
Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700
Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: October 1998 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 and indexed correctly, and I have converted November 1994 through January 1995 and June 2002 to the present.

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

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9810.
Part 1/1, total size 545224 bytes:

----- Cut here -----
>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Thu Oct 1 07:40:39 1998
Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA09119 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 07:40:39 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (user-381ca2a.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.40.74])
by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA11263
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 10:40:36 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981001102836.007fdb70@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Thu, 01 Oct 1998 10:28:36 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Forum Plan Suggestions
In-Reply-To: <1305045587-21184719@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

I applaud Sid's ideas for a forum.

I would only add that if the audience is to be the general public, the ideas

and the way they are presented should and must be made as clear and as unambiguous as possible. No joke. Better to operate under the principle that if something can be misunderstood, it will be....sometimes purposely by those who want to discredit polling as part of their own political or ideological agendas or because the findings don't agree with their own preconceived ideas. Just listen to the talk show hosts.

Such a forum would also afford an excellent opportunity to discuss the differences between the representative samples that we know and love and the self selected samples employed by write in/call in polls. Might also include discussion of polls that are a regular part of CNN's and Washington Post's web pages. They properly and correctly warn the reader that the sample is not representative...but I've heard the results being quoted anyway by others.

As a starter, one might begin to explore how polling and sampling might best be explained to 5th, 6th and 7th graders! If they can understand what we are talking about, there's a good chance that the general public might also. Polling has become too important a tool for both understanding and affecting how our society functions for us not to take every possible advantage of this opportunity to explain how it works, or should work.

Dick Halpern

At 01:48 PM 9/29/1998 -0400, you wrote:

>Jo:
>
>Here are some ideas that come to mind. I would welcome the opportunity
>to
>discuss these and others with the Council or with a forum planning
>committee.
>
> 1. We should organize a two-day forum on political public opinion
>polling
>(polls). The purpose is twofold: 1) to explain to the public, press
>and
>politicians -- using non-academic terms with as little jargon as
>possible --
>how polls are conducted, analyzed, and disseminated; 2) discuss and

>analyze polls (from January, 1998 to present) about President Clinton
>and

>the current political crisis.

>

> 2. The format of the two-day forum could be divided each day by a

>presentation by four individuals in the a.m. and two 6-member +
>chairperson

>panel discussions in the afternoon.

>

> 3. Topics and individuals could be determined by the organizing
committee.

>

> 4. A forum chair could introduce the forum and all sessions.

>

> 5. Forum should be telecast on C-Span, online q and a involving our
web

>site, recorded for subsequent edited videotape, culminating in an edited

>paperback edition.

>

> 6. Two sources of funding come to mind: 20th Century Fund and the
John and

>Mary Markle Foundation. Estimated budget: \$50,000.

>

>Hope this is helpful.

>Best,

>Sid

>

>

<smaller>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121

E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

</smaller>

>From gulicke@slhn.org Thu Oct 1 08:10:15 1998

Received: from ntserver.slhn.org ([205.147.244.6])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id IAA18389 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 08:10:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by NTSERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

id <T66WPKY9>; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 11:10:52 -0400

Message-ID: <7138ECDD5A46D11192AC00805F1930FF157D52@NTSERVER>

From: "Gulick, Elizabeth" <gulicke@slhn.org>

To: "'AAPOR'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Effectiveness of Consent Forms

Date: Thu, 1 Oct 1998 11:10:51 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

Content-Type: text/plain

I am soliciting advice on what to include in a survey whose purpose is to determine clarity of our clinical study consent forms. This survey would be submitted to patients agreeing to participate in a clinical study and completing a consent form. The Institutional Review Board(IRB) is concerned with determining the following about the format of our consent forms: 1). The descriptions of the treatments in the consent form were very clear 2). I did not understand some of the information in the consent form 3). I felt uncomfortable asking questions about parts of the form that I didn't understand. 4). The consent form was easy to read. 5). The consent form was easy to understand.

These are just some general issues the IRB would like to assess. I am looking for anyone who may have conducted a similar survey or anyone who may have thoughts on what to include in the survey.

Thank You.

Elizabeth P. Gulick

Quality Coordinator

Quality Resources Department

St. Luke's Hospital

Bethlehem, PA

610-954-4129

gulicke@slhn.org

>From bthompso@bsmg.com Thu Oct 1 08:25:40 1998

Received: from bjke.com (firewall-user@ganymede.bjke.com [144.210.8.38])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id IAA23620 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 08:25:38 -0700

(PDT)
From: bthompso@bsmg.com
Received: by bjke.com; id KAA06173; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 10:24:58 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com(144.210.140.12) by gauntlet.bjke.com via smap (4.1)
id xma005511; Thu, 1 Oct 98 10:24:17 -0500
Received: by eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
id <T1AR0PSC>; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 11:23:21 -0400
Message-ID: <24C3CEDAD424D11191BD00805F0D6C4DD7072E@eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Forum Plan Suggestions
Date: Thu, 1 Oct 1998 11:23:20 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
Content-Type: text/plain

I agree with Dick, particularly when he discusses the 5th-7th graders. There could be the added benefit, (if this were done on a large-scale) of having a new generation of kids grow up understanding polls better than their parents did, which couldn't hurt our industry.

> -----

> From: richard s. halpern[SMTP:rshalpern@mindspring.com]
> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Sent: Thursday, October 01, 1998 10:28 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Forum Plan Suggestions

>
> I applaud Sid's ideas for a forum.

>
> I would only add that if the audience is to be the general public, the
> ideas and the way they are presented should and must be made as clear
> and as unambiguous as possible. No joke. Better to operate under the
> principle that if something can be misunderstood, it will
> be....sometimes purposely by those who want to discredit polling as
> part of their own political or ideological agendas or because the
> findings don't agree with their own preconceived ideas. Just listen to
> the talk show hosts.

>
> Such a forum would also afford an excellent opportunity to discuss the
> differences between the representative samples that we know and love
> and the self selected samples employed by write in/call in polls.
> Might also include discussion of polls that are a regular part of
> CNN's and Washington Post's web pages. They properly and correctly
> warn the reader that the sample is not representative...but I've heard
> the results being quoted anyway by others.

>
> As a starter, one might begin to explore how polling and sampling
> might best be explained to 5th, 6th and 7th graders! If they can
> understand what we are talking about, there's a good chance that the
> general public might also. Polling has become too important a tool for
> both understanding and affecting how our society functions for us not

> to take every possible advantage of this opportunity to explain how it
> works, or should work.

>
> Dick Halpern

>
>
>
>
> At 01:48 PM 9/29/1998 -0400, you wrote:

>>Jo:
>>
>>Here are some ideas that come to mind. I would welcome the
> opportunity to
>>discuss these and others with the Council or with a forum planning
> committee.

>>
>> 1. We should organize a two-day forum on political public
> opinion polling
>>(polls). The purpose is twofold: 1) to explain to the public, press
> and
>>politicians -- using non-academic terms with as little jargon as
> possible --
>>how polls are conducted, analyzed, and disseminated; 2) discuss and
>
>>analyze polls (from January, 1998 to present) about President Clinton
> and
>>the current political crisis.

>>
>> 2. The format of the two-day forum could be divided each
> day by a
>>presentation by four individuals in the a.m. and two 6-member +
> chairperson
>>panel discussions in the afternoon.

>>
>> 3. Topics and individuals could be determined by the
> organizing committee.

>>
>> 4. A forum chair could introduce the forum and all
> sessions.

>>
>> 5. Forum should be telecast on C-Span, online q and a
> involving our web
>>site, recorded for subsequent edited videotape, culminating in an
> edited
>>paperback edition.

>>
>> 6. Two sources of funding come to mind: 20th Century Fund
> and the John and
>>Mary Markle Foundation. Estimated budget: \$50,000.

>>
>>Hope this is helpful.
>>Best,
>>Sid

>>
>>

> Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
> Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
> Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121
> E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

>
>From tholp@wright.edu Thu Oct 1 10:05:15 1998
Received: from nova.wright.edu (nova.wright.edu [130.108.128.43])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA06337 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 10:05:13 -0700

(PDT)
Received: from 83382.cupa.wright.edu ([130.108.149.54])
by nova.wright.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #12548)
with SMTP id <01J2GH4I4HA494FOQQ@nova.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;

Thu,
1 Oct 1998 13:05:01 EDT
Date: Thu, 01 Oct 1998 13:03:19 -0500
From: "Timothy J. Sweet-Holp" <tholp@wright.edu>
Subject: SATISFACTION, RATING, AND IMPORTANCE
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Reply-to: tholp@wright.edu
Message-id: <01J2GH4I5YZ294FOQQ@nova.wright.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.42a)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Friends and Colleagues:

I am trying to find out if there is any evidence (empirical or anecdotal) indicating preferred methods for question wording and question ordering in the following situation.

Our client is interested in asking a series of questions about a range of services offered by them. We have discussed asking satisfaction, and/or importance, and/or rating for each service offered. For example:

How SATISFIED are you with PK services?
(Very Dissatisfies/DS/S/Very Satisfied)

How IMPORTANT is PK service to you?
(Not Important/SI/I/Very Important)

How would you RATE PK service?
Excellent/G/F/Poor)

If only one type of question is asked, what are the arguments for favoring SATISFACTION and for favoring RATING? I understand the two questions ask about different attitudes, but I don't recall seeing both sets of questions ask on the same surveys a lot. It seems to me I see more satisfaction questions than rating questions. Is this true? Is this just personal preference?

If all three, or two of the three, questions are asked is there a order preference?

If you ask about a list of services, e.g., PK, AB, NS, should you ask all the satisfaction questions by service and then all the rating questions by service, or ask each service question by satisfaction and by rating?

Please send replies to <tholp@wright.edu>. I am more than happy to share replies with anyone who is interested. Any help is greatly appreciated.

Tim

Timothy J. Sweet-Holp
Center for Urban and Public Affairs
THOLP@WRIGHT.EDU

"Everyone is important, no one is necessary, life goes on" --- Paul Brown

>From lang@u.washington.edu Thu Oct 1 12:53:38 1998

Received: from jason01.u.washington.edu (root@jason01.u.washington.edu [140.142.70.24])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id MAA10641 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 12:53:37 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from homer12.u.washington.edu (lang@homer12.u.washington.edu [140.142.78.13])

by jason01.u.washington.edu (8.8.4+UW97.07/8.8.4+UW98.06) with ESMTP

id MAA15932 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 12:53:34 -0700

Received: from localhost (lang@localhost)

by homer12.u.washington.edu (8.8.4+UW97.07/8.8.4+UW98.06) with SMTP

id MAA14866 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 1 Oct 1998 12:53:32 -0700

Date: Thu, 1 Oct 1998 12:53:31 -0700 (PDT)

From: Kurt Lang <lang@u.washington.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Watergate and Professional Memory

In-Reply-To: <s607c628.077@srbi.com>

Message-ID:

<Pine.A41.3.95b.981001124610.106126B-100000@homer12.u.washington.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I have been busy and hence remiss in checking my e-mail on the discussion of the recent "gate." Re Mark Shulman's reminder of Watergate, you might be interested that we had a call from AP, just about the day of Mark's letter, about similarities with and differences from earlier scandal. I was out of the house but Gladys spent considerable time briefing him. The brief article that appeared a day or tow after made no reference to the movement of public opinion or the recording of this movement in polls at the time.

So much for trying to influence the media coverage.

Kurt

Kurt Lang, Prof. emeritus
Dept. of Sociology
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3340
Home Address:
1249 20th Ave. E.
Seattle, WA 98112-3530
Tel. (206) 325-4569
FAX (at UW) 206-543-2516

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Fri Oct 2 04:13:03 1998
Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.4])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id EAA08838; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 04:13:02 -0700 (PDT)
From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo14.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id KRKMa18750;
Fri, 2 Oct 1998 07:12:15 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <e41c07c6.3614b50f@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Oct 1998 07:12:15 EDT
To: rshalpern@mindspring.com, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Forum Plan Suggestions
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

In a message dated 10/1/98 10:43:35 AM, rshalpern@mindspring.com wrote:

<< Might also include discussion of polls that are a regular part of CNN's
and
Washington Post's web pages. They properly and correctly warn the reader
that
the sample is not representative...but I've heard the results being quoted
anyway by others.
>>

As an aside, Dateline polls on TV regularly only mention that ____ (usually
some odd number such as 543 or 316) adults (with no other explanation of
demographics) were asked for their opinions on _____. More could be done
here.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph. D.
Research Statistician,
and former member of National Agricultural Statistics Service, USDA,
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

>From kwang@ui.urban.org Fri Oct 2 10:07:04 1998
Received: from ABACUS.URBAN.ORG (ABACUS.URBAN.ORG [192.188.252.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id KAA03691 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 10:07:02 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ui.urban.org by ABACUS.URBAN.ORG with SMTP;
Fri, 2 Oct 1998 12:57:24 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from UINET2/SpoolDir by ui.urban.org (Mercury 1.31);
2 Oct 98 12:54:41 -0500
Received: from SpoolDir by UINET2 (Mercury 1.31); 2 Oct 98 12:54:15 -0500
Received: from abacus.urban.org by ui.urban.org (Mercury 1.31);
2 Oct 98 12:54:13 -0500
From: "Kevin Wang" <kwang@ui.urban.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Fri, 2 Oct 1998 12:59:52 -0500
Subject: asking about taxes
Reply-to: KWANG@ui.urban.org
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.54)
Message-ID: <7AD503D30DA@ui.urban.org>

Are there any RDD surveys which have asked whether or not the respondent has filed income taxes? Have there been any efforts to try this question on an experimental basis? Sharing any experience in even trying to do this would be appreciated.

Kevin Wang
The Urban Institute
2100 M. St. NW
Washington, DC 20037

TEL: 202-261-5732

FAX: 202-293-1918

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Oct 2 13:05:44 1998
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA11716 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 13:05:35 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id NAA25358 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 13:05:31 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Fri, 2 Oct 1998 13:05:30 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Social and Economic Well-Being by Race and Hispanic Origin
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9810021302580.13582-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Now available in "pdf" [Acrobat] format at

<http://www.access.gpo.gov/eop/ca/index.html>

Indicators of Social and Economic Well-Being by Race and Hispanic Origin

Prepared by the Council of Economic Advisers for the President's Initiative on Race

This chart book documents current differences in well-being by race and Hispanic origin and describes how such differences have evolved over the past several decades. The book is designed to further one of the goals of the President's Initiative on Race: To educate Americans about the facts surrounding the issue of race in America.

Entire Document	PDF 688k
Foreword and Table of Contents	PDF 282k
I. Introduction	PDF 18k
II. Population	PDF 61k
III. Education	PDF 66k
IV. Labor Markets	PDF 54k
V. Economic Status	PDF 34k
VI. Health	PDF 57k
VII. Crime and Criminal Justice	PDF 54k
VIII. Housing and Neighborhoods	PDF 46k
IX. Appendix	PDF 34k
X. Detailed Chart Sources	PDF 32k

Underlying Chart Data in wk4 format can be downloaded [your Windows spreadsheet or word processor should be able to handle this]

You can download the data underlying the charts as spreadsheet files in Lotus WK4 format. To do this, right click you mouse and choose "Save Link As..." Then open this file using a spreadsheet program.

II. Population

Racial/Ethnic Composition of the Population	2k
Foreign-Born Population	2k
Minority Population by Region, 1995	3k
Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Residence	3k
Intergroup Married Couples, 1990	3k
Household Structure	3k
Age Distribution, 1997	2k

III. Education

Participation in Literacy Activities with a Parent or Family Member by Children Aged Three to Five	2k
Children Aged Three to Four Enrolled in Center-Based Programs or Kindergarten	2k

Computer Use by Children in First through Sixth Grade	2k
Average Reading Proficiency Scores	2k
Average Mathematics Proficiency Scores	2k
Educational Attainment of Adults Aged 25 and Over	3k
Persons Aged 25 to 29 with a High School Degree or Equivalent	4k
Persons Aged 25 to 29 with a Four-Year College Degree or Higher	4k

IV. Labor Markets

Labor Force Participation Rates of Persons Aged 25 to 54	7k
Unemployment Rates of Persons Aged 16 and Over	6k
Persons Aged 16 to 24 Who Are Not in School and Not Employed	4k
Median Usual Weekly Earnings of Male Full-Time Workers	4k
Median Usual Weekly Earnings of Female Full-Time Workers	4k
Black and Hispanic Male Earnings as a Percentage of White Male Earnings	3k
Black and Hispanic Female Earnings as a Percentage of White Female Earnings	3k
Occupations of Employed Persons, 1997	4k

V. Economic Status

Median Family Income	4k
Poverty Rates for Individuals	4k
Poverty Rates for Children	4k
Poverty Rates by Selected Individual Characteristics, 1996	2k
Households Owning Selected Assets, 1993	2k

VI. Health

Infant Mortality Rates	2k
Life Expectancy at Birth	4k
Children Aged 19 to 35 Months Who Are Up to Date with Recommended Vaccinations, 1995-96	2k
Prevalence of Smoking Among Persons Aged 18 to 24	4k
Death Rates by Cause for Persons Aged 15 to 34, 1994-95	2k
Death Rates by Cause for Persons Aged 45 to 64, 1995	3k
Persons Aged 18 to 64 without Health Insurance Coverage, 1994-95	2k

VII. Crime and Criminal Justice

Victims of Homicide	7k
Victims of Property Crime	6k
Admissions to State and Federal Prisons	3k
Adults under Correctional Supervision	4k
Arrests, Convictions, and Prison Admissions for Violent Crimes, 1994	4k
Minority Composition of Local Police and Sheriffs'	

Departments 3k
Perception of Whether Blacks or Whites are Treated More
Harshly by the Criminal Justice System 3k

VIII. Housing and Neighborhoods

Homeownership Rates 2k
Households with High Housing Cost Burdens 2k
Housing Units with Physical Problems 2k
Crowding: Households with More Than One Person per Room 3k
Reported Problems in Neighborhood, 1993-95 2k
Average Racial and Ethnic Composition of Metropolitan
Neighborhoods, 1990 2k
Whites' Attitudes towards Integration 3k

==end==

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Oct 2 13:11:28 1998
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA15951 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 13:11:20 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id NAA27123 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 13:11:20 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Fri, 2 Oct 1998 13:11:20 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: CONFANN: Race in 21st Century America, East Lansing 4/99 (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9810021306030.13582-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Date: Thu, 1 Oct 1998 07:14:48 -0500
From: "Josef J. Barton" <texbart@merle.acns.nwu.edu>
Subject: CONFANN: Race in 21st Century America, East Lansing 4/99

Conference Announcement:

RACE IN 21ST CENTURY AMERICA: A NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Michigan State University
Kellogg Center

April 7-10, 1999

Sponsored by James Madison College and The Black History Committee at

Michigan State University

"Race in 21st Century America: A National Conference" convenes against the backdrop of a complex period of transition, both nationally and globally.

This includes rapid population growth among people of color in the United States, the simultaneous increase of impoverishment and concentrated wealth, and global economic restructuring. These trends are marked by growing efforts to reverse the social, economic, and political gains resulting from the Civil Rights Movement, as well as by increasing debates about the utility of the concept of "race" as a descriptive, analytic, and prescriptive tool.

The Conference examines existing systems of power and privilege in the United States, especially as these impact upon communities of color. We identify specific goals and strategies that promote democratic social, political, and economic structures. Academicians, public officials, community activists, and citizens representing racial, ethnic, and ideological diversity from across the country convene April 7-10, 1999, at Michigan State University.

Keynote and Roundtable Speakers (include):

Molefi Asante, Temple University
Mary Frances Berry, University of Pennsylvania
Dinesh D'Souza, American Enterprise Institute
Evelyn Hu-DeHart, University of Colorado, Boulder
Arturo Madrid, Trinity University
Manning Marable, Columbia University
Janine Pease Pretty-Topon, Little Big Horn College
Abigail Thernstrom, Manhattan Institute
William Julius Wilson, Harvard University

List of Panels:

1. The Origins of the Concept of "Race"
2. Competition and Alliance among Communities of Color
3. Gender and Sexuality
4. Immigration and the Law
5. The Politics and Economics of Education
6. The Evolution of Whiteness
7. Cross-National Models of Race: South Africa, Brazil, Cuba and the United States
8. The Politics of Language in the United States
9. Multiculturalism: Hybridity, Unity and Diversity
10. Representation of Race in Popular Culture
11. Affirmative Action: The Rhetoric and the Reality
12. Race and Religion
13. Community Building for the 21st Century
14. Violence and Social Control
15. The Invention of the Mixed Race

16. Race and Class in America
17. Race and Scientific Research
18. Perspectives on Race: MSU and LCC Student Testimonies
19. Perspectives on Race: MSU Graduate Testimonies
20. Round Table Reflections

More information will be available in the coming weeks.

Questions:

www.jsri.msu.edu/raceconf
raceconf@jsri.msu.edu
517-353-3372

>From leos@christa.unh.edu Fri Oct 2 13:32:57 1998
Received: from christa.unh.edu (leos@christa.unh.edu [132.177.137.10])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA27633 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 13:32:55 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (leos@localhost)
by christa.unh.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id QAA06588
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 16:32:53 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Fri, 2 Oct 1998 16:32:53 -0400 (EDT)
From: Leo G Simonetta <leos@christa.unh.edu>
To: Mailing list <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Closing Gender Gap?
Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.96L.981002162302.13614A-100000@christa.unh.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Recently, I was writing up a press release about Bill Clinton's job approval rating (in NH) and I was looking at the crosstabs and I noticed a curious thing. Clinton was receiving about the same level of approval from both men and women. I went back and checked the spring results on this question and found that the level of approval then was about 14 percentage points higher among women than men.

In the recent survey we also asked whether people had a favorable or unfavorable impression of a list of people as a person (the standard wording of that question). The results from this question seemed to confirm the results of the job approval question. He was viewed much more favorably by men than by women (~20%).

Has anyone else seen these kinds of shifts or is an ideosyncratic NH shift?

--

Leo G. Simonetta

leos@christa.unh.edu

UNH Survey Center

>From BLUMWEP@aol.com Fri Oct 2 13:34:30 1998
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA28419 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 13:34:27 -0700
(PDT)

From: BLUMWEP@aol.com
Received: from BLUMWEP@aol.com
by imo12.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FZICa19215
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 16:33:46 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <58b8bb0a.361538aa@aol.com>

Date: Fri, 2 Oct 1998 16:33:46 EDT

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: Re: Forum Plan Suggestions

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 226

In a message dated 10/2/98 7:13:14 AM Eastern Daylight Time,
MILTGOLD@aol.com
writes:

<< As an aside, Dateline polls on TV regularly only mention that ____
(usually
some odd number such as 543 or 316) adults (with no other explanation of
demographics) were asked for their opinions on _____. More could be done
here.
>>

The Dateline "Question of the Week" polls are indeed conducted weekly of RDD
samples of 500+ adults, margin of error +/- 4.5 percentage points. The
polls
are usually conducted the night before you see the results on the show.
While any significant differences by demographic subgroups are given to the
show --along with a discussion of the methodology-- the producers rarely
choose to present them because of time constraints. I will gladly suggest
that they add the margin of error to the graphics.

>From binddav@statcan.ca Fri Oct 2 15:09:22 1998
Received: from stcgate.statcan.ca (stcgate.statcan.ca [142.206.192.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA12712 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 15:09:15 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from stcnet (stcnet.statcan.ca [142.206.128.146]) by
stcgate.statcan.ca (8.9.1/8.6.9) with SMTP id SAA03830; Fri, 2 Oct 1998
18:14:13 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from statcan.ca by statcan.ca (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
id SAA27587; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 18:12:11 -0400; sender binddav@statcan.ca

Message-Id: <3.0.1.16.19981002180815.20af0c3e@142.206.128.146>

X-Sender: binddav@142.206.128.146

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (16)

Date: Fri, 02 Oct 1998 18:08:15

To: <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>, <allstat@mailbase.ac.uk>, <AAPORNET@usc.edu>
From: "David A. Binder" <binddav@statcan.ca>
Subject: Symposium 99: WORKSHOP AND SYMPOSIUM ON COMBINING DATA FROM
DIFFERENT SOURCES
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I am sending a second announcement of Statistics Canada's Symposium 99 because the first one did not include the call for papers (and the deadlines) and because some people experienced problems in accessing our WEB site, <http://www.statcan.ca/english/conferences/symposium99/index.htm>

=====
Symposium 99
WORKSHOP AND SYMPOSIUM ON COMBINING DATA FROM DIFFERENT SOURCES
Statistics Canada
Ottawa, Canada
May 4-7, 1999

The theme of Statistics Canada's XVIth Annual International Methodology Symposium will be Combining Data from Different Sources. This symposium is organised in conjunction with EUROSTAT. Two workshops on topics related to the theme will be presented.

The focus of Symposium 99 is on techniques and methods for combining data from different sources and on analysis of the resulting data sets. Special consideration will be given to the methodological aspects of and problems encountered when combining data. Practical examples of applications in different areas of study such as public health, national accounts, education, income, and labour will be presented. The symposium will give participants an opportunity to hear and meet colleagues who are involved in the development and application of these methods.

Two half-day workshops will be offered to participants. The topics are: (i) Calibration of Survey Estimates, and (ii) Meta-Analysis.

We invite abstracts for papers related to the theme of Symposium '99. Papers concerning new or previously undocumented approaches, methodologies and applications are especially welcome. Academic researchers and practitioners from both the private and public sectors are encouraged to submit.

Abstracts of 200-300 words, in English or French, along with the presenter's name, affiliation, complete address, telephone and fax numbers and email address, should be sent to the address below. The deadline for abstracts is October 31, 1998. The final selection of papers will be announced by December 31, 1998.

Presenters must submit a draft paper, in English or French, by April 17, 1999, for the purposes of official simultaneous translation. The final version of a paper must be provided by June 30, 1999, in order to appear in the symposium proceedings.

Submit abstracts to:

Christian Thibault
Statistics Canada
16th floor, R.H. Coats Building
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1A 0T6
Telephone: (613) 951-6935
Fax: (613) 951-3100
email: THIBCHR@statcan.ca

Non-exhaustive list of topics

Benefits:

Minimizing Response Burden
Minimizing Cost
Maximizing the Use of Information

Prerequisites:

Harmonization/Standardization
Comparability (coverage, time frame, population)
Internal Consistency (definition, classification)

Techniques (or Methods):

Statistical Matching
Record Linkage
Imputation (Cold Deck)

Analysis from combined sources:

Examples
Meta-Analysis
Meta-Synthesis

Combining Surveys/Sources - Methodological Issues:

Applications
Quality Issues (measurement, frames, coverage studies)

Estimation Issues:

Multiple Frames
Combined Estimation
Benchmark/Calibration

Round Table:

Privacy when Combining Data

Workshops:

Calibration

Meta-Analysis

Demo:

Record Linkage

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Oct 2 17:51:50 1998
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA12914 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 17:51:48 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (plp1.vgernet.net [205.219.186.101])
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id XAA09623
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 2 Oct 1998 23:54:46 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <36157490.569DBD2A@jwdp.com>
Date: Fri, 02 Oct 1998 20:49:20 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Pummeling the Pollsters
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

While I was in New York to attend the NYAAPOR meeting at which David Moore and others told tales of politicians pummeling the pollsters, my hometown newspaper, The Berkshire Eagle was publishing the following op-ed piece by a local lawyer and politician, ironically misusing David Moore's own words to pummel the pollsters.

Should anyone wish to respond, please address replies to:
eagle@berkshire.net

Survey says: Dump the pollsters

By Robert F. Jakubowicz

PITTSFIELD

ONE OF my pet peeves is the ubiquitousness of polling in politics. In my opinion, political pollsters differ little from the official 16 Roman diviners (called augurs) who interpreted the intestines of sacrificed animals, the calls and flights of birds, and the feeding habits of sacred chickens to determine a right course of action to take in political and other matters.

The serious business of whether President Clinton should complete his term of office is too important to be left to the interpretation of, day-to-day samplings of the opinion of a few hundred or at most about a thousand people by congress-men, the president, and the press. Yet such public opinion polling is currently the main basis for Clinton's decision to remain in office, Congress's uncertainty about what to do

about impeaching him, and the TV and print media conclusions and generalizations about the views of the electorate.

One of CNN's political pundits proclaims on TV that favorable public opinion polls are the only reason President Clinton remains in office. Peter Jennings on his evening ABC news show touts the results of overnight polling by his news organization as headline-breaking news that most Americans want Clinton to remain in office.

Political pollsters and those who interpret their data try to sell their interpretations as a science. Daniel S. Greenberg, a columnist who writes about scientific matters, described these pollster interpretations as schlock-scientific prophecies. He correctly points out that the pollster's phraseology such as scientific samples, and margins of error conveys the notion that their information is based on a scientific inquiry.

Rather unscientifically, the pollsters only use a few hundred to a little over a thousand people to sample opinion that they then generalize as representing the American public. One of the big reasons for such small numbers is cost. The numbers have to be kept low to insure a profit for the pollster. Many people overlook the fact that polling is done for profit. Just like the small fish who have come to swim with the sharks to live off the scraps of their hosts, political pollsters have the same sort of symbiotic relationship with politicians and are making a good living off them.

Sometimes polls turn out to be accurate, but in my view many such results are quite obvious to anyone doing a little study about the matter. For example, it became a foregone conclusion early in the last presidential race that Bob Dole would lose the election.

However, increasingly polling is being used by politicians to tailor their decisions and positions on public issues to what their pollsters tell them is the majority opinion in the country or their state.

Polling is turning our politicians into chameleons who change their political colors to suit what they consider to be the political climate as predicted by the polls. Currently many congressmen seem to be waiting to see what their pollsters will eventually tell them is the best course of action for them to take over the Clinton impeachment for the sake of their own re-election in the coming congressional elections.

* * * *

Even worse is the main point made by David W. Moore in his book "The Superpollsters," that people's opinions taken by pollsters are very much swayed by the polling itself, by the type of questions asked, how they are placed in the interview and the character of the interviewer. By such shaping of public opinion rather than measuring it, pollsters for the sake of their personal profit are exercising a very unhealthy influence over decision-making by voters in elections and decision-making by political leaders in their governance.

There has also been a dramatic rise in polling by news organizations who then treat the results as big news events. There is neither any science involved in nor any real information to be gained by asking TV viewers to call certain, telephone numbers to express a yes or no on some simply and briefly written question.

This extensive use of polling by politicians is a rather recent phenomena. Frustrated by the many variables in doing or saying the right thing to ensure their main objective of being elected or

re-elected, many politicians had long sought some sort of scientific method to accomplish this objective. Meanwhile in this century pollsters were seeking to expand the fledgling business of polling beyond market products to increase their profits.

Then in the latter part of the century politicians discovered the pollsters, or vice-versa, and pollsters sold the politicians the notion that polling was the political holy grail they had been seeking. Now every politician thinks he needs a pollster and in the words of Greenberg, profit-seeking pollsters feast on the people's business of not only choosing leaders, but the decision-making by our leaders in dealing with such a matter as Clinton's impeachment.

We should let the candidates for office sway us with their campaigns and cast our votes on that basis and not be influenced by pollsters. Our political leaders should decide public policy on the basis of what they believe is the right course of action rather than following the polls. The matter of what course of action should be taken by the 'president and Congress over the question of 'impeachment should be decided by them without any interference by the questionable practice by pollsters of taking and interpreting limited polls as reflecting the opinions of all of us.

Robert F. Jakubowicz is a Pittsfield lawyer and regular Eagle contributor.

The Berkshire Eagle - Thursday, October 1, 1998 - Page A7
>From worc@worc.demon.co.uk Sun Oct 4 13:08:14 1998
Received: from post.mail.demon.net (post-12.mail.demon.net [194.217.242.41])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA09758 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 4 Oct 1998 13:08:10 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [194.222.4.107] (helo=worc.demon.co.uk)
by post.mail.demon.net with smtp (Exim 2.03 #1)
id 0zPuRp-0003fZ-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Sun, 4 Oct 1998 20:08:06 +0000
Message-ID: <V9YfzPABB8F2EwpZ@worc.demon.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 4 Oct 1998 19:36:49 +0100
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Robert M. Worcester" <worc@worc.demon.co.uk>
Subject: Re: Forum Plan Suggestions
In-Reply-To: <3.0.5.32.19981001102836.007fdb70@pop.mindspring.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Turnpike Version 3.04 <eEJ11NtraR\$afropsRVDqGcN\$q>

Dear Dick et al

Ken Schwartz wrote an excellent book about 30 years ago designed to inform young people how polling works. I'd guess Herb Abelson must have a copy somewhere; you could do worse than start from there.

Bob

In message <3.0.5.32.19981001102836.007fdb70@pop.mindspring.com>, "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com> writes
>I applaud Sid's ideas for a forum.

>
>I would only add that if the audience is to be the general public, the ideas and
>the way they are presented should and must be made as clear and as unambiguous
>as possible. No joke. Better to operate under the principle that if something
>can be misunderstood, it will be....sometimes purposely by those who want to
>discredit polling as part of their own political or ideological agendas or
>because the findings don't agree with their own preconceived ideas. Just listen
>to the talk show hosts.

>
>Such a forum would also afford an excellent opportunity to discuss the
>differences between the representative samples that we know and love and the
>self selected samples employed by write in/call in polls. Might also include
>discussion of polls that are a regular part of CNN's and Washington Post's web
>pages. They properly and correctly warn the reader that the sample is not
>representative...but I've heard the results being quoted anyway by others.

>
>As a starter, one might begin to explore how polling and sampling might best be
>explained to 5th, 6th and 7th graders! If they can understand what we are
>talking about, there's a good chance that the general public might also.

Polling
>has become too important a tool for both understanding and affecting how our
>society functions for us not to take every possible advantage of this
>opportunity to explain how it works, or should work.

>
>Dick Halpern

>
>
>
>
>At 01:48 PM 9/29/1998 -0400, you wrote:

>>Jo:
>>
>>Here are some ideas that come to mind. I would welcome the opportunity to
>>discuss these and others with the Council or with a forum planning committee.

>>
>> 1. We should organize a two-day forum on political public opinion
>polling
>>(polls). The purpose is twofold: 1) to explain to the public, press and
>>politicians -- using non-academic terms with as little jargon as possible
--
>>how polls are conducted, analyzed, and disseminated; 2) discuss and
>>analyze polls (from January, 1998 to present) about President Clinton and
>>the current political crisis.

>>
>> 2. The format of the two-day forum could be divided each day by
a
>>presentation by four individuals in the a.m. and two 6-member +
chairperson
>>panel discussions in the afternoon.
>>
>> 3. Topics and individuals could be determined by the organizing
>committee.
>>
>> 4. A forum chair could introduce the forum and all sessions.
>>
>> 5. Forum should be telecast on C-Span, online q and a involving
our
>web
>>site, recorded for subsequent edited videotape, culminating in an edited
>>paperback edition.
>>
>> 6. Two sources of funding come to mind: 20th Century Fund and
the
>John and
>>Mary Markle Foundation. Estimated budget: \$50,000.
>>
>>Hope this is helpful.
>>Best,
>>Sid
>>
>>
>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
>Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
>Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121
>E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

--
Robert M. Worcester
>From dhenwood@panix.com Sun Oct 4 16:25:46 1998
Received: from mail2.panix.com (mail2.panix.com [166.84.0.213])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id QAA07928 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 4 Oct 1998 16:25:45 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [166.84.250.86] (dhenwood.dialup.access.net [166.84.250.86])
by mail2.panix.com (8.8.8/8.8.8/PanixM1.3) with ESMTP id TAA20415
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 4 Oct 1998 19:25:43 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dhenwood@popserver.panix.com
Message-Id: <l0313030bb23db438b4ec@[166.84.250.86]>
In-Reply-To: <Pine.OSF.3.96L.981002162302.13614A-100000@christa.unh.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Sun, 4 Oct 1998 19:25:54 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>
Subject: Re: Closing Gender Gap?

Leo G Simonetta wrote:

>Recently, I was writing up a press release about Bill Clinton's
>job approval rating (in NH) and I was looking at the crosstabs
>and I noticed a curious thing. Clinton was receiving about the
>same level of approval from both men and women. I went back and
>checked the spring results on this question and found that the
>level of approval then was about 14 percentage points higher
>among women than men.

>
>In the recent survey we also asked whether people had a
>favorable or unfavorable impression of a list of people as
>a person (the standard wording of that question). The results
>from this question seemed to confirm the results of the
>job approval question. He was viewed much more favorably by
>men than by women (~20%).

>
>Has anyone else seen these kinds of shifts or is an ideosyncratic
>NH shift?

I noticed that in a recent New York Times comparison of Clinton's September numbers with those from early in the year, that his approval rating among men rose about 8 points, if I remember correctly. I attributed this to admiration for his phallic prowess.

Doug

--

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

>From RoniRosner@aol.com Mon Oct 5 11:10:23 1998
Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.5])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA24171 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 5 Oct 1998 11:10:04 -0700
(PDT)
From: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: from RoniRosner@aol.com
by imo15.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FEUMa17798
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 5 Oct 1998 14:09:23 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <20722efb.36190b53@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Oct 1998 14:09:23 EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: DISCOVERING DATA MINING WORKSHOP, 10/21
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 2.5 for Windows

AAPOR/New York Chapter Afternoon Workshop

Date: Wednesday, 21 October 1998

Presentation: 2:30 p.m. sharp -- 5:00 p.m.

Place: NBC
30 Rockefeller Plaza (49th - 50th)/Mezzanine, Room A
(Must use studio elevators! In center of lobby, follow signs)

ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE RESERVATION ONLY.
Reservation dateline: Mon., 19 Oct. 1998
E-MAIL RoniRosner@AOL.COM, or call if you must (212/722-5333).

--

DISCOVERING DATA MINING:
Searching for the Hidden Treasure in Large Databases

Data Mining has captured the imagination of both the business and academic worlds. Its toolkit of methods are designed to extract and analyze valuable information from databases to discover the "hidden gold" within.

This introductory session will look at data mining in perspective, including:

- * How "true" data-mining works
- * An overview of the methods used; the strengths, weaknesses, validation issues of the alternatives
- * Current applications used within industry today, and the potential benefits
- * How data mining can complement or enhance survey and market research
- * Tutorials of 2 primary data mining techniques: Rule Induction and Classification Tree (AID & MAID)

Presentations by:

Dr. Michael Gilman, President of Data Mining Technologies, Inc., a company specializing in software and services for science and industry.

Daniel Ray, Vice President of Management Science Associates, a consulting firm specializing in data management and analysis services in Marketing and advertising.

-

Prepaid fees (by 19 Oct.: \$25 (members), \$40 (nonmembers), \$12 (student members), \$20 (student nonmembers, HLMs).

Fees at the door are: \$35 (members), \$50 (nonmembers), \$17 (student members), \$25 (student nonmembers, HLMs).

Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

Send prepaid fee, payable to NYAAPOR, by 19 Oct. to:
Roni Rosner, 1235 Park Avenue, #7C, New York, New York 10128-1759

--

Save the date!! Evening meeting on 12 Nov.1998

"Polling and the 1998 Election"

>From jsosin@bsmg.com Wed Oct 7 14:24:58 1998

Received: from bjke.com (firewall-user@ganymede.bjke.com [144.210.8.38])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id OAA01668 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 7 Oct 1998 14:24:41 -0700

(PDT)

From: jsosin@bsmg.com

Received: by bjke.com; id QAA18833; Wed, 7 Oct 1998 16:24:38 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com(144.210.140.12) by gauntlet.bjke.com via smap (4.1)

id xma018175; Wed, 7 Oct 98 16:23:52 -0500

Received: by eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

id <4KNQ1AXV>; Wed, 7 Oct 1998 17:22:35 -0400

Message-ID: <24C3CEDAD424D11191BD00805F0D6C4D013FAE41@eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Research Positions

Date: Wed, 7 Oct 1998 17:22:34 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)

Content-Type: text/plain

KRC Research, a division of BSMG Worldwide, has Associate and Senior Associate positions open in its New York City office. Associates and Senior Associates work with Directors and Managing Directors on both qualitative and quantitative research, and are responsible for writing proposals, analyzing data, and writing reports. A minimum of 1-2 years research experience and knowledge of qualitative and/or quantitative methodologies is required for Associates; a minimum of 3 years experience is required for Senior Associates. A bachelors degree is required; an advanced degree is preferred. Please forward resume and cover letter to Debra Rosenthal-Fox, KRC Research, 640 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10019-6102, or e-mail to drosenth@bsmg.com.

Jennifer A. Sosin

KRC Research

1501 M Street NW, Suite 600

Washington, DC 20005

Phone: 202-739-0217

Fax: 202-659-8287

E-mail: jsosin@bsmg.com

>From GNFPRC@aol.com Thu Oct 8 07:26:38 1998

Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.70])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id HAA07638 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 07:26:37 -0700

(PDT)

From: GNFPRC@aol.com

Received: from GNFPRC@aol.com

by imo26.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FTWLa02301

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 10:25:47 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <2473cfda.361ccb6b@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 10:25:47 EDT

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: Pew polling analysis

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 64

As part of our occasional attempts to summarize what the polls are finding, the Pew Research Center released this week an analysis of recent survey results in two areas - the upcoming congressional elections and the Clinton scandal.

Although at least five national polls in September showed Republicans with more support than Democrats among likely voters, recent trends find no clear evidence that the White House scandal has Democratic voters any more dispirited about voting this fall than they were earlier this year, or in 1994.

At the same time, Americans have shown a great deal of conviction on the bottom-line questions about the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal. This is reflected in three ways: the remarkably similar results that emerge, despite difference in question wording across polling organizations; consistency in individual responses to different questions within the same survey; and finally, when people are asked in follow-up questions if they ever consider changing their views, most say no.

As with all of our results, this report is available online at www.people-press.org .

Greg Flemming

Pew Research Center

>From kbcg@ix.netcom.com Thu Oct 8 07:32:42 1998

Received: from dfw-ix16.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix16.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.16])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id HAA11334 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 07:32:40 -0700

(PDT)

Received: (from smap@localhost)

by dfw-ix16.ix.netcom.com (8.8.4/8.8.4)
id JAA14880 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 09:32:08 -0500
(CDT)

Received: from lex-ky1-20.ix.netcom.com(204.31.246.52) by
dfw-ix16.ix.netcom.com via smap (V1.3)

id rma014788; Thu Oct 8 09:31:49 1998

Message-ID: <002e01bdf2ae\$980a8720\$34f61fcc@fb0zt>

Reply-To: "#kbcg" <kbcg@ix.netcom.com>

From: "#kbcg" <kbcg@ix.netcom.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Open Position Listing

Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 07:27:10 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----_NextPart_000_002B_01BDF28D.0FA935A0"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_002B_01BDF28D.0FA935A0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The following is an announcement for an open position in market =
research.

Market Research Analyst

A Lexington, KY market research company is looking for a very capable =
person to assist in its market and survey research needs. The individual =
will be responsible for participating in all aspects of studies, =
including questionnaire development, data collection management, =
analysis, and report writing.

To qualify for the position you must have a minimum of 1-2 years =
quantitative research experience, preferably on the supplier side. In =
addition, you must have excellent verbal and written skills.

This is a growing firm with an excellent list of blue chip clients in =
both consumer products and high technology. A very pleasant working =
environment and the opportunity to advance.

Please fax your resume to Chris Grecco at (606) 335-0261.

-----=_NextPart_000_002B_01BDF28D.0FA935A0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>

<META content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type>
<META content="MSHTML 4.72.3110.7" name=GENERATOR>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgcolor=#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT size=14>
<P>The following is an announcement for an open position in market =
research.</P>
<P align=Center>Market Research Analyst</P>
<P>A Lexington, KY market research company is looking for a very capable =
person=20
to assist in its market and survey research needs. The individual will =
be=20
responsible for participating in all aspects of studies, including =
questionnaire=20
development, data collection management, analysis, and report =
writing.</P>
<P>To qualify for the position you must have a minimum of 1-2 years =
quantitative=20
research experience, preferably on the supplier side. In addition, you =
must have=20
excellent verbal and written skills.</P>
<P>This is a growing firm with an excellent list of blue chip clients in =
both=20
consumer products and high technology.&nbsp; A very pleasant working =
environment=20
and the opportunity to advance.</P>
<P>Please fax your resume to Chris Grecco at (606) 335-0261.</P>
<P>&nbsp;</P></FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
```

-----=_NextPart_000_002B_01BDF28D.0FA935A0--

```
>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Thu Oct 8 08:20:12 1998
Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.214.31])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id IAA07152 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 08:20:06 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])
  by mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA29112
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 11:20:05 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19981008152004.00b531c8@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Thu, 08 Oct 1998 11:20:04 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
```

From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: 1999 AAPOR Call for Papers, Panels, Posters, Roundtables

54th Annual Conference -- St. Petersburg, Florida
May 13-16, 1999
Tradewinds Resort -- On St. Pete Beach

CALL FOR PAPERS, PANELS, POSTERS, ROUNDTABLES

SUBMISSIONS DUE 98/12/11

The American Association for Public Opinion Research will hold its 54th annual conference in St. Petersburg, Florida in May of 1999. AAPOR's Conference Committee seeks proposals for papers, panels, poster presentations, and roundtable discussion groups that will address important research questions, increase the knowledge and skills of AAPOR's membership, and promote the development of our profession.

Papers, panels, posters, and roundtable ideas on any topic in public opinion and/or survey research are welcomed for consideration for next May's conference. We encourage submitters to form sessions with common themes and to submit their papers together as a potential panel. These papers will be considered individually in the event that the entire panel session is not accepted.

We especially encourage the submission of panel proposals or other less formal presentations that will appeal to those working in the commercial and government sectors.

Based on comments at recent AAPOR conferences and from AAPOR's membership survey, the selection process will be more stringent this year. The goal will be to limit the number of presentations to approximately 200. This number is approximately 10%-15% fewer than in recent past years.

Presently, AAPOR is developing a special submission process on its website (www.aapor.org). This will be the preferred way to make your submission, which is due by December 11, 1998. However, this website procedure will not be operational until sometime in November. An announcement will go out via AAPORnet once it becomes operational, but please also check the website on occasion for updates.

If you cannot make your submission via the website, please submit one copy of your proposal or abstract, of no more than 600 words, including a title, a few keywords, the name and contact information for each co-author or participant, to this year's Conference Committee Chair: Dr. Paul J. Lavrakas; College of Social & Behavioral Sciences; Ohio State University, Derby Hall, Room 0126, Columbus, OH 43210 or via email to aapor99@osu.edu or via fax to 614-292-6673. The deadline for submissions is December 11, 1998.

If you email, mail, or fax your proposal, please fit it onto two or fewer pieces of 8" x 11.5" paper if at all possible. Use one additional sheet if necessary for contact information about co-authors. You will receive confirmation that your proposal has been received by the first week of

January 1999. Final decisions about the program will be made by the end of January 1999, and you will be notified about the status of your proposal shortly thereafter.

The following information should accompany the narrative that describes your proposal.

1. Submitter's name, mailing address, telephone number(s) and email address
2. The same identifying information for any other authors or panelists
3. Two or three KEYWORDS to signal what your proposal is about (e.g., nonresponse; interviewer training)
4. No more than 600 words describing your paper, poster, panel, etc.

Before you submit your proposal, PLEASE have someone else review what you are submitting to make certain it will be readily understood by AAPOR reviewers. If you are submitting a proposal that presents new research findings, please succinctly and briefly describe the source of your data in terms of mode, sampling design, sample size, response rates, dates of field period, etc.

 * Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
 * Professor of Journalism & Communication *
 * Professor of Public Policy & Management *
 * 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 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu *

>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Thu Oct 8 09:32:56 1998
 Received: from fw (fw.gallup.com [206.158.235.10])
 by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
 id JAA14147 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 09:32:54 -0700
 (PDT)

From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com
 Received: from exchn5.gallup.com by fw (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
 id LAA24857; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 11:32:21 -0500
 Received: by EXCHNG5 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
 id <437D68R3>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 11:32:22 -0500
 Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F9038F751@exchn3.gallup.com>
 To: aapornet@usc.edu
 Subject: By Popular Demand
 Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 11:32:21 -0500
 MIME-Version: 1.0
 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
 Content-Type: text/plain

In response to AAPOR and American public requests for more bivariate information from polls on President Clinton, Gallup aggregated seven recent surveys (5,123 national adult telephone interviews) and reports the aggregated answers to our Clinton job approval and "Should Clinton be Impeached" questions online. All polls combined for this aggregate were conducted between September 10-24, a two week period beginning when the Starr Report was sent to Congress.

The increased sample sizes provide greater reliability for the subgroup numbers (such as gender, age, party id) being reported. Given the basic stability in public opinion about Clinton and impeachment during this period, we at Gallup felt it was appropriate to report averages using this aggregate.

The average Clinton approval rating across these polls is 63% -- identical to the result of a new CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll taken this week which is not represented in the aggregate. Support for impeachment in the aggregate was 31%, compared to 32% in the poll taken this week.

You can find the Gallup Post-Starr Report aggregate at:
http://www.gallup.com/The_Poll/100198/subgroupviews.asp

Lydia Saad
Managing Editor, The Gallup Poll

>From penaloza@WSRL.CEE.UWEX.EDU Thu Oct 8 09:37:17 1998
Received: from smtphost.uwex.edu (smtphost.uwex.edu [144.92.126.17])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA16501 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 09:37:16 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from wsrl.cee.uwex.edu ([144.92.88.146])
by smtphost.uwex.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id LAA21474;
Thu, 8 Oct 1998 11:37:15 -0500
Received: from CONT_ED_2/SpoolDir by wsrl.cee.uwex.edu (Mercury 1.40);
8 Oct 98 11:37:13 -0600
Received: from SpoolDir by CONT_ED_2 (Mercury 1.40); 8 Oct 98 11:37:05 -0600
From: "Linda Penaloza 5-2796" <penaloza@WSRL.CEE.UWEX.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 11:37:01 -0600
Subject: Misleading polling
CC: Holly Breikreutz <breikreutz@learn.uwsa.edu>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.23)
Message-ID: <480DA905560@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu>

Colleagues -

A poll is currently being conducted in Wisconsin, asking respondents whom they intend to vote for in the upcoming state elections. The polling company, based in the Washington DC area, is using our name to solicit responses from folks around the state. Several employees of our lab, as well as others who know us around the state, have been called. Several asked the interviewer for identification, for the sponsor, and for a supervisor to verify the call, but were refused. Caller ID has helped us locate the calls as coming from the DC area, but the polling organization was not forthcoming about their true identity, who is sponsoring the poll, or how the results will be used. We have received irate calls from some of the respondents, blaming us for what they perceived as a biased and poorly conducted

poll.

It seems likely that the mystery organization will call across the country, and equally likely that they will misrepresent themselves as being a local survey research laboratory. I bring this to your attention, so you can be on the watch for such "identity theft." Such practices do damage to survey research laboratories in general, through providing misleading and erroneous information. They can also damage the lab whose name is being used, through creating ill will among the citizens.

If this happens to any of you, would you please let me know? If you find out any information about the individuals or organization responsible, I would appreciate knowing about it. You may email me directly at penaloza@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu, or you may email our director, Holly Breitkreutz, at breitkreutz@learn.uwsa.edu

Thank you.

Linda J. Penaloza
Associate Director
Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory (the real one)

Linda J. Penaloza
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: penaloza@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 esinger@isr.umich.edu Thu Oct 8 10:29:09 1998
Received: from runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.144.15])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA09907 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 10:29:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from s-isr-m1.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])
by runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.5/2.3) with ESMTP id NAA14365;
Thu, 8 Oct 1998 13:29:07 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199810081729.NAA14365@runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu>
Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
id <RDG7J1TH>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 13:30:47 -0400
From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@isr.umich.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu, Linda Penaloza 5-2796
<penaloza@WSRL.CEE.UWEX.EDU>
Cc: Holly Breitkreutz <breitkreutz@learn.uwsa.edu>
Subject: RE: Misleading polling

Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 13:27:00 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
Content-Type: text/plain

It seems to me that this is a potential case for the AAPOR Standards Committee.

From: Linda Penaloza 5-2796
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: Holly Breitkreutz
Subject: Misleading polling
Date: Thursday, October 08, 1998 1:37PM

Colleagues -

A poll is currently being conducted in Wisconsin, asking respondents whom they intend to vote for in the upcoming state elections. The polling company, based in the Washington DC area, is using our name to solicit responses from folks around the state. Several employees of our lab, as well as others who know us around the state, have been called. Several asked the interviewer for identification, for the sponsor, and for a supervisor to verify the call, but were refused. Caller ID has helped us locate the calls as coming from the DC area, but the polling organization was not forthcoming about their true identity, who is sponsoring the poll, or how the results will be used. We have received irate calls from some of the respondents, blaming us for what they perceived as a biased and poorly conducted poll.

It seems likely that the mystery organization will call across the country, and equally likely that they will misrepresent themselves as being a local survey research laboratory. I bring this to your attention, so you can be on the watch for such "identity theft." Such practices do damage to survey research laboratories in general, through providing misleading and erroneous information. They can also damage the lab whose name is being used, through creating ill will among the citizens.

If this happens to any of you, would you please let me know? If you find out any information about the individuals or organization responsible, I would appreciate knowing about it. You may email me directly at penaloza@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu, or you may email our director, Holly Breitkreutz, at breitkreutz@learn.uwsa.edu

Thank you.

Linda J. Penaloza
Associate Director
Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory (the real one)

Linda J. Penaloza
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: penaloz@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 p-miller@nwu.edu Thu Oct 8 12:46:06 1998
Received: from casbah.acns.nwu.edu (casbah.acns.nwu.edu [129.105.16.52])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA16679 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 12:46:05 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from mailnull@localhost)
by casbah.acns.nwu.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) id OAA14527
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 14:46:05 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from pmiller.medill.nwu.edu(129.105.249.129) by
casbah.acns.nwu.edu via smap (V2.0)
id xma013705; Thu, 8 Oct 98 14:44:45 -0500
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19981008145323.006b2c34@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>
X-Sender: pvm@casbah.acns.nwu.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Thu, 08 Oct 1998 14:53:23 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Peter Miller <p-miller@nwu.edu>
Subject: Job Openings
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

The Department of Communication Studies at Northwestern University invites applications for two tenure track assistant professorships beginning September 1999.

The individuals who fill these positions will be expected to pursue a productive program of research as well as teach effectively at both undergraduate and graduate levels in a department that values interdisciplinary work. They also will be expected to hold the PhD or JD degree by the starting date of the appointment.

1. Telecommunications and Information Technology Policy. The person hired for this position will teach and conduct research on public policy issues involving telecommunications and information technology. This person's expertise may be grounded in a broad range of disciplines as they apply to information and communication industries and technologies. Possible specializations include economics, international relations, law, management, mass communication (esp. media industry studies), policy studies and public administration.

2. Technology and Society. The person hired for this position will teach and conduct research on the psychological, organizational and/or societal

implications of information and communication technologies. This person's expertise may be grounded within a broad range of research areas as they relate to information and communication technology. Possible specializations include computer-mediated communication, distance learning, electronic publishing and commerce, health communication, media effects and audience behavior, organizational communication and political communication.

Consideration of applications will begin on January 4, 1999. Please send a letter of application, curriculum vitae and three letters of recommendation to:

James Ettema
Search Committee Chair
Department of Communication Studies
Northwestern University
1815 Chicago Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60208-1340

Northwestern University is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Hiring is contingent upon eligibility to work in the United States.

Peter V. Miller
Department of Communication Studies
Northwestern University
1881 Sheridan Road, Room 12
Evanston, IL 60208

847-491-5835
847-467-1171 (FAX)
p-miller@nwu.edu

>From ABIDER@american.edu Thu Oct 8 19:18:08 1998

Received: from AUVN.AMERICAN.EDU (smtp@auvm.american.edu [147.9.1.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id TAA24989 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 19:18:07 -0700

(PDT)

Message-Id: <199810090218.TAA24989@usc.edu>

Received: from AUVN.AMERICAN.EDU by AUVN.AMERICAN.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTP id 7689; Thu, 08 Oct 98 22:19:55 EDT

Received: from american.edu (NJE origin ABIDER@AUVN) by AUVN.AMERICAN.EDU
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 9587; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 22:19:55 -0400

Date: Thu, 08 Oct 98 22:19:03 EDT

From: Albert Biderman <ABIDER@american.edu>

Subject: Likely Voters' Views

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Am I correct in believing:

1. That references I've been reading to the to the high proportions of anti-Clinton views among "those most likely to vote" refer to a category of respondents rated highest in voting liklihood rather than to views of all respondents weighted by a rating of voting liklihood?

2. That after an election a considerable proportion of those who have actually voted will be voters who before the election had been rated as "least likely to vote?"

3. That the confusion in "1, above" is used to put a spin on polls?

Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu

>From oneil@speedchoice.com Thu Oct 8 22:21:34 1998

Received: from mail.speedchoice.com ([207.240.197.31])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id WAA19443 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 22:21:31 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from phx35035 (hybrid-217-120.phoenix.speedchoice.com

[207.240.217.120]) by mail.speedchoice.com (8.8.8/) with SMTP id WAA27407

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 8 Oct 1998 22:22:23 -0700 (MST)

Message-ID: <003f01bdf343\$98906440\$78d9f0cf@phx35035>

From: "Michael O'Neil" <oneil@speedchoice.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Misleading polling

Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 22:13:47 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2120.0

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2120.0

or a good lawyer..... Mike O'Neil

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

From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@isr.umich.edu>

To: aapornet <aapornet>; Linda Penalzoza 5-2796 <penalzoza>

Cc: Holly Breitkreutz <breitkreutz>

Date: Thursday, October 08, 1998 10:30 AM

Subject: RE: Misleading polling

>It seems to me that this is a potential case for the AAPOR Standards

>Committee.

> -----

>From: Linda Penalzoza 5-2796

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Cc: Holly Breitkreutz

>Subject: Misleading polling

>Date: Thursday, October 08, 1998 1:37PM

>

>Colleagues -

>

>A poll is currently being conducted in Wisconsin, asking respondents

>whom they intend to vote for in the upcoming state elections. The

>polling company, based in the Washington DC area, is using our name
>to solicit responses from folks around the state. Several employees
>of our lab, as well as others who know us around the state, have been
>called. Several asked the interviewer for identification, for the
>sponsor, and for a supervisor to verify the call, but were refused.
>Caller ID has helped us locate the calls as coming from the DC area,
>but the polling organization was not forthcoming about their true
>identity, who is sponsoring the poll, or how the results will be
>used. We have received irate calls from some of the respondents,
>blaming us for what they perceived as a biased and poorly conducted
>poll.

>
>It seems likely that the mystery organization will call across the
>country, and equally likely that they will misrepresent themselves as
>being a local survey research laboratory. I bring this to your
>attention, so you can be on the watch for such "identity theft."
>Such practices do damage to survey research laboratories in general,
>through providing misleading and erroneous information. They can also
>damage the lab whose name is being used, through creating ill will
>among the citizens.

>
>If this happens to any of you, would you please let me know? If you
>find out any information about the individuals or organization
>responsible, I would appreciate knowing about it. You may email me
>directly at penaloza@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu, or you may email our
>director, Holly Breitkreutz, at breitkreutz@learn.uwsa.edu

>
>Thank you.

>
>Linda J. Penaloza
>Associate Director
>Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory (the real one)

>
>*****
> Linda J. Penaloza
> 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: penaloza@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 CaplanJR@aol.com Fri Oct 9 06:04:17 1998

Received: from imo16.mx.aol.com (imo16.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.6])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id GAA04598 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 06:04:16 -0700
(PDT)
From: CaplanJR@aol.com

Received: from CaplanJR@aol.com
by imo16.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FXRa007908
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 09:03:26 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <ab92a03f.361e099e@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Oct 1998 09:03:26 EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Casablanca - Windows sub 214

In a message dated 10/8/98 9:19:55 PM EST, ABIDER@american.edu writes:

<< Am I correct in believing: <snip>
2. That after an election a considerable proportion of
those who have actually voted will be voters who before the
election had been rated as "least likely to vote?" >>

If so, then the measure of voting likelihood is seriously flawed.

Jim Caplan
BSR
Miami

>From CaplanJR@aol.com Fri Oct 9 06:07:33 1998
Received: from imo20.mx.aol.com (imo20.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.10])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id GAA05534 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 06:07:32 -0700
(PDT)

From: CaplanJR@aol.com
Received: from CaplanJR@aol.com
by imo20.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FTWYa03786
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 09:06:46 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <65111c0d.361e0a66@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Oct 1998 09:06:46 EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Misleading polling
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Casablanca - Windows sub 214

In a message dated 10/9/98 0:27:05 AM EST, oneil@speedchoice.com writes:

<< or a good lawyer..... Mike O'Neil
>It seems to me that this is a potential case for the AAPOR Standards
>Committee. >>

Problem is, we gotta catch 'em in order to brand 'em.

Jim Caplan
Miami

>From Dcolasanto@aol.com Fri Oct 9 09:13:00 1998
Received: from imo28.mx.aol.com (imo28.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.72])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA26627 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 09:12:59 -0700
(PDT)
From: Dcolasanto@aol.com
Received: from Dcolasanto@aol.com
by imo28.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FEPKa02082
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 12:11:52 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <d0f86922.361e35c8@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Oct 1998 12:11:52 EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Fwd: Environmental Scan
Content-type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="part0_907949512_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--part0_907949512_boundary
Content-ID: <0_907949512@inet_out.mail.aol.com.1>
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Fellow AAPOR Members,

Can anyone help this person with her project? Please reply directly to
her
at

SNRandall@aol.com.

Thanks.

Diane

--part0_907949512_boundary
Content-ID: <0_907949512@inet_out.mail.aol.com.2>
Content-type: message/rfc822
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

From: SNRandall@aol.com
Return-path: <SNRandall@aol.com>
To: Dcolasanto@aol.com
Subject: Environmental Scan
Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 22:35:42 EDT
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Diane Colasanto,

I am writing to you in your role as President and official contact for the

AAPOR. I am currently engaged in an environmental scan for Wayne County Community College District in Michigan. As team leader for the political taxonomy area of this scan, I am seeking information on public opinion in any arena that may affect the future direction of this institution.

I have spent the evening (trying to do my own homework !) searching the rich resources available through the web site maintained by the ISR at U of Michigan. . . I have found a number of interested data bases (e.g., GSSDIRS, Natl Ctr for Education Statistics, Intl Archive of Edu Data), but am not satisfied that I have found what we need (& my energy is quickly dissipating after a long day !). . .

Based on a scanning of media and legislative resources, we have decided to focus on public opinion concerning several possible trends in higher education:

- 1) who should pay for education (govt vs user),
- 2) privatization of support services (outsourcing to private-run businesses)
- 3) privatization of academic services (e.g., charter schools & the shift from public to private/business educational institutions),
- 4) relative importance of traditional liberal arts education vs vocational/job training,
- 5) affirmative action,
- 6) early tracking (in high school) of students in vocational vs liberal arts academic training.

We will be very appreciative of any suggestions/ guidance you could provide us in this process. . . the environmental scanning process is advancing at a rapid pace ! We met this afternoon with Joel Lapin who is overseeing the scan, and need to acquire any additional, relevant information within 10 days to be prepared for the next phase.

Thanks for your consideration,

Sandra Nagel Randall, Ph.D.
Wayne County Community College District
Athabasca University, Alberta, Canada
snrandall@aol.com
Off: 248-948-8162
Fax: 248-948-5090
Sandra Nagel Randall - Curriculum Vitae

--part0_907949512_boundary--

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Fri Oct 9 09:50:25 1998
Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA12018 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 09:50:23 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (user-38ld1nn.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.134.247])
by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id MAA32651
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 12:50:22 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199810091650.MAA32651@camel8.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Fri, 09 Oct 1998 12:53:18 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views
In-Reply-To: <ab92a03f.361e099e@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I think Jim Caplan is confusing "likelihood" of voting with certainty of voting or not voting. If voters are put in categories that define different likelihoods of voting it does not mean that those with lower likelihoods do not vote.

Whether the measure is seriously flawed, as he suggests, depends on how the researcher uses voter likelihood to make an estimate. Some researchers retain the most likely and discard the less likely when making an estimate. Other models assign a probability to each likelihood category which is used as a weight when making an estimate. Most models I have seen work do not work well for low turnout elections like the one we will have on November 3rd, or on primaries.
warren mitofsky

At 09:03 AM 10/9/98 -0400, you wrote:

>In a message dated 10/8/98 9:19:55 PM EST, ABIDER@american.edu writes:

>

>><< Am I correct in believing: <snip>

>2. That after an election a considerable proportion of
> those who have actually voted will be voters who before the
> election had been rated as "least likely to vote?" >>

>If so, then the measure of voting likelihood is seriously flawed.

>

>Jim Caplan

>BSR

>Miami

>

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

212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Fri Oct 9 10:32:37 1998

Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu (bones.asic.csuohio.edu [137.148.16.17])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id KAA29452 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 10:32:35 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from myhost.csuohio.edu (137.148.18.21) by mail.asic.csuohio.edu with SMTP (MailShare 1.0fc6); Fri, 9 Oct 1998 13:33:57 -0400

X-Sender: s.kraus@bones.asic.csuohio.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Dr. Sidney Kraus" <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views

Date: Fri, 9 Oct 1998 13:33:57 -0400

Message-ID: <1304182459-5782335@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

I would be interested in the source(s) for lthe finding.

At 09:03 AM 10/9/98 EDT, you wrote:

>In a message dated 10/8/98 9:19:55 PM EST, ABIDER@american.edu writes:

>

>>< Am I correct in believing: <snip>

>2. That after an election a considerable proportion of

> those who have actually voted will be voters who before the

> election had been rated as "least likely to vote?" >>

>

>If so, then the measure of voting likelihood is seriously flawed.

>

>Jim Caplan

>BSR

>Miami

>

>From CaplanJR@aol.com Fri Oct 9 10:50:11 1998

Received: from imo20.mx.aol.com (imo20.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.10])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id KAA06642 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 10:50:07 -0700

(PDT)

From: CaplanJR@aol.com

Received: from CaplanJR@aol.com

by imo20.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FUXAa03786

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 13:49:23 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <1b205e1e.361e4ca3@aol.com>

Date: Fri, 9 Oct 1998 13:49:23 EDT

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Casablanca - Windows sub 214

In a message dated 10/9/98 12:42:02 PM EST, mitofsky@mindspring.com writes:

<< I think Jim Caplan is confusing "likelihood" of voting with certainty of voting or not voting >>

Actually, I think the issue is what Al meant by a "considerable proportion."

Has anyone looked differences in actual voting behavior between respondents who state that their intent to vote is high or very high versus those who are

categorized as probable voters according to some grouping variables?

>From mcohen@inet.ed.gov Fri Oct 9 11:04:32 1998

Received: from inet.ed.gov (mcohen@inet.ed.gov [165.224.217.64])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id LAA12518 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 11:04:31 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Fri, 9 Oct 1998 14:04:25 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Michael P. Cohen" <mcohen@inet.ed.gov>

To: aapornet@usc.edu, snrandall@aol.com

Subject: Re: Fwd: Environmental Scan

In-Reply-To: <d0f86922.361e35c8@aol.com>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSU.4.04.9810091359150.23656-100000@inet.ed.gov>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

It would be worth at least taking a look at the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC) Web pages:

<http://www.nces01.ed.gov/npec/>

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

Washington DC 20208-5654 USA

On Fri, 9 Oct 1998 Dcolasanto@aol.com wrote:

> Fellow AAPOR Members,

>

> Can anyone help this person with her project? Please reply directly to

her

> at

>

> SNRandall@aol.com.

>

> Thanks.

>

> Diane

>
>
>

>From CaplanJR@aol.com Fri Oct 9 11:11:42 1998
Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA16316 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 11:11:41 -0700
(PDT)
From: CaplanJR@aol.com
Received: from CaplanJR@aol.com
by imo19.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FFZEa22052
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 14:11:01 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <c38627d2.361e51b5@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Oct 1998 14:11:01 EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Casablanca - Windows sub 214

Actually, I threw out the flip remark about how good a given measure of voter likelihood was to generate discussion about methodology, not start a flame war. Seems to me that categorizing people according to demographics and interests as a method of predicting voting behavior is an interesting approach. But the use of such "indirect" measures may a tacit confession that we as researchers are uncomfortable using more direct estimates of motivation to predict behavior.

I think it would be fun to interview people about their voting behavior and have them remember when they did and didn't vote and see if they recall what prompted them to take the time and trouble to vote. Wouldn't it be interesting to see if perceived concerns about the individual and his family were more motivating than general concerns about the country and its future? At any rate, it would give us some good items to directly predict likelihood of voting.

Jim Caplan
Miami

>From ABIDER@american.edu Fri Oct 9 16:21:24 1998
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (smtp@auvm.american.edu [147.9.1.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id QAA07811 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 16:21:22 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <199810092321.QAA07811@usc.edu>
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTP id 3878; Fri, 09 Oct 98 19:23:08 EDT
Received: from american.edu (NJE origin ABIDER@AUVM) by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 1960; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 19:23:09 -0400
Date: Fri, 09 Oct 98 18:06:57 EDT

From: Albert Biderman <ABIDER@american.edu>
Subject: Re:Likely Voter's Views
To: aapornet@usc.edu

I am no voting research expert, but my ear was caught by references to differences between usual polls and "views of most likely voters" as one of various devices (some hilarious) to discount the disjunction between polls and Pooh Bahs on Monicagate and whatever.

The Medill Journalism School's study of apathetic votes in 1996 found 20 percent of its "most unlikely to vote" respondents actually ended up voting as compared with about 80 percent of those "most likely...." (This is from memory. Put "Medill +'likely voter'" in a web search and you'll get quite a few hits.) My use of "considerable" to describe their representation was not a stretch, at least insofar as this study and a presidential election is concerned, especially considering that they are being rendered not worthy of consideration.

If only the polls' "most likely voters" voted, Democrats would be a small minority of the House. (Ex post, all the voters are more 'n likely ones.)

I

As an aside on Warren's good point about turnout importance, around here the old pol's wisdom is that it's bimodal: in a small vote, goo-goo's are a big percent of the vote and they tilt Dem; a moderately big vote is Republican, and a huge vote is likely more Dem. Never seen a formal analysis of this, however,

Albert Biderman

abider@american.edu

>From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Fri Oct 9 16:29:03 1998

Received: from mail-lax-2.pilot.net (mail-lax-2.pilot.net [205.139.40.16])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id QAA10405 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 16:29:02 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mailgw.latimes.com (unknown-c-23-147.latimes.com [204.48.23.147] (may be forged))

by mail-lax-2.pilot.net (Pilot/) with ESMTP id QAA18096

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 16:28:59 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from latimes.com (bierce.latimes.com [192.187.72.9]) by mailgw.latimes.com (8.9.1/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA21684 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 16:15:15 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from news.latimes.com (fowler.news.latimes.com [192.187.72.7]) by latimes.com (8.6.10/8.6.9) with ESMTP id QAA28661 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 16:15:13 -0700

Received: (from pinkus@localhost) by news.latimes.com (8.6.9/8.6.9) id QAA23021; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 16:17:18 -0700

Date: Fri, 9 Oct 1998 16:17:18 -0700 (PDT)

From: Susan Pinkus <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Misleading polling
In-Reply-To: <480DA905560@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu>
Message-ID:
<Pine.A32.3.91.981009161523.69709E-100000@fowler.news.latimes.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Is this something for AAPOR Councils-Standards Committee to investigate?

Susan Pinkus

On Thu, 8 Oct 1998, Linda Penalosa 5-2796 wrote:

> Colleagues -

>

> A poll is currently being conducted in Wisconsin, asking respondents
> whom they intend to vote for in the upcoming state elections. The
> polling company, based in the Washington DC area, is using our name
> to solicit responses from folks around the state. Several employees
> of our lab, as well as others who know us around the state, have been
> called. Several asked the interviewer for identification, for the
> sponsor, and for a supervisor to verify the call, but were refused.
> Caller ID has helped us locate the calls as coming from the DC area,
> but the polling organization was not forthcoming about their true
> identity, who is sponsoring the poll, or how the results will be
> used. We have received irate calls from some of the respondents,
> blaming us for what they perceived as a biased and poorly conducted
> poll.

>

> It seems likely that the mystery organization will call across the
> country, and equally likely that they will misrepresent themselves as
> being a local survey research laboratory. I bring this to your
> attention, so you can be on the watch for such "identity theft."
> Such practices do damage to survey research laboratories in general,
> through providing misleading and erroneous information. They can also
> damage the lab whose name is being used, through creating ill will
> among the citizens.

>

> If this happens to any of you, would you please let me know? If you
> find out any information about the individuals or organization
> responsible, I would appreciate knowing about it. You may email me
> directly at penalosa@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu, or you may email our
> director, Holly Breitkreutz, at breitkreutz@learn.uwsa.edu

>

> Thank you.

>

> Linda J. Penalosa
> Associate Director
> Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory (the real one)

>

> *****

>

Linda J. Penalosa

> 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: penaloza@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

>
>
>

Susan H. Pinkus
Los Angeles Times Poll
Internet:susan.pinkus@latimes.com
American Online: spinkus@aol.com
FAX: 213-237-2505

>From oneil@speedchoice.com Fri Oct 9 20:17:24 1998
Received: from mail.speedchoice.com ([207.240.197.31])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id UAA14874 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 20:17:24 -0700

(PDT)
Received: from phx35035 (hybrid-217-120.phoenix.speedchoice.com
[207.240.217.120]) by mail.speedchoice.com (8.8.8/) with SMTP id UAA05686
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 9 Oct 1998 20:18:16 -0700 (MST)
Message-ID: <005501bdf3fb\$6b394c60\$78d9f0cf@phx35035>
From: "Michael O'Neil" <oneil@speedchoice.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views
Date: Fri, 9 Oct 1998 20:09:38 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2120.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2120.0

I think Mike Traugott published a series of papers on this subject in the
early 1980's.

Mike O'Neil
-----Original Message-----
From: CaplanJR@aol.com <CaplanJR@aol.com>
To: aapornet <aapornet>

Date: Friday, October 09, 1998 10:51 AM
Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views

>In a message dated 10/9/98 12:42:02 PM EST, mitofsky@mindspring.com writes:

>
><< I think Jim Caplan is confusing "likelihood" of voting with certainty of
> voting or not voting >>

>
>Actually, I think the issue is what Al meant by a "considerable
proportion."

>
>Has anyone looked differences in actual voting behavior between respondents
>who state that their intent to vote is high or very high versus those who
are
>categorized as probable voters according to some grouping variables?

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Sat Oct 10 04:18:05 1998
Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id EAA10647; Sat, 10 Oct 1998 04:18:04 -0700 (PDT)

From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo19.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FOQLa22057;
Sat, 10 Oct 1998 07:17:23 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <8e91cd32.361f4243@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 10 Oct 1998 07:17:23 EDT

To: CaplanJR@aol.com, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: Re: Re: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

In a message dated 10/9/98 2:12:08 PM, CaplanJR@aol.com wrote:

<< Seems to me that categorizing people according to demographics and
interests as a method of predicting voting behavior is an interesting
approach. >>

Isn't something like that already done, along with other factors relevant to
the issues of a case--- in jury selection ? (And no doubt in other fields,
perhaps in marketing/consumer purchase behavior)

"The likelihood of voting" vs. "The certainty of voting"--- it would seem
that

as the likelihood increases, it becomes more of a certainty (!) As in
selecting sampling units with a high probability from a stratum vs.
selecting
those units with certainty. [Or are we dealing with some Clintonian
phrasing
logic here?]

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

Research Statistician

U. S. Dept. of Justice

miltgold@aol.com

>From mtrau@umich.edu Sun Oct 11 14:25:47 1998

Received: from relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (relic.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.11])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id OAA27854 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 11 Oct 1998 14:25:46 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from umich.edu (pm464-31.dialip.mich.net [207.75.177.41])

by relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/2.5) with ESMTP id RAA15417

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 11 Oct 1998 17:24:47 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <3621235D.F88D1F36@umich.edu>

Date: Sun, 11 Oct 1998 17:30:06 -0400

From: Mike Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views

References: <005501bdf3fb\$6b394c60\$78d9f0cf@phx35035>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have published fairly extensively on this since 1978, including a piece with

Clyde Tucker in POQ that represents a kind of "standard" for current practice.

But others, including Freedman and Goldstein have published more recently.

There is also quite a literature on various aspects of the vote intention question as well. Stan Presser has added to this, and Bob Belli and I, with others, will have a piece in a forthcoming POQ.

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Mon Oct 12 06:47:05 1998

Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.32])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id GAA15976 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 06:47:03 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])

by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id JAA06030

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 09:47:01 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19981012134701.00b5bfdc@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 09:47:01 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>

Subject: 1999 AAPOR Student Paper Award Competition

*** Please share this with interested parties who are not on AAPORnet***

ANNUAL AAPOR STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION

Open to Current Students and Recent Degree Recipients

54th Annual Conference

American Association for Public Opinion Research

Tradewinds Resort St. Pete Beach, Florida

May 13- 16, 1999

The American Association for Public Opinion Research will award its 33rd Annual Student Paper Prize this year. The prize is open both to current students (graduate or undergraduate) and to those who graduated during calendar year 1998. The research must have been substantially completed while the author(s) was(were) enrolled in a degree program. 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, communication, 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 multiple authors. However, each author on an entry must be a student or a former students who meets the eligibility requirements for the prize.

A prize of \$500 will be awarded to the winning paper; in addition, one or more papers may receive an Honorable Mention and be listed in the 1999 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 54th Annual Conference, to be held in St. Petersburg, FL, May 13-16, 1999.

Please mail five copies of each entry to arrive by DECEMBER 11, 1998 to::

Professor Paul J. Lavrakas
1999 AAPOR Conference Chair
Ohio State University
154 N. Oval Mall
Derby Hall, Room 3016
Columbus OH 43210-1339

Be sure to include your name, mailing address, telephone number(s), and, if possible, an email 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 February, 1999, and you

will be notified about the status of your paper shortly thereafter.

* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
* Professor of Journalism & Communication *
* Professor of Public Policy & Management *
* 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 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu *

>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Mon Oct 12 09:39:22 1998
Received: from fw (fw.gallup.com [206.158.235.10])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id JAA23086 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 09:39:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from exchng5.gallup.com by fw (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
id LAA11157; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 11:38:44 -0500
Received: by EXCHNG5 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
id <4Q4J2GWP>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 11:38:46 -0500
Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F9038F761@exchng3.gallup.com>
From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: CaplanJR@aol.com, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 11:38:43 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="windows-1252"

As (perhaps) the first polling organization to develop and institute likely voter modelling techniques, Gallup has conducted extensive research on this subject and arrived at a method decades ago which has proved remarkably accurate in both presidential and midterm congressional elections ever since. This entails scoring respondents' likelihood of voting (using questions about past voting behavior and current voting intent), then taking only a subset of voters at the top of the scale who are equal in size to the expected turnout.

This year, for example, we are looking at the 39% top scoring national adults in our pre-election samples to represent likely midterm voters. (We will adjust this toward the end of the election as the projected turnout rate becomes clearer.) Using the exact same method in 1994 (and allocating the small undecided vote proportionally), we arrived at a two-party vote figure which was identical to the national two-party vote. Then used a regression equation based on historical analysis to convert the generic ballot vote to projected House seats...coming within single digits of the actual distribution of seats.

In 1996 Gallup experimented with the other method Warren has described -- assigning probabilities of voting to each respondent, rather than taking the cutoff approach. Using probabilities of voting derived from post-election validation studies, Gallup assigned probabilities ranging from .04 to over

.8. However, when comparing these results to figures derived using our traditional cutoff method, we determined the traditional method was superior.

In 1997 I presented a paper at AAPOR reviewing voter preferences for presidential candidates in all presidential elections back to 1952 -- looking at voter preferences according to their apparent likelihood to vote. We found a clear pattern of vote preferences becoming more Republican with increasing likelihood to vote (using three levels of likelihood: highly, moderately, not likely). However the pattern was particularly strong in 1980 and 1996, both years when the sitting president was Democratic. In these years, the Democratic preference among non-voters was exceptionally strong, something like 4:1. In other years, when the sitting president was Republican, the Democratic preference among non voters was far less pronounced. The analysis indicated why accuracy in pre-election predictions relies so heavily on removing those non-voters from the sample base -- to a greater or lesser extent depending on the election.

The current team of editors of the Gallup Poll -- Frank Newport, David Moore, and myself - have reported these methods and results quite extensively since 1993 at AAPOR conferences as well as in at least two POQ articles. I am writing this message from home today, without the benefit of my files and POQ references. Please write or call if you would like more information. If you email me, please use the gallup url shown below.

Lydia Saad
managing editor, The Gallup Poll
ph: 609-279-2219
lydia_saad@gallup.com

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

From: CaplanJR@aol.com
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Sent: 10/9/98 1:11 PM
Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.

Actually, I threw out the flip remark about how good a given measure of voter likelihood was to generate discussion about methodology, not start a flame war. Seems to me that categorizing people according to demographics and interests as a method of predicting voting behavior is an interesting approach. But the use of such "indirect" measures may a tacit confession that we as researchers are uncomfortable using more direct estimates of motivation to predict behavior.

I think it would be fun to interview people about their voting behavior and have them remember when they did and didn't vote and see if they recall what prompted them to take the time and trouble to vote. Wouldn't it be interesting to see if perceived concerns about the individual and his

family
were more motivating than general concerns about the country and its
future?
At any rate, it would give us some good items to directly predict
likelihood
of voting.

Jim Caplan
Miami

>From sgoold@unm.edu Mon Oct 12 10:14:13 1998
Received: from pyxis.unm.edu (pyxis.unm.edu [129.24.8.14])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id KAA06972 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 10:14:10 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [129.24.14.124](ppp-125.unm.edu[129.24.14.125]) (894 bytes)
by pyxis.unm.edu
via sendmail with P:smtp/R:bind_hosts/T:inet_zone_bind_smtp
(sender: <sgoold@unm.edu>)
id <m0zSIYH-0000HpC@pyxis.unm.edu>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 11:14:33 -0600 (MDT)
(Smail-3.2.0.101 1997-Dec-17 #2 built 1998-Sep-15)
Message-Id: <v02130502ae858568e8c1@[129.24.14.124]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Sat, 12 Oct 1996 11:31:02 -0600
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: sgoold@unm.edu (Scott Goold)
Subject: survey research

In 1984, Sharp published research in POQ estimating that over 20 million
interviews
are conducted in the US annually. Has anyone seen more recent figures
estimating the
total number of interviews as well as the percent attributed to the federal
government?

Thanks in advance.

Scott Goold, Ph.D. (abd)
University of New Mexico
505.293.2504
Web page @ < www.unm.edu/~sgoold >

"I Can't Accept Not Trying"

>From rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu Mon Oct 12 12:34:30 1998
Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA10470 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 12:34:23 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [144.92.209.136] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu

id OAA41490 (8.8.6/50); Mon, 12 Oct 1998 14:34:12 -0500
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 14:34:12 -0500
Message-Id: <v03007800b247c2bda272@[144.92.182.56]>
In-Reply-To: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F9038F761@exchn3.gallup.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu>
Subject: RE: Likely Voters' Views

Wired News reported:

7:27a.m.12.Oct.98.PDT

A Washington Post poll taken after the Clinton impeachment-inquiry vote ends that support for the Republican-led Congress has fallen, particularly among voters who say they are certain to vote in the 3 November elections. At the same time, support for Democratic candidates in the House has increased among likely voters. As for Clinton, his approval rating surged to 67 percent.

Robert Godfrey

UW-Madison

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Mon Oct 12 13:50:30 1998
Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA06548 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 13:50:27 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from warrenmi (user-38ld02r.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.128.91])
by dewdrop2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA25249
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 16:50:27 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199810122050.QAA25249@dewdrop2.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 16:49:44 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Investor's Business Daily
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

An article in today's Investor's Business Daily is titled, "do Polls Mean What They Say?" Sorry, the article is not on the web, so I cannot attach it. In case you are not familiar with this paper, it has a distinctly Republican tilt. The article is not friendly to a pro-Clinton interpretation of his current high approval ratings. The article quotes those paragons of polling methods John Zogby and Kellyanne Fitzpatrick of

the Polling Company, along with others.

The only point worth noting, as we have been discussing response rates, is an off-hand line that says, "To fill the sample, pollsters often call anywhere from five to 10 times the number of people questioned in a poll." There is no follow up to this observation, but I am sure someone like Huffington will see it and use it as part of the current response rate attack on the interpretation of polls.

warren mitofsky

>From dhenwood@panix.com Mon Oct 12 14:18:59 1998

Received: from mail1.panix.com (mail1.panix.com [166.84.0.212])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id OAA17012 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 14:18:58 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [166.84.250.86] (dhenwood.dialup.access.net [166.84.250.86])

by mail1.panix.com (8.8.8/8.8.8/PanixM1.3) with ESMTP id RAA01399

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 17:18:56 -0400 (EDT)

X-Sender: dhenwood@popserver.panix.com

Message-Id: <103130325b24822aaa64e@[166.84.250.86]>

In-Reply-To: <199810122050.QAA25249@dewdrop2.mindspring.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 17:18:56 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>

Subject: Re: Investor's Business Daily

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>The article is not friendly to a pro-Clinton

>interpretation of his current high approval ratings. The article quotes

>those paragons of polling methods John Zogby and Kellyanne Fitzpatrick of

>the Polling Company, along with others.

I assume this is ironically meant, so what's wrong with Zogby in particular?

Doug

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Mon Oct 12 14:34:37 1998

Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id OAA23422 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 14:34:37 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from warrenmi (user-38ld02r.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.128.91])

by dewdrop2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id RAA29091

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 17:34:36 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <199810122134.RAA29091@dewdrop2.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2

Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 17:33:53 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Huffington column
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Here is Arianna Huffington's column. I would say the polling industry looks pretty foolish. Response rates are not proprietary information as she says Alderman (ABC News) and Riehle (Peter Hart) claim. Any column where Caddell sounds reasonable and the rest sound defensive is not good news for the profession.

I believe we should prepare an AAPOR statement to give out in response to inquiries.

warren mitofsky

Investigating The Pollsters

by Arianna Huffington

(from her web site: <<http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/101298.html>>

Filed October 12, 1998

When the history books are written, the Clinton crisis will be the first political crisis to be so entirely driven and shaped by polls. It was, according to Dick Morris' grand jury testimony, a poll that he secretly conducted for the president when the Lewinsky scandal broke that set him on his 8-month-long course of deceiving the public. "You can't tell them about it, they'll kill you,"

Morris told the president. "They're just not ready for it." And the man who has lived by polls throughout his political career concluded, "Well, we just have to win, then."

So the few hundred people who answered Morris' poll determined a critical presidential decision. And now, nine months later, the president's high approval ratings remain his only protection. If the polls are going to be the instrument by which we will judge the fate of this president, it becomes all the more important to answer the key question: Who is talking to pollsters and who isn't?

In the 20 months before Richard Nixon resigned in August 1974, 128 polls were conducted asking people whether the president should leave office. In the nine months of the Lewinsky scandal, 325 polls asked that question. It's no wonder that the mushrooming number of opinion polls coupled with the outrageous growth of telemarketing calls have led to a soaring refuse-to-answer rate among people polled.

This is not good news for pollsters. The key to polling's accuracy is the principle of "equal probability of selection." But if larger and larger

numbers among those randomly selected refuse to participate, this principle no longer applies.

It turns out that polling companies will talk about anything except the response and refusal rates of their last poll. Here's a sampling of a nonscientific poll of pollsters that my office conducted between Oct. 1 and Oct. 9, and that illustrated the nonscientific nature of polling.

Ours was a short poll: Can you please give us the response and refusal rates for your most recent national poll? ABC News pollster Jeff Alderman's first response was to say that he didn't understand the question. When it was repeated to him, with minor refinements, he growled: "That's proprietary information. ... I've got another call. Goodbye." In polling lingo, that was a refusal -- but a very revealing one. After all, we were not asking if the pollster wanted to change telephone services or presidents. And we were not calling at home during dinner time.

Tom Riehle of Peter Hart Associates also used the "proprietary information" defense. He called their methods "our secret recipe" and explained usefully: "That's not your business." Our little poll was batting 0 for 2 a 100 percent refusal rate. CBS' Kathy Frankovic was reluctant to release CBS response and refusal data without knowing the information her competitors were giving out. She added that it was a complicated issue. But then hiding behind complexity has been a staple of the polling profession.

Mike Kagay of the New York Times, Frankovic's partner in the CBS/New York Times polls, did release a response rate for an actual poll, though not the most recent one: 43 percent for the Sept. 12-15 poll.

At Gallup, senior methodologist Rajesh Srinivasan promised to fax us response rate data right away. And indeed, we did receive reams of data right away -- on everything except response rates.

A representative for Roper-Starch-Worldwide, who did not want his name used, explained that "that information is not available. Caddell, who conducted the first major presidential polls for the Carter campaign, is now appalled by the monster he helped unleash. "The dodging of such basic questions is alarming. When the polling industry is talking to itself, they express their worries about the progressive decline in response rates. But when they talk to the public, they clam up. It's ludicrous to suggest that response and refusal rates are any more proprietary than the size of the sample or the date of the interviews."

It's time to ask polling companies to make their response rates public for every poll. And if they refuse, perhaps it's time for the media to stop just quoting and start investigating the polling industry to get to the truth behind all the smoke it's been blowing.

>From worc@mori.com Mon Oct 12 14:43:02 1998

Received: from post.mail.demon.net (post-11.mail.demon.net [194.217.242.40])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA26647 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 14:43:00 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [194.222.4.107] (helo=worc.demon.co.uk)
by post.mail.demon.net with smtp (Exim 2.03 #1)
id 0zSpjX-0000fN-00; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 21:42:27 +0000
From: "Robert M Worcester" <worc@mori.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>, <CaplanJR@aol.com>
Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 22:38:01 +0100
Message-ID: <01bdf628\$96086820\$6b04dec2@worc.demon.co.uk>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.71.1712.3
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3

The British methodology that has worked reasonably well over the past six or seven general elections is to ask a certainty of vote question (certain to vote/very likely/quite likely/not very likely/not likely/certain not to) and taking just the 'certain', as post election surveys show that c. 90% of the 'certains' vote, half of the 'very likely' do, about one in five of the 'quites' do and almost none of the rest, but it averages out to the best bet being just those 'certain'.

Works for general elections, but overstates by-elections and local elections.

Worcester

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

From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com <Lydia_Saad@gallup.com>
To: CaplanJR@aol.com <CaplanJR@aol.com>; aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: 12 October 1998 17:46
Subject: RE: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.

>As (perhaps) the first polling organization to develop and institute likely
>voter modelling techniques, Gallup has conducted extensive research on this
>subject and arrived at a method decades ago which has proved remarkably
>accurate in both presidential and midterm congressional elections ever
>since. This entails scoring respondents' likelihood of voting (using
>questions about past voting behavior and current voting intent), then
>taking
>only a subset of voters at the top of the scale who are equal in size to
>the
>expected turnout.

>
>This year, for example, we are looking at the 39% top scoring national
>adults in our pre-election samples to represent likely midterm voters. (We
>will adjust this toward the end of the election as the projected turnout
>rate becomes clearer.) Using the exact same method in 1994 (and allocating

>the small undecided vote proportionally), we arrived at a two-party vote
>figure which was identical to the national two-party vote. Then used a
>regression equation based on historical analysis to convert the generic
>ballot vote to projected House seats...coming within single digits of the
>actual distribution of seats.
>
>In 1996 Gallup experimented with the other method Warren has described --
>assigning probabilities of voting to each respondent, rather than taking
the
>cutoff approach. Using probabilities of voting derived from post-election
>validation studies, Gallup assigned probabilities ranging from .04 to over
>.8. However, when comparing these results to figures derived using our
>traditional cutoff method, we determined the traditional method was
>superior.
>
>In 1997 I presented a paper at AAPOR reviewing voter preferences for
>presidential candidates in all presidential elections back to 1952 --
>looking at voter preferences according to their apparent likelihood to
vote.
>We found a clear pattern of vote preferences becoming more Republican with
>increasing likelihood to vote (using three levels of likelihood: highly,
>moderately, not likely). However the pattern was particularly strong in
>1980 and 1996, both years when the sitting president was Democratic. In
>these years, the Democratic preference among non-voters was exceptionally
>strong, something like 4:1. In other years, when the sitting president was
>Republican, the Democratic preference among non voters was far less
>pronounced. The analysis indicated why accuracy in pre-election
predictions
>relies so heavily on removing those non-voters from the sample base -- to a
>greater or lesser extent depending on the election.
>
>The current team of editors of the Gallup Poll -- Frank Newport, David
>Moore, and myself - have reported these methods and results quite
>extensively since 1993 at AAPOR conferences as well as in at least two POQ
>articles. I am writing this message from home today, without the benefit of
>my files and POQ references. Please write or call if you would like more
>information. If you email me, please use the gallup url shown below.
>
>Lydia Saad
>managing editor, The Gallup Poll
>ph: 609-279-2219
>lydia_saad@gallup.com
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: CaplanJR@aol.com
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Sent: 10/9/98 1:11 PM
>Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.
>
>Actually, I threw out the flip remark about how good a given measure of
>voter
>likelihood was to generate discussion about methodology, not start a
>flame
>war. Seems to me that categorizing people according to demographics and

>interests as a method of predicting voting behavior is an interesting
>approach. But the use of such "indirect" measures may a tacit
>confession that
>we as researchers are uncomfortable using more direct estimates of
>motivation
>to predict behavior.
>
>I think it would be fun to interview people about their voting behavior
>and
>have them remember when they did and didn't vote and see if they recall
>what
>prompted them to take the time and trouble to vote. Wouldn't it be
>interesting to see if perceived concerns about the individual and his
>family
>were more motivating than general concerns about the country and its
>future?
>At any rate, it would give us some good items to directly predict
>likelihood
>of voting.
>
>Jim Caplan
>Miami

>From hschuman@umich.edu Mon Oct 12 15:47:01 1998
Received: from berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.63.17])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA17821 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 15:46:57 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.63.90])
by berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id
SAA15454
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 18:46:57 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)
by choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with SMTP id
SAA06538
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 18:46:56 -0400 (EDT)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 18:46:56 -0400 (EDT)
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
X-Sender: hschuman@choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Information on response rates
In-Reply-To: <199810122134.RAA29091@dewdrop2.mindspring.com>
Message-ID:
<Pine.SOL.3.95.981012184350.20346B-100000@choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Here's a second (or nth) for AAPOR to take a strong stand on the need for
polls to make information on response rates regularly available, including
separation of refusals from other forms of non-response. This is an issue

that involves much of the membership, and is different from and harder than the typical standards case about a deviant organization or push polls or something else that doesn't involve the core profession. It is appropriate for polls to cite evidence that refusals and other forms of non-response have little effect on results--where such evidence exists. But it is not appropriate to hide behind the frequent vague statements about the "practical difficulties" of conducting a survey.

>From surveys@wco.com Mon Oct 12 17:11:32 1998
Received: from mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (mailhub2.ncal.verio.com [204.247.247.54])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA10131 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 17:11:15 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from compaq (sextans132.wco.com [209.21.28.132])
by mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id RAA15779
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 17:11:13 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <00d301bdf63d\$e674e3a0\$2b54fea9@compaq>
From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Huffington column
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 17:08:42 -0700
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Hi All

I've been an AAPOR member since 1976, but have only recently joined aapornet.

I strongly second Warren's suggestion that someone who can speak for AAPOR prepare a statement in response to columns like Huffington's. The statement should be sent to as many papers as possible that run her column. If opinions like hers are published unchallenged, people will believe them.

Republican leaders long ago successfully established the myth that the national media are biased against their party. Much of the public believes it. We must not let them now establish a myth that pollsters are all part of another anti-Republican conspiracy to mislead the nation or that polling is "nonscientific." We must not let them kill the messenger.

Hank Zucker
Creative Research Systems
makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
<http://www.surveysystem.com>
<mailto:surveys@wco.com>

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

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Monday, October 12, 1998 2:35 PM
Subject: Huffington column

>Here is Arianna Huffington's column. I would say the polling industry looks
>pretty foolish. Response rates are not proprietary information as she says
>Alderman (ABC News) and Riehle (Peter Hart) claim. Any column where Caddell
>sounds reasonable and the rest sound defensive is not good news for the
>profession.

>
>I believe we should prepare an AAPOR statement to give out in response to
>inquiries.

> warren mitofsky

>

>

>Investigating The Pollsters

>by Arianna Huffington

>(from her web site:

<<http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/101298.html>>

>

> Filed October 12, 1998

>

> When the history books are written, the Clinton
> crisis will be the first political crisis to be so entirely driven and
> shaped by polls. It was, according to Dick Morris' grand jury
> testimony, a poll that he secretly conducted for the president when the
> Lewinsky scandal broke that set him on his 8-month-long course of
> deceiving the public. ``You can't tell them about it, they'll kill
> you,"

> Morris told the president. ``They're just not ready for it." And the
man

> who has lived by polls throughout his political career concluded,
> ``Well, we just have to win, then."

>

> So the few hundred people who answered Morris' poll determined a
> critical presidential decision. And now, nine months later, the
> president's high approval ratings remain his only protection. If the
polls

> are going to be the instrument by which we will judge the fate of this
> president, it becomes all the more important to answer the key
> question: Who is talking to pollsters and who isn't?

>

> In the 20 months before Richard Nixon resigned in August 1974, 128
> polls were conducted asking people whether the president should
> leave office. In the nine months of the Lewinsky scandal, 325 polls
> asked that question. It's no wonder that the mushrooming number of
> opinion polls coupled with the outrageous growth of telemarketing
> calls have led to a soaring refuse-to-answer rate among people
> polled.

>

> This is not good news for pollsters. The key to polling's accuracy is
the

> principle of "equal probability of selection." But if larger and larger numbers among those randomly selected refuse to participate, this principle no longer applies.

> It turns out that polling companies will talk about anything except the response and refusal rates of their last poll. Here's a sampling of a nonscientific poll of pollsters that my office conducted between Oct. 1 and Oct. 9, and that illustrated the nonscientific nature of polling.

> Ours was a short poll: Can you please give us the response and refusal rates for your most recent national poll? ABC News pollster Jeff Alderman's first response was to say that he didn't understand the question. When it was repeated to him, with minor refinements, he growled: "That's proprietary information. ... I've got another call. Goodbye." In polling lingo, that was a refusal -- but a very revealing one. After all, we were not asking if the pollster wanted to change telephone services or presidents. And we were not calling at home during dinner time.

> Tom Riehle of Peter Hart Associates also used the "proprietary information" defense. He called their methods "our secret recipe" and explained usefully: "That's not your business." Our little poll was

> batting 0 for 2 a 100 percent refusal rate. CBS' Kathy Frankovic was reluctant to release CBS response and refusal data without knowing the information her competitors were giving out. She added that it was a complicated issue. But then hiding behind complexity has been a staple of the polling profession.

> Mike Kagay of the New York Times, Frankovic's partner in the CBS/New York Times polls, did release a response rate for an actual poll, though not the most recent one: 43 percent for the Sept. 12-15 poll.

> At Gallup, senior methodologist Rajesh Srinivasan promised to fax us response rate data right away. And indeed, we did receive reams of data right away -- on everything except response rates.

> A representative for Roper-Starch-Worldwide, who did not want his name used, explained that "that information is not available. Caddell, who conducted the first major presidential polls for the Carter campaign, is now appalled by the monster he helped unleash. "The dodging of such basic questions is alarming. When the polling industry is talking to itself, they express their worries about the progressive decline in response rates. But when they talk to the public, they clam up. It's ludicrous to suggest that response and refusal rates are any more proprietary than the size of the sample or the date of the interviews."

> It's time to ask polling companies to make their response rates public for every poll. And if they refuse, perhaps it's time for the media to stop just quoting and start investigating the polling industry to get to

> the truth behind all the smoke it's been blowing.
>

>From kbogen@erols.com Mon Oct 12 18:05:10 1998
Received: from smtp2.erols.com (smtp2.erols.com [207.172.3.235])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id SAA25593 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 18:05:09 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from uymfdlvk (207-172-130-252.s252.tnt3.col.erols.com
[207.172.130.252])
by smtp2.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id VAA14143;
Mon, 12 Oct 1998 21:05:09 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Karen Bogen" <kbogen@erols.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Karen Bogen" <kbogen@jhu.edu>
Subject: time use data collection
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 21:02:26 -0400
Message-ID: <01bdf645\$24cf8cc0\$fc82accf@uymfdlvk>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.71.1712.3
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3

In thinking about how to design an interviewer-administered instrument in which we want to ask about where a child was during each hour of the previous day (and where the parents were at the time), I am trying to find some examples of other people's data collection instruments. I know that self-administered time diaries are a popular tool, but we are not particularly interested in the very specific details that usually entails. We are looking at more broad categories of time use -- e.g., at home, at school, at a day care center, etc. I would appreciate any examples you have of what you've done or suggestions of where I might find some ideas. They don't have to be about our exact topic (kids' time use); I would appreciate any suggestions.

Thank you very much.
Karen Bogen
kbogen@erols.com
kbogen@jhu.edu

>From rusciano@enigma.rider.edu Mon Oct 12 19:41:48 1998
Received: from enigma.RIDER.EDU (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id TAA19227 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 19:41:46 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from enigma.rider.edu by enigma.rider.edu (PMDf V5.1-10 #29692)
id <01J2WEHHSO0W8WY6KZ@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon,
12 Oct 1998 22:41:53 EDT

Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 22:41:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: rusciano@enigma.rider.edu
Subject: Re: Huffington column
In-reply-to: <199810122134.RAA29091@dewdrop2.mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <Pine.PMDF.3.95.981012223200.539071955A-100000@enigma.rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Perhaps the most disturbing thing about Huffington's column is that it once again reflects an ideological "kill the messenger" mentality-- that is, if you don't like the results, attack the credibility of those giving them to you. The end here is not to engage in a scientific argument, but to convert the discussion into an "us vs. them" confrontation, with "us" being those who agree with our position, and "them" being anyone who offers contrary evidence. Hence, all discussion is reduced to listening to those on your side, a classic ideologue's position.

I agree that pollsters should be willing to give out such information as refusal rates, etc. Unfortunately, I can also understand, though, why they would refuse to give them to someone like Huffington; if I received a call from her, I would not believe she desired the information in order to write a reasoned piece on the problems of refusal rates. In short, this is a real conundrum for pollsters (and scholars) who do not generally have access to the media in the way that Huffington does-- how do we answer what are, on the surface, reasonable questions without allowing someone to reduce a complex argument to a simple (and perhaps) false one through the information we provide?

Does anyone have any thoughts?

Frank Rusciano
Dept. of Political Science
Rider University

On Mon, 12 Oct 1998, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> Here is Arianna Huffington's column. I would say the polling industry looks
> pretty foolish. Response rates are not proprietary information as she says
> Alderman (ABC News) and Riehle (Peter Hart) claim. Any column where
> Caddell
> sounds reasonable and the rest sound defensive is not good news for the
> profession.
>
> I believe we should prepare an AAPOR statement to give out in response to
> inquiries.
> warren mitofsky
>
>
> Investigating The Pollsters
> by Arianna Huffington
> (from her web site:
<<http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/101298.html>>

>
> Filed October 12, 1998
>

> When the history books are written, the Clinton
> crisis will be the first political crisis to be so entirely driven and
> shaped by polls. It was, according to Dick Morris' grand jury
> testimony, a poll that he secretly conducted for the president when
the

> Lewinsky scandal broke that set him on his 8-month-long course of
> deceiving the public. "You can't tell them about it, they'll kill
you,"

> Morris told the president. "They're just not ready for it." And the
man

> who has lived by polls throughout his political career concluded,
> "Well, we just have to win, then."

>
> So the few hundred people who answered Morris' poll determined a
> critical presidential decision. And now, nine months later, the
> president's high approval ratings remain his only protection. If the
polls

> are going to be the instrument by which we will judge the fate of this
> president, it becomes all the more important to answer the key
> question: Who is talking to pollsters and who isn't?

>
> In the 20 months before Richard Nixon resigned in August 1974, 128
> polls were conducted asking people whether the president should
> leave office. In the nine months of the Lewinsky scandal, 325 polls
> asked that question. It's no wonder that the mushrooming number of
> opinion polls coupled with the outrageous growth of telemarketing
> calls have led to a soaring refuse-to-answer rate among people
> polled.

>
> This is not good news for pollsters. The key to polling's accuracy is
the
> principle of "equal probability of selection." But if larger and
larger

> numbers among those randomly selected refuse to participate, this
> principle no longer applies.

>
> It turns out that polling companies will talk about anything except
the

> response and refusal rates of their last poll. Here's a sampling of a
> nonscientific poll of pollsters that my office conducted between Oct.

1
> and Oct. 9, and that illustrated the nonscientific nature of polling.

>
> Ours was a short poll: Can you please give us the response and
> refusal rates for your most recent national poll? ABC News pollster
> Jeff Alderman's first response was to say that he didn't understand
the

> question. When it was repeated to him, with minor refinements, he
> growled: "That's proprietary information. ... I've got another call.

> Goodbye." In polling lingo, that was a refusal -- but a very
revealing

> one. After all, we were not asking if the pollster wanted to change
> telephone services or presidents. And we were not calling at home
> during dinner time.
>
> Tom Riehle of Peter Hart Associates also used the "proprietary
> information" defense. He called their methods "our secret recipe"
> and explained usefully: "That's not your business." Our little poll
was
> batting 0 for 2 a 100 percent refusal rate. CBS' Kathy Frankovic was
> reluctant to release CBS response and refusal data without knowing
> the information her competitors were giving out. She added that it was
> a complicated issue. But then hiding behind complexity has been a
> staple of the polling profession.
>
> Mike Kagay of the New York Times, Frankovic's partner in the
> CBS/New York Times polls, did release a response rate for an actual
> poll, though not the most recent one: 43 percent for the Sept. 12-15
> poll.
>
> At Gallup, senior methodologist Rajesh Srinivasan promised to fax us
> response rate data right away. And indeed, we did receive reams of
> data right away -- on everything except response rates.
>
> A representative for Roper-Starch-Worldwide, who did not want his
> name used, explained that "that information is not available."

Caddell,

> who conducted the first major presidential polls for the Carter
> campaign, is now appalled by the monster he helped unleash. "The
> dodging of such basic questions is alarming. When the polling
> industry is talking to itself, they express their worries about the
> progressive decline in response rates. But when they talk to the
> public, they clam up. It's ludicrous to suggest that response and
> refusal rates are any more proprietary than the size of the sample or
> the date of the interviews."
>
> It's time to ask polling companies to make their response rates public
> for every poll. And if they refuse, perhaps it's time for the media to
> stop just quoting and start investigating the polling industry to get
to
> the truth behind all the smoke it's been blowing.
>

>From oneil@speedchoice.com Mon Oct 12 20:14:02 1998
Received: from mail.speedchoice.com ([207.240.197.31])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id UAA26355 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 20:14:01 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from phx35035 (hybrid-217-120.phoenix.speedchoice.com
[207.240.217.120]) by mail.speedchoice.com (8.8.8/) with SMTP id UAA15515
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 12 Oct 1998 20:14:22 -0700 (MST)
Message-ID: <001001bdf656\$669800e0\$78d9f0cf@phx35035>
From: "Michael O'Neil" <oneil@speedchoice.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: survey research

Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 20:05:57 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2120.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2120.0

An answer to your question about the number of opinion research interviews conducted annually would be particularly interesting if we could also derive an estimate of the number of instances of telemarketing calls annually. We constantly hear from respondents that they are surveyed to death. I feel certain that the VAST majority of these are actually telemarketing encounters. I we could credibly document the ratio between the two, it might be incorporated into effective industry PR. I suspect that if we got the figures, they would demonstrate that the average household is called less than once a year by legitimate survey research, but many times that by telemarketing organizations. While both are undoubtedly increasing, I suspect telemarketing is increasing more rapidly.

While many respondents complain about the extent to which they are over-surveyed, it is interesting to juxtapose the extent to which others (or, perhaps even the same people) assert that surveys cannot possibly be accurate "because no one has ever called me".

Mike O'Neil

Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, Arizona 85282

602.967.4441 Voice
602.967.6171 Personal Fax
602.967.6122 O'Neil Associates Fax

oneil@speedchoice.com personal email
surveys@primenet.com O'Neil Associates email

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

From: Scott Goold <sgoold@unm.edu>
To: aapornet <aapornet>
Date: Monday, October 12, 1998 10:15 AM
Subject: survey research

>In 1984, Sharp published research in POQ estimating that over 20 million
>interviews
>are conducted in the US annually. Has anyone seen more recent figures
>estimating the
>total number of interviews as well as the percent attributed to the federal
>government?
>

>Thanks in advance.

>

>-----

>Scott Goold, Ph.D. (abd)

>University of New Mexico

>505.293.2504

>Web page @ < www.unm.edu/~sgoold >

>

>"I Can't Accept Not Trying"

>-----

>

>

>

>From abider@earthlink.net Tue Oct 13 00:06:46 1998

Received: from snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.62])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id AAA17718 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 00:06:40 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from alvbysy (sdn-ar-002dcwashP321.dialsprint.net

[168.191.22.98])

by snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id AAA15401;

Tue, 13 Oct 1998 00:06:39 -0700 (PDT)

Message-ID: <001e01bdf679\$e5e35ac0\$6216bfa8@alvbysy>

Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>

From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>, <CaplanJR@aol.com>

Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.

Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 03:20:01 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="windows-1252"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

I appreciate Lydia's unscrambling of some strands of this thread which I spooled out originally. After looking at the recent data at the Gallup web site, it would seem that those who have found in "likely voters, only" data great solace for their unhappiness with poll findings of widespread anti-anti-Clinton sentiments must have found it in reports other than any I found at Gallup's site.

While it's good to hear how well the Gallup model has worked, my brain has a hard time working itself around why it would do better than Mitofsky's kind of model. One hunch was that lying about likelihood varies inversely with actual likelihood. I would also have questions about whether the Gallup method would work as well for estimates of stuff like the instant Monicagate issues where the opinion choices depart much further from 50/50 splits than does vote by party and which involve novelty rather than historically patterned voter turnouts.

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

From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com <Lydia_Saad@gallup.com>
To: CaplanJR@aol.com <CaplanJR@aol.com>; aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Monday, October 12, 1998 12:41 PM
Subject: RE: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.

>As (perhaps) the first polling organization to develop and institute likely
>voter modelling techniques, Gallup has conducted extensive research on this
>subject and arrived at a method decades ago which has proved remarkably
>accurate in both presidential and midterm congressional elections ever
>since. This entails scoring respondents' likelihood of voting (using
>questions about past voting behavior and current voting intent), then
>taking
>only a subset of voters at the top of the scale who are equal in size to
>the
>expected turnout.
>

> <SNIP>

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Tue Oct 13 03:59:50 1998
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id DAA13398; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 03:59:49 -0700 (PDT)
From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo12.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id HNVHa19215;
Tue, 13 Oct 1998 06:58:44 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <acad6bdd.36233264@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 06:58:44 EDT
To: oneil@speedchoice.com, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Re: survey research
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

In a message dated 10/13/98 3:02:54 AM, oneil@speedchoice.com wrote:

<<We

constantly hear from respondents that they are surveyed to death. I feel
certain that the VAST majority of these are actually telemarketing
encounters. I we could credibly document the ratio between the two, it
might be incorporated into effective industry PR. I suspect that if we got

the figures, they would demonstrate that the average household is called less than once a year by legitimate survey research, but many times that by telemarketing organizations. >>

To respondents, it may be that "a survey is a survey" and they see it as the same form of encounter: a telephone contact by someone they don't know. Some more education on our part may be needed. A "figure-ground illusion" may also be occurring here--- they remember the sometimes lengthy, sometimes more direct contact to buy or do something encounter more so than the purer, provide information contact.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph. D.
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

>From esinger@isr.umich.edu Tue Oct 13 07:11:08 1998
Received: from runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.144.15])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA05607 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 07:11:07 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from s-isr-m1.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])
by runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.5/2.3) with ESMTP id KAA23139;
Tue, 13 Oct 1998 10:11:06 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199810131411.KAA23139@runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu>
Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
id <RDG7JM50>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 10:12:49 -0400
From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@isr.umich.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu, Howard Schuman <HSchuman@umich.edu>
Subject: RE: Information on response rates
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 10:10:00 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
Content-Type: text/plain

I agree with Howard, and Warren. Low response rates (high refusal rates) may make the profession look bad, but refusing to make them public makes us look even worse.

From: Howard Schuman
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Information on response rates
Date: Monday, October 12, 1998 6:46PM

Here's a second (or nth) for AAPOR to take a strong stand on the need for polls to make information on response rates regularly available, including separation of refusals from other forms of non-response. This is an issue

that involves much of the membership, and is different from and harder than the typical standards case about a deviant organization or push polls or something else that doesn't involve the core profession. It is appropriate for polls to cite evidence that refusals and other forms of non-response have little effect on results--where such evidence exists. But it is not appropriate to hide behind the frequent vague statements about the "practical difficulties" of conducting a survey.

>From Krosnick.1@osu.edu Tue Oct 13 07:33:51 1998
Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA11626 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 07:33:50 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from krosoffice2.psy.ohio-state.edu (pc342.psy.ohio-state.edu [128.146.254.42])
by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA12358
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 10:33:48 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19981013103407.00d8cdc8@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: krosnick.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (32)
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 10:34:07 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jon Krosnick <Krosnick.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Information on response rates
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I support Howard's suggestion as well.

Jon Krosnick

>Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 18:46:56 -0400 (EDT)
>From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
>Subject: Information on response rates
>Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
>X-Sender: hschuman@choplifter.rs.itd.umich.edu
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Reply-to: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
>X-Listprocessor-version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN
>
>Here's a second (or nth) for AAPOR to take a strong stand on the need for
>polls to make information on response rates regularly available, including
>separation of refusals from other forms of non-response. This is an issue
>that involves much of the membership, and is different from and harder
>than the typical standards case about a deviant organization or push polls
>or something else that doesn't involve the core profession. It is
>appropriate for polls to cite evidence that refusals and other forms of
>non-response have little effect on results--where such evidence exists.
>But it is not appropriate to hide behind the frequent vague statements
>about the "practical difficulties" of conducting a survey.

>
>
>
>
>
>

Jon A. Krosnick
Department of Psychology
Ohio State University
1885 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Phone: 614-292-3496

Fax: 614-292-5601

>From Krosnick.1@osu.edu Tue Oct 13 07:34:10 1998

Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.214.33])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id HAA11727 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 07:34:09 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from krosoffice2.psy.ohio-state.edu (pc342.psy.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.254.42])

by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA12461

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 10:34:06 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19981013103426.00def00c@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: krosnick.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu (Unverified)

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (32)

Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 10:34:26 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Jon Krosnick <Krosnick.1@osu.edu>

Subject: RE: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

According to analyses Penny Visser, Jesse Marquette, Mike Curtin, and I have recently completed (and reported at the last AAPOR meeting), the methods Lydia describes do **not** yield the most accurate election outcome forecasts of which surveys are capable.

We analyzed **telephone** survey forecasts of Ohio elections conducted between 1988 and 1996 using various different ways of selecting likely voters. We obtained the most accurate predictions **not** by throwing respondents out at a rate to match the proportion of people **projected** to turn out in an election.

Rather, throwing out substantially **more** respondents yielded more accurate projections. Specifically, using the data from only the minority of respondents who said they were registered, would **definitely** vote, and were **very** interested in the election led to more accurate predictions

than using larger groups of respondents, closer in size to the actual turnout rate for the election. For example, our best predictions in 1996 came from 35% of respondents, when the actual turnout rate was 56%.

Interestingly, at our AAPOR session, Kathy Frankovic mentioned that the CBS/NYTimes dramatic overprediction of Clinton's '96 victory went away when they threw out a large majority of their respondents along the lines of our research findings.

Our findings are written up in a chapter to be published in a book being edited by Paul Lavrakas and Mike Traugott, and I'd be happy to send a copy to anyone who sends me a request (*not* via AAPORnet, of course!).

Jon Krosnick

At 11:38 AM 10/12/98 -0500, you wrote:

>As (perhaps) the first polling organization to develop and institute likely
>voter modelling techniques, Gallup has conducted extensive research on this
>subject and arrived at a method decades ago which has proved remarkably
>accurate in both presidential and midterm congressional elections ever
>since. This entails scoring respondents' likelihood of voting (using
>questions about past voting behavior and current voting intent), then
>taking
>only a subset of voters at the top of the scale who are equal in size to
>the
>expected turnout.

>
>This year, for example, we are looking at the 39% top scoring national
>adults in our pre-election samples to represent likely midterm voters. (We
>will adjust this toward the end of the election as the projected turnout
>rate becomes clearer.) Using the exact same method in 1994 (and allocating
>the small undecided vote proportionally), we arrived at a two-party vote
>figure which was identical to the national two-party vote. Then used a
>regression equation based on historical analysis to convert the generic
>ballot vote to projected House seats...coming within single digits of the
>actual distribution of seats.

>
>In 1996 Gallup experimented with the other method Warren has described --
>assigning probabilities of voting to each respondent, rather than taking
>the
>cutoff approach. Using probabilities of voting derived from post-election
>validation studies, Gallup assigned probabilities ranging from .04 to over
>.8. However, when comparing these results to figures derived using our
>traditional cutoff method, we determined the traditional method was
>superior.

>
>In 1997 I presented a paper at AAPOR reviewing voter preferences for
>presidential candidates in all presidential elections back to 1952 --
>looking at voter preferences according to their apparent likelihood to
>vote.

>We found a clear pattern of vote preferences becoming more Republican with
>increasing likelihood to vote (using three levels of likelihood: highly,
>moderately, not likely). However the pattern was particularly strong in
>1980 and 1996, both years when the sitting president was Democratic. In
>these years, the Democratic preference among non-voters was exceptionally
>strong, something like 4:1. In other years, when the sitting president was
>Republican, the Democratic preference among non voters was far less
>pronounced. The analysis indicated why accuracy in pre-election
predictions
>relies so heavily on removing those non-voters from the sample base -- to a
>greater or lesser extent depending on the election.

>
>The current team of editors of the Gallup Poll -- Frank Newport, David
>Moore, and myself - have reported these methods and results quite
>extensively since 1993 at AAPOR conferences as well as in at least two POQ
>articles. I am writing this message from home today, without the benefit of
>my files and POQ references. Please write or call if you would like more
>information. If you email me, please use the gallup url shown below.

>
>Lydia Saad
>managing editor, The Gallup Poll
>ph: 609-279-2219
>lydia_saad@gallup.com

>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: CaplanJR@aol.com
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Sent: 10/9/98 1:11 PM
>Subject: Re: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.

>
>Actually, I threw out the flip remark about how good a given measure of
>voter
>likelihood was to generate discussion about methodology, not start a
>flame
>war. Seems to me that categorizing people according to demographics and
>interests as a method of predicting voting behavior is an interesting
>approach. But the use of such "indirect" measures may a tacit
>confession that
>we as researchers are uncomfortable using more direct estimates of
>motivation
>to predict behavior.

>
>I think it would be fun to interview people about their voting behavior
>and
>have them remember when they did and didn't vote and see if they recall
>what
>prompted them to take the time and trouble to vote. Wouldn't it be
>interesting to see if perceived concerns about the individual and his
>family
>were more motivating than general concerns about the country and its
>future?
>At any rate, it would give us some good items to directly predict
>likelihood
>of voting.

>
>Jim Caplan
>Miami
>
>

Jon A. Krosnick
Department of Psychology
Ohio State University
1885 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Phone: 614-292-3496
Fax: 614-292-5601

>From yd17@cornell.edu Tue Oct 13 07:46:35 1998
Received: from postoffice2.mail.cornell.edu (POSTOFFICE2.MAIL.CORNELL.EDU
[132.236.56.10])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA13887 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 07:46:33 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from Yasamin.ilr.cornell.edu ([128.253.61.241])
by postoffice2.mail.cornell.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id KAA18177;
Tue, 13 Oct 1998 10:46:32 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19981013104933.00ca2004@postoffice4.mail.cornell.edu>
X-Sender: yd17@postoffice4.mail.cornell.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.2 (32) -- [Cornell
Modified]
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 10:49:33 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Yasamin DiCiccio <yd17@cornell.edu>
Subject: surveys on custody issues
Cc: lew14@cornell.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Would anyone know of any references to survey questions that address custody issues, in particular, how best to ask questions that will capture information on the type of custody arrangements a respondent has with his/her ex?

Any information in this area will be greatly appreciated. You may respond to me directly at (YD17@CORNELL.EDU). I will be happy to share any information I receive from this request.

Thanks,

Yasamin DiCiccio

Computer-Assisted Survey Team
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14850

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Tue Oct 13 08:18:14 1998
Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.214.33])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA20455 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 08:18:12 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu (ts18-7.homenet.ohio-state.edu
[140.254.113.110])
by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA24974
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 11:18:08 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 11:18:08 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199810131518.LAA24974@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Huffington and poll bashers

Most AAPOR members will be unaware that AAPOR Council has been talking extensively during the past week about how AAPOR should respond to the Huffington column (we knew it was coming out) and hers and others' efforts to discredit public opinion polls by attacking their methodology. I believe Council is still undecided about this.

However, in terms of response rates, I for one suggest to AAPOR members that if confronted with this issue, refocus the discussion on whether or not there is likely nonresponse *error* in the survey not (merely) whether the responses rates are relatively high or low. For example, for pre-election polls trying to predict election outcomes, there's a lot of evidence that "low" response rates do not lead to meaningful levels of nonresponse error (bias) in otherwise well conducted surveys. (An implication being that there's no reason to be defensive about one's response rates if one is confident there's not likely to be any appreciable nonresponse bias.)

Furthermore, as the Total Survey Error perspective suggests, the profession generally has had a misguided concern with the actual rates as opposed to being concerned with whether or not surveys are likely to have nonresponse error due to nonresponse. The Pew study on nonresponse using national samples which was reported at the 1998 AAPOR conference showed what many of us knew from our own research, that efforts to improve response *rates*, such as many callbacks and refusals conversion efforts, may well not lead to any meaningful differences in nonresponse error; (e.g., Sandy Bauman, Dan Merkle, and I had a series of papers we gave at AAPOR conferences in the early 1990s using metro Chicago RDD data which suggested the same conclusion.)

P.S. For those unaware of Ms. Huffington's clear dislike of our profession as tide-bearers of "public opinion," here's a segment of a column of hers that was released after our last conference:

"Hang It Up"
Filed May 21, 1998

Last weekend the American Association of Public Opinion Research had its 53rd annual convention in St. Louis. The pollsters were there to celebrate their profession and look ahead to a bright future. But if you ``agree strongly" or ``agree somewhat" with me, you want that future to be bleak -- so bleak, in fact, that at least 90 percent (plus or minus four points) of them are forced into occupational retraining. I wouldn't even mind if it were government-funded. Maybe it could help them break into something less damaging -- like growing tobacco or producing ``Jerry Springer."

It's been a good week for challenging entrenched behemoths, with students bringing down President Suharto and the Justice Department going after Monopolysoft. And, likewise, the time has come for pollsters.

I should confess up front that I'm their sworn enemy. Together with satirist and all-purpose good guy Harry Shearer, I have launched a campaign -- Partnership for a Poll-Free America -- intended to make the 54th annual pollster convention a lot less joyous than the 53rd. And if all goes well, by the year 2000, Harry and I -- a mere .00000001 percent of Americans 18 or older -- will ensure that the 55th conference doesn't take place.

And a good day to you Arianna....

* * * * *
* *

* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.

* Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy & Management

* Director, OSU/SBS Survey Research Unit

* * * * *
* *

* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences; Derby Hall, Room 0126

* 154 North Oval Mall, Ohio State University; Columbus OH 43210

* Voice: (614)-292-6672 Fax: (614)-292-6673 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu

* * * * *
* *

>From kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu Tue Oct 13 09:02:33 1998
Received: from ackroyd.harvard.edu (ackroyd.harvard.edu [128.103.208.29])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA03871 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 09:02:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21])
by ackroyd.harvard.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id MAA08787
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 12:02:06 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from sph76-133.harvard.edu by hsph.harvard.edu
(8.8.8+Sun/SMI-SVR4)
id MAA25749; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 12:02:05 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <362378B2.952@hsph.harvard.edu>
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 11:58:42 -0400
From: Karen Donelan <kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Information on response rates
References: <199810131411.KAA23139@runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It seems to me that this is the ultimate lesson from an endless number
of political scandals--

The cover up is worse than the crime.

As for the concern raised by some that there is a danger that Huffington
and others might not treat response rate information fairly or in a
different light than we might want or expect--

So what else is new in the research business?

Karen Donelan
Harvard School of Public Health

Eleanor Singer wrote:

>
> I agree with Howard, and Warren. Low response rates (high refusal
> rates) may make the profession look bad, but refusing to make them
> public makes us look even worse.
> -----
> From: Howard Schuman
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Information on response rates
> Date: Monday, October 12, 1998 6:46PM
>
> Here's a second (or nth) for AAPOR to take a strong stand on the need

> for
> polls to make information on response rates regularly available,
> including
> separation of refusals from other forms of non-response. This is an
> issue
> that involves much of the membership, and is different from and harder
> than the typical standards case about a deviant organization or push
> polls
> or something else that doesn't involve the core profession. It is
> appropriate for polls to cite evidence that refusals and other forms of
> non-response have little effect on results--where such evidence exists.
> But it is not appropriate to hide behind the frequent vague statements
> about the "practical difficulties" of conducting a survey.
>From adam.safir@arbitron.com Tue Oct 13 10:46:42 1998
Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA23568 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 10:46:41 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id NAA28719; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 13:32:00
-0400 (EDT)
Received: from mercury.arbitron.com(198.40.5.145) by vulcan.arbitron.com via
smtp (4.1)
id xma028620; Tue, 13 Oct 98 13:31:19 -0400
Received: from ARBITRON-Message_Server by arbitron.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 13:44:08 -0400
Message-Id: <s6235928.097@arbitron.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 13:43:46 -0400
From: Adam Safir <adam.safir@arbitron.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Return rate effects of live vs. business reply postage.
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline

I'm looking for any information or research concerning the return rate effects of substituting business reply postage for live stamps on return envelopes.

We have test results from the early '80s that clearly show live stamps to be the superior, if more expensive method, but are interested in more recent research.

Any help would be greatly appreciated.

thanks,

Adam Safir
Research Department
The Arbitron Company

>From Mark@bisconti.com Tue Oct 13 11:41:31 1998
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA15246 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 11:41:28 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by
medusa.nei.org
(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000246115@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;
Tue, 13 Oct 1998 14:39:42 -0400
Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange
Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)
id QY43SM7G; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 14:43:09 -0400
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
id <01BDF6B6.61584EE0@mark-bri>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 14:33:01 -0400
Message-Id: <01BDF6B6.61584EE0@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Inquiry
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 14:33:00 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I am searching for opinion studies on global climate change issues and =
willingness to modify ones lifestyle and adapt conservation measures in =
light of the need to reduce energy consumption and cut fossil fuel =
emissions, per the Kyoto Agreements. I would like to compare pre-Kyoto =
data to post-Kyoto data, and compare industrialized countries to =
developing ones. Any suggestions?

Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com

>From p-miller@nwu.edu Tue Oct 13 12:15:20 1998
Received: from casbah.acns.nwu.edu (casbah.acns.nwu.edu [129.105.16.52])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA29897 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 12:15:19 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from mailnull@localhost)
by casbah.acns.nwu.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) id OAA14707
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 14:15:18 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from pmiller.medill.nwu.edu(129.105.249.129) by
casbah.acns.nwu.edu via smap (V2.0)
id xma014602; Tue, 13 Oct 98 14:15:07 -0500
Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19981013142355.006d08c4@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>
X-Sender: pvm@casbah.acns.nwu.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 14:23:55 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Peter Miller <p-miller@nwu.edu>
Subject: Re: Huffington column
In-Reply-To: <Pine.PMDF.3.95.981012223200.539071955A-100000@enigma.rider
.edu>
References: <199810122134.RAA29091@dewdrop2.mindspring.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

If Huffington's account is accurate (I haven't seen any evidence to the contrary thus far) the most disturbing thing about it is that she was asking for information that should be available to ANYONE who inquires, according to the AAPOR code, and she was apparently refused or put off by people involved in some prominent survey firms -- people who ought to know better.

Again, if the account is accurate, it is not the first time that Alderman of ABC has told someone to "buzz off" when asked for methodological information. He treated similarly a request for a POQ article about ABC polls concerning the Clarence Thomas/Anita Hill controversy (see Rucinski, "Rush to Judgment?" POQ, Winter, 1993). In that case, he was asked for information for a scholarly paper. And, since people at Chilton (which does ABC's fieldwork) had already agreed to provide the requested information with Alderman's permission, granting the request would have required no work on his part. His most recent refusal, if accurately reported by Huffington, is just another inexcusable embarrassment. The "proprietary information" claim by the Peter Hart representative falls in the same category. In my view, these are straightforward standards violations.

The disclosure principle is an essential underpinning of our profession. The recent AAPOR effort to standardize reporting of response rates further underscores the importance of being able to provide this fundamental methodological information routinely, as a matter of course, for every poll or survey, for ANYONE who inquires.

We should also -- as Paul Lavrakas notes -- be able to discuss the difference between response rate and nonresponse error. We should help people make sense of response rate numbers. But we can't even engage in that discussion without first willingly and accurately reporting the response rate.

At 10:41 PM 10/12/98 -0400, you wrote:

>Perhaps the most disturbing thing about Huffington's column is that it
>once again reflects an ideological "kill the messenger" mentality-- that
>is, if you don't like the results, attack the credibility of those giving
>them to you. The end here is not to engage in a scientific argument, but
>to convert the discussion into an "us vs. them" confrontation, with "us"
>being those who agree with our position, and "them" being anyone who
>offers contrary evidence. Hence, all discussion is reduced to listening
>to those on your side, a classic ideologue's position.

>

>I agree that pollsters should be willing to give out such information as
>refusal rates, etc. Unfortunately, I can also understand, though, why
>they would refuse to give them to someone like Huffington; if I received a
>call from her, I would not believe she desired the information in order to
>write a reasoned piece on the problems of refusal rates. In short, this
>is a real conundrum for pollsters (and scholars) who do not generally have

>access to the media in the way that Huffington does-- how do we answer
>what are, on the surface, reasonable questions without allowing someone to
>reduce a complex argument to a simple (and perhaps) false one through the
>information we provide?

>
>Does anyone have any thoughts?

>
>Frank Rusciano
>Dept. of Political Science
>Rider University

>
>On Mon, 12 Oct 1998, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>
>> Here is Arianna Huffington's column. I would say the polling industry
looks

>> pretty foolish. Response rates are not proprietary information as she
says

>> Alderman (ABC News) and Riehle (Peter Hart) claim. Any column where
Caddell

>> sounds reasonable and the rest sound defensive is not good news for the
>> profession.

>>
>> I believe we should prepare an AAPOR statement to give out in response to
>> inquiries.

>> warren mitofsky

>>
>> Investigating The Pollsters
>> by Arianna Huffington
>> (from her web site:
<<http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/101298.html>>

>>
>> Filed October 12, 1998

>>
>> When the history books are written, the Clinton
>> crisis will be the first political crisis to be so entirely driven

and
>> shaped by polls. It was, according to Dick Morris' grand jury
>> testimony, a poll that he secretly conducted for the president when

the
>> Lewinsky scandal broke that set him on his 8-month-long course of
>> deceiving the public. ``You can't tell them about it, they'll kill
you,"

>> Morris told the president. ``They're just not ready for it." And
the man

>> who has lived by polls throughout his political career concluded,
>> ``Well, we just have to win, then."

>>
>> So the few hundred people who answered Morris' poll determined a
>> critical presidential decision. And now, nine months later, the
>> president's high approval ratings remain his only protection. If the
polls

>> are going to be the instrument by which we will judge the fate of
this

>> president, it becomes all the more important to answer the key
>> question: Who is talking to pollsters and who isn't?
>>

>> In the 20 months before Richard Nixon resigned in August 1974, 128
>> polls were conducted asking people whether the president should
>> leave office. In the nine months of the Lewinsky scandal, 325 polls
>> asked that question. It's no wonder that the mushrooming number of
>> opinion polls coupled with the outrageous growth of telemarketing
>> calls have led to a soaring refuse-to-answer rate among people
>> polled.
>>

>> This is not good news for pollsters. The key to polling's accuracy
is the
>> principle of "equal probability of selection." But if larger and
larger
>> numbers among those randomly selected refuse to participate, this
>> principle no longer applies.
>>

>> It turns out that polling companies will talk about anything except
the
>> response and refusal rates of their last poll. Here's a sampling of a
>> nonscientific poll of pollsters that my office conducted between Oct.
1
>> and Oct. 9, and that illustrated the nonscientific nature of polling.
>>

>> Ours was a short poll: Can you please give us the response and
>> refusal rates for your most recent national poll? ABC News pollster
>> Jeff Alderman's first response was to say that he didn't understand
the
>> question. When it was repeated to him, with minor refinements, he
>> growled: "That's proprietary information. ... I've got another call.
>> Goodbye." In polling lingo, that was a refusal -- but a very
revealing
>> one. After all, we were not asking if the pollster wanted to change
>> telephone services or presidents. And we were not calling at home
>> during dinner time.
>>

>> Tom Riehle of Peter Hart Associates also used the "proprietary
>> information" defense. He called their methods "our secret recipe"
>> and explained usefully: "That's not your business." Our little
poll was
>> batting 0 for 2 a 100 percent refusal rate. CBS' Kathy Frankovic was
>> reluctant to release CBS response and refusal data without knowing
>> the information her competitors were giving out. She added that it
was
>> a complicated issue. But then hiding behind complexity has been a
>> staple of the polling profession.
>>

>> Mike Kagay of the New York Times, Frankovic's partner in the
>> CBS/New York Times polls, did release a response rate for an actual
>> poll, though not the most recent one: 43 percent for the Sept. 12-15
>> poll.
>>

>> At Gallup, senior methodologist Rajesh Srinivasan promised to fax us
>> response rate data right away. And indeed, we did receive reams of
>> data right away -- on everything except response rates.

>>
>> A representative for Roper-Starch-Worldwide, who did not want his
>> name used, explained that ``that information is not available.

Caddell,

>> who conducted the first major presidential polls for the Carter
>> campaign, is now appalled by the monster he helped unleash. ``The
>> dodging of such basic questions is alarming. When the polling
>> industry is talking to itself, they express their worries about the
>> progressive decline in response rates. But when they talk to the
>> public, they clam up. It's ludicrous to suggest that response and
>> refusal rates are any more proprietary than the size of the sample or
>> the date of the interviews."

>>
>> It's time to ask polling companies to make their response rates
public
>> for every poll. And if they refuse, perhaps it's time for the media
to
>> stop just quoting and start investigating the polling industry to
get to
>> the truth behind all the smoke it's been blowing.

>>

>

>

>

Peter V. Miller

Department of Communication Studies

Northwestern University

1881 Sheridan Road, Room 12

Evanston, IL 60208

847-491-5835

847-467-1171 (FAX)

p-miller@nwu.edu

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Tue Oct 13 13:12:24 1998

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.10])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id NAA24903 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 13:12:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (garnet3.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.4])

by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id QAA58024

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 16:12:15 -0400

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (xyp10-11.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.5.52])

by garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id QAA45504

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 16:12:13 -0400

Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 16:12:13 -0400

Message-Id: <199810132012.QAA45504@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>

X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Huffington column

Amen to Frank. Our latest standards promote giving information about both nonresponse and response error.

Personally I spend more time than I would like explaining differences between surveys and telemarketing (much of it to my University colleagues outside the field). "Refusals" such as those Huffington quotes don't help.

Susan

At 02:23 PM 10/13/98 -0500, you wrote:

>If Huffington's account is accurate (I haven't seen any evidence to the
>contrary thus far) the most disturbing thing about it is that she was
>asking for information that should be available to ANYONE who inquires,
>according to the AAPOR code, and she was apparently refused or put off by
>people involved in some prominent survey firms -- people who ought to know
>better.

>
>Again, if the account is accurate, it is not the first time that Alderman
>of ABC has told someone to "buzz off"
>when asked for methodological information. He treated similarly a request
>for a POQ article about ABC polls concerning the Clarence Thomas/Anita Hill
>controversy (see Rucinski, "Rush to Judgment?" POQ, Winter, 1993). In that
>case, he was asked for information for a scholarly paper. And, since
>people at Chilton (which does ABC's fieldwork) had already agreed to
>provide the requested information with Alderman's permission, granting the
>request would have required no work on his part. His most recent refusal,
>if accurately reported by Huffington, is just another inexcusable
>embarrassment. The "proprietary information" claim by the Peter Hart
>representative falls in the same category. In my view, these are
>straightforward standards violations.

>
>The disclosure principle is an essential underpinning of our profession.
>The recent AAPOR effort to standardize reporting of response rates further
>underscores the importance of being able to provide this fundamental
>methodological information routinely, as a matter of course, for every poll
>or survey, for ANYONE who inquires.

>
>We should also -- as Paul Lavrakas notes -- be able to discuss the
>difference between response rate and nonresponse error. We should help
>people make sense of response rate numbers. But we can't even engage in
>that discussion without first willingly and accurately reporting the
>response rate.

>
>
>
>At 10:41 PM 10/12/98 -0400, you wrote:
>>Perhaps the most disturbing thing about Huffington's column is that it
>>once again reflects an ideological "kill the messenger" mentality-- that
>>is, if you don't like the results, attack the credibility of those giving
>>them to you. The end here is not to engage in a scientific argument, but
>>to convert the discussion into an "us vs. them" confrontation, with "us"

>>being those who agree with our position, and "them" being anyone who
>>offers contrary evidence. Hence, all discussion is reduced to listening
>>to those on your side, a classic ideologue's position.
>>
>>I agree that pollsters should be willing to give out such information as
>>refusal rates, etc. Unfortunately, I can also understand, though, why
>>they would refuse to give them to someone like Huffington; if I received a
>>call from her, I would not believe she desired the information in order to
>>write a reasoned piece on the problems of refusal rates. In short, this
>>is a real conundrum for pollsters (and scholars) who do not generally have
>>access to the media in the way that Huffington does-- how do we answer
>>what are, on the surface, reasonable questions without allowing someone to
>>reduce a complex argument to a simple (and perhaps) false one through the
>>information we provide?
>>
>>Does anyone have any thoughts?
>>
>>Frank Rusciano
>>Dept. of Political Science
>>Rider University
>>

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh
Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208

>From feinberg@surveys.com Tue Oct 13 13:13:11 1998
Received: from webhp1.surveys.com (mta@webhp1.surveys.com [204.217.98.6])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA25359 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 13:13:04 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from BARRYM.F ([38.209.106.188]) by webhp1.surveys.com
(Netscape Messaging Server 3.52) with SMTP id AAA6539
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 16:11:20 -0400
From: feinberg@surveys.com (Barry Feinberg)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 16:13:32 +0000
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Huffington column
X-pmrqc: 1
In-reply-to: <3.0.3.32.19981013142355.006d08c4@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>
References: <Pine.PMDF.3.95.981012223200.539071955A-100000@enigma.rider.edu>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.52)
Message-ID: <77189B4845F.AAA6539@webhp1.surveys.com>

In the interest of understanding who Ms. Huffington is, I am attaching her bio from her web page.

Barry Feinberg
Audits & Surveys Worldwide

What's New | Email

Arianna Huffington is a nationally syndicated columnist and author of seven books. She is also the chair of the Center for Effective Compassion, dedicated to reinvigorating our communities and promoting greater citizen involvement in the solution of social problems. Born in Greece, she moved to England when she was sixteen and graduated from Cambridge University with an M.A. in Economics. At twenty-one she became President of the famed debating society, the Cambridge Union. Her first book, *The Female Woman*, a critique of extremism in the feminist movement, was published in 1974 by Random House and translated into eleven languages. In 1978 she published *After Reason*, a book on political leadership and the intersection of politics and culture. Her biography of Maria Callas: *The Woman Behind the Legend*, published in 1981 quickly became an international bestseller. Her fourth book, *The Gods of Greece*, celebrated the power of myths as guides to forgotten dimensions of life and ourselves, and was recently republished by Atlantic Monthly Press, with paintings by Francoise Gilot. Check out Arianna's new photo gallery Her biography of Pablo Picasso, *Picasso: Creator and Destroyer*, published in 1988, was a major international bestseller, translated into sixteen languages. The book was recently reissued by Avon Books to coincide with the release of "Surviving Picasso", a film based on the book, produced by Merchant-Ivory for Warner Bros. and starring Anthony Hopkins. In 1994, she published *The Fourth Instinct* on the longing for meaning in a secular world. Her latest book, *Greetings from the Lincoln Bedroom*, a book of political satire, has just been released by Crown. Her talk show, *Critical Mass*, on National Empowerment Television, aired until December 1994. During Campaign '96, Arianna teamed up with Al Franken to provide political coverage for Comedy Central during the Republican and Democratic conventions, as well as on election night. She and Franken also appeared, in bed, in a point-counterpoint segment for *Politically Incorrect* called *Strange Bedfellows*. She wants the American people to know--listen to her--that she did nothing improper with "that man," Mr. Franken. And anyway, even if she did--which is irrelevant because she didn't, but just supposing--it's all right, because Billy Graham has forgiven her, although, strangely, not Al. She is now developing a political satire show with Comedy Central which includes a segment on the media called *Eat the Press*. She has

made many guest appearances on other shows, including Larry King, Oprah, Phil Donahue, Inside Politics, Charlie Rose, Tom Snyder, Crossfire, Firing Line, To The Contrary, Good Morning America, the Today Show, 48 Hours, Roseanne, and possibly, should her lawsuit go the distance, Court TV. Or alternatively if the plaintiff agrees, that strange Ed Koch version of People's Court. It is her lifelong dream to break William Ginsburg Sunday morning talk show record of five appearances in one day. She is currently the Greek national champion (if you don't count George Stephanopoulos--and she'd prefer not to) and is lobbying the close-minded International Olympic Committee to make it an Olympic sport for the Sydney games in 2000. Arianna Huffington lives in Los Angeles and Washington D.C. with her daughters Christina and Isabella. She has seen Titanic 728 times and cried at every single show.

--

ARIANNA ONLINE

1158 26th Street, Suite #428

Santa Monica, CA 90403

email: info@ariannaonline.com

Copyright c 1998 Christabella, Inc.

Developed and hosted by BOLD NEW WORLD

>From Mark@bisconti.com Tue Oct 13 13:27:25 1998

Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id NAA00821 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 13:27:24 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by

medusa.nei.org

(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000246410@medusa.nei.org> for

<aapornet@usc.edu>;

Tue, 13 Oct 1998 16:25:45 -0400

Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange

Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)

id QY43SN15; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 16:29:11 -0400

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

id <01BDF6C5.31BB7180@mark-bri>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 16:19:03 -0400

Message-Id: <01BDF6C5.31BB7180@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Columnists, Disclosure, and Kudos

Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 16:19:02 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Dick Boland, another nationally syndicated columnist, is another poll =
basher. I have an article he wrote in March suggesting a poll do see if =
we should do away with polls. He complains because he can't find =
anybody who has every been interviewed, he suspects the polls are =
conducted at odd times of the day when working people aren't at home..., =
and on and on. =20

Full disclosure: What does that mean? How much info is enough?

Any time an organization declines or refuses to release information (or return a reporter's call...), they may be creating the perception of hiding something. "I don't know, I'll find out" is a better answer than "None of your business!" or "Why do you want to know?" (See the literature on "crisis communications"!)

I recently encountered a situation in which a national newspaper (my local paper) declined to provide the full questionnaire and full results (crosstabs) of a poll of the local Mayoral race, because they said they did not have the time. It may be provided to The Roper Center eventually, but not in a timely way. They released the total numbers for select questions (with the full question wording). I was interested in looking at demographic and Ward differences, and thought it would be an important public service for them to make all the information available to the public and the candidates, perhaps on their website. A number of candidates couldn't afford to do polling research. I know that private companies cannot get away with this kind of answer when a reporter calls for info. If they are going to release data publicly, they have to assume somebody will want more detail...

Although they did NOT violate AAPOR standards, and the quality of their research is EXCELLENT, their lack of openness in the midst of a competitive political race made me FEEL that (or wonder if) they were somehow using their poll to support the particular candidate they endorsed on the editorial page (and who won the primary by about the same margin as their poll showed!). I know there are issues related to competition between newspapers. =20

Many people question polls because they know how powerful polls can be. They are inherently political, because they claim to re-present people.

I'm always interested in what is not asked. I can name many issues locally that, as far as I know, have never been explored and which could help our city by throwing light on issues that pundits like to try to guess and offer interpretations about. Public figures constantly talk about how the public feel and think, but (not to be overly cynical) many times I doubt they really want to know, any more than they want the public to be involved in decision-making.

In some ways, I wonder if the current national/Washington affair isn't really a fight over who controls the Presidency-the public or the Congress!?!

By the way, about a week or so ago I saw Jim Norman of USA Today on C-SPAN, explaining polling. He did an excellent job of explaining the issues to people who called in, and he did it in easy to understand terms.

Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com

>From surveys@wco.com Tue Oct 13 14:35:36 1998

Received: from mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (mailhub2.ncal.verio.com [204.247.247.54])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id OAA29084 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 14:35:34 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from compaq (sextans142.wco.com [209.21.28.142])

by mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id OAA06345

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 14:35:30 -0700 (PDT)

Message-ID: <01ab01bdf6f1\$4e36b000\$2b54fea9@compaq>

From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Huffington column

Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 14:33:03 -0700

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

"In the interest of better understanding who Ms. Huffington is..." part two:

Interesting how Ms. H does not include in her bio how she and her ex tried to buy a US Senate seat for something like \$30 million from his personal fortune four years ago. They had previously bought a House seat representing Santa Barbara. Mr. H was so obviously a carpet bagger and unqualified for the Senate that they lost to Diane Feinstein, despite out-spending her and despite the big Republican gains of that year. They lost the swing areas, but did carry most of the traditional Republican parts of the state - except his home district (to know them was not to love them). Mr. H was widely seen as a non-entity, with Ms. H making all the decisions.

Thanks to Barry for part one.

Hank Zucker

Creative Research Systems

makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good

<http://www.surveysystem.com>

<mailto:surveys@wco.com>

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

From: Barry Feinberg <feinberg@surveys.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>

Date: Tuesday, October 13, 1998 1:16 PM

Subject: Re: Huffington column

In the interest of understanding who Ms. Huffington is, I am attaching her bio from her web page.

Barry Feinberg

Audits & Surveys Worldwide

Arianna Huffington is a nationally syndicated columnist and author of seven books. She is also the chair of the Center for Effective Compassion, dedicated to reinvigorating our communities and promoting greater citizen involvement in the solution of social problems. Born in Greece, she moved to England when she was sixteen and graduated from Cambridge University with an M.A. in Economics. At twenty-one she became President of the famed debating society, the Cambridge Union. Her first book, *The Female Woman*, a critique of extremism in the feminist movement, was published in 1974 by Random House and translated into eleven languages. In 1978 she published *After Reason*, a book on political leadership and the intersection of politics and culture. Her biography of Maria Callas: *The Woman Behind the Legend*, published in 1981 quickly became an international bestseller. Her fourth book, *The Gods of Greece*, celebrated the power of myths as guides to forgotten dimensions of life and ourselves, and was recently republished by Atlantic Monthly Press, with paintings by Françoise Gilot. Check out Arianna's new photo gallery Her biography of Pablo Picasso, *Picasso: Creator and Destroyer*, published in 1988, was a major international bestseller, translated into sixteen languages. The book was recently reissued by Avon Books to coincide with the release of "Surviving Picasso", a film based on the book, produced by Merchant-Ivory for Warner Bros. and starring Anthony Hopkins. In 1994, she published *The Fourth Instinct* on the longing for meaning in a secular world. Her latest book, *Greetings from the Lincoln Bedroom*, a book of political satire, has just been released by Crown. Her talk show, *Critical Mass*, on National Empowerment Television, aired until December 1994. During Campaign '96, Arianna teamed up with Al Franken to provide political coverage for Comedy Central during the Republican and Democratic conventions, as well as on election night. She and Franken also appeared, in bed, in a point-counterpoint segment for *Politically Incorrect* called *Strange Bedfellows*. She wants the American people to know--listen to her--that she did nothing improper with "that man," Mr. Franken. And anyway, even if she did--which is irrelevant because she didn't, but just supposing--it's all right, because Billy Graham has forgiven her, although, strangely, not Al. She is now developing a political satire show with Comedy Central which includes a segment on the media called *Eat the Press*. She has made many guest appearances on other shows, including Larry King, Oprah, Phil Donahue, *Inside Politics*, Charlie Rose, Tom Snyder, *Crossfire*, *Firing Line*, *To The Contrary*, *Good Morning America*, the *Today Show*, *48 Hours*, *Roseanne*, and possibly, should her lawsuit go the distance, *Court TV*. Or alternatively if the plaintiff agrees, that strange Ed Koch version of *People's Court*. It is her lifelong dream to break William Ginsburg Sunday morning talk show record of five appearances in one day. She is currently the Greek national champion (if you don't count George Stephanopoulos--and she'd prefer not to) and is lobbying the close-minded International Olympic Committee to make it an Olympic sport for the Sydney games in 2000. Arianna Huffington lives in Los Angeles and Washington D.C. with her daughters Christina and Isabella. She has seen *Titanic* 728 times and cried at every single show.

--
ARIANNA ONLINE
1158 26th Street, Suite #428
Santa Monica, CA 90403
email: info@ariannaonline.com
Copyright c 1998 Christabella, Inc.
Developed and hosted by BOLD NEW WORLD

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Oct 13 14:50:26 1998
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA04790 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 14:50:23 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (plpm3-2.vgernet.net [207.51.117.2])
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id VAA04229
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 21:09:52 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <3623CB27.113A5AFD@jwdp.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 17:50:31 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win98; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Census Sampling
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Today's Washington Post Op-Ed page contains the best argument in favor
of using sampling in the 2000 Census that I have yet read, by Everett M.
Ehrlich, a member of the U.S. Census Monitoring Board.

The column may be read at:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-10/13/0131-101398-idx.html>

Or go to the Post web site, then to today's print edition, then to
editorials.

Jan Werner

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Tue Oct 13 18:53:45 1998
Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.70])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id SAA24878; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 18:53:40 -0700 (PDT)
From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo26.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id 6VTQa02302;
Tue, 13 Oct 1998 21:52:40 +2000 (EDT)
Message-ID: <a7bb0c52.362403e8@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 21:52:40 EDT

To: adam.safir@arbitron.com, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Return rate effects of live vs. business reply postage.
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

You might try a search at the AAPOR.org web site, and its hypertext link that contains the Public Opinion Quarterly index. There may be an article on this or similar topics published in the last few years in POQ. You might also try a CD ROM search via PsychInfo, which includes articles published in sociological and marketing journals. That might be available in university libraries, among other places.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph. D.
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Tue Oct 13 19:05:37 1998
Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.70])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id TAA29410; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 19:05:36 -0700 (PDT)

From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo26.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id 9LTUa02301;
Tue, 13 Oct 1998 22:04:03 +2000 (EDT)

Message-ID: <6ab71187.36240693@aol.com>

Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 22:04:03 EDT

To: abider@earthlink.net, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu,
CaplanJR@aol.com

Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Re: Likely Voters' Views, a question of methodology.
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

In a message dated 10/13/98 10:12:37 AM, abider@earthlink.net wrote:

<<One hunch was that lying about likelihood varies inversely with actual likelihood. >>

This is possible: your comment got me to think about the issue. There may be a "social desirability " factor working here. Asking someone whether or not they intended to vote may be perceived as the sort of topic that some proportion of less-likely (perhaps uncertain) voters actually answer that they intend to--- just because they believe that this response will be received with approval. After all, "be sure to vote" is stressed on TV, in newspapers

and in schools. This factor also may correlate with some demographic segments, with certain types of ethnic or socioeconomic groups being less likely to vote, and yet stating that they plan to vote.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph. D.

Research Psychologist and Statistician

U. S. Dept. of Justice

miltgold@aol.com

>From abider@earthlink.net Tue Oct 13 22:10:28 1998

Received: from avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.50])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id WAA06395 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 22:10:27 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from alvbysny (sdn-ar-002dcwashP325.dialsprint.net [168.191.22.102])

by avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id WAA19710

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 22:10:25 -0700 (PDT)

Message-ID: <004301bdf732\$d3e57e20\$6616bfa8@alvbysny>

Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>

From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Arianna, Likelies, and the Census

Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 01:23:49 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

We can now put together the three threads of yesterday's AAPORNET:

Thread 1: AAPORniks can now tell Huffington and other Preachy 'Peachies that with greater non-response (Thread 2) polls will have no less and possibly greater election-predicting accuracy and (Thread 1, again) the more happy Mme Arianna and friends will be with the polls' voter attitude findings, just as (Thread 3) they are more'n happy to have a Decennial Census as free as possible of those who do not vote, vote Republican, speak English, nor wash.

Albert D. Biderman

abider@american.edu or

abider@earthlink.net

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Wed Oct 14 05:36:50 1998

Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id FAA15187 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 05:36:49 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from rachel (tr-ppp16.monmouth.com [209.191.24.48]) by

shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id IAA26494 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 08:36:24 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <36249BF8.6A26@monmouth.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 08:41:28 -0400
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Faculty and Fellowship Opportunities - University of
Pennsylvania
References: <8354fdbbc.3623d297@aol.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

> POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP OPPORTUNITY

> "Services System Research in Mental Health and Substance Abuse"

>

> Center for Mental Health Policy and Services Research

> Department of Psychiatry

> University of Pennsylvania

>

> CMHPSR, a program of the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics,

> invites applications for one- and two-year post-doctoral research

> fellowships. The program provides an excellent opportunity for social

> scientists to improve their knowledge of mental health systems and

> gain experience in applying qualitative and quantitative research

> methods to the evaluation of mental health systems. Services system

> research involves the study of the organization, financing, delivery

> and outcomes of care in the context of a changing relationship between

> the private and public sectors. The research focuses on vulnerable

> populations such as persons with serious mental illness and substance

> abuse problems.

>

> Post-Doctoral positions are available in the following areas: *

> Epidemiology of Mental Illness * Managed Behavioral Care *

> Evaluation of Innovative Programs * Services for Geriatric

> Populations * Vocational Rehabilitation * Cost Effectiveness

> and Pharmaco-economic Studies.

>

> The Center seeks applications from persons with a Ph.D., M.D., or

> equivalent doctoral degree and a strong commitment to a career in

> mental health services research. Past applicants have come from both

> qualitative and quantitative backgrounds in disciplines such as

> anthropology, demography, social welfare policy, health

> administration, clinical and community psychology, etc. Applications

> are accepted throughout the year. Both recent graduates as well as

> those seeking to enhance their skills in new areas are welcome to

> apply. Stipends vary with experience.

>

> For further information, view our web site at

> <http://www.med.upenn.edu/cmhpsr/>, or contact:

>

> Dr. Aileen Rothbard

> Center for Mental Health Policy and Services Research

> University of Pennsylvania
> 3600 Market Street, Room 713
> Philadelphia, PA 19104-2648
> e-mail: abr@cmhpsr.upenn.edu
> (215) 349-8707
> fax (215) 349-8715

>
>
> _____
>

> UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY:

> The Center for Mental Health Policy and Services Research is
> recruiting a (several) faculty position (s) at the Research
> Assistant/Associate Professor level. The Center, which is the mental
> health program of the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics,
> does research in the organization, financing, delivery and outcomes of
> care for vulnerable populations such as persons with serious mental
> illness and substance abuse problems.

>
> Qualified candidates should have Ph.D. or equivalent degree in
> psychology, sociology, social work, or a related social science field.
> Publications background required. Experience writing grants
> preferred. Send curriculum vitae and cover letter to: Trevor R.
> Hadley, Ph.D., c/o Ava Plotnick, Department of Psychiatry, 305
> Blockley Hall, 418 Guardian Drive, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6021. An
> Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action Employer
> From leos@christa.unh.edu Wed Oct 14 08:39:56 1998

Received: from christa.unh.edu (leos@christa.unh.edu [132.177.137.10])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA15999 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 08:39:54 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (leos@localhost)
by christa.unh.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA09844
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 11:39:51 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 11:39:50 -0400 (EDT)
From: Leo G Simonetta <leos@christa.unh.edu>
Reply-To: Leo G Simonetta <leos@christa.unh.edu>
To: Mailing list <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Killing the Messenger (was Huffington)
Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.96L.981014105122.27155A-100000@christa.unh.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

It seems to me that by concentrating on Ms Huffington's politics and history we are doing what we so deplore in others. Though perhaps with more cause.

I believe that by not providing the information that she asked for to anyone who asks for it we are feeding into the perception of Political Pollsters as a group that has a political agenda and is hiding information about the methodology that it uses to protect themselves. I have been involved a number of discussion on Usenet (including in statistics groups) and when guest lecturing

to undergraduate classes that have shown me that this is not exclusively a fringe perception.

--

Leo G. Simonetta leos@christa.unh.edu
UNH Survey Center

>From dhenwood@panix.com Wed Oct 14 08:55:21 1998
Received: from mail1.panix.com (mail1.panix.com [166.84.0.212])
 by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
 id IAA24148 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 08:55:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [166.84.250.86] (dhenwood.dialup.access.net [166.84.250.86])
 by mail1.panix.com (8.8.8/8.8.8/PanixM1.3) with ESMTP id LAA07369
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 11:54:59 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dhenwood@popserver.panix.com
Message-Id: <10313030db24a7794cdfb@[166.84.250.86]>
In-Reply-To: <01BDF6C5.31BB7180@mark-bri>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 11:54:56 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>
Subject: Re: Columnists, Disclosure, and Kudos

Ok, you're right to denounce ignorant poll-bashers. But the public opinion industry really does deserve some serious criticism. To boil it down into a few points:

- 1) Polls constantly force respondents to reduce complex and contradictory feelings and opinions into categories that just don't fit. When I'm polled, I'm often asked are you a liberal, conservative, or a moderate? Well, none of the above, actually. Polls define the acceptable range of opinion, and if you fall outside of it, tough luck. You don't exist.
- 2) Polling makes politicians hyper-cautious. Social life can be wildly unpredictable; a political figure can change things by pushing an initially unpopular position that wins adherents. Under the influence of polling, though, most politicians are terrified of doing anything unfamiliar. As with 1), the opinion-measurement machinery reinforces the status quo.
- 3) Pierre Bourdieu makes an interesting point about the anti-democratic aspects of polling in his book *On Television*. If I may quote my own review of the book, "Why TV Sucks"
<http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/Why_TV_sucks.html>: "Polls and simulated referenda fit nicely into TV-land. They provide an endless stream of novel events to report, usually in complete isolation from each other. But polls are more than instruments 'of rationalistic demagoguery' that bound political discourse, by defining what are the reasonable range of opinions to hold. Their major function, argues Bourdieu, is to set up direct relations between the political elite and the voters, undermining institutions like unions and parties. Unions and parties offer solidarity, analysis, and institutional power - all those things that could offer a counterweight to

the elite and their opinion managers. Polls create the illusion of democracy, while undermining the institutions that could make real democracy possible."

Doug

--

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

>From C.A.O'Muirheartaigh@lse.ac.uk Wed Oct 14 09:36:52 1998
Received: from exchf2.lse.ac.uk (exchf2.lse.ac.uk [158.143.100.7])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA11413 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 09:36:47 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by exchf2.lse.ac.uk with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
id <4XY4A3BJ>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 17:36:43 +0100
Message-ID: <6B8DE02DDCFED111A6A00000F80319162B5D28@exchf2.lse.ac.uk>
From: "O'Muirheartaigh,CA" <C.A.O'Muirheartaigh@lse.ac.uk>
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: "Peter Miller" <p-miller@nwu.edu>,
"aapornet@usc.edu"
Subject: RE: Huffington column
Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 17:36:38 +0100
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="windows-1252"

The concentration on the personality and political views of Huffington simply obscures the critical issue for AAPOR here. The polling industry (if accurately represented) has failed to answer reasonable questions about its methods and procedures. Failure to do this to any interested party would be improper. Failure to do so to an (apparently) influential (and antagonistic) commentator is also foolish.

It is not a sufficient argument to state that most people will not appreciate the difference between nonresponse rate and nonresponse bias. This point can be made AFTER response rates have been disclosed, but cannot be put forward as a justification for non-disclosure. This kind of obfuscation is usually associated with attempts by closed professional groups to protect themselves from external audit and criticism. AAPOR should not allow itself to behave in this way.

Colm O'Muirheartaigh

>From mwolford@hers.com Wed Oct 14 10:26:08 1998
Received: from mail.his.com (root@mail.his.com [205.177.25.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA29989 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 10:26:07 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from macawii (pm10-163.his.com [206.161.108.163])
by mail.his.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id NAA20737
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 13:26:00 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <3624DE77.2222@hers.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 13:25:11 -0400
From: Monica Wolford <mwolford@hers.com>
Reply-To: mwolford@hers.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-KIT (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Columnists, Disclosure, and Kudos
References: <10313030db24a7794cdfb@[166.84.250.86]>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Doug Henwood wrote:

>

> 2) Polling makes politicians hyper-cautious. Social life can be wildly
> unpredictable; a political figure can change things by pushing an initially
> unpopular position that wins adherents. Under the influence of polling,
> though, most politicians are terrified of doing anything unfamiliar. As
> with 1), the opinion-measurement machinery reinforces the status quo.

>

>

I have often heard this point made, most recently by commentators of The NewsHour With Jim Lehrer (10/13/98). However, I have yet to see data that supports this assertion. Interviews with Congressional Reps. that we (PIPA) conducted generally include the claim that they don't listen to the polls. One member of Congress said "I don't read polls. I don't take polls in my district... I think people lie in polls..I don't think that folks want to be as revealing of their true feelings as pollsters tend to believe that they are..." In a recent Pew study only 25% of member of Congress (n=81) responded that polls were a principal source of information. Of course, there may well be a social desirability factor operating, politicians may not want to look like they pay attention to polls.

While Dick Morris claims to have poll-tested many positions for Clinton, no data have been forthcoming. The one example cited most frequently involves not policy decisions, but the affair with Lewinsky.

Does anyone have data to support or discount the assertion that politicians are driven by polling results? That polling on issues makes politicians cautious?

Monica Wolford

Univ. of Maryland
Program on International Policy Attitudes
1779 Mass. Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036

>From p-miller@nwu.edu Wed Oct 14 10:37:20 1998

Received: from casbah.acns.nwu.edu (casbah.acns.nwu.edu [129.105.16.52])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA05176 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 10:37:19 -0700
(PDT)

Received: (from mailnull@localhost)
by casbah.acns.nwu.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) id MAA11256
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 12:36:36 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from pmiller.medill.nwu.edu(129.105.249.129) by
casbah.acns.nwu.edu via smap (V2.0)
id xma011144; Wed, 14 Oct 98 12:36:27 -0500

Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19981014124517.006c5a40@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>

X-Sender: pvm@casbah.acns.nwu.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)

Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 12:45:17 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Peter Miller <p-miller@nwu.edu>

Subject: Disclosure Systems

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

>A number of people in the exchange on the Huffington column now have
>converged on the point that it is simply inexcusable to refuse to provide
>response rate information when it is requested, no matter who requests it.

>

>But there is an important operational issue that also needs to be
>addressed. It is probable that standard coding and archiving of case
>dispositions is not a routine operation in many survey organizations, nor
>is standard calculation of response rates before call records are
>discarded. (Note that the Roper Center archives a number of items of
>information about the polls and surveys in its collection, but not response
>rates).

>

>When requests such as Huffington's come in, therefore, the information may
>truly be "unavailable," or very difficult to come by. Busy people have to
>be detailed to find call records and to perform ad hoc calculations that
>should be done as a matter of routine -- IF the case disposition records
>are still intact. In such circumstances, one can see why requests for
>information are not answered immediately, or are not answered at all.

>

>In other cases, routinized systems for keeping track of calls do exist, but
>they are set up to do specialized internal productivity measurement rather
>than to account for case dispositions in a standard way that serves the
>interests of poll data users.

>

>The recently published AAPOR guidelines for response rate reporting are
>intended to establish standard response rate disclosure and to facilitate
>the design of systems that make it possible. Those organizations whose
>case disposition systems do not already conform to the AAPOR guidelines

>should use this opportunity to set them up appropriately now.
>
>Survey organizations whose findings enter the public domain should never
>refuse to provide response rate information. And, they should not find
>themselves in the position of having to say that the information is
>"unavailable" or that it does not conform to accepted reporting guidelines.

>Peter V. Miller
>Department of Communication Studies
>Northwestern University
>1881 Sheridan Road, Room 12
>Evanston, IL 60208
>
>847-491-5835
>847-467-1171 (FAX)
>p-miller@nwu.edu

> -----End of Unsent Message

>
>
Peter V. Miller
Department of Communication Studies
Northwestern University
1881 Sheridan Road, Room 12
Evanston, IL 60208

847-491-5835
847-467-1171 (FAX)
p-miller@nwu.edu

>From Mark@bisconti.com Wed Oct 14 12:28:16 1998
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA18210 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 12:28:14 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by
medusa.nei.org
(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000248361@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;
Wed, 14 Oct 1998 15:26:42 -0400
Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange
Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)
id QY43S3W2; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 15:30:05 -0400
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
id <01BDF786.1D5303E0@mark-bri>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 15:20:02 -0400
Message-Id: <01BDF786.1D5303E0@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Columnists, Disclosure, and Kudos
Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 15:20:01 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Maybe we need to develop a publication entitled "10 Ways to Undermine an =

Opinion Poll That Finds Something You Disagree With," since that is usually why polls are attacked in the first place.

Poll-bashers come in all shapes, sizes, races, and political ideologies... Whenever findings threaten ones status, power, or agenda, and you don't have your own poll numbers to work with, just attack their poll! I think most attack the sponsor first, because they may have a "bias" in bringing up information in the first place. So that's an easy start. Next, attack the question wording or the question order. (Everyone enjoys arguing about question wording.) The more scientifically oriented work to undermine the sampling method--if that (appears to be) flawed, they've reduced the pollster from "scientist" to "reporter" (where a few qualitative interviews --he said, she said, properly attributed but without attention to weights of opinion--are enough to satisfy the "accuracy, accuracy, accuracy" creed). At that point, one can have a one-on-one argument!

Pollsters, like nuclear engineers or other professions that require technical expertise, have to be concerned about their method and other issues frequently addressed through their professional associations, and they need to be open about response rate, etc., and speak in easy to understand terms with people who have a mind block in math and statistics but who are really interested. But they have to be clear about who they are addressing, and the question the audience is asking, and not ramble on about nonresponse rate versus nonresponse bias to people who want to know if the results are a valid measure of opinion, or not, and why or why not. In fact, if you want to make the public feel that you are hiding something, a good approach is to use terms and ideas they don't understand. Some people need more info than others, and Mme Huffington may be one of them (I don't know if she cares or not, or if she just wants to set a techno trap. Sometimes all it takes is to create uncertainty with the audience).

Certainly the public opinion "industry" should be self-critical, and I think the people who form that group are. The discussion about what quantitative methodology does and does not offer has been going on for a long time... Pull C. Wright Mills critique in "The Sociological Imagination" off the shelf... where he (probably misunderstanding what they were trying to do) attacked people like Stouffer for becoming too technically oriented and for decontextualizing information, missing some of the big picture. And listen to ongoing arguments between quantitative and qualitative gurus about who does what and who misses what. But different approaches have important, but sometimes different, roles to play in contributing to our individual and social constructions. I don't think public opinion polling, per say, is anti-democratic--just the opposite. Perhaps it is used anti-democratically. And maybe it emphasizes majoritarian democracy (by giving more credibility to those with majority positions, as does our political system). But it can help prioritize, show where there is agreement, and even count those who don't get counted at the voting booth (where a self-selected sample is a valid measure!?!). I agree that polling may reduce complex and contradictory issues to simplistic categories, but, one can always work on that... few claim that one or two questions can reveal a whole story. I do think polling tends to establish or reinforce the boundaries of

political action, although a clever person can use polls to understand = her public and become more persuasive in articulating an unpopular or = marginal position. And, by combining polling with public involvement, = civic minded journalism... it has an important role to play. =20

Along with Bourdieu, I think Baudrillard describes polling in a mass = media environment as an atomic simulation chamber of in-put, out-puts... = nothing left to chance, all is question/response, the 0 and the 1. All = I know is that everything seems to be political/power struggles from the = location I've been observing. Our political elites didn't need polling = to create the illusion of democracy, they already had a well-oiled = Federal Constitutional Republican system set up to filter out the great = unwashed. Polling can demonstrate the real contradictions between how = Congress legislates and how the people they represent feel. Politicians = are obsessive about counting heads because that's where their legitimacy = (as re-presentatives) comes from. They can't ignore polls, but they = certainly like to filter out the non-voters. And even then the national = polls might not reflect the election outcome and the makeup of the next = Congress, as The Washington Times pointed out, because of gerrymandering = (A Republican consolation now).

What does that mean for pollsters? If we adhere to the standards of the = practice, know we will be attacked and prepare for it, avoid = in-fighting, continue to learn and improve on what we know, question our = categories, don't overstate what our technique does or can do, provide = more info than is required as a matter of routine (and if data is made = public and especially if it is political... put all the data in a well = lit public place, like a website!), and, when asked a question = (especially by a reporter who holds the power of the press in their = hand), see the audience who is reading/watching, try to hear what is = really being asked, answer it, and follow-up with "Does that answer your = question?" And, now and then, we should probably do a little unmasking = by asking "why do the findings of this poll bother you?," and "what = questions would you have preferred to ask?"

As a group, we need people like Jim Norman who speak clearly and = non-defensively (speakers bureau?) to answer questions and to take = advantage of times when there is a big public interest in our work.

Sorry for being long-winded. I need an editor!

Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com

>From Mark@bisconti.com Wed Oct 14 13:01:54 1998
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA05343 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 13:01:51 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by
medusa.nei.org
(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000248421@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;

Wed, 14 Oct 1998 16:00:17 -0400

Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)

id QY43S3X7; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 16:02:35 -0400

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

id <01BDF78A.A8052960@mark-bri>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 15:52:33 -0400

Message-Id: <01BDF78A.A8052960@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Columnists, Disclosure, and Kudos

Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 15:52:32 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Savvy politicians use the polls to develop strategy but avoid talking = about them because they want to convey the impression of being a leader, = not a follower. If they wave a poll around on the floor, it is because = it makes their case.

Bonner and Associates and Gallup did a study to drum up business among = business interests in '93. It showed that members of Congress pay a = great deal of attention to (70% or more): personally written letters = from their constituents, meetings with heads of groups with an interest = in the issue, CEO visits affected by the issue with a job presence, = personally written letters from heads of groups in their district, = letters from company officials with a job presence in their district, = and phone calls from their constituents. Polling data was not on the = list ...

I think Federal Washington is mostly driven by elite stakeholder = bargaining, not democracy or the polls. But the polls do seem to = establish a sort of boundary of political action.

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Wed Oct 14 17:08:44 1998

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.10])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id RAA09982 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 17:08:40 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (garnet3.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.4])

by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id UAA23014

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 20:08:40 -0400

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial132.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.32.132])

by garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id UAA74416

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 20:08:37 -0400

Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 20:08:37 -0400

Message-Id: <199810150008.UAA74416@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>

X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: RE:A background to columnists

Can we stand one more? I began to get very curious because I have been studying "financed and agenda-driven scholarship" for the last several months and the Huffington material was starting to sound suspiciously familiar. I visited Arianna Online to discover that deep-sixing our profession to render the 1999 AAPOR Meetings unnecessary is the least of this. We are Arianna Huffington's latest crusade and I have copied this for AAPOR-neters below. If you don't want to see hatred of democracy, press your delete key.

Arianna Huffington is Chair of the Center for Effective Compassion, a nonprofit center. It is affiliated with the multi-million dollar Progress and Freedom Foundation also in DC. The CEC seeks privatization of solutions to welfare and social problems, i.e., a charity approach. It is anti-"big government" and for rugged self-sufficiency. Ms Huffington appears to take a highly adversarial approach and I am not sure what ANYONE could have said to mollify her on survey research.

AAPOR internally "polices itself" more than any other professional organization I can think of. And, yes, of course we should be (and are) open to outside criticism. But in my experience Huffington's kind of discourse is agenda-driven; it stakes out a position in advance and selectively gathers evidence to "prove it", akin to a speech debate, a legal case, or advocacy journalism. It is about as far from the term "proof" as used in science as one can get. In my opinion, there is no way to "win" such a debate on scientific grounds because an advocacy scholar will select the 10 percent of material that supports their position and discard the 90 percent that falsifies it.

After checking the validity of an "agenda scholar's" claims, one (or an organization) must then decide how much time and energy to expend debating them.

Amen. The Arianna Online Column is below. Deep-six it if you like.

Susan

Arianna Online>What's New |
<Picture: Crusades>

Arianna Online will undertake a series of grass roots "crusades". The first campaign Arianna Online will be launching is the Partnership for a Poll-Free America -- a campaign she is developing with satirist and host of Public Radio's "Le Show," Harry Shearer.

HEY YOU!...Yes, you.

Would you be interested in answering a few questions? No it's not a poll.

It's just the opposite--the end of polls. Click here to sign the No Poll

Pledge

Why?

Polls are polluting our political environment, and there is an urgent need to clean it up.

It is not pollsters themselves who are toxic. It's not even the way polls unduly influence election outcomes. Or the fact that they dominate the press coverage. No, the greatest threat to the body politic is that polls turn political leaders into slavish followers of the most shallow reading of the electorate's whims and wishes.

John F. Kennedy's administration was the first to be infected with the polling disease. "We were not unlike the people who checked their horoscope each day before venturing out," wrote Evelyn Lincoln, Kennedy's longtime secretary.

The 1976 election was the first time a presidential campaign was dominated by one pollster: Pat Caddell. "Jimmy Carter is going to be president because of Pat Caddell," said Hamilton Jordan, Carter's chief of staff. Caddell was also responsible for the greatest miscalculation of the Carter presidency -- his malaise speech of July 1979 -- but the world blamed Carter.

Bob Teeter was the first pollster to be named manager of a presidential campaign. The vacuity of the Bush campaign in 1992 owes a lot to Teeter's determination to poll every question before making a decision.

Likewise, the Dole campaign has no overarching vision but has instead "three top priorities" set and fine-tuned by extensive polling and focus-group testing: taxes, blaming Clinton for teen drug use and -- the most recent poll-driven addition -- attacking Clinton as a tax-and-spend liberal.

Clinton, with his scores of little plans, is pathologically addicted to polls and, unencumbered by principle, has no problem bending to their every dictate.

So the political landscape today is littered with politicians who never stop looking over their shoulders at the latest polls and whose motto seems to be "I'm their leader, I shall follow them."

But what we need are political leaders with the wisdom to see what does not show up in the polling data and the passion to work to create the consensus for it.

In the 1950s, Jacques Soustelle, a close aide to President DeGaulle, returned from Algiers, where he had taken an informal poll, and told the president that all his friends were bitterly opposed to his policies. "Changez vos amis (change your friends)," DeGaulle replied.

In that spirit and for the good of the American republic, we need to make answering pollsters' questions declassé. Since we cannot expect today's politicians to ever kick the habit on their own, we must focus on stopping the polls at their source. We the people are the source, and if enough of us stop talking to pollsters, we could force our leaders to think for themselves.

This task may be easier than it sounds because polls are already notoriously

unreliable. Has anybody asked pollsters to explain how Dole moved in six weeks from 17 points behind to 2 a week later and then to 22 at the beginning of this month? These are swings of 20 million to 30 million voters!

Anti-Polling Columns

Hang It Up

Hard Facts And Bogus Poll Results

The Most Admired Man in America: Par for the Course

Oracles And Demographers

A Modest Proposal

And who exactly is talking to pollsters? Busy, productive people don't have time to answer silly questions for no money. It takes 7,000 calls to get a 1,000-person sample. How do pollsters allow for the fact that it may be only lonely people with too much time on their hands talking to them?

For those not ready to quit cold turkey, an intermediary stage could be making up answers. Of course, Americans have been doing that for years already.

Norman Podhoretz noted in 1981, for example, that Jews in New York could not bring themselves to admit to pollsters that they were for Ronald Reagan, and so they said they planned to vote for Carter, who failed to win a majority of Jewish votes.

Supporters of extreme candidates also lie. Who wants to admit they'll vote for David Duke? He in fact always draws more votes than his polling indicates.

And blacks are often loath to admit that they will not vote for a black candidate. When Doug Wilder was running for governor in Virginia in 1989, polls showed him with much higher support in the black community than his razor-thin victory implied.

Polling, you may say, is only a symptom of a deeper political crisis. Fair enough, but at least unlike the crisis of leadership, it is something that millions of us can do something about. Starting now. Starting tonight.

What if all 270 million of us collectively decided to hang up the next time some stranger from a polling company interrupted our dinner with moronic questions like: "Do you describe yourself as very liberal/somewhat liberal/moderate/somewhat conservative/very conservative?"

ARIANNA ONLINE

1158 26th Street, Suite #428

Santa Monica, CA 90403

email: info@ariannaonline.com

Copyright 1998 Christabella, Inc.

Developed and hosted by BOLD NEW WORLD

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh
Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208

>From mdbenson@compuserve.com Wed Oct 14 19:18:07 1998
Received: from hil-img-6.compuserve.com (hil-img-6.compuserve.com
[149.174.177.136])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id TAA16712 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 19:18:06 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from mailgate@localhost)
by hil-img-6.compuserve.com (8.8.6/8.8.6/2.14) id WAA17712
for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 22:17:35 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 22:17:17 -0400
From: Mark Benson <mdbenson@compuserve.com>
Subject: AAPOR Double Standards?
Sender: Mark Benson <mdbenson@compuserve.com>
To: "INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-ID: <199810142217_MC2-5CB7-A591@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline

I can't help but remember how AAPOR "sanctioned" the Frank Luntz organization after he refused to disclose methodological information after an AAPOR request. Among his reasons were his belief that AAPOR, an organization he believed to be dominated by people who are hostile to his party, wouldn't treat the information fairly.

I'm now anxious to see AAPOR denounce Mr. Alderman at ABC, and his colleagues at the NY Times and Hart who have similarly refused to answer

methodological questions.

Go ahead....let's prove Luntz wrong. Let's prove that AAPOR isn't just another practitioner of the ole' double standard. Let's honestly address the issues raised by Ms. Huffington and send a clear signal that we'll do our best to shine a spotlight on organizations who diminish the credibility of the research profession. =

=

>From mdbenson@compuserve.com Wed Oct 14 19:25:34 1998
Received: from hil-img-6.compuserve.com (hil-img-6.compuserve.com [149.174.177.136])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id TAA18626 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 19:25:32 -0700 (PDT)
Received: (from mailgate@localhost)
by hil-img-6.compuserve.com (8.8.6/8.8.6/2.14) id WAA19480
for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 14 Oct 1998 22:25:01 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Wed, 14 Oct 1998 22:24:37 -0400
From: Mark Benson <mdbenson@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: Huffington column
Sender: Mark Benson <mdbenson@compuserve.com>
To: "INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-ID: <199810142224_MC2-5CB7-A5F4@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline

Mr. Zucker seems more interested in an hominen attack on Ms. Huffington than in answering questions that, if we take our "best practices" document seriously, ought to be answered. If Ms. Huffington prompts more disclosure on methodological issues, she deserves our thanks -- not sneering by Mr. Zucker and his ilk.

>From hjsmith@unm.edu Thu Oct 15 07:19:09 1998
Received: from pyxis.unm.edu (pyxis.unm.edu [129.24.8.14])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id HAA13724 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 07:18:54 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from unm.edu(ppp-263.unm.edu[129.24.11.7]) (1804 bytes) by pyxis.unm.edu
via sendmail with P:esmtip/R:bind_hosts/T:inet_zone_bind_smtp
(sender: <hjsmith@unm.edu>)
id <m0zToER-0000HPC@pyxis.unm.edu>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 08:18:23 -0600 (MDT)
(Smail-3.2.0.101 1997-Dec-17 #2 built 1998-Sep-15)
Message-ID: <3625B022.8A965566@unm.edu>
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 08:19:48 +0000

From: "Hank C. Jenkins-Smith" <hjsmith@unm.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.05 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Ideology and attitudes toward surveys
References: <199810150008.UAA74416@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Given the drubbing survey reasearch is getting these days, I was wondering if anyone has looked carefully at the relationship between political ideology (or party ID) and attitudes toward polls. Is the current hostile view of polling is associated with a conservative attitude, as the Huffington screed might indicate? If so, what are the implications for survey non-response bias?

We routinely measure "reluctance" to participate in our surveys (using several different indicators), and those who are most reluctant (as coded by the interviewers) are also the most conservative ($p < 0.001$, using a self-rated political ideology scale). If conservatives are more likely to drop out, of course, non-response bias results.

What I'm particularly worried about is a politicization of polling, that may amplify the relationship between ideology and reluctance (and hence non-response). It is also possible that attacks on polls are purely opportunistic, and that the current mess in Washington simply makes it more attractive for conservatives than liberals to attack the polls. Any thoughts on the problem?

Hank C. Jenkins-Smith
Director
UNM Institute for Public Policy
hjsmith@unm.edu

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Thu Oct 15 07:59:13 1998
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.EDU [128.218.6.65])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA25383 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 07:59:11 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by psg.ucsf.EDU with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
id <4R3G5GCK>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 08:05:24 -0700
Message-ID: <1E164712D2DBD111832A00A0C921A21353D531@psg.ucsf.EDU>
From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: A background to columnists
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 08:05:21 -0700

X-Priority: 3
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Regardless of Ms. Huffington's agenda, the core issues here are disclosure and education. The rules for disclosure, whether to a request from AAPOR or a member of AAPOR or anyone else, must be uniformly applied and recognized. Such a request cannot be ignored just because we don't like, or suspect the motives of, the person/organization making the request. Besides, if you wish to claim that Huffington or anyone else is "twisting" or "misconstruing" the facts, you cannot do this unless and until you have made full disclosure of said facts.

I might also point out that the only issues we can engage Huffington on are methodological ones, the same ones we wish to educate the public about. We constantly need to demonstrate the scientific underpinnings of survey research - the value of random sampling, re-contacts, procedures for refusal conversion, and why it is important to record everyone's opinion, not just the extremists' views. By the way, when you get to non-response bias you better produce hard numbers, not just assumptions.

However, much of Huffington's blather seems to be about how polls are used or abused by politicians. This is hardly the province of AAPOR except in the area of misrepresenting findings. The idea that some pols are too dependent on polls while others use them too little is not something we can deal with. Perhaps we can do a better job of educating not just the public and the press, but also the politicians, on what it takes to run a survey and get good solid numbers on an issue - random sampling, defining the sample frame (where) and the population to be sampled from (who: likely voters, all adults, etc.), sample size required, options for data gathering, the importance of wording questions, the value of focus groups vs. large scale surveys, the costs involved, etc.

Our methods must hold up to scientific scrutiny. If they do not, then we have been fooling ourselves. As for unscientific scrutiny, we must defend our methods (if they are sound) and point out the errors and misinterpretations of those who attack those methods. However, failure to disclose these methods will be our undoing.

Lance M. Pollack

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

From: Susan Losh [SMTP:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 1998 5:09 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE:A background to columnists

Can we stand one more? I began to get very curious because I have been studying "financed and agenda-driven scholarship" for the last several

months and the Huffington material was starting to sound suspiciously familiar. I visited Arianna Online to discover that deep-sixing our profession to render the 1999 AAPOR Meetings unnecessary is the least of this. We are Arianna Huffington's latest crusade and I have copied this for AAPOR-neters below. If you don't want to see hatred of democracy, press your delete key.

Ariana Huffington is Chair of the Center for Effective Compassion, a nonprofit center. It is affiliated with the multi-million dollar Progress and Freedom Foundation also in DC. The CEC seeks privatization of solutions to welfare and social problems, i.e., a charity approach. It is anti-"big government" and for rugged self-sufficiency. Ms Huffington appears to take a highly adversarial approach and I am not sure what ANYONE could have said to mollify her on survey research.

AAPOR internally "polices itself" more than any other professional organization I can think of. And, yes, of course we should be (and are) open to outside criticism. But in my experience Huffington's kind of discourse is agenda-driven; it stakes out a position in advance and selectively gathers evidence to "prove it", akin to a speech debate, a legal case, or advocacy journalism. It is about as far from the term "proof" as used in science as one can get. In my opinion, there is no way to "win" such a debate on scientific grounds because an advocacy scholar will select the 10 percent of material that supports their position and discard the 90 percent that falsifies it.

After checking the validity of an "agenda scholar's" claims, one (or an organization) must then decide how much time and energy to expend debating them.

Amen. The Arianna Online Column is below. Deep-six it if you like.

Susan

Arianna Online>What's New |
<Picture: Crusades>

Arianna Online will undertake a series of grass roots "crusades". The first campaign Arianna Online will be launching is the Partnership for a Poll-Free America -- a campaign she is developing with satirist and host of Public Radio's "Le Show," Harry Shearer.

HEY YOU!...Yes, you.
Would you be interested in answering a few questions? No it's not a poll.
It's just the opposite--the end of polls. Click here to sign the No Poll Pledge

Why?

Polls are polluting our political environment, and there is an urgent need to clean it up.

It is not pollsters themselves who are toxic. It's not even the way polls unduly influence election outcomes. Or the fact that they dominate the press coverage. No, the greatest threat to the body politic is that polls turn political leaders into slavish followers of the most shallow reading of the electorate's whims and wishes.

John F. Kennedy's administration was the first to be infected with the polling disease. "We were not unlike the people who checked their horoscope each day before venturing out," wrote Evelyn Lincoln, Kennedy's longtime secretary.

The 1976 election was the first time a presidential campaign was dominated by one pollster: Pat Caddell. "Jimmy Carter is going to be president because of Pat Caddell," said Hamilton Jordan, Carter's chief of staff. Caddell was also responsible for the greatest miscalculation of the Carter presidency -- his malaise speech of July 1979 -- but the world blamed Carter.

Bob Teeter was the first pollster to be named manager of a

presidential
campaign. The vacuity of the Bush campaign in 1992 owes a lot to
Teeter's
determination to poll every question before making a decision.

Likewise, the Dole campaign has no overarching vision but has
instead "three
top priorities" set and fine-tuned by extensive polling and
focus-group
testing: taxes, blaming Clinton for teen drug use and -- the
most recent
poll-driven addition -- attacking Clinton as a tax-and-spend
liberal.

Clinton, with his scores of little plans, is pathologically
addicted to
polls and, unencumbered by principle, has no problem bending to
their every
dictate.

So the political landscape today is littered with politicians
who never stop
looking over their shoulders at the latest polls and whose motto
seems to be
"I'm their leader, I shall follow them."

But what we need are political leaders with the wisdom to see
what does not
show up in the polling data and the passion to work to create
the consensus
for it.

In the 1950s, Jacques Soustelle, a close aide to President
DeGaulle,
returned from Algiers, where he had taken an informal poll, and
told the
president that all his friends were bitterly opposed to his
policies.
"Changez vos amis (change your friends)," DeGaulle replied.

In that spirit and for the good of the American republic, we
need to make
answering pollsters' questions declassé. Since we cannot expect
today's
politicians to ever kick the habit on their own, we must focus
on stopping
the polls at their source. We the people are the source, and if
enough of us
stop talking to pollsters, we could force our leaders to think
for themselves.

This task may be easier than it sounds because polls are already
notoriously
unreliable. Has anybody asked pollsters to explain how Dole

moved in six weeks from 17 points behind to 2 a week later and then to 22 at the beginning of this month? These are swings of 20 million to 30 million voters!

Anti-Polling Columns

Hang It Up

Hard Facts And Bogus Poll Results

The Most Admired Man in America: Par for the Course

Oracles And Demographers

A Modest Proposal

And who exactly is talking to pollsters? Busy, productive people don't have time to answer silly questions for no money. It takes 7,000 calls to get a 1,000-person sample. How do pollsters allow for the fact that it may be only lonely people with too much time on their hands talking to them?

For those not ready to quit cold turkey, an intermediary stage could be making up answers. Of course, Americans have been doing that for years already.

Norman Podhoretz noted in 1981, for example, that Jews in New York could not bring themselves to admit to pollsters that they were for Ronald Reagan, and so they said they planned to vote for Carter, who failed to win a majority of Jewish votes.

Supporters of extreme candidates also lie. Who wants to admit they'll vote for David Duke? He in fact always draws more votes than his polling indicates.

And blacks are often loath to admit that they will not vote for a black candidate. When Doug Wilder was running for governor in Virginia in 1989, polls showed him with much higher support in the black community than his razor-thin victory implied.

Polling, you may say, is only a symptom of a deeper political

crisis. Fair
enough, but at least unlike the crisis of leadership, it is
something that
millions of us can do something about. Starting now. Starting
tonight.

What if all 270 million of us collectively decided to hang up
the next time
some stranger from a polling company interrupted our dinner with
moronic
questions like: "Do you describe yourself as very
liberal/somewhat
liberal/moderate/somewhat conservative/very conservative?"

ARIANNA ONLINE
1158 26th Street, Suite #428
Santa Monica, CA 90403
email: info@ariannaonline.com
Copyright 1998 Christabella, Inc.
Developed and hosted by BOLD NEW WORLD

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh
Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208

>From rstuefen@usd.edu Thu Oct 15 08:41:13 1998
Received: from sunflowr.usd.edu (sunflowr.usd.edu [192.55.228.42])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id IAA21089 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 08:40:58 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from brb015 ([206.176.1.6]) by sunflowr.usd.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12)
with SMTP id KAA24631 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 10:39:28
-0500
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981015104059.00973720@sundance.usd.edu>
X-Sender: rstuefen@sundance.usd.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 10:40:59 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Randall M. Stuefen" <rstuefen@usd.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Thank you Mr. Pollack,

Mr. Pollack states it succinctly and accurately:

"Our methods must hold up to scientific scrutiny. If they do not, then we have been fooling ourselves. As for unscientific scrutiny, we must defend our methods (if they are sound) and point out the errors and misinterpretations of those who attack those methods. However, failure to disclose these methods will be our undoing."

Lance M. Pollack

>From rakekay@erols.com Thu Oct 15 09:17:36 1998
Received: from dfw-ix4.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix4.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.4])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA05754 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 09:17:34 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from smap@localhost)
by dfw-ix4.ix.netcom.com (8.8.4/8.8.4)
id LAA09725 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 11:17:00 -0500
(CDT)
Message-Id: <199810151617.LAA09725@dfw-ix4.ix.netcom.com>
Received: from unknown(207.95.37.141) by dfw-ix4.ix.netcom.com via smap
(V1.3)
id rma009573; Thu Oct 15 11:15:30 1998
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.0c (197)
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 12:17:17 -0400
Subject: Web surveys magazine article request
From: "Ward & Kathleen Rakestraw Kay" <rakekay@erols.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-version: 1.0
X-Priority: 3
Content-type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

My wife is the editor of Upgrade magazine, published by the Software Publishers Association. She's looking for someone to write an article on the pros and cons of using Web-based surveys rather than traditional phone- or mail-based surveys. Upgrade's readers are marketing professionals, product development managers and CEOs of software publishing companies, running the gamut from Microsoft on down to small start-up companies looking for venture capital funding. The article should NOT go too deeply into research and statistical issues. The article would be due Dec. 1, about 1,700 words.

I suggested she contact Joel Webster of Chilton Research, who presented a paper on this topic at AAPOR in St. Louis, but the e-mail she

sent to the address I had come back undeliverable.

If you're interested or know someone who might be, please directly contact Kathleen Rakestraw at krakestraw@spa.org.

Thanks,
Ward Kay

>From Mark@bisconti.com Thu Oct 15 09:40:38 1998

Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id JAA16778 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 09:40:25 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by medusa.nei.org

(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000249943@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Thu, 15 Oct 1998 12:38:31 -0400

Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)

id QY43SQBG; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 12:41:50 -0400

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

id <01BDF837.C9E723A0@mark-bri>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 12:31:53 -0400

Message-Id: <01BDF837.C9E723A0@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions

Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 12:31:51 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Public rating of honesty and ethical standards of people in the = following fields:

(The Gallup Organization, Dec. 1996: = www.gallup.com/POLL_ARCHIVES/1997/97010.htm)

"Please tell me how you would rate the honesty and ethical standards of = people in these different fields-very high, high, average, low, or very = low? First..."

% Saying Very high+high / Average / Low+very low

Druggists, pharmacists-64/30/4

Clergy-56/30/9

College teachers-55/33/5

Medical doctors-55/35/9

Dentists-53/38/7

Policemen-49/38/11

Engineers-48/41/3

Funeral directors-35/46/13

Bankers-26/59/12

Public opinion pollsters-24/54/16

Journalists-23/50/23

TV reporters, commentators-23/49/26
Building contractors-23/49/22
Local officeholders-19/57/20
Newspaper reporters-17/48/31
Lawyers-17/39/41
Business executives-17/58/20
Labor union leaders-16/39/38
Senators-15/48/34
Real estate agents-15/56/25
Stockbrokers-15/58/16
Congressmen-14/45/38
State officeholders-13/54/29
Insurance salesmen-11/49/37
Advertising practitioners-11/46/37
Car salesmen-8/29/60

>From bthompso@bsmg.com Thu Oct 15 11:16:24 1998
Received: from bjke.com (firewall-user@ganymede.bjke.com [144.210.8.38])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA29134 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 11:16:20 -0700
(PDT)
From: bthompso@bsmg.com
Received: by bjke.com; id NAA04470; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 13:16:19 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com(144.210.140.12) by gauntlet.bjke.com via
smtp (4.1)
id xma003869; Thu, 15 Oct 98 13:15:49 -0500
Received: by eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
id <4KNQ15R8>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 14:14:03 -0400
Message-ID: <24C3CEDAD424D11191BD00805F0D6C4D016F54F0@eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 14:14:02 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
Content-Type: text/plain

Well, at least we're above car salesmen, congressmen and lawyers.

If we get above clergy, then I'll begin to worry...

Thanks for letting us all know where we stand.

> -----
> From: Mark Richards[SMTP:Mark@bisconti.com]
> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Sent: Thursday, October 15, 1998 12:31 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions
>
> Public rating of honesty and ethical standards of people in the
> following fields:
>

> (The Gallup Organization, Dec. 1996:
> www.gallup.com/POLL_ARCHIVES/1997/97010.htm)
>
> "Please tell me how you would rate the honesty and ethical standards
> of people in these different fields-very high, high, average, low, or
> very low? First..."
>
> % Saying Very high+high / Average / Low+very low
>
> Druggists, pharmacists-64/30/4
> Clergy-56/30/9
> College teachers-55/33/5
> Medical doctors-55/35/9
> Dentists-53/38/7
> Policemen-49/38/11
> Engineers-48/41/3
> Funeral directors-35/46/13
> Bankers-26/59/12
> Public opinion pollsters-24/54/16
> Journalists-23/50/23
> TV reporters, commentators-23/49/26
> Building contractors-23/49/22
> Local officeholders-19/57/20
> Newspaper reporters-17/48/31
> Lawyers-17/39/41
> Business executives-17/58/20
> Labor union leaders-16/39/38
> Senators-15/48/34
> Real estate agents-15/56/25
> Stockbrokers-15/58/16
> Congressmen-14/45/38
> State officeholders-13/54/29
> Insurance salesmen-11/49/37
> Advertising practitioners-11/46/37
> Car salesmen-8/29/60
>
>
>
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Oct 15 11:58:16 1998
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA17295 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 11:58:14 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id LAA25559 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 11:58:14 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 11:58:13 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Focus On One Focus Group
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9810151157440.27870-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

National pollsters might find some comfort in knowing that at least theirs are not the only methodologies taking hits in the country's media. Focus group research is also coming under scrutiny, as seen in the opening three paragraphs of Gail Collins's "Editorial Observer" piece, headlined "Presenting President Clinton's New Best Friend," published just below the main unsigned editorials in last Sunday's New York Times (Week in Review section, page 16, national edition):

Early in this election season, a consultant for New York City Council Speaker Peter Vallone used a focus group to test Mr. Vallone's potential as a gubernatorial candidate. Kevin McCabe, Mr. Vallone's top aide, reported that the focus group initially felt the Speaker was "a nice guy who'd been around too long." But, Mr. McCabe added triumphantly, once shown extensive information on Mr. Vallone's accomplishments, the group saw the error of its ways and announced that he was an excellent public official who just needed more publicity.

Grasping onto reeds like this, and with the faithful Mr. McCabe at his side, Mr. Vallone jumped into the race. But cynics have always had doubts about that focus group -- mainly because it seemed extraordinary that there were that many average citizens in New York who knew enough about Peter Vallone to feel they were tired of him.

Now that he is the Democratic gubernatorial nominee, it appears that virtually the only people in the state familiar with Mr. Vallone were the ones in that group. A month before the November election, 49 percent of the respondents in a New York Times/CBS News Poll said they did not know anything about Mr. Vallone. Twenty-eight percent claimed to know enough to have an opinion but did not know exactly what that opinion was. This is no way

to win an election, and sure enough, Mr. Vallone is trailing the incumbent, George Pataki, by about 28 points. "We got Pataki where we want him," cried Mr. McCabe, who has a well-honed, if occasionally dark, sense of humor.

Copyright 1998 The New York Times Co.

>From ande271@ibm.net Thu Oct 15 13:41:30 1998
Received: from out1.ibm.net (out1.ibm.net [165.87.194.252])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA02120 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 13:41:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (slip-32-100-252-105.ny.us.ibm.net [32.100.252.105])
by out1.ibm.net (8.8.5/8.6.9) with SMTP id UAA105066 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 15 Oct 1998 20:41:24 GMT
Message-ID: <362688A3.2C36@ibm.net>
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 16:43:31 -0700
From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@ibm.net>
Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Response to Huff
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree with Lance Pollack that we need to educate politicians as well as the press. It is not appropriate for the pols to learn about survey research from journalists. Yet political leaders should know more about polling methodology.

Would it be possible to issues a statement to Huff that AAPOR generally favors release of response rate and response bias figures to anyone who asks? Could Hart and others who did not send those figures to her before AAPOR makes its statement? It would seem only professional to issue a correction where personal factors (about her, in this case) have entered into the decision not to abide by standards.

I would think we all understand, however, the reluctance of legitimate survey firms to feed Ms Huffington anything that she can use to attack polls or polling firms. Honest error, in view of her statements.

>From jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU Thu Oct 15 14:23:26 1998
Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA19070 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 14:23:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])

by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA10940
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 16:13:47 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
with Novell_GroupWise; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 16:03:56 -0500
Message-Id: <s6261ceb.018@SRL.UIC.EDU>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 16:13:43 -0500
From: Jennifer Parsons <jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Announcing 1999 Illinois Omnibus Poll

The Survey Research Laboratory, a unit of the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago, is preparing for the 1999 Illinois Poll.

The Illinois Poll is an annual statewide telephone survey that allows researchers the opportunity to obtain information on the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of Illinois residents. Your questions are combined with those of other participants and administered in one survey. The cost is lower than that of a custom-designed survey because many of the expenses of conducting the poll are shared by all participants.

The cost for each question is \$1200 (open-ended questions are slightly more). A variety of demographic indicators will be collected and shared with all participants, and are provided to you along with the data for the question(s) you purchase.

Deadline for question submission is November 25, 1998. The poll will be administered in March-April 1999, with data delivered in May 1999. A total of 600 interviews will be completed.

For more information, please contact Amy DeGrush at 312-413-7250, or amyd@srl.uic.edu. Or visit the SRL web site at www.srl.uic.edu.

>From surveys@wco.com Thu Oct 15 14:51:56 1998
Received: from mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (mailhub2.ncal.verio.com [204.247.247.54])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA28842 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 14:51:53 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from compaq (carina39.wco.com [209.21.28.39])
by mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id OAA05111
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 14:51:49 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <009101bdf885\$e5422ca0\$9a51fea9@compaq>
From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Huffington column
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 14:39:16 -0700
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

I feel I must reply to Mr. Benson's comments on my previous message.

>Mr. Zucker seems more interested in an hominen attack on Ms. Huffington
>than in answering questions that, if we take our "best practices" document
>seriously, ought to be answered.

I am not interested in attacking Ms. Huffington, per se. I had earlier posted a message saying whoever is empowered to speak for AAPOR should promptly issue a public reply and send it to all papers that carry her column. That was my first reaction, and remains my main one. I did not suggest an "attack."

Barry Feinberg felt some readers would be interested in Ms. Huffington's self description. After reading it I felt some readers might be interested in some information she left out of her description - especially given the political context of her attack on polling. I believe in knowing one's enemy, and she has declared herself our enemy in no uncertain terms ("Arianna Online will undertake a series of grass roots "crusades". The first campaign Arianna Online will be launching is the Partnership for a Poll-Free America...", as quoted in Susan Losh's message).

Susan also said:

>AAPOR internally "polices itself" more than any other professional
>organization I can think of. And, yes, of course we should be (and are)
open
>to outside criticism. But in my experience Huffington's kind of discourse
is
>agenda-driven; it stakes out a position in advance and selectively gathers
>evidence to "prove it", akin to a speech debate, a legal case, or advocacy
>journalism. It is about as far from the term "proof" as used in science as
>one can get. In my opinion, there is no way to "win" such a debate on
>scientific grounds because an advocacy scholar will select the 10 percent
of
>material that supports their position and discard the 90 percent that
>falsifies it.

I agree with most of what Ms. Losh says, but hope we may be able to win such a debate by exposing her selectivity.

Finally, Mr. Benson said

>If Ms. Huffington prompts more disclosure
>on methodological issues, she deserves our thanks -- not sneering by Mr.
>Zucker and his ilk.

Those of us who wish to thank Ms. Huffington are welcome to do so. If Mr. Benson wants to interpret my mentioning a few facts Ms. Huffington leaves out of her bio as "sneering," so be it - but I thought of my message as providing information to those of us who might not have been aware of her 1994 CA campaign, not as "sneering."

Ms Huffington has power in the form of media exposure. I understand the AAPOR Council is discussing a reply. I urge Councilmembers to send one out soon.

Hank Zucker

>From Mark@bisconti.com Thu Oct 15 17:18:35 1998
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA22333 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 17:18:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by
medusa.nei.org
(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000251057@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 15 Oct 1998 20:16:02 -0400
Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange
Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)
id QY43SQ7J; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 20:05:19 -0400
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
id <01BDF875.BF3DC380@mark-bri>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 19:55:23 -0400
Message-Id: <01BDF875.BF3DC380@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Need
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 19:55:22 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I doubt politicians, at least at the national level, can be much more =
educated about polling... most who have run competitive campaigns use =
polling and focus groups to help win. It may be that a few staffers =
would be interested in methodological issues, but generally they are so =
overwhelmed with information they will only be interested if it is =
directly relevant to some policy position they are working on. Most =
people, including politicians, are less interested in HOW it works than =
in WHETHER it works. Need and benefits. If you want to educate people, =
give them proof that it works. If they believe it, they'll use it. =
Maybe it is the consultants who talk with the politicians who need a =
one-pager (talking points), in case they are asked.

What drives need? In a competitive environment, it is usually the need =
for intelligence to get an edge over the competition. In public policy, =
it is the need for intelligence to make better quality laws. Why are =

journalists and newspapers asking so many questions about Clinton? =
There must be some need... Mme Huffington apparently disagrees over the =
need.

Although it's probably not the point for AAPOR to make, nobody looks =
blindly at polls when they make decisions. Polls are only one piece of =
information among many. In the case of impeachment... the White House =
is most interested in national polls because the whole country elects =
the President; in the House of Reps, members are thinking about pleasing =
their voter base in their own district; in the Senate, many members will =
probably think more about the disadvantages of allowing Gore to have too =
much TV time before the next Presidential election. Their decisions =
will be influenced by public opinion, one measure of which is the polls, =
but certainly not controlled by it.

Mme Huffington has raised an issue that is important to pollsters. But =
her motive is not one of kindness. Every field has problems to solve as =
they work toward excellence. This issue is discussed seriously at =
nearly every AAPOR meeting. Huffington's latest article presents =
pollsters wrenching their hands over this worrisome issue, as if the sky =
is falling. She implies that the pollsters are hiding the truth, =
generating false data, and by misrepresenting, misleading the country, =
like a shadow government. I suppose if there is a recession and =
consumer confidence ratings fall (or vice versa), she will blame =
pollsters.

But the bottom line is that Huffington is distorting the facts. The =
polls she is annoyed with are NOT unreliable. When majorities of the =
American people are convinced that Clinton should be impeached, the =
numbers will change to the way she would like to see them... and the =
change will be replicated in poll after poll, not because the right wing =
has taken over the pollsters, or because the response rates are up to =
90%. The method, even at current response levels, is pretty darn =
reliable. We need to show examples to convey this fact. How often do =
we predict election outcomes-that's one real world measure?

(On the side... Are our elected leaders legitimate if voter turnout is =
low? I seem to recall less than 20%? electing the Republican majority =
in the House last round. And about 30% participated in this year's =
primaries. Maybe the federal government should set a standard measure =
in that area??)

It is important for AAPOR to address the key questions the public has =
about the profession, and put it on the website (has anyone asked the =
public what their key questions are? I think Doris Graber and friends =
have done a lot of interesting research in this area).

Maybe polling methodologists should agree on a common method to =
calculate and report participation levels as a standard practice. But =
it must include an explanation of what that number means in terms of =
overall reliability, otherwise it will be used to distort.

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Oct 15 17:40:20 1998
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA00846 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 17:40:17 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (plp35.vgernet.net [205.219.186.135])
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id AAA21275
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 00:02:27 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <362695E4.CC70AAD3@jwdp.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 20:40:04 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win98; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Huffington & AAPOR
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have been arguing for years that it is misleading to publish sampling error figures that imply great precision in surveys while failing to disclose relatively huge non-response rates that would allow an honest observer to question those claims.

Arianna Huffington is certainly not my idea of an honest observer, so it is all the more disheartening to see her handed the moral high ground in her campaign to disparage our profession, but that is exactly what has happened here.

The AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices lists, among the minimum disclosure requirements for any report of research results, "if applicable, completion rates" (III-5).

The AAPOR Best Practices recommendation is for "documentation and a full description, if applicable, of any response or completion rates cited (for quota designs, the number of refusals), and (whenever available) information on how nonrespondents differ from respondents," along with "any other information that a layperson would need to make a reasonable assessment of the reported findings."

Perhaps someone could explain to me, if not to Ms. Huffington, why our most respected news organizations feel that it is "not applicable" to disclose completion rates for surveys they publish, particularly when so many of these are conducted by leading members of AAPOR. At the very least, failure to do so shows a striking disdain for the intellect of their audience, which plays right into the hands of the Arianna Huffingtons of this world.

>From rusciano@enigma.rider.edu Thu Oct 15 19:20:44 1998
Received: from enigma.RIDER.EDU (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id TAA00281 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 19:20:42 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from enigma.rider.edu by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-10 #29692)
id <01J30KMCMNZ48WY696@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu,
15 Oct 1998 22:20:46 EDT
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 22:20:46 -0400 (EDT)
From: rusciano@enigma.rider.edu
Subject: Re: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions
In-reply-to: <01BDF837.C9E723A0@mark-bri>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-id: <Pine.PMDF.3.95.981015220519.539071530A-100000@enigma.rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Food for thought:

Public opinion pollsters rank above journalists, TV commentators, and newspaper reporters in public ratings of honesty and ethics. That would put pollsters above such commentators as Ariana Huffington (and liberal commentators too-- let's be fair). Of course, this result is based upon a poll, so what would we expect?

Further, if people do not trust pollsters much, as the results suggest, how could one be sure they were telling the truth? Think about it-- if people trusted pollsters, they would tell the truth, but pollsters would be rated higher. But if people do not trust pollsters, they would lie, and pollsters would be rated higher. So the finding is reasonably accurate, regardless of whether the respondents have been telling the truth. But that, of course, is absurd, rather like the paradox of the man who always lies who states "I am a liar."

Perhaps that is not the best response to the critics, however...

Frank Rusciano

On Thu, 15 Oct 1998, Mark Richards wrote:

> Public rating of honesty and ethical standards of people in the following fields:
>
> (The Gallup Organization, Dec. 1996:
> www.gallup.com/POLL_ARCHIVES/1997/97010.htm)
>
> "Please tell me how you would rate the honesty and ethical standards of people in these different fields--very high, high, average, low, or very low? First..."
>
> % Saying Very high+high / Average / Low+very low
>
> Druggists, pharmacists-64/30/4
> Clergy-56/30/9
> College teachers-55/33/5
> Medical doctors-55/35/9
> Dentists-53/38/7
> Policemen-49/38/11
> Engineers-48/41/3

- > Funeral directors-35/46/13
- > Bankers-26/59/12
- > Public opinion pollsters-24/54/16
- > Journalists-23/50/23
- > TV reporters, commentators-23/49/26
- > Building contractors-23/49/22
- > Local officeholders-19/57/20
- > Newspaper reporters-17/48/31
- > Lawyers-17/39/41
- > Business executives-17/58/20
- > Labor union leaders-16/39/38
- > Senators-15/48/34
- > Real estate agents-15/56/25
- > Stockbrokers-15/58/16
- > Congressmen-14/45/38
- > State officeholders-13/54/29
- > Insurance salesmen-11/49/37
- > Advertising practitioners-11/46/37
- > Car salesmen-8/29/60
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >

>From abider@earthlink.net Thu Oct 15 20:01:17 1998
 Received: from swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.123])
 by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
 id UAA08770 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 20:01:15 -0700 (PDT)
 Received: from alvbysy (sdn-ar-002dcwashP266.dialsprint.net [168.191.22.67])
 by swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id UAA11284
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 20:01:04 -0700 (PDT)
 Message-ID: <004601bdf8b3\$1c4106e0\$4316bfa8@alvbysy>
 Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
 From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
 To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
 Subject: Re: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions
 Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 23:14:36 -0400
 MIME-Version: 1.0
 Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
 X-Priority: 3
 X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
 X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
 X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

That exalted position of pollsters above car salesmen, etc. may well be due to non-response bias which presumably excludes from representation the views of those most averse to polls. I expect that (pace Hank C. Jenkins' 10/15/98/ post on "Ideology and Attitudes Toward Surveys") that someone like Arianna would not be a refusal but rather would bitch all the way through

the interview.

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

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

From: bthomps@bsmg.com <bthomps@bsmg.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>

Date: Thursday, October 15, 1998 2:27 PM

Subject: RE: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions

>Well, at least we're above car salesmen, congressmen and lawyers.

>

>If we get above clergy, then I'll begin to worry...

>

>Thanks for letting us all know where we stand.

>

>> -----

>> From: Mark Richards[SMTP:Mark@bisconti.com]

>> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu

>> Sent: Thursday, October 15, 1998 12:31 PM

>> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>> Subject: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions

>>

>> Public rating of honesty and ethical standards of people in the
>> following fields:

>>

>> (The Gallup Organization, Dec. 1996:

>> www.gallup.com/POLL_ARCHIVES/1997/97010.htm)

>>

>> "Please tell me how you would rate the honesty and ethical standards

>> of people in these different fields-very high, high, average, low, or

>> very low? First..."

>>

>> % Saying Very high+high / Average / Low+very low

>>

>> Druggists, pharmacists-64/30/4

>> Clergy-56/30/9

>> College teachers-55/33/5

>> Medical doctors-55/35/9

>> Dentists-53/38/7

>> Policemen-49/38/11

>> Engineers-48/41/3

>> Funeral directors-35/46/13

>> Bankers-26/59/12

>> Public opinion pollsters-24/54/16

>> Journalists-23/50/23

>> TV reporters, commentators-23/49/26

>> Building contractors-23/49/22

>> Local officeholders-19/57/20

>> Newspaper reporters-17/48/31

>> Lawyers-17/39/41

>> Business executives-17/58/20

>> Labor union leaders-16/39/38
>> Senators-15/48/34
>> Real estate agents-15/56/25
>> Stockbrokers-15/58/16
>> Congressmen-14/45/38
>> State officeholders-13/54/29
>> Insurance salesmen-11/49/37
>> Advertising practitioners-11/46/37
>> Car salesmen-8/29/60
>>
>><SNIP>
>

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Thu Oct 15 21:12:36 1998

Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id VAA01740 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 15 Oct 1998 21:12:16 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-37kb90s.dialup.mindspring.com [207.69.164.28])

by dewdrop2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id AAA04926

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 00:11:26 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981016001102.0086d100@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 00:11:02 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: Today's political atmosphere and polling

In-Reply-To: <1E164712D2DBD111832A00A0C921A21353D531@psg.ucsf.EDU>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Today's political atmosphere is perhaps more emotionally charged than it has been in many, many years. And, because polling is smack in the middle and contributes so much of the content of what constitutes news these days, is it any wonder that polling and pollsters are under attack? If you don't like the message, shoot the messenger. We shouldn't be so surprised. Recall the attacks made for over three decades on research devoted to proving that tobacco was harmful. I'm sure that there are many other examples. Doesn't it go without saying that any research which conflicts with or challenges how some people think and feel about certain key issues will be subject to harsh criticism? Nevertheless, it is up to us to at least help the media, the public and politicians become better informed about how polls and survey research in general works.

It's doubtful that polling and market research will disappear any time soon. Politicians and the business community depend too heavily on the findings, despite their claims to the contrary.

Lance M. Pollack makes a very valid argument when he says:

>Regardless of Ms. Huffington's agenda, the core issues here are
>disclosure and education. The rules for disclosure, whether to a request
>from AAPOR or a member of AAPOR or anyone else, must be uniformly
>applied and recognized. Such a request cannot be ignored just because we
>don't like, or suspect the motives of, the person/organization making
>the request. Besides, if you wish to claim that Huffington or anyone
>else is "twisting" or "misconstruing" the facts, you cannot do this
>unless and until you have made full disclosure of said facts.

>

>I might also point out that the only issues we can engage Huffington on
>are methodological ones, the same ones we wish to educate the public
>about. We constantly need to demonstrate the scientific underpinnings of
>survey research - the value of random sampling, re-contacts, procedures
>for refusal conversion, and why it is important to record everyone's
>opinion, not just the extremists' views. By the way, when you get to
>non-response bias you better produce hard numbers, not just assumptions.

>

>However, much of Huffington's blather seems to be about how polls are
>used or abused by politicians. This is hardly the province of AAPOR
>except in the area of misrepresenting findings. The idea that some polls
>are too dependent on polls while others use them too little is not
>something we can deal with. Perhaps we can do a better job of educating
>not just the public and the press, but also the politicians, on what it
>takes to run a survey and get good solid numbers on an issue - random
>sampling, defining the sample frame (where) and the population to be
>sampled from (who: likely voters, all adults, etc.), sample size
>required, options for data gathering, the importance of wording

>questions, the value of focus groups vs. large scale surveys, the costs

>involved, etc.

>

>Our methods must hold up to scientific scrutiny. If they do not, then we

>have been fooling ourselves. As for unscientific scrutiny, we must

>defend our methods (if they are sound) and point out the errors and

>misinterpretations of those who attack those methods. However, failure

>to disclose these methods will be our undoing.

>

>Lance M. Pollack

>

<smaller>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121

E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

</smaller>

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Fri Oct 16 05:02:20 1998

Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id FAA09130 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 05:02:19 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])

by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id IAA20161

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:02:15 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19981016120215.00b5c9ec@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:02:15 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems

I'd like to second the practical point that Peter makes. And in fact, I

tried to explain this point to Huffington's staffer, Fleming Saunders, when I spoke with him last Friday. I told him that it really was not surprising that he was finding that news polling organizations did not have response rate information immediately available to send Ms. Huffington. While lamentable, it appears common that neither clients nor consumers of news polls routinely seek information about response rates and possible nonresponse error. Thus, it's not surprising that the media/polling researchers themselves may not have immediate access to the information that was being requested, since it's rarely asked for and almost never published in news stories...

In fact, I am aware of only one newspaper that has recently printed response rate information about a survey they commissioned along with the poll story they published. This was the Columbus Dispatch and the monthly Buckeye State Poll which we conduct with their funding support. In the early months of 1997, they listed the response rate information (which I write up every month as part of our monthly, and publicly available, methodology -- see below for a recent example of the text of this write-up) in the "methods box" they ran to accompany their lead stories on the poll findings. However, after a few months they dropped the response rate information and now only publish the same information as other papers, which mostly deals with sampling.

If anyone is aware of any other media organization that routinely publishes response/nonresponse information when they run poll stories, please let us know.

98/10/07
September 1998 Central Ohio Buckeye State Poll

How the Poll Was Conducted

This survey of Ohioans is based on telephone interviews conducted September 21, 1998 to September 30, 1998, with 802 randomly selected adults throughout the seven-county Columbus metropolitan area. This region includes Delaware, Fairfield, Franklin, Licking, Madison, Pickaway, and Union counties.

The Buckeye State Poll (BSP) is a monthly sample survey of Ohio residents conducted by the OSU College of Social and Behavioral Sciences' survey research unit. It is co-sponsored by the College, the Columbus Dispatch, and WBNS-TV. In this survey a special sequence of questions was asked that focused on the public's perception and attitudes towards the intercollegiate sports programs at The Ohio State University. The questionnaire also included a standard set of demographic/background measures.

For the September-98 Central Ohio BSP, a random sample of computer-generated telephone numbers was used to reach households throughout Central Ohio regardless of whether their number was listed or unlisted. Within each household, one English-speaking adult was selected by a random procedure to be the respondent for the survey. All interviewing was completed from the OSU survey research unit.

A total of 3,388 randomly-generated telephone numbers was used for this survey, with many being called 10 or more times to try to reach a respondent at a time that was convenient for her/him to be interviewed. Of these numbers, 1,606 were known to reach a household in central Ohio with an eligible respondent. From these households, interviews were completed in 50% of the cases. Among those households in which interviewers actually spoke with the eligible adult respondent, interviews were completed in 86% of the cases.

The results have been weighted to take into account the number of telephone lines in each household and to adjust for variations in the sample relating to county of residence, gender, age, race, education, and whether or not any non-adult children lived in the household.

In theory, in 19 cases of 20, the results for this weighted sample of Ohioans will differ due to sampling error by no more than 3.5 percentage points in either direction from what would have been obtained by interviewing all adults in the seven-county Columbus metro area.

In addition, all surveys are subject to other potential sources of imprecision and bias which may be associated with the question wording and/or ordering, the response rate, and the quality of the interviewers, for example, and which could lead to somewhat different results from the present findings.

For more information, contact Professor Paul J. Lavrakas at the OSU/SBS survey research unit, at 614-292-6672.

At 12:45 PM 10/14/98 -0500, you wrote:

>>A number of people in the exchange on the Huffington column now have
>>converged on the point that it is simply inexcusable to refuse to provide
>>response rate information when it is requested, no matter who requests it.

>>
>>But there is an important operational issue that also needs to be
>>addressed. It is probable that standard coding and archiving of case
>>dispositions is not a routine operation in many survey organizations, nor
>>is standard calculation of response rates before call records are
>>discarded. (Note that the Roper Center archives a number of items of
>>information about the polls and surveys in its collection, but not
response
>>rates).

>>
>>When requests such as Huffington's come in, therefore, the information may
>>truly be "unavailable," or very difficult to come by. Busy people have to
>>be detailed to find call records and to perform ad hoc calculations that
>>should be done as a matter of routine -- IF the case disposition records
>>are still intact. In such circumstances, one can see why requests for
>>information are not answered immediately, or are not answered at all.

>>
>>In other cases, routinized systems for keeping track of calls do exist,
but
>>they are set up to do specialized internal productivity measurement rather
>>than to account for case dispositions in a standard way that serves the
>>interests of poll data users.
>>
>>The recently published AAPOR guidelines for response rate reporting are
>>intended to establish standard response rate disclosure and to facilitate
>>the design of systems that make it possible. Those organizations whose
>>case disposition systems do not already conform to the AAPOR guidelines
>>should use this opportunity to set them up appropriately now.
>>
>>Survey organizations whose findings enter the public domain should never
>>refuse to provide response rate information. And, they should not find
>>themselves in the position of having to say that the information is
>>"unavailable" or that it does not conform to accepted reporting
guidelines.
>>Peter V. Miller
>>Department of Communication Studies
>>Northwestern University
>>1881 Sheridan Road, Room 12
>>Evanston, IL 60208
>>
>>847-491-5835
>>847-467-1171 (FAX)
>>p-miller@nwu.edu
>>

* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
* Professor of Journalism & Communication *
* Professor of Public Policy & Management *
* 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 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu *

>From LANGRO1@UKCC.uky.edu Fri Oct 16 05:18:36 1998
Received: from UKCC.uky.edu (ukcc.uky.edu [128.163.1.170])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id FAA10981 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 05:18:35 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by UKCC.uky.edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id 8660 ;
Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:18:22 EDT
Received: from ukcc.uky.edu (NJE origin LANGRO1@UKCC) by UKCC.UKY.EDU (LMail
V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 3788; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:18:22 -0400
Date: Fri, 16 Oct 98 08:16:28 EDT
From: Ron Langley <LANGRO1@UKCC.uky.edu>
Subject: Re: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: <01BDF837.C9E723A0@mark-bri>
X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000
Message-Id: <981016.081821.EDT.LANGRO1@ukcc.uky.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Given our "expertise" re: question wording; has anyone else wondered where we would have ranked if the term public opinion surveyors, or researchers were used as opposed to the much-maligned term "pollsters"?

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Fri Oct 16 05:45:15 1998

Received: from okeefe.bestweb.net (okeefe.bestweb.net [209.94.100.110])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id FAA14862 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 05:44:56 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-1.tuckahoe.bestweb.net

[209.94.107.210])

by okeefe.bestweb.net (8.9.0/8.9.0) with ESMTP id IAA14600;

Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:42:42 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <36273EF3.FEF63CCB@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:41:23 -0400

From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.05 [en] (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: jwerner@jwdp.com

CC: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Protesting Too Much

References: <362695E4.CC70AAD3@jwdp.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR'ers:

As the yearly map that SSI sends out indicates, the response rates for telephone surveys are quite low, usually around 50 % or less.

If present trends continue we will converge to a point that is not so different from the survey industry before the advent of sampling. Something like the early Gallup years.

With telemarketing, caller id, and the like, survey respondents are becoming more and more like volunteers.

This is a serious problem. I don't think the solution is that simple.

Personal interviewing is too expensive and too slow. Refusals happen there as well.

Ms. Huffington plainly does not like the results of the polls, both pre and post Lewinsky, but she is now trying for a comedy career. She was quite lame in the "Political Bedfellows" segment on Comedy Channel. But she has retreated massively from knee jerk support of her GOP friends, like Newt.

How else could one interpret her "Partnership for Poll Free America."

But the extent to which polling and opinion research is an "art," and

is defended as such, is the extent to which there are few possible responses to a Huffington like attack.

She may not buy "newspaper ink by the barrel," as the old saw goes about who you are not supposed to get into a war of words with, but she does have a syndicated column.

She is nicely and quite sympathetically portrayed in Al Franken's book: "Rush Limbaugh is a Big Fat Idiot and Other Observations."

Andy Beveridge

>From rstuefen@usd.edu Fri Oct 16 06:22:53 1998

Received: from sunflowr.usd.edu (sunflowr.usd.edu [192.55.228.42])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id GAA19486 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 06:22:50 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from brb015 ([206.176.1.6]) by sunflowr.usd.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12)

with SMTP id IAA07192 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:21:19 -0500

Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981016082253.00975100@sundance.usd.edu>

X-Sender: rstuefen@sundance.usd.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:22:53 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Randall M. Stuefen" <rstuefen@usd.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Dear All,

For those interested in a one stop review of polling. The Annenberg/CBP project has taken a shot at it. Check it out at:

<http://www.learner.org/cgi-bin/w3-mysql/exhibits/statistics/activity0/frontpoll>

Stuefen

>From mbednarz@umich.edu Fri Oct 16 06:24:01 1998

Received: from donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.19])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id GAA19857 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 06:24:00 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from joust.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@joust.rs.itd.umich.edu

[141.211.63.86])

by donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id JAA23295

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 09:23:59 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (mbednarz@localhost)

by joust.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with SMTP id JAA16717

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 09:23:58 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class
Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 09:23:58 -0400 (EDT)
From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>
X-Sender: mbednarz@joust.rs.itd.umich.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Info on Census Bureau Budget
Message-ID:
<Pine.SOL.3.95.981016092252.16151A-100000@joust.rs.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 09:02:34 EDT
From: COPAFS@aol.com
Subject: 1999 Census Bureau Budget

Dear Colleagues:

For those of you who are interested in what happened with the Census Bureau's Budget for 1999, here's the outcome as of last night:

The Census Bureau will receive \$1.027 billion for 2000 preparations in the fiscal year that began on October 1, according to an agreement reached today between Congress and the Administration. But Congress will revisit the dispute over sampling methods by June 15, 1999 before funds can be spent after that date. Negotiators also agreed to stop the flow of funds to the entire budget account covering the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, and the judicial branch after June 15 unless a new measure granting spending authority is enacted.

The Bureau's allocation is \$75 million above the \$952 million for census preparations approved by the House of Representatives last August. Of the additional \$75 million, \$40 million must be spent on preparations for a census that doesn't include sampling methods.

Negotiators hope that the threat of shutting down law enforcement activities, foreign embassy operations, and other vital programs in the same bill will force sampling critics and the Administration to resolve the controversy over census methods. The Census Bureau will complete evaluations of this year's census dress rehearsal by next winter, and the Census Monitoring Board must issue reports by February 1 and April 1 of next year, as well.

Congress and the Administration also hope that the Supreme Court will issue a ruling before the self-imposed June 15 deadline in two lawsuits challenging the use of sampling for purposes of congressional apportionment. However, Rep. Dan Miller (R-FL) said in a statement yesterday that a Supreme Court ruling that sampling is lawful "doesn't automatically" mean that sampling will be used in the 2000 census.

Funding for the census will be included in an omnibus spending package covering numerous Federal departments and agencies. Congress is expected to pass the bill within the next few days before leaving town

for the fall elections.

>From daves@startribune.com Fri Oct 16 07:14:26 1998
Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com
[132.148.80.211])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA01499 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 07:14:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id JAA22657; Fri, 16 Oct 1998
09:13:52 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by
firewall2.startribune.com via smap (3.2)
id xma022523; Fri, 16 Oct 98 09:13:42 -0500
Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 09:17:53 -0600
Message-Id: <s6270f41.012@mail.startribune.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 09:17:20 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: lavrakas.1@osu.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

The Minnesota Poll does not, as a matter of course, publish response rates =
in the newspaper in its methods description which is usually headlined =
"How the poll was conducted." It does, however, refer readers to the more =
expanded description of the methodology on the Star Tribune's web site in =
conjunction with the results; cooperation rates are included in that more =
expanded description. When CATI software can be adapted to generate other =
response rate information as delineated in AAPOR's recent booklet on the =
topic, "Standard Definitions," then that info will be posted on the =
website too.

Rob Daves
The Minnesota Poll

>>> "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu> 10/16 6:02 AM >>>

I'd like to second the practical point that Peter makes. And in fact, I
tried to explain this point to Huffington's staffer, Fleming Saunders, =
when

I spoke with him last Friday. I told him that it really was not surprising=

that he was finding that news polling organizations did not have response
rate information immediately available to send Ms. Huffington. While
lamentable, it appears common that neither clients nor consumers of news
polls routinely seek information about response rates and possible
nonresponse error. Thus, it's not surprising that the media/polling
researchers themselves may not have immediate access to the information =
that
was being requested, since it's rarely asked for and almost never =
published

in news stories...

In fact, I am aware of only one newspaper that has recently printed =
response
rate information about a survey they commissioned along with the poll =
story
they published. This was the Columbus Dispatch and the monthly Buckeye =
State
Poll which we conduct with their funding support. In the early months of
1997, they listed the response rate information (which I write up every
month as part of our monthly, and publicly available, methodology -- see
below for a recent example of the text of this write-up) in the "methods
box" they ran to accompany their lead stories on the poll findings. =
However,
after a few months they dropped the response rate information and now only
publish the same information as other papers, which mostly deals with =
sampling.=20

If anyone is aware of any other media organization that routinely =
publishes
response/nonresponse information when they run poll stories, please let us
know.=20

98/10/07
September 1998 Central Ohio Buckeye State Poll

How the Poll Was Conducted

This survey of Ohioans is based on telephone interviews conducted =
September
21, 1998 to September 30, 1998, with 802 randomly selected adults =
throughout
the seven-county Columbus metropolitan area. This region includes =
Delaware,
Fairfield, Franklin, Licking, Madison, Pickaway, and Union counties.

The Buckeye State Poll (BSP) is a monthly sample survey of Ohio residents
conducted by the OSU College of Social and Behavioral Sciences' survey
research unit. It is co-sponsored by the College, the Columbus Dispatch,
and WBNS-TV. In this survey a special sequence of questions was asked =
that
focused on the public's perception and attitudes towards the intercollegiat=
e
sports programs at The Ohio State University. The questionnaire also
included a standard set of demographic/background measures.

For the September-98 Central Ohio BSP, a random sample of computer-generate=
d
telephone numbers was used to reach households throughout Central Ohio
regardless of whether their number was listed or unlisted. Within each
household, one English-speaking adult was selected by a random procedure =

to be the respondent for the survey. All interviewing was completed from the OSU survey research unit.

A total of 3,388 randomly-generated telephone numbers was used for this survey, with many being called 10 or more times to try to reach a respondent at a time that was convenient for her/him to be interviewed. Of these numbers, 1,606 were known to reach a household in central Ohio with an eligible respondent. From these households, interviews were completed in 50% of the cases. Among those households in which interviewers actually spoke with the eligible adult respondent, interviews were completed in 86% of the cases.

The results have been weighted to take into account the number of telephone lines in each household and to adjust for variations in the sample relating to county of residence, gender, age, race, education, and whether or not any non-adult children lived in the household.

In theory, in 19 cases of 20, the results for this weighted sample of Ohioans will differ due to sampling error by no more than 3.5 percentage points in either direction from what would have been obtained by interviewing all adults in the seven-county Columbus metro area.

In addition, all surveys are subject to other potential sources of imprecision and bias which may be associated with the question wording and/or ordering, the response rate, and the quality of the interviewers, for example, and which could lead to somewhat different results from the present findings.

For more information, contact Professor Paul J. Lavrakas at the OSU/SBS survey research unit, at 614-292-6672.

At 12:45 PM 10/14/98 -0500, you wrote:

>>A number of people in the exchange on the Huffington column now have >>converged on the point that it is simply inexcusable to refuse to provide

>>response rate information when it is requested, no matter who requests it. =20

>>

>>But there is an important operational issue that also needs to be >>addressed. It is probable that standard coding and archiving of case >>dispositions is not a routine operation in many survey organizations, =

nor

>>is standard calculation of response rates before call records are

>>discarded. (Note that the Roper Center archives a number of items of
>>information about the polls and surveys in its collection, but not =
response
>>rates).
>>
>>When requests such as Huffington's come in, therefore, the information =
may
>>truly be "unavailable," or very difficult to come by. Busy people have =
to
>>be detailed to find call records and to perform ad hoc calculations that
>>should be done as a matter of routine -- IF the case disposition records
>>are still intact. In such circumstances, one can see why requests for
>>information are not answered immediately, or are not answered at all.
>>
>>In other cases, routinized systems for keeping track of calls do exist, =
but
>>they are set up to do specialized internal productivity measurement =
rather
>>than to account for case dispositions in a standard way that serves the
>>interests of poll data users. =20
>>
>>The recently published AAPOR guidelines for response rate reporting are
>>intended to establish standard response rate disclosure and to facilitate=

>>the design of systems that make it possible. Those organizations whose
>>case disposition systems do not already conform to the AAPOR guidelines
>>should use this opportunity to set them up appropriately now.=20
>>
>>Survey organizations whose findings enter the public domain should never
>>refuse to provide response rate information. And, they should not find
>>themselves in the position of having to say that the information is
>>"unavailable" or that it does not conform to accepted reporting =
guidelines.=20

>>Peter V. Miller
>>Department of Communication Studies=20
>>Northwestern University
>>1881 Sheridan Road, Room 12
>>Evanston, IL 60208
>>
>>847-491-5835
>>847-467-1171 (FAX)
>>p-miller@nwu.edu=20
>>

* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
* Professor of Journalism & Communication *
* Professor of Public Policy & Management *
* 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 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu *

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Fri Oct 16 08:01:17 1998

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.10])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA13160 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:01:16 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (garnet1.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.2])
by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA37294
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 11:01:15 -0400

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (xyp09-18.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.5.38])
by garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA45076
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 11:01:14 -0400

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 11:01:14 -0400

Message-Id: <199810161501.LAA45076@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>

X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>

Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems

Dear Rob,

Please post Star Tribune site.

Thank you.

Also, has anyone checked with those who reportedly did not "disclose" to
Arianna Huffington to see what questions **really** were asked, what
"interviewer rapport" was like, and what the responses **really** were?
Before indicting the profession, a little research seems called for.
Susan

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh
Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208

>From David_Moore@gallup.com Fri Oct 16 08:02:14 1998

Received: from fw (fw.gallup.com [206.158.235.10])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id IAA13631 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:02:10 -0700

(PDT)

From: David_Moore@gallup.com

Received: from exchng5.gallup.com by fw (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)

id KAA13821; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 10:01:36 -0500

Received: by EXCHNG5 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

id <4Q4J2QM6>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 10:01:38 -0500

Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F9033F2DE@exchng3.gallup.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 10:01:30 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

Content-Type: text/plain

In the early years, those who did polls were called "pollers", but Lindsay Rogers published a book highly critical of polling in 1949 called "The Pollsters: Public Opinion, Politics and Democratic Leadership....", using a term which Jean Converse says was intended to evoke the disparaging term applied to modern advertisers, the "hucksters." It seems as though the term has stuck, although only in recent months would I say the term is "much-maligned." In fact, one author has written about the "Super Pollsters" with no disparagement intended or conveyed.

David Moore

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

> From: Ron Langley [SMTP:LANGRO1@UKCC.uky.edu]

> Sent: Friday, October 16, 1998 8:16 AM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions

>

> Given our "expertise" re: question wording; has anyone else wondered

> where we would have ranked if the term public opinion surveyors, or

> researchers were used as opposed to the much-maligned term "pollsters"?

>From fweil@lsu.edu Fri Oct 16 08:36:25 1998

Received: from mail081.lsu.edu (sp115.ocs.lsu.edu [130.39.174.48])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id IAA23378 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 08:36:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from weber ([130.39.69.59]) by mail081.lsu.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA

v4.6.1 (569.2 2-6-1998)) with SMTP id 8625669F.0055B475; Fri, 16 Oct 1998

10:36:07 -0500

Message-ID: <000901bdf919\$dbfcfa50\$3b452782@weber.laopo.lsu.edu>

Reply-To: "Rick Weil" <fweil@lsu.edu>

From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@lsu.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE:A background to columnists

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 10:30:07 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3155.0

X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3155.0

I agree with Susan Losh's two main points: (1) it's probably pointless to engage in debates with "agenda-driven" advocates. They've already made up their minds, and they're just looking for debating points. But (2) that doesn't mean they're all wrong. It's important for us to consider their serious points among ourselves and among other people who are prepared to look for the truth, even if that includes "uncomfortable facts."

I think Huffington's first point is important, but she makes it a red herring. Of course politicians should not be strictly poll-driven, but in a democracy, of course they should take polls into account. There are plenty of important issues for debate here, but Huffington doesn't raise them.

I think Huffington's second point is much more serious. I do worry about refusal rates and the representativeness of polls. It's probably unpopular to admit it in this forum, but I do hesitate to speak with anyone who phones or knocks at my door out of the blue. There are tons of people out there trying to sell you things, put you in databases, or worse (including crime). Privacy and security are real concerns. Plus, most of us really don't have a lot of time to waste, especially if we are uncertain whom we're talking to, if we think they're just trying to sell us something, if we think they are engaged in one of the practices we condemn under the cover of a "poll," and/or if we simply don't think they're doing a good job on the survey. How many calls does everyone else get at dinnertime?

I would feel best about participating in a poll if (a) they contacted me by mail ahead of time, said the poll was coming, and gave me a way to confirm their identity, and (b) the polling source was known and reputable. This is obviously impractical for many of us as pollsters, especially if we need to measure opinion quickly. But the respondent may still have the same hesitation.

This is not a new problem in surveying higher status/better educated respondents, but I think the problem may be getting worse and extending further down the status/education ladder. Irritation, privacy, and security are probably becoming more, not less, serious concerns. I think this is indeed a difficult issue for us as pollsters.

Rick Weil

Frederick Weil, Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
504-388-1140
504-388-5102 fax
fweil@lsu.edu

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Oct 16 09:04:34 1998
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA00307 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 09:04:32 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp9.vgernet.net [205.219.186.109])
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id PAA04826
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 15:27:30 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <36276E77.A12BE689@jwdp.com>

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 12:04:07 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win98; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions

References: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F9033F2DE@exchng3.gallup.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Cynthia Crossen, in "Tainted Truth" uses the term "pollers" exclusively,
the only recent use of the word that I am aware of.

Given that Ms. Crossen later proudly informed a NYAAPOR meeting that she
had deliberately tried not learn too much about statistics because she
did not want to bias her book in favor of "pollers," I doubt that her
use of the word was an attempt to be historically correct.

David_Moore@gallup.com wrote:

>
> In the early years, those who did polls were called "pollers", but Lindsay
> Rogers published a book highly critical of polling in 1949 called "The
> Pollsters: Public Opinion, Politics and Democratic Leadership....", using
> a
> term which Jean Converse says was intended to evoke the disparaging term
> applied to modern advertisers, the "hucksters." It seems as though the
> term
> has stuck, although only in recent months would I say the term is
> "much-maligned." In fact, one author has written about the "Super
> Pollsters" with no disparagement intended or conveyed.
> David Moore

>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Ron Langley [SMTP:LANGRO1@UKCC.uky.edu]
>> Sent: Friday, October 16, 1998 8:16 AM
>> To: aapornet@usc.edu
>> Subject: Re: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions
>>

>> Given our "expertise" re: question wording; has anyone else wondered
>> where we would have ranked if the term public opinion surveyors, or
>> researchers were used as opposed to the much-maligned term "pollsters"?
>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Fri Oct 16 09:19:45 1998

Received: from camell4.mindspring.com (camell4.mindspring.com
[207.69.200.64])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA04370 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 09:19:42 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-38lc122.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.4.66])
by camell4.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id MAA12492
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 12:19:40 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981016121841.00825d20@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 12:18:41 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: How to explain non response rate in simple terms?
In-Reply-To: <199810161501.LAA45076@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

Forgive my naivete, but how does one explain in SIMPLE terms what a non response rate means and how one can validly compensate for the large proportion of refusals? If a polling organization reported that it took 10,000 calls to complete 1000 interviews, how would one persuade a reader that the 1000 completed interviews are still representative of the population? To those uninitiated in the mysteries of statistics, the fact that 9000 people refused to participate could easily leave them in doubt about the validity of the findings. Those that agree to participate in a study with a very high refusal rate become in a sense a kind of self-selected sample...the kind of thing which we preach against. I know there are good, statistical explanations which will attest to the validity of the findings, but to the unsophisticated, this might be a hard sell. Nevertheless, we do have to face up to the challenge.

Dick Halpern

<smaller>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121

E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

</smaller>

>From Mark@bisconti.com Fri Oct 16 10:16:22 1998

Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA22590 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 10:16:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by
medusa.nei.org
(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000252124@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;
Fri, 16 Oct 1998 13:00:55 -0400

Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)

id QY43SRSQ; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 13:05:10 -0400

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

id <01BDF904.3A2F3680@mark-bri>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 12:55:18 -0400

Message-Id: <01BDF904.3A2F3680@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Resources: Polls on polls

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 12:55:07 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Here are citations for a few studies that might be of interest:

"Representation by Phone? What the Public Thinks About Polls as Policy = Communication," by Anne Hildreth, Dept. of Political Science, SUNY = Albany, and Ellen M. Dran, Northern Illinois University, 1992. Sample = of 800 Illinois residents, divided into two groups, were asked:

* "In general, when elected officials decide how to vote on important = issues, do you think they should pay most attention to: the people who = are most active about that issue; or (version A-what citizens think; = version B-public opinion polls); or their own knowledge and conscience?"

	Citizens Gp. A	Polls Gp. B
Activists	8	15
Citizens/polls	60	48
Conscience	16	20

1996 Poll on Polls, The Gallup Organization. National survey of 1000 = adults April 25-28, 1996 (updating benchmark "Poll on Polls" from 1944 = by Hadley Cantri, the second in 1975 by the Gallup Poll, and third in = 1985 by Andrew Kohut (then Pres. of The Gallup Oran.), and fourth by The = Roper Organization. Some findings:

- * 18% had been interviewed in p.o. studies, compared to 15% in 1975
- * More American read po polls regularly than in the past-55% claim to = read polls in newspapers and magazines, with 31% saying they read them = regularly.
- * Public holds highly favorable views about po polling's societal = contribution. Large majorities feel the nation would be better off if = its leaders followed the views of the public more closely, consider = polls a good thing for the country, and believe that polls work for the = best interests of the public at large. =20
- * However, only 28% believe it is possible for samples of 1,500 or 2,000 = to accurately reflect the views of the total population under study.

CMOR Refusal Rates and Industry Image Study, Harry W. O'Neill, Roper = Starch, 1996. Telephone interviews with 1,920 adults in April 1995.

Select findings:

% Agree that polls...

- * Opportunity to provide feedback about products and services-92%
- * Help produce better products and services-87
- * Survey research industry services a useful purpose-86
- * Responding to surveys is in my best interest-65
- * Responding to surveys is interesting-64
- * Research firms maintain confidentiality-58

% Disagree

- * Responding to surveys is a waste of time-73%
- * Surveys are an invasion of privacy-67
- * Some questions are too personal-46
- * The term "poll" or "survey" is used to disguise a sales pitch-45

Reasons for refusal to participate

- * Not have time-49%
- * Not interested-21
- * Inopportune time-20
- * Don't want to be bothered-10
- * Knew it was sales pitch-9
- * Questions too personal-6
- * Surveys waste time-5

Prefer to participate in surveys about...

- * Products and services-47%
- * Politics and issues-12
- * Doesn't matter-41

Other tidbits

- * 76% said polls and surveys are useful for government officials to = understand how the public feels about important issues
- * 75% said TV and newspaper stories that report polls and surveys are = very or somewhat interesting=20
- * 64% said they like to compare their opinions with those of others = reported in polls and surveys
- * 63% said they are often skeptical of the results of reported polls and = surveys rather than usually believing the results
- * 73% said that when it comes to bias in polls, it depends on the = particular poll
- * 80% said they received a telemarketing call in the past year
- * 48% said they responded to a poll that turned out to be a sales pitch

More studies:

Trends: Public Opinion on Public Opinion and Polling, by Ellen M. Dran, = Center for Governmental Studies, Northern Illinois University. =20

The Role of Polls in American Democratic Talk: A Focus Group Analysis, = by Anne Hildreth and Ellen M. Dran

Public Opinion about Public Opinion: What We Know and Why We Should =

Care, by Ellen M. Dran and Anne Hildreth

Polling on Polling: History and Issues, by Ellen M. Dran.

Representation by Phone? What the Public Thinks About Polls as Policy =
Communication, by Anne Hildreth and Ellen M. Dran

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Oct 16 12:22:34 1998
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA12135 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 12:22:33 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id MAA26716 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 12:22:33 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 12:22:33 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Moore on Pollers vs. Pollsters
In-Reply-To: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F9033F2DE@exchn3.gallup.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9810161210580.29998-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

If what David Moore says here is true, and I'm sure he would know, then I think we all owe Lindsay Rogers a considerable debt of gratitude, the word "pollers" (variously spelled) having a venerable history of its own in 16th- through 18th-century pornographic fiction (something I know only via dry academic footnotes, it hardly need be said).

-- Jim Beniger

On Fri, 16 Oct 1998 David_Moore@gallup.com wrote:

> In the early years, those who did polls were called "pollers", but Lindsay
> Rogers published a book highly critical of polling in 1949 called "The
> Pollsters: Public Opinion, Politics and Democratic Leadership....", using
> a
> term which Jean Converse says was intended to evoke the disparaging term
> applied to modern advertisers, the "hucksters." It seems as though the
> term
> has stuck, although only in recent months would I say the term is
> "much-maligned." In fact, one author has written about the "Super
> Pollsters" with no disparagement intended or conveyed.
> David Moore
>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Ron Langley [SMTP:LANGRO1@UKCC.uky.edu]
>> Sent: Friday, October 16, 1998 8:16 AM

>> To: aapornet@usc.edu
>> Subject: Re: Perceptions of Honesty of Various Professions
>>
>> Given our "expertise" re: question wording; has anyone else wondered
>> where we would have ranked if the term public opinion surveyors, or
>> researchers were used as opposed to the much-maligned term "pollsters"?
>

>From SSDCF@UCONNVNVM.UConn.Edu Fri Oct 16 12:28:52 1998
Received: from UCONNVNVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id MAA13621 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 12:28:51 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by UCONNVNVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id
4401 ; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 15:28:01 EDT
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UCONNVNVM) by
UCONNVNVM.UCONN.EDU (LMail V1.2c/1.8c) with BSMTP id 7503; Fri, 16 Oct 1998
15:28:01 -0400
Date: Fri, 16 Oct 98 15:22:19 EDT
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UCONNVNVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject: Re: Huffington column
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
In-Reply-To: <199810142224_MC2-5CB7-A5F4@compuserve.com>
X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000
Message-Id: <981016.152801.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

At about 2:45 (EDT) everyone's favorite talk show host (Rush Limbaugh) said that he had finally found out why the "polls are wrong" from Arianna Huffington's column. He passed on the idea of very low response rates (I did not quite catch what fraction he cited) but then went on to say that she explained this as being because people with jobs and so on weren't called, meaning that the responses were "mostly" unemployed people on welfare, so no wonder Clinton looks good(?!). I mention this just to note that the criticism has been picked up and passed on as fact, and now undoubtedly, lots of folks will pick up on Limbaugh's comments. Especially since there was one assertion which CAN easily be refuted (the people in surveys are manifestly NOT predominantly unemployed welfare clients), it points up the importance of making clear what is and is not happening and why -- from the standpoint of sampling, at least -- polls ARE accurate.

>From mtrau@umich.edu Fri Oct 16 12:50:30 1998
Received: from relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (relic.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.11])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA22043 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 12:50:29 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from umich.edu (isr-207-96.isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.96])
by relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/2.5) with ESMTP id PAA24165
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 15:49:24 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <3627B190.8C8EBE80@umich.edu>

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 15:50:24 -0500
From: Mike Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (WinNT; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Comments on Huffington
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I spent some time on the phone yesterday with a reporter for The Washington Times who was writing a piece about the Huffington column. He has spoken to several people in the business, and I think he will produce a thoughtful piece about response rates and polls.

>From ARCGTH@langate.gsu.edu Fri Oct 16 14:52:10 1998
Received: from sphinx.Gsu.EDU (root@sphinx.Gsu.EDU [131.96.1.22])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA27905 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 14:52:04 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from langate.gsu.edu (langate.Gsu.EDU [131.96.175.15])
by sphinx.Gsu.EDU (8.8.8/8.8.8-GSU-MOD-1) with SMTP id RAA16118
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 17:52:02 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from GSU-Message_Server by langate.gsu.edu
with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 17:52:04 -0400
Message-Id: <s62787c4.096@langate.gsu.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 17:51:51 -0400
From: "Gary T. Henry" <ARCGTH@langate.gsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Interesting take on the media and Cinton
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

Some of you may be interested in the New York Review of Books article by =
Joan Didion entitled "Clinton Agonistes." She refers to our current =
protagonist, Arianna Huffington, along with Matt Drudge, as "'journalistic =
amateurs' and 'journalistic pretenders'" .
It is more depth than I have found in most reporting or columns on the =
evolution of the current hearings.
It is in the October 22, 1998 issue. The web address is www.nybooks.com, =
but I have not checked to see if the article is accessible.
Gary Henry

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Oct 16 20:48:04 1998
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id UAA23192 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 20:48:02 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (plpm3-37.vgernet.net [207.51.117.37])
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id DAA11958
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Oct 1998 03:11:47 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <3628136A.9D008AD9@jwdp.com>

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 23:47:54 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win98; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems
References: <2.2.32.19981016120215.00b5c9ec@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The disclosure statement provided by Dr. Lavrakas is excellent, giving all the relevant information clearly and concisely, and putting to shame even the New York Times' disclosure statement, which is probably the best of the national press polls.

There is no reason why newspapers cannot print this kind of information when they have major articles based on polls they conduct themselves or commission. Broadcast media, who have greater constraints on time, can certainly post this on their web sites for those interested.

You cannot begin to educate the public (or journalists) about non-response rates and non-response bias when you try to hide the issue in the first place. Unless the national media begin to publish this kind of disclosure, they will continue to give the impression that they are deliberately concealing information damaging to the validity of their poll results.

Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. wrote:

>
> I'd like to second the practical point that Peter makes. And in fact, I
> tried to explain this point to Huffington's staffer, Fleming Saunders,
when
> I spoke with him last Friday. I told him that it really was not
surprising
> that he was finding that news polling organizations did not have response
> rate information immediately available to send Ms. Huffington. While
> lamentable, it appears common that neither clients nor consumers of news
> polls routinely seek information about response rates and possible
> nonresponse error. Thus, it's not surprising that the media/polling
> researchers themselves may not have immediate access to the information
that
> was being requested, since it's rarely asked for and almost never
published
> in news stories...
>
> In fact, I am aware of only one newspaper that has recently printed
response
> rate information about a survey they commissioned along with the poll
story
> they published. This was the Columbus Dispatch and the monthly Buckeye
State

> Poll which we conduct with their funding support. In the early months of
> 1997, they listed the response rate information (which I write up every
> month as part of our monthly, and publicly available, methodology -- see
> below for a recent example of the text of this write-up) in the "methods
> box" they ran to accompany their lead stories on the poll findings.

However,

> after a few months they dropped the response rate information and now only
> publish the same information as other papers, which mostly deals with
> sampling.

>

> If anyone is aware of any other media organization that routinely
> publishes

> response/nonresponse information when they run poll stories, please let us
> know.

>

> -----

>

> 98/10/07

> September 1998 Central Ohio Buckeye State Poll

>

> How the Poll Was Conducted

>

> This survey of Ohioans is based on telephone interviews conducted
> September

> 21, 1998 to September 30, 1998, with 802 randomly selected adults
> throughout

> the seven-county Columbus metropolitan area. This region includes
> Delaware,

> Fairfield, Franklin, Licking, Madison, Pickaway, and Union counties.

>

> The Buckeye State Poll (BSP) is a monthly sample survey of Ohio residents

> conducted by the OSU College of Social and Behavioral Sciences' survey

> research unit. It is co-sponsored by the College, the Columbus Dispatch,

> and WBNS-TV. In this survey a special sequence of questions was asked
> that

> focused on the public's perception and attitudes towards the
> intercollegiate

> sports programs at The Ohio State University. The questionnaire also

> included a standard set of demographic/background measures.

>

> For the September-98 Central Ohio BSP, a random sample of
> computer-generated

> telephone numbers was used to reach households throughout Central Ohio

> regardless of whether their number was listed or unlisted. Within each

> household, one English-speaking adult was selected by a random procedure
> to

> be the respondent for the survey. All interviewing was completed from the

> OSU survey research unit.

>

> A total of 3,388 randomly-generated telephone numbers was used for this

> survey, with many being called 10 or more times to try to reach a

> respondent

> at a time that was convenient for her/him to be interviewed. Of these

> numbers, 1,606 were known to reach a household in central Ohio with an

- > eligible respondent. From these households, interviews were completed in
- > 50% of the cases. Among those households in which interviewers actually
- > spoke with the eligible adult respondent, interviews were completed in 86%
- > of the cases.
- >
- > The results have been weighted to take into account the number of
- telephone
- > lines in each household and to adjust for variations in the sample
- relating
- > to county of residence, gender, age, race, education, and whether or not
- any
- > non-adult children lived in the household.
- >
- > In theory, in 19 cases of 20, the results for this weighted sample of
- > Ohioans will differ due to sampling error by no more than 3.5 percentage
- > points in either direction from what would have been obtained by
- > interviewing all adults in the seven-county Columbus metro area.
- >
- > In addition, all surveys are subject to other potential sources of
- > imprecision and bias which may be associated with the question wording
- > and/or ordering, the response rate, and the quality of the interviewers,
- for
- > example, and which could lead to somewhat different results from the
- present
- > findings.
- >
- > For more information, contact Professor Paul J. Lavrakas at the OSU/SBS
- > survey research unit, at 614-292-6672.
- >

> -----

>From abider@earthlink.net Fri Oct 16 22:04:05 1998
 Received: from gull.prod.itd.earthlink.net (gull.prod.itd.earthlink.net
 [207.217.120.85])
 by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
 id WAA02523 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 22:04:05 -0700
 (PDT)
 Received: from alvbysny (sdn-ar-002dcwashP322.dialsprint.net
 [168.191.22.99])
 by gull.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id WAA16939
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 22:04:03 -0700 (PDT)
 Message-ID: <004801bdf98d\$7fbf7280\$6316bfa8@alvbysny>
 Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
 From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
 To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
 Subject: The Credo of the Unbeliever
 Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 01:17:50 -0400
 MIME-Version: 1.0
 Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
 X-Priority: 3
 X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
 X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
 X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

CNN: The Latest Polls: The DNC and RNC
Chairmen Argue the Implications
Aired October 13, 1998 - 5:08 p.m. ET

<SNIP>

NICHOLSON: Our base is definitely more fired up.
Every poll, if you want to believe polls, and I don't put a
lot of credence in polls: they're just a snapshot in time --
we're not guided by polls, but the polls show that the
people most likely to vote in America three weeks from
today, are most likely to vote Republican.

>From RFunk787@aol.com Fri Oct 16 22:29:38 1998
Received: from imo18.mx.aol.com (imo18.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.8])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id WAA05382 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 22:29:37 -0700
(PDT)
From: RFunk787@aol.com
Received: from RFunk787@aol.com
by imo18.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FGPHa29194
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 16 Oct 1998 16:27:00 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <1b34a18b.3627ac14@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 16:27:00 EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Attacking methodology
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: PCAO 1.6

10/16/98

Attacking the methodology of research that produces "unwelcome" or
"distasteful" results is nothing new. It is the easiest avenue for an
unsympathetic critic to follow (except for, perhaps, attacking the
sponsorship). Discrediting research via its methodology relieves the critic
of the messy job of confronting the substance of the findings.
Methodological
principles and procedures, while well-defined and largely agreed-upon, can
be
complex and subtle, and are often difficult to realize fully in practice
(e.g., high response rates). Thus no substantive, nontrivial social
research
can be so flawlessly designed and conducted as to be totally
methodologically
unassailable.

Nor is this solely the tactic of rightwing critics of polling. Recall, for
example, the methodological trashing by leftish critics of The Bell Curve,
which was based on voluminous research conducted over many years whose
methodology was no worse, perhaps even better in some instances, than that
of

more trendy studies with "politically correct" findings whose equally vulnerable methodologies are given a pass by social scientists sympathetic to the results. The tactic also is no secret among reviewers of academic journal articles.

For that matter, recall the AAPORian attacks on the methodology of the 1996 Zogby polls -- might they have occurred because outsider Zogby committed the affront of producing election forecasts more accurate than those of more prominent polling organizations?

Of course, every now and then, faulty methodology really does call research findings into question. Shere Hite comes to mind, in this regard.

Ray Funkhouser

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Sat Oct 17 19:10:37 1998

Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id TAA16035 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Oct 1998 19:10:36 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-37kboog.dialup.mindspring.com [207.69.227.16])

by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id WAA13474

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 17 Oct 1998 22:10:34 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981017221000.00816730@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 22:10:00 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: A Poll-Watcher's Guide to Stalking the Elusive Likely Voter

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

An excellent article on polling may be found in this Sunday's NY Times:

A Poll-Watcher's Guide to Stalking the Elusive Likely

Voter By MICHAEL R. KAGAY

Look at:

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/review/101898polls-voters-review-art.html>

Dick Halpern

<smaller>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121

E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

</smaller>

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Sun Oct 18 09:17:05 1998

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id JAA18204 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Oct 1998 09:17:04 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plpm3-36.vgernet.net [207.51.117.36])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id PAA14289
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Oct 1998 15:42:49 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <362A147C.DB77134D@jwdp.com>

Date: Sun, 18 Oct 1998 12:17:00 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win98; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: SUGging by US News & World Report

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have just received a "survey" form from U.S. News and World Report, titled "Oct. 1998 U.S. & World Events Nationwide Opinion Poll."

The packet contains an actual survey form, along with descriptions of 4 gifts that participants will receive, the last of which is a cut-rate trial subscription to USN&WR, for which the participant will be billed.

The survey form begins with a demographic section (that concentrates on items of interest to advertisers), followed by 16 rating scale questions on current events. The bottom of the survey has a notice under the title "Attention survey participant: Please read carefully!", containing a check box next to a bold face statement that says "Yes, I have filled out both sides of the survey, please send me 4 participation rewards." Below this, the fine print has a paragraph describing the free gifts, then, another that explains that this will activate a trial 26-week subscription for which the respondent will be billed \$15.00.

This is the most noxious example of SUGging that I have seen in quite some time, and I would like to request that the AAPOR Executive Council take action to protest to the publisher. I can forward the materials I received to whoever should get them.

Jan Werner

>From abider@earthlink.net Sun Oct 18 18:36:59 1998

Received: from swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.123])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id SAA10363 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Oct 1998 18:36:58 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from alvbynsy (sdn-ar-002dewashP278.dialsprint.net [168.191.22.79])

by swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA11086

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Oct 1998 18:36:55 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <000701bdfb02\$e4f1cc40\$4f16bfa8@alvbynsy>
Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: A Poll-Watcher's Guide to Stalking the Elusive Likely Voter
Date: Sun, 18 Oct 1998 21:50:41 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

Had Kagay's clear piece been published a week ago, it would have saved me some flaunting of my ignorance.

Other than for the value of preserving the series, I wonder why these polls retain as mainstay Q's on incumbents vs. challengers the Gallup wording where R's have to disown "your own" to choose the challenger or the Times/CBS wordings which make the choice between the (damning with?) faint praise of "good enough" and the good of "giving new people a chance"?

Kagay's discussion of the questions also leaves me wondering about questions that will allow the situations in districts with open seats to cut more ice in the national totals.

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

From: richard s. halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Sunday, October 18, 1998 3:09 AM
Subject: A Poll-Watcher's Guide to Stalking the Elusive Likely Voter

An excellent article on polling may be found in this Sunday's NY Times:

A Poll-Watcher's Guide to Stalking the Elusive Likely Voter By MICHAEL R. KAGAY

Look at:

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/review/101898polls-voters-review-art.html>

Dick Halpern
Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121
E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

>From TomPellFW@aol.com Sun Oct 18 19:47:05 1998
Received: from imo24.mx.aol.com (imo24.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.68])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id TAA21627 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Oct 1998 19:47:03 -0700
(PDT)
From: TomPellFW@aol.com
Received: from TomPellFW@aol.com
by imo24.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FOAa002341
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 18 Oct 1998 22:46:03 +2000 (EDT)
Message-ID: <f4a79433.362aa7eb@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Oct 1998 22:46:03 EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL for Macintosh sub 189

My newspaper, The Journal Gazette of Fort Wayne, Ind., will publish a sidebar similar to what the Columbus Dispatch does to explain methods in its Sunday, Nov. 1 reporting of the statewide Journal Gazette Poll we conduct. We anticipate two main stories and a sidebar; you can find the material beginning that afternoon at <http://www.jg.net/jg>

Broad information about response rates will be included, although I've never gotten a paragraph quite as detailed as the one Paul Lavrakas shared through my copy desk.

I view the methods sidebar as a means of explaining to readers the "chain of custody" that polling data goes through, from the time we begin to write a questionnaire and select a sample through the articles they are reading in the paper. Those readers who understand what we are talking about are free to judge whether we did our job well (and, therefore, whether to "believe" us). Those who don't understand what we are talking about, we hope, will at least understand that there is a method we are seeking to follow (and, therefore, that we can be "believed").

One point, though -- during the last 15 years, this sidebar has shrunk in size from about 12 to 15 inches to more like 6 or 8 inches. It's hard to explain to senior editors that the public "really needs to know" all the nitty-gritty details. I will, however, keep fighting the good fight.

Tom Pellegrine Jr.
Regional Editor/Director of Survey Research
The Journal Gazette
Fort Wayne, Indiana

P.S. If we in the media spent less time worrying about horse races and more

time explaining to readers why respondents were divided as they were in our samples, the readers would be better informed. -- TJP2.

>From Chun_Y@BLS.GOV Mon Oct 19 05:42:18 1998
Received: from blsmail.bls.gov (dcgate.bls.gov [146.142.4.13])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id FAA01786 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 05:42:17 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov ([146.142.42.8]) by mailgate.bls.gov
(5.x/SMI-SVR4)
id AA06864; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 08:42:06 -0400
Received: by PSBMAILHUB with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
id <VCYKWSAV>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 08:44:23 -0400
Message-Id: <705AF639142AD211BCE500104B6A39891CC9CB@PSBMAIL4>
From: Chun_Y <Chun_Y@BLS.GOV>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: AP - Pollsters recall lessons of 'Dewey Defeats Truman' fiasco
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 08:44:14 -0400
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Several AAPORites appear in the AP clip included in CNN below.
This month is the 50th anniversary of the "Dewey Defeats Truman" =
polling
fiasco.
We humbly admitted our total faults then in public, learned lessons, =
and
are still learning lessons from it.

Young Chun, Behavioral Scientist
Bureau of Labor Statistics

Pollsters recall lessons of 'Dewey Defeats Truman' fiasco=20
AP, Sunday, October 18, 1998
<http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/stories/1998/10/18/pollsters.mistake.ap/>

<Picture: Truman>
Truman holds a newspaper with the infamous 'Dewey Defeats Truman'
headline on November 4, 1948 =A0=20

*Mistake prompted changes -- for the better *Accuracy up, but precision
varies=20

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Political pollsters quite accurately boast of the
reliability of their science, but polling's biggest-ever goof remains
alive 50 years later in a headline seared into America's collective
memory: "Dewey Defeats Truman."=20

Fifty years ago this month, all major polls predicted victory for New

York Gov. Thomas Dewey over Harry Truman, the incumbent president. Reasons for that mistake are still a cause of debate.=20

"I don't think the polls were wrong in terms of measuring national sentiment," said Burns W. "Bud" Roper, retired chairman of Roper Starch Worldwide and son of pioneering pollster Elmo Roper. "Clearly they were wrong in determining the election. I think the 1948 polls were more accurate than the 1948 election."=20

Far from killing the fledgling industry, which had become popular in the 1930s, the pollsters' embarrassing mistake laid the foundation for modern polling techniques. It also offered a valuable reminder that "it ain't over 'til it's over."=20

"We stopped polling a few weeks too soon," said George Gallup Jr., co-chairman of the Gallup organization and son and namesake of another of polling's giants. "We had been lulled into thinking that nothing much changes in the last few weeks of the campaign."=20

The problem was that major pollsters of the day, Elmo Roper, George Gallup and Archibald M. Crossley, cut their teeth on elections involving Franklin D. Roosevelt.=20

"Roosevelt was the issue. People were either for him or against him. The whole thing was built around Roosevelt," said Burns Roper, explaining the approach to polling in presidential elections of 1936, 1940 and 1944.=20

In the 1948 presidential election, there was no Roosevelt, but a field of the two major candidates, as well as Dixiecrat Strom Thurmond and Progressive party candidate Henry Wallace.=20

The polls predicted a Dewey victory of between 5 to 15 percentage points, but Truman won by 4.4 percentage points. The labor vote was energized as Democrats worried about Dewey's strength in pre-election polls, and Republicans felt their candidate would win "so they played golf that day," Roper said.=20

Mistake prompted changes -- for the better

The offspring of the famous pollsters from 1948 remember the days around the election as stressful.=20

Helen Crossley recalls "a very tense household" as her father worried aloud that Truman, who drew increasingly enthusiastic crowds at his pre-election speeches, was gaining momentum.=20

George Gallup Jr. says his father had to visit many newspaper clients after the election to lure them back after 30 canceled their poll

service.=20

Burns Roper said the election came just weeks after the suicide of his brother, and he recalled that he and his father voted for Truman.=20

"It sort of looked like the end of the world," Roper said. "It was the definition of mixed emotions. We saw our man winning, but our company going down the tubes."=20

Roper company officials huddled and came up with an approach for Elmo Roper's next newspaper column: "We were wrong. We couldn't have been more wrong. We're going to find out why."=20

The polling pioneers admitted their mistakes, re-examined their methods and plunged back to work. They moved gradually away from quota = sampling, which questioned a set number of people from different ethnic and age groups, and moved toward random sampling. They extended polling deadlines up until Election Day and developed their ability to predict those likely to come out and vote.=20

"Political polling was nonprobability, and for a number of years they got away with it," says New York pollster Warren Mitofsky, a pioneer of random-digit dialing and the use of extensive telephone sampling 20 years ago. "In 1948, they got burned."=20

Accuracy up, but precision varies

There's never been a comparable election disaster since 1948, when all the major players picked the wrong winner, said Tom W. Smith, director of the general social survey at the National Opinion Research Center in Chicago. The scale of the disaster was such that a panel of scientists analyzed the industry for the Social Science Research Council.=20

Since then, pre-election polls have become far more accurate, although some years are more precise than others. The margin of Ronald Reagan's 1980 victory was underestimated by some pollsters, for example.=20

While the polling industry has made progress in methods of sampling and poll timing, it still has plenty to learn about probability methods and the wording and order of questions, Mitofsky said. "Identifying likely voters is still a mystery to most polling organizations," he said.=20

And a big lesson for pollsters from 1948 still holds true today.=20

"There's a lot of room for humility in polling," Mitofsky said. "Every time you get cocky, you lose."=20

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Oct 19 07:38:17 1998

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id HAA20476 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 07:38:16 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id HAA27021 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 07:38:15 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 07:38:15 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Welcoming a Guy Named Roper
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9810190726130.20128-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

AAPORNETters,

I have just had the distinct pleasure of adding to AAPORNET a newcomer and rising star in the field, one Burns W. Roper, whom I understand is known in some quarters as Bud. If you wish to bother him in ways inappropriate for all of us to read, he's supposedly at broper@capecod.net , which sounds like a fishy E-mail address to me. Bud, since you are among the roughly 900 people reading this, welcome from us all! And what took you so long? And do write us often, please.

-- Jim Beniger

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Mon Oct 19 08:05:24 1998
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.EDU [128.218.6.65])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA26536 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 08:05:20 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by psg.ucsf.EDU with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
id <4R3G5LH1>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 08:11:41 -0700
Message-ID: <1E164712D2DBD111832A00A0C921A21353D536@psg.ucsf.EDU>
From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Attacking methodology
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 08:11:39 -0700
X-Priority: 3
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Leave the Bell Curve controversy out of this. It is true that the methodology of the data collection was entirely correct and appropriate, but the interpretation of results was completely without merit from a scientific standpoint. First and foremost, the IQ test is NOT a test of intelligence but an index for predicting future school performance. That's how it was designed, that's what it was validated for, that's how it is still used. While intelligence plays a part, it is not the entire story. Second, it has been clearly demonstrated that the IQ test depends largely on knowledge of formal English which creates a bias against non-middle class, non-white populations. Third, the analyses were almost

entirely correlational in nature which means that attributions of causality are unwarranted and obtained findings may be explained by other underlying and/or unmeasured factors. To wit, the association between race and IQ disappears when accounting for family income, parents' education, access to programs like Head Start, etc. It was not the methodology of data collection that was assailed, but the validity of the instrument as a measure of intelligence and interpretations of the data that were inappropriate, beyond the scope of the data, and ignored other analyses of the same data that would not support the conclusions of the authors. That was NOT a parallel case and should be excluded from these discussions.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
University of California, San Francisco

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

From: RFunk787@aol.com [SMTP:RFunk787@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, October 16, 1998 1:27 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Attacking methodology

10/16/98

Attacking the methodology of research that produces "unwelcome" or "distasteful" results is nothing new. It is the easiest avenue for an unsympathetic critic to follow (except for, perhaps, attacking the sponsorship). Discrediting research via its methodology relieves the critic of the messy job of confronting the substance of the findings. Methodological principles and procedures, while well-defined and largely agreed-upon, can be complex and subtle, and are often difficult to realize fully in practice (e.g., high response rates). Thus no substantive, nontrivial social research can be so flawlessly designed and conducted as to be totally methodologically unassailable.

Nor is this solely the tactic of rightwing critics of polling. Recall, for example, the methodological trashing by leftish critics of The Bell Curve, which was based on voluminous research conducted over many years whose methodology was no worse, perhaps even better in some instances, than that of more trendy studies with "politically correct" findings whose equally vulnerable methodologies are given a pass by social scientists

sympathetic to
the results. The tactic also is no secret among reviewers of
academic journal
articles.

For that matter, recall the AAPORian attacks on the methodology
of the 1996

Zogby polls -- might they have occurred because outsider Zogby
committed the
affront of producing election forecasts more accurate than those
of more
prominent polling organizations?

Of course, every now and then, faulty methodology really does
call research
findings into question. Shere Hite comes to mind, in this
regard.

Ray Funkhouser

>From Mark@bisconti.com Mon Oct 19 08:15:10 1998

Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id IAA29920 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 08:15:08 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by
medusa.nei.org

(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000254375@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;

Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:13:00 -0400

Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange
Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)

id QY43STSL; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:17:02 -0400

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

id <01BDFB50.A87901E0@mark-bri>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:07:27 -0400

Message-Id: <01BDFB50.A87901E0@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: The Washington Times

Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:07:25 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The Washington Times published extensive articles on polling yesterday =
(10/18/98) and today. Both quite good. Today's article ranks =
pollsters. <http://www.washtimes.com/>

Also today, the editorial writers of The Times are up in arms about a =
NYT/CBS News poll showing "most Americans could not name one =
accomplishment of this Congress this year." The Times advise that "Thus =
does spin become current wisdom." The Times use another poll from a =
couple years ago by The Washington Post, the Kaiser Family Foundation =
and Harvard University showing that Americans have little knowledge of =
political facts, and conclude that "public ignorance results in a belief =

that politicians have no accomplishments," and "The White House does = plenty of spinning of its own-Mr. Clinton doesn't need any help from the = pollsters at the New York Times and CBS. But he's getting that help = anyway. The pollsters ought to be smart enough to know the difference = between opinion and ignorance. In this case they confounded the two by = building a quiz into their poll. Is it too much to ask that pollsters = stick to polling?..." =20

They didn't show the questions, and since I personally don't trust the = editorial page writers of The Washington Times (which I subscribe to and = read daily) to be nonpartisan, I'm not sure if their criticism is = justified. Did CBS/NYT get caught in Clinton's spin cycle?

The Washington Times, in pointing out that citizens are ignorant, didn't = mention that many of these same "ignorant" people vote. Public = ignorance was the main argument by aristocrats who opposed = representative democracy-"citizens will make poor choices because they = don't have their facts straight." Modern day aristocrats and experts = continue to make this argument as they work to cut the public out of = decision-making, and at times I have the impression their voices are = getting louder.

Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com

>From Mark@bisconti.com Mon Oct 19 08:46:52 1998
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA13188 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 08:46:51 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by
medusa.nei.org
(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000254512@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;
Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:44:44 -0400
Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange
Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)
id QY43ST4X; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:48:46 -0400
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
id <01BDFB55.170C0EA0@mark-bri>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:39:11 -0400
Message-Id: <01BDFB55.170C0EA0@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Seeking guidance
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:39:09 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I would like to do a study of civic (non-)involvement and voter = (non-)participation in the District of Columbia.=20

It appears that The District has one of the most cynical populations in = the country and I would like to know what people are thinking and how to =

get people involved locally (so much of the focus here is = national/international) so that more people become informed about local = issues and our little District can succeed in our attempt to rebuild our = limited local self-government, which is now in the hands of a federal = control board.

I do not have funding, and I would like the study to be a grassroots = effort. Therefore, I am investigating the possibility of bringing = together a volunteer team of college students, etc., to conduct citywide = in-person interviews.

I will appreciate any suggestions, guidance, or words of wisdom.

Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com

>From Wei.Yen@ofm.wa.gov Mon Oct 19 09:36:09 1998
Received: from ofm001.OFM.WA.GOV ([198.186.221.239])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA01176 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 09:36:07 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by OFM001 with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
id <VCP1XGVL>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 09:38:44 -0700
Message-ID: <966A8EF58355D211968F00805FEADEAF035FF6@OFM001>
From: "Yen, Wei" <Wei.Yen@ofm.wa.gov>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Use of Medicaid Rolls in Survey Estimation
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 09:38:43 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
Content-Type: text/plain

This message may be cross-posted to some of you. If so, my apology.

I was wondering whether anyone has used administrative Medicaid rolls for purpose of adjusting RDD surveys for the Medicaid population or low income populations? If so, I would very much appreciate it if you can share your experience. A pointer to a study that has used this kind of adjustment is also appreciated. TIA.

Wei Yen
Washington State Office of Financial Management
Tel: (360) 902-0591
Email: wei.yen@ofm.wa.gov

>From lvoigt@fhcrc.org Mon Oct 19 11:38:42 1998
Received: from fhcrc.org (bug1.fhcrc.org [140.107.10.110])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA16290 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:38:41 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from moe.fhcrc.org (moe [140.107.10.42])
by fhcrc.org (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id LAA08197
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:38:35 -0700 (PDT)

Received: by moe.fhrc.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
id <RJS1VF34>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:36:33 -0700
Message-ID: <21C98F2C5C8AD1118AD200805FEACAF07B12CB@moe.fhrc.org>
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@fhrc.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Disclosure Systems
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:36:32 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
Content-Type: text/plain

It is not always easy to get scientific journals to publish all the relevant information about response rates, either. A Lancet editor cut all of the detail that I included about RDD response in an article of mine that was published.

Lynda Voigt
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle

lvoigt@fhrc.org

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

> From: TomPellFW@aol.com [SMTP:TomPellFW@aol.com]

> Sent: Sunday, October 18, 1998 7:46 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems

>

> My newspaper, The Journal Gazette of Fort Wayne, Ind., will publish a
> sidebar

> similar to what the Columbus Dispatch does to explain methods in its

> Sunday,

> Nov. 1 reporting of the statewide Journal Gazette Poll we conduct. We

> anticipate two main stories and a sidebar; you can find the material

> beginning

> that afternoon at <http://www.jg.net/jg>

>

> Broad information about response rates will be included, although I've

> never

> gotten a paragraph quite as detailed as the one Paul Lavrakas shared

> through

> my copy desk.

>

> I view the methods sidebar as a means of explaining to readers the

> "chain of

> custody" that polling data goes through, from the time we begin to

> write a

> questionnaire and select a sample through the articles they are

> reading in the

> paper. Those readers who understand what we are talking about are free

> to

> judge whether we did our job well (and, therefore, whether to

> "believe" us).

> Those who don't understand what we are talking about, we hope, will at

> least
> understand that there is a method we are seeking to follow (and,
> therefore,
> that we can be "believed").
>
> One point, though -- during the last 15 years, this sidebar has shrunk
> in size
> from about 12 to 15 inches to more like 6 or 8 inches. It's hard to
> explain to
> senior editors that the public "really needs to know" all the
> nitty-gritty
> details. I will, however, keep fighting the good fight.
>
> Tom Pellegrine Jr.
> Regional Editor/Director of Survey Research
> The Journal Gazette
> Fort Wayne, Indiana
>
> P.S. If we in the media spent less time worrying about horse races and
> more
> time explaining to readers why respondents were divided as they were
> in our
> samples, the readers would be better informed. -- TJP2.
>From tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu Mon Oct 19 14:41:38 1998
Received: from mhuh2.tc.umn.edu (mhuh2.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.42])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id OAA27395 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 14:41:37 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhuh2.tc.umn.edu; Mon, 19 Oct 1998
16:41:31 -0500
Received: from localhost by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Mon, 19 Oct 98 16:41:30 -0500
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 16:41:30 -0500 (CDT)
From: Phil Tichenor <tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Disclosure Systems
In-Reply-To: <21C98F2C5C8AD1118AD200805FEACAF07B12CB@moe.fhrc.org>
Message-Id: <Pine.SOL.3.96.981019163016.26222A-100000@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Probably many, if not most, publications, would decline to include so much detail. It seems that the fundamental issue, raised specifically by the Arianna Huffington article, is whether such detailed information will be disclosed upon request--whether the request is from another researcher, a reporter, or any interested citizen. If we're not prepared to respond in full to these requests, regardless of the perspectives of the individual making the request, I fear we have a substantial professional problem.

If--and this we don't know yet--the November elections produce a strong Republican gain in Congressional seats, that result will be widely interpreted as a discrediting of the poll findings that repeatedly indicate majorities opposing impeachment and removal of Mr. Clinton. This would in all likelihood be followed by a discussion of polling methodology as a political issue. That might well produce many requests such as those

reported by Huffington.

Phil Tichenor

On Mon, 19 Oct 1998, Voigt, Lynda wrote:

> It is not always easy to get scientific journals to publish all the
> relevant information about response rates, either. A Lancet editor cut
> all of the detail that I included about RDD response in an article of
> mine that was published.

>
> Lynda Voigt
> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
> Seattle

>
> lvoigt@fhcrc.org

>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: TomPellFW@aol.com [SMTP:TomPellFW@aol.com]
>> Sent: Sunday, October 18, 1998 7:46 PM
>> To: aapornet@usc.edu
>> Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems

>>
>> My newspaper, The Journal Gazette of Fort Wayne, Ind., will publish a
>> sidebar
>> similar to what the Columbus Dispatch does to explain methods in its
>> Sunday,
>> Nov. 1 reporting of the statewide Journal Gazette Poll we conduct. We
>> anticipate two main stories and a sidebar; you can find the material
>> beginning
>> that afternoon at <http://www.jg.net/jg>

>>
>> Broad information about response rates will be included, although I've
>> never
>> gotten a paragraph quite as detailed as the one Paul Lavrakas shared
>> through
>> my copy desk.

>>
>> I view the methods sidebar as a means of explaining to readers the
>> "chain of
>> custody" that polling data goes through, from the time we begin to
>> write a
>> questionnaire and select a sample through the articles they are
>> reading in the
>> paper. Those readers who understand what we are talking about are free
>> to
>> judge whether we did our job well (and, therefore, whether to
>> "believe" us).
>> Those who don't understand what we are talking about, we hope, will at
>> least
>> understand that there is a method we are seeking to follow (and,
>> therefore,
>> that we can be "believed").

>>

>> One point, though -- during the last 15 years, this sidebar has shrunk
>> in size
>> from about 12 to 15 inches to more like 6 or 8 inches. It's hard to
>> explain to
>> senior editors that the public "really needs to know" all the
>> nitty-gritty
>> details. I will, however, keep fighting the good fight.
>>
>> Tom Pellegrine Jr.
>> Regional Editor/Director of Survey Research
>> The Journal Gazette
>> Fort Wayne, Indiana
>>
>> P.S. If we in the media spent less time worrying about horse races and
>> more
>> time explaining to readers why respondents were divided as they were
>> in our
>> samples, the readers would be better informed. -- TJP2.
>

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Mon Oct 19 20:27:04 1998
Received: from camel14.mindspring.com (camel14.mindspring.com
[207.69.200.64])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id UAA00909 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 20:27:02 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from default (user-38lc143.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.4.131])
by camel14.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id XAA03091
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 23:27:00 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981019232300.007f0740@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 23:23:00 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: RE: Disclosure Systems

In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.96.981019163016.26222A-100000@maroon.tc.umn.edu>

>

References: <21C98F2C5C8AD1118AD200805FEACAF07B12CB@moe.fhcr.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Phil Tichenor raises a good point. As he implies, if the elections do result in a strong Republican gain, we should be prepared for political fall out in which the credibility of polling will come under sharp attack because of the seeming contradiction between the election outcome and currently expressed public attitudes toward impeachment. Although there have been references to the fact that a low voter turnout could materially affect the election outcome, I think this idea deserves more public attention now, before the election, rather than afterwards as a defense or interpretation after the fact. It would serve polling well to prepare the groundwork beforehand, in case an explanation and/or defense is needed. Hopefully not.

Dick Halpern

Tichenor wrote:

>If--and this we don't know yet--the November elections produce a strong
>Republican gain in Congressional seats, that result will be widely
>interpreted as a discrediting of the poll findings that repeatedly
>indicate majorities opposing impeachment and removal of Mr. Clinton. This
>would in all likelihood be followed by a discussion of polling methodology
>as a political issue. That might well produce many requests such as those
>reported by Huffington.

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Mon Oct 19 21:33:51 1998

Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id VAA07428 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 21:33:47 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plpm3-45.vgernet.net [207.51.117.45])
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id EAA27926
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 04:01:28 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <362C12A4.B34E7A96@jwdp.com>

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 00:33:40 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win98; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: What to expect after the election

References: <21C98F2C5C8AD1118AD200805FEACAF07B12CB@moe.fhrc.org>
<3.0.5.32.19981019232300.007f0740@pop.mindspring.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

There will almost surely be a concerted attack on polling and pollsters following this election unless there is a Democratic gain in the Congress.

House Judiciary Committee chairman Henry Hyde has been quoted as saying that he would consider ANY Republican gain in the election to be a repudiation of the President by the electorate and presumably would use this as evidence that the polls showing popular support for Clinton are wrong.

Former NY Governor Mario Cuomo claims that the sole purpose of this is to set up a false premise that can be exploited by the Republican leadership after the election to discredit the President's poll numbers and justify any actions they want to take against the President. He calls this a "phony" issue, since the Republicans had been projected long before the Lewinsky matter as gaining seats in Congress, if only because the non presidential party nearly always does so in off year elections.

Mr. Cuomo's analysis can be heard

at:<http://www.wamc.org/audio/meandmario/>

Note that such an attack would also have the added attraction for the Republicans of helping to discredit the use of sampling in the 2000 Census.

Jan Werner

richard s. halpern wrote:

>
> Phil Tichenor raises a good point. As he implies, if the elections do
> result in a strong Republican gain, we should be prepared for political
> fall out in which the credibility of polling will come under sharp attack
> because of the seeming contradiction between the election outcome and
> currently expressed public attitudes toward impeachment. Although there
> have been references to the fact that a low voter turnout could materially
> affect the election outcome, I think this idea deserves more public
> attention now, before the election, rather than afterwards as a defense or
> interpretation after the fact. It would serve polling well to prepare the
> groundwork beforehand, in case an explanation and/or defense is needed.
> Hopefully not.
>
> Dick Halpern
>
> Tichenor wrote:
>
>>If--and this we don't know yet--the November elections produce a strong
>>Republican gain in Congressional seats, that result will be widely
>>interpreted as a discrediting of the poll findings that repeatedly
>>indicate majorities opposing impeachment and removal of Mr. Clinton. This
>>would in all likelihood be followed by a discussion of polling
methodology
>>as a political issue. That might well produce many requests such as
those
>>reported by Huffington.
>From daves@startribune.com Tue Oct 20 07:15:38 1998
Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com
[132.148.80.211])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA25325 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 07:15:36 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id JAA16641; Tue, 20 Oct 1998
09:15:06 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by
firewall2.startribune.com via smap (3.2)
id xma016597; Tue, 20 Oct 98 09:15:03 -0500
Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 09:17:58 -0600
Message-Id: <s62c5546.003@mail.startribune.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 08:29:16 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: MN gubernatorial race
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

For those of you with Minnesota connections, you might be interested in =
checking out the most recent Minnesota Poll on the gubernatorial election =
at <http://www.startribune.com>

Cheers.

Rob Daves
Director of Polling and News Research
Star Tribune
Minneapolis MN =20

>From salthaus@uiuc.edu Tue Oct 20 07:51:14 1998

Received: from mx1.cso.uiuc.edu (mx1.cso.uiuc.edu [128.174.5.37])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id HAA03016 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 07:51:13 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from asbestos.spcomm.uiuc.edu (asbestos.spcomm.uiuc.edu
[128.174.166.160])

by mx1.cso.uiuc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id JAA08844
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 09:50:41 -0500 (CDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19981020094820.008e6ba0@staff.uiuc.edu>

X-Sender: salthaus@staff.uiuc.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (32)

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 09:48:20 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Scott Althaus <salthaus@uiuc.edu>

Subject: Re: What to Expect After the Election

In-Reply-To: <199810200704.AAA22609@usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

In light of the ongoing discussion about response rates, the accuracy of opinion polls, and the methodological questions that will inevitably arise if the Republican party picks up Congressional seats, I think it will be helpful to remind inquiring journalists and other interested parties that the midterm loss of Congressional seats by the president's party has been closely scrutinized by political scientists. The findings of this literature should have a bearing on how the election results on November 3rd are interpreted, given current polling results about opinions on the Clinton presidency.

At the risk of being overly reductive, my reading of the political science literature on midterm loss suggests two important conclusions to bear in mind when interpreting aggregate midterm election results as an expression of public opinion. The first conclusion is that the phenomenon of midterm loss, in the words of noted political scientist Robert Erikson, "is more than a mere tendency. Midterm loss is an almost invariable historical regularity." In other words, we should be greatly surprised if the Democrats hold their ground in the House and Senate elections this year. No matter

which party is in power, no matter how popular or despised the president, no matter the shape of the economy, the presidential party nearly always suffers a loss of Congressional seats in midterm elections.

The second conclusion from the literature on midterm loss is that no one is sure precisely why it happens or what it means. In a famous 1960 article, Angus Campbell described the phenomenon as "surge and decline" and attributed midterm loss to the fact that elections in presidential election years tend to overmobilize partisans from the president's party relative to midterm election years. In this view, the loss of seats in midterm elections stems from the "regression to the mean" caused by withdrawn presidential coattails. In a 1975 article, Edward Tufte suggested an alternative explanation by concluding that the phenomenon reflected a referendum on the presidency.

The interpretations of Campbell and Tufte (and others) have been hotly contested in recent years, and in the end readers of this literature are left with the distinct impression that specific meaning to the midterm loss phenomenon is almost impossible to divine. In this light, a 1988 article by Robert Erikson concluded that in contrast to the views of Campbell and Tufte and others, the midterm loss phenomenon best could be understood as an indiscriminant penalty against the party controlling the presidency that has no specific evaluative meaning.

For what it's worth, my reading of this literature leaves me persuaded by Erikson's view. At any rate, the upshot is that the election results should not be taken as a referendum on the Clinton presidency, despite the fact that both national parties want to insist that a small loss by the Democrats is a vote of confidence for Clinton while a big loss by the Democrats is a vote against Clinton. Such an interpretation is not consistent with the empirical findings on midterm loss, which suggest that the picture is much more complicated than the national parties want to suggest. For those of you who are interested in exploring this topic further, here are a few recent articles on the topic that together summarize the points of view in this debate:

Born, Richard. 1990. "Surge and Decline, Negative Voting, and the Midterm Loss Phenomenon." *American Journal of Political Science* 34(3):61-645. [supports the surge and decline hypothesis]

Campbell, James. 1991. "The Presidential Surge and Its Midterm Decline in Congressional Elections, 1968-1988." *Journal of Politics* 53(2): 477-487. [supports midterm loss as an evaluation of the incumbent administration's performance]

Erikson, Robert. 1988. "The Puzzle of Midterm Loss." *Journal of Politics* 50(4): 1011-1029. [proposes presidential penalty interpretation, where midterm loss is not related to evaluation but represents a penalty for being the party in power]

Chappell, Henry, and Motoshi Suzuki. 1993. "Aggregate Vote Functions for the U.S. Presidency, Senate, and House." *Journal of Politics* 55(1): 207-217. [finds evidence in support of several interpretations, particularly for Erikson's incumbent penalty hypothesis]

These are straight-forward questions without any qualifiers such as "if Congress determines that Bill Clinton committed perjury..."

By grouping people who said "yes" to either the impeachment or resignation question and those who said "no" to both (no opinions excluded) the results are:

Yes (to either)	40%
No (to both)	60

Also, out of the 63% who approve, 17% (1 in 6) said yes to either the impeachment or resignation question.

Another interesting crosstab of those who want either impeachment or resignation is by region. East 30%, Midwest 40%, South 46%, West 43%.

Rob Persons

Rob Persons

The Roper Center

rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu

ph: (860) 486-4440

fax:(860) 486-6308

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Tue Oct 20 08:01:07 1998

Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.EDU [128.218.6.65])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id IAA05984 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 08:00:48 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by psg.ucsf.EDU with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

id <4R3G5NVP>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 08:07:08 -0700

Message-ID: <1E164712D2DBD111832A00A0C921A21353D538@psg.ucsf.EDU>

From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Disclosure Systems

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 08:07:07 -0700

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Polling experts need to be more straightforward in their responses to these kinds of charges. First, as mentioned previously, the party of the president typically loses ground in mid-term elections. This has happened to Democrats and Republicans alike, to popular presidents and unpopular ones. Have historical numbers ready to back up your contention.

Second, Clinton is not on the ballot and not running for office. Therefore it is not inconsistent that people want him to stay in office but do not vote for candidates from his party. This is not a parliamentary system. The president is not a member of the legislature. The only true referendum on Clinton would be a presidential election and this isn't one.

Third, despite low approval ratings for Congress, it is not exactly unusual for voters to simultaneously have high approval ratings for their own representatives and senators. It is always somebody else's rep who is creating the problem. This is an extension of the proposition that my rep brings good, honest, needed federal dollars into my district/state, but the money for everybody else is strictly pork.

Fourth, a national poll asking which party's candidate for Congress a person will vote for cannot possibly predict outcomes of individual races for Congress. My understanding is that amalgamating information from polls looking at individual races currently predict gains in the House and the Senate for the Republicans. One might ask the conservative critics if these polls are also lies.

The theme here seems to be, once again, that interpretations of poll results are being "spun" beyond the scope and specificity of the actual polling questions. There is a significant "disconnect" between the president's performance ratings and poll numbers for races not involving the president. There is a significant "disconnect" between approval ratings for Congress and poll numbers for individual Congressional races. This has always been true. Be forthright, be specific, be scientific without being jargony, and always, always, always have numbers (current and historical) to back your claims.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
University of California, San Francisco

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

From: richard s. halpern [SMTP:rshalpern@mindspring.com]

Sent: Monday, October 19, 1998 8:23 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: Disclosure Systems

Phil Tichenor raises a good point. As he implies, if the elections do result in a strong Republican gain, we should be prepared for political fall out in which the credibility of polling will come under sharp attack because of the seeming contradiction between the election outcome and currently expressed public attitudes toward impeachment. Although there have been references to the fact that a low voter turnout could materially affect the election outcome, I think this idea deserves more public

attention now, before the election, rather than afterwards as a defense or interpretation after the fact. It would serve polling well to prepare the groundwork beforehand, in case an explanation and/or defense is needed.

Hopefully not.

Dick Halpern

Tichenor wrote:

>If--and this we don't know yet--the November elections produce a strong

>Republican gain in Congressional seats, that result will be widely

>interpreted as a discrediting of the poll findings that repeatedly

>indicate majorities opposing impeachment and removal of Mr. Clinton. This

>would in all likelihood be followed by a discussion of polling methodology

>as a political issue. That might well produce many requests such as those

>reported by Huffington.

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Tue Oct 20 08:37:58 1998

Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id IAA14331 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 08:37:57 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])

by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA17125

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 11:37:57 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19981020153756.00b7b5d0@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 11:37:56 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: What to Expect After the Election

I'd like to add a point to Scott Althaus' posting on thinking about midterm election results:

We all will have the VNS exit poll data that will tell us **why** voters voted as they did, whether it was to repudiate Clinton or repudiate the Republican Congress or both of these reasons or neither. Thus, it won't merely be left to the spin doctors on from both parties or the nonempirical pundits to frame the meaning of the November 3 electorate's behavior.

To my mind, this is a great service that VNS's media funders provide the nation.

* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
* Professor of Journalism & Communication *
* Professor of Public Policy & Management *
* 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 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu *

>From SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu Tue Oct 20 08:58:12 1998
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id IAA20560 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 08:57:58 -0700
(PDT)

Received: by UConnVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id
0433 ; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 11:56:02 EDT
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UConnVM) by
UConnVM.UConn.EDU (LMail V1.2c/1.8c) with BSMTP id 4903; Tue, 20 Oct 1998
11:56:03 -0400
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 98 11:54:24 EDT
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
Subject: Re: What to Expect After the Election
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
In-Reply-To: <2.2.32.19981020153756.00b7b5d0@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000
Message-Id: <981020.115602.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Paul makes a VERY good point about the exit polls. Unfortunately, the media's record of using these data, as opposed to simply asking pundits "what does it mean" is not especially good. We as individuals more likely than most to be asked interpretative questions after November 3 have a special responsibility to take such sources of data into account when framing our own answers.

>From mb@mori-usa.com Tue Oct 20 08:59:37 1998
Received: from dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA21336 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 08:59:35 -0700
(PDT)

Received: (from smap@localhost)
by dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com (8.8.4/8.8.4)
id KAA27298 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 10:58:54 -0500
(CDT)

Received: from pen-nj1-10.ix.netcom.com(205.184.179.42) by
dfw-ix2.ix.netcom.com via smap (V1.3)
id rma027188; Tue Oct 20 10:58:15 1998
Message-ID: <000401bdfc42\$bc84c1e0\$2ab3b8cd@mbasanez.ix.netcom.com>
Reply-To: "Miguel Basanez" <mb@mori-usa.com>

From: "Miguel Basanez" <mb@mori-usa.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 09:44:31 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

One possible way is to forecast elections' outcome at different levels of voters turnout. It should help to be more accurate. The presidential election of Mexico in 1994 is a good example.

Dr. Miguel Basanez
MORI-USA, President
e-mail: mb@mori-usa.com

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

From: richard s. halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Monday, October 19, 1998 11:12 PM
Subject: RE: Disclosure Systems

>Phil Tichenor raises a good point. As he implies, if the elections do
>result in a strong Republican gain, we should be prepared for political
>fall out in which the credibility of polling will come under sharp attack
>because of the seeming contradiction between the election outcome and
>currently expressed public attitudes toward impeachment. Although there
>have been references to the fact that a low voter turnout could materially
>affect the election outcome, I think this idea deserves more public
>attention now, before the election, rather than afterwards as a defense or
>interpretation after the fact. It would serve polling well to prepare the
>groundwork beforehand, in case an explanation and/or defense is needed.
>Hopefully not.
>
>Dick Halpern

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Tue Oct 20 09:10:59 1998
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.170])
 by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
 id JAA25664 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 09:10:57 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)
 by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id MAA17000
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 12:11:36 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 12:11:36 -0400 (EDT)
From: Andrew Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Sender: andy@troll

To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Mid-Term Losses
In-Reply-To: <1E164712D2DBD111832A00A0C921A21353D538@psg.ucsf.EDU>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.96.981020120633.16914D-100000@troll>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear All:

The New York Times had an article on Sunday about losses in lame duck mid-term elections. It shows that there are virtually always losses. I think it already has had some effect re: Sunday Talk Shows.

My wife also reminded me that when Al Franken introduced Arianna Huffington in the Strange Bedfellows segment on the Comedy Central's Indecision 96, he introduced her as:

"The beautiful but evil, Arianna Huffington."

She was never able to make much of a comeback.

Andy Beveridge

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Oct 20 09:21:57 1998
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA28710 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 09:21:54 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (plp27.vgernet.net [205.219.186.127])
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id PAA18116
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 15:50:08 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <362CB893.292CEA6@jwdp.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 12:21:39 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win98; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: What to Expect After the Election
References: <2.2.32.19981020153756.00b7b5d0@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. wrote:

>
> We all will have the VNS exit poll data that will tell us *why* voters
voted
> as they did, whether it was to repudiate Clinton or repudiate the
Republican
> Congress or both of these reasons or neither. Thus, it won't merely be
left
> to the spin doctors on from both parties or the nonempirical pundits to

> frame the meaning of the November 3 electorate's behavior.

The VNS exit poll is still a poll, the only difference being that it is used to explain what has just happened, rather than to predict what is likely to happen. Therefore, you should certainly expect that any arguments advanced by opponents of polling will be applied equally to exit polls if the results are not those desired.

The message being promoted by the Republicans here is not that the Democrats are faking poll data to promote their cause, but that sample surveys are inherently misleading and inaccurate and should not be used to base decisions on. I have no illusion about Democratic politicians being any more enlightened on this subject, they just happen to be the ones whose cause benefits from poll data at this time.

Jan Werner

>From Mark@bisconti.com Tue Oct 20 10:59:06 1998

Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id KAA00025 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 10:59:03 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by medusa.nei.org

(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000256814@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Tue, 20 Oct 1998 13:56:49 -0400

Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)

id QY43SVSZ; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 14:00:47 -0400

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

id <01BDFC30.B3E067E0@mark-bri>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 13:51:14 -0400

Message-Id: <01BDFC30.B3E067E0@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: German election/focus gps.

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 13:51:12 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Does anyone know what "research tools" were used by the SD Party in = helping to win the recent election? Does anyone know if Schroeder used = focus groups to help craft their campaign messages, as did Clinton and = Blair. Are focus groups being used worldwide, or are the mainly used in = Anglo countries?

Mark@bisconti.com

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Tue Oct 20 16:15:50 1998

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.10])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id QAA15207 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 16:15:37 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from garnet2.acns.fsu.edu (garnet2.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.3])

by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id TAA42084

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 19:14:32 -0400

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial110.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.32.110])

by garnet2.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id TAA35494

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 19:14:31 -0400

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 19:14:31 -0400

Message-Id: <199810202314.TAA35494@garnet2.acns.fsu.edu>

X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>

Subject: Re: surveys of jurors

Does anyone have references to studies of either (1) juror attitudes [jury pool members]--toward anything, but ESPECIALLY toward jury service or (2) attitudes of any other groups, but certainly general public samples if available, toward jury service. We are especially interested in local, state, regional, or national United States or Great Britain studies/samples but willing to scout down other, international research.

I will compile a list to make available to any interested AAPOR-netter.

Thanks very much,

Susan Losh

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh

Department of Sociology

Florida State University

Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-644-1753 Office

850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

FAX 850-644-6208

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Tue Oct 20 18:07:33 1998

Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id SAA19712 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 18:07:32 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from rachel (tr-ppp16.monmouth.com [209.191.24.48]) by

shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id VAA04830 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 21:07:05 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <362D34EF.5A4F@monmouth.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 21:12:15 -0400
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: [Fwd: Faculty and Fellowship Opportunities - University of
Pennsylvania]
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.5]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with ESMTP id SAA27901 for
<rhickson@monmouth.com>; Tue, 13 Oct 1998 18:33:45 -0400 (EDT)
From: JOYQUILL@aol.com
Received: from JOYQUILL@aol.com
by imo15.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id GSNSa17800;
Tue, 13 Oct 1998 18:22:15 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <8354fdb3.3623d297@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 18:22:15 EDT
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Faculty and Fellowship Opportunities - University of Pennsylvania
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214
X-UIDL: 8e636f5f2439cf7fb3475142ca0749bf
X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

A communication from:

=09Joy Quill, Principal
=09Management Evaluation Training, LLC
=09Annapolis MD 21403
=09Email: JoyQuill@aol.com

The following is brought to you courtesy of the Washington Evaluators and =
the
Eastern Evaluation Research Society.

POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP OPPORTUNITY
"Services System Research in Mental Health and Substance Abuse"

Center for Mental Health Policy and Services Research
Department of Psychiatry
University of Pennsylvania

CMHPSR, a program of the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics,
invites applications for one- and two-year post-doctoral research
fellowships. The program provides an excellent opportunity for social
scientists to improve their knowledge of mental health systems and
gain experience in applying qualitative and quantitative research

methods to the evaluation of mental health systems. Services system research involves the study of the organization, financing, delivery and outcomes of care in the context of a changing relationship between the private and public sectors. The research focuses on vulnerable populations such as persons with serious mental illness and substance abuse problems.

Post-Doctoral positions are available in the following areas: =B7 Epidemiology of Mental Illness =B7 Managed Behavioral Care =B7 Evaluation of Innovative Programs =B7 Services for Geriatric Populations =B7 Vocational Rehabilitation =B7 Cost Effectiveness and Pharmaco-economic Studies.

The Center seeks applications from persons with a Ph.D., M.D., or equivalent doctoral degree and a strong commitment to a career in mental health services research. Past applicants have come from both qualitative and quantitative backgrounds in disciplines such as anthropology, demography, social welfare policy, health administration, clinical and community psychology, etc. Applications are accepted throughout the year. Both recent graduates as well as those seeking to enhance their skills in new areas are welcome to apply. Stipends vary with experience.

For further information, view our web site at <http://www.med.upenn.edu/cmhpsr/>, or contact:

Dr. Aileen Rothbard
Center for Mental Health Policy and Services Research
University of Pennsylvania
3600 Market Street, Room 713
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2648
e-mail: abr@cmhpsr.upenn.edu
(215) 349-8707
fax (215) 349-8715

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY:

The Center for Mental Health Policy and Services Research is recruiting a (several) faculty position (s) at the Research Assistant/Associate Professor level. The Center, which is the mental health program of the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics, does research in the organization, financing, delivery and outcomes of care for vulnerable populations such as persons with serious mental illness and substance abuse problems.

Qualified candidates should have Ph.D. or equivalent degree in psychology, sociology, social work, or a related social science field.

Publications background required. Experience writing grants preferred. Send curriculum vitae and cover letter to: Trevor R. Hadley, Ph.D., c/o Ava Plotnick, Department of Psychiatry, 305 Blockley Hall, 418 Guardian Drive, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6021. An Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action Employer

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Tue Oct 20 18:08:08 1998
Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id SAA19849 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 18:08:07 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from rachel (tr-ppp16.monmouth.com [209.191.24.48]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id VAA05544 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 21:07:42 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <362D3513.5CB0@monmouth.com>

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 21:12:51 -0400

From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: [Fwd: Job Opportunity - Washington DC area]

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from imo13.mx.aol.com (imo13.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.3]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with ESMTP id NAA19998 for
<rhickson@monmouth.com>; Sun, 18 Oct 1998 13:26:16 -0400 (EDT)

From: JOYQUILL@aol.com

Received: from JOYQUILL@aol.com

by imo13.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id GNJJa13873;

Sun, 18 Oct 1998 09:42:52 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <c6f8671e.3629f05c@aol.com>

Date: Sun, 18 Oct 1998 09:42:52 EDT

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: Job Opportunity - Washington DC area

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214

X-UIDL: ae8413dfdca5f05b32b6d8dafa129033

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

A communication from:

Joy Quill, Principal
Management Evaluation Training, LLC
Annapolis MD 21403
Email: JoyQuill@aol.com

The following is brought to you courtesy of the Washington Evaluators and
the

Eastern Evaluation Research Society.

Health Care Consulting firm seeks a Project Director to direct a
national evaluation of a Federally funded grant program.
Responsibilities include providing technical oversight, project team
management, supervising and coordinating staff activities, maintaining

ongoing communication with Federal, State, and local officials and overseeing time lines and budgets. The ideal candidate should have superb oral and written skills, an advanced degree in social science research, evaluation research, public health or related discipline; experience working with Federal and/or community substance abuse treatment agencies; knowledge of evaluation methodologies for substance abuse treatment programs; and experience conducting cross-site evaluations, developing, implementing, and supporting national data collection efforts.

Submit resume to Birch & Davis Associates, Inc., Human Resources Director (DA), 8905 Fairview Road, Suite 200, Silver Spring, MD 20910

or

fax to Human Resources/DA at (301) 650-0299. Competitive salary and benefits. For more information about B&D, browse our home page at <http://www.birchdavis.com> EOE

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Tue Oct 20 18:08:39 1998
Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id SAA19973 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 18:08:37 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from rachel (tr-ppp16.monmouth.com [209.191.24.48]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id VAA06102 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 20 Oct 1998 21:08:11 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <362D3531.7C45@monmouth.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 21:13:21 -0400
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: [Fwd: Job Opportunities - Prospect Associates, Silver Spring MD]
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from imo20.mx.aol.com (imo20.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.10]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with ESMTP id LAA08410 for
<rhickson@monmouth.com>; Mon, 19 Oct 1998 11:06:12 -0400 (EDT)
From: JOYQUILL@aol.com

Received: from JOYQUILL@aol.com
by imo20.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id GHYZa03786;
Mon, 19 Oct 1998 10:52:41 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <c1bb5cdb.362b5239@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 10:52:41 EDT
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Job Opportunities - Prospect Associates, Silver Spring MD
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214
X-UIDL: d3dae74500ec4b6eb1b79d12bacc6953
X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Prospect Associates, a dynamic health sciences research and communications firm located in Silver Spring, Maryland, has two opportunities which are available immediately.

1. Program Evaluation Manager

This position requires an individual with strong quantitative skills to provide technical direction on health-related program evaluations. Requirements: Master's degree or greater in social sciences or public health; 5-10 years of relevant experience in conducting, designing, and managing evaluation of large-scale, multi-site behavior change interventions; managing analysts, programmers, and other professional staff; designing data collection instruments; identifying statistical methods and supervising analysts and programmers in the conduct of data analysis using statistical software; managing databases; scientific and technical writing and editing; presenting results at professional conferences and meetings, as well as to clients and internal audiences; working in and managing interdisciplinary teams on multiple projects; assisting in development of new business, including proposal preparation. Full-time required.

2. Senior Program Evaluation Associate:

This position requires strong quantitative skills and experience in conducting health-related program evaluations. Requirements: Master's degree or greater in social sciences or public health; 3-5 years of relevant experience in conducting and managing evaluation research to assess behavior change interventions; designing data collection instruments; identifying statistical methods and conducting data analysis using statistical software; managing databases; programming skills in ACCESS, SAS, and SPSS; scientific and technical writing and editing; presenting results to clients and internal audiences; working in interdisciplinary teams and on multiple projects. Full or part-time flexibility.

To apply for either position, please forward resume to:

Director of Research
Prospect Associates
10720 Columbia Pike
Silver Spring, MD 20901

>From worc@mori.com Wed Oct 21 00:58:12 1998
Received: from post.mail.demon.net (post-20.mail.demon.net [194.217.242.27])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id AAA25513 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Oct 1998 00:58:11 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [194.222.4.107] (helo=worc.demon.co.uk)
by post.mail.demon.net with esmtp (Exim 2.05demon1 #1)
id 0zVt9k-0004Vs-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 21 Oct 1998 07:58:08 +0000
From: "Robert M Worcester" <worc@mori.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems
Date: Wed, 21 Oct 1998 07:51:26 +0100
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Priority: 3
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1155
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Message-Id: <E0zVt9k-0004Vs-00@post.mail.demon.net>

Dear Colleagues:

More than twenty years ago we decided to make such disclosure part of our legal Terms and Conditions of Contract with our clients. These Terms were put forward by the Market Research Society in Great Britain as a model for adoption by all companies in the UK undertaking polls for the media, or 'advocacy' polls which were designed to be released to the media. In our polls for the Times (of London), The Economist, Mail on Sunday, Reader's Digest, etc., the specified details are invariably included. We occasionally have more trouble getting the TV to include them, but this is as much to do with changing personnel as reluctance with the principle.

I offer them to you for your consideration.

Robert Worcester

Extracted verbatim from the 1998 Terms & Conditions of Contract of Market & Opinion Research International (MORI):

IN THE CASE OF SURVEYS INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION, WHETHER IN PRINT OR BROADCAST MEDIA, THE FOLLOWING TERMS AND CONDITIONS SHALL APPLY.

In accordance with the Market Research Society Code of Conduct:

19. Every published report or broadcast of the poll findings should give: sampling method used, sample size, dates of fieldwork, number of sampling points

20. MORI will, on request, make available to a reasonable number of journalists, academics, students, other polling organisations, other interested parties and the political parties, the following additional information:

- a) the number and type of sampling areas
- b) other details of sample design, such as stratification, clustering and success rates
- c) composition of sample
- d) the question wording used
- e) description of the method used to collect the information (eg personal interview, postal questionnaire)
- f) details of statistical weighting, if any

21. Where data are to be used by other parties, subject to client's approval, MORI will endeavour to ensure that the client is credited for the survey which will be described as "a poll conducted by MORI for.....(client)"

22. Where data from a private poll are leaked to the media either by a client or by a third party, MORI reserves the right to clarify/correct any misleading or incorrect impressions and to provide the details referred to at paragraphs 19 and 20.

23. Once the data have been published by the client, MORI reserves the right to give the results to other parties, subject to the client's approval, and normally data tapes for political polls will be lodged at the ESRC archives.

24. When results are published/broadcast outside the client's organisation, in order to ensure that these conditions are adhered to, MORI reserves the right to maintain editorial control over the figures and graphics to be used and the copy must be cleared with MORI beforehand and must not subsequently be altered. Headlines must reasonably reflect the findings.

25. In any reference in any publication or broadcast it must be identified as a "MORI poll".

FOR POLITICAL OPINION POLLS INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION IN PRINT OR BROADCAST MEDIA, THE FOLLOWING SHALL ALSO APPLY:

26. Where in reply to questions on voting intention, there are abnormal levels or sharp changes in the manner of those who say they would not vote or who are undecided, these facts should be reported.

27. The results of the questions on voting intention in the final week of an election campaign are not to be published unless these results are based on a sample size of not less than 1,000 respondents.

> From: Phil Tichenor <tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>

> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'

> Subject: RE: Disclosure Systems

> Date: 19 October 1998 22:41

>

> Probably many, if not most, publications, would decline to include so much

> detail. It seems that the fundamental issue, raised specifically by the

> Arianna Huffington article, is whether such detailed information will be

> disclosed upon request--whether the request is from another researcher, a

> reporter, or any interested citizen. If we're not prepared to respond in

> full to these requests, regardless of the perspectives of the individual

> making the request, I fear we have a substantial professional problem.

>

> If--and this we don't know yet--the November elections produce a strong
> Republican gain in Congressional seats, that result will be widely
> interpreted as a discrediting of the poll findings that repeatedly
> indicate majorities opposing impeachment and removal of Mr. Clinton. This
> would in all likelihood be followed by a discussion of polling
methodology
> as a political issue. That might well produce many requests such as
those
> reported by Huffington.

> Phil Tichenor

> On Mon, 19 Oct 1998, Voigt, Lynda wrote:

>> It is not always easy to get scientific journals to publish all the
>> relevant information about response rates, either. A Lancet editor cut
>> all of the detail that I included about RDD response in an article of
>> mine that was published.

>> Lynda Voigt

>> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

>> Seattle

>> lvoigt@fhcrc.org

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

>>> From: TomPellFW@aol.com [SMTP:TomPellFW@aol.com]

>>> Sent: Sunday, October 18, 1998 7:46 PM

>>> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>>> Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems

>>> My newspaper, The Journal Gazette of Fort Wayne, Ind., will publish a
>>> sidebar

>>> similar to what the Columbus Dispatch does to explain methods in its
>>> Sunday,

>>> Nov. 1 reporting of the statewide Journal Gazette Poll we conduct. We

>>> anticipate two main stories and a sidebar; you can find the material

>>> beginning

>>> that afternoon at <http://www.jg.net/jg>

>>> Broad information about response rates will be included, although
I've

>>> never

>>> gotten a paragraph quite as detailed as the one Paul Lavrakas shared

>>> through

>>> my copy desk.

>>> I view the methods sidebar as a means of explaining to readers the

>>> "chain of

>>> custody" that polling data goes through, from the time we begin to

>>> write a

>>> questionnaire and select a sample through the articles they are

>>> reading in the

>>> paper. Those readers who understand what we are talking about are

free
>>> to
>>> judge whether we did our job well (and, therefore, whether to
>>> "believe" us).
>>> Those who don't understand what we are talking about, we hope, will
at
>>> least
>>> understand that there is a method we are seeking to follow (and,
>>> therefore,
>>> that we can be "believed").
>>>
>>> One point, though -- during the last 15 years, this sidebar has
shrunk
>>> in size
>>> from about 12 to 15 inches to more like 6 or 8 inches. It's hard to
>>> explain to
>>> senior editors that the public "really needs to know" all the
>>> nitty-gritty
>>> details. I will, however, keep fighting the good fight.
>>>
>>> Tom Pellegrine Jr.
>>> Regional Editor/Director of Survey Research
>>> The Journal Gazette
>>> Fort Wayne, Indiana
>>>
>>> P.S. If we in the media spent less time worrying about horse races
and
>>> more
>>> time explaining to readers why respondents were divided as they were
>>> in our
>>> samples, the readers would be better informed. -- TJP2.
>>

>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Wed Oct 21 13:57:45 1998
Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu (bones.asic.csuohio.edu
[137.148.16.17])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA24700 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 21 Oct 1998 13:57:29 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from myhost.csuohio.edu (137.148.59.28) by mail.asic.csuohio.edu
with SMTP (MailShare 1.0fc6); Wed, 21 Oct 1998 16:56:56 -0400
X-Sender: s.kraus@bones.asic.csuohio.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Dr. Sidney Kraus" <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>
Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems
Date: Wed, 21 Oct 1998 16:56:56 -0400
Message-ID: <1303133480-119144@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

How does MORI deal with the issue of non-response rate, or did I miss it in
your discussion?

At 07:51 AM 10/21/98 +0100, you wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>More than twenty years ago we decided to make such disclosure part of our
>legal Terms and Conditions of Contract with our clients. These Terms were
>put forward by the Market Research Society in Great Britain as a model for
>adoption by all companies in the UK undertaking polls for the media, or
>'advocacy' polls which were designed to be released to the media. In our
>polls for the Times (of London), The Economist, Mail on Sunday, Reader's
>Digest, etc., the specified details are invariably included. We
>occasionally have more trouble getting the TV to include them, but this is
>as much to do with changing personnel as reluctance with the principle.

>

>I offer them to you for your consideration.

>

>Robert Worcester

>

>Extracted verbatim from the 1998 Terms & Conditions of Contract of Market &
>Opinion Research International (MORI):

>

> IN THE CASE OF SURVEYS INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION, WHETHER IN PRINT OR
>BROADCAST MEDIA, THE FOLLOWING TERMS AND CONDITIONS SHALL APPLY.

>

> In accordance with the Market Research Society Code of Conduct:

>

>19. Every published report or broadcast of the poll findings should give:
>sampling method used, sample size, dates of fieldwork, number of sampling
>points

>

>20. MORI will, on request, make available to a reasonable number of
>journalists, academics, students, other polling organisations, other
>interested parties and the political parties, the following additional
>information:

>

> a) the number and type of sampling areas
> b) other details of sample design, such as stratification,
clustering and

>success rates

> c) composition of sample

> d) the question wording used

> e) description of the method used to collect the information (eg
personal

>interview, postal questionnaire)

> f) details of statistical weighting, if any

>

>21. Where data are to be used by other parties, subject to client's
>approval, MORI will endeavour to ensure that the client is credited for the
>survey which will be described as "a poll conducted by MORI
>for.....(client)"

>

>22. Where data from a private poll are leaked to the media either by a
>client or by a third party, MORI reserves the right to clarify/correct any
>misleading or incorrect impressions and to provide the details referred to

>at paragraphs 19 and 20.

>

>23. Once the data have been published by the client, MORI reserves the
>right to give the results to other parties, subject to the client's
>approval, and normally data tapes for political polls will be lodged at the
>ESRC archives.

>

>24. When results are published/broadcast outside the client's
organisation,

>in order to ensure that these conditions are adhered to, MORI reserves the
>right to maintain editorial control over the figures and graphics to be
>used and the copy must be cleared with MORI beforehand and must not
>subsequently be altered. Headlines must reasonably reflect the findings.

>

>25. In any reference in any publication or broadcast it must be identified
>as a "MORI poll".

>

> FOR POLITICAL OPINION POLLS INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION IN PRINT OR
BROADCAST

>MEDIA, THE FOLLOWING SHALL ALSO APPLY:

>

>26. Where in reply to questions on voting intention, there are abnormal
>levels or sharp changes in the manner of those who say they would not vote
>or who are undecided, these facts should be reported.

>

>27. The results of the questions on voting intention in the final week of
>an election campaign are not to be published unless these results are based
>on a sample size of not less than 1,000 respondents.

>

>

>-----

>> From: Phil Tichenor <tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>

>> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'

>> Subject: RE: Disclosure Systems

>> Date: 19 October 1998 22:41

>>

>> Probably many, if not most, publications, would decline to include so
>>much

>> detail. It seems that the fundamental issue, raised specifically by the
>> Arianna Huffington article, is whether such detailed information will be
>> disclosed upon request--whether the request is from another researcher, a
>> reporter, or any interested citizen. If we're not prepared to respond in
>> full to these requests, regardless of the perspectives of the individual
>> making the request, I fear we have a substantial professional problem.

>>

>> If--and this we don't know yet--the November elections produce a strong
>> Republican gain in Congressional seats, that result will be widely
>> interpreted as a discrediting of the poll findings that repeatedly
>> indicate majorities opposing impeachment and removal of Mr. Clinton. This
>> would in all likelihood be followed by a discussion of polling

>>methodology

>> as a political issue. That might well produce many requests such as

>>those

>> reported by Huffington.

>>
>> Phil Tichenor
>>
>> On Mon, 19 Oct 1998, Voigt, Lynda wrote:
>>
>>> It is not always easy to get scientific journals to publish all the
>>> relevant information about response rates, either. A Lancet editor cut
>>> all of the detail that I included about RDD response in an article of
>>> mine that was published.
>>>
>>> Lynda Voigt
>>> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
>>> Seattle
>>>
>>> lvoigt@fhcrc.org
>>>
>>>> -----Original Message-----
>>>> From: TomPellFW@aol.com [SMTP:TomPellFW@aol.com]
>>>> Sent: Sunday, October 18, 1998 7:46 PM
>>>> To: aapornet@usc.edu
>>>> Subject: Re: Disclosure Systems
>>>>
>>>> My newspaper, The Journal Gazette of Fort Wayne, Ind., will publish a
>>>> sidebar
>>>> similar to what the Columbus Dispatch does to explain methods in its
>>>> Sunday,
>>>> Nov. 1 reporting of the statewide Journal Gazette Poll we conduct. We
>>>> anticipate two main stories and a sidebar; you can find the material
>>>> beginning
>>>> that afternoon at <http://www.jg.net/jg>
>>>>
>>>> Broad information about response rates will be included, although
>>>> I've
>>>> never
>>>> gotten a paragraph quite as detailed as the one Paul Lavrakas shared
>>>> through
>>>> my copy desk.
>>>>
>>>> I view the methods sidebar as a means of explaining to readers the
>>>> "chain of
>>>> custody" that polling data goes through, from the time we begin to
>>>> write a
>>>> questionnaire and select a sample through the articles they are
>>>> reading in the
>>>> paper. Those readers who understand what we are talking about are
>>>> free
>>>> to
>>>> judge whether we did our job well (and, therefore, whether to
>>>> "believe" us).
>>>> Those who don't understand what we are talking about, we hope, will
>>>> at
>>>> least
>>>> understand that there is a method we are seeking to follow (and,
>>>> therefore,

>>>> that we can be "believed").
>>>>
>>>> One point, though -- during the last 15 years, this sidebar has
>shrunk
>>>> in size
>>>> from about 12 to 15 inches to more like 6 or 8 inches. It's hard to
>>>> explain to
>>>> senior editors that the public "really needs to know" all the
>>>> nitty-gritty
>>>> details. I will, however, keep fighting the good fight.
>>>>
>>>> Tom Pellegrine Jr.
>>>> Regional Editor/Director of Survey Research
>>>> The Journal Gazette
>>>> Fort Wayne, Indiana
>>>>
>>>> P.S. If we in the media spent less time worrying about horse races
>and
>>>> more
>>>> time explaining to readers why respondents were divided as they were
>>>> in our
>>>> samples, the readers would be better informed. -- TJP2.
>>>>
>

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Wed Oct 21 15:19:37 1998
Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA24779; Wed, 21 Oct 1998 15:19:35 -0700 (PDT)
From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo19.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FALNa04682;
Wed, 21 Oct 1998 18:11:21 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <c9aaedba.362e5c09@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Oct 1998 18:11:21 EDT
To: owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: FBI Job Openings for Survey Statisticians
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

The following is posted on behalf of the FBI. Please direct all questions
to
the individual mentioned in this multiple jobs posting. The Bureau would
also appreciate your passing this job announcement along to any persons you
think would be interested. Thanks.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

SURVEY STATISTICIAN

(CRIMINOLOGIST)

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division (CJIS) is in need of Survey Statisticians (multiple positions) to serve in a professional capacity in the planning and execution of complex data collection and analysis programs and in conducting crime-related research and analytical projects.

Responsibilities include recommending analytical, methodological, and crime-oriented research projects which involve nationwide data collection and statistical analyses; completing complex assignments which include formulating, designing, executing, interpreting, and developing final reports; and working with other professional/technical personnel in performing research and proposed solutions and alternatives for the same and serves as a leader for small to medium groups of lower grade personnel when performing surveys or other statistical compilations requiring groups.

Qualification Requirements:

A. A Ph.D. or equivalent doctoral degree that included 15 semester hours in statistics (or in mathematics and statistics, provided at least six semester hours were in statistics), and nine additional semester hours in one or more of the following: physical or biological sciences, medicine, education, or engineering; or in the social sciences including demography, history, economics, social welfare, geography, international relations, social or cultural anthropology, health sociology, political science, public administration, psychology, etc. Credit toward meeting statistical course requirements will be given for courses in which at least 50 percent of the course content appears to be statistical methods, e.g., courses that included studies in research methods in psychology or economics such as test and measurements or in business cycles, or courses in methods of processing mass statistical data such as tabulating methods or electronic data processing.

OR

B. A combination of education and experience-courses identified in A above, plus appropriate experience or additional education. The experience should

have included a full range of professional statistical work such as a) sampling, b) collecting, computing, and analyzing statistical data, and c) applying statistical techniques such as measurement of central tendency, dispersion, skewness, sampling error, simple and multiple correlation, analysis of variance, and tests of significance.

This position is located at the CJIS facility in Clarksburg, West Virginia, and the salary begins at \$46,254 or \$55,004, dependent upon qualifications.

All interested applicants should call John Strovers at (304) 625-4766 no later than 10/30/98 in order to be sent an application and vacancy announcement. You must be a U.S. citizen and consent to a complete background investigation, polygraph, and drug test as a prerequisite for employment.

The FBI is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

>From mbednarz@umich.edu Thu Oct 22 07:30:55 1998

Received: from berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.17])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id HAA07138 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Oct 1998 07:30:52 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from frogger.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@frogger.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.85])

by berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id KAA20516

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Oct 1998 10:29:51 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (mbednarz@localhost)

by frogger.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with SMTP id KAA27092

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Oct 1998 10:29:50 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Thu, 22 Oct 1998 10:29:50 -0400 (EDT)

From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>

X-Sender: mbednarz@frogger.rs.itd.umich.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Congress Goes Home and Budget Figures Begin to Emerge (fwd)

Message-ID:

<Pine.SOL.3.95.981022102932.24915B-100000@frogger.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Thu, 22 Oct 1998 09:49:21 EDT

From: COPAFS@aol.com

There are close to 4000 pages in the Omnibus spending bill (H.R. 4328). As we plod through the Bill we will update the Budget sheet on our web site. Here's

what we have found out about the Census Bureau Budget, along with some Senate confirmations.

Congress has approved and sent to the President for signature a \$487 billion omnibus spending package that gives the Census Bureau more money for 2000 census preparations but sets up another confrontation next spring over the use of sampling to count the population.

The spending measure allocates \$1.027 billion for 2000 census activities, \$179 million more than the Bureau's request of \$848 million for fiscal year 1999. Congress provided an additional \$104 million to improve compilation of the address lists. Of the additional \$75 million provided by the budget negotiators, \$23 million is for opening and staffing all local census offices in 1999, some earlier than planned; \$17 million is for increased promotion, outreach, and marketing activities; and \$35 million is for modifying census forms so that six, instead of five, people in each household can report information directly without a follow-up visit from a census taker. The Bureau will incur additional printing costs (\$25 million) and must modify the scanners that "read" the questionnaires electronically (\$10 million) to accommodate revisions to the forms. Households may list up to 12 residents on the forms and fill in demographic information for up to six of those residents. Census takers will telephone or visit households with more than six residents to collect data on the remaining people.

The catch-all spending bill funds the Departments of Commerce, State and Justice, and the Federal judiciary, only through June 15, 1999. Failure to reach an agreement on census methods by that date could stop the flow of funds not only for census activities but also for American embassies overseas, the FBI, the National Weather Service, and other activities in that entire budget account. The Administration and congressional Republicans, who are at odds over the Bureau's plan to use sampling, hope the prospect of a large-scale shutdown will pressure both sides in the dispute to settle their differences quickly. All other government functions covered under the omnibus bill are funded through September 30, 1999, the end of the fiscal year.

Congress allocated \$20 million for the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) program, substantially less than the \$38.5 million requested by the Administration. The Census Bureau is developing the ACS to produce more timely demographic and economic data throughout the decade, eliminating the need for the traditional census long form in 2010. The Census Monitoring Board received \$4 million for its work in fiscal year 1999.

Census director confirmed: The Senate yesterday confirmed Dr. Kenneth Prewitt to be director of the Census Bureau. The nomination was approved by a consent request with no vote, since many Senators have left Washington to campaign in their home states. Dr. Prewitt most recently headed the Social Science Research Council in New York City.

.
BTS Director Confirmed: Dr. Ashish Sen was confirmed yesterday by the

Senate

as the Director of the Bureau of Transportation Statistics. Dr. Sen of Chicago, Illinois, has served as Director of the Statistics and Evaluation Laboratory at the Urban Transportation Center at the University of Illinois. He was also the Director of the Urban Transportation Center.

>From Mark@bisconti.com Thu Oct 22 14:49:52 1998

Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id OAA15436 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Oct 1998 14:49:51 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by medusa.nei.org

(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000262890@medusa.nei.org> for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Thu, 22 Oct 1998 17:47:46 -0400

Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)

id QY43SZ4Q; Thu, 22 Oct 1998 17:51:50 -0400

Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail

id <01BDFDE3.5A062E80@mark-bri>; Thu, 22 Oct 1998 17:42:34 -0400

Message-Id: <01BDFDE3.5A062E80@mark-bri>

From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>

To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Role of election forecasting

Date: Thu, 22 Oct 1998 17:42:33 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

in testing methodological accuracy

Prof. Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann kindly answered my question (about = whether Schroeder/SPD used focus groups as did Clinton and Blair) by = FAX, following a telephone conversation. She indicated that three = German Institutes conducted election research and did campaign = consulting for SPD during this year's election, one of which used focus = groups (POLIS in Munich). Also, the FDP commissioned focus groups for = use in developing their strategy and to test their campaign posters. = The Greens did not use focus groups.

Prof. Noelle-Neumann has some questions about the role that election = forecasting (based on interviews completed prior to election day) plays = in testing the methodological accuracy and quality of survey research in = the U.S. Allensbach Institute put its instruments to the test and found = that their forecasts, in 12 consecutive federal elections, based on = personal interviews completed prior to election day and published well = in advance of the official election results, have shown an average = deviation of about 1 percent or less. They released a press release on = the subject.

She would like to know (1) how elections are used to test survey = research methods in the U.S., (2) if the findings of the forecasts are = published and by whom, and (3) how accurate forecasts have been.

If you reply on AAPORNET, I will print and FAX your responses to her. =
Please include your Tel. And Fax No. so she can contact you if she has =
follow-up questions. [Her FAX is 49 / 7533-3048.] The Blue Book lists =
the Institut's E-mail address as ifd-archiv@t-online.de, but I don't =
know to whom this address goes or if they subscribe to AAPORNET.

It would be interesting to know what other countries do also.

Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.

From: Mark Richards
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 1998 1:51 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: German election/focus gps.

Does anyone know what "research tools" were used by the SD Party in =

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Thu Oct 22 14:53:54 1998
Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA17424 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Oct 1998 14:53:52 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from rachel (tr-ppp5.monmouth.com [209.191.24.37]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id RAA23951 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Oct 1998 17:53:24 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <362FAA88.498@monmouth.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Oct 1998 17:58:32 -0400
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Use of Medicaid Rolls in Survey Estimation
References: <966A8EF58355D211968F00805FEADEAF035FF6@OFM001>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I tried without success to send the following to the message's author
directly, but I couldn't get the e-mail address to work.

New Jersey will use Medicaid, plus other databases, in administrative
profiling and sampling for a longitudinal study of beneficiaries which
is getting ready to start.

Mathematica, the data collection contractor, has (I believe) used
Medicaid before in studies in the way you propose. Try contacting
Stuart Kerachsky.

Good luck.

Rachel Hickson

>From mtrau@umich.edu Thu Oct 22 15:31:35 1998
Received: from relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (relic.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.83.11])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA28485 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 22 Oct 1998 15:31:34 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from umich.edu ([141.211.28.25])
by relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/2.5) with ESMTP id SAA26270; Thu, 22
Oct 1998 18:29:33 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <362FB216.63A63565@umich.edu>
Date: Thu, 22 Oct 1998 18:30:46 -0400
From: Michael Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (WinNT; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: BTAUGHER <BTAUGHER@aao.org>, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Research
References: <199810222200.SAA19223@twins.rs.itd.umich.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Beverly - In my own area of research, we think of pre-election surveys and
measures of various attitudes that predict voting as that kind of study. But
by sending your original message out to the AAPORnet, you will probably get
other responses as well. If you would like to know more about voting
studies, please let me know. Mike Traugott

BTAUGHER wrote:

> Michael W. Traugott:
>
> Can you tell me if your association has conducted research on surveys of
> attitudes and their reliability as predictors of future behavior.
>
> Thanks you for any information you may be able to provide.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Beverly Taugher
> American Academy of Ophthalmology
> btaugher@aao.org
>
> American Academy of Ophthalmology
> The Eye M.D.s
> <http://www.eyenet.org>

>From rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu Fri Oct 23 08:50:21 1998
Received: from opinion (opinion.isi.uconn.edu [137.99.84.21])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id IAA05654 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Oct 1998 08:50:18 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from Marc1.isi.uconn.edu (mmaynard.isi.uconn.edu [137.99.84.24])
by opinion (SMI-8.6/8.6.9) with SMTP id LAA13497 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Fri, 23 Oct 1998 11:49:27 -0400
Message-Id: <3.0.32.19981023114639.007b8100@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>
X-Sender: rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 11:46:40 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Rob Persons <rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>
Subject: radio show
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I listened to a discussion on the Jim Bohannon show two days ago on polling. It was very early in the morning and I was only half awake but it was very good. I have tried to find out who the guest was but have been unable to do so. He name was Scott _____. I thought he said his company was Point of America. There was a lot of discussion from callers about the issues talked about recently on aapornet such as response rates, the upcoming election, Clinton's approval #s, etc.

Did anyone else listen to the show and remember his last name and organization?

Thanks,

Rob Persons

Rob Persons

The Roper Center

rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu

ph: (860) 486-4440

fax:(860) 486-6308

>From tsilver@CapAccess.org Fri Oct 23 11:06:36 1998

Received: from cap1.CapAccess.org (root@cap1.CapAccess.org [151.200.199.10])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id LAA22831 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Oct 1998 11:06:35 -0700

(PDT)

Received: (from tsilver@localhost) by cap1.CapAccess.org (8.6.12/8.6.10) id

NAA21937; Fri, 23 Oct 1998 13:57:19 -0400

Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 13:57:19 -0400 (EDT)

From: Tom Silver <tsilver@CapAccess.org>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: radio show

In-Reply-To: <3.0.32.19981023114639.007b8100@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91-FP.981023135010.19420A-100000@cap1.capaccess.org>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Rob,

Didn't hear the show, but there's a survey firm in North Carolina called Rasmussen Research (headed by Scott Rasmussen) that calls its national

studies "Portrait of America" polls.

Tom Silver
The Polling Report
PollingReport.com

On Fri, 23 Oct 1998, Rob Persons wrote:

> I listened to a discussion on the Jim Bohannon show two days ago on
> polling. It was very early in the morning and I was only half awake but
it
> was very good. I have tried to find out who the guest was but have been
> unable to do so. He name was Scott _____. I thought he said his
> company was Point of America.
> There was a lot of discussion from callers about the issues talked about
> recently on aapornet such as response rates, the upcoming election,
> Clinton's approval #s, etc.
>
> Did anyone else listen to the show and remember his last name and
> organization?
>
>

>From frey@nevada.edu Fri Oct 23 11:13:24 1998

Received: from pollux.nevada.edu (frey@pollux.nevada.edu [131.216.1.217])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA26501 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Oct 1998 11:13:19 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (frey@localhost)
by pollux.nevada.edu (8.8.8/8.8.7) with SMTP id LAA23642
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Oct 1998 11:13:17 -0700 (PDT)

X-Authentication-Warning: pollux.nevada.edu: frey owned process doing -bs

Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 11:13:16 -0700 (PDT)

From: JAMES H FREY <frey@nevada.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re:Virtual Interviews

In-Reply-To:

<Pine.SUN.3.91-FP.981023135010.19420A-100000@cap1.capaccess.org>

Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.96.981023111152.30858A-100000@pollux.nevada.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Does anyone have some references, observations, or experiences with
interviews via the internet. I would appreciate any thoughts. Thanks.

Jim Frey

**

James H. Frey, Ph.D., Dean
College of Liberal Arts, Box 455001
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
4505 South Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89154-5001
frey@nevada.edu

Office: (702)895-3401
Fax: (702)895-4097

>From rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu Fri Oct 23 11:24:55 1998
Received: from opinion (opinion.isi.uconn.edu [137.99.84.21])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id LAA00550 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Oct 1998 11:24:54 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from Marc1.isi.uconn.edu (mmaynard.isi.uconn.edu [137.99.84.24])
by opinion (SMI-8.6/8.6.9) with SMTP id OAA14600; Fri, 23 Oct 1998 14:24:16
-0400
Message-Id: <3.0.32.19981023142127.0080e8a0@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>
X-Sender: rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 14:21:28 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
From: Rob Persons <rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>
Subject: Re: radio show
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Thank you very much Tom. That's who was on the show.

Rob

At 01:57 PM 10/23/98 -0400, Tom Silver wrote:

>
>Rob,
>
>Didn't hear the show, but there's a survey firm in North Carolina called
>Rasmussen Research (headed by Scott Rasmussen) that calls its national
>studies "Portrait of America" polls.
>
>Tom Silver
>The Polling Report
>PollingReport.com
>
>
>On Fri, 23 Oct 1998, Rob Persons wrote:
>
>> I listened to a discussion on the Jim Bohannon show two days ago on
>> polling. It was very early in the morning and I was only half awake but
>> it
>> was very good. I have tried to find out who the guest was but have been
>> unable to do so. He name was Scott _____. I thought he said his
>> company was Point of America.
>> There was a lot of discussion from callers about the issues talked about
>> recently on aapornet such as response rates, the upcoming election,
>> Clinton's approval #s, etc.
>>
>> Did anyone else listen to the show and remember his last name and
>> organization?
>>

>>
>
>

Rob Persons
The Roper Center
rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu
ph: (860) 486-4440
fax:(860) 486-6308

>From arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu Fri Oct 23 13:32:16 1998
Received: from mailer.fsu.edu (mailer.fsu.edu [128.186.6.122])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA14225 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Oct 1998 13:32:10 -0700

(PDT)
Received: from localhost (aroBBin@localhost)
by mailer.fsu.edu (8.9.0/8.9.0) with ESMTP id QAA03612
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 23 Oct 1998 16:32:08 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 16:32:08 -0400 (EDT)
From: ALICE R ROBBIN <aroBBin@mailer.fsu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re:Virtual Interviews
In-Reply-To: <Pine.OSF.3.96.981023111152.30858A-100000@pollux.nevada.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9810231628350.2638-100000@mailer.fsu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Ditto, from me. I've been intending to ask everyone whether anyone has been collecting references to articles on web surveys. I was unable to attend last May's annual meeting, and therefore missed the series of panels on this issue. I'm now developing the syllabus for my web-based research methods course and would like to add readings on e-surveys for the students. AAPOR has been a superb resource for me, and shortly I will report to everyone about the trials and tribulations of developing a totally web-based research methods course. Many thanks in advance.
Alice Robbin
FSU

On Fri, 23 Oct 1998, JAMES H FREY wrote:

> Does anyone have some references, observations, or experiences with
> interviews via the internet. I would appreciate any thoughts. Thanks.
> Jim Frey

>
>

**

> James H. Frey, Ph.D., Dean
> College of Liberal Arts, Box 455001
> University of Nevada, Las Vegas
> 4505 South Maryland Parkway
> Las Vegas, NV 89154-5001
> frey@nevada.edu

> Office: (702)895-3401
> Fax: (702)895-4097
>
>

```
*****  
* Alice Robbin *  
* School of Information Studies *  
* Florida State University *  
* 240 Louis Shores Building *  
* Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 *  
* Office: 850-644-8116 Fax: 850-644-6253 *  
* email: arobbin@mailers.fsu.edu *  
*****
```

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Sat Oct 24 05:35:46 1998
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id FAA07701; Sat, 24 Oct 1998 05:35:44 -0700 (PDT)
From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo12.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id ITDZa19215;
Sat, 24 Oct 1998 08:34:09 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <82bcf318.3631c941@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Oct 1998 08:34:09 EDT
To: rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: radio show
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

In a message dated 10/23/98 11:50:51 AM, rob@opinion.isi.uconn.edu wrote:

<<I listened to a discussion on the Jim Bohannon show two days ago on polling. It was very early in the morning and I was only half awake but it was very good. I have tried to find out who the guest was but have been unable to do so. He name was Scott _____. I thought he said his company was Point of America.>>

I've generally just called the radio/TV station involved and asked for their programming dept., asked my question, and found them to be very gracious and willing to supply the information, since you are a listener. Try it! The other approach might be to do a web search, say with the very effective <http://www.hotbot.com> search engine for the Point of America company's web site. (Or, switchboard.com has a business search section, where you'd put in the name and not specify state)

Milton Goldsamt
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

>From joholz@mindspring.com Sun Oct 25 09:15:27 1998
Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com
[207.69.200.82])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA01374 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 25 Oct 1998 09:15:26 -0800
(PST)
Received: from default (user-38ld0qh.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.131.81])
by dewdrop2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id MAA32025
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 25 Oct 1998 12:15:27 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <1.5.4.32.19981025171422.0069a5f0@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: joholz@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (32)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Sun, 25 Oct 1998 12:14:22 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jo Holz <joholz@mindspring.com>
Subject: National Center for Health Statistics announcement

I was asked to post the following announcement on AAPORNET:

NCHS announces the release of a "Fieldwork File", a supplement to the
1995 National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG). This data will enable
analysis of survey nonresponse, and related subjects.

This file contains information for all women comprising the original
sampling frame for the NSFG, both respondents (10,847) and
nonrespondents (3153), for a total of 14,000 sample women. This is
possible because the respondents in the 1995 NSFG are a subset of a
larger probability sample selected from the households that responded to
the 1993 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS), also conducted by the
National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS).

The file provides data on the fieldwork process, including results of
attempted contacts with sample women; on interviewers; and on
characteristics of all sample women. Data from the 1995 NSFG main file
can be merged with the fieldwork file, using the common ID.

The data is in the form of an ASCII (text) file compressed on one
diskette. Also included on the diskette is the codebook, with necessary
information and frequencies for each variable, and a brief user's guide.

For more information, or to receive the file and documentation, contact:

Joyce Abma
(301) 436-8731, extension 123
E-mail: jza2@cdc.gov.

Jo Holz Phone: (718) 499-3212
Holz Research & Consulting Fax: (718) 499-3606
434 Fifth Street
Brooklyn, NY 11215

>From tsilver@CapAccess.org Sun Oct 25 22:18:27 1998
Received: from cap1.CapAccess.org (tsilver@cap1.CapAccess.org
[151.200.199.10])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id WAA24388 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 25 Oct 1998 22:18:25 -0800
(PST)
Received: (from tsilver@localhost) by cap1.CapAccess.org (8.6.12/8.6.10) id
BAA08959; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 01:18:14 -0500
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 1998 01:18:14 -0500 (EST)
From: Tom Silver <tsilver@CapAccess.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Web surveys
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91-FP.981026011120.8825A-100000@cap1.capaccess.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Fri, 23 Oct 1998, ALICE R ROBBIN wrote:

> Ditto, from me. I've been intending to ask everyone whether anyone has
> been collecting references to articles on web surveys. ...

On Fri, 23 Oct 1998, JAMES H FREY wrote:

> Does anyone have some references, observations, or experiences with
> interviews via the internet. ...

The following article is from the current issue of The Polling Report,
and can also be found on our web site (www.pollingreport.com).
-- Tom Silver, tsilver@pollingreport.com

Gordon S. Black is Chairman and CEO of Harris Black International, Ltd.,
where George Terhanian is Director of Internet Research.

USING THE INTERNET FOR ELECTION FORECASTING

by Gordon S. Black and George Terhanian

For more than 20 years, election polling in the United States and many
other countries has been conducted by telephone. And why not? Telephone
polls, on the whole, have proved to be remarkably accurate predictors of
voter behavior -- the gold standard of all polling research. Telephone
polls are also far less expensive to conduct than door-to-door
interviews, the method they have largely replaced.

Although telephone polls possess many virtues, they are not without
their imperfections-ones we do not like to mention too often or too
loudly to our clients. For instance, refusal rates today routinely

exceed 40% of all households. Unreachable respondents (due to traveling, working, answering machines, the absence of telephones in college dorms, etc.) can regularly run another 30% of the sample. The cost of telephone research can also be prohibitive -- making it virtually impossible for one survey firm to cover every statewide race during an election year, not to mention congressional races.

A 16-STATE TEST DRIVE

We at Harris Black International believe, however, that the strengths of the Internet as a platform for conducting research more than compensate for the documented limitations of the telephone, as well as the purported limitations of the Internet. This is one major reason why we are now testing a new methodology of forecasting statewide elections via the Internet.

Using an Internet database of more than one million cooperative respondents nationwide, we are inviting individuals from 16 states to complete three polls. The first is under way as this is being written, the week of Oct. 18. The second will be completed on the Sunday before the election. The third will be an exit poll, the day of the election.

This effort is a combined venture with Excite, Inc., one of the most popular Internet portals, and the political science faculty at the University of Rochester. Excite is driving Internet traffic to our web site, where respondents are invited to register to participate in the Harris Poll Online (sm) at www.harrispollonline.com. Excite will also display the results, as they become available, at www.harrisblackintl.com/electionpollresults.

The political science team from the University of Rochester, led by Dr. Richard Niemi, will receive the entire database after the experiment is complete. They will be able to use it for scientific evaluation and publication.

ACCURATE ELECTION FORECASTS

Conducting research on the Internet is by no means a simple or simple-minded exercise. In the past six months, for example, we have had to overcome a variety of complex problems, including software breakdowns and bugs, security problems, hardware failures, and so forth. We feel a little like Chilton must have felt when they introduced the first computerized telephone interviewing system back in the 1970s.

Our experience has convinced us, however, that properly weighted findings from Internet studies compare favorably to findings from telephone research. Nevertheless, we realize the validity of any polling method hinges on its ability to reliably and accurately forecast voter behavior.

We also realize that many of our colleagues in the polling community are rightfully skeptical of our efforts. To do what we are doing we have had to set aside the staple of our industry -- the simple random sample. Virtually every social scientist in America was educated on the power of random sampling.

Random sampling is a very powerful tool in every avenue of science and industry for increasing the accuracy of estimates while decreasing the cost of the process. It has been canonized by academics, and it is the standard by which we judge research in most scientific fields. To describe something as a "convenience sample" is to assign the research to the bottom of the ladder of scientific quality and value.

We are not challenging the validity of random sampling. In fact, we employ random sampling daily in our telephone polling and believe that it is a wonderful statistical tool for those applications for which it is designed. We are instead investigating whether findings from huge samples of Internet respondents, coupled with sophisticated weighting processes, are as accurate as anything done on the telephone or door-to-door.

We have decided to mount this investigation in public for myriad reasons, including our desire to advance the collective understanding of our colleagues in the polling and scientific communities who, at times, tend to dismiss this methodology without any empirical evidence.

CAMPAIGN 2000

We are also preparing for the future. In the year 2000 election, the first presidential election of the new millennium, we will possess a database of millions of cooperative respondents, and we plan to use that database to cover the entire campaign, from the primaries to the general election, beginning in January. Our coverage will include the presidency, state offices, the U.S. Senate, and all congressional districts for which we have adequate data. On election day 2000, we will conduct the largest -- by a factor of 15 -- "exit poll" ever conducted.

In a classic example of the impact of scientific advancement, we expect to improve the performance while dropping the prices. That is the vision that motivates this experiment in polling.

(c) 1998 The Polling Report, Inc.

>From sgoold@unm.edu Mon Oct 26 10:48:56 1998

Received: from pyxis.unm.edu (pyxis.unm.edu [129.24.8.14])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id KAA21567 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 10:48:53 -0800

(PST)

Received: from [129.24.14.125](ppp-079.unm.edu[129.24.14.79]) (6857 bytes)

by pyxis.unm.edu

via sendmail with P:smtp/R:bind_hosts/T:inet_zone_bind_smtp

(sender: <sgoold@unm.edu>)

id <m0zXri3-0000HwC@pyxis.unm.edu>

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 11:49:43 -0700 (MST)

(Smail-3.2.0.101 1997-Dec-17 #2 built 1998-Sep-15)

Message-Id: <v02130503ae980fab03b5@[129.24.14.125]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Sat, 26 Oct 1996 12:06:14 -0700

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: sgoold@unm.edu (Scott Goold)

Subject: Ideology and attitudes toward surveys

In an email message (10/15/98) Hank Jenkins-Smith reported that his research group, the Institute for Public Policy (IPP), had found evidence to suggest that those who are most reluctant (as coded by the interviewers) are also the most conservative ($p < 0.001$, using a self-rated political ideology scale). Jenkins-Smith further suggested that if conservatives are more likely to drop out, of course, non-response bias would result. Jenkins-Smith framed his comments by referring to the "current hostile view of polling [that] is associated with a conservative attitude, as the Huffington creed might indicate."

I had worked for Jenkins-Smith through the end of 1995. I helped develop the reluctance measures as described by Jenkins-Smith as part of my dissertation effort. I considered a number of relationships that I had hypothesized would affect sample validity, but many of these just didn't work out. My dissertation committee and I believed at the time that our N-sizes were too small for precise examination.

The recent findings by Jenkins-Smith excited me. I attempted to contact him a number of times without success. Finally, I reached him by phone. I offered to share my research but Jenkins-Smith stated that he was unwilling to share his findings with me or to collaborate further on this topic. I guess I now understand the frustrations expressed by Arianna Huffington (10/12/98).

Nevertheless, I believe that AAPOR would benefit greatly from the results I have found. It is my hope that Jenkins-Smith will share his work with the group as nonresponse and its effects are a critical issue at this time.

The IPP traditionally uses a seven-point Likert scale to measure political ideology. Due to my limited number of observations, I collapsed this scale to three broad components: liberal, moderate, and conservative. Looking at twenty-one databases that include local New Mexico residents as well as regional and national general populations, I found that nearly half of the IPP respondents considered themselves as conservative. Approximately 28% listed themselves as moderates and the remaining 25% claimed they were liberals.

These figures perplexed me. I didn't think there were this many conservatives in either this local area or across the country. I, therefore, began to look deeper.

My underlying assumption has been that the construct of "conservative" equated roughly to Republican party identification. In my preliminary examination I have found this not to be the case. While 80% of Republicans do consider themselves conservative, a third of Democrats do as well.

More importantly, when I controlled for Party Identification the relationship furthered by Jenkins-Smith disappeared (in my data). When I initially read the report by Jenkins-Smith concerning ideology and respondent reluctance, I made the assumption that Republicans, as a group, are the most-resistant to survey participation. I believe this is the conclusion furthered by the Huffington followers as well. My research does not support this. I find that it is Democratic conservatives who make up the cohort of individuals most-resistant to participation. If my

preliminary findings are accurate, then Huffington is correct to raise concerns about the low level of participation and the potential negative effects on survey data. Yet the error should favor Republicans. My findings suggest that it is Democrats who are most-likely to refuse to participate.

Add to this the fact the comments noted by Black and Terhanian (10/26/98) that unreachable respondents (those individuals unable to participate due to traveling, working, answering machines, the absence of telephones in college dorms, etc.) can regularly run another 30% of the sample. These individuals may be predominately Democratic as well. If this assumption is correct, then Democrats are further underrepresented in survey research.

As part of my dissertation, I have been working on what I label as a "Spectrum of Resistance." The conclusions that I have reached derive from information collected from survey participants. The reluctance questions are asked to only those individuals who participate. We are, therefore, still missing information on those who ultimately refuse to continue the sessions.

In an attempt to close this gap, I developed a program of refusal conversion while at the IPP. When I looked at some of the preliminary data we collected through this program, I found that the individuals who had initially refused but had consented on the later callbacks considered themselves as conservative ($p < 0.001$). Again, my initial assumption was that these individuals would be Republicans. My data does not support this. In fact it appears that we were most likely to convert conservative Democrats ($p < 0.1$). [Note the statistical relationship here is weak. This is the problem I have confronted throughout my dissertation work and I assume that this is due to the low N-sizes.]

Thinking about the Spectrum of Resistance, I now conclude that the individuals most-likely to identify themselves as very resistant to participation are also conservative Democrats. And, the individuals we were able to interview through our refusal conversion program were predominantly conservative Democrats as well. Through this process I have narrowed the spectrum on who's not participating.

The final slice of the Spectrum is formed by those individuals who did not consent to be interviewed (or who were not contacted). From the NES data, the 1994 figures illustrate that 47% of adults consider themselves as Democrats, 43% as Republicans and 10% as Independents. In my data, I find respondents identify themselves as Democrats (36%), Republicans (36%) and Independents/Other (28%). To help understand these discrepancies, I considered the strength of their party identification and compared to the NES figures. The results did not shed further light on this problem so I will not list this here. Nevertheless, I cannot go much further at this point. My data just does not support closer examination.

I would appreciate any feedback on these issues. I would be happy to include your comments in my dissertation work.

Thanks in advance.

Scott

Scott Goold, Ph.D. (abd)
University of New Mexico
505.293.2504
Web page @ < www.unm.edu/~sgoold >

"I Can't Accept Not Trying"

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Mon Oct 26 11:44:33 1998
Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com
[207.69.200.82])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA13517 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 11:44:31 -0800
(PST)
Received: from default (user-38ld1ei.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.133.210])
by dewdrop2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id OAA03956
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 14:44:30 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199810261944.OAA03956@dewdrop2.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 1998 14:44:30 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Ideology and attitudes toward surveys
In-Reply-To: <v02130503ae980fab03b5@[129.24.14.125]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Scott Goold's comments on nonresponse were interesting and informative. I learned a lot. However, I find the material he presented in the paragraph below to be surprising, if it is correct. I would have thought people who are traveling for work or other reasons to be a number that is significantly less than 10% of the public. The number of college students, registered to vote and living in college dorms without telephones is probably an insignificant number as compared to all adults. I do not know how many people are not reachable due to answering machines over the entire period of a survey. Scott's figure of 30% as the total of all these groups seems much too large. Lastly, I would be most surprised if these individuals are "predominately Democratic," as Scott suggests. I would have guessed they tended to be more Republican. Can any one shed some light on this discussion?

warren mitofsky

>Add to this the fact the comments noted by Black and Terhanian (10/26/98)
>that unreachable respondents (those individuals unable to participate due
>to traveling, working, answering machines, the absence of telephones in
>college dorms, etc.) can regularly run another 30% of the sample. These

>individuals may be predominately Democratic as well. If this assumption is
>correct, then Democrats are further underrepresented in survey research.

>

>-----

>Scott Goold, Ph.D. (abd)
>University of New Mexico
>505.293.2504
>Web page @ < www.unm.edu/~sgoold >

>

>"I Can't Accept Not Trying"

>-----

>

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

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu Mon Oct 26 12:44:35 1998

Received: from cicero.spc.uchicago.edu (root@cicero.spc.uchicago.edu
[128.135.232.3])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id MAA01190 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 12:44:34 -0800

(PST)

Received: from nittany.uchicago.edu (nittany.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.8])

by cicero.spc.uchicago.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id OAA14620

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 14:44:33 -0600 (CST)

Received: by nittany.uchicago.edu (16.8/UofC3.0)

id AA16318; Mon, 26 Oct 98 14:44:33 -0600

Date: Mon, 26 Oct 98 14:44:33 -0600

From: "Tom_W. Smith" <abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu>

Message-Id: <9810262044.AA16318@nittany.uchicago.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Who Doesn't Do Surveys

The hypothesis that the refusers are conservatives has been around
over 30 years. In the early 1980s I did several tests of this
idea using NORC's General Social Surveys. I could find essentially
no support for this idea. Ideologically the refusers differed from
the responders by being somewhat more apolitical, but not more
conservative.

Tom W. Smith [A [A [A [A [A [A [C [A [B [B [B [B [B [B [B

>From RobFarbman@aol.com Mon Oct 26 13:47:56 1998

Received: from imo24.mx.aol.com (imo24.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.68])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id NAA25628 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 13:47:53 -0800

(PST)

From: RobFarbman@aol.com

Received: from RobFarbman@aol.com

by imo24.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FYFIa02343

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 16:47:14 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <1c3b951a.3634ede2@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 1998 16:47:14 EST
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Job Posting - Entry Level
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 226

PROJECT COORDINATOR

Small, rapidly growing research co. looking for college grad interested in media & pop culture. Entry level position for highly organized person to oversee music research projs. for radio & record industries. Great oppty. to learn & advance. PC skills & media exp. a +; intellectual curiosity and willingness to work hard a must.

Send or fax resume to Edison Media Research,
100 Franklin Sq. Dr. Ste. 103, Somerset, NJ 08873. Fax: 732-560-8989.
>From rhickson@monmouth.com Mon Oct 26 17:16:39 1998
Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA16159 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 17:16:36 -0800
(PST)

Received: from rachel (tr-ppp47.monmouth.com [209.191.24.79]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id UAA26947 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 20:16:07 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <36352007.7CA9@monmouth.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 1998 20:21:11 -0500
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: [Fwd: Job Opportunities: Center for Development and Population
Activities]
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from imo15.mx.aol.com (imo15.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.5]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with ESMTP id TAA16155 for
<rhickson@monmouth.com>; Mon, 26 Oct 1998 19:46:25 -0500 (EST)
From: JOYQUILL@aol.com
Received: from JOYQUILL@aol.com
by imo15.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id GOKa002538;
Mon, 26 Oct 1998 19:20:33 +1900 (EST)
Message-ID: <3a9a30f8.363511d1@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 1998 19:20:33 EST
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Job Opportunities: Center for Development and Population Activities
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214

X-UIDL: 0e66c9ab855d7ed9e2896315ec0cbbc1
X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

A communication from:

Joy Quill, Principal
Management Evaluation Training, LLC
Annapolis MD 21403
Email: JoyQuill@aol.com

The following is brought to you courtesy of the Washington Evaluators and the Eastern Evaluation Research Society.

The Center for Development and Population Activities (CEDPA) is actively recruiting candidates for two positions:

- (1) Senior Technical Advisor for Evaluation
- (2) Evaluation Specialist.

Interested persons should write to Pat Bell, Personnel Director, CEDPA, 1400 16th Street, NW, Washington DC - 20036 or email her at pbell@cedpa.org <<mailto:pbell@cedpa.org>> .

POSITION DESCRIPTION

Position: Senior Technical Advisor/Evaluation
Location: Washington, DC, with some global travel
Reports to: Vice President/Field Programs
Salary: Negotiable, per qualifications and experience

General: As a member of the CEDPA technical team providing technical leadership for the new USAID-funded ENABLE Project, the person in this position is responsible for designing and managing an evaluation system to measure impact and results of programs and strategies. These strategies are focused on gender, women's empowerment and family planning, programs for youth, institution building and advocacy. The position is responsible for supervising the management information system to ensure the reliability and relevance of data collected, and the design of special studies to document the lessons learned and effectiveness of program interventions and linkages.

Qualifications: Ph.D. in Social Demography, Epidemiology or Public Health or related area. Requires 5-10 years experience in research and evaluation as well as program development. Strong analytic skills required and experience with data analysis. Experience in qualitative research, designing special studies and conducting operations research. Ability to conceptualize, analyze, and synthesize lessons learned, and to document results in publications. Must be able to function well within teams. Excellent interpersonal skills to work with diverse staff at HQ and in the field. International travel approximately 25 percent.

Specific responsibilities: designs an integrated data system which captures

the results of programs and resource inputs; develops evaluation framework which measures the impact of women's empowerment strategies, gender, family planning/reproductive health services, youth interventions, institution building and advocacy; designs and conducts special studies to assess the impact of inputs and results at the local and country level; designs and supervises baseline surveys, mid-term and final evaluations of subprojects; reviews report findings and recommendations designs and conducts operations research studies to test new approaches or models; works closely with Field and Washington-based program staff to document and apply lessons to expand or replicate successful strategies for broader impact; writes progress reports, articles, case studies for USAID and other audiences to document the results of project, in collaboration with staff team at headquarters and in field.; supervises the Evaluation and Documentation Unit; provides technical support to the Vice President to respond to requests for information and to provide program documentation.

POSITION DESCRIPTION

Position: Evaluation Specialist
Location: Washington DC, with some global travel
Reports to: Senior Technical Advisor for Evaluation
Salary: Negotiable, per qualifications and experience

General: Responsible for broadening CEDPA's M&E framework and management information system (MIS) to reflect CEDPA's areas of technical focus. The Evaluation Specialist will work 50% under CEDPA's USAID funded ENABLE Project which aims to improve reproductive health decision-making among women in India, Nepal, Nigeria and Ghana. The remaining 50% will be focused on other CEDPA-wide M&E needs. As a member of the M&E team, the incumbent will work closely with the Senior Technical Advisor for Evaluation in conceptualizing, designing, and implementing the integrated M&E system, management information system (MIS) and special studies for ENABLE and other CEDPA programs.

Qualifications: Advanced degree, preferably Master's degree or Ph.D. in Public Health or other social science, plus 3-5 years experience in research and evaluation as well as program development. Strong analytic skills and experience with data analysis and MIS. Experience in designing and conducting quantitative and qualitative research studies and conducting operations research. Ability to conceptualize, analyze, and synthesize lessons learned and to document findings in publications. Excellent writing and presentation skills. Must be able to function well within teams. Excellent interpersonal skills to work with diverse staff at HQ and in the field. International travel approximately 25 percent.

Specific Responsibilities:

ENABLE Project responsibilities:

Works with the Sr. Tech. Adv. for Evaluation to design, conduct, and publish special studies on reproductive health initiatives and their linkages with NFE, community mobilization and linkages with women's empowerment.

Identifies international and in-country research consultants, develops scopes of work and collaborates with consultants to design and implement evaluation and research studies to fulfill ENABLE requirements

Works with ENABLE Washington-based and Field Office team to write ENABLE progress reports and newsletters and USAID documents.

Other responsibilities:

Works with the Sr. Technical Advisor for Evaluation and CEDPA program managers to develop and implement an M&E framework for CEDPA's program teams.

Develops and implements CEDPA MIS to track the progress of programs.

Provides technical support to assure quality of field-based MIS data.

Contributes to CEDPA annual reports and responds to other requests for reports and updates.

Conducts statistical analysis and presentation of service statistics, using data management programs such as SPSS-PC, Epi-Info, and/or MS Access.

>From exp12@psu.edu Tue Oct 27 08:11:41 1998

Received: from f04n07.cac.psu.edu (f04s07.cac.psu.edu [128.118.141.35])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id IAA20152 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 08:11:40 -0800

(PST)

Received: from ecuador.la.psu.edu (ecuador.la.psu.edu [128.118.17.50]) by

f04n07.cac.psu.edu (8.8.7/8.6.12) with SMTP id LAA76310 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 11:11:39 -0500

Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19981027111138.00740244@mail.psu.edu>

X-Sender: exp12@mail.psu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.1 (32)

Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 11:11:38 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@psu.edu>

Subject: Non-response and ideology

In-Reply-To: <199810270804.AAA26979@usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

As the contributions by Jenkins-Smith, Goold, Mitofsky and Tom Smith suggest, the relationship between non-response and ideology is undoubtedly complex.

It's useful to keep in mind that ideology is itself multidimensional;

conservative Democrats tend to be law-and-order or social conservatives while conservative Republicans tend towards the free-market flavor. Add to this historical patterns related to race/region (Southern White Democrats vs. Southern Black Democrats, for example) and religion (older cohorts of Southern Baptists and Roman Catholics are mostly Democrats) and it is pretty clear that a simple correlation between self-identified ideology and non-response is not going to be especially informative whether it is statistically significant or not.

Goold seems to be on the right track in looking at multiple indicators. But the relevant indicators will shift slightly from election to election, as different candidates attract slightly different coalitions (think of the different types of conservatives that formed the energetic base for Carter, Reagan, Bush, and Buchanan, for example).

Thus, the lesson for both pollsters and academics is probably that we need increased ONGOING attention to non-response and reluctance, with an open mind regarding the different elements of ideology that define slices of the electorate in each election. Only then will be able to provide an informed response to Huffington's speculation and to build in reasonable qualifications to inferences drawn from specific polls.

Eric Plutzer, Interim Head
Department of Political Science
The Pennsylvania State University
107 Burrowes Building, University Park, PA 16802

Phone: (814) 863-8978 Fax: (814) 863-8979
Personal homepage: <http://www.la.psu.edu/~eplutzer/>
Graduate programs: <http://www.la.psu.edu/polisci/grad/>
>From hschuman@umich.edu Tue Oct 27 08:12:59 1998
Received: from donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.19])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA20740 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 08:12:57 -0800 (PST)
Received: from moonpatrol.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@moonpatrol.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.63.97])
by donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id LAA26016
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 11:12:56 -0500 (EST)
Received: from localhost (hschuman@localhost)
by moonpatrol.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with SMTP id LAA27188
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 11:12:55 -0500 (EST)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 11:12:54 -0500 (EST)
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
X-Sender: hschuman@moonpatrol.rs.itd.umich.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Non-response by conservatives
In-Reply-To: <9810262044.AA16318@nittany.uchicago.edu>
Message-ID:

<Pine.SOL.3.95.981027110847.11322D-100000@moonpatrol.rs.itd.umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On the issue of "conservatives" as non-respondents, here is a small bit of data. For a 1991 mail survey, Maria Krysan and I had a prior way of identifying strong supporters of David Duke, and these people also opposed gun control, legalized abortion, and affirmative action. The response rate to the mail survey for the Duke supporters was significantly higher (a surprising 86%), not lower, than for the general white population (74%). A number of Duke supporters added notes indicating their belief that the survey was biased in a liberal direction, but they nevertheless responded fully. (The study is reported in IJPO, 1996.)

>From daves@startribune.com Tue Oct 27 08:15:34 1998
Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com [132.148.80.211])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA21901 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 08:15:33 -0800 (PST)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id KAA11262; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 10:15:03 -0600 (CST)
Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by
firewall2.startribune.com via smap (3.2)
id xma010882; Tue, 27 Oct 98 10:14:34 -0600
Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 10:14:18 -0600
Message-Id: <s6359cfa.051@mail.startribune.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 10:13:56 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: SAS conversion help
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

Colleagues ...

Later this year we at the Minnesota Poll will be switching tab software = from mainframe-based SAS to SAS-PC. I'd appreciate any cautions, hints, = suggestions or other observations you might have that would be helpful to = us when we undertake that process. Please reply to me individually to = avoid cluttering up the mailboxes of those who don't have the same = interest.

Thanks, and cheers.

Rob Daves
Director of Polling & News Research

Star Tribune
425 Portland Av. S. =20
Minneapolis MN 55488
V: 612/673-7278 F: 612/673-4359
daves@startribune.com

>From dillman@wsu.edu Tue Oct 27 10:15:40 1998
Received: from cheetah.it.wsu.edu (root@cheetah.it.wsu.edu [134.121.1.8])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA06461 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 10:15:33 -0800
(PST)
From: dillman@wsu.edu
Received: from dillman.wsu.edu (dillman.libarts.wsu.edu [134.121.52.48])
by cheetah.it.wsu.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id KAA23989
for <aapornet@vm.usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 10:15:28 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <199810271815.KAA23989@cheetah.it.wsu.edu>
X-Sender: dillmand@mail.wsu.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 10:18:03 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: households with Internet
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I'm trying to find 1998 national survey data on percent of households with computers and percent with Internet connections. It's important that the data be for 1998 (I have seen data for earlier years), and that I be able to get a sense of how well the survey was done---response rate, measurement, sample frame, coverage etc.

Please respond to dillman@wsu.edu

Thankyou very much. 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 LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Tue Oct 27 11:25:04 1998
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.EDU [128.218.6.65])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA05260 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 11:25:00 -0800
(PST)
Received: by psg.ucsf.EDU with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
id <4R3G559Y>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 11:31:37 -0800
Message-ID: <1E164712D2DBD111832A00A0C921A21353D544@psg.ucsf.EDU>
From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: households with Internet
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 11:31:35 -0800
X-Priority: 3
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
Content-Type: text/plain

Make sure the data you get is on HOUSEHOLDS. A huge proportion of internet connections are actually through businesses.

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

From: dillman@wsu.edu [SMTP:dillman@wsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 1998 10:18 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: households with Internet

I'm trying to find 1998 national survey data on percent of households with computers and percent with Internet connections. It's important that the data be for 1998 (I have seen data for earlier years), and that I be able to get a sense of how well the survey was done---response rate, measurement, sample frame, coverage etc.

Please respond to dillman@wsu.edu

Thankyou very much. 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 RoniRosner@aol.com Tue Oct 27 12:12:46 1998
Received: from imo16.mx.aol.com (imo16.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.6])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA08044 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 12:12:43 -0800
(PST)

From: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: from RoniRosner@aol.com
by imo16.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FAHZa07908
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 15:11:48 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <2138ba16.36362904@aol.com>

Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 15:11:48 EST

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Subject: "POLLING AND THE 1998 ELECTION" -- 11/12 MEETING

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 16-bit for Windows sub 64

NEW YORK AAPOR & the NEWSEUM/NY present an Evening Meeting

Date Thursday, 12 November 1998

Refreshments ... 5:30 p.m.

Presentation 6:00 -- 8:00 p.m.

Place Newseum/NY (aka The Media Studies Center)
580 Madison Ave. (56-57th Sts.)/Mezzanine Level

Admission NYAAPOR members, student members, HLMs, MSC, free;
other students, \$5; all others, \$10

SEX, LIES AND VIDEOTAPE . . . POLLING AND THE 1998 ELECTION

How important were the Clinton and Starr factors to election outcomes?

- * Did either or both precipitate a Republican landslide?
- * Or was the political damage contained?
- * Will the Democrats be able to block a filibuster?
- * Was it "the economy stupid"?
- * Which were the overriding issues that got translated into the vote?
- * Was there low voter turnout?

Did incumbents win, or was there a change in New York's State and/or Federal seats?

What were the voices of American public opinion? What did our polls tell us?

Join our distinguished panel of media pollsters as they reflect upon these and other questions raised, critical issues identified and their consequences, as they covered the 1998 election campaigns.

Introducing our Panelists:

Dr. Sheldon Gawiser, NBC News (Panel Chair)

Cheryl Arnedt, CBS News

Micheline Blum, Blum & Weprin Associates, Inc.

Dr. Murray Edelman, Voter News Service

Gary Langer, ABC News

Dr. Lee M. Miringoff, Marist College

BUILDING SECURITY CANNOT ADMIT ANYONE WHOSE NAME IS NOT ON OUR LIST!! If you are planning to attend, respond by TUES., 10 NOV. E-mail RoniRosner@aol.com Or, if you must, call 722-5333.

NYAAPOR MEMBERS & THEIR GUESTS, SAVE THE DATE!!

HOLIDAY DINNER ON 4 DECEMBER 1998

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Tue Oct 27 17:08:19 1998

Received: from imo17.mx.aol.com (imo17.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.7])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA12936; Tue, 27 Oct 1998 17:08:17 -0800 (PST)
From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo17.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id HIYOa04134;
Tue, 27 Oct 1998 20:04:34 +1900 (EST)
Message-ID: <45905c96.36366da2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 20:04:34 EST
To: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: RE: households with Internet
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

I think I've seen some recent survey data, citing a 43% ownership/usage level of households.

I subscribe to <http://www.infobeat.com> for various internet information. I think they posted a paragraph on a survey done by J.D. Powers on computer usage; not many methodology details in the paragraph though. Such surveys are done periodically, I've seen such findings more than once posted from infobeat.

Milton Goldsamt, Ph.D.
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

>From monson.6@osu.edu Wed Oct 28 05:43:41 1998
Received: from mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.30])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id FAA09646 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Oct 1998 05:43:38 -0800 (PST)
Received: from monson.6.acs.ohio-state.edu (ts3-8.homenet.ohio-state.edu [140.254.112.63])
by mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id IAA24296
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Oct 1998 08:43:34 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19981028084126.006b770c@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: monson.6@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (32)
Date: Wed, 28 Oct 1998 08:41:26 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Quin Monson <monson.6@osu.edu>
Subject: push polling in Utah congressional race?
In-Reply-To: <45905c96.36366da2@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I was reading an on-line version of the Salt Lake Tribune this morning and

noticed an article about alleged push polling in Utah's 2nd congressional district race. The push poll calls are being made on behalf of the Democratic candidate, Lily Eskelson against the Republican, Merrill Cook. Interestingly, Eskelson denies involvement but state Republican leaders seem to agree, reasoning that if the effort originated in Utah, the perpetrators would have more sense than to make push poll calls on Sunday. The leading suspect for the calls named in the article is "Americans for Limited Terms," which is named as an "affiliate" of US Term Limits. Republican Cook has refused to take a term limit pledge. Has anyone else encountered alleged push polling by Americans for Limited Terms?

The article can be seen at:
<http://www.sltrib.com/10281998/utah/59036.htm>

--Quin Monson

Dept. of Political Science
Ohio State University

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Oct 28 14:51:30 1998

Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id OAA29308 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Oct 1998 14:51:29 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default (user-38lcoui.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.99.210])

by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id RAA14844

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Oct 1998 17:51:27 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981028112505.00809100@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Wed, 28 Oct 1998 11:25:05 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: RE: households with Internet

In-Reply-To: <45905c96.36366da2@aol.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Georgia Institute of Technology conducts a yearly survey of internet usage....globally. Don't know if results from their 1998 survey are available yet but take a look at:

http://www.cc.gatech.edu/gvu/user_surveys/www6/www6-0.html

They describe in some detail their questionnaire, sampling methods, etc.

<smaller>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121

E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

</smaller>

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Oct 28 18:57:40 1998
Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id SAA01769 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Oct 1998 18:57:35 -0800
(PST)
Received: from default (user-38lca2v.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.40.95])
by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id VAA23995
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 28 Oct 1998 21:56:47 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981028215618.00813960@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Wed, 28 Oct 1998 21:56:18 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: RE: households with Internet
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

Should have mentioned this earlier: The November issue of WIRED magazine has what seems to be a rather comprehensive picture by country of phone, TV, Net Hosts, Cell phones, Radios, PC's Satellite Dishes, and cable TV connections. Page 162. Info sources are listed.

<smaller>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121

E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

</smaller>

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Thu Oct 29 01:36:57 1998
Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id BAA08892 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 01:36:55 -0800
(PST)
Received: from rachel (tr-ppp8.monmouth.com [209.191.24.40]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id EAA01715 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 04:36:23 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <36383849.73C7@monmouth.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 04:41:29 -0500
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: [Fwd: Job Opportunity - Washington DC]
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from imo28.mx.aol.com (imo28.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.72]) by

shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with ESMTP id TAA12839 for
<rhickson@monmouth.com>; Wed, 28 Oct 1998 19:46:36 -0500 (EST)
From: JOYQUILL@aol.com
Received: from JOYQUILL@aol.com
by imo28.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id GAMYa02083;
Wed, 28 Oct 1998 19:31:54 +1900 (EST)
Message-ID: <5d6b3646.3637b77a@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Oct 1998 19:31:54 EST
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Job Opportunity - Washington DC
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214
X-UIDL: 91025645cc3483f84dea55b28643f8a0
X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

A communication from:

Joy Quill, Principal
Management Evaluation Training, LLC
Annapolis MD 21403
Email: JoyQuill@aol.com

The following is brought to you courtesy of the Washington Evaluators and
the
Eastern Evaluation Research Society.

Research Social Scientist - Washington, D.C

Job Description

Lead and/or participate as member of research team in conducting evaluations
of programs and policy studies related to higher education and institutional
change. Responsibilities include designing evaluations, designing survey
instruments, overseeing and conducting quantitative analysis of survey data,
generating written reports, making oral presentations and briefs, and
developing
proposals for new research. Responsibilities may also include managing
projects, monitoring project expenditures, coordinating and interacting
with consultants, subcontractors, and clients.
Marketing activities related to expanding client base in the area of higher
education and institutional change, leading and participating in case
studies.

Experience, Education, and Other Requirements

Qualified candidates will have at least 10 years experience designing and
conducting large-scale research and/or evaluation studies using quantitative
data. Experience should include survey design and descriptive and
explanatory
analysis of quantitative data. Particularly relevant to this position are
experience in (1) policy analysis related to higher education and/or
institutional
change (particularly undergraduate preparation in science, mathematics,

engineering, and technology), (2) professional development for faculty, and (3) equity issues for both students and faculty. Candidate should have experience serving as a senior member of an evaluation team, marketing, client relations, and supervision of junior analysts. Experience working in an educational laboratory, university research center, or contract research firm would be especially relevant. Ideally, candidate would have established a solid reputation and track record with one or more federal, commercial or foundation clients. Excellent oral and written communication skills required.

Ph.D. or Ed.D. in evaluation methods, educational psychology and measurement, social policy analysis, sociology or related discipline.

Interested applicants should submit a resume and cover letter directly via regular mail or email attachment to:

Dr. Joan Ruskus, Program Manager
SRI International
1611 Kent St.
Arlington, VA 22209

Email: groover@wdc.sri.com

SRI International extends equal employment to all applicants without regard to race, religion, color, gender, sexual orientation, creed, national origin, ancestry, citizenship, age, disability, or any other status.

Raymond McGhee, Jr., Ph.D.
SRI International, Policy Division
Higher Education Policy & Evaluation
1611 N. Kent St.
Arlington, VA 22209
Tel. 703-247-8573
Fax. 703-247-8493
Email: mcghee@wdc.sri.com
<http://www.sri.com/policy/cehs/hepe.html>

>From rusciano@enigma.rider.edu Thu Oct 29 06:43:54 1998
Received: from enigma.RIDER.EDU (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id GAA20640 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 06:43:53 -0800
(PST)
Received: from enigma.rider.edu by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-10 #29692)
id <01J3JE8LF39U8WZFSM@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu,
29 Oct 1998 09:42:58 EST
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 09:42:55 -0500 (EST)
From: rusciano@enigma.rider.edu
Subject: Search for a survey of law schools
In-reply-to: <3.0.5.32.19981017221000.00816730@pop.mindspring.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: rusciano@enigma.rider.edu
Message-id: <Pine.PMDF.3.95.981029093923.539130550B-100000@enigma.rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear colleagues:

I was wondering if anyone knows of any surveys done of law school admissions or deans regarding the qualifications they prefer for law school students (i.e. majors, skills, whether a "pre-law" or "law and society" major is preferable to traditional majors, etc.). If anyone knows of such a survey, I would appreciate it if you could contact me directly, as I suspect our colleagues would not have an interest in it. (If there is interest, I will post the information).

Thanks.

Frank Rusciano
Political Science Dept.
Rider University
email at rusciano@rider.edu

>From Mark@bisconti.com Thu Oct 29 12:23:07 1998
Received: from medusa.nei.org (medusa.nei.org [208.158.210.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA19468 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 12:23:03 -0800
(PST)
Received: from jetson.nei.org (unverified [208.158.210.200]) by
medusa.nei.org
(Integralis SMTPRS 2.0.15) with ESMTP id <B0000275091@medusa.nei.org> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 29 Oct 1998 14:02:40 -0500
Received: from MARK-BRI by jetson.nei.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange
Internet Mail Service Version 5.0.1458.49)
id QY43TCWW; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 14:06:28 -0500
Received: by mark-bri with Microsoft Mail
id <01BE0344.1ED83D60@mark-bri>; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 13:57:52 -0500
Message-Id: <01BE0344.1ED83D60@mark-bri>
From: Mark Richards <Mark@bisconti.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Liars, hidrs, refusers, fools, and wimps
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 13:57:51 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

And the elite pollsters behind it all...! EXTRA, EXTRA! ... :)

William Safire in an essay in today's (10/29/98) New York Times, =
entitled "That Wagging Finger," wonders "How, in the face of all this =
objective reporting, and aware of the personalities that affect each =
local election, can I cling to the iconoclastic belief that impeachment =
is the gut issue in the 1998 campaign? One reason is that normal, =

forthright people, not under oath, will happily mislead pollsters and =
journalists with the same equanimity that Clinton will half-truth grand =
jurors. Beyond that, even (John) Zogby admits that 'the nasty secret of =
this business' is that more than half the people approached by pollsters =
tell them to get lost." He applauds non-responders ("those who assert =
their privacy") and says they are affected with "pluralistic =
ignorance"-"that is, they do not realize that most other people feel the =
way they do-and so refuse to tell strangers what they mistakenly think =
is a minority view, disapproved of by the elites." His next reason is =
the timidity of the Republican politicians "fooled by folks who fancy =
focus-groupies" ... "The G.O.P. has been spooked by its fear of =
'energizing' the wrong 'core.'"

Let's see. In summary, if impeachment is not the key campaign issue, it =
must be because:

- * People who participate in polls are liars, like Clinton
- * Those who refuse to participate in polls are not like those who do; =
those who do not participate think impeachment IS the key issue, but =
their opinion is not getting registered
- * There is an elite fostered spiral of silence in which the public =
refuses to tell strangers (pollsters) how they really feel because they =
feel they are in the minority
- * The G.O.P has been fooled by pollsters and focus-groupies into =
believing a heavy handed approach might energize the voters they would =
prefer stayed home
- * Republican politicians are wimping out

;))

Safire hints that last minute advertising will help people think more =
clearly about the fact that more Democrats means more Clinton protection =
and more Republicans means more serious consequences for Clinton.

In a 100% response rate in-person interview with a non-representative =
sample of one (forgive me please), a Republican colleague told me she =
plans to vote Republican because she likes many of the positions of the =
Republican candidate. However, she does not favor impeachment because =
she thinks Clinton has gotten/will continue to get adequate punishment =
via humiliation and in the history books, and she would prefer to not =
give Gore a head start in the next election.

Cheers, Mark Richards
mark@bisconti.com

>From Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU Thu Oct 29 13:33:46 1998
Received: from mailgate.nau.edu (mailgate.nau.edu [134.114.96.19])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA27099 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 13:33:44 -0800
(PST)

Received: from pc176.sbs.nau.edu ([134.114.152.191])
by mailgate.nau.edu (PMDF V5.1-12 #D3114)
with SMTP id <0F1L004W5YJYL4@mailgate.nau.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu,
29 Oct 1998 14:33:34 -0700 (MST)
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 14:34:04 -0700

From: Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU>
Subject: Request for Information
X-Sender: solop@nauvax.ucc.nau.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <0F1L004W6YJYL4@mailgate.nau.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I am posting this on behalf of a colleague not on AAPORnet.

~~~~~  
I need some assistance with my dissertation research and was wondering if any of you had thoughts on the subject.

I'm trying to track down any work that has been done on the subject of how employee attitudes change over time. For example, how does the motivation of a new employee relative to his/her organization change as time progresses. Do people tend to get more optimistic or pessimistic?

I'd like to include this type of research as contextual material for the Aerospace Basic Course results that will be presented in my dissertation. I haven't come across any other studies that capture similar information and was wondering if any of you may have names (phone numbers or email) of people or have come across any research.

Mike  
michael.thirtle@us.pwcglobal.com

Fred Solop  
Associate Professor  
Department of Political Science  
PO Box 15036  
Northern Arizona University  
Flagstaff, AZ 86011-5036  
(520) 523-3135 - phone  
(520) 523-6777 - fax  
Fred.Solop@nau.edu

>From feinberg@surveys.com Thu Oct 29 13:59:16 1998  
Received: from webhp1.surveys.com (mta@webhp1.surveys.com [204.217.98.6])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id NAA09236 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 13:59:13 -0800  
(PST)

Received: from BARRYM.F ([38.209.106.188]) by webhp1.surveys.com  
(Netscape Messaging Server 3.52) with SMTP id AAA273E  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 16:56:47 -0500

From: feinberg@surveys.com (Barry Feinberg)  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 17:00:26 +0000  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
Subject: Internet Access  
X-pmrqc: 1  
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.52)  
Message-ID: <7718A189160E.AAA273E@webhp1.surveys.com>

Here's some recent data -- Summer 1998 -- on incidence of PC household ownership and Internet access from our TechTrack Study. The study is conducted quarterly (N=2,000/quarter). It is done by RDD and is subscribed to by hardware, software and component clients.

Incidence of households that own a PC is 42%; (4 - 5% have a PC at home which they do not own (from school, business or borrowed from someone else. There is some overlap between the 42% and 4-5%).

65% of these household have Internet access, or about 27% of all households (a small proportion have access as well/or through WebTV).

We do not get into detailed internet usage questions for individuals in the household; but in summary in almost all of the Internet access households at least one person in the household has accessed the Net at least once in the three months prior to the interview.

In another RDD study with random selection of adult within household done early this year (data probably stale but I can release it), N = 1,200, 12% of adults signed onto the Net, on-line service or bulletin board at least once a day (4% several times a day), 6% every other day and 7% once a week. So that's about 25% of adults at least once during week. These data are about 9 months old.

Barry M. Feinberg, Ph.D.  
Senior Vice President  
Audits & Surveys Worldwide

>From mwolford@hers.com Thu Oct 29 15:50:35 1998  
Received: from mail.his.com (root@mail.his.com [205.177.25.9])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id PAA00414 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 15:50:29 -0800  
(PST)  
Received: from macawii (pm10-133.his.com [206.161.108.133])  
by mail.his.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA27533  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 29 Oct 1998 18:50:24 -0500 (EST)  
Message-ID: <3638FEFD.7792@hers.com>  
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 18:49:17 -0500  
From: Monica Wolford <mwolford@hers.com>  
Reply-To: mwolford@hers.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-KIT (Win95; U)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Liars, hidrs, refusers, fools, and wimps

References: <01BE0344.1ED83D60@mark-bri>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Of course, since all these people lie to pollsters on a regular basis, we can therefore presume that they do not have a strong moral stance about lying -therefore they probably don't care that Clinton may have lied, so they won't want to impeach him for that, but then if they were lying when they said that they don't want to impeach him.....

Hmmm--is there something wrong here?

Monica Wolford  
PIPA

Mark Richards wrote:

>  
> And the elite pollsters behind it all...! EXTRA, EXTRA! ... :)  
>  
>  
>  
> Let's see. In summary, if impeachment is not the key campaign issue, it must be because:  
>  
> \* People who participate in polls are liars, like Clinton  
> \* Those who refuse to participate in polls are not like those who do; those who do not participate think impeachment IS the key issue, but their opinion is not getting registered  
> \* There is an elite fostered spiral of silence in which the public refuses to tell strangers (pollsters) how they really feel because they feel they are in the minority  
> \* The G.O.P has been fooled by pollsters and focus-groupies into believing a heavy handed approach might energize the voters they would prefer stayed home  
> \* Republican politicians are wimping out  
> :)  
> Safire hints that last minute advertising will help people think more clearly about the fact that more Democrats means more Clinton protection and more Republicans means more serious consequences for Clinton.  
>  
> In a 100% response rate in-person interview with a non-representative sample of one (forgive me please), a Republican colleague told me she plans to vote Republican because she likes many of the positions of the Republican candidate. However, she does not favor impeachment because she thinks Clinton has gotten/will continue to get adequate punishment via humiliation and in the history books, and she would prefer to not give Gore a head start in the next election.

>  
> Cheers, Mark Richards  
> mark@bisconti.com  
>From leos@christa.unh.edu Fri Oct 30 11:22:47 1998

Received: from christa.unh.edu (leos@christa.unh.edu [132.177.137.10])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id LAA29908 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Oct 1998 11:22:43 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (leos@localhost)  
by christa.unh.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id OAA09158  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 30 Oct 1998 14:22:21 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Fri, 30 Oct 1998 14:22:21 -0500 (EST)  
From: Leo G Simonetta <leos@christa.unh.edu>  
To: IMailing list <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.96L.981030142207.25715A-100000@christa.unh.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

--

Leo G. Simonetta                   leos@christa.unh.edu  
UNH Survey Center

>From Krosnick.1@osu.edu Sat Oct 31 00:45:21 1998  
Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu  
[128.146.214.32])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id AAA06262 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Oct 1998 00:45:18 -0800  
(PST)  
Received: from notebookpc.psy.ohio-state.edu (ts7-14.homenet.ohio-state.edu  
[140.254.112.133])  
by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id DAA05948  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Oct 1998 03:45:14 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Sat, 31 Oct 1998 03:45:14 -0500 (EST)  
Message-Id: <199810310845.DAA05948@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu>  
X-Sender: krosnick@pop.service.ohio-state.edu  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Jon A. Krosnick" <Krosnick.1@osu.edu>  
Subject: Position Vacancy Listing: NES Director of Studies

>Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 09:43:32 -0500  
>From: Virginia Sapiro <sapiro@polisci.wisc.edu>  
> (by way of Jon Krosnick <Krosnick.1@osu.edu>)  
>Subject: Position Vacancy Listing: NES Director of Studies  
>X-Sender: krosnick@pop.service.ohio-state.edu  
>To: krosnick@osu.edu  
>X-PH: V4.4@mail3

>  
>The National Election Studies (NES), based in the Center for Political  
>Studies at the University of Michigan, is opening a national search for a  
>new Director of Studies. The position will be advertised shortly; below is  
>a draft announcement. For more information, please contact the Principal  
>Investigator, Virginia Sapiro (sapiro@polisci.wisc.edu).

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

>Position Vacancy Announcement:  
>Research Investigator, Department: Center for Political Studies (Director



of  
>Studies, National Election Studies)  
>  
>The National Election Studies (NES), located at the Center for Political  
>Studies, ISR, is a National Science Foundation-funded national resource for  
>the social sciences which conducts national surveys of the American  
>electorate in  
>presidential and midterm election years as well as occasional research and  
>development work. NES data are used across the social sciences to support  
>basic scholarly research. The Director of Studies reports to the NES  
>Principal Investigator and is  
>responsible for every aspect of the NES data collections and scientific  
>operations (from study planning and implementation to the production of  
>data  
>sets, documentation, and other materials); works with the Principal  
>Investigator and the Board of Overseers to ensure continuity in the NES  
>program of research, identify innovative methods of data collection,  
>formulate and  
>execute R&D work, including technical reports and scholarly papers, to  
>assess  
>NES instrumentation and data quality; collaborates in the management of the  
>NES project and acts as a liaison to the NES Board, the NES research  
>community,  
>and other entities; and serves as a coordinator of the Comparative Study of  
>Electoral Systems for which NES is the Secretariat.

>  
>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS:  
>A Masters degree in a relevant social science discipline; demonstrated  
>substantive expertise in the scholarship on public opinion, electoral  
>studies,  
>or a related field; graduate training and demonstrated expertise in all  
>phases  
>of survey research and in statistical analysis of survey data; the ability  
>to  
>interpret and evaluate standards by which data collections should be  
>carried  
>out and an understanding of the ways in which social scientists are likely  
>to  
>use NES data; strong organizational skills; the ability to interact well  
>with  
>others and to work well as a member of a team; very effective verbal and  
>written communication skills.

>  
>DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS:  
>A Ph.D. in a relevant social science discipline (or an equivalent  
>combination  
>of education and experience); several years experience managing national  
>surveys; experience with the processing and archiving of survey data;  
>experience using microcomputers in a network environment for word  
>processing,  
>data management, spreadsheets and statistical analysis; experience with  
>computer-assisted interviewing software.

>  
>The University of Michigan is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action

>employer.

>

>Send a letter of application, curriculum vita, names and contact information

>for at least 3 references, and other helpful supporting information (for >example, a writing sample) to:

>Virginia Sapiro, Search Committee, National Election Studies, Center for

>Political Studies, 426 Thompson Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106-1248

>

>

>

>

>

>From adam.safir@arbitron.com Sat Oct 31 00:47:33 1998

Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id AAA07248 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Oct 1998 00:47:31 -0800

(PST)

Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id DAA10197; Sat, 31 Oct 1998 03:47:05

-0500 (EST)

Received: from mercury.arbitron.com(198.40.5.145) by vulcan.arbitron.com via smap (4.1)

id xmaa10195; Sat, 31 Oct 98 03:46:57 -0500

Received: from ARBITRON-Message\_Server by arbitron.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Sat, 31 Oct 1998 03:43:43 -0500

Message-Id: <s63a876f.037@arbitron.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Sat, 31 Oct 1998 03:43:25 -0500

From: Adam Safir <adam.safir@arbitron.com>

Sender: ed.popek@arbitron.com

Reply-To: adam.safir@arbitron.com

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Position Vacancy Listing: NES Director of Studies -Reply

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain

Content-Disposition: inline

I will be out of the office from Monday, November 2 through Tuesday, November 3. If you need to contact me, please leave a message at (410) 312-8481.

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Sat Oct 31 07:32:57 1998

Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id HAA29528 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Oct 1998 07:32:56 -0800

(PST)

Received: from default (user-38lc8sl.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.35.149])

by dewdrop2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA31828

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 31 Oct 1998 10:32:54 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981031103220.007fa250@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Sat, 31 Oct 1998 10:32:20 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>  
Subject: An Eye for Patterns in the Social Fabric -- Robert K Merton  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

A few excerpts from a fascinating article in today's NY Times about Robert K. Merton Professor of Sociology at Columbia Univ (retired). You can retrieve the whole article at:

<http://search.nytimes.com/search/daily/bin/fastweb?getdoc+site+iib-site+55+0+wAAA+merton>

Excerpts:

<excerpt><excerpt>

" Even if most people haven't heard of <bold>Merton</bold>, they have probably heard of his ideas. He coined the phrase "self-fulfilling prophecy" and developed the idea of "role models." He invented the focus group interview, which has turned into the bedside tool of every political consultant and advertising executive. He formed a theory of "deviant behavior," explaining why people broke the rules when they couldn't achieve success playing by them.

"If those ideas have seeped into daily conversation, dozens of other, less familiar ones have helped lay the foundations of modern sociology and are still invoked in today's battles over the nature of scientific truth. Indeed, before Robert K. <bold>Merton</bold>, there was no sociology of science. Scientists were considered a breed apart, singular geniuses who didn't conform to normal rules. But <bold>Merton</bold> treated the scientific profession as he would any other social entity, pulling it apart like a house made of Legos to figure out how knowledge is produced and how scientists behave. In 1942, he laid out the "ethos of science" and single-handedly founded a new field, an achievement that contributed to his becoming the first sociologist to win a National Medal of Science in 1994.

<bold>"Merton</bold> taught sociologists to think about the world in a different way -- not to focus on piddling minutiae or to ponder some grand theory-of-everything, but to aim for the "middle range." No one really cares, for example, when a particular Harry met a particular Sally; and it is impossible to devise a theory about when every Harry met every Sally; but one might be able to figure out under what conditions some Harrys met some Sallys, and then draw conclusions about their socioeconomic status or marriage and birth rates.

"What distinguishes **Merton**, then, is a remarkable ability not only to identify a problem, puzzle out the research method and make sense of the significant details, but also to articulate it all with literary grace. This flair for exposing the unrecognized patterns that lie beneath a society's skin tends to elicit a slap on the forehead. ("Of course!") As Eugene Garfield, an information scientist, has written: "So much of what he says is so beautifully obvious -- so transparently true -- that one can't imagine why no one else has bothered to point it out."

"Consider his work on the word "serendipity." (He just this year agreed to publish a 400-page manuscript on the word that he collaborated on 41 years ago.) "My coming upon 'serendipity' was itself an instance of serendipity," he has said.

"It was at Columbia University, his academic home since 1941, that **Merton**, began his "improbable collaboration," with Paul Lazarsfeld. For years, the sociology department there was so riven that it could not agree on whom to hire. Finally, the department added two men: **Merton**, the theorist, and Lazarsfeld, the empiricist. An unplanned excursion to study a radio show led to a lifelong friendship and professional partnership that gave sociology a scientific edge. (The failure to use research to test theory is one of the reasons **Merton** complains about focus group research as "being mercilessly misused." Still, he says, a wry smile on his lips, "Wish I'd get a royalty on it.")

"Yet as even Gieryn concedes, skepticism has its costs. The sociology of science has lost some of the theoretical richness it had during **Merton**'s heyday. The post-modern reflex to question whether anything can be known for sure has created an atmosphere of doubt, replacing the fledgling field's sense of hopeful possibility and self-confidence. The kind of self-confidence that enables a scholar to have faith that he can distinguish fact from falsehood, to believe his work can make a difference, or to walk in front of a moving plane.

</excerpt></excerpt>

<center>

-----

</center>

<smaller>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121

E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

</smaller>