists.

These individuals will perform various survey research duties in accordance
with their level of experience. Entry-level candidates must have a BS or BA degree with strong writing and presentation skills, and WordPerfect 6.1 and Lotus123 (or similar computer) skills. Advanced candidates must possess the same degree and computer skills, and 3 or more years of experience in survey research, as well as data collection training, data collection, and task management experience.

RTI offers a competitive salary and excellent benefits. Interested applicants should send their resume to:

RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE
OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES
P.O. BOX 12194
RTP, NC 27709-2194

Rachel A. Caspar
Survey Methodologist
Research Triangle Institute

P.O. Box 12194
(919) 541-6376

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194
(919) 541-1261

Phone: 541-6376
Fax: 541-1261

If interested, please respond to Professor Scott Cook as noted below.

LATINO/PUERTO RICAN PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

The Institute for Puerto Rican and Latino Studies at the University of Connecticut is seeking candidates for an anticipated tenure-track position of assistant or associate professor to begin in September 1, 1997. We seek candidates whose research and teaching interest will focus primarily on survey research within the Puerto Rican, Mexican-American and other Latino communities in the United States. The candidates should have a Ph.D in Political Science or Communication Sciences. The position will be a joint
appointment between the Institute of Puerto Rican and Latino Studies, the
department of the candidate's discipline, and the Institute for Social
Inquiry/Roper Center for Public Opinion Research.

Requirements include training and background in survey methodology and
experience in public opinion survey research, a commitment to teaching, and
the capacity to establish and run a regional and national survey program
focussing on Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and other Latinos.

Salary is competitive. Screening of applicants will begin December 1,
1996 and continue until the position is filled. Send curriculum vitae,
three letters of recommendation and a statement describing your research and
teaching interests to: Prof. Scott Cook, Acting Director, Institute for
Puerto Rican and Latino Studies, 354 Mansfield Road, Beach Hall, Room 412,
U-137, Storrs, CT 06269-2137. We encourage applications from
under-represented groups, including minorities, women, and people with
disabilities.

>From caspar@rti.org Thu Oct  3 09:04:10 1996
Return-Path: caspar@rti.org
Received: from cscnts3.rti.org (cscnts3.rti.org [152.5.128.49])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA24237 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 3 Oct 1996 09:04:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by cscnts3.rti.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet
Mail Connector Version 4.0.993.5)
    id <01BBBB122.E9B55480@cscnts3.rti.org>; Thu, 3 Oct 1996 12:03:37 -0400
Message-ID: <c=US%a=%p=Research_Triangl%l=CSCNTS3-9610031603372-58980@cscnts3.rti.org>
From: "Caspar, Rachel A." <caspar@rti.org>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Pate, D. Kirk" <dkp@rti.org>
Subject: Re-posting of job openings at RTI
Date: Thu, 3 Oct 1996 12:03:37 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version
4.0.993.5
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I apologize for the duplicate posting, but the last lines of the message
were inadvertently left off.

SURVEY SPECIALISTS

The Research Triangle Institute, a leading contract research organization
located in Research Triangle Park, NC, currently has several entry-level and
advanced openings for Survey Specialists.

These individuals will perform various survey research duties in accordance
with their level of experience. Entry-level candidates must have a BS or BA
degree with strong writing and presentation skills, and WordPerfect 6.1 and
Lotus123 (or similar computer) skills. Advanced candidates must possess the
same degree and computer skills, and 3 or more years of experience in survey
research, as well as data collection training, data collection, and task
management experience. Proposal preparation experience a plus.
RTI offers a competitive salary and excellent benefits. Interested applicants should send their resume to:

RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE
OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES
P.O. BOX 12194
RTP, NC 27709-2194

No Telephone Calls Please

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer M/D/F/V

Rachel A. Caspar
Survey Methodologist
Research Triangle Institute
Phone:
(919) 541-6376
P.O. Box 12194
Fax:
(919) 541-1261
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194
Email: caspar@rti.org

> From ckadushi@email.gc.cuny.edu Fri Oct  4 10:46:15 1996
> Return-Path: ckadushi@email.gc.cuny.edu
> Received: from gaudi.gc.cuny.edu (gaudi.gc.cuny.edu [146.96.64.20]) with ESMTP
> id KAA09959 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Oct 1996 10:46:11 -0700
> (PDT)
> Received: from broadway.gc.cuny.edu (broadway.gc.cuny.edu)
> by GAUDI.GC.CUNY.EDU (PMDF V5.0-5 #13310)
> id <01IA8WOP9TD000206@GAUDI.GC.CUNY.EDU> for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 04
> Oct 1996 13:45:35 -0400 (EDT)
> Received: from localhost (ckadushi@localhost)
> by broadway.gc.cuny.edu (8.7.6/ank-osf96) with SMTP id NAA10624 for
> aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 04 Oct 1996 13:45:34 -0400 (EDT)
> Date: Fri, 04 Oct 1996 13:45:34 -0400 (EDT)
> From: Charles Kadushin <ckadushi@email.gc.cuny.edu>
> Subject: Overly-Cautious Poll Reporting (fwd)
> X-Sender: ckadushi@broadway.gc.cuny.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Message-id: <Pine.OSF.3.93.961004134330.8117A-100000@broadway.gc.cuny.edu>
> MIME-version: 1.0
> Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
> Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: David Rindskopf <drindsko@email.gc.cuny.edu>
> Someone was kind enough to forward some of the discussion about how
> to report polling results.  If I could suggest something, it might be
> enlightening
> to hear what Rev. Bayes would have said about the subject.  No, it's
> not that we should all pray that the election is over soon; he is
> responsible for an "alternative" approach to statistics that many
> people think makes more sense than the classical approach.  Let me
describe how it could be used for this problem.

I will take as a starting point that there is a 5 point difference, with a standard error of 4 points for that difference. (Note: in the original article, it was not clear if the "sampling error" was meant to be one standard error or two standard errors, and whether it applied to the proportions for each candidate or to the difference; Warren Mitofsky's comments cleared that up for me.)

In the classical tradition, we have a point estimate, and can generate a confidence interval. However, we cannot make a statement such as some of you (and probably your readers and listeners) would like to make, "...the odds are pretty good that Clinton is really ahead of Dole." But that's the magic of Bayesian statistics: such a statement is exactly what you can make using these methods. To simplify somewhat, draw a normal distribution centered at 5 and with a standard deviation of 4 points. This is a Bayesian's POSTERIOR DISTRIBUTION, which gives the degree of belief about various possible values of the difference after having looked at the polling data. To find the probability that Clinton is really ahead of Dole, just find the area under the normal curve to the right of zero (the point of no difference). The z-score at zero is \(-5/4 = -1.25\), and the desired probability can be read from a normal table as about .89. A Bayesian would say that there is an 89 percent chance that Clinton is really ahead of Dole.

A classical statistician would groan, and say that such statements can't be made, but of course everyone makes them anyway (it is the most frequently made error in misinterpreting confidence intervals and related quantities). It seems to me so natural that I would advise news organizations to become Bayesian, in accordance with the way their (statistically untrained) audiences think.

One could, of course, go on to predict the outcome of the election using these methods. If one didn't have to worry about electoral college votes, it would be simple to apply these methods to a poll of the entire country. If one did worry about electoral votes, with a little effort one could set up a simulation in which polling results from all the states were used, and 1000 or so replications were done. Each simulation would draw a random number from 0 to 1 for each state; if it were greater than the probability of Clinton beating Dole in that state, the electoral votes in that state go to Dole; otherwise they go to Clinton. The electoral votes for each candidate are added, and the process is repeated 1000 times. If Clinton beats Dole in 700 of the simulated "elections" then the probability is .70 that he would beat Dole (given that the election were held on that day, with the sample accurately reflecting likely voters, etc. etc. and all the rest of those assumptions). Probably this wouldn't give a result greatly different from ignoring electoral votes, but it would be interesting to see.

Hope this is of some help in your search for improved methods of reporting.
Panel Study Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Dole</th>
<th>Perot</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Clinton</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dole</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Perot</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Undecided</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered Voters in Arizona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Dole</th>
<th>Perot</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early September</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late September</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likely Voters in Arizona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Dole</th>
<th>Perot</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early September</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional information about the Arizona elections can be found on our election web site: http://www.nau.edu/azelection

Fred Solop
Fred Solop
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ  86011-5036

(520) 523-3135
(520) 523-6777 - fax
Fred.Solop@nau.edu

>From dhickson@voicenet.com Tue Oct  8 20:28:16 1996
Return-Path: dhickson@voicenet.com
Received: from mail3.voicenet.com (mail3.voicenet.com [207.103.0.45])
   by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
   id UAA14224 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Oct 1996 20:28:15 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from ewing21.voicenet.com (ewing21.voicenet.com [207.103.121.85])
   by mail3.voicenet.com (8.7.5/8.6.12) with SMTP id VAA07657 for
   <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Oct 1996 21:39:21 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 8 Oct 1996 21:39:21 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199610090139.VAA07657@mail3.voicenet.com>
X-Sender: dhickson@popmail.voicenet.com
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dhickson@voicenet.com (David J. Hickson)
Subject: Re: Op Scan Mail Questionnaires
X-Mailer: <PC Eudora Version 1.4>

from Rachel A. Hickson: I have used op-scan for group administration of self-administered surveys. For example, when at Response Analysis I did a survey of junior high school students that was administered in their school system. Response rate, etc. were very high because they were required to do it then and there.

I have not used op-scan for general pop mail surveys.

>Have you set out a questionnaire by mail that was designed for optical scanning?
> If so, I would really appreciate your help. I'd like to know
> 1) the population
> 2) the response rate
> 3) number of contacts including replacement questionnaires
> 4) Your impressions of any influence of layout on response rates
> 5) Length of survey
>
I plan to summarize experiences as grouped data so will not reveal response information for individual surveys.

My phone, fax and e-mail address are below.

Also, if there is someone else you know who I should contact for their experience please let me know that as well.

During the last two months I have been collecting as many experiences as I can in an effort to ascertain the influence of typical opscan layouts on questionnaires and want to get more, so am casting the net a little further. I don't have as many as I think would be desirable for the analysis I am doing. Thus, I would really appreciate your help.

Thankyou!

Don Dillman

Don A. Dillman, Deputy Director
for Research and Development
Social and Economic Sciences Research Center
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-4014
phone: 509-335-1511
fax: 509-335-0116
e-mail: dillman@wsu.edu


Fellow APPORNetters,

A couple of months ago, there was a brief discussion concerning procedures for within household respondent selection. As I recall, a particular survey drew the ire of a number of us for asking for the youngest male in the household. This discussion sparked a question in my mind as to whether there really exists a set of systematic random procedures for selecting respondents within households.
For seven years I have been conducting surveys on a regular basis. Over the course of these seven years I have used a number of random selection procedures for choosing respondents from within households. It has been my experience that all of them (Kish and its variants, Birthday method and its variants, Systematic quotas), tend to run into problems because of excessively high refusal rates and/or an over sampling of females. I am a little concerned that a sizable group of female household members (household gatekeepers) are thwarting our profession's systematic, rigorous, and random selection procedures. I am concerned that these procedures are actually resulting in samples that possess systematic biases that are more onerous than biases that are introduced through uncontrolled selection procedures that may only keep a running tally on males vs females and adjust the selection procedures accordingly.

I know that many of you will suggest that my training procedures are somehow lacking. However, I do not believe that this is the problem because I have a very rigorous training program. In addition, many of my surveyors stay with me for two to three years. Since many of my polls are for communities in our rural region (Kansas, the western half), I have also begun to wonder whether this may be a phenomena that is regionally based. However, I must admit, I do not find this to be a compelling explanation.

If you have any suggestions or solutions (perhaps a cite to a journal article that may help me out), or have experienced the same problems, or are like me, you are beginning to wonder whether these particular random selection procedures are not introducing more biases than they are solving, please send your responses to me at:

POJA@fhsuvm.fhsu.edu

or, share your response with everyone on through the list server.

Thank you. Joe Aistrup

>From NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU Wed Oct  9 10:52:54 1996
Return-Path: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU
Received: from UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (uchimvs1.uchicago.edu [128.135.19.10]) by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP id KAA06557 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 9 Oct 1996 10:50:59 -0700 (PDT)
Date:    Wed, 09 Oct 96 12:20 CST
From: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU
Message-Id: <199610091220.CE06557@usc.edu>
Received: from UCHIMVS1.BITNET by UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (IBM MVS SMTP V3R1) with BSMTPT id 5432; Wed, 09 Oct 96 12:49:31 CDT
To: aapornet@USC.EDU

All full-probability surveys I've ever have examined under-represent men regardless of the respondent selection method. Research on the General Social Survey indicates that men are under-represented because a) they are less likely to be at home and b) they are more likely to refuse to participate. Weak recall and conversion efforts lead to a big gender bias, but even the strongest efforts still under-represent men somewhat. tom w smith
Hi Joe,

I was interested in your message, and wondered if you had any data to speak to the potential source of the problem (as mentioned by Tom Smith). If you have detailed call record information from your surveys, you should be able to analyze whether it is (a) mostly females who answer the phone initially, (b) whether it is males or females who are inclined to refuse the initial request for a within-household selection, (c) whether it is the female gatekeepers for selected males, or the selected males themselves who tend to refuse, or (d) once certain respondents are selected, they cannot be contacted in subsequent calls. Given that gender is one characteristics that interviewers are able to reliably ascertain, this information could be collected at each call, and the source of the bias ascertained from the call records. I suspect as Tom Smith does that it there are a variety of factors operating, but I know of no study that has examined the relative contributions of these various factors.

Mick Couper
particular survey drew the ire of a number of us for asking for the
youngest male in the household. This discussion sparked a question in
my mind as to whether there really exists a set of systematic random
procedures for selecting respondents within households.

For seven years I have been conducting surveys on a regular basis.
Over the course of these seven years I have used a number of random
selection procedures for choosing respondents from within households.
It has been my experience that all of them (Kish and its variants,
Birthday method and its variants, Systematic quotas), tend to run into
problems because of excessively high refusal rates and/or an over
sampling of females. I am a little concerned that a sizable group of
female household members (household gatekeepers) are thwarting
our profession's systematic, rigorous, and random selection
procedures. I am concerned that these procedures are actually
resulting in samples that possess systematic biases that are
more onerous than biases that are introduced through
uncontrolled selection procedures that may only keep a running
tally on males vs females and adjust the selection procedures
accordingly.

I know that many of you will suggest that my training procedures are
somehow lacking. However, I do not believe that this is the problem
because I have a very rigorous
training program. In addition, many of my surveyors stay
with me for two to three years. Since many of my polls are for
communities in our rural region (Kansas, the western half), I have
also begun to wonder whether this may be a phenomena that is
regionally based. However, I must admit, I do not find this to be a
compelling explanation.

If you have any suggestions or solutions (perhaps a cite to a journal
article that may help me out), or have experienced the same problems,
or are like me, you are beginning to wonder whether these particular
random selection procedures are not introducing more biases than they
are solving, please send your responses to me at:

POJA@fhsuvm.fhsu.edu

or, share your response with everyone on through the list server.

Thank you. Joe Aistrup
These data are now old (1987) -- but a colleague and I looked into this problem a while back (O'Rourke & Lakner, "Gender Bias: Analysis of Factors Causing Male Underrepresentation in Surveys" International Journal of Public Opinion Research, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1989, 164-176.) based on a telephone survey of 1,000 adult Illinois residents. We kept track of gender of informant, (birthday) respondent selection, gender of selected potential respondent, birthday validation errors, refusals (before and after R selection) & noncontacts. We wound up with an interview case base of 60% females & 40% males. (The IL census at the time indicated 53% females & 47% males in households.) We did not find major differences in gender due to incorrect respondent selection, refusals by the potential R, or noncontacts. Comparing our gender and marital status distribution to the Census, we found that we were mainly missing MARRIED MEN. Although it would not account for the entire discrepancy, the most glaring problem seemed to be one of gatekeeping by married women. Married female informants, after identifying their husbands as the ones who should be the respondents, refused to call them to the phone. (And I'm sure lots of other female informants who refused BEFORE completing respondent selection were doing the same thing.) This is a hard problem to crack!

Diane O'Rourke
Survey Research Laboratory
Univ. of IL
Urbana, IL

>>> Mick Couper <mcouper@survey.umd.edu> 10/09/96 03:59pm >>>
Hi Joe,

I was interested in your message, and wondered if you had any data to speak to the potential source of the problem (as mentioned by Tom Smith). If you have detailed call record information from your surveys, you should be able to analyze whether it is (a) mostly females who answer the phone initially, (b) whether it is males or females who are inclined to refuse the initial request for a within-household selection, (c) whether it is the female gatekeepers for selected males, or the selected males themselves who tend to refuse, or (d) once certain respondents are selected, they cannot be contacted in subsequent calls. Given that gender is one characteristics that interviewers are able to reliably ascertain, this information could be collected at each call, and the source of the bias ascertained from the call records. I suspect as Tom Smith does that it there are a variety of factors operating, but I know of no study that has examined the relative contributions of these various factors.
A couple of months ago, there was a brief discussion concerning procedures for within household respondent selection. As I recall, a particular survey drew the ire of a number of us for asking for the youngest male in the household. This discussion sparked a question in my mind as to whether there really exists a set of systematic random procedures for selecting respondents within households.

For seven years I have been conducting surveys on a regular basis. Over the course of these seven years I have used a number of random selection procedures for choosing respondents from within households. It has been my experience that all of them (Kish and its variants, Birthday method and its variants, Systematic quotas), tend to run into problems because of excessively high refusal rates and/or an over sampling of females. I am a little concerned that a sizable group of female household members (household gatekeepers) are thwarting our profession's systematic, rigorous, and random selection procedures. I am concerned that these procedures are actually resulting in samples that possess systematic biases that are more onerous than biases that are introduced through uncontrolled selection procedures that may only keep a running tally on males vs females and adjust the selection procedures accordingly.

I know that many of you will suggest that my training procedures are somehow lacking. However, I do not believe that this is the problem because I have a very rigorous training program. In addition, many of my surveyors stay with me for two to three years. Since many of my polls are for communities in our rural region (Kansas, the western half), I have also begun to wonder whether this may be a phenomena that is regionally based. However, I must admit, I do not find this to be a compelling explanation.

If you have any suggestions or solutions (perhaps a cite to a journal article that may help me out), or have experienced the same problems, or are like me, you are beginning to wonder whether these particular random selection procedures are not introducing more biases than they are solving, please send your responses to me at: POJA@fhsuvm.fhsu.edu or, share your response with everyone on through the list server.

Thank you. Joe Aistrup
Communication Studies -- Pending approval, the University of Michigan Department of Communication Studies seeks applicants for three positions. Appointments likely at assistant professor level but more advanced candidates will also be considered. Growing department emphasizes mass communication as a social phenomenon and the study of mass media systems, processes, contexts, and effects. Positions available, and possible areas of research and teaching, are as follows. Position 1: Media, culture and society (communication and social identity, including ethnicity, gender and sexuality; media history and theory; media and social movements; or the role of media in maintaining or altering the social order). Position 2: Media and public affairs (media and government; issues of freedom of expression; media and politics, media policy; or comparative media systems). Position 3: Media effects (behavioral impact of the media; effects on social values; media information and development campaigns; children and the media; or educational effects of the media). The University of Michigan is an equal opportunity employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Applicants should send a vita, three letters of recommendation, and evidence of teaching effectiveness to: Search Committee, Department of Communication Studies, 2020 Frieze Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1285. Evaluation of applicants will begin November 15, 1996.
On Wed, 9 Oct 1996, Diane O'Rourke wrote:

> ... Comparing our gender and marital status distribution to the Census, we found that we were mainly missing MARRIED MEN. Although it would not account for the entire discrepancy, the most glaring problem seemed to be one of gatekeeping by married women. Married female informants, after identifying their husbands as the ones who should be the respondents, refused to call them to the phone. (And I'm sure lots of other female informants who refused BEFORE completing respondent selection were doing the same thing.) This is a hard problem to crack!

Hmmm ... any differences on this by gender of interviewer?

Mike Mokrzycki        Associated Press        mikemokr@ap.org

>From ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU Thu Oct 10 10:41:44 1996
Return-Path: ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (ksherril@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.96])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP id KAA26166 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Oct 1996 10:41:42 -0700 (PDT)
Received: (from ksherril@localhost) by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/George) id NAA22808; Thu, 10 Oct 1996 13:44:43 -0400
Date: Thu, 10 Oct 1996 13:44:43 -0400 (EDT)
From: Kenneth Sherrill <ksherril@shiva.Hunter.CUNY.EDU>
To: kenslist <kenslist@queernet.org>
cc: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>,
    Public Opinion Research Discussion <por@unc.edu>
Subject: : NEW: OPINION-L - Your Opinion Counts (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961010134328.21768I-100000@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

FYI

Ken Sherrill
---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Jay Jolicoeur <jay@switchback.com>
To: NEW-LIST@LISTSERVER.NODAK.EDU
Subject: NEW: OPINION-L - Your Opinion Counts

OPINION-L on LISTSERVER@switchcom.net - Your Opinion Counts
OPINION-L is an unmoderated list for anyone who would like to voice an opinion about anything that is on their mind.

List topics are open to anything. The purpose of this list is to provide anyone with a platform to voice their opinion about any issue they may be concerned about. With the upcoming US elections, unrest in the Middle East again, terrorism around the world, new movies, the space program, the weather, etc. everyone has an opinion about something. This is the forum for those opinions.

Although unmoderated, this list is NOT for spamming, advertising, vulgar or abusive language, or lewd behavior. No matter how strong someone's opinion is, or someone's opinion about another person's opinion, let us not sink down to the level of many of today's politicians, but remain civil. Do not take someone's criticism of your opinions personally. The list owner reserves the right to remove anyone from the list who is overly offensive and to shut down the list if it turns into a forum for personal attacks on list members who have submitted articles.

To subscribe, send the following command in the BODY of mail to LISTSERVER@switchcom.net on the Internet:

SUBSCRIBE OPINION-L yourfirstname yourlastname

For example:

SUBSCRIBE OPINION-L Joe Opinion

Owner: Jay Jolicoeur <jay@switchcom.net>

Use this information at your own risk. For more information and disclaimer send E-mail to LISTSERV@LISTSERV.NODAK.EDU with the command INFO NEW-LIST in the body.

>From skeeter@saturn.vcu.edu Thu Oct 10 15:15:02 1996
Return-Path: skeeter@saturn.vcu.edu
Received: from saturn.vcu.edu (saturn.vcu.edu [128.172.2.31])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id PAA17470 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Oct 1996 15:15:00 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by saturn.vcu.edu (AIX 4.1/UCB 5.64/4.03)
    id AA37884; Thu, 10 Oct 1996 18:13:34 -0400
Message-Id: <9610102213.AA37884@saturn.vcu.edu>
Subject: Va. Pres and Senate poll
To: aapornet@usc.edu, por@unc.edu
Date: Thu, 10 Oct 96 18:13:34 EDT
From: Scott Keeter <skeeter@saturn.vcu.edu>
X-Mailer: ELM-MIME [version 1.0 PL0]

>From the Survey Research Laboratory at Virginia Commonwealth University
For immediate release October 10, 1996
Full text and details available on the World Wide Web at
www.vcu.edu/srl/press/cpoll133.htm

Contact: Scott Keeter, poll director
804 828 8035
BILL CLINTON, JOHN WARNER HOLD LEADS AS RACE ENTERS FINAL WEEKS FIRST PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE APPEARS TO HAVE HAD LITTLE IMPACT; JOHN WARNER DOING WELL AMONG INDEPENDENT DEMOCRATS

A new Virginia Commonwealth University poll finds President Bill Clinton leading his Republican opponent, former Sen. Robert J. Dole, by a margin of 7 percentage points in the race for Virginia's 13 electoral votes. In the race for the U.S. Senate, incumbent Sen. John W. Warner holds a 16-point lead over his Democratic challenger, businessman Mark R. Warner. The Republican Warner is receiving the votes of one-in-five Democrats and over 2-in-5 independents who say they lean to the Democratic party.

The Commonwealth Poll found that the first presidential debate, held Oct. 6, had little impact on the views of voters about the candidates, according to interviews conducted by VCU's Survey Research Laboratory.

The poll, conducted by telephone Oct. 2-9, interviewed 1,011 registered voters who said they were likely to vote in the general elections this fall. A total of 1,458 randomly-selected adult residents of Virginia were screened to locate likely voters. The poll has a sampling error of plus or minus approximately 4% for likely voters.

Voters who were aware that John Warner opposed Oliver L. North's 1994 bid for the U.S. Senate were much more likely than others to favor the incumbent. The poll found striking evidence to support the notion that many independent and Democratic-leaning voters may be supporting Senator Warner, in part, because of his stand against North.

Detailed summary, tables, and the full questionnaire at www.vcu.edu/srl/press/cpoll33.htm

--
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Scott Keeter  ..........  skeeter@vcu.edu
Survey Research Laboratory ..............
and Department of Political Science ..............
and Public Administration ..............
Virginia Commonwealth University .............. Phone: 804.828.8035
Richmond, VA 23284-2028 USA .............. Fax: 804.828.7463

From: logoff UNDEFINED <DMCCALLU@UA1VM.UA.EDU>
Organization: The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL
Subject: Missing Males - Reply
To: aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer: MailBook 95.01.263
Message-Id: <961011.110526.CDT.DMCCALLU@ualvm.ua.edu>
An additional factor in this issue which I haven't seen mentioned before: Census data in Alabama show that males are less likely than females to live in households where they are the only adult, i.e., less likely to live alone, and less likely to be single parents. Therefore, in a random sample of households, the likelihood of selecting males is reduced, because there are other adults in the household. When you reach a household with only one adult (most likely a female), of course, that one is automatically in your sample. I don't know if the household data look the same in other areas, but this does particularly address our usual difficulty in reaching young single men (who also are rarely at home during typical polling hours) and older single men. It does not help with the missing married men mentioned by Diane O'Rourke.

One additional anecdote regarding the gatekeeping issue-- when we were conducting a survey of youth (12-17), we quickly learned to ask permission from mothers, rather than fathers. In this case the women were less stringent gatekeepers than the men.

Debra McCallum
Capstone Poll, Institute for Social Science Research
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL
dmcallu@ualvm.ua.edu

About the sex ratio problem in telephone surveys using respondent selection:
Chuck Denk and I presented a paper on respondent selection at AAPOR in Salt Lake City, one of several in an excellent session regarding issues in respondent selection. Please send an e-mail directly to me if you'd like a copy of that paper.

We report there the important finding (which has previously been published by others, I believe) that a PERFECT random selection within household protocol would only generate about 45% male respondents, because there are far more female-only households than there are male-only households. We use PUMS data to show this in our paper. The female percent in the population (52, 53%) is an unattainable target when there is one respondent per household, unless one intentionally weights the selection protocol to favor men.

We further report that there is little or no difference in male vs female rates of cooperation at various stages of the recruitment process. The key
problem is that respondent 2 (the chosen respondent if that's not the one who answered the phone) is often not home or not available, and must be called back. Call-backs are never 100% effective. Thus, any 'hand-off' results in predictable levels of failure to get the targeted respondent. Because females are much more likely to answer (or be home) in the male-female households, it is the mechanics of the hand-off process that result in the loss of males. As Chuck Denk wrote in our paper: "It's the hand-offs, stupid".

BTW, Chuck is now at Mathematica Policy Research and you can send a note to him at ced@mprnj.com if you'd like some harder numbers on all this, or a copy of our REVISED paper which is currently under review.

CSR is continuing our experimental work in exploring these issues.

Tom

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

We are looking for a forms processing software package which would allow us to scan completed mail questionnaires with a document imaging scanner and capture data without the need for entering data manually. We want to be able to use our standard, attractive mail surveys, and not use "fill-in-the-bubble with a number 2 pencil" scan sheets. So far we have not found software packages we like. If anyone out there knows of anything along these lines that you might recommend, please e-mail me directly at: penaloza@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu

Thanks for your help! I'd be delighted to publish what I come up with to the general list.

Linda J. Penaloza
"I am a little concerned that a sizable group of female household members (household gatekeepers) are thwarting our profession's systematic, rigorous, and random selection procedures."

Do women disproportionately answer the door in enumerative surveys? Others have mentioned that this varies based on household composition and, calling on the household at a time when men are more/less at home. If it is 'systematic', where and how much is it affecting your data? Couper et al. found that in 60% (+/-) of households, one person opens the mail. It's possible that if there's a gatekeeper on mail, that there is a doorstep gatekeeper, a telephone gatekeeper, but is it usually one person and why? I would think that depending on the survey topic, environment, etc., reluctance in rostering could be correlated with some of your survey measures. If it's not, do you have a problem, then?

Eileen O'Brien
eobrien@nass.usda.gov

Eileen O'Brien
eobrien@nass.usda.gov

Eileen O'Brien
eobrien@nass.usda.gov
Debra McCallum wrote ...

An additional factor in this issue which I haven't seen mentioned before: Census data in Alabama show that males are less likely than females to live in households where they are the only adult, i.e., less likely to live alone, and less likely to be single parents. Therefore, in a random sample of households, the likelihood of selecting males is reduced, because there are other adults in the household.

We deal with this by designating phone numbers as "male recruitment" or "female recruitment" when we are using RDD to recruit controls for our population-based studies that use both men and women. When the interviewer has RDD numbers that are designated "male recruitment", only men in the household are enumerated and recruited. The number of phone numbers that must be called using this method is the same as would have to be called if only one household member per household was recruited at each call. This also avoids the problem of under-recruitment of men and women who live in a household with the opposite sex -- if only one person in the household is selected, they have 1/2 a chance of being selected, whereas a single male (or female) living alone has a 100% chance of selection.

Lynda Voigt
lvoigt@cclink.fhcrc.org

I am forwarding this to AAPORNET for Mark Schulman.

****************************************************************
Where have the men gone in our surveys?

One of the most thorough examinations of the impact of respondent selection methods on sample gender composition is Charles Denk, Thomas Guterbock and Can Gold, "Modelling Selection of Respondents Within Household in Telephone
Surveys," presented at the 1996 AAPOR meeting in Salt Lake City. The authors developed a behavior model for response rate and, importantly, gender mix of the sample. They randomly assigned attempted interviews into three selection methods: first available adult, last birthday, and selection based upon household inventory. They then carefully analyze every stage of the process, from initial answering of the phone to the handoff to the selected respondent.

Their findings affecting gender sample composition include the following:

1. Men are less likely to answer the phone.

2. Men and women are not uniformly distributed across households. Absolutely random selection of adults in households would yield a sample of 55% female, based on PUMS data.

3. Attempted "handoffs" to the selected respondent, where the person answering the phone is not the selected respondent, produce lower cooperation, because of the need for additional consent. Since handoffs are disproportionately targeted at males (because females are more likely to answer the phone), this contributes to undercount of men in our surveys.

In short, the key factor in the male undercount is, according to them, "It's the handoff, stupid."

The authors are at the University of Virginia.

Mark Schulman
Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc
212-779-7700
pollmark@nyc.pipeline.com

>From lvoigt@cclink.fhcrc.org Fri Oct 11 16:17:02 1996
Return-Path: lvoigt@cclink.fhcrc.org
Received: from bug1.fhcrc.org (bug1.fhcrc.org [140.107.10.110]) by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP id QAA23344 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Oct 1996 16:17:01 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ccout.fhcrc.org (ccout.fhcrc.org [140.107.10.17]) by bug1.fhcrc.org (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id QAA11977 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Oct 1996 16:17:01 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ccMail by ccout.fhcrc.org (IMA Internet Exchange 1.04b) id 25ed5eb0; Fri, 11 Oct 96 16:19:07 -0700
Mime-Version: 1.0
Date: Fri, 11 Oct 1996 16:11:49 -0700
Message-ID: <25ed5eb0@cclink.fhcrc.org>
From: lvoigt@cclink.fhcrc.org (lvoigt)
Subject: Male respondents
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

[002] Mail was received that was addressed to unknown addresses. Mail item was not delivered to:
CORP/NIP1/erz1
Debra McCallum wrote ...

An additional factor in this issue which I haven't seen mentioned before:
Census data in Alabama show that males are less likely than females to live in households where they are the only adult, i.e., less likely to live alone, and less likely to be single parents. Therefore, in a random sample of households, the likelihood of selecting males is reduced, because there are other adults in the household.

We deal with this by designating phone numbers as "male recruitment" or "female recruitment" when we are using RDD to recruit controls for our population-based studies that use both men and women. When the interviewer has RDD numbers that are designated "male recruitment", only men in the household are enumerated and recruited. The number of phone numbers that must be called using this method is the same as would have to be called if only one household member per household was recruited at each call. This also avoids the problem of under-recruitment of men and women who live in a household with the opposite sex -- if only one person in the household is selected, they have 1/2 a chance of being selected, whereas a single male (or female) living alone has a 100% chance of selection.

Lynda Voigt
lvoigt@cclink.fhcrc.org

Tom
I would like a copy of the paper you mentioned on respondent selection on aapornet.
"The truth is rarely pure and never simple. Modern life would be tedious if it were either, and modern literature a complete impossibility!" -- Oscar Wilde "The Importance of Being Earnest"

Is anyone aware of any literature on the pro's and con's of using differential incentives -- i.e., incentives offered to only a subgroup of respondents, such as refusals or hard to reach populations?

Reply directly to me
jmclemen@umich.edu

Thank you.
Mea Culpa

Don't do what I did; make sure you are smart enough to reply directly to Tom.

Leo

>>> Leo G. Simonetta <ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu> 10/12/96 01:08pm
>>> Tom

I would like a copy of the paper you mentioned on respondent selection on aapornet.

Mailing Address
Leo G. Simonetta
Survey Research Lab
P.O. Box 4039
Georgia State University
Atlanta GA 30302

Thanks

Leo G. Simonetta (404) 651-3539
ARCLGS@LANGATE.GSU.EDU Applied Research Center
My opinions, mine, all mine.

"The truth is rarely pure and never simple. Modern life would be tedious if it were either, and modern literature a complete impossibility!" -- Oscar Wilde
"The Importance of Being Earnest"

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Oct 13 15:02:26 1996
Return-Path: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.166])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA19431 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 13 Oct 1996 15:02:25 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.3/usc) with SMTP
    id PAA08114 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 13 Oct 1996 15:02:25 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Sun, 13 Oct 1996 15:02:25 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Query from Non-Subscriber
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.92.961013145748.7848A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
I have some questions I would like to pose to your subscribers regarding undecided voters. Please let me know if you can forward this message for me. I would be happy to share the results with your subscribers. Thanks.

First, How do you report the size of the undecided vote?

Second, Do you allocate the undecided vote? Why or Why not?

Third, What method, if any, do you use? Even-split, proportional to decided vote?

Finally, Is the undecided vote treated differently for national v. local (state, city, county, etc.) campaigns?

Thank you.

Thomas S. Gruca
College of Business
University of Iowa
thomas-gruca@uiowa.edu

JOB ANNOUNCEMENT
The Survey Section of the Statistical Laboratory at Iowa State University (Ames, Iowa) has a position open for a computer assisted telephone interview (CATI) programmer. The ISU Stat Lab conducts 15 to 20 research projects each year on a variety of topics and modes of data collection.

Job Title
Systems Support Specialist I

Job Summary
Program computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) questionnaires and associated production reports, develop questionnaire coding procedures, download data from completed questionnaires. Work with survey operations staff to clean and edit data sets. Work with systems analyst to select software/network upgrades for CATI lab. Work closely with operational survey staff project teams to accomplish assigned tasks within study time lines.

Duties
Works with project manager to program survey instruments and production reports using CASES software. Works with a team of questionnaire testers to debug questionnaires and improve usability of instruments.

Works with survey operations staff on coding, data cleaning, and data deliveries of CATI and non-CATI studies. Uses software (SAS preferably) to help clean survey data. Produces databases, and case production reports.

Works with systems analyst to maintain CATI Lab hardware, approx. 25 PCs, server, printers, link to University's UNIX system.

Works with project manager and telephone supervisors to develop and implement training sessions. Assists with training.

Qualifications
Bachelor's degree in computer science, social sciences, or related field. Some computing coursework. Employee must have some programming experience and knowledge of PC-based systems. Survey research experienced preferred.

Salary

Send resume and names of references to:
Andrew Williams
Survey Projects Manager
Survey Section, Statistical Laboratory
216 Snedecor Hall
Iowa State University
Ames IA 50011

For additional details visit the ISU Job Page:
http://www.iastate.edu/~hrs_info/jobs/ps.html
Today the Star Tribune published the results of the most recent Minnesota Poll of likely voters that examined the race between Republican challenger Rudy Boschwitz and Sen. Paul Wellstone. Below is a summary of these and other recent results. If you care for more information, you can go to http://www.startribune.com and click on the "metro" button on the newspaper's home page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>7-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=1,207</td>
<td>n=701</td>
<td>n=900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paul Wellstone 47% 43% 47%
Rudy Boschwitz 39 42 38
Dean Barkley 7 2 3
Other candidates 2 3 7
No opinion 5 10 5

Rob Daves
Director of Polling & News Research
Star Tribune
425 Portland Av. S. Minneapolis MN 55488 USA
daves@startribune.com v: 612/673-7278 f: 612/673-4359

Received: from post5.inre.asu.edu by asu.edu (PMDF V5.0-4 #7723) id HAA15256 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 07:39:01 -0700 (PDT)

From: Warren Miller <ICWEM@ASUVM.INRE.ASU.EDU>
SECOND REQUEST: PLEASE REMOVE MY NAME FROM YOUR LIST SERVE I DO NOT WANT TO RECEIVE SO MANY MESSAGES.

THANK YOU

Bill--though this is not interesting to you as a job, there is some good language to use in your job description, with a number of modifications. file this somewhere for next time. --shap

JOB ANNOUNCEMENT

The Survey Section of the Statistical Laboratory at Iowa State University (Ames, Iowa) has a position open for a computer assisted telephone interview (CATI) programmer. The ISU Stat Lab conducts 15 to 20 research projects each year on a variety of topics and modes of data collection.

Job Title
Systems Support Specialist I

Job Summary
Program computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) questionnaires and associated production reports, develop questionnaire coding procedures, download data from completed questionnaires. Work with survey operations staff to clean and edit data sets. Work with systems analyst to select software/network upgrades for CATI lab. Work closely with operational survey staff project teams to accomplish assigned tasks within study time
Duties
Works with project manager to program survey instruments and production reports using CASES software. Works with a team of questionnaire testers to debug questionnaires and improve usability of instruments.

Works with survey operations staff on coding, data cleaning, and data deliveries of CATI and non-CATI studies. Uses software (SAS preferably) to help clean survey data. Produces databases, and case production reports.

Works with systems analyst to maintain CATI Lab hardware, approx. 25 PCs, server, printers, link to University's UNIX system.

Works with project manager and telephone supervisors to develop and implement training sessions. Assists with training.

Qualifications
Bachelor's degree in computer science, social sciences, or related field. Some computing course work. Employee must have some programming experience and knowledge of PC-based systems. Survey research experienced preferred.

Salary

Send resume and names of references to:
Andrew Williams
Survey Projects Manager
Survey Section, Statistical Laboratory
216 Snedecor Hall
Iowa State University
Ames IA 50011

For additional details visit the ISU Job Page:
http://www.iastate.edu/~hrs_info/jobs/ps.html
I'm attempting to compile a list of all the CATI software packages available out there (for example, ACS-Query & CASES). It would be fantastic if you could include any phone numbers/addresses of the company that creates the software.

Please send all responses directly to:
   kcbreese@christa.unh.edu

Thank you so much!

Kara Breese  
Assistant Director/Information Specialist  
UNH Survey Center  
(603) 862-2983 Phone  
(603) 862-1488 Fax  
kcbreese@christa.unh.edu

Hi there,

I think you have me mistaken for someone else. Have we met? This is Bill Thompson in Alexandria, VA.

Bill Thompson
Public Opinion Strategies
(703) 548-8800 Phone
(703) 548-8820 Fax
billt@pos.org
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Job Announcement -- CATI Programmer

Bill--though this is not interesting to you as a job, there is some good language to use in your job description, with a number of modifications. file this somewhere for next time.

JOB ANNOUNCEMENT

The Survey Section of the Statistical Laboratory at Iowa State University (Ames, Iowa) has a position open for a computer assisted telephone interview (CATI) programmer. The ISU Stat Lab conducts 15 to 20 research projects each year on a variety of topics and modes of data collection.

Job Title
Systems Support Specialist I

Job Summary
Program computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) questionnaires and associated production reports, develop questionnaire coding procedures, download data from completed questionnaires. Work with survey operations staff to clean and edit data sets. Work with systems analyst to select software/network upgrades for CATI lab. Work closely with operational survey staff project teams to accomplish assigned tasks within study time lines.

Duties
Works with project manager to program survey instruments and production reports using CASES software. Works with a team of questionnaire testers to debug questionnaires and improve usability of instruments.

Works with survey operations staff on coding, data cleaning, and data deliveries of CATI and non-CATI studies. Uses software (SAS preferably) to help clean survey data. Produces databases, and case production reports.

Works with systems analyst to maintain CATI Lab hardware, approx. 25 PCs, server, printers, link to University's UNIX system.

Works with project manager and telephone supervisors to develop and implement training sessions. Assists with training.

Qualifications
Bachelor's degree in computer science, social sciences, or related field.

Some computing course work. Employee must have some programming experience and knowledge of PC-based systems. Survey research experienced preferred.
Salary

Send resume and names of references to:
Andrew Williams
Survey Projects Manager
Survey Section, Statistical Laboratory
216 Snedecor Hall
Iowa State University
Ames IA 50011

For additional details visit the ISU Job Page:
http://www.iastate.edu/~hrs_info/jobs/ps.html

Regards, Bill

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

Bill Thompson, Virginia, USA

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

To all AAPORNETers:

My sincerest apologies. I believe I have posted a reply to the entire list when my intention was to reply to the individual.

I am normally more careful than that.

Sorry again...

Bill Thompson
PUBLIC OPINION ANALYST - IMMEDIATE OPENING

Public Agenda - a nonpartisan, not-for-profit, research organization - has an opening for an issue-oriented public opinion analyst. We are searching for someone who can conduct qualitative research - especially focus groups - and who can help design surveys as well. This is a wonderful opportunity to do challenging, high-quality work in a very collegial atmosphere.

Responsibilities will include:
- conducting focus groups and in-depth interviews with leaders
- helping to design survey questionnaires
- report-writing and editing
- preparing and making presentations
- negotiating prices and study specifications with suppliers
- arranging travel and logistical details
- using on-line data bases

Applicants should:
- be highly organized and detail-oriented
- have a graduate degree
- be computer-literate
- be able to work independently
- be able to work on several different projects simultaneously
- be able to work under pressure
- be willing to travel frequently
- be able to write quickly and crisply

Founded in 1975 by public opinion analyst Daniel Yankelovich and former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, Public Agenda works to help citizens better understand critical policy issues and to help the nations' leaders better understand the public's point of view. It is widely respected for the quality and depth of its nonpartisan opinion research.

Respond to:
Steve Farkas, Vice President and Director of Research
The Public Agenda Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, NY 10016
fax: 1 212 889-3461
To: aapornet@usc.edu, srmsnet@umdd.umd.edu
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: JOB POSTING: Asst. Director for Survey Operations

PH.D. LEVEL POSITION AVAILABLE: Assistant Director for Operations at Ohio State University's new survey center on the Columbus campus.

PREFERRED STARTING DATE: November 11, 1996

EDUCATION/BACKGROUND: Ph.D. in a quantitative social science discipline, with a solid background in research methodology and in survey methods, in particular.

In addition, the person being sought should be enthused about survey research, have a high energy level yet with a relaxed demeanor, have strong interpersonal skills, be a "team player," and be a highly reliable individual of utmost integrity.

UNIT DESCRIPTION: Ohio State University's College of Social and Behavioral Sciences established a new survey research unit in July, 1996. The mission of the unit includes: (1) enhance OSU faculty and student scholarship through the conduct of high quality, cost-beneficial survey research and, thereby, add to the academic reputation of the University; (2) provide survey research services to internal and external (public- and private-sector) clients; (3) train students in survey research methods; and (4) advance the state of knowledge in survey methodology.

The unit contains a 20-station CATI facility. Five social science departments of the College have assigned a total of 10 full-year doctoral-track graduate assistantships to the survey center. A number of other University and College resources also have been committed to provide the unit a solid financial underpinning.

In November, 1996, the unit will field the first of a continuing monthly survey of Ohio residents, the "Buckeye State Poll." This RDD survey, with a monthly sample size varying between 800-1,200, will gather a varied set of social indicators on a recurring monthly or quarterly basis. The Columbus
Dispatch and WBNS-TV are major funders of this monthly statewide survey.

POSITION DESCRIPTION/RESPONSIBILITIES: The Assistant Director for Operations is a full-time, salaried position. The person reports to the Director of the center who is a tenured member of the OSU faculty with a 50% administrative appointment to the unit. The Asst. Director is charged with overseeing the daily operations and services of the unit. This primarily includes maintaining a high calibre CATI data collection and data processing staff. The Asst. Director works with the Director to develop the operational polices/practices of the unit and sees that they are routinely implemented at a high level of quality and quantity. On occasion, the Asst. Director will serve as project director for client-sponsored studies and may be required to provide full survey research services to select clients (e.g., questionnaire development and refinement, sampling advice, analyses, and report writing). The Asst. Director also is expected to help advance the scholarship mission of the center by collaborating on original research in survey methods. The Asst. Director works with the Director to help market the unit’s services to potential internal and external clients.

APPLICATION: Interested and qualified individuals should fax a brief cover letter and vita/resume to the attention of the center's director, Dr. Paul J. Lavrakas, at 614-292-6673, or mailed to his attention at Room 0126 Derby Hall, Ohio State University, 154 N Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210.

The Ohio State University is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action Employer. Women, minorities, veterans, and individuals with disabilities are encouraged to apply.

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

>From ABIDER@american.edu Wed Oct 16 21:49:03 1996
Return-Path: ABIDER@AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (smtp@auvm.american.edu [147.9.1.2])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id VAA18838 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 16 Oct 1996 21:49:00 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <199610170449.VAA18838@usc.edu>
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
    with BSMTP id VAA18838 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 16 Oct 1996 21:49:00 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <199610170449.VAA18838@usc.edu>
Received: from american.edu (NJE origin ABIDER@AUVM) by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
    (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 0577; Thu, 17 Oct 1996 00:47:54 -0400
Date: Thu, 17 Oct 96 00:44:42 EDT
From: Albert Biderman <ABIDER@american.edu>
Organization: The American University
Subject: Obit: BSSR's Rosa Brown Greene
To: aapornet@usc.edu

ROSA BROWN GREENE, May 13, 1927 – Sep 29, 1996

During the 1960's and '70's, the many social scientists who did stints at
the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. (BSSR) in Washington D.C. got to
enjoy the wit, wisdom, and sass of Rosa Brown Greene. Hundreds of other
researchers encountered her in seminars, conferences and consortia organized
by BSSR or at AAPOR annual conferences where she worked at registration.
She was at various times secretary to the Director of BSSR, Robert T. Bower,
and to its assistant directors Albert D. Biderman and Laure M. Sharp. She
worked also at the Brookings Institution as a conference organizer and for
the American Association of Psychiatric Services for Children.

A precocious honor graduate of Washington's Dunbar High
School during its heyday, Greene was admitted to Howard University as a
15-year-old physics major. She worked for the Atomic Energy Commission as
it emerged from the Manhattan Project. She quit on discovering that her
work was directed toward developing a hydrogen bomb. She first worked at
BSSR in 1958 as a typist where she quickly revealed an ability to convert
rough drafts speed into grammatically and orthographically flawless
documents as she typed them at
high speed. Her name can be found in the acknowledgments of
numerous books and monographs by BSSR authors.

A case of her sociological practice illustrates well Greene's character.
She was angered by frequent instances of black cab drivers passing up blacks
or refusing to take fares to "bad" sections of town and she brought legal
actions against violations she could document. Her response to the
protestations, "You would do the same if you were driving this cab," was to
get a hack license and to drive her cab with the firm policy of taking any
fare anywhere.

Greene died at the Capitol Hill Nursing Home in Washington, D.C. on
September 28 after a long illness.

--Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

MANAGER, SYSTEMS AND PROGRAMMING STAFF

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. is seeking a manager to oversee and
direct activities of programmers and systems analysts in its Princeton,
NJ office. MPR is an employee-owned company that conducts domestic
policy research and provides survey research services for government
agencies and private industry.
DUTIES
The manager supervises, oversees, and assists three systems analysts and four programmers to meet the needs of clients and the company. Leads the staff in the specification and implementation of systems and programming requirements in the areas of (1) computer-assisted data collection (CATI/CAPI), (2) sample selection and tracking, (3) use of automated tools for survey management and coding, (4) analysis file creation, and (5) other systems tasks. Recommends computer hardware and software to meet the company's needs. Writes system specifications, technical memos, reports, and data processing sections of proposals. Develops or reviews budget specifications. Works on specialized programming projects that require advanced programming and systems skills.

QUALIFICATIONS
Masters degree in computer science, social science, mathematics, statistics, economics or related field, OR equivalent experience from which comparable knowledge can be gained. Experience with computer-assisted interviewing software such as CASES, Blaise, Autoquest, or similar, and with UNIX and C is required. Twelve plus years of work experience. Experience supervising exempt and nonexempt systems and programming staff essential. Excellent oral and written communication skills.

MPR offers a competitive salary commensurate with qualifications and comprehensive benefits that include an on-site fitness center and three weeks vacation. To apply, please send your resume, salary requirements, and three references to Patricia Shirkness at P.O. Box 2393, Princeton, NJ 08543-2393. Fax: 609-799-0005. E-mail: PBS@MPRNJ.COM. Mathematica Policy Research is an equal opportunity employer.

>From GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov Thu Oct 17 12:04:19 1996
Return-Path: GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov
Received: from dcatge ([146.142.4.13])
  by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
  id MAA17869 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Thu, 17 Oct 1996 12:04:16 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from [146.142.42.8] by mailgate.bls.gov (5.x/SMI-SVR4)
  id AB14448; Thu, 17 Oct 1996 15:01:08 -0400
Received: by psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server
  Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.993.5)
  id <01BBBC3C.71717060@psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov>; Thu, 17 Oct 1996
  15:04:07 -0400
Message-Id: <c=US%a=%p=BLs%l=BLs/PSB/00029FFA@psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov>
From: Goldberg_K <Goldenberg_K@OEUS.PSB.BLS.GOV>
To: "SRMSnet" <LISTSERV@UMDD.UMD.EDU>, "AAPORnet" <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>,
  "CommStat:PSB" <commstat@dcatge.bls.gov>, "por"
  <por@irss.unc.edu>
Subject: AAPOR 1997 Call for Papers/Participation/Posters
Date: Thu, 17 Oct 1996 15:03:00 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version
  4.0.993.5
Encoding: 174 TEXT

Apologies for the cross-posting to those of you on multiple lists.
CALL FOR PAPERS AND PARTICIPATION
52nd Annual Conference
American Association for Public Opinion Research

Norfolk Waterside Marriott, Norfolk, Virginia
May 15 - 18, 1997

PAPERS AND SESSIONS
The American Association for Public Opinion Research will hold its 52nd annual conference in Norfolk, Virginia, in May of 1997. We hope the conference will appeal to AAPOR's diverse membership and to others with an interest in public opinion research and survey methodology. We plan a wide range of sessions and other activities. AAPOR's Conference Committee seeks proposals for papers, panels, and round tables that will illuminate important research questions, increase the skills of AAPOR's membership and the public opinion research community, and promote the development of our profession.

Papers, panels, and round table ideas on any topic in public opinion and survey research are welcomed for consideration for next May's conference. We especially encourage less formal presentations that will appeal to those working in the commercial sector. In addition, we are particularly interested in proposals that look to the future of survey research, its changing methods, and the changing context in which surveys and polls are carried out.

The list of suggested topics given below is meant only to suggest the breadth of our interests, not to limit the scope of proposals. The wide range of interests of AAPOR's members is a strength of the organization and a contributor to the success of its conferences.

Ideology
Attitudes and Attitude Change
Religious Attitudes
Racism and Racial Attitudes
Telephone Polling
Exit Polls
Random-Digit Dialing
Media Research
Methods of Telephone Sampling
Response Rates
Political Knowledge
Interviewer Training
Respondent Incentives
Political Advertising
The Impact of Nonresponse
Computer-Assisted Data Collection
The Interviewer
The Survey Interview as Interaction
New Modes of Data Collection
Measurement Error
Questionnaire Design
Weighting and Imputation
Proxy Responding
New Technologies and Survey Methods
Political Attitudes
CALL FOR POSTER SESSION PROPOSALS

AAPOR's Conference Committee invites proposals for research to be presented at a poster session, which will be part of the official program of the conference.

Posters will be expected to describe substantive or methodological findings from current or recently completed research. This information will be presented on a poster board, usually including four to six pages of text, tables, charts, and diagrams. At least one author of the paper will remain near the poster throughout the poster session to explain or discuss the findings, as the audience circulates among the displays. A poster is a particularly appropriate means for presenting preliminary findings from projects still in progress, for describing small-scale studies, or for presenting the results of replications of earlier studies.

Please submit three copies of an abstract (of no more than 250 words) of your proposed poster session, INCLUDING TWO OR THREE KEY WORDS DESCRIBING THE TOPIC, by December 15, 1996, to this year's Conference Committee Chair, Roger Tourangeau, at the address below.

ADDRESS FOR ALL PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS:
Roger Tourangeau
c/o The Joint Program in Survey Methodology
1218 LeFrak Hall
College Park, Maryland 20782

Be sure to attach an Author Information form, including your name, mailing address, telephone number(s), and, if possible, an electronic mail address. You will receive confirmation that your proposal has been received. Final decisions about the proposals and posters accepted for the program will be made by the end of January and you will be notified about the status of your proposal shortly thereafter.

************************************************************************
*************
1997 AAPOR Conference      May 15 - 18      Norfolk, Virginia
AUTHOR INFORMATION
*************
*************
SUBMISSION DEADLINE: December 15, 1996
*****************************************************************************
Send form and abstract to:
Roger Tourangeau
AAPOR Conference Chair
c/o The Joint Program in Survey Methodology
1218 LeFrak Hall
College Park, MD 20782
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Please supply the following information. (If multiple authors, give information for each author.)

Name: ____________________________________________
AAPOR Member? Yes ___ No ___
Affiliation: _______________________________________
Address: _________________________________________
(CONTACT AUTHOR)
Phone: ___________________________________________
E-mail: __________________________________________

Name: ____________________________________________
AAPOR Member? Yes ___ No ___
Affiliation: _______________________________________
Address: _________________________________________
Phone: ___________________________________________
E-mail: __________________________________________

Name: ____________________________________________
AAPOR Member? Yes ___ No ___
Affiliation: _______________________________________
Address: _________________________________________
Phone: ___________________________________________
E-mail: __________________________________________

Name: ____________________________________________
AAPOR Member? Yes ___ No ___
Affiliation: _______________________________________
Address: _________________________________________
Phone: ___________________________________________
E-mail: __________________________________________

>From dillmand@mail.wsu.edu Fri Oct 18 10:22:29 1996
Many thanks for your response. I appreciate it. You had a good way of getting high response! Don

> from Rachel A. Hickson: I have used op-scan for group administration
> of
> self-administered surveys. For example, when at Response Analysis I did a
> survey of junior high school students that was administered in their school
> system. Response rate, etc. were very high because they were required to do
> it then and there.
>
> I have not used op-scan for general pop mail surveys.
>
>> Have you set out a questionnaire by mail that was designed for optical
>> scanning?
>> If so, I would really appreciate your help. I'd like to know
>>
>> 1) the population
>> 2) the response rate
>> 3) number of contacts including replacement questionnaires
>> 4) Your impressions of any influence of layout on response rates
>> 5) Length of survey
>>
>> I plan to summarize experiences as grouped data so will not reveal
>> response information for individual surveys.
>>
>> My phone, fax and e-mail address are below.
>>
>> Also, if there is someone else you know who I should contact for their
>> experience please let me know that as well.
>>
>> During the last two months I have been collecting as many experiences
>> as I can in an effort to ascertain the influence of typical opscan
>> layouts on questionnaires and want to get more, so am casting the net
>> a little further. I don't have as many as I think would be desirable
>> for the analysis I am doing. Thus, I would really appreciate your
>> help.
How do we measure strength of belief, or devotion to the cause, or intensity, or whatever, in a sample survey? Matalin, in a TV interview claimed that the polls are for Clinton by a large margin, but there's no "intensity", in that his strength is "soft", and easily swayed, whereas Dole's support is very "intense", in that people could be dragged across an active freeway but they would still be voting for him (I don't quite get
that analogy, but I'll let it go). How does she know this? What questions convey such information, or should? Have there been such questions in political polls?

Please advise.

Jim Press
jpress@ucrac1.ucr.edu

>From David_Moore@internet.gallup.com Mon Oct 21 06:49:24 1996
Return-Path: David_Moore@internet.gallup.com
Received: from gateway.gallup.com (firewall-user@gateway.gallup.com [206.158.235.2])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP
    id GAA16794 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Oct 1996 06:49:22 -0700
(PDT)
From: David_Moore@internet.gallup.com
Received: (from uucp=localhost) by gateway.gallup.com (8.7.4/8.6.11) id IAA22180 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Oct 1996 08:46:35 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from internt2.gallup.com(198.247.195.182) by gateway.gallup.com via smap (3.2)
    id xma022158; Mon, 21 Oct 96 08:46:05 -0500
Received: from ccMail by internet.gallup.com (SMTP/2.11 PreRelease 4)
    id AA845913171; Mon, 21 Oct 96 08:52:23 CDT
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 96 08:52:23 CDT
Message-Id: <9609218459.AA845913171@internet.gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: a query

In response to the query by Jim Press about intensity of support for the candidates:

The Gallup/CNN/USA Today tracking poll measures intensity in two ways: 1) a follow-up question to the basic horserace question asking whether a person feels strongly or only moderately about their choice, and -- in different surveys -- a follow-up question that asks respondents about the candidates they did NOT choose: "Is there any chance you could vote for xxx, or is there no chance whatsoever?"

The trend for the Strongly/Moderately method is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 15-16</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 7-8</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2-3</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the last two polls, 57%-58% of Clinton's support was "strong," while 57% to 59% of Dole's support was "strong." In the Oct 2-3 poll, 51% of Clinton's support was "strong," compared with 58% of Dole's (although, of course, Clinton's base was larger).

The "any chance/no chance" question allows us to categorize voters
into four categories depending on their support for each candidate: core supporter, soft supporter, potential supporter, and no chance. Core supporters say they will vote for the candidate and there is no chance they will vote for either of the other two candidates. Soft supporters choose the candidate, but say there is a chance they could vote for another. Potential supporters choose another candidate, but say they could vote for this one. And "no chance" is self-explanatory. The trend for this question is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Soft</th>
<th>Potntl</th>
<th>No Chance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 11-12</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | Clinton | 34  | 17  | 14  | 35 |
| Dole | 24 | 11 | 19  | 45  |
| Perot | 2  | 5 | 19  | 74  |

Adding the "core" and "soft" support gives the vote choice for that poll. Thus, Oct 11-12 showed Clinton with 56%, Dole 35% and Perot 4%.

Note that Clinton's core support is larger than Dole's, and the number of voters who say "no chance" about Clinton is proportionately smaller.

These two ways of looking at the data suggest that contrary to Mary Matalin's assertion, there are more people who feel strongly about (or who are "core" supporters of) Clinton than feel strongly about Dole or who are "core" supporters of Dole. On the other hand, whether any of the voters could be "dragged across an active freeway" to vote for their candidate was not, per se, addressed by these questions.

David Moore
The Gallup Organization
609-924-9600
david_moore@internet.gallup.com

Subject: a query
Author: aapornet@usc.edu at Internet
Date: 10/20/96 1:03 AM

Dear AAPOR folks-- Jim Press asked that I post the following message -- you can reply directly to him -- his address is at the end. Thanks, Judy Tanur

How do we measure strength of belief, or devotion to the cause, or intensity, or whatever, in a sample survey? Matalin, in a TV interview claimed that the polls are for Clinton by a large margin, but there's no "intensity", in that his strength is "soft", and easily swayed, whereas Dole's support is very "intense", in that people could be dragged across an active freeway but they would still be voting for him (I don't quite get that analogy, but I'll let it go). How does she know this? What questions
convey such information, or should? Have there been such questions in political polls?

Please advise.
Jim Press
jpress@ucrac1.ucr.edu

>From Usapolls@aol.com Mon Oct 21 17:34:02 1996
Return-Path: Usapolls@aol.com
Received: from emout17.mail.aol.com (emout17.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.43])
   by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
   id RAA03394 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Oct 1996 17:33:59 -0700 (PDT)
From: Usapolls@aol.com
Received: by emout17.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id UAA16880 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 21 Oct 1996 20:33:30 -0400
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 1996 20:33:30 -0400
Message-ID: <961021203328_1611457852@emout17.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: OpScanQuestionnaire--need recommended scan equip

Some time back I requested information on software, hardware for the optical scanning of questionnaires. I received several helpful suggestions and purchased a piece of software that portends to be a perfect solution. I will share results with those who are interested once we have completed our first project.

At this point, we need to purchase a scanner with a sheet feeder to accommodate high volume processing of surveys (several hundred to several thousand per project). We do not, however, need resolution higher than 300dpi, nor do we need color. Two sided would be a plus (dependant on cost), but is not essential. I would appreciate suggestions you might have for equipment. A sheet feed capacity of 50 would probably be OK, but dependant on cost might consider more (or even less)

Again, I will share results with those indicating an interest.

Mike O'Neil
O'Neil Associates
412 East Southern Ave.
Tempe, AZ 85282
602.967-4441
fax 967-6122

many thanks
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Oct 22 06:58:11 1996
Return-Path: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.166])
   by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA07313 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Oct 1996 06:58:09 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.3/usc) with SMTP
   id GAA22717 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Oct 1996 06:58:08 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Tue, 22 Oct 1996 06:58:08 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
Illinois State University. The Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology invites applications for a tenure-track position at the Assistant Professor level to begin August, 1997. A primary area of specialization in statistics and/or quantitative methods is required; secondary areas of specialization are open. Candidates must have completed a Ph.D. in Sociology or Anthropology by the time of the appointment. Review of applications will begin November 30, 1996. Send curriculum vitae, a statement of current research and teaching interests, and three letters of reference to: Search Committee, Illinois State University, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, Box 4660, Normal, IL 61790-4660. ISU is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer encouraging diversity.
issues. Must have experience in quantitative analysis using large complex survey data sets. Excellent writing skills required. Will work with programmers and mid-level analysts. Abilities to manage analysis/reporting teams and to meet schedules and budgets are pluses.

If you would like to be considered for this position, please mail a resume and writing samples to:

Boni Fash
Westat
1650 Research Blvd.
Rockville MD 20850

Alternatively you may FAX the requested materials to Ms. Fash at (301) 294-3928. No telephone or e-mail inquiries please.

>From Mitofsky@aol.com Tue Oct 22 17:48:28 1996
Return-Path: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: from emout11.mail.aol.com (emout11.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.26]) by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
   id RAA09958 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Oct 1996 17:48:26 -0700 (PDT)
(PDT)
From: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: by emout11.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id UAA14353 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 22 Oct 1996 20:47:55 -0400
Date: Tue, 22 Oct 1996 20:47:55 -0400
Message-ID: <961022204734_216376177@emout11.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: overly cautious poll reporting

David Rindskopf has asked that his message be forwarded.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------
Someone was kind enough to forward some of the discussion about how to report polling results. If I could suggest something, it might be enlightening to hear what Rev. Bayes would have said about the subject. No, it's not that we should all pray that the election is over soon; he is responsible for an "alternative" approach to statistics that many people think makes more sense than the classical approach. Let me describe how it could be used for this problem.

I will take as a starting point that there is a 5 point difference, with a standard error of 4 points for that difference. (Note: in the original article, it was not clear if the "sampling error" was meant to be one standard error or two standard errors, and whether it applied to the proportions for each candidate or to the difference; Warren Mitofsky's comments cleared that up for me.)

In the classical tradition, we have a point estimate, and can generate a confidence interval. However, we cannot make a statement such as some of you (and probably your readers and listeners) would like to make, "...the odds are pretty good that Clinton is really ahead of Dole." But that's the
magic of Bayesian statistics: such a statement is exactly what you can make using these methods. To simplify somewhat, draw a normal distribution centered at 5 and with a standard deviation of 4 points. This is a Bayesian's POSTERIOR DISTRIBUTION, which gives the degree of belief about various possible values of the difference after having looked at the polling data. To find the probability that Clinton is really ahead of Dole, just find the area under the normal curve to the right of zero (the point of no difference). The z-score at zero is $-5/4 = -1.25$, and the desired probability can be read from a normal table as about .89. A Bayesian would say that there is an 89 percent chance that Clinton is really ahead of Dole. A classical statistician would groan, and say that such statements can't be made, but of course everyone makes them anyway (it is the most frequently made error in misinterpreting confidence intervals and related quantities). It seems to me so natural that I would advise news organizations to become Bayesian, in accordance with the way their (statistically untrained) audiences think.

One could, of course, go on to predict the outcome of the election using these methods. If one didn't have to worry about electoral college votes, it would be simple to apply these methods to a poll of the entire country. If one did worry about electoral votes, with a little effort one could set up a simulation in which polling results from all the states were used, and 1000 or so replications were done. Each simulation would draw a random number from 0 to 1 for each state; if it were greater than the probability of Clinton beating Dole in that state, the electoral votes in that state go to Dole; otherwise they go to Clinton. The electoral votes for each candidate are added, and the process is repeated 1000 times. If Clinton beats Dole in 700 of the simulated "elections" then the probability is .70 that he would beat Dole (given that the election were held on that day, with the sample accurately reflecting likely voters, etc. etc. and all the rest of those assumptions). Probably this wouldn't give a result greatly different from ignoring electoral votes, but it would be interesting to see.

Hope this is of some help in your search for improved methods of reporting.
ANNUAL AAPOR STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION

(PDT)
Received: from mailhost.rug.nl (mailhost.rug.nl) by HEARNVAX.nic.SURFnet.nl
(PMDF V5.0-7 #8340) id <01IAZRG8AKZKOOTNYD@HEARNVAX.nic.SURFnet.nl> for
aapornet@usc.EDU; Wed, 23 Oct 1996 19:07:22 +0200 (MET_DST)
Received: from dep.ppsw.rug.nl by mailhost.rug.nl with SMTP (PP); Wed, 23
Oct 1996 19:06:52 +0200
Received: from ppsw2.ppsw.rug.nl by dep.ppsw.rug.nl (TAA18097); Wed, 23
Oct 1996 19:06:02 +0200
Received: from PPSW2/SpoolDir by ppsw2.ppsw.rug.nl (Mercy 1.21); Wed, 23
Oct 1996 19:09:30 +0100
Received: from SpoolDir by PPSW2 (Mercy 1.21); Wed, 23 Oct 1996 19:09:13
+0100
Date: Wed, 23 Oct 1996 19:09:03 GMT+0100
From: "Wijbrandt van Schuur, Sociologie RUG" <H.van.SCHUUR@ppsw.RUG.NL>
Subject: RCPT: Re: Job Annoucement -- CATI Programmer
To: aapornet@usc.EDU
Message-id: <7BC77D73AC@ppsw2.ppsw.rug.nl>
Organization: Fac. PPSW RUG
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail v3.22
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Priority: normal

Bevestiging van lezing : uw bericht -

Datum: 15 Oct 96 14:54
Aan: aapornet@usc.edu
Ondw.: Re: Job Annoucement -- CATI Programmer

Gelezen om 19:09, 23 Oct 96.

>From GoldenbK@oeus.psb.blx.gov Wed Oct 23 10:57:45 1996
Return-Path: GoldenbK@oeus.psb.blx.gov
Received: from dctype ([146.142.4.13])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usd) with SMTP
    id KAA19024 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Wed, 23 Oct 1996 10:57:39 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from psbmailhub.psb.blx.gov ([146.142.42.8]) by mailgate.blx.gov
(5.x/SMI-SVR4)
Received: by psbmailhub.psb.blx.gov with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server
Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.993.5)
    id <01BBCOE&19571830@psbmailhub.psb.blx.gov>; Wed, 23 Oct 1996
13:58:09 -0400
Message-Id: <c=US%a=%p=BL5%1=LSB/P5/0003111D3@psbmailhub.psb.blx.gov>
From: Goldenberg K <GoldenbK@oeus.psb.blx.gov>
To: "'aapornet'" "AAPORNET@USC.EDU>" ","por'" <por@irss.unc.edu>,
,,"SRMSNet""
<SRMSNet@UMDD.UMD.EDU>
Subject: AAPOR Student Paper Competition
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version
4.0.993.5
Encoding: 55 TEXT

Apologies for the cross-posting to those of you on multiple lists.
*************************************************************************
ANNUAL AAPOR STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION
52nd Annual Conference
American Association for Public Opinion Research

Norfolk Waterside Marriott, Norfolk, Virginia
May 15 - 18, 1997

The American Association for Public Opinion Research will award its 31st Annual Student Paper Prize this year. The prize is open both to current students (graduate or undergraduate) and to those who graduated during the 1995-1996 academic year. AAPOR will consider papers in any field related to the study of public opinion, broadly defined, or to the theory and methods of survey and market research, including statistical techniques used in such research. Past winners have come from many fields, including political science, psychology, sociology, and survey methods.

Paper topics might include methodological issues in survey, public opinion, or market research, theoretical issues in the formation and change of public opinion, or substantive findings about public opinion. Entries should be roughly 15 to 25 pages in length and may have two or more authors. (All of the authors on an entry must be eligible for the prize, however.)

A prize of $500 is awarded to the winning paper; in addition, one or more papers may receive an Honorable Mention and be listed in the 1997 Conference Program. The entries will be judged by a panel of survey researchers selected from AAPOR+s membership, including researchers drawn from the academic, government, and commercial sectors. The winning paper and any Honorable Mentions will be invited to present their papers at AAPOR+s 52nd Annual Conference, to be held in Norfolk, Virginia, May 15 - 18, 1997.

Please submit FIVE COPIES OF EACH ENTRY TO ARRIVE BY DECEMBER 15, 1996, to this year+s Conference Committee Chair:

Roger Tourangeau
c/o The Joint Program in Survey Methodology
1218 LeFrak Hall
College Park, Maryland  20782

Be sure to include your name, mailing address, telephone number(s), and, if possible, an electronic mail address. You will receive confirmation that your paper has been received. Final decisions about the winner and the inclusion of papers in the Conference Program will be made by the end of January, and you will be notified about the status of your paper shortly thereafter.
Lowndes F. (Rick) Stephens, Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communications
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
E-MAIL: STEPHENS-LOWNDES@SCAROLINA.EDU or STEPHENS-RICK@SCAROLINA.EDU or RickSTEPH@AOL.COM
Voice: (803)-777-2974
Fax: (803)-777-4103

>From Mitofsky@aol.com Wed Oct 23 12:33:01 1996
Return-Path: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: from emout02.mail.aol.com (emout02.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.93]) by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA06195 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Oct 1996 12:32:59 -0700 (PDT)
From: Mitofsky@aol.com
Received: by emout02.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id PAA09376 for AAPORNET@usc.edu; Wed, 23 Oct 1996 15:32:28 -0400
Message-ID: <961023153227_1112994064@emout02.mail.aol.com>
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu
Subject: overly cautious poll reporting

David Rindskopf has asked that his message be forwarded.

------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------
Someone was kind enough to forward some of the discussion about how to report polling results. If I could suggest something, it might be enlightening to hear what Rev. Bayes would have said about the subject. No, it's not that we should all pray that the election is over soon; he is responsible for an "alternative" approach to statistics that many people think makes more sense than the classical approach. Let me describe how it could be used for this problem.

I will take as a starting point that there is a 5 point difference, with a standard error of 4 points for that difference. (Note: in the original article, it was not clear if the "sampling error" was meant to be one standard error or two standard errors, and whether it applied to the proportions for each candidate or to the difference; Warren Mitofsky's comments cleared that up for me.)
In the classical tradition, we have a point estimate, and can generate a confidence interval. However, we cannot make a statement such as some of you (and probably your readers and listeners) would like to make, "...the odds are pretty good that Clinton is really ahead of Dole." But that's the magic of Bayesian statistics: such a statement is exactly what you can make using these methods. To simplify somewhat, draw a normal distribution centered at 5 and with a standard deviation of 4 points. This is a Bayesian's POSTERIOR DISTRIBUTION, which gives the degree of belief about various possible values of the difference after having looked at the polling data. To find the probability that Clinton is really ahead of Dole, just find the area under the normal curve to the right of zero (the point of no difference). The z-score at zero is \(-\frac{5}{4} = -1.25\), and the desired probability can be read from a normal table as about .89. A Bayesian would say that there is an 89 percent chance that Clinton is really ahead of Dole. A classical statistician would groan, and say that such statements can't be made, but of course everyone makes them anyway (it is the most frequently made error in misinterpreting confidence intervals and related quantities). It seems to me so natural that I would advise news organizations to become Bayesian, in accordance with the way their (statistically untrained) audiences think.

One could, of course, go on to predict the outcome of the election using these methods. If one didn't have to worry about electoral college votes, it would be simple to apply these methods to a poll of the entire country. If one did worry about electoral votes, with a little effort one could set up a simulation in which polling results from all the states were used, and 1000 or so replications were done. Each simulation would draw a random number from 0 to 1 for each state; if it were greater than the probability of Clinton beating Dole in that state, the electoral votes in that state go to Dole; otherwise they go to Clinton. The electoral votes for each candidate are added, and the process is repeated 1000 times. If Clinton beats Dole in 700 of the simulated "elections" then the probability is .70 that he would beat Dole (given that the election were held on that day, with the sample accurately reflecting likely voters, etc. etc. and all the rest of those assumptions). Probably this wouldn't give a result greatly different from ignoring electoral votes, but it would be interesting to see.

Hope this is of some help in your search for improved methods of reporting.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------
David Rindskopf                                            Phone:  (212)
642-2256                                                FAX:     (212)
Educational Psychology                               email: drindsko@email.gc.cuny.edu
642-2257                                          CUNY Graduate Center
CUNY Graduate Center                              33 West 42nd Street
33 West 42nd Street                              New York, NY 10036 >>
I am interested in finding information (published or unpublished) comparing list assisted samples with pure RDD surveys including the potential biasing effects. I am also interested in learning of any list assisted techniques for targeting low incidence population groups such as household teenagers. Any help that can be provided would be appreciated. Thanks.

Alan Bernstein
Mr. Bernstein,

Below is a list of papers relating to your question. The one by Brick, Waksburg, Kulp, and Starer (1995) and Keeter (1995) should be most helpful. I also coauthored a paper with Kulp and Starer that will appear in the 1996 ASA JSM Proceedings entitled, "Estimating Coverage Bias in RDD Samples with Current Population Survey Data".


If you come across any other work that isn't represented in this list, I'd appreciate you letting me know.
Here is the Presidential trend data for the Ohio Poll Election '96 Tracking Survey, conducted by the Institute for Policy Research at the University of Cincinnati.

Bob Dole, Bill Clinton, or Ross Perot for President (Likely Voters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dole</th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Perot</th>
<th>Other/Neither</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20 - 23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 19 - 22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18 - 21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 17 - 20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 17 - 19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ohio Poll Election '96 Tracking Survey is sponsored by the Cincinnati Enquirer, WLWT-TV, and the University of Cincinnati. Press releases are available at http://www.ipr.uc.edu/elect96.htm

-- Eric Rademacher
Institute for Policy Research
University of Cincinnati
We would like to bring to your attention a new web site, Public Spaces, which reports on media coverage of the presidential election campaign and its relationship to public opinion polls. Based on our examination of more than 11,000 newspaper, newswire, and television stories since early March, we have found:

* remarkably even-handed coverage of the two major party candidates, President Bill Clinton and Senator Bob Dole, and
* that we can predict the time trend of the horserace polls from favorable and unfavorable news coverage of the candidates. For details and the analysis see:

http://www.soc.umn.edu/~sssmith/publicspaces.html

For further information, please contact:
Professor David Fan  email: dfan@simvax.labmed.umn.edu
University of Minnesota  phone: (612) 624-4718

or
Professor Steven S. Smith  email: ssssmith@polisci.umn.edu
University of Minnesota  phone: (612) 624-6820

Does anyone know of any studies that have looked at whether respondents in face-to-face surveys actually remember the amount of the pre-paid incentive they received?

In the survey I'm analyzing, respondents were asked at the end of the survey to recall whether they or a household member received any money before they agreed to participate, and how much they received. I found that 25% of the
sample misremembered the incentive, and am trying to find some literature that could help me explain this phenomenon.

Any advice would be greatly appreciated. Please reply directly to me at darbym@umich.edu

Thank you.

Darby Miller Steiger
University of Michigan

>From tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu Tue Oct 29 12:19:11 1996
Return-Path: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu
Received: from virginia.edu (mars.itc.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
  by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
  id MAA25952 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 29 Oct 1996 12:19:09 -0800
  (PST)
Received: from uva.pcmail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa23798;
  29 Oct 96 15:16 EST
Received: by uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU (8.7.6/1.34)
  id PAA12329; Tue, 29 Oct 1996 15:16:19 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199610292016.PAA12329@uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU>
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu>
Date: Tue, 29 Oct 96 15:14:04 EST
X-Mailer: UVa PCMail 1.9.0
To: por@unc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Job Announcement
Cc: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

Center for Survey Research
University of Virginia

CSR seeks to fill a position at the Research Associate level immediately or not later than January 15. This is a one-year appointment renewable for up to three years; it is a 12-month, full time position on a Research Professional Staff line, carrying health benefits. Salary range: $29,000 and up with Ph.D. in hand, somewhat less if ABD. (ABD must be close to completion and would carry job title of Research Assistant). We prefer to hire someone who plans to stay for more than one year.

Must have training and experience in survey research, particularly in questionnaire development and project management. Areas of substantive specialty are open. Primary job duty is to help CSR with direction of multiple projects, both phone and mail, for a varied mix of clients. Expected to work effectively with clients and with other staff in a close-knit, team environment. A more formal description of the job is attached.

Applicants: please telephone or e-mail directly to Thomas M. Guterbock, Director, at 1-804-924-6516, TomG@virginia.edu. Send C.V. right away, but hold your letters of reference for now, please. Applications will be processed as they are received until position is filled. We are an AA/EEO employer.

For more about our organization, point your web browser to http://darwin.clas.virginia.edu/~surveys
Job Description

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE--Center for Survey Research
[Research Professional Staff Position]

Provides scientific and managerial direction for survey projects and prospective survey projects. Designs studies and sets study parameters; develops conceptual outlines for questionnaires; drafts questionnaires and interview scripts; develops budgets for contracts and proposals; oversees pretest, training, field, and analysis phases of projects; drafts reports and prepares presentation materials; and maintains liaison with clients and project sponsors.

Shares in management of Centers technical and operations staff and facilities. Provides support to other Center projects as assigned, including design of samples, data analysis, CATI programming, and assistance in proposal preparation.

Participates in management of the Center by attending staff meetings, assisting with project staff development and training, developing new clients for the Center, and other management tasks as assigned. Conducts research in connection with the Center's data collection and analysis projects, and may conduct survey research unrelated to Center projects with approval. May be assigned additional tasks and activities for training purposes.

The Research Associate reports directly to the Center's Director. Supervision of training of the Research Associate may be delegated by the Director to other senior staff. The Research Associate's decisions with respect to project design, budgets, and contracts are subject to senior staff oversight and approval. The Research Associate must coordinate projects under his or her management with the Operations staff, and must supervise and delegate tasks to Graduate Research Assistants and other project staff.

---end of job description

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

--- From rshalp@cris.com Tue Oct 29 19:13:38 1996
Return-Path: rshalp@cris.com
Received: from tribune.concentric.net (tribune.concentric.net [199.3.12.34])
        by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
        id TAA28937 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 29 Oct 1996 19:13:28 -0800
(PST)
Received: from cliff.cris.com (cliff.cris.com [199.3.12.45])
        by tribune.concentric.net (8.7.5/(96/10/25 1.9))
        id WAA1941; Tue, 29 Oct 1996 22:12:34 -0500 (EST)

[1-800-745-2747 The Concentric Network]
Errors-To: <rshalp@cris.com>
Received: from LOCALNAME (cnc028077.concentric.net [206.83.93.77])
        by cliff.cris.com (8.8.0)
        id WAA17606; Tue, 29 Oct 1996 22:11:55 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 29 Oct 1996 22:11:55 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199610300311.WAA17606@cliff.cris.com>
We have confirmation of the latest poll results....

According to an article in yesterday's (October 28) NY Times as reported by Reuters, a leading British Genealogist says that Bob Dole doesn't have enough royal blood to become the next President of the United States. "He's not royal enough to win the White House" says Harold Brookes-Baker who has investigated the ancestry of every American President and concludes that "the candidate with the most royal genes has always been the victor".

"Clinton has the advantage in this election because not only is he related to the British Royal Family through Simon de Montfort, a 13th century baronial leader, but also because he is a direct descendent of King Robert I of France. He said that Mr. Dole's sole link royal blood was to 13th century King Henry III of England."

Rattling very old skeletons in some very distant cupboards, Mr Brookes-Baker said that Mr. Clinton, too, was related to Henry III, adding "'President Clinton's descent form Henry III is, however, illegitimate."

Be interesting to know how Perot would fare using these criteria.

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: por@ripken.oit.unc.edu
Subject: Re: Confirmation of the Polls....

We have confirmation of the latest poll results....

According to an article in yesterday's (October 28) NY Times as reported by Reuters, a leading British Genealogist says that Bob Dole doesn't have enough royal blood to become the next President of the United States. "He's not royal enough to win the White House" says Harold Brookes-Baker who has investigated the ancestry of every American President and concludes that "the candidate with the most royal genes has always been the victor".

"Clinton has the advantage in this election because not only is he related to the British Royal Family through Simon de Montfort, a 13th century baronial leader, but also because he is a direct descendent of King Robert I of France. He said that Mr. Dole's sole link royal blood was to 13th century King Henry III of England."

Rattling very old skeletons in some very distant cupboards, Mr Brookes-Baker said that Mr. Clinton, too, was related to Henry III, adding "'President Clinton's descent form Henry III is, however, illegitimate."

Be interesting to know how Perot would fare using these criteria.

---Perot must be related to Napolean, no?

**************
Craig A. Hill, Ph.D.
NORC
**************

>From djmingay@midway.uchicago.edu Wed Oct 30 16:01:03 1996
Return-Path: djmingay@midway.uchicago.edu
Received: from haven.uchicago.edu (root@haven.uchicago.edu [128.135.12.3])
  by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
     id QAA27848 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Oct 1996 16:00:52 -0800
     (PST)
Received: from midway.uchicago.edu (midway.uchicago.edu [128.135.12.12]) by
  haven.uchicago.edu (8.7.5/8.7.3) with ESMTP id QAA20505 for
  <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Oct 1996 16:08:03 -0600 (CST)
Received: from [128.135.94.55] (dacc-38.bsd.uchicago.edu [128.135.94.55]) by
  midway.uchicago.edu (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id PAA28353 for
  <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Oct 1996 15:45:35 -0600 (CST)
X-Sender: djmingay@ucpopmail.uchicago.edu
Message-Id: <v01510106ae9d883b80420[128.135.94.55]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 1996 16:47:34 -0600
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: djmingay@midway.uchicago.edu (David J. Mingay)
Subject: response quality on CAPI questionnaires
On some CAPI surveys when the respondent selects an answer to a question he/she is immediately presented the next question. In contrast, on other CAPI surveys the respondent must press a second, "next question" key in order to receive the question that follows.

Presumably there are advantages of each procedure (e.g., possible differences in data quality, and time to complete the questionnaire). I would be grateful for information on any research that has evaluated these two methods of administering questions on CAPI.

==========================
David J. Mingay, Ph.D.
djmingay@midway.uchicago.edu
Research Associate (Assistant Professor) (773) 702-1185 (office)
Dept of Anesthesia & Critical Care (773) 363-4152 (home)
The University of Chicago (773) 702-1182 (fax)
5841 S. Maryland Ave, MC4028
Chicago, Illinois 60637

>From ABIDER@american.edu Wed Oct 30 20:16:59 1996
Return-Path: ABIDER@AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (smtp@auvm.american.edu [147.9.1.2])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id UAA27834 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 30 Oct 1996 20:16:57 -0800
    (PST)
Message-Id: <199610310416.UAA27834@usc.edu>
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
    with BSMTP id 0292; Wed, 30 Oct 96 23:15:42 EST
Received: from american.edu (NJE origin ABIDER@AUVM) by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
    (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 1971; Wed, 30 Oct 1996 23:15:21 -0500
Date:   Wed, 30 Oct 96 23:07:10 EST
From: Albert Biderman <ABIDER@american.edu>
Organization: The American University
Subject: Re: Confirmation of the Polls....
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: Message of Tue, 29 Oct 1996 22:11:55 -0500 (EST) from <rshalp@cris.com>

The post on royal descent awakes a memory of an exchange between our statistical forbears Galton and Karl Pearson. The eugenicist Galton came up with the Eureka finding after diligently tracing the lineages of the most illustrious men of his time and found that he could trace many back to Charlemagne. KP did some calculations and determined that the probability that any randomly-selected Western European was a descendant of Charlemagne was roughly .50.

--Albert Biderman