

---

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

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

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

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

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

Begin archive:

---

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

----- Cut here -----  
>From dillmand@mail.wsu.edu Tue Oct 1 10:03:01 1996  
Return-Path: dillmand@mail.wsu.edu  
Received: from cheetah.it.wsu.edu (cheetah.it.wsu.edu [134.121.1.8])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id KAA27836 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Oct 1996 10:02:57 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: dillmand@mail.wsu.edu  
Received: from Dillman.wsu.edu (dillman.libarts.wsu.edu [134.121.52.48]) by  
cheetah.it.wsu.edu (8.6.13/WSUit-1.1) with SMTP id KAA04189 for  
<aapornet@vm.usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Oct 1996 10:02:51 -0700  
Date: Tue, 1 Oct 1996 10:02:51 -0700  
Message-Id: <199610011702.KAA04189@cheetah.it.wsu.edu>  
X-Sender: dillmand@mail.wsu.edu  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 2.0.3  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Op Scan Mail Questionnaires

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 08:53:45 -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  
(919) 541-6376  
P.O. Box 12194  
(919) 541-1261

Phone:

Fax:

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194 Email: caspar@rti.org

>From SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu Thu Oct 3 08:19:06 1996

Return-Path: SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu

Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])

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

id IAA15750 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Thu, 3 Oct 1996 08:19:00 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU by UConnVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)  
with BSMTP id 0800; Thu, 03 Oct 96 11:17:57 EDT

Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UConnVM) by  
UConnVM.UConn.Edu (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 6521; Thu, 3 Oct 1996  
11:17:57 -0400

Date: Thu, 03 Oct 96 11:16:17 EDT

From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>

Subject: job announcement

To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>,  
Multiple Recipients of POR <por@unc.edu>

X-Mailer: MailBook 95.01.263

Message-Id: <961003.111756.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>

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 <01BBB122.E9B55480@cscnts3.rti.org>; Thu, 3 Oct 1996 12:03:39 -0400

Message-ID:

<c=US%a=\_p=Research\_Triangl%l=CSCNTS3-961003160337Z-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  
(919) 541-6376  
P.O. Box 12194  
(919) 541-1261  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194  
>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])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP  
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 <01IA8WOP9TDC000206@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.  
>  
>  
>

-----  
-----

David Rindskopf  
642-2256  
Educational Psychology  
CUNY Graduate Center  
drindsko@email.gc.cuny.edu  
33 West 42nd Street  
New York, NY 10036

Phone: (212)

FAX: (212) 642-2257  
email:

>From Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU Fri Oct 4 15:15:56 1996  
Return-Path: Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU  
Received: from logjam.ucc.nau.edu (mailgate.nau.edu [134.114.96.14])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id PAA25072 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Oct 1996 15:15:54 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from pc90 (pc90.sbs.nau.edu)  
by NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU (PMDF V5.0-6 #2384) id  
<01IA8ZTNBU9C8XAYQL@NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU>; Fri, 04 Oct 1996 15:15:51 -0700  
(MST)  
Date: Fri, 04 Oct 1996 15:15:51 -0700 (MST)  
Date-warning: Date header was inserted by NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU  
From: Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU>  
Subject: New Poll Numbers from Arizona  
X-Sender: solop@nauvax.ucc.nau.edu (Unverified)  
To: por@irss.unc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu, psrt-1@mizzou1.missouri.edu  
Message-id: <1.5.4b11.16.19960301152152.624f75b6@nauvax.ucc.nau.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4b11 (16)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Based on a recent panel study conducted by the Social Research  
Laboratory at Northern Arizona University, here is the latest in  
the presidential race for Arizona:

#### Panel Study Data

	Clinton	Dole	Perot	Other	Undecided
Old Clinton	96%	1%	1%	2%	---
Old Dole	3%	92%	1%	---	3%
Old Perot	12%	4%	76%	---	8%
Old Undecided	23%	27%	9%	5%	32%

#### Registered Voters in Arizona

	Clinton	Dole	Perot	Other	DK
Early September	43%	42%	9%	NA	6%
Late September	44%	41%	9%	1%	6%

#### Likely Voters in Arizona

	Clinton	Dole	Perot	Other	DK
Early September	44%	44%	6%	NA	6%

Late September      45%    43%    6%    1%    5%

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 ESMTTP  
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  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>  
>  
>

>From POJA@FHSUVM.FHSU.EDU Wed Oct 9 07:19:19 1996  
Return-Path: POJA@FHSUVM.FHSU.EDU  
Received: from FHSUVM.FHSU.EDU ([198.22.249.1])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id HAA02436 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Oct 1996 07:19:17 -0700  
(PDT)  
Message-Id: <199610091419.HAA02436@usc.edu>  
Received: from FHSU by FHSUVM.FHSU.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3) with BSMTMP id  
7439;  
Wed, 09 Oct 96 09:19:20 CDT  
Comments: Converted from PROFS to RFC822 format by PUMP V2.2X  
Date: Wed, 9 Oct 96 09:19:19 CDT  
From: "Joe Aistrup, Assistant Director" <POJA@FHSUVM.FHSU.EDU>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Docking Institute  
Picken Hall 209 - Phone 4189

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@fhsvm.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)  
From: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU  
Message-Id: <199610091750.KAA06557@usc.edu>  
Received: from UCHIMVS1.BITNET by UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (IBM MVS SMTP V3R1)  
with BSMTP id 5432; Wed, 09 Oct 96 12:49:31 CDT  
Date: Wed, 09 Oct 96 12:20 CST  
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

From: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU  
>From mcouper@survey.umd.edu Wed Oct 9 13:00:07 1996  
Return-Path: mcouper@survey.umd.edu  
Received: from umail.umd.edu (umail.umd.edu [128.8.10.28])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id NAA27469 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Oct 1996 13:00:05 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from survey.umd.edu (survey.umd.edu [129.2.24.103]) by  
umail.umd.edu (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id PAA02245; Wed, 9 Oct 1996 15:59:39  
-0400 (EDT)  
Received: from SURVEY/MAILQUEUE1 by survey.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);  
Wed, 9 Oct 96 15:59:57 +1100  
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by SURVEY (Mercury 1.13); Wed, 9 Oct 96 15:59:36  
+1100  
From: "Mick Couper" <mcouper@survey.umd.edu>  
Organization: Joint Program In Survey Methodology  
To: "Joe Aistrup, Assistant Director" <POJA@FHSUVM.FHSU.EDU>,  
aapornet@usc.edu  
Date: Wed, 9 Oct 1996 15:59:33 EST  
Subject: Re:  
Priority: normal  
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.23)  
Message-ID: <1DC106645EE@survey.umd.edu>

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

> Date: Wed, 9 Oct 96 09:19:19 CDT  
> Reply-to: aapornet@usc.edu  
> From: "Joe Aistrup, Assistant Director" <POJA@FHSUVM.FHSU.EDU>  
> To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

> Docking Institute  
> Picken Hall 209 - Phone 4189  
>

> 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  
>  
>

Mick Couper

Joint Program in Survey Methodology

1218 LeFrak Hall, College Park, MD 20742

Tel: 301-405-9523 Fax: 301-314-7912

<mcouper@survey.umd.edu>

>From DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU Wed Oct 9 14:28:53 1996

Return-Path: DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU

Received: from icarus.cc.uic.edu (root@ICARUS-FDDI.CC.UIC.EDU

[128.248.100.53])

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

id OAA11185 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Oct 1996 14:28:47 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (MAIL.SRL.UIC.EDU [128.248.232.55]) by icarus.cc.uic.edu (8.7.6/8.7.6) with SMTP id QAA10255 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Oct 1996 16:29:48 -0500 (CDT)  
Received: from main-Message\_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU with Novell\_GroupWise; Wed, 09 Oct 1996 16:23:58 -0500  
Message-Id: <s25bd19d.085@SRL.UIC.EDU>  
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1  
Date: Wed, 09 Oct 1996 16:22:26 -0500  
From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOroureke@SRL.UIC.EDU>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Missing Males -Reply

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.

Mick Couper

> Date: Wed, 9 Oct 96 09:19:19 CDT  
> Reply-to: aapornet@usc.edu  
> From: "Joe Aistrup, Assistant Director"  
<POJA@FHSUVM.FHSU.EDU>  
> To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

> Docking Institute  
> Picken Hall 209 - Phone 4189  
> > 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  
> >

Mick Couper  
Joint Program in Survey Methodology  
1218 LeFrak Hall, College Park, MD 20742

Tel: 301-405-9523 Fax: 301-314-7912  
<mcouper@survey.umd.edu>

>From veprice@umich.edu Thu Oct 10 07:18:41 1996  
Return-Path: veprice@umich.edu  
Received: from joust.rs.itd.umich.edu (root@joust.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.86])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id HAA00836 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Oct 1996 07:18:40 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost by joust.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.7.5/2.3)  
with SMTP id KAA26830; Thu, 10 Oct 1996 10:18:39 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Thu, 10 Oct 1996 10:18:38 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Vincent Edward Price <veprice@umich.edu>  
X-Sender: veprice@joust.rs.itd.umich.edu  
To: Conf Am Assn Pub Op Res <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Faculty Openings  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.SOL.3.95.961010101639.18015E-100000@joust.rs.itd.umich.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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.

>From mikemokr@ap.org Thu Oct 10 08:51:19 1996  
Return-Path: mikemokr@ap.org  
Received: from hermes.ap.org (hermes.ap.org [165.1.6.7])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id IAA10568 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 10 Oct 1996 08:51:16 -0700

(PDT)  
Received: by hermes./home/mikemokr (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)  
id LAA17346; Thu, 10 Oct 1996 11:47:32 -0400  
Date: Thu, 10 Oct 1996 11:47:31 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Mike Mokrzycki <mikemokr@ap.org>  
X-Sender: mikemokr@hermes  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Missing Males -Reply  
In-Reply-To: <s25bd19d.085@SRL.UIC.EDU>  
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.961010114238.16990C-100000@hermes>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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!

Hmmmm ... 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@LISTSERV.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 polititions, 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

E-mail skeeter@vcu.edu

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](http://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 DMCCALLU@UA1VM.UA.EDU Fri Oct 11 09:05:49 1996  
Return-Path: DMCCALLU@UA1VM.UA.EDU  
Received: from UA1VM.UA.EDU (ualvm.ua.edu [130.160.4.100])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id JAA25605 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 11 Oct 1996 09:05:44 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from UA1VM.UA.EDU by UA1VM.UA.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)  
with BSMTMP id 6604; Fri, 11 Oct 96 11:05:29 CDT  
Received: from ualvm.ua.edu (NJE origin DMCCALLU@UA1VM) by UA1VM.UA.EDU  
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP id 1205; Fri, 11 Oct 1996 11:05:29 -0500  
Date: Fri, 11 Oct 96 10:36:33 CDT  
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  
dmccallu@ualvm.ua.edu

>From tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu Fri Oct 11 12:53:25 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 MAA26323 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Oct 1996 12:53:22 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from uva.pcmail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa12935;  
11 Oct 96 15:49 EDT  
Received: by uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU (8.6.10/1.34)  
id PAA06767; Fri, 11 Oct 1996 15:49:37 -0400  
Message-Id: <199610111949.PAA06767@uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU>  
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu>  
Date: Fri, 11 Oct 96 15:49:23 EDT  
X-Mailer: UVa PCMail 1.9.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: missing males  
Cc: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.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

>From PENALOZA@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu Fri Oct 11 13:29:18 1996  
Return-Path: PENALOZA@conted2.uwex.edu  
Received: from shaggy.uwex.edu (shaggy.uwex.edu [144.92.105.17])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id NAA01456 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Oct 1996 13:29:14 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from charon1.uwex.edu by shaggy.uwex.edu;  
id AA20249; 4.1/42; Fri, 11 Oct 96 15:29:01 CDT  
Received: From SCOOPY/WORKQUEUE by charon1.uwex.edu  
via Charon-4.0-VROOM with IPX id 100.961011152757.320;  
11 Oct 96 15:29:00 +600

Message-Id: <MAILQUEUE-101.961011152707.320@conted2.uwex.edu>  
From: "Linda Penalozza 5-2796" <PENALOZA@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Date: Fri, 11 Oct 1996 15:27:07 CDT  
Subject: scanning mail surveys  
Priority: normal  
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail v3.22

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: penalozza@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. Penalozza

\*\*\*\*\*

Linda J. Penalozza  
Associate Director and Head of Field Operations  
Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory  
1930 Monroe St., Madison, WI 53711

Phone: (608) 265-2796 FAX: (608) 262-3366  
email: penalosa@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

"The researches of many commentators have already thrown much darkness on this subject, and it is probable that, if they continue, we shall soon know nothing at all about it." - Mark Twain

>From EOBRIEN@nass.usda.gov Fri Oct 11 13:51:29 1996

Return-Path: EOBRIEN@nass.usda.gov

Received: from ag.gov (ag.gov [162.79.3.5])

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

id NAA04607 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Oct 1996 13:51:25 -0700

(PDT)

From: EOBRIEN@nass.usda.gov

Received: from nass.usda.gov ([199.129.206.11]) by ag.gov (4.1/SMI-4.1)

id AA11941; Fri, 11 Oct 96 14:52:19 MDT

Received: from ccMail by nass.usda.gov (SMTPLINK V2.11 PreRelease 4)

id AA845077778; Fri, 11 Oct 96 16:42:13 EST

Date: Fri, 11 Oct 96 16:42:13 EST

Message-Id: <9609118450.AA845077778@nass.usda.gov>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Random Respondent Selection Procedures- Household

"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

>From lvoigt@cclink.fhcrc.org Fri Oct 11 14:21:02 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 ESMTMP

id OAA08605 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Oct 1996 14:21:00 -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 OAA08793 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Fri, 11 Oct 1996 14:20:59 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from ccMail by ccout.fhcrc.org

(IMA Internet Exchange 1.04b) id 25eba790; Fri, 11 Oct 96 14:22:01 -0700

Mime-Version: 1.0

Date: Fri, 11 Oct 1996 14:16:03 -0700

Message-ID: <25eba790@cclink.fhcrc.org>

From: lvoigt@cclink.fhcrc.org (lvoigt)

Subject: Missing Males - Reply  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

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

>From DMMerkle@aol.com Fri Oct 11 16:12:45 1996  
Return-Path: DMMerkle@aol.com  
Received: from emout19.mail.aol.com (emout19.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.45])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id QAA22534 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Oct 1996 16:12:43 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: DMMerkle@aol.com  
Received: by emout19.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id TAA17060; Fri, 11 Oct  
1996 19:12:14 -0400  
Date: Fri, 11 Oct 1996 19:12:14 -0400  
Message-ID: <961011191202\_541386184@emout19.mail.aol.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
cc: pollmark@pipeline.com  
Subject: Missing Males

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

>From ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu Sat Oct 12 10:13:41 1996  
Return-Path: ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu  
Received: from sphinx.Gsu.EDU (sphinx.Gsu.EDU [131.96.1.22])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id KAA10363 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 12 Oct 1996 10:13:39 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from langate.gsu.edu (langate.Gsu.EDU [131.96.24.27]) by  
sphinx.Gsu.EDU (8.7.6/8.7.3) with SMTP id NAA06768 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;  
Sat, 12 Oct 1996 13:13:38 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from GSU-Message\_Server by langate.gsu.edu  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Sat, 12 Oct 1996 13:19:01 -0500  
Message-Id: <s25f9ac4.040@langate.gsu.edu>  
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1  
Date: Sat, 12 Oct 1996 13:08:26 -0500  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: missing males -Reply

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 jmclemen@umich.edu Sat Oct 12 10:52:24 1996  
Return-Path: jmclemen@umich.edu  
Received: from breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu (root@breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.81])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id KAA12944 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 12 Oct 1996 10:52:22 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from localhost by breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.7.5/2.3)  
with SMTP id NAA14849; Sat, 12 Oct 1996 13:52:21 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Sat, 12 Oct 1996 13:52:20 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Judith M Clemens <jmclemen@umich.edu>  
X-Sender: jmclemen@breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Differential incentives  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.SOL.3.95.961012134840.14186A-100000@breakout.rs.itd.umich.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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.

>From ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu Sat Oct 12 11:01:52 1996  
Return-Path: ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu  
Received: from sphinx.Gsu.EDU (sphinx.Gsu.EDU [131.96.1.22])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id LAA13937 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 12 Oct 1996 11:01:50 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from langate.gsu.edu (langate.Gsu.EDU [131.96.24.27]) by  
sphinx.Gsu.EDU (8.7.6/8.7.3) with SMTP id OAA08101 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;  
Sat, 12 Oct 1996 14:01:49 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from GSU-Message\_Server by langate.gsu.edu  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Sat, 12 Oct 1996 14:07:02 -0500  
Message-Id: <s25fa606.046@langate.gsu.edu>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1  
Date: Sat, 12 Oct 1996 13:56:16 -0500  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <ARCLGS@langate.gsu.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: missing males -Mea Culpa

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 ESMTTP  
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>

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

Please reply directly to Tom Gruca <thomas-gruca@uiowa.edu>

\*\*\*\*\*

Date: Thu, 10 Oct 1996 12:05:14 -0500  
From: tom gruca <thomas-gruca@uiowa.edu>  
Subject: a question for your AAPOR subscribers

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

>From andywill@iastate.edu Mon Oct 14 14:53:16 1996  
Return-Path: andywill@iastate.edu  
Received: from mailhub.iastate.edu (mailhub.iastate.edu [129.186.1.102])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP  
id OAA03722 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Oct 1996 14:53:10 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from sssurv.stat.iastate.edu (sssurv.stat.iastate.edu  
[129.186.101.100]) by mailhub.iastate.edu (8.7.3/8.7.3) with SMTP id  
QAA06056 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Oct 1996 16:53:07 -0500 (CDT)  
Received: from SSSURV/MAILQUEUE by sssurv.stat.iastate.edu (Mercury 1.12);  
Mon, 14 Oct 96 16:50:38 CST  
Received: from MAILQUEUE by SSSURV (Mercury 1.12); Mon, 14 Oct 96 16:50:30  
CST  
From: "Andy Williams" <andywill@iastate.edu>  
Organization: Statistical Laboratory  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Date: Mon, 14 Oct 1996 16:50:20 CST  
Subject: Job Annoucement -- CATI Programmer  
Priority: normal  
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.0-WB3)  
Message-ID: <4DE8840155@sssurv.stat.iastate.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 course work. Employee must have some programming experience and knowledge of PC-based systems. Survey research experienced preferred.

#### Salary

Minimum salary \$23,787. University benefits.

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](http://www.iastate.edu/~hrs_info/jobs/ps.html)

>From daves@startribune.com Tue Oct 15 05:29:11 1996

Return-Path: daves@startribune.com

Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com

[132.148.80.211])  
 by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
 id FAA03623 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 05:29:09 -0700  
 (PDT)  
 Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id HAA12702; Tue, 15 Oct 1996  
 07:28:00 -0500  
 Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by  
 firewall2.startribune.com via smap (V3.1)  
 id xma012698; Tue, 15 Oct 96 07:27:55 -0500  
 Received: from STAR-Message\_Server by mail.startribune.com  
 with Novell\_GroupWise; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 07:33:04 -0600  
 Message-Id: <s2633e30.059@mail.startribune.com>  
 X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1  
 Date: Tue, 15 Oct 1996 07:34:05 -0600  
 From: Rob Daves <daves@startribune.com>  
 To: aapornet@usc.edu  
 Cc: FINEPAM@mail.startribune.com, tmcguire@startribune.com  
 Subject: Minnesota Poll results

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.

	July 8-14 n=1,207	September n=701	October 3-8 n=900	7-13
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  
 >From ICWEM@ASUVM.INRE.ASU.EDU Tue Oct 15 07:39:03 1996  
 Return-Path: ICWEM@ASUVM.INRE.ASU.EDU  
 Received: from post5.inre.asu.edu (post5.INRE.ASU.EDU [129.219.13.72])  
 by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
 id HAA15256 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 07:39:01 -0700  
 (PDT)  
 Received: from ASUVM.INRE.ASU.EDU by asu.edu (PMDf V5.0-4 #7723) id  
 <01IANX5T1E5S92FO7E@asu.edu> for aapornet@USC.EDU; Tue, 15 Oct 1996  
 07:41:15 -0700 (MST)  
 Received: from ASUVM.INRE.ASU.EDU by ASUVM.INRE.ASU.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)  
 with BSMTTP id 7092; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 07:41:15 -0700 (MST)  
 Received: from ASUACAD (NJE origin ICWEM@ASUACAD)  
 by ASUVM.INRE.ASU.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTTP id 7942; Tue, 15 Oct  
 1996 07:41:15 -0700  
 Date: Tue, 15 Oct 1996 07:39:55 -0700 (MST)  
 From: Warren Miller <ICWEM@ASUVM.INRE.ASU.EDU>

Subject: Re: Query from Non-Subscriber  
In-reply-to: "13 Oct 1996 15:02:25 -0700 from" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu> (PDT)  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <01IANX5TAE5Y92FO7E@asu.edu>  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

SECOND REQUEST: PLEASE REMOVE MY NAME FROM YOUR LIST SERVE I DO NOT WANT TO RECEIVE SO MANY MESSAGES.

THANK YOU

>From Shap.Wolf@asu.edu Tue Oct 15 08:57:00 1996  
Return-Path: Shap.Wolf@asu.edu  
Received: from post3.inre.asu.edu (post3.INRE.ASU.EDU [129.219.10.148])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id IAA24217 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 08:56:56 -0700  
(PDT)

Registered-mail-reply-requested-by: Shapard Wolf <Shap.Wolf@asu.edu>

Received: from smtp1.asu.edu by asu.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #7723)  
id <01IANZSKRQDS8X6GLE@asu.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue,  
15 Oct 1996 08:56:52 -0700 (MST)

Received: from la\_srl2.la.asu.edu ([129.219.74.220])  
by smtp1.asu.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP id IAA21967 for  
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 08:56:27 -0700

Date: Tue, 15 Oct 1996 08:56:50 -0700 (MST)

From: Shapard Wolf <Shap.Wolf@asu.edu>

Subject: Job Annoucement -- CATI Programmer

Sender: shapwolf@asu.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <SIMEON.9610150850.A@la\_srl2.asu.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.0.9

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Priority: NORMAL

X-Authentication: none

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

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

Minimum salary \$23,787. University benefits.

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](http://www.iastate.edu/~hrs_info/jobs/ps.html)

```
>From kcbreese@christa.unh.edu Tue Oct 15 09:28:37 1996
Return-Path: kcbreese@christa.unh.edu
Received: from unh.edu (unh.edu [132.177.132.50])
    by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA28866 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 09:28:34 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from christa.unh.edu by unh.edu with SMTP id AA18060
    (5.67b+/IDA-1.5 for <aapornet@usc.edu>); Tue, 15 Oct 1996 12:28:30 -0400
Received: from unhsc10.unh.edu (unhsc10.unh.edu [132.177.130.73]) by
    christa.unh.edu (8.7.6/8.7.3) with SMTP id MAA29718 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
    Tue, 15 Oct 1996 12:28:32 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 15 Oct 1996 12:28:32 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199610151628.MAA29718@christa.unh.edu>
X-Sender: kcbreese@christa.unh.edu (Unverified)
Mime-Version: 1.0
```

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: kcbreese@christa.unh.edu (Kara Breese)  
Subject: cati software  
X-Mailer: <PC Eudora Version 1.4>

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

>From billt@pos.org Tue Oct 15 11:50:19 1996  
Return-Path: billt@pos.org  
Received: from netrail.net (root@netrail.net [205.215.6.3])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP  
id LAA23060 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 11:50:13 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from info (neil.pos.org [205.215.50.23]) by netrail.net  
(8.7.6/Netrail) with SMTP id OAA25028 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Oct  
1996 14:50:08 -0400  
Message-Id: <199610151850.OAA25028@netrail.net>  
Comments: Authenticated sender is <billt@pos.org>  
From: "Bill Thompson" <billt@pos.org>  
Organization: Public Opinion Strategies  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Date: Tue, 15 Oct 1996 14:54:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Job Annoucement -- CATI Programmer  
X-Confirm-Reading-To: "Bill Thompson" <billt@pos.org>  
X-pmrqc: 1  
Priority: normal  
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.42)

Hi there,

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

> Date: Tue, 15 Oct 1996 08:56:50 -0700 (MST)  
> Reply-to: aapornet@usc.edu  
> From: Shapard Wolf <Shap.Wolf@asu.edu>



> 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.  
> --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  
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  
> Minimum salary \$23,787. University benefits.  
>  
> 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](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"

>From billt@pos.org Tue Oct 15 12:10:10 1996

Return-Path: billt@pos.org

Received: from netrail.net (root@netrail.net [205.215.6.3])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP

id MAA27092 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 12:10:07 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from info (neil.pos.org [205.215.50.23]) by netrail.net  
(8.7.6/Netrail) with SMTP id PAA25892 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Oct  
1996 15:10:05 -0400

Message-Id: <199610151910.PAA25892@netrail.net>

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

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

Organization: Public Opinion Strategies

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Tue, 15 Oct 1996 15:14:39 -0400

Subject: Apologies

Priority: normal

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

To all AAPORNETers:

My sincerest aologies. 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

>From mbednarz@umich.edu Tue Oct 15 13:08:12 1996

Return-Path: mbednarz@umich.edu  
Received: from battlezone.rs.itd.umich.edu (root@battlezone.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.96])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id NAA05109 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 13:08:10 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost by battlezone.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.7.5/2.3)  
with SMTP id QAA12566; Tue, 15 Oct 1996 16:08:05 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Tue, 15 Oct 1996 16:08:04 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>  
X-Sender: mbednarz@battlezone.rs.itd.umich.edu  
Reply-To: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Job Opening (fwd)  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.SOL.3.95.961015160723.12325A-100000@battlezone.rs.itd.umich.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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 project 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 publics 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

email: paresearch@aol.com

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Wed Oct 16 10:59:01 1996  
Return-Path: lavrakas.1@osu.edu  
Received: from postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu (postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.20])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id KAA22202 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 16 Oct 1996 10:58:52 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45]) by postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu (8.8.0/8.7.3) with SMTP id NAA02524; Wed, 16 Oct 1996 13:42:03 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19961016173655.006862b4@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu>  
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Wed, 16 Oct 1996 13:36:55 -0400  
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 BSMTMP id 7195; Thu, 17 Oct 96 00:47:56 EDT  
Received: from american.edu (NJE origin ABIDER@AUVM) by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU  
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTMP 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 BROWM 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

>From MPRNJ!GJC@mprnj.com Thu Oct 17 05:55:39 1996  
Return-Path: mprnj!MPRNJ!GJC@mprnj.com  
Received: from tigger.jvnc.net (tigger.jvnc.net [128.121.50.145])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id FAA23307 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Oct 1996 05:55:35 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from mprnj.com by tigger.jvnc.net with UUCP id AA09932  
(5.65c/IDA-1.4.4 for aapornet@usc.edu); Thu, 17 Oct 1996 08:55:13 -0400  
From: MPRNJ!GJC@mprnj.com (George Carcagno)  
Date: 17-Oct-96 08:56:22  
Received: by mprnj.com (UUCP-MHS-XtcN) Thu Oct 17 08:57:50 1996  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Position Open  
Message-Id: 18E0A43A01B4ACD1  
Importance: Normal  
Encoding: 39 TEXT

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 dcgate ([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: Goldenberg\_K <GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov>

To: "'SRMSnet'" <LISTSERV@UMDD.UMD.EDU>, "'aapornet'" <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>,

"CommStat:PSB" <commstat@dcgate.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



Television and Its Impact on Public Opinion  
Talk Radio  
Estimates of Usage of the Internet  
The 1996 Elections  
The Effectiveness of Advertising

Please submit three copies of an abstract (of no more than 300 words) of your proposal, 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.

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. INDICATE THAT YOUR PROPOSAL IS FOR A POSTER SESSION.

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

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

When responding to the AAPOR Conference Call for Papers and Posters, attach this form to your abstract. THIS FORM MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH EACH ABSTRACT

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

Return-Path: dillmand@mail.wsu.edu  
Received: from cheetah.it.wsu.edu (cheetah.it.wsu.edu [134.121.1.8])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id KAA04633 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Oct 1996 10:22:26 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: dillmand@mail.wsu.edu  
Received: from Dillman.wsu.edu (dillman.libarts.wsu.edu [134.121.52.48]) by  
cheetah.it.wsu.edu (8.6.13/WSUit-1.1) with SMTP id KAA05471 for  
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 18 Oct 1996 10:22:27 -0700  
Date: Fri, 18 Oct 1996 10:22:27 -0700  
Message-Id: <199610181722.KAA05471@cheetah.it.wsu.edu>  
X-Sender: dillmand@mail.wsu.edu  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 2.0.3  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Op Scan Mail Questionnaires

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.  
>>

>>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  
>>\*\*\*\*\*

>>  
>>  
>>  
>  
>  
>

\*\*\*\*\*  
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 JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu Sat Oct 19 22:07:10 1996  
Return-Path: JTANUR@CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU  
Received: from ccvm.sunysb.edu (ccvm.sunysb.edu [129.49.2.183])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id WAA04247 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Sat, 19 Oct 1996 22:07:08 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU by ccvm.sunysb.edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)  
with BSMTP id 9106; Sun, 20 Oct 96 01:05:48 EDT  
Received: from ccvm.sunysb.edu (NJE origin JTANUR@SBCCVM) by CCVM.SUNYSB.EDU  
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 5626; Sun, 20 Oct 1996 01:05:48 -0400  
Date: Sun, 20 Oct 96 01:03:31 EDT  
From: Judy Tanur <JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu>  
Organization: State University of New York at Stony Brook  
Subject: a query  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-Id: <961020.010526.EDT.JTANUR@ccvm.sunysb.edu>  
X-Mailer: MailBook 95.01.000

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@ucracl.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 ESMTP

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 (SMTPLINK V2.11 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:

		Strong	Mod	Total
Oct 15-16	Clinton	29	21	50
	Dole	22	16	38
Oct 7-8	Clinton	31	24	55
	Dole	20	14	34
Oct 2-3	Clinton	27	26	53
	Dole	21	16	37

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:

		Core	Soft	Potntl	No Chance
Oct 11-12	Clinton	40	16	10	34
	Dole	26	9	15	50
	Perot	1	3	16	80
Sep 11-13	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

---

Reply Separator

---

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@ucracl.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 accomodate high volume processing of surveys (several hundred to several thousand per jroject) . 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 ESMTMP

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>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Tenure-Track Statistics/Methods Position  
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.92.961022065449.21563D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

From: Kathleen McKinney <kmckinne@rs6000.cmp.ilstu.edu>  
Subject: job announcement

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.

>From EDWARDS1@westatpo.westat.com Tue Oct 22 12:19:35 1996  
Return-Path: EDWARDS1@westatpo.westat.com  
Received: from relay7.UU.NET (relay7.UU.NET [192.48.96.17])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id MAA22013 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Oct 1996 12:19:32 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: EDWARDS1@westatpo.westat.com  
Received: from alterdial.UU.NET by relay7.UU.NET with ESMTTP  
(peer crosschecked as: alterdial.UU.NET [192.48.96.22])  
id QQbmoj26108; Tue, 22 Oct 1996 15:19:31 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from westatpo.westat.com by alterdial.UU.NET with SMTP  
(peer crosschecked as: [198.232.250.102])  
id QQbmoj15508; Tue, 22 Oct 1996 15:19:28 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from ccMail by westatpo.westat.com (SMTPLINK V2.11)  
id AA846022909; Tue, 22 Oct 96 15:19:48 EDT  
Date: Tue, 22 Oct 96 15:19:48 EDT  
Encoding: 27 Text  
Message-Id: <9609228460.AA846022909@westatpo.westat.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Job opening at Westat

Westat, Inc., an employee-owned survey research organization located in Rockville, MD, has an opening for a senior survey analyst/report writer.

Westat is an affirmative action employer. Salary for this position is dependent upon qualifications. Salaried staff compensation includes standard benefits as well as a 401K plan and employee stock ownership plan.

Position description:

Senior survey analyst/report writer, to work with research team on a variety of descriptive/analytic reports related to DoD Human Resource



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)  
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.

-----  
-----

David Rindskopf	Phone: (212)
642-2256	
Educational Psychology	FAX: (212)
642-2257	
CUNY Graduate Center	email:
drindsko@email.gc.cuny.edu	
33 West 42nd Street	
New York, NY 10036 >>	

>From H.van.SCHUUR@ppsw.RUG.NL Wed Oct 23 10:07:38 1996  
Return-Path: H.van.SCHUUR@ppsw.RUG.NL  
Received: from hearnvax.nic.surfnet.nl (hearnvax.nic.surfnet.nl [192.87.5.131])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id KAA10088 for <aapornet@usc.EDU>; Wed, 23 Oct 1996 10:07:34 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mailhost.rug.nl (mailhost.rug.nl) by HEARNVAX.nic.SURFnet.nl (PMDF V5.0-7 #8340) id <01IAZRG8AKZK00TNYD@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 (Mercury 1.21); Wed, 23 Oct 1996 19:09:30 +0100  
Received: from SpoolDir by PPSW2 (Mercury 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@oews.psb.bls.gov Wed Oct 23 10:57:45 1996  
Return-Path: GoldenbK@oews.psb.bls.gov  
Received: from dcgate ([146.142.4.13])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id KAA19024 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Wed, 23 Oct 1996 10:57:39 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov ([146.142.42.8]) by mailgate.bls.gov (5.x/SMI-SVR4)  
id AA18299; Wed, 23 Oct 1996 13:54:37 -0400  
Received: by psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.993.5)  
id <01BBC0EA.39571830@psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov>; Wed, 23 Oct 1996 13:58:09 -0400  
Message-Id: <c=US%a=\_p=BLS%l=BLS/PSB/000311D3@psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov>  
From: Goldenberg\_K <GoldenbK@oews.psb.bls.gov>  
To: "'aapornet'" <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>, "'por'" <por@irss.unc.edu>, "'SRMSnet'" <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>  
Subject: AAPOR Student Paper Competition  
Date: Wed, 23 Oct 1996 13:55:00 -0400  
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

Open to Current Students and Recent Degree Recipients

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.

>From N370005@VM.SC.EDU Wed Oct 23 11:16:41 1996  
Return-Path: N370005@VM.SC.EDU  
Received: from VM.SC.EDU (vm.sc.edu [129.252.41.4])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id LAA22168 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 23 Oct 1996 11:16:36 -0700  
(PDT)  
Message-Id: <199610231816.LAA22168@usc.edu>  
Received: from VM.SC.EDU by VM.SC.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3) with BSMTMP id 9863;  
Wed, 23 Oct 96 14:16:19 EDT

Received: from UNIVSCVM (NJE origin N370005@UNIVSCVM) by VM.SC.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 9964; Wed, 23 Oct 1996 14:16:19 -0400  
Date: Wed, 23 Oct 96 14:15:40 EDT  
From: N370005@VM.SC.EDU  
Organization: University of South Carolina  
Subject: Re: AAPOR Student Paper Competition  
To: AAPOR Paper Deadlines <aapornet@usc.edu>  
In-Reply-To: Message of Wed, 23 Oct 1996 13:55:00 -0400 from <GoldenbK@oeus.psb.bls.gov>  
X-Acknowledge-To: <N370005@UNIVSCVM>

And where should faculty papers be sent and what is deadline?

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  
Date: 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  $-5/4 = -1.25$ , 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  
642-2256  
Educational Psychology  
642-2257  
CUNY Graduate Center  
drindsko@email.gc.cuny.edu  
33 West 42nd Street  
New York, NY 10036 >>

Phone: (212)

FAX: (212)

email:

>From piresrc@dnai.com Thu Oct 24 16:14:33 1996  
Return-Path: piresrc@dnai.com  
Received: from dnai.com (dnai.com [140.174.162.28])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id QAA02074 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Thu, 24 Oct 1996 16:14:30 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from d-54.dnai.com (d-54.dnai.com [140.174.162.54]) by dnai.com  
(8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id QAA10758 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Thu, 24 Oct 1996  
16:13:36 -0700 (PDT)  
Date: Thu, 24 Oct 1996 16:13:36 -0700 (PDT)  
Message-Id: <199610242313.QAA10758@dnai.com>  
X-Sender: piresrc@dnai.com  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.3  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU  
From: piresrc@dnai.com (P.I.R.E./S.R.C.)  
Subject: list assisted vs pure RDD surveys

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

>From Lee.H.Giesbrecht@ccMail.Census.GOV Fri Oct 25 05:04:17 1996  
Return-Path: Lee.H.Giesbrecht@ccMail.Census.GOV  
Received: from info.census.gov (info.census.gov [148.129.129.10])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id FAA16786 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Oct 1996 05:04:16 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from gate.census.gov (gate.census.gov [148.129.129.2]) by  
info.census.gov (8.7.6/8.7.3) with SMTP id IAA09203 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;  
Fri, 25 Oct 1996 08:04:14 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from it-relay1.census.gov by gate.census.gov with SMTP id AA14610  
(InterLock SMTP Gateway 3.0 for <aapornet@usc.edu>);  
Fri, 25 Oct 1996 08:04:14 -0400  
Received: from smtp-gw3.census.gov (smtp-gw3.census.gov [148.129.126.23]) by  
it-relay1.census.gov (8.7.6/8.7.3/v1.9) with SMTP id IAA05817 for  
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Oct 1996 08:04:12 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from ccMail by smtp-gw3.census.gov (SMTPLINK V2.10.05)  
id AA846256269; Fri, 25 Oct 96 07:55:42 EST  
Date: Fri, 25 Oct 96 07:55:42 EST  
From: "Lee H Giesbrecht" <Lee.H.Giesbrecht@ccMail.Census.GOV>  
Message-Id: <9609258462.AA846256269@smtp-gw3.census.gov>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: list assisted vs pure RDD surveys

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".

Biemer, Paul and D. Akin. 1994. "The Efficiency of List-Assisted Random Digit Dialing Schemes for Single and Dual Frame Surveys", 1994 Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Section on Survey Research Methods, 1:1-10.

Brick, J. Michael, and J. Waksberg. 1991. "Avoiding Sequential Sampling with Random Digit Dialing", Survey Methodology 17(1): 27-42.

Brick, J. Michael, J. Waksberg, D. W. Kulp, and A. Starer. 1995. "Bias in List-Assisted Telephone Samples", Public Opinion Quarterly 59(10):218-35.

Casady, Robert J. and J. M. Lepkowski. 1993. "Stratified Telephone Survey Designs", Survey Methodology 19(1): 103-13.

Connor, Judy, and S. Heeringa. 1992. "An Evaluation of Two Cost Efficient RDD Designs", Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, St. Petersburg, Fl.

Keeter, Scott. 1995. "Estimating Noncoverage Bias from a Phone Survey", Public Opinion Quarterly 59(10):218-35.

Kulp, Dale W. 1994. "Dynamics of List-Assisted Sampling", 1994 Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Section on Survey Research Methods, 1:18-35.

Pothoff, Richard F. 1987. "Generalizations of the Mitofsky-Waksberg Technique for Random Digit Dialing", Journal of the American Statistical Association, 82:409-18.

Thornberry, O.T. Jr. and Massey, J.T. 1988. "Trends in US Telephone Coverage Across Time and Subgroups." In Groves, R.M., et al, (eds). 1988 Telephone Survey Methodology. New York: John Wiley & Sons. pp 25-49.

Tucker, Clyde, R. M. Casady, and J. M. Lepkowski. 1993. "A Hierarchy of List-Assisted Stratified Telephone Sample Design Options", Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, St. Charles, IL.

Waksberg, Joseph. 1978. "Sampling Methods for Random Digit Dialing", Journal of the American Statistical Association, 73(361):40-46.

If you come across any other work that isn't represented in this list, I'd appreciate you letting me know.



Lee Giesbrecht  
U.S. Bureau of the Census  
Federal Building 3, Room 3357  
Washington, D.C. 20233  
Tel: (301) 457-3801  
FAX: (301) 457-2306  
lgiesbre@survey.umd.edu

>From rademaew@UCBEH.SAN.UC.EDU Fri Oct 25 12:51:52 1996  
Return-Path: rademaew@UCBEH.SAN.UC.EDU  
Received: from jazz.san.uc.edu (jazz.san.uc.edu [129.137.32.224])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP  
id MAA23674 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Fri, 25 Oct 1996 12:51:48 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from 129.137.76.115 (129.137.76.115)  
by UCBEH.SAN.UC.EDU (PMDF V5.0-7 #15949)  
id <01IB2D4U6DHO90W2TV@UCBEH.SAN.UC.EDU> for AAPORNET@USC.EDU; Fri, 25 Oct  
1996 15:49:42 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Fri, 25 Oct 1996 15:49:42 -0500 (EST)  
Date-warning: Date header was inserted by UCBEH.SAN.UC.EDU  
From: rademaew@UCBEH.SAN.UC.EDU (Eric W. Rademacher)  
Subject: Ohio Poll Elction '96 Tracking Survey Results  
X-Sender: rademaew@ucbeh.san.uc.edu  
To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU  
Message-id: <01IB2D4UA4IM90W2TV@UCBEH.SAN.UC.EDU>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: <PC Eudora Version 1.4>  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

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)

	Dole	Clinton	Perot	Other/Neither	Don't Know
Oct. 20 - 23	38	47	8	1	6 (N=619)
Oct. 19 - 22	35	48	9	2	6 (N=560)
Oct. 18 - 21	35	49	9	2	6 (N=567)
Oct. 17 - 20	35	49	8	3	5 (N=648)
Oct. 17 - 19	35	49	8	3	5 (N=515)

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

>From dfan@simvax.labmed.umn.edu Sat Oct 26 14:24:35 1996  
Return-Path: dfan@simvax.labmed.umn.edu  
Received: from simvax.labmed.umn.edu (simvax.labmed.umn.edu [128.101.59.1])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id OAA00511 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 26 Oct 1996 14:24:34 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: dfan@simvax.labmed.umn.edu  
Received: by simvax.labmed.umn.edu (MX V3.3 VAX) id 7845; Sat, 26 Oct 1996  
16:22:05 CST  
Date: Sat, 26 Oct 1996 16:21:03 CST  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-ID: <009AA6E2.2573B240.7845@simvax.labmed.umn.edu>  
Subject: Clinton-Dole; Press-Polls

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: sssmith@polisci.umn.edu  
University of Minnesota               phone: (612) 624-6820

>From darbym@umich.edu Mon Oct 28 14:16:06 1996  
Return-Path: darbym@umich.edu  
Received: from pacman.rs.itd.umich.edu (root@pacman.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.80])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP  
id OAA25211 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Oct 1996 14:16:04 -0800  
(PST)  
Received: from localhost by pacman.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.7.5/2.3)  
with SMTP id RAA19665; Mon, 28 Oct 1996 17:16:04 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Mon, 28 Oct 1996 17:16:04 -0500 (EST)  
From: Darby E Miller <darbym@umich.edu>  
X-Sender: darbym@pacman.rs.itd.umich.edu  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Remembering Incentives  
In-Reply-To: <9609288465.AA846551761@mailgateway.gao.gov>  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.SOL.3.95.961028171114.7502C-100000@pacman.rs.itd.umich.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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

P O S I T I O N   A N N O U N C E M E N T

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 ESMTTP  
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 WAA11941; 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>

X-Sender: rshalp@pop3.concentric.net  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalp@cris.com>  
Subject: Confirmation of the Polls....  
Cc: por@ripken.oit.unc.edu

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

According to an article in yesterdays'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

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

>From hillcrai@norcmail.uchicago.edu Wed Oct 30 06:34:06 1996  
Return-Path: hillcrai@norcmail.uchicago.edu  
Received: from genesis0s.norc.uchicago.edu (root@genesis0s.norc.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.68])  
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP  
id GAA26205 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Oct 1996 06:34:05 -0800  
(PST)  
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])  
by genesis0s.norc.uchicago.edu (8.6.12/8.6.9) with SMTP id IAA07300; Wed, 30 Oct 1996 08:34:17 -0600  
Received: from cc:Mail by norcmail.uchicago.edu  
id AA846693112; Wed, 30 Oct 96 08:31:15 CST  
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 96 08:31:15 CST  
From: "HILL-CRAIG" <hillcrai@norcmail.uchicago.edu>  
Message-Id: <9609308466.AA846693112@norcmail.uchicago.edu>

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 yesterdays'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 Napoleon, 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 ESMTTP  
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 ESMTTP 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: <v01510106ae9d883b8042@[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 BSMTMP 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 BSMTMP 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