==

Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700

Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>

Subject: October 1999 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 log9910.

Part 1/1, total size 513298 bytes:

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

>From pbeatty@umich.edu Fri Oct 1 13:42:29 1999

Received: from donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu

[141.211.63.19])

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

   id NAA29915 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Oct 1999 13:42:27 -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

PAA05846

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Oct 1999 15:48:19 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (pbeatty@localhost)

   by joust.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id PAA14456

   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Oct 1999 15:48:18 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Fri, 1 Oct 1999 15:48:18 -0400 (EDT)

From: Paul Beatty <pbeatty@umich.edu>

X-Sender: pbeatty@joust.rs.itd.umich.edu

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Call for AV volunteer

Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.10.9910011526590.6293-100000@joust.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

***** A message from the Conference Operations Committee***********

Call for Volunteers -- AAPOR Conference Audio-Visual Coordinator

We are writing to ask if any members of AAPOR would like to volunteer as the audio-visual coordinator for AAPOR conferences. The AV coordinator's specific duties include taking requests from conference presenters for AV equipment, and working the hotel to be sure the needed equipment is in each meeting room. Shap Wolf held the position for the last two years and will work with the new coordinator to learn the details of the job.

The AV coordinator serves as a member of AAPOR's Conference Operations Committee, which is charged with running our conference each year from an operational standpoint, selecting sites, and serving as liaisons with hotel staff. The Committee is comprised of AAPOR members who volunteer to help run different aspects of the Conference.

Without this volunteer effort, AAPOR would face annual costs exceeding $20,000 to "run" the conference if we had to hire a professional organization to do this for us. AAPOR volunteers on the Conference Operations Committee generally get their hotel room & meals for the Conference nights paid by AAPOR.

The members of the committee include (1) the Committee Chair, (2) the Associate Chair, (3) Book Exhibit Coordinator, (4) Technology Exhibit Coordinator, (5) Social Activities Coordinator and (6) Audio-Visual Coordinator. Currently the Associate Chair serves a four year stint, first as Associate Chair for 2 years, then as Chair for 2 yrs. There are no set terms for the other members of the Committee.

If you would like to be considered for the Audio-Visual Coordinator, please contact me via email at pbeatty@umich.edu. If you have questions about what the duties involve, you may contact former coordinator Shap Wolf at

shap.wolf@asu.edu or 480-965-5032.

Thank you.

Paul Beatty

Chair, Conference Operations Committee

RIchard Morin leaves for an interesting assignement and I thought that fellow AAPORITES would be interested:

Dick HAlpern

Struggling With a New
        Democracy

        By Richard Morin
        Washington Post Polling Director
        Monday, September 13, 1999

        With this column, I reluctantly surrender this space for
four months to go to
        Harvard University, where I will be a Shorenstein Fellow
in the John F.
        Kennedy School of Government. While I will be on leave
from daily
        journalism, I am not taking a break from thinking about
public opinion and
        polling.

        I will spend my time at Harvard writing about a unique
project: a survey of
        3,000 randomly selected South Africans conducted by the
Independent
        Newspapers and the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.

The project,

        which took me to South Africa earlier this year,

examined the views of

        South Africans five years after the fall of apartheid.

Here's a first look at

        some of the key findings.

        The twin banner headlines on the front page of the Cape

Times on a lazy

        South African summer morning last February told a tale

of two democracies

        battling their own worst impulses. Terrorists had bombed

another police

        station in downtown Cape Town, killing a passerby. And

in equally large

        type: "Lewinsky to Testify."

        To a newly arrived visitor from the United States, the

juxtaposed headlines

        were at once odd and revealing. Back home, the world's

most powerful and

        successful democracy lurched toward a constitutional

crisis over what most

        Americans regarded as an inconsequential sex scandal.

Meanwhile, South

        Africa, one of the world's newest democracies, struggled

with issues of life

        and death, stability and chaos.

The story of South Africa's political transformation has been told often and

told well, notably by reporters for the Independent Newspapers group, the

largest newspaper chain in the country. Now another chapter has been

added by these journalists. In a multi-part series that ran in April, they

reported the results of a national public opinion poll of 3,000 randomly

selected South Africans who were asked in December to express their

views about race, reconciliation and national unity.

In important ways, the survey quantified the obvious: South Africans were

dismayed by their country's soaring crime rate, anemic economy and

continuing disparities between white and black South Africans. "It

underscored South Africa's essential challenge: how to create a more

equitable society without pushing underlying tensions to the breaking point,"

wrote Mollyann Brodie, Drew Altman and Michael Sinclair of the Kaiser

Foundation in a summary of the survey findings.

"But the strongest message that came through in the

survey was an

unequivocally positive one," the Kaiser team wrote. "Finding after finding

underscored the South African people's commitment to democracy and

national unity; their confidence in South Africa's major institutions; their

realism about the pace of change; and their optimism for the future."

The survey found strong agreement on the fundamental principles of

democracy. Nine in 10 South Africans believed voting should be private.

Eight in 10 supported the right of a free press. Three in four disagreed that

"voting is a waste of time."

There was one discordant note, however. A majority of those interviewed -

58 percent - agreed that "if a community supports one political party, other

parties should not be allowed to campaign in that area," a view that likely

reflects the deep and troubled history of intertribal and interracial conflict

that still plagues some parts of the country.

While not embracing politics, the overwhelming majority

of South Africans

see the need for vigorous, contested elections. Three in four agreed that

"for good government, we must have strong opposition." About half - 52

percent - acknowledged that they "didn't really like politics, but it's

important to keep in touch with what's happening," while 36 percent said it

was important to them "to be as involved as possible" in politics. Only one in

eight - 12 percent - said "politics is a waste of time."

The survey showed that much has gone right with South Africa in the

Mandela years. Nearly half - 48 percent - said public education has gotten

better, while 23 percent said there's been no change. Only 29 percent said

education has gotten worse, a view shared by a disproportionately large

number of white South Africans whose local schools had been opened to

black children. Nearly four in 10 - 37 percent - said race relations had

gotten better, while 42 percent reported no change. One in five reported

that relations between the races had eroded. In other important areas, the

results are more troubling. More than eight in 10 - 85 percent - said crime

has gotten worse. And nearly two in three - 64 percent - said the economy

had declined.

Yet the survey revealed general optimism for the future. A majority of

South Africans - 54 percent - said they believed that South Africa will

remain a democratic country, while 38 percent were uncertain (perhaps the

most realistic view in a country where great change has come so quickly).

Only 8 percent doubted democracy will survive; even among whites, only

one in eight offered this pessimistic view.

"This survey of South Africans certainly underscores South Africa's

challenges but it also shows that the new South Africa has made a good

beginning and there is cause of guarded optimism about the future," the

Kaiser team wrote. "When viewed in the context of South Africa's history

and what might have been, the survey illuminates South Africa's standing as

perhaps the leading example of democratic transformation

in the world."

Richard Morin is director of polling for The Washington

Post. "What Americans

Think" appears Mondays in The Washington Post National

Weekly Edition.

Morin can be reached at morinr@clark.net .

>From JAM@moviefone.com Sun Oct 3 19:38:59 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

    id TAA09386 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 3 Oct 1999 19:38:58 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

    with Novell_GroupWise; Sun, 03 Oct 1999 22:38:07 -0400

Message-Id: <s7f7dacf.008@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Sun, 03 Oct 1999 22:37:46 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

Sender: Postmaster@smtp1.moviefone.com

Reply-To: JAM@moviefone.com

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Morin goes on an interesting assignment

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id TAA09396

This e-mail address has expired. Please send to my new e-mail address,

JayMattlin@aol.com.

Thank you.

   Jay

>From daves@startribune.com Mon Oct 4 09:56:50 1999

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

[132.148.80.211])

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

    id JAA20648 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 4 Oct 1999 09:56:48 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id MAA26828; Mon, 4 Oct 1999

12:03:31 -0500

Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by

firewall2.startribune.com via smap (V4.2)

    id xma026524; Mon, 4 Oct 99 12:03:00 -0500

Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com

    with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 04 Oct 1999 11:52:29 -0600

Message-Id: <s7f894fd.065@mail.startribune.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Mon, 04 Oct 1999 11:51:50 -0600

From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Jesse Ventura

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

Colleagues ...

Those of you with Minnesota connections or an interest in Jesse Ventura might be interested in our latest Minnesota Poll about the governor. The website is www.startribune.com.

Cheers,

Rob Daves

Director of polling and news research

Star Tribune   e: daves@startribune.com

425 Portland Av. S.   v: 612.673.7278

Minneapolis MN 55419 USA   f: 612.673.4359

Representative George Miller, Democrat of California, has introduced

a bill that would ban the collection of any information in a school,

for commercial purposes, from any student under the age of 18 without

prior written permission from both parents.

-- Jim

_____
____

_____
____

September 29, 1999

Education Notebook: Marketing in Schools

MICHAEL POLLAK

Commercial advertising in public schools used to be subtle and issue-oriented, like the science posters about the need for pest control sponsored by insecticide makers.

But blunter commercialism has entered many classrooms, in the form of direct advertising of products and access to students for marketing surveys in return for gifts to schools like free computers.

Procter& Gamble, for example, sponsors oral hygiene classes in elementary school in return for distributing samples of Crest toothpaste.

Concern about using students as captive consumers has led Representative George Miller, Democrat of California, to introduce a bill to ban the collection of any information in school from any student under 18 for commercial purposes without first getting written permission from parents.

Miller mentioned the practice of Zap Me, a California company that has offered schools free computers with limited Internet access, but then monitors the students' Web selections to get information on what advertising would appeal to them. He also noted deals with schools in several

states in which marketers held focus groups with students and had them take taste tests and fill out questionnaires.

The bill, the Student Privacy Protection Act and introduced last week, would also order a broad Federal study of the extent and the trends of commercialism in schools, including both advertising and market research.

"Students should go to school to learn," Miller said in a statement, "not to provide companies an edge in the hotly contested youth market."

An aide to Miller said the bill would not interfere with scholarly academic research and noted that Federal regulations already require parental permission for any federally sponsored studies that solicit personal information from students.

The bill would not ban soft-drink companies' practice of trading donations to schools for exclusive contracts to sell only their brands, but it may bar contracts if they require the schools to allow market testing of students as part of the deal.

_____

—

_____

—

****

>From GSO-GSO@worldnet.att.net Tue Oct 5 14:29:23 1999

Received: from mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net

[204.127.131.37])

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

   id OAA01629 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Tue, 5 Oct 1999 14:29:22 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from worldnet.att.net ([12.75.165.15])

    by mtiwmhc02.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.07.07 118-134)

    with ESMTP id <19991005212149.MNHQ26062@worldnet.att.net>

    for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Tue, 5 Oct 1999 21:21:49 +0000

Message-ID: <37FA6C71.9114C41C@worldnet.att.net>

Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 16:24:01 -0500

From: Gary Siegel <GSO-GSO@worldnet.att.net>

Reply-To: GSO-GSO@worldnet.att.net

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU

Subject: PROPER TERMINOLOGY

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In a recent report on a US-Canadian project we wrote about miles driven and mileage for the US segment.

For the Canadian segment we wrote about kilometers driven.

What is the proper Canadian term that would be equivelant to "mileage?"

Gary Siegel

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Tue Oct 5 18:23:42 1999

Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.110])

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

    id SAA29528 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 5 Oct 1999 18:23:41 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-38lc868.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.32.200])

    by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id VAA28206

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 5 Oct 1999 21:23:57 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991005210047.009e6920@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 21:06:29 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: Re: Miller Bill: Student Privacy Protection Act

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9910051129300.6487-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I see no problem with the bill providing the term "commercial" is well

defined. Rep George Miller's point is well taken. Opening school doors to

blatant commercialism is inappropriate.

Dick Halpern

>   Representative George Miller, Democrat of California, has introduced

>   a bill that would ban the collection of any information in a school,

>   for commercial purposes, from any student under the age of 18 without

>   prior written permission from both parents.

>   -- Jim

>

>_____

>____

>_____

>

>_____

>____

>_____

>

>

>   September 29, 1999

>

>   Education Notebook: Marketing in Schools

>
>   MICHAEL POLLAK
>
>   Commercial advertising in public schools used to
>   be subtle and issue-oriented, like the science
>   posters about the need for pest control sponsored
>   by insecticide makers.
>
>   But blunter commercialism has entered many
>   classrooms, in the form of direct advertising of
>   products and access to students for marketing
>   surveys in return for gifts to schools like free
>   computers.
>
>   Procter& Gamble, for example, sponsors oral
>   hygiene classes in elementary school in return
>   for distributing samples of Crest toothpaste.
>
>   Concern about using students as captive consumers
>   has led Representative George Miller, Democrat of
>   California, to introduce a bill to ban the
>   collection of any information in school from any
>   student under 18 for commercial purposes without
>   first getting written permission from parents.
>
>   Miller mentioned the practice of Zap Me, a
>   California company that has offered schools free
>   computers with limited Internet access, but then
>   monitors the students' Web selections to get

> information on what advertising would appeal to
>
> them. He also noted deals with schools in several
>
> states in which marketers held focus groups with
>
> students and had them take taste tests and fill
>
> out questionnaires.
>
> The bill, the Student Privacy Protection Act and
>
> introduced last week, would also order a broad
>
> Federal study of the extent and the trends of
>
> commercialism in schools, including both
>
> advertising and market research.
>
> "Students should go to school to learn," Miller
>
> said in a statement, "not to provide companies an
>
> edge in the hotly contested youth market."
>
> An aide to Miller said the bill would not
>
> interfere with scholarly academic research and
>
> noted that Federal regulations already require
>
> parental permission for any federally sponsored
>
> studies that solicit personal information from
>
> students.
>
> The bill would not ban soft-drink companies'
>
> practice of trading donations to schools for
>
> exclusive contracts to sell only their brands,
>
> but it may bar contracts if they require the
>
> schools to allow market testing of students as
>
> part of the deal.

>

>_____

>____

>_____

>

>   Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

>_____

>____

>_____

>

>

>*******

>From kneuman@cra.ca Wed Oct 6 04:19:18 1999

Received: from cclgroup.ca ([142.176.86.2])

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

    id EAA25790 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Oct 1999 04:19:16 -0700

(PDT)

Message-id: <fc.000f7cf7001e3a293b9aca009ddd7e35.1e3a2f@cclgroup.ca>

Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1999 08:27:37 -0300

Subject: Re: PROPER TERMINOLOGY

To: GSO-GSO@worldnet.att.net

Cc: aapornet@usc.edu

From: kneuman@cra.ca (Keith Neuman)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The proper term would be "kilometrage", as defined by the Canadian Oxford

Dictionary. That being the case, having lived in Canada for close to 17

years I'm not sure I have actually heard anyone use this term, nor do I

recall seeing it written.

Keith Neuman,Ph.D.

Halifax, Nova Scotia

An article by Myron Levin in Monday's _LA Times_ presents an interesting

problem that is apparently becoming legendary in the world of legal dicovery

processes.

http://www.latimes.com/HOME/BUSINESS/UPDATES/lat_smoke991004.htm

The controversy is over whether researchers of a study on the effects of

second hand smoke should be required to turn their data over to tobacco

companies as part of a pre-trial discovery process. The USC researchers

claim they will not because of their confidentiality promise to their

subjects. Tobacco defense lawyers insist they do not want identifier data,

only the data used in the analysis that eventually persuaded the EPA in 1993

to consider second-hand smoke a significant hazard. Lawyers on both sides

have been to-ing and fro-ing since 1994.

My question: can researchers withhold data in a situation like this on the

grounds of "respondent confidentiality" even when the party requesting has

specifically requested that all identifiers be removed? If I understand the

specifics correctly, I have to side with tobacco lawyers on this issue, in

spite of my dislike of Big Tobacco.

=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=
Jim Wolf   Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net
>From srg@regen.com Wed Oct 6 08:00:44 1999
Received: from mailhost.iconn.net (mailhost.iconn.net [207.171.128.7])

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

    id IAA12169 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Oct 1999 08:00:42 -0700

(PDT)
Received: from regen.com (regenx.regen.com [207.171.147.133] (may be

forged))

    by mailhost.iconn.net (8.9.1/19981210) with SMTP id LAA04451

NBC News will hire a poll researcher/analyst for the 2000 election season.

This is a temporary job from December 1999 through November 2000.

Applicants should have an advanced degree, experience in survey research,

and an interest in journalism and politics.

This position is based in NYC.

Please send resumes to

Sheldon.Gawiser@nbc.com

In response to Jim's insightful query. If we promise confidentiality and

anonymity I, personally, feel we are in the position of a news reporter and

their sources. As long as their is nothing that can identify a respondent,

we release it. If there is identification that gives someone "away," e.g.,

zip code with a special demographic that identifies one individual, that

must be suppressed but otherwise, I think it is a professional

responsibility to allow other to assess the data.

Brian Vargus

Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory

P.S. I have faced this issue with research we did for the Hoosier Lottery

and the state decided that the raw data could only be released if we could

hide any way to identify anyone in the study.

Jim Wolf wrote:

> An article by Myron Levin in Monday's _LA Times_ presents an

> interesting problem that is apparently becoming legendary in the world

> of legal dicovery processes.

>

>   http://www.latimes.com/HOME/BUSINESS/UPDATES/lat_smoke991004.htm

>

> The controversy is over whether researchers of a study on the effects

> of second hand smoke should be required to turn their data over to

> tobacco companies as part of a pre-trial discovery process. The USC

> researchers claim they will not because of their confidentiality

> promise to their subjects. Tobacco defense lawyers insist they do not

> want identifier data, only the data used in the analysis that

> eventually persuaded the EPA in 1993 to consider second-hand smoke a

> significant hazard. Lawyers on both sides have been to-ing and

> fro-ing since 1994.

>

> My question: can researchers withhold data in a situation like this on

> the grounds of "respondent confidentiality" even when the party

> requesting has specifically requested that all identifiers be removed?

> If I understand the specifics correctly, I have to side with tobacco

> lawyers on this issue, in spite of my dislike of Big Tobacco.

>

> =-=

> Jim Wolf   Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

I would like to support the position of Brian Vargas. The science of

secondhand smoke is an important issue area in this country. Public health

experts have criticized (rightfully) the tobacco industry for their

manipulation and deception of the American public regarding the health

effects of smoking and secondhand smoke. As researchers, we should demand

that the scientific community on both sides of this issue allow full access

to the raw data. It is not that difficult to obscure personal identifying

information. We are in search of "truth" here.

I would like to include a copy of an email message that came to me today.

While the source is reputable, I cannot verify the accuracy or validity of

the statement. I believe this is relevent to the current discussion. I have

not corrected the typos. This is exactly how it came to me.

*****

My Name is D. Warrignton. For reasons that will become obvious it is

important that I do not identify myself by my current name. I work at a PR

firm that handles Philip Morris business -- I do NOT work on this business.

My aunt died of emphasyma and lung cancer several years ago. A colleague of

mine who does work on this business told me that Philip Morris is going to

launch a website on October 13 in an attempt to present a "friendlier" face

to the general public. As part of this "friendlier face" Philip Morris will

acknowledge that ETS causes lung cancer and heart disease as well as

bronchial disorders and asthma and children. I have seen a copy of the draft

Philip Morris statement as well as a confidential Questions/Answers document

on this issue that my agency helped to create with Philip Morris' attorneys

-- this document explicitly describes how Philip Morris can continue to

accept the science and at the same time state that the company acknowledges

the positions taken by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S.

Department of Health. Moreover the question/answer document discusses how

Philip Morris employees can justify the so-called accommodation of smokers

and non-smokers in restaurants and bars despite acknowledging the health

risks that they acknowledge are associated with ETS. When I read the draft

of this statement, I decided that I had sat on the sidelines long enough --

I want to make this information known to you and other health advocates in

the hope that you can use it to your advantange and get out ahead of Philip

Morris on October 13th.

Best of Luck -- A Friend

-=-

Scott Goold, Ph.D.*

University of New Mexico

505.293.2504

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

"I Can't Accept Not Trying"

 -=-

This case, as presented to aapornet, does not make sense. There is no issue

of loss of confidentiality if all identifying information has been removed.

Surely, there is more to the USC story than what we have heard so far. Can

someone tell us more of the USC side of the story?

At 09:28 AM 10/6/99 -0400, you wrote:

>An article by Myron Levin in Monday's _LA Times_ presents an

>interesting problem that is apparently becoming legendary in the world

>of legal dicovery processes.

>

> http://www.latimes.com/HOME/BUSINESS/UPDATES/lat_smoke991004.htm

>

>The controversy is over whether researchers of a study on the effects

>of second hand smoke should be required to turn their data over to

>tobacco companies as part of a pre-trial discovery process. The USC

>researchers claim they will not because of their confidentiality

>promise to their subjects. Tobacco defense lawyers insist they do not

>want identifier data, only the data used in the analysis that

>eventually persuaded the EPA in 1993 to consider second-hand smoke a

>significant hazard. Lawyers on both sides have been to-ing and fro-ing

>since 1994.

>

>My question: can researchers withhold data in a situation like this on

>the grounds of "respondent confidentiality" even when the party

>requesting has specifically requested that all identifiers be removed?

>If I understand the specifics correctly, I have to side with tobacco

>lawyers on this issue, in spite of my dislike of Big Tobacco.

>

>=-=

>Jim Wolf   Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

Mitofsky International

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Oct 6 12:48:34 1999

Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.110])

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

    id MAA26595 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Oct 1999 12:48:31 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-38lcf34.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.60.100])

    by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id PAA02084

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Oct 1999 15:48:47 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991006143829.00a64550@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1999 15:44:43 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: Re: Big tobacco and the right to data

In-Reply-To: <v02130519b420d58e737f@[204.134.5.16]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I support the position of Brian Vargas and Scott Goold with respect to the releasing of raw data minus the identity of the respondents. I am not a lawyer but I suspect that the confidentiality agreement between the researcher and a respondent would not hold up legally in court during the discovery process. However, raw data is one thing but the identity of respondents is something else....and I suspect that a court would go along with this limitation even though they might not have to as a legal matter. As long as the tobacco company does not want actual respondent's names the raw data ought to be released.

Dick Halpern

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology

3837 Courtyard Drive

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

rshalpern@mindspring.com

phone/fax 770 434 4121

Serious questions have been raised about the validity and

varidicality of the research underlying EPA's claims about the

effects of second hand smoke on health. If the tobacco industry's

consultants have not requested information about respondent

identity, then I cannot see how confidentiality can serve as any sort

of basis for withholding survey data that has been used to justify

government actions that have such colossal impacts on society.

Facts are facts. Let's have a look at em.

PS. My firm does not work for the tobacco industry.

I support the position of Brian Vargas and Scott Goold with respect to the releasing of raw data minus the identity of the respondents. I am not a lawyer but I suspect that the confidentiality agreement between the researcher and a respondent would not hold up legally in court during the discovery process. However, raw data is one thing but the identity of respondents is something else....and I suspect that a court would go along with this limitation even though they might not have to as a legal matter. As long as the tobacco company does not want actual respondent's names the raw data ought to be released.

Dick Halpern

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology

3837 Courtyard Drive

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

rshalpern@mindspring.com

phone/fax 770 434 4121

>From abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu Thu Oct 7 13:03:40 1999

Received: from allman.src.uchicago.edu (allman.src.uchicago.edu

[128.135.252.22])

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

    id NAA14302 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Oct 1999 13:03:35 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from nittany.uchicago.edu (nittany.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.8])

    by allman.src.uchicago.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id PAA16263

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Oct 1999 15:03:29 -0500

Received: (from abcgss1@localhost)

    by nittany.uchicago.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) id PAA22399

    for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 7 Oct 1999 15:03:29 -0500 (CDT)

Date: Thu, 7 Oct 1999 15:03:29 -0500 (CDT)

From: "Tom_W. Smith" <abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu>

Message-Id: <199910072003.PAA22399@nittany.uchicago.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

General Social Survey Student Paper Competition

The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago announces the latest annual General Social Survey (GSS) Student Paper Competition. To be eligible papers must:

1) be based on data from the 1972-1998 GSSs or from the GSS's cross-national component, the International Social Survey Program (any year or combination of years may be used), 2) represent original and unpublished work, and 3) be written by a student or students at an accredited college or university. Both undergraduates and graduate students may enter and college graduates are eligible for one year after receiving their degree. Recent college graduates who completed an appropriate undergraduate or senior honors thesis are encouraged to consider submitting such research. Professors are urged to inform their students of this opportunity.

The papers will be judged on the basis of their: a) contribution to expanding understanding of contemporary American society, b) development and testing of social science models and theories, c) statistical and methodological sophistication, and d) clarity of writing and organization. Papers should be less than 40 pages in length (including tables, references, appendices, etc.) and should be double spaced.

Paper will be judged by the principal investigators of the GSS (James A. Davis and Tom W. Smith) with assistance from a group of leading scholars. Separate prizes will be awarded to the best undergraduate and best graduate-level entries. Entrants should indicate in which group they are competing. Winners will receive a cash prize of $250, a commemorative plaque, and SPSS BASE, the main statistical analysis package of SPSS. SPSS Base is donated by SPSS, Inc. of Chicago, Illinois. Honorable mentions may also be awarded by the judges.

Two copies of each paper must be received by February 15, 2000. The winner will be announced in late April, 2000. Send entries to:

Tom W. Smith

General Social Survey

National Opinion Research Center

1155 East 60th St.

Chicago, Il 60637

For further information:

Phone: 773-256-6288

Fax: 773-753-7886

Email: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu

>From george.bishop@uc.edu Fri Oct 8 13:18:53 1999

Received: from newman.bch.uc.edu (newman.bch.uc.edu [129.137.33.152])

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

   id NAA29673 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 Oct 1999 13:18:36 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from uc.edu.uc.edu (ucpsc16.crs.uc.edu [129.137.72.211])

   by newman.bch.uc.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id PAA06520

   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 Oct 1999 15:02:36 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <199910081902.PAA06520@newman.bch.uc.edu>

X-Sender: bishopgf@email.uc.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1

Date: Fri, 08 Oct 1999 16:16:03 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: George Bishop 513-556-5078 <george.bishop@uc.edu>

Subject: Graduate Program in Public Opinion & Survey Research

The University of Cincinnati's Political Science Department is pleased

to announce the opening of a new graduate program

in Public Opinion and Survey Research under the direction of Dr.George

Bishop, Professor of Political Science.

The program includes 24 credits of coursework as part of a Master's

(M.A.)

degree in Political Science (or in a related field). Students can also

choose to complete the program in one year on a part-time basis and receive

a graduate certificate in

Public Opinion and Survey Research.

Please refer interested students or employees to our website for

applications to the program for the next academic year

2000-2001:

http://ucaswww.mcm.uc.edu/polisci

George Bishop, Ph.D.

Professor of Political Science

Director, Graduate Certificate Program in Public Opinion & Survey Research

University of Cincinnati Cincinnati,Ohio 45221-0375 U.S.A.

Phone: 513-556-5078

Fax: 556-2314

E-Mail: george.bishop@uc.edu

>From Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU Fri Oct 8 14:23:43 1999

Received: from mailgate.nau.edu (mailgate.nau.edu [134.114.96.19])

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

    id OAA08329 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 8 Oct 1999 14:23:10 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from conversion.mailgate.nau.edu by mailgate.nau.edu (PMDF

V5.2-32 #39840) id <0FJA00E01ZEBF4@mailgate.nau.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;

Fri, 8 Oct 1999 14:23:06 -0700 (MST)

Received: from pc176.sbs.nau.edu (pc176.sbs.nau.edu [134.114.152.191]) by

mailgate.nau.edu (PMDF V5.2-32 #39840) with SMTP id

<0FJA003BFZE9HZ@mailgate.nau.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 08 Oct 1999

14:22:58 -0700 (MST)

Date: Fri, 08 Oct 1999 14:23:47 -0700

From: Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU>

Subject: MOE Question

X-Sender: solop@jan.ucc.nau.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <4.1.19991008141757.00ac63c0@jan.ucc.nau.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Content-type: MULTIPART/ALTERNATIVE;

BOUNDARY="Boundary_(ID_5mLFw29UwIbTFwwkKuqgyw)"

--Boundary_(ID_5mLFw29UwIbTFwwkKuqgyw)

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

Colleagues,

I have a question regarding Margin of Error calculations. Perhaps someone
can help me out. If I conduct an RDD survey with 400 respondents, my known
MOE on any one question is +/- 5% with a 95% confidence level. If I then
average together the mean of 3 thermometer
scales (1 - 10) to build an overall index, is the error from each of the 3
questions compounded? How do I calculate the MOE and confidence level
associated with the new index? Now, if I put the 3 questions into a more
complex model, perhaps an econometric model, how do I then calculate MOE and
confidence level?

Any help on this concern is most appreciated.

Thanks,

Fred Solop

Fred Solop, Director

Social Research Laboratory

PO Box 15301

Northern Arizona University

Flagstaff, AZ 86011

E-mail: Fred.Solop@nau.edu

(520) 523-3135 -- phone

(520) 523-6654 -- fax

--Boundary_(ID_5mLFw29UwIbTFwwkKuqgyw)

Content-type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<html><div>Colleagues,</div>

<div>I have a question regarding Margin of Error calculations.</div>
<div>Perhaps someone can help me out. If I conduct an</div> <div>RDD
survey with 400 respondents, my known MOE</div> <div>on any one question is
+/- 5% with a 95% confidence</div> <div>level. If I then average
together the mean of 3 thermometer </div> <div>scales (1 - 10) to build an
overall index, is the error from</div> <div>each of the 3 questions
compounded? How do I calculate</div> <div>the MOE and confidence level
associated with the new index?</div> <div>Now, if I put the 3 questions into
a more complex model,</div> <div>perhaps an econometric model, how do I then
calculate</div> <div>MOE and confidence level?</div>
 <div>Any help on
this concern is most appreciated.</div>
 <div>Thanks,</div>
<div>Fred Solop</div>

Fred Solop, Director
 Social Research
Laboratory
 PO Box 15301
 Northern Arizona University
 Flagstaff,
AZ 86011
 E-mail: Fred.Solop@nau.edu
(520) 523-3135 -- phone
(520) 523-6654 -- fax</html>

--Boundary_(ID_5mLFw29UwIbTFwwkKuqgyw)--
>From mbednarz@umich.edu Sat Oct 9 07:33:54 1999
Received: from berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@berzerk.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.63.17])
	by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
	id HAA06720 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 9 Oct 1999 07:33:53 -0700

Please Contact: FAX or mail letters of application along with a current

vitae

to:Linda Young,

Community Systems Research Institute

1300 S. Fourth Street, Suite 300

Louisville, KY 40208

Phone: 502/634-3694

      POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE), a national, nonprofit applied research organization, is seeking a Research Scientist for Community Systems Research, a division located in Louisville, KY. We are seeking a Research Scientist with excellent quantitative skills including survey research design and sampling, program evaluation, social experimentation, epidemiological research and analysis of large, complex databases. PIRE personnel are involved in a variety of research projects and proposal activities in collaboration with universities, local governments, nonprofit and private organizations at the local, state, national and international level. The Institute promotes the integration of research, policy and practice related to a wide variety of community issues such as affordable housing, alcohol, tobacco and drug abuse, HIV/AIDS prevention, community development, school safety, criminal justice, violence, health education and care, information use in policy decision-making, organizational change, and international research. Job Title: Research Scientist

Location: Louisville, Kentucky

Opening Date: October 1, 1999

Closing Date: October 31, 1999 or until position is filled. Summary of Primary Duties and Responsibilities: The Research Scientist will design and direct studies that address community, organizational and health related issues. Responsibilities will include conducting needs assessments and evaluating evidence based programs for local, state and federal agencies, documentation and analysis of community health, social and environmental indicators, producing estimates of at-risk populations, estimates of health and behavioral incidence and prevalence, directing and managing special population studies (e.g. children, elderly, homeless or disabled) and criminal justice studies, producing descriptive measures of preventive services use, access, and health resources. Publication in referred journals

and national and international presentations of research findings are expected.

Qualifications/Requirements: The successful candidate will have a Ph.D. in a social science, with emphasis in public health or a closely related field. She/he will have knowledge and experience with sampling theory, survey research, and program evaluation methods. Additional experience with epidemiological investigative techniques is preferred but not required. She/he must demonstrate 8 to 10 years of experience in writing proposals with an established track record of independently funded grants and contracts. Additional experience in designing and directing large research grants and contracts, application of advanced multivariate analysis and statistical skills and strong skills in electronic data processing necessary to analyze large data sets is essential. Salary Range: $70,000 - $100,000 commensurate with experience. Position Status: Full-time, benefit eligible Contact: FAX or mail letters of application along with a current vitae to:

Linda Young,

Community Systems Research Institute

1300 S. Fourth Street, Suite 300

Louisville, KY 40208

Phone: 502/634-3694

FAX: 502/634-5690

 PIRE/CSR is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

At 02:23 PM 10/8/99 -0700, Fred Solop wrote:

>

>... Now, if I put the 3 questions into a more complex model, perhaps an

>econometric model, how do I then calculate MOE and confidence level?

>

The simple and frequently used (and misused) formula for the 95% margin of

error (MOE) is 1.96 times the square root of the proportion P times (1-P)

divided by N. If I create a scale from several variables which results in a

given P, wouldn't the same formula apply (where N would simply be the number

of cases used to estimate P)?

If I'm over-simplifying the problem, please stop me before I confuse more!

=-=

Jim Wolf   Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

>From john.nordbo@dot.state.wi.us Mon Oct 11 09:05:16 1999

Received: from dot.state.wi.us (hfstbx.dot.state.wi.us [130.47.34.2])

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

    id JAA13863 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Oct 1999 09:05:16 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by dot.state.wi.us; id MAA18505; Mon, 11 Oct 1999 12:05:12 -0400

(EDT)

Received: from mes01.dot.state.wi.us(130.47.218.16) by

hfstbx.dot.state.wi.us via smap (V4.2)

    id xma018483; Mon, 11 Oct 99 11:04:35 -0500

Received: by mes01.dot.state.wi.us with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

    id <SKP4H5CN>; Mon, 11 Oct 1999 11:04:35 -0500

Message-ID: <3995FAFE614ED211A9330060942583E90180D085@mes02.dot.state.wi.us>

From: "Nordbo, John" <john.nordbo@dot.state.wi.us>

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

Subject: Organizations that offer training

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1999 11:04:33 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

Greetings!

A couple of weeks ago, I posted a request for information on organizations

that offer short courses in survey concepts. A couple of you asked me to

post the responses I received--here they are:

Several of you recommended the Joint Program in Survey Methodology (JPSM) at

the University of Maryland (http://www.jpsm.umd.edu/home/).

I was also made aware of the Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques

at the University of Michigan (http://www.isr.umich.edu/src/si/home.html)

and the Institute for Program in Arlington, Virginia (I was unable to locate

a Web address).

I had hoped for more responses but am very appreciative of the information I

did receive. Thanks very much!

(If anyone knows of other organizations not listed above that provide 3-5

day training sessions/workshops on survey development, analysis, or

management please let me know. Thanks!)

John P. Nordbo

Office of Organizational Development Services

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Madison, WI

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Mon Oct 11 09:36:00 1999

Received: from web2.tdl.com (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])

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

    id JAA06497 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Oct 1999 09:36:00 -0700

(PDT)

From: sullivan@fsc-research.com

Received: from BECKY (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])

You are correct.

At 02:23 PM 10/8/99 -0700, Fred Solop wrote:

>

>... Now, if I put the 3 questions into a more complex model, perhaps an

>econometric model, how do I then calculate MOE and confidence level?

>

The simple and frequently used (and misused) formula for the 95% margin of

error (MOE) is 1.96 times the square root of the proportion P times (1-P)

divided by N. If I create a scale from several variables which results in a

given P, wouldn't the same formula apply (where N would simply be the number

of cases used to estimate P)?

If I'm over-simplifying the problem, please stop me before I confuse more!

=-=

Jim Wolf   Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net

>From pmoy@u.washington.edu Mon Oct 11 16:12:32 1999

Received: from jason01.u.washington.edu (root@jason01.u.washington.edu

[140.142.70.24])

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

    id QAA00925 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Oct 1999 16:12:31 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from homer28.u.washington.edu (pmoy@homer28.u.washington.edu

[140.142.70.18])

    by jason01.u.washington.edu (8.9.3+UW99.09/8.9.3+UW99.09) with ESMTP

Dear AAPORNET,

Does anyone have recent data on response rates for email vs. fax vs. mail

surveys? Also, would U.S. figures be comparable to those from Southern

hemisphere countries?

Any information would be greatly appreciated.

Many thanks,

Patricia Moy

AAPORNetters,

A few weeks ago I was lamenting the unsettling need to defend the use of

respondent selection techniques. I received several very helpful

responses. Having now gone through the various papers, I'm hoping to

borrow more specific information from AAPOR's collective wisdom. In

addition to the various "random" selection techniques, I have come

across a few systematic, non-random techniques such as the "youngest

male/oldest female" method. I have reviewed several empirical "tests" of this method and found none that demonstrate a significant demographic or attitudinal difference between this method and either household inventory or "last birthday" methods. My question is why? I realize that the lack of a significant difference could simply be a result of chance. However, with 3 different studies all indicating little to no significant difference, I am beginning to think chance isn't the whole story.

What is the theoretical underpinning of this method? Where did it come from? Who suggested it first? I gather that it is derived from the Troldahl/Carter method. Is there a good reason to suspect that this method would result in a representative sample? My understanding is that both Gallup and Pew have used this method. Which in my mind on adds credence to the idea that it must "work."

As before, thanks in advance for any and all light you can shed on this issue. And thanks again to those who replied to the first message.

Best Regards,

John

--

John C. Fries.................................Voice: (804) 358-8981

Senior Project Director..........................FAX: (804) 358-9701

Southeastern Institute of Research................Richmond, Virginia

Marketing and Opinion Research............email: JCF@SIRresearch.com

----

John C. Fries   jcf3c@erols.com

PhD Candidate   Department of Sociology

University of Virginia   Charlottesville, Virginia

"The truth is always the strongest argument." -- Sophocles

>From RFunk787@aol.com Tue Oct 12 07:39:20 1999

Received: from imo25.mx.aol.com (imo25.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.69])

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

    id HAA05397 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Oct 1999 07:39:19 -0700

(PDT)

From: RFunk787@aol.com

Received: from RFunk787@aol.com

    by imo25.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5NSJa04501 (4232)

     for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Oct 1999 10:38:39 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <0.d8a9b5c9.2534a1ef@aol.com>

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 1999 10:38:39 EDT

Subject: .05 confidence limits, cont.

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 42

I think the recent suggestions about computing (.05) confidence limits for

survey data combined and entered into econometric models may have fallen a

little short. The suggested formula, 1.96 x square root of PQ/N , is fine

for probability samples of responses to dichotomous variables.   However,

many econometric models do not yield dichotomous, but rather continuous,

results. And often econometric models simply compute summary figures, not

scores for each respondent.   To calculate a confidence limit, the model

would first of all have to produce scores for each respondent. For each

variable, the mean of the scores would be calculated.   To then compute the

(.05) confidence limit around these means, you'd have to go back to the

generic version of standard error, which is, sigma divided by the sample

size. Multiply the dividend by 1.96 and that is the (.05) confidence limit.

(for dichotomous data, this becomes the familiar PQ/N formulation). Or

something like that -- it's been a while since I've done one of these, and I

may be missing a detail here and there -- but I do know that in many cases,

PQ/N would not be applicable.

Ray Funkhouser

>From fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu Tue Oct 12 08:09:19 1999

Received: from pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu [130.39.64.234])

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

    id IAA16948 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Oct 1999 08:09:18 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from c54386-a (c54386-a.btnrug1.la.home.com [24.4.42.222]) by

pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (AIX4.3/UCB 8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id KAA11084 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 12 Oct 1999 10:01:23 -0500

Message-ID: <006001bf14c3$bf01d5d0$de2a0418@c54386-a.btnrug1.la.home.com>

Reply-To: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

Hi everyone - I'm preparing a new course (for me) on sociological methods

for undergrad sociology majors for next semester. I want to make a

student-run survey the centerpiece of the course, but the course needs to

cover some other methods, too. I'd be grateful for any suggestions people

may have in putting this together: good textbooks, course materials, tips on

running the course. Please send me any responses off-list, and I'll be

happy to summarize the results to the list.

Thanks, Rick Weil

Frederick Weil, Associate Professor

Department of Sociology

Louisiana State University

Baton Rouge, LA 70803

225-388-1140

225-388-5102 fax

fweil@lapop.lsu.edu

Last week, we had a brief discussion on the right to data.

This article summary, comes from the LA Times. Thought

you would find it interesting.

Big Tobacco Pursues Secondhand Smoke Data

Faced with increasing litigation over secondhand smoke, tobacco companies

have engaged in a campaign to discredit studies on the effects of secondhand

smoke. In a case pending in the US District Court in Los Angeles, Philip

Morris is fighting to gain access to data from an influential study done by

the University of Southern California, known as the Fontham study. The

Fontham study helped persuade the Environmental Protection Agency to declare

secondhand smoke a health hazard, and is one of the key studies forming the

foundation behind the growing number of secondhand smoke lawsuits

threatening the industry. One reason these cases pose such a threat is

because Big Tobacco's typical defense that victims accept the risks of their

behavior does not apply. The industry hopes to analyze the data and then

discredit the findings.

So far, researchers at USC have successfully thwarted the industry's pursuit

of the data, claiming promises of confidentiality to the subjects in the

study. But the case is now before Judge Richard Paez who is expected to

rule in the industry's favor. The researchers say the industry's pursuit of

the data could have a chilling effect on future research, because of

promises of confidentiality made to subjects of the study. The data

includes medical records and personal information on the subjects, such as

work and marital histories, dietary habits and exposure to other toxic

substances.

Source: Myron Levin, "Big Tobacco Pursues Secondhand Smoke Data," LOS

ANGELES TIMES, October 4, 1999, p. A1.

-=-

Scott Goold, Ph.D.*

University of New Mexico

505.293.2504

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

"I Can't Accept Not Trying"

-=-

CALL FOR PAPERS (excuses for cross-posting)

Fifth International Conference on Social Science Methodology

of the Research Committee on Logic and Methodology (RC33)

of the International Sociological Association (ISA)

Cologne, October 3 - 6, 2000

The Fifth International Conference on Social Science Methodology will

combine all areas of quantitative and qualitative methods and statistics in

empirical social research.

Earlier conferences were held in Amsterdam, Dubrovnik, Trento,

and Essex.

Conference language is English only.

Early registration fees (applicable till June 1, 2000): DM

200.- for RC33 members and DM 230.- for non-members;

(graduate) students pay 100.- DM. Participants from countries in monetary

transition will have to pay a reduced fee of DM

100.- (RC33 members) or DM 130.- (non-members). After this

date participants have to pay an additional 50.- DM.

Persons wishing to present a paper should send

- a title

- an abstract of no more than 200 words

- name(s) and affiliation(s) of the author(s)

- key-words

The deadline for abstracts for individual papers is

31 January 2000. Papers which combine methods and

empirical results are very welcome.

Please send your abstract to Joerg Blasius (see the address below).

For further information and for e-mail registration please access the web

page http://www.za.uni-koeln.de/rc33. or contact Joerg Blasius

(Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung,

University of Cologne, Bachemer Str. 40, D-50931 Koeln, Germany;

email: rc33@za.uni-koeln.de).

Organizing committee: Nancy Andes (University of Alaska), Joerg Blasius

(Za-Archive), Edith deLeeuw (MethodikA), Joop Hox (University of Utrecht),

Peter Schmidt (ZUMA), Karl van Meter (BMS).

John McCain has pulled ahead of George Bush, Jr. in

Arizona.

http://www.nau.edu/~paffairs/gcstatepoll991013.html

Fred Solop, Ph.D.

Director

Social Research Laboratory

PO Box 15301

Northern Arizona University

Flagstaff, AZ 86011

(520) 523-3135 -- phone

(520) 523-6654 -- fax

Fred.Solop@nau.edu

--Boundary_(ID_mtsmi7HgH32PWTGC8noYtw)

Content-type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<html>

John McCain has pulled ahead of George Bush, Jr. in
 Arizona.

<u><a

href="http://www.nau.edu/~paffairs/gcstatepoll991013.html"

eudora="autourl">http://www.nau.edu/~paffairs/gcstatepoll991013.html</fo

nt></u>

Fred Solop, Ph.D.
 Director

Social Research Laboratory
 PO Box 15301
 Northern Arizona

University
 Flagstaff, AZ 86011

(520) 523-3135 -- phone

(520) 523-6654 -- fax

Fred.Solop@nau.edu</html>

--Boundary_(ID_mtsmi7HgH32PWTGC8noYtw)--

>From sidg@his.com Thu Oct 14 15:43:18 1999

Received: from herndon3.his.com (root@herndon3.his.com [209.67.207.6])

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

   id PAA23136 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 14 Oct 1999 15:43:15 -0700

(PDT)

Survey Research: Health Care and Other Topics

Washington DC area, other locations

Market Facts, Inc., one of the world's leading marketing and survey research
companies, has openings for experienced, talented survey professionals in
Washington, New York, Boston, and Chicago. We are currently especially
interested in finding a senior or mid-level researcher to join a successful
and growing unit of company in Washington to help build our heath care
practice. This group handles a broad range of telephone and mail survey
studies for corporations, government, associations, non-profit
organizations, and consulting firms. Besides health surveys, the range of

the group's current research includes financial services,

telecommunications, mass media products and services, advertising,

customer/member/employee satisfaction, current issues polling, and other

areas.

Requirements: 2+ years of relevant post-school experience plus a Masters

degree or 5+ years of research experience with a supplier, corporation,

consulting firm, government agency, or non-profit. Highly competitive salary

and benefits commensurate with your capabilities. Applicants for New York

City or Boston positions would benefit from interest and experience in

financial services research.

Please send, fax, or e-mail a resume and cover letter summarizing your

capabilities and location availability to:

Sid Groeneman

Market Facts

1650 Tysons Blvd. - Suite 110

McLean, VA 22102-2915

Fax: 703 790-9181

E-mail: sgroeneman@marketfacts.com

>From M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com Fri Oct 15 10:18:49 1999

Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])

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

    id KAA01478 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 15 Oct 1999 10:18:48 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from SRBI_NEW_YORK-Message_Server by srbi.com

Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc. (SRBI), a rapidly expanding market and
opinion research firm, is seeking skilled and highly motivated analysts and
project directors to join our research teams in public policy and market
research. Candidates must thrive in a fast-paced and collaborative
environment.

The following positions are available:

Analysts/Senior Analysts: excellent verbal, analytic, client and
presentation skills required. Requires excellent database skills. MBA,
MA/MS, Ph.D. or 3-5 years experience in commercial strategy research.
Areas: transportation policy, telecommunications, public policy evaluation.

Project Directors: detail-oriented team person, with heavy project
management responsibility. BA/BS and/or 1-3 years of project experience.
Position can be situated in any of the following offices: NYC, Ft. Myers,

Florida, or West Long Branch, NJ.

Visit our web site at www.srbi.com.

ABOUT SRBI: SRBI is a leading market and opinion research firm. The company
specializes in public opinion, public policy, telecommunications, media,
health care, financial services, utilities, automotive and transportation
research. The firm conducts large-scale policy evaluation and strategy
surveys for government, foundations, and major corporations.

SRBI is an American affiliate of Global Market Research, an international
consortium of research companies in 24 countries.

Salaries are highly competitive, with full benefits.

APPLICATIONS: Send resume and cover letter to: Katie Bisbee, Schulman, Ronca
& Bucuvalas, Inc., 145 E. 32nd St., Suite 500, New York, NY 10016 or Email
to: K.Bisbee@srbi.com. EOE.

.

>From KMARKS@aarp.org Mon Oct 18 06:39:17 1999
Received: from gatekeeper.aarp.org (gatekeeper.aarp.org [204.254.118.1])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id GAA07784 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 06:39:10 -0700
(PDT)

AARP, a national nonprofit membership organization with 33 million members,

seeks accomplished professionals for two senior research associate positions

at its Washington, DC, headquarters.

One position emphasizes client satisfaction, market assessment, and

segmentation studies. The other focuses on survey research, needs

assessments, and evaluations. Both involve working with diverse

organizational clients to design research projects and develop measurement

strategies, managing data collection and analysis, preparing reports, making

presentations, and directing research contracts for external studies.

Both positions require a Ph.D. or advanced degree and 6+ years of

postdoctoral research experience, with extensive applied/field research a

must. Knowledge of quantitative and qualitative research methods,

competency with statistical analysis software, and experience managing

research vendors are essential.

Experience with mail and telephone survey modes is required.

AARP provides a competitive salary and excellent benefits, including

medical, dental, 401k, defined pension, and much more. Please send resume

with salary requirements to: AARP, Attn: EW-YM & EW-KB, 601 E Street, NW,

Washington, DC 20049; Fax: (202)434-2809; E-mail (ASCII): resumes@aarp.org.

EOE

>From Sharon.Riley@arbitron.com Mon Oct 18 07:28:02 1999

Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])

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

    id HAA22102 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 07:28:01 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id KAA12118; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 10:13:38

-0400 (EDT)

Received: from arbmdex.arbitron.com(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via

smap (4.1)

    id xma011991; Mon, 18 Oct 99 10:12:55 -0400

Received: by arbmdex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

    id <47YWSF40>; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 10:29:39 -0400

Message-ID: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B395DE55@arbmdex.arbitron.com>

From: "Riley, Sharon" <Sharon.Riley@arbitron.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Bilingual Pre-alert

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 1999 10:29:38 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain

Has anyone had any experience using a bilingual

pre-alert?Does anyone know where I can find software/files that list Spanish

surnames?

I am planning to test a bilingual pre-alert and

would like to find a file we can run our name/address list against to

identify the households with Spanish surnames. Any suggestions?

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Mon Oct 18 08:03:28 1999

Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])

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

    id IAA06599 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 08:03:26 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-1.tuckahoe.bestweb.net

[209.94.107.210])

    by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id LAA17907;

    Mon, 18 Oct 1999 11:03:19 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <380B3684.1A0F1551@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 1999 11:02:28 -0400

From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win95; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Bilingual Pre-alert

References: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B395DE55@arbmdex.arbitron.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Sharon and AAPORNET:

The number of potential Spanish Surnames is very,

very high, something on the order of

several hundred thousand. Information

about that is in a document on the Census Website.

As I recall you need many, many names to get at

all of the Hispanics, and many also are not a

very good indicator of being Hispanic.

Also, the names vary by location, obviously, depending

upon the Hispanic groups involved.

This is one study that the Census can and has done that

is impossible for anyone else. They obviously can use

the surnames and the informtion on language, to which

none of us would have access.

Andy Beveridge

"Riley, Sharon" wrote:

>

>   Has anyone had any experience using a

> bilingual pre-alert?Does anyone know where I can find software/files

> that list Spanish surnames?

>   I am planning to test a bilingual pre-alert

> and would like to find a file we can run our name/address list against

> to identify the households with Spanish surnames. Any suggestions?

--

Andrew A. Beveridge   Home Office

209 Kissena Hall   50 Merriam Avenue

Department of Sociology   Bronxville, NY 10708

Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237

Flushing, NY 11367-1597   Fax: 914-337-8210

Phone: 718-997-2837   E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu

Fax: 718-997-2820   Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

>From RobFarbman@aol.com Mon Oct 18 13:50:49 1999

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

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

    id NAA16913 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 13:50:48 -0700

(PDT)

From: RobFarbman@aol.com

Received: from RobFarbman@aol.com

    by imo20.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5VAGa14300 (3878)

     for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 16:50:12 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <0.31491faa.253ce203@aol.com>

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 1999 16:50:11 EDT

Subject: Looking for Buenos Aires Field Company

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 214

Our company is performing a survey in the greater Buenos Aires area. Can

anyone recommend a company in the region that can assist us in fielding the

study?

Ideally, this company will not only perform the interviews but can assist us

with understanding the culture and interpreting the data.

Any ideas or assistance is appreciated. Please respond directly to my email

address: rfarbman@edisonresearch.com. Thanks.

Edison Media Research

Rob Farbman

Vice President, Research

(P) 908-707-4707

(F) 908-707-4740

>From jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU Mon Oct 18 15:21:22 1999

Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])

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

    id PAA02499 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 15:21:21 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])

Please reply directly to Tim Johnson at timj@srl.uic.edu

>>> Tim Johnson 10/18/99 04:12pm >>>

Our university has asked me to draft a policy statement regarding refusal

conversions as part of social and health-related surveys. Some IRB members

here feel that ANY attempt to recontact potential respondents who have

initially declined to participate is "harrassment" and should be prohibited.

Arguments that refusal conversions are 'standard practice" for survey

researchers do not carry much weight. Does anyone have experience dealing

with university IRBs regarding this issue?

Timothy Johnson

Director, Survey Research Laboratory

University of Illinois at Chicago

In a message dated 10/18/99 10:28:36 AM, Sharon.Riley@arbitron.com wrote:

<<I am planning to test a bilingual pre-alert and

would like to find a file we can run our name/address list against to

identify the households with Spanish surnames. Any suggestions?

>>

Be careful: I hope the file you find is well-screened: years ago the Census

Bureau did research in the Southwest on households with Spanish surnames and

found a high miss rate and even a sizable false positive rate. In other

words, some names are Hispanic/Latino/Spanish and don't seem to be because

of

their fairly rare occurence (such as Otal), and may not be although they

seem

to be. If I remember correctly, the Census Bureau dropped the idea of using

that concept to identify Hispanic households.

However, there are marketing research firms that focus on Hispanic

demographics, and perhaps one of these firms might have such a database or

software. Perhaps they advertise in American Demographics magazine, try

looking through that magazine's recent issues.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

Research Statistician

(and former staff member of Development Associates, a Latino-owned firm) U.

S. Dept. of Justice miltgold@aol.com

>From fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu Mon Oct 18 23:04:44 1999

Received: from pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu [130.39.64.234])

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

    id XAA05401 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 23:04:43 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from c54386-a (c54386-a.btnrug1.la.home.com [24.4.42.222]) by

pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (AIX4.3/UCB 8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id AAA15654 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 00:56:49 -0500

Message-ID: <007101bf19f7$d0e4df20$de2a0418@c54386-a.btnrug1.la.home.com>

Reply-To: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

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

Subject: Summary of replies to my query on teaching a methods course

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 1999 01:04:28 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

I got a very gratifying response to my query about teaching a sociology methods course that features a student survey - 11 very helpful replies. I'll summarize them here for the list.

Opinions varied widely on actually conducting a survey in class, though everyone said it was challenging. One person had several articles come out of the class over the years. Several people have had good results, but caution that it's a lot of work. (It's easier to do in a course on surveys than one on general methods.) A couple people have given it up or cautioned against doing it.

Here are a few specific suggestions and cautions -

- Allow plenty of time for writing the survey questions and inputting and verifying the data.
- Also allow time to get approval from the university "human subjects" board, if needed.
- 25-50 interviews per student is reasonable.
- Use a campus survey lab with CATI, if available.
- A thorough grounding in sample design and development is the "heart of the problem."

- There's a real danger that if things are rushed, the students will get the impression it's okay to be sloppy.
- A few students may try to fudge the survey interviews.

People suggested that I look at the following resources:

- The course layout for SURV620, "Survey Practicum" on the JPSM website (http://www.jpsm.umd.edu/home/)
- The ASA web site, with a very large number of publications on teaching sociology
- The journal, "Teaching Sociology," especially some articles in the July 1996 issue

People recommended several books:

Earl Babbie, The Practice of Social Research (Wadsworth) (several recs).
Earl Babbie, The Basics of Social Research (?). Russell Schutt, Investigating the Social World (Pine Forge) (several recs; and some people had switched from Babbie to Schutt). Emily Stier Adler and Roger Clark, How It's Done: An Invitation to Social Research (Wadsworth). Chava Frankfort-Nachmias and Anna Leon-Guerrero, Social Statistics for a Diverse Society (Pine Forge). Singleton, et al., Approaches to Social Research. Dillman on mail surveying. Groves on telephone interviewing (but tough for UGs).

Many thanks again to everyone who replied. Since I'm still at the beginning of the development stage, I of course still welcome any further replies or help!

Rick Weil

Frederick Weil, Associate Professor

Department of Sociology

Louisiana State University

Baton Rouge, LA 70803

225-388-1140

225-388-5102 fax

fweil@lapop.lsu.edu

Subject: IRBs and Refusal Conversions

Tim,

Depending upon what type of information your interviewers record on the

refusal report form (RRF) you use, you should be able to argue/support your

decision to call back the vast majority of respondents/households who

intially refuse. That is, most refusals are "soft refusals" in which

respondents do NOT say anything to the effect of "don't call me back."

Rather many of these soft refusals are the result of people being call at a

"bad time" and calling back at a better time is NOT harassing them. The

information we gather on our RRF, (which is the same form I used at

Northwestern and was jointly developed by Sandy Bauman, Judee Richardson,

Dan Merkle, and myself), allows us to make an individual decision about each

inital refusal and whether or not it should be retried for a conversion. The

basic form appears in my 1993 Telephone Survey Methods book (Sage).

ALso, you can tell the IRB that in many cases it's not the actual respondent

who refuses initally, but rather another member of the household.

And, sorry to learn of this "harassment" you are experiencing from your IRB.

>Date: Mon, 18 Oct 1999 17:18:56 -0500

>Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

>X-PH: V4.4@orb2

>From: Jennifer Parsons <jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU>

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Subject: IRBs and Refusal Conversions

>X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

>

>Please reply directly to Tim Johnson at timj@srl.uic.edu

>

>>>> Tim Johnson 10/18/99 04:12pm >>>

>Our university has asked me to draft a policy statement regarding

>refusal conversions as part of social and health-related surveys. Some

>IRB members here feel that ANY attempt to recontact potential

>respondents who have initially declined to participate is "harrassment"

>and should be prohibited. Arguments that refusal conversions are

>'standard practice" for survey researchers do not carry much weight.

>Does anyone have experience dealing with university IRBs regarding this

>issue?

>

>Timothy Johnson

>Director, Survey Research Laboratory

>University of Illinois at Chicago

>

>

>

>From seymours@SRL.UIC.EDU Tue Oct 19 06:42:39 1999

Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])

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

    id GAA07267 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 06:42:38 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])

I think it is important in spelling out a policy to distinguish between

"soft" and "hard" refusals. "Soft" refusals such as I'm too busy right now

can legitimately be called back at a more convenient time. "Hard refusals

such as "I never respond to surveys" or "don't bother me again" should of

course not be followed. Seymour

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 1999 09:11:12 -0500

From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: IRBs and Refusal Conversions -Forwarded

This is weird. Your mail to aapornet: showed YOUR name first in the TO:

box, and THEN aapornet (which was off the screen unless you scrolled to it.)

I see that you ONLY sent the message to AAPORNET and BCd me.

That's understandable.

I guess I was referring to other times when the TO: was to Tim, me, etc.

AND AAPORNET.

From: Jennifer Parsons <jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: IRBs and Refusal Conversions

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

Please reply directly to Tim Johnson at timj@srl.uic.edu

>>> Tim Johnson 10/18/99 04:12pm >>>

Our university has asked me to draft a policy statement regarding refusal
conversions as part of social and health-related surveys. Some IRB members
here feel that ANY attempt to recontact potential respondents who have
initially declined to participate is "harrassment" and should be prohibited.
Arguments that refusal conversions are 'standard practice" for survey
researchers do not carry much weight. Does anyone have experience dealing
with university IRBs regarding this issue?

Timothy Johnson

Director, Survey Research Laboratory

University of Illinois at Chicago

Thanks Milton

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

> From: MILTGOLD@aol.com [SMTP:MILTGOLD@aol.com]

> Sent: Monday, October 18, 1999 11:59 PM

> To: Sharon.Riley@arbitron.com; owner-aapornet@usc.edu; aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: Bilingual Pre-alert

>

>

> In a message dated 10/18/99 10:28:36 AM, Sharon.Riley@arbitron.com

> wrote:

>

> <<I am planning to test a bilingual pre-alert and

> would like to find a file we can run our name/address list against to

> identify the households with Spanish surnames. Any suggestions?

> >>

>

> Be careful: I hope the file you find is well-screened: years ago the

> Census Bureau did research in the Southwest on households with Spanish

> surnames and

> found a high miss rate and even a sizable false positive rate. In other

> words, some names are Hispanic/Latino/Spanish and don't seem to be because

> of

> their fairly rare occurence (such as Otal), and may not be although they

> seem

> to be. If I remember correctly, the Census Bureau dropped the idea of

> using

> that concept to identify Hispanic households.

>

> However, there are marketing research firms that focus on Hispanic

> demographics, and perhaps one of these firms might have such a database or

>

> software. Perhaps they advertise in American Demographics magazine,

> try

> looking through that magazine's recent issues.

>

> Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

> Research Statistician

> (and former staff member of Development Associates, a Latino-owned

>firm) U. S. Dept. of Justice miltgold@aol.com

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Tue Oct 19 07:59:25 1999

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])

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

    id HAA03667 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 07:59:24 -0700

(PDT)

Hi Tim and AAPOR-net,

Some of you may recall that I had IRB problems two years ago about not

telling callers they could "hang up anytime". Following this, I was an IRB

member for a year so I now see these issues from both sides.

The refusal conversion issue came up at FSU too.

Part of the problem is that most of what an IRB sees is experimental (often

physiological) or surveys handed out in class to students at all levels,

including elementary school. Most IRB members have next to no experience

with RDD and tend to confuse it with telemarketing. Partly this is because most (but not all) surveys of adults are exempt from the Federal Guidelines and these designs are probably only seen by the IRB Head and/or an assistant and do not come before full committee review.

I also learned there is more abuse than I ever would have dreamed. I saw protocols where procedures could have severely physically harmed the participants. I saw introductions that told inner-city children they would be kicked out of taxpayer-supported recreational programs unless they cooperated with researchers. Needless to say, these were corrected and they taught me a lot about why IRBs can be sensitive to anything that could be construed as harassment.

AAPOR should also know there is an active IRB List-Serve. Some of its members construe any telephone call as something that could trigger schizophrenia (I am not joking here) and others find surveys annoying so they would make them illegal.

Next to most of what came before the full Human Subjects Committee review, RDD with adults is NOTHING, including refusal conversions.

So here is what I reported to our IRB about initial refusals (some overlaps with earlier answers):

Some initial refusals are interviewer error: the respondent says "I can't do this now" and it is marked as a refusal. In other cases, the interviewer calls when the respondent has flu, is changing a diaper, making dinner and says "No" but the respondent is perfectly willing to answer later. Even well-trained interviewers don't always fill out a disposal sheet correctly

or completely.

Some respondents will only talk to an interviewer of their own sex--or the other sex--but we don't know that the first time.

The person answering the phone is not the respondent--and may not even live at that telephone number. (My favorite was the member of my IRB who said "But I know my wife wouldn't want to do it either.")

Husbands turn down a male interviewer asking for their wife and wives turn down females asking for their husbands (Ah...that old "I'm just doing a survey routine again, huh?")

The respondent confuses the survey with telemarketing. Since telemarketers almost never call back, a second call often informs the person this is a "real survey".

Often it is impossible for the field director to sort all these reasons out because the disposition sheet is vague or not filled out, the call happened several interviews back and the interviewer remembers nothing about it.

In my experience, three-quarters of 'initial refusals' were not refusals at all. The only way to check it out is to call back.

What is tougher than "real refusals" are "stringers" who ask you to call them back time after time, who are totally insincere but think they are "being polite." Every time an interviewer calls back, they are busy, out the door, AND THEY GIVE AN EXACT TIME TO CALL BACK. At the callback the same thing happens. Being a sincere person, of course I direct interviewers to

follow through until it is apparent even to me that these folks are faking

it. IRBs do not address the stringer at all and yet here (innocently on our

parts) is what can come close to harassment 'cause these folks don't know

how to say no for the first five calls.

Good luck. My guess is you have educating to do ahead of you.

Susan

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

Susan Losh, PhD.

Department of Sociology

Florida State University

Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000

　　850-644-1753 Office

　　850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

FAX 850-644-6208

Speaking of refusals and their codes, I have been attempting to use the

AAPOR

disposition codes as presented in documentation for

Sawtooth Software's Wincati system.

I believe a distinction made here is that when the household unit is being

queried, it is considered a PRESCREENER and once the respondent in the

household

has been selected, you are in the SCREENER mode. The Wincati implementation

of

this gives us a SCREENER mode refusal code -- 2110, but not a PRESCREENER

refusal code.

Shouldn't there be both for surveys which use a method to select the

eligible

respondent within a household? Or is "Eligible" in the AAPOR list of codes

always referring to the household and not the respondent in the household?

That is, I may call a household and they may say I'm too busy right now and hang

up. Or I may speak with the person who answers the phone, find out that the

household is eligible and then pick the respondent from the members of the

household. When I get in touch with the selected R, he/she may say he will not

participate. The current system would require me to use the same disposition

code in either case. Is this the desired intent?

If you are involved in these AAPOR code creations, please advise what the intent

was here.

Thank you.

Carolyn S. White, PhD

Program Coordinator, OCCSS

University of Illinois

Urbana, Il 61801

Voice: 217-333-6751

Fax: 217-333-2869

Email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

>From abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu Tue Oct 19 13:34:19 1999

Received: from allman.src.uchicago.edu (allman.src.uchicago.edu

[128.135.252.22])

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

id NAA20445 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 13:34:18 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from nittany.uchicago.edu (nittany.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.8])

by allman.src.uchicago.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id PAA28209

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 15:34:16 -0500

Received: (from abcgss1@localhost)

by nittany.uchicago.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) id PAA06565

for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 15:34:15 -0500 (CDT)

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 1999 15:34:15 -0500 (CDT)

From: "Tom_W. Smith" <abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu>

Message-Id: <199910192034.PAA06565@nittany.uchicago.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: nonresponse codes

The codes in the AAPOR Standard Definitions are only final disposition

codes. Thus, refusals are final refusuals, non- respondents. In addition, to

the final codes one needs temporary codes. One might have a single temporary

refusal code or several to distinguish between types of refusals. AAPOR does

not address this issue.

Tom W. Smith

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Tue Oct 19 18:44:09 1999

Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (IDENT:root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu

[128.227.11.150])

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

id SAA10985 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 18:44:08 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149])

The thing is, most IRBs make a big deal about the concept of "informed

consent." Well, okay. Most refusals are not "informed" because they

haven't hung on the line long enough to let us give them the information

about the study that would allow them to decide intelligently whether or not

to participate. So I have no hesitation to call back and attempt to give

them that information.

For my current project, we got addresses for the twice-refused with listed

numbers and sent them a letter of explanation. Then we called back a few

days later.

The response was pretty positive. We provided a toll-free number and email address in our letter, so that the few people who were most aggravated could call immediately and get their numbers dropped (saves on interviewer wear and tear!). But even some of those who refused at that point did say they appreciated knowing who we were, at least.

Many of the phone calls and e-mails were to make an appointment or ask questions, and there were a lot of comments along the lines of, "Oh, well, if we had known it was you...we thought someone was trying to sell us health insurance."

So you might look at that letter and extra phone call as harassment. Or you can view it as allowing the folks to make an informed decision.

Colleen K. Porter

Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu

phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109

UF Department of Health Services Administration

Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Tue Oct 19 18:45:09 1999

Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (IDENT:root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.150])

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

    id SAA13333 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 18:45:08 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149])

Susan Losh wrote:

[....some thoughtful stuff including...]

>

> What is tougher than "real refusals" are "stringers" who ask you to

> call them back time after time, who are totally insincere but think

> they are "being polite." Every time an interviewer calls back, they

> are busy, out the door, AND THEY GIVE AN EXACT TIME TO CALL BACK. At

> the callback the same thing happens. Being a sincere person, of course

> I direct interviewers to follow through until it is apparent even to

> me that these folks are faking it. IRBs do not address the stringer at

> all and yet here (innocently on our

> parts) is what can come close to harassment 'cause these folks don't know

> how to say no for the first five calls.

Can someone in a different part of the country confirm whether this happens

to them, too? All my survey experience is in Florida, Georgia and Texas,

and I've always thought of this as "Southern Women's Syndrome" because I've

most often encountered it among women of a certain age who just don't know

how to flat-out say NO.

I have had some of these same people accuse me of harassment even though

they gave a time for callback. And there was no question of

miscommunication or a fudged form, because it was a Census survey for which

I was the only field person with whom they dealt.

So is this really a widespread phenomenon?

Colleen K. Porter

Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu

phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109

UF Department of Health Services Administration

Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL

55th Annual AAPOR Conference

Portland, Oregon

May 18-21, 2000

Doubletree Hotel -- Janzen Beach & Columbia River

"FACING THE CHALLENGES OF THE NEW MILLENNIUM"

CALL FOR PAPERS AND PARTICIPATION

The American Association for Public Opinion Research will hold its 55th

annual conference in Portland, Oregon in May 2000. AAPOR's Conference

Committee seeks proposals for papers, panels, and round tables that will

illuminate important research questions, increase the skills of AAPOR's

membership, and promote the development of our profession.

Papers, panels, and round table ideas on any topic in public opinion and survey research are welcomed for consideration for next May's conference. We encourage participants to form sessions with common themes and to submit their papers together.   These papers will, of course, be considered individually if for some reason the session is not used.

CONFERENCE THEME

Since this will be our first conference of the 21st century, we especially encourage thoughtful papers and panels that focus on the challenges ahead. This would include the following:

-- Impact of technology on public opinion/communications research

-- New insights from data mining

-- Internet surveys: where do we stand?

-- Cross-national research: opportunities and pitfalls

-- The 2000 Census: a methodological assessment

-- Understanding the voter in the 2000 elections

-- Consumer and lifestyle trends

-- Legislative/political threats to public opinion research

-- Retaining customers/customer loyalty

-- Generations "X"and "Y"/generational analyses

-- Sources of response bias/measurement error

AAPOR/WAPOR CONFERENCE

This conference is a joint AAPOR/WAPOR conference year. We encourage

submissions on topics of interest to WAPOR's world-wide membership.

SUBMISSIONS FROM COMMERCIAL RESEARCHERS

We particularly encourage the submission of panel, round table and paper

presentations that will appeal to those working in the commercial sector.

Please feel free to contact the conference chair with ideas that may depart

from the normal conference paper format.

ABSTRACT SUBMISSION

Please submit your proposal or abstract (of no more than 300 words):

INCLUDING TWO OR THREE KEY WORDS DESCRIBING THE TOPIC, by December 9, 1999.

Please fit your proposal onto one page and include the name, mailing

address, telephone number(s) and email address of the principal author. Use

an additional page if necessary for the same information about the other

authors.   You will receive confirmation that your proposal has been

received. 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.

Our preference is to receive abstracts electronically through the AAPOR web

site: www.aapor.org. This feature will be ready shortly. Please click on

"Conferences" for submission instructions. If you do not have Internet

access, submit three copies of your abstract directly to this year's

Conference Chair:

Mark A. Schulman

Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc.

145 E. 32nd Street, Suite 500

New York, NY 10016

Email: m.schulman@srbi.com

Voice: 212-779-7700

We look forward to seeing you in Portland!

>From cswhite@uiuc.edu Wed Oct 20 13:43:10 1999

Received: from ntx1.cso.uiuc.edu (ntx1.cso.uiuc.edu [128.174.68.203])

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

    id NAA19414 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Oct 1999 13:41:35 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by ntx1.cso.uiuc.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

    id <TSRA2NXB>; Wed, 20 Oct 1999 15:41:31 -0500

Message-ID: <744DBC8BC3FBD01192C200A0C96BA7BD0114A38E@ntx1.cso.uiuc.edu>

From: Carolyn White <cswhite@uiuc.edu>

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

Subject: Refusal of household = refusal of respondent?

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 1999 15:41:30 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Content-Type: text/plain;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

I would think even final disposition codes would want to track these two

events separately. And wouldn't some of the calculations of rates differ if

they were treated the same versus different?

Carolyn S. White, PhD

Program Coordinator

Office of Computing and Communications for the Social Sciences (OCCSS)

Assistant Professor, Sociology

Room 212 Lincoln Hall   Voice: 217-333-6751

702 S. Wright Street   Fax: 217-333-2869

Urbana, Il 61801   Email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

"Plan Ahead: It wasn't raining when Noah started building the Ark" Ron

Fields

>From sotirovi@staff.uiuc.edu Wed Oct 20 14:03:50 1999

Received: from staff2.cso.uiuc.edu (root@staff2.cso.uiuc.edu [128.174.5.53])

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

    id OAA05756 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Oct 1999 14:02:50 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [128.174.28.122] (rm411b.comm.uiuc.edu [128.174.28.122])

    by staff2.cso.uiuc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id QAA02185

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Oct 1999 16:02:43 -0500 (CDT)

Message-Id: <v03007804b43389bcc260@[128.174.28.122]>

In-Reply-To: <744DBC8BC3FBD01192C200A0C96BA7BD0114A38E@ntx1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 1999 16:04:02 +0100

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: mirjana sotirovic <sotirovi@staff.uiuc.edu>

Subject: Re: Refusal of household = refusal of respondent?

Yes, you are right, especially in the light of the AAPOR discussion about soft versus hard refusals. Refusal of household means, I guess, never call this number again.

Did you get Prof. Tewksbury's corrections? I sent it to your ntx1 address?

>I would think even final disposition codes would want to track these
>two events separately. And wouldn't some of the calculations of rates
>differ if they were treated the same versus different?
>
>Carolyn S. White, PhD
>Program Coordinator
>Office of Computing and Communications for the Social Sciences (OCCSS)
>Assistant Professor, Sociology
>Room 212 Lincoln Hall   Voice: 217-333-6751
>702 S. Wright Street   Fax: 217-333-2869
>Urbana, Il 61801   Email: cswhite@uiuc.edu
>
>"Plan Ahead: It wasn't raining when Noah started building the Ark" Ron
>Fields

Mira Sotirovic

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Department of Journalism

119 Gregory Hall

810 S. Wright St.

Urbana, IL 61801

Office Tel.: 217.333.7833

Home Tel.: 217.384.4990

Fax: 217.333.7931

We certainly have a problem with "stringers". Almost all of our studies

involve personal interviews, and we have people who say that they will do

the interview but at some indefinite later time and then repeat this story

every time we call them back. We have some success when the end of the

study is near and we tell them that the study is ending and their

participation is very important to us and ask for a definite appointment.

Even worse, some of these "stringers" make appointments and then are not

home when the interviewer shows up at the appointed time -- these no-shows

are very expensive.

Lynda Voigt

Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

Seattle, WA

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

> From: Colleen K. Porter [SMTP:cporter@hp.ufl.edu]

> Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 1999 6:57 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: IRBs and Refusal Conversions

>

> Susan Losh wrote:

> [....some thoughtful stuff including...]

> >

> > What is tougher than "real refusals" are "stringers" who ask you to

> > call them back time after time, who are totally insincere but think

> > they are "being polite." Every time an interviewer calls back, they

> > are busy, out

> the

> > door, AND THEY GIVE AN EXACT TIME TO CALL BACK. At the callback the

> > same thing happens. Being a sincere person, of course I direct

> > interviewers

> to

> > follow through until it is apparent even to me that these folks are

> faking

> > it. IRBs do not address the stringer at all and yet here (innocently

> > on

> our

> > parts) is what can come close to harassment 'cause these folks don't

> know

> > how to say no for the first five calls.

>

> Can someone in a different part of the country confirm whether this

> happens to them, too? All my survey experience is in Florida, Georgia

> and Texas, and I've always thought of this as "Southern Women's

> Syndrome" because I've most often encountered it among women of a

> certain age who just don't know how to flat-out say NO.

>

> I have had some of these same people accuse me of harassment even

> though they gave a time for callback. And there was no question of

> miscommunication or a fudged form, because it was a Census survey for

> which I was the only field person with whom they dealt.

>

> So is this really a widespread phenomenon?

>

> Colleen K. Porter

> Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

>cporter@hp.ufl.edu

> phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109

> UF Department of Health Services Administration

> Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009

We track household refusals and respondent refusals seperately in studies

where we are explicitly selecting a respondnent from the household.

Typically, we

tell the person that answers the telephone who is reluctant to speak with us

that we can only accept a refusal from the selected respondent, and that

they

may not be selected to be interviewed. Of course, if this peson gets angry

and

asks us never to call the household again, we will not.

Strictly speaking, if we have not selected a respondent, we have not determined

if the person (not yet selected) to represent that household has refused or not.

William Robb

Macro International Inc.

_____Reply Header_____

Author: mirjana sotirovic <sotirovi@staff.uiuc.edu>

Subject: Re: Refusal of household = refusal of respondent? 10-20-1999 11:04

AM

Yes, you are right, especially in the light of the AAPOR discussion about

soft versus hard refusals. Refusal of household means, I guess, never call

this number again.

Did you get Prof. Tewksbury's corrections? I sent it to your ntx1 address?

>I would think even final disposition codes would want to track these

>two events separately. And wouldn't some of the calculations of rates

>differ if they were treated the same versus different?

>

>Carolyn S. White, PhD

>Program Coordinator

>Office of Computing and Communications for the Social Sciences (OCCSS)

>Assistant Professor, Sociology

>Room 212 Lincoln Hall   Voice: 217-333-6751

>702 S. Wright Street   Fax: 217-333-2869

>Urbana, Il 61801   Email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

>

>"Plan Ahead: It wasn't raining when Noah started building the Ark" Ron

>Fields

Mira Sotirovic

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Department of Journalism

119 Gregory Hall

810 S. Wright St.

Urbana, IL 61801

Office Tel.: 217.333.7833

Home Tel.: 217.384.4990

Fax: 217.333.7931

It would appear that the AAPOR codes accept that notion -- there is only one

code for refusal and it is ELIGIBLE Refusal.

So given the general schema of the AAPOR codes, where would you insert a

temporary HU refusal code? -- in the 3.xs?

Carolyn S. White, PhD

Program Coordinator

Office of Computing and Communications for the Social Sciences (OCCSS)

Assistant Professor, Sociology

Room 212 Lincoln Hall   Voice: 217-333-6751

702 S. Wright Street   Fax: 217-333-2869

Urbana, Il 61801   Email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

>William Robb writes:

>

>We track household refusals and respondent refusals seperately in

>studies

where

>we are explicitly selecting a respondnent from the household.

>Typically,

we

>tell the person that answers the telephone who is reluctant to speak

>with

us

>that we can only accept a refusal from the selected respondent, and

>that

they

>may not be selected to be interviewed. Of course, if this peson gets

>angry

and

>asks us never to call the household again, we will not.

>Strictly speaking, if we have not selected a respondent, we have not

determined

>if the person (not yet selected) to represent that household has

>refused or

not.

>William Robb

>Macro International Inc.

"Plan Ahead: It wasn't raining when Noah started building the Ark" Ron

Fields

>From bauman@aecom.yu.edu Wed Oct 20 19:52:50 1999

Received: from post.aecom.yu.edu (post.aecom.yu.edu [129.98.1.4])

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

    id TAA03403 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Oct 1999 19:52:49 -0700

(PDT)

We too have a 'southern women" phenomenon, but it's South Bronx women.

We thought the stringer problem was an inner-city problem. We too have many

women agree to an in-person interview, schedule a time, and confirm that

time within 24 hours, but are not at home when the interviewer comes

-- and then repeat this pattern 3,4,5 times (we are interviewing rare

populations using list samples so each respondent is important to us). We

feared that we were harrassing them, but they do not discourage us from

calling back. We tried sending them a letter telling them it is OK to

decline the interview, and to return the enclosed postcard if they would

prefer not to be called. Not one was returned. I admit it; I'm puzzled!

Laurie

     \\\|///

    \\ - - //

    (@ @)

------oOOo-(_)-oOOo---

Laurie J. Bauman, Ph.D.

Professor of Pediatrics

Co-Director, Preventive Intervention Research Center

Department of Pediatrics Albert Einstein College of Medicine 1300 Morris

Park Avenue, NR 7 South 21 Bronx, New York 10461 phone (718) 918-4421 fax

(718) 918-4388 email bauman@aecom.yu.edu

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

    boundary="----_=_NextPart_000_01BF1BED.97820AE0"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand

this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

------_=_NextPart_000_01BF1BED.97820AE0

Content-Type: text/plain

I found the questionnaire we used for a project several years ago. I am

aattaching the questionnaire. As I recall, the results of this study were

very reasonable. We have decided this year to use a more reliable method of

data collection, a radio diary with instructions to parents to assist older

children with it.

 <<Children1.doc>>

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

> From: Kathy Cirksena [SMTP:KathrynC@socialresearch.com]

> Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 1999 1:44 PM

> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'

> Subject: Surveying children

>

> Hello AAPORites,

>

> I'm looking for references on surveying children, especially research

> and suggestions on questionnaire design and question wording that are

> developmentally appropriate for kids between 7 and 12. Thanks in

> advance for your help.

>

> Kathryn Cirksena, Ph.D.

> Research Services Manager

> Communication Sciences Group/

> Survey Methods Group

> 140 Second Street, Suite 400

> San Francisco, CA 94105

> (415) 495-6692 ext. 269

------_=_NextPart_000_01BF1BED.97820AE0

Content-Type: application/msword;

   name="Children1.doc"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Content-Disposition: attachment;

   filename="Children1.doc"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAANQAAAAAAA
AA

EAAANwAAAAEAAAD+////AAAAADQAAAD///

EAAANwAAAAEAAAD+////

///

///

///

///

///

///

///s

pcEAWQAJBAAAABK/AAAAAAAEAAAAAAABAAAqxwAAA4AYmpiavNX81cAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAJBBYAKjIAAJE9AQCRPQEAqxgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//w8AAAAA

AAAAAAD//w8AAAAAAAAAAAAD//w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAF0AAAAAADABAAAAAAAAMAEAADAB

AAAAAAAMAEAAAAAAAwAQAAAAAAADABAAAAAAAAMAEAABQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEQBAAAAAAAARAEA

AAAAAABEAQAAAAAAAEQBAAAAAAAARAEAAAwAAABQAQAAPAAAAEQBAAAAAAAAhBAAALYAAACgAQAA

AAAAAKABAAAAAAAAoAEAAAAAAACgAQAAAAAAAKABAAAAAAAAoAEAAAAAAACgAQAAAAAAAKABAAAA

AAAASRAAAAIAAABLEAAAAAAAAEsQAAAAAAAASxAAAAAAAABLEAAAAAAAAEsQAAAAAAAASxAAACQA

AAA6EQAA9AEAAC4TAACGAAAAbxAAABUAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAMAEAAAAAAACgAQAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACgAQAAAAAAKABAAAAAAAAoAEAAAAAAACgAQAAAAAAG8QAAAAAAAA

gAIAAAAAAAwAQAAAAAAADABAAAAAAAAoAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAKABAAAAAAAAoAEAAAAAAA

CA

AgAAAAAAAIACAAAAAAAAgAIAAAAAACgAQAAFgAAADABAAAAAAAAoAEAAAAAAAwAQAAAAAAAKA

B

AAAAAAAASRAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAARAEAAAAAAABEAQAAAAAAADABAAAAAAAAM

AEA

AAAAAAAwAQAAAAAAADABAAAAAAAAoAEAAAAAAABJEAAAAAAAAIACAABKAwAAgAIAAAAAAADKBQA

A

ogIAAC8OAADkAQAAMAEAAAAAAAAwAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAASRAAAAAAAACgAQAAAAAAAIwBAAAUAAAAoMJtws/

6

vgFEAQAAAAAAAEQBAAAAAAAAtgEAAMoAAAATEAAANgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQ

2hp

bGRyZW6ScyBSYWRpbyBTdHVkeQ0NQ2hpbGRyZW6ScyBRdWVzdGlvbm5haXJlDQ1JIHdhbnQgdG8g

dGFsayB0byB5b3UgZmlyc3QgYWJvdXQgcmFkaW8uICBBYm91dC3aGVuIHlvdSBsaXN0ZW5lZCB0

byByYWRpbyB5ZXN0ZXJkYXkuICBJIGhhdmUganVzdCBhIGZldyBxdWVzdGlvbnMgdG8gYXNrIHlv

dSwgb2s/DQ1ZZXN0ZXJkYXksIGRpZCB5b3UgbGlzdGVuIHRvIGEgcmFkaW8gb3IgaGVhciBvbmUg

cGxheWluZyBhbnl3aGVyZSBmcm9tIHRoZS0aW1lIHlvdSB3b2tlIHVwIHVudGlsIGp1c3QgYmVm

b3JlIGx1bmNodGltZT8NDQlZRVMgLS0gIFBST09JIA0JTk8gICAtLSAgUFJPQkUNDVBST0JFOiAg

CURvZXMgdGhpcyBtZWFuIHRoYXQgeW91IChkaWQvDGlkIG5vdCkgbGlzdGVuIHRvIHJhZGlvIHll

c3RlcmRheSAoc29tZXRpbWUvYW55dGltZSkgYmV0d2VlbiA2IG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIG1v

c3RlcmRheSAoc29tZXRpbWUvYW55dGltZSkgYmV0d2VlbiA2cm5p

bmcgYW5kIDEwIG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIG1vcm5pbmc/DQ0JRElEIExJU1RFTiAgLS0gQ09O

bmcgYW5kIDEwIG+VElO

VUUNCURJRCBOT1QgTElTVEVOIC05PL0RPTpJUIEtOT1cgliBHTyBUTyBRVUVTVElPTiA4DQ1XaGF0

IHN0YXRpb24gZGlkIHlvdSBsaXN0ZW4gdG8/ICANUFJPQkUgRk9SIFNUQVRJT04gQ0FMTCBMRVRU

RVJTIE9SIE5BTUUgOiAgV2hhdCBkb2VzIHRoZSBzdGF0aW9uIGNhbGwgaXRzZWxmPw0NV2FzIHRo

aXMgYW4gQU0gb3IgRk0gc3RhdGlvbj8NDURpZCB5b3UgZG8gdGhpcyByYWRpbyBsaXN0ZW5pbmcg

YXQgaG9tZSBvciBhd2F5IGZyb20gaG9tZT8NDUFIIEhTUUgICAtLSBDT05TSU5VRSBXSVRIIFFV

RVNUSU9OIDQNQVdBWSBGUk9NIEhTUUgliBHTyBUTyBRVUVTVElPTiA1DVNPTUUgQ09NQklOQVRJ

T04gliBDT05USU5VRSBXSVRIIFFVRVNUSU9OIDYNDVdoYXQgdGltZSBkaWQgeW91IHN0YXJ0IGxp

c3RlbmluZyB0byB0aGlzIHJhZGlvIHN0YXRpb24gYXQgaG9tZT8gIFdoYXQgdGltZSBkaWQgeW91

IHN0b3AgbGlzdGVuaW5nPw0NSUYgT05MWSBJTi1IT01FIExJU1RFTklORywgUkVDT1JEIEJFU1BP

TlNFIEFORCBTS0lQIFRPIFFVRVNUSU9OIDYNDVdoYXQgdGltZSBkaWQgeW91IHN0YXJ0IGxpc3Rl

bmluZyB0byB0aGlzIHJhZGlvIHN0YXRpb24gYXdheSBmcm9tIGhvbWU/ICBBbmQsIHdoYXQgdGlt

ZSBkaWQgeW91IHN0b3AgbGlzdGVuaW5nPw0NRGlkIHlvdSBsaXN0ZW4gdG8gb3IgaGVhciAoSU5T

RVJUIFNUQVRJT04pIGF0IGFueSBvdGhlciB0aW1lIGJldHdlZW4gNiBvcmNsb2NrIGluIHRoZSBt

b3JuaW5nIGFuZCAxMCBvcmNsb2NrIGluIHRoZSBtb3JuaW5nPw0NWUVTIYgR08gVE8gUVVFU1RJ

T04gMw1OTy1ET06SVCBLTk9XIIYgQ09OVElOVUUNWWVzdGVyZGF5LCBiZXR3ZWVuIDYb5JjbG9j

ayBpbiB0aGUgbW9ybmluZyBhbmQgMTAgb5JjbG9jayBpbiB0aGUgbW9ybmluZyBkaWQgeW91IGxp

c3RlbiB0byBvciBoZWFyIGFueSBvdGhlciByYWRpbyBzdGF0aW9uPw0NWWVzdGVyZGF5LCBiZXR3

U1RJT04gMi1OTy9ET06SVC0tIENPTlRJRTlVFDQ1ZZXN0ZXJkYXksIGRpZCB5b3UgbGlz

dGVuIHRvIGEgcmFkaW8gb3IgaGVhciBvbmUgcGxheWluZyBhbnl3aGVyZSBiZWZvcmUsIGR1cmlu

Zywgb3IganVzdCBhZnRlciBsdW5jaD8NDQlZRVMgLS0gIFBST09JIA0JTk8gICAtLSAgUFJPQkUN

DVBST0JFOiAgCURvZXMgdGhpcyBtZWFuIHRoYXQgeW91IChkaWQvZGlkIG5vdCkgbGlzdGVuIHRv

IHJhZGlvIHllc3RlcmRheSAoc29tZXRpbWUvYW55dGltZSkgYmV0d2VlbiAxMCBvbrNsb25lIGlu

IHRoZSBtb3JuaW5nIGFuZCAzIG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIGFmdGVybm9vbj8NDQlESUQgTElT

IHRoZSBtb3JuaW5nIGFuZCAzIG+SVEVO

ICAtLSBDT05USU5VRQ0JRElEIE5PVCBMSVNURU4vTk8vRE9OlQgS05PVyCIEdPIFRPIFFVRVNU

SU9OIA0NV2hhdCBzdGF0aW9uIGRpZCB5b3UgbGlzdGVuIHRvPyAgDVBST0JIEZPUiBTVEFUSU9O

IENBTEwgTEVUVEVSUyBPUiBOQU1FIDogIFdoYXQgZG9lcyB0aGUgc3RhdGlvbiBjYWwsIGl0c2Vs

Zj8NDVdhcyB0aGlzIGFuIEFNIG9yIEZNIHN0YXRpb24/DQ1EaWQgeW91IGRvIHRoaXMgcmFkaW8g

bGlzdGVuaW5nIGF0IGhvbWUgb3IgYXdheSBmcm9tIGhvbWU/DQ1BVCBIT01FICAgLS0gQ09OVElO

VUUgV0lUSCBRVUVTVElPTiAxMQ1BV0FZIEZST00gSE9NRSCWIEdPIFRPIFFVRVNUSU9OIDEyDVNP

TUUgQ09NQklOQVRJT04gliBDT05USU5VRSBXSVRIIFFVRVNUSU9OIDExDQ1XaGF0IHRpbWUgZGlk

IHlvdSBzdGFydCBsaXN0ZW5pbmcgdG8gdGhpcyByYWRpbyBzdGF0aW9uIGF0IGhvbWU/ICBXaGF0

IHRpbWUgZGlkIHlvdSBzdG9wIGxpc3RlbmluZz8NDUlgIE9OTFkgSU4tSE9NRSBMSVNURU5JTkcs

IFJFQ09SRCBSRVNQT05TRSBBTkQgU0tJUCBUbyBRVUVTVElPTiAxMw0NV2hhdCB0aW1lIGRpZCB5

b3Ugc3RhcnQgbGlzdGVuaW5nIHRvIHRoaXMgcmFkaW8gc3RhdGlvbiBhd2F5IGZyb20gaG9tZT8g

IEFuZCwgd2hhdCB0aW1lIGRpZCB5b3Ugc3RvcCBsaXN0ZW5pbmc/DQ1EaWQgeW91IGxpc3RlbiB0

byBvciBoZWFyIChTTElFFUlQgU1RBVElPTikgYXQgYW55IG90aGVyIHRpbWUgYmV0d2VlbiAxMCBv

kmNsb2NrIGluIHRoZSBtb3JuaW5nIGFuZCAzIG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIGFmdGVybm9vbj8N

kmNsb2NrIGluIHRoZSBtb3JuaW5nIGFuZCAzIG+SDVlF

UyCWIEdPIFRPIFFVRVNUSU9OIDEwDU5PLURPTpJUIEtOT1cgliBDT05USU5VRQ0NWWVzdGVyZGF5

LCBiZXR3ZWVuIDEwIG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIG1vcm5pbmcgYW5kIDMgb5JjbG9jayBpbiB0

LCBiZXR3ZWVuIDEwIG+SaGUg

YWZ0ZXJub29uIGRpZCB5b3UgbGlzdGVuIHRvIG9yIGhlYXIgYW55IG90aGVyIHJhZGlvIHN0YXRp

b24/DQ1ZRVMgliBHTyBUUyBRVUVTVElPTiA5DU5PL0RPTpJUIEtOT1cgLS0gQ09OVElOVUUNQ1Z

ZXN0ZXJkYXksIGRpZCB5b3UgbGlzdGVuIHRvIGEgcmFkaW8gb3IgaGVhciBvbmUgcGxheWluZyBh

bnl3aGVyZSBmcm9tIGFib3V0IHRoZSB0aW1lIHlvdSB3b3lwZCBnZXQgb3V0IG9mIHNjaG9vbCB1

bnRpbCByaWdodCBhZnRlciBkaW5uZXJ0aW1lPw0NV1FUyAtLSAgUFJPQkUgDQlOTyAgLS0tICBQ

Uk9CRC0NUFJPQkU6ICAJRG9lciB0aGlzIG1lYW4gdGhhdCB5b3UgKGRpZC9kaWQgbm90KSBsaXN0

ZW4gdG8gcmFkaW8geWVzdGVyZGF5IChzb21ldGltZS9hbnl0aW1lKSBiZXR3ZWVuIDMgb5JjbG9j

ayBpbiB0aGUgYWZ0ZXJub29uIGFuZCA3IG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIGV2ZW5pbmc/DQ0JRElE

ayBpbiB0aGUgYWZ0ZXJub29uIGFuZCA3IG+IExJ

U1RFTiAgLS0gQ09OVElOVUUNCURJRCBOT1QgTElTVEVOL05PL0RPTpJUIEtOT1cgliBHTyBUyBR

VUVTVElPTiAyMg0NV2hhdCBzdGF0aW9uIGRpZCB5b3UgbGlzdGVuIHRvPyAgDVBST0JFIEZPUiBT

VEFUSU9OIENBTEwgTEVUVEVSUyBPUiBOQU1FIDogIFdoYXQgZG9lcyB0aGUgc3RhdGlvbiBjYWxs

IGl0c2VsZj8NDVdhcyB0aGlzIGFuIEFNIG9yIEZNIHN0YXRpb24/DQ1EaWQgeW91IGRvIHRoaXMg

cmFkaW8gbGlzdGVuaW5nIGF0IGhvbWUgb3IgYXdheSBmcm9tIGhvbWU/DQ1BVCBIT01FICAgLS0g

Q09OVElOVUUgV0lUSCBRVUVTVElPTiAxOA1QV0ZIEZST00gSE9NRSWIEdPIFRPIFFVRVNUSU9O

IDE5DVNTUUgQ09NQklOQVRJT04gliBDT05USU5VRSBXSVRIIFFVRVNUSU9OIDE4DQ1XaGF0IHRp

bWUgZGlkIHlvdSBzdGFydCBsaXN0ZW5pbmcgdG8gdGhpcyByYWRpbyBzdGF0aW9uIGF0IGhvbWU/

ICBXaGF0IHRpbWUgZGlkIHlvdSBzdG9wIGxpc3RlbmluZz8NDUlgIE9OTFkgSU4tSE9NRSBMSVNU

RU5JTkcsIFJFQ09SRCBSRVNQT05TRSBBTkQgU0tJUCBUyBRVUVTVElPTiAyMA0NV2hhdCB0aW1l

IGRpZCB5b3Ugc3RhcnQgbGlzdGVuaW5IRvIHRoaXMgcmFkaW8gc3RhdGlvbiBhd2F5IGZyb20g

aG9tZT8gIEFuZCwgd2hhdCB0aW1lIGRpZCB5b3Ugc3RvcCBsaXN0ZW5pbmc/DQ1EaWQgeW91IGxp

c3RlbiB0byBvciBoZWFyIChJTlNFUlIQgU1RBVElPPTikgYXQgYW55IG90aGVyIHRpbWUgYmV0d2Vl

biA2IG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIG1vcm5pbmcgYW5kIDEwIG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIG1vcm5p

biA2IG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIG1vcm5pbmcgYW5kIDEwIG+bmc/

DQ1ZRVMgliBHTyBUyBRVUVTVElPTiAxNw1OTy1ET06SVCBLTk9XIJYgQ09OVElOVUUNDVllc3Rl

cmRheSwgYmV0d2VlbiA2IG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIG1vcm5pbmcgYW5kIG+SY2xvY2sg

cmRheSwgYmV0d2VlbiA2IG+SY2xvY2sgaW4gdGhlIG1vcm5pbmcgYW5kIG+aW4g

dGhlIG1vcm5pbmcgZGlkIHlvdSBsaXN0ZW4gdG8gb3IgaGVhciBhbnkgb3RoZXIgcmFkaW8gc3Rh

dGlvbj8NDVlFUyCWIEdPIFRPIFFVRVNUSU9OIDE2DU5PL0RPTpJUIEtOT1cgLS0gQ09OVElPTUN

DVllc3RlcmRheSwgZGlkIHlvdSBsaXN0ZW4gdG8gYSByYWRpbyBvciBoZWFyIG9uZSBwbGF5aW5n

IGFueXdoZXJlIGFmdGVyIGRpbm5lcnRpbWUgdW50aWwgbWlkbmlnaHQ/DQ0JWUVTIC0tICBQUk9C

RSANCU5PICAgLS0gIFBST0JFDQ1QUk9CRTogIAlEb2VzIHRoaXMgbWVhbiB0aGF0IHlvdSAoZGlk

L2RpZCBub3QpIGxpc3RlbiB0byByYWRpby5ZXN0ZXJkYXkgKHNvbWV0aW1lL2FueXRpbWUpIGJl

dHdlZW4gcnBvcmNsb2NrIGluIHRoZSBldmVuaW5nIGFuZCAxMiBvcmNsb2NrIG1pZG5pZ2h0Pw0N

CURJRCBCMSVNURU4gIC0tICNPTIRJTVUFDQlESUQgTk9UIExJU1RFTi9OTy9ET06SVCBLTk9XIJYg

R08gVE8gUVVFU1RJT04gMjkNVdoYXQgc3RhdGlvbiBkaWQgeW91IGxpc3RlbiB0bz8gIA1SUk9C

RSBGT1IgU1RBVElPTiBDQUxxMIExFVFRFUlMgT1IgTkFNRSA6ICBXaGF0IGRvZXMgdGhlIHN0YXRp

b24gY2FsbCBpdHNlbGY/DQ1XYXMgdGhpcyBhbiBBTSBvciBGTSBzdGF0aW9uPw0NRGlkIHlvdSBk

byB0aGlzIHJhZGlvIGxpc3RlbmluZyBhdCBob21lIG9yIGF3YXkgZnJvbSBob21lPw0NQVQgSE9N

RSAgIC0tIENPTTlRJTlVFIFdJVEggUVVFU1RJT04gMjUNVdBWSBGUk9NIEhPTUUgliBHTyBUTyBR

VUVTVElPPTiAyNg1TT01FIENPTUJJTkFSU9OIYgQ09OVElOVUUgV0lUSCBRVUVTVElPPTiAyNQ0N

V2hhdCB0aW1lIGRpZCB5b3Ugc3RhcnQgbGlzdGVuaW5nIHRvIHRoaXMgcmFkaW8gc3RhdGlvbiBh

dCBob21lPyAgV2hhdCB0aW1lIGRpZCB5b3Ugc3RvcCBsaXN0ZW5pbmc/DQ1JRiBPTkxZIElOIOLUhP

TUUgTElTVEVOSU5HLCBSRUNPUkQgUkVTUE9OU0UgQU5EIFNLSVAgVE8gUVVFU1RJT04gMjcNVdo

YXQgdGltZSBkaWQgeW91IHN0YXJ0IGxpc3RlbmluZyB0byB0aGlzIHJhZGlvIHN0YXRpb24gYXdh

eSBmcm9tIGhvbWU/ICBBbmQsIHdoYXQgdGltZSBkaWQgeW91IHN0b3AgbGlzdGVuaW5nPw0NRGlk

IHlvdSBsaXN0ZW4gdG8gb3IgaGVhciAoSU5TRVJUIFNUQVRJT04pIGF0IGFueSBvdGhlciB0aW1l

IGJldHdlZW4gNyBvbkmb2NrIGluIHRoZSBldmVuaW5nIGFuZCAxMiBvbkmb2NrIG1pZG5pZ2h0

Pw0NWUYTIJYgR08gVE8gUVVFU1RJT04gMjQNTk8tRE9OJQgS05PVyCWIENPTlRJTlVFDQ1ZZXN0

ZXJkYXksIGJldHdlZW4gNyBvbkmb2NrIGluIHRoZSBldmVuaW5nIGFuZCAxMiBvbkmb2NrIG1p

ZG5pZ2h0IGRpZCB5b3UgbGlzdGVuIHRvIG9yIGhlYXIgYW55IG90aGVyIHJhZGlvIHN0YXRpb24/

DQ1ZRVMgliBHTyBUTyBRVUVTVElPPTiAyMw1OTy9ET06SVCBLTk9XIJYgQ09OVElOVUUNDU5vdywg

bGV0IG1lIGdvI92ZXIgd2hhdCB5b3UganVzdCB0b2xkIG1lLiAgVGVsbCBtZSBpZiBJIG1pc3Nl

ZCBhbnl0aGluZy4gIFRlbGwgbUUgaWYgeW91IGxpc3RlbmVkIHRvIGFueSBvdGhlciByYWRpbyBz

dGF0aW9ucyBvciBoZWFyZCBhbnkgb3RoZXIgcmFkaW9zIHBsYXlpbmcgeWVzdGVyZGF5IGF0IGFu

eSB0aW1lLg0NUkVURUFUIFJFUE9SVEVEIExJU1RFTklORyBBSBDSFJPTk9MT0dJQ0FMIE9SREVS

LiAgUFJPQkUgRk9SIE9USEVSIFJBREImIFNUQVRJT05TIFRIQVQgTUlHSFQgSEFWRSBCRUVOIExJ

U1RFTkVEIFRPIERVUklORyBBTlkgUkVQT1JURUQgVElNRVMgT1IgQkVUV0VFTiBBTlkgUkVQT1JU

RUQgTElTVEVOSU5HLg0NTm93LCBJIHdvdWxkIGxpa2UgdG8gYXNrIHlvdSBhYm91dCB0aGUga2lu

ZCBvZiBtdXNpYy5b3UgbGlrZSB0byBsaXN0ZW4gdG8gdGhlIG1vc3QuICBDYW4geW91IHRlbGwg

bWUgdGhlIG5hbWUgb2YgYW55IHNpbmdlcnMgb3IgbXVzaWMgZ3JvdXBzIHlvdSBsaWtlIHRvIGxp

c3Rlbi0bz8NDWdoZX4geW91IGFyZSBub3QgbGlzdGVuaW5nIHRvIHRoZSByYWRpbyBwbGF5aW5n

LCBkbyB5b3UgZXZlcjoNDS4ubGlzdGVuIHRvIG11c2ljIG9uIGNhc3NldHRlIHRhcGVzPw0NhS5s

aXN0ZW4gdG8gbXVzaWMgb24gY29tcGFjdCBkaXNjcyAoQ0RzKT8NDVUubGlzdGVuIHRvIG11c2lj

IG9uIHRoZSBpbnRlcm5ldCBvbiBhIFBDPw0NVGhhbnsgeW91IGZvciB0YWxraW5nIHdpdGggbWUg

dG9kYXkuICBZb3UgaGF2ZSBiZWVuIHZlcnkgaGVscGZ1bC4NDQ0NDQ0NAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAFwQAABgEAAxBA
AA

fQQAAIYEAAC2BAAALwUAAK0IAAC7CAAA8AkAAFcKAAAkDwAAtA8AAH4UAADhFAAAYxwAAKUcAACr

HAAA/fj9+PL4/fjr+P34/fj9+P34AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AxD

ShQAT0oCAFFKAgAACz4qAU9KAgBRSgIACE9KAgBRSgIAAARDShgAEgAEAAAXBAAAGAQAADEEAAAy

BAAAtQQAALYEAAAvBQAAMAUAAEAFAABQBQAAUQUAAO0FAADuBQAABwYAADgGAAA5BgAAWwYAAAK
gG

AACpBgAAxwYAAMgGAAADBwAABAcAACoHAABMBwAAeAcAAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAD6AAAAAAAAAA
AA

AAAA+AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2AAAAAAAAAAAAAA9gAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAA+APEA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2AAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAA9gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9gAAAAAAAAAAAAA

APYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA6AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADoAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAA6AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADfAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA3wAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAN8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAADfAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAMAAA+E0AIFAAAKJgALRgUAAAMAAA+E

AAAAAN8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAADfAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAMAAA+E0AIFAAAKJgALRgUAAAMAAA+hgEF

AAAKJgALRgMABREACiYAC0YEAAABAAAAARAAwAAAyQBAAEPAAAaAAQAABcEAAAYBAAAMQQAADIE

AAC1BAAAtgQAAC8FAAAwBQAAQAUAAFAFAABRBQAA7QUAAO4FAAAHBgAAOAYAADkGAABbBgAAqAYA

AKkGAADHBgAAyAYAAAMHAAAEBwAAKgcAAEwHAAB4BwAAeQcAAN0HAADeBwAAIAgAACEIAACRCAAA

kggAAA8JAAAQCQAAJwkAAEAJAAC9CQAAvgkAANUJAADvCQAA8AkAAFcKAABYCgAAaAoAAHgKAAB5

CgAAFwsAABgLAAAxCwAAYQsAAGILAACECwAA0QsAANILAADwCwAA8QsAACwMAAAtDAAAVAwAAHcM

AACkDAAApQwAAAkNAAAKDQAATQ0AAE4NAAC+DQAAvw0AAD4OAAA/DgAAVw4AAHAOAABxDgAA

AACkDAAApQwAAAkNAAAKDQAATQ0AAE4NAAC+8A4A

APEOAAAIDwAAIg8AACMPAAAkDwAAtA8AALUPAADFDwAA1Q8AANYPAABzEAAAdBAAAI0QAAC/EAAA

wBAAAOIQAAAvEQAAMBEAAE4RAABPEQAAihEAAIsRAACyEQAA1REAAAISAAD+/v7+/v7+/v7+

wBAAAOIQAAAvEQAAMBEAAE4RAABPEQAAihEAAIsRAACyEQAA1REAAAISAAD+/v7+

/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+

/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+AAAAAAIBAWR4BwAAeQcAAN0HAADeBwAAIAgA

ACEIAACRCAAAkggAAA8JAAAQCQAAJwkAAEAJAAC9CQAAvgkAANUJAADvCQAA8AkAAFcKAABYCgAA

aAoAAHgKAAB5CgAAFwsAABgLAAAxCwAAYQsAAGILAAD7AAAAAAAAAAAAAA9gAAAAAAAAAAAAA

APQAAAAAAAAAAAAAADwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA8AAAAAA

AAAAAOsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

D0

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA5gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAA

AAA

AAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABREACiYAC0YKAAUAAAom
m

AAtGCQAAAwAAD4RoAQABAAAFAAAKJgALRgUAAAMAAA+E0AIAGmILAACECwAA0QsAANILAADw

AAtGCQAAAwAAD4RoAQABAAAFAAAKJgALRgUAAAMAAA+CwAA

8QsAACwMAAAtDAAAVAwAAHcMAACkDAAApQwAAAkNAAAKDQAATQ0AAE4NAAC+DQAAvw0AAD4O

8QsAACwMAAAtDAAAVAwAAHcMAACkDAAApQwAAAkNAAAKDQAATQ0AAE4NAAC+AAA/

DgAAVw4AAHAOAABxDgAA8A4AAPEOAAAIDwAAIg8AAPoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

9gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPIA

9gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAADyAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA8gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADyAAAAAAAAA
AA

AAAA+gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAA+APoA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAADwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADsAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAADwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+AAAA

AAAAAAAA7AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7AAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AOwAAAAAAAAAAAAAADsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAUAAAomAAtGDQAAA
wAA

D4RoAQABAAAAwAAD4TQAgADAAAPhIYBBQAACiYAC0YKAAAaIg8AACMPAAAkDwAAtA8AALUPAADF

DwAA1Q8AANYPAABzEAAAdBAAAI0QAAC/EAAAwBAAAOIQAAAvEQAAMBEAAE4RAABPEQAAihEAAIsR

AACyEQAA1REAAAISAAADEgAAZxIAAGgSAACrEgAA/QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD4

AAAAAAAAAAAA/QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/QAAAA
AA

AAAAAAAAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP0AAAAAAAAAA
AA

AAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA8wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAO8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAADvAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7
wAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAO8AAAAAAAAAAAAAADzAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA6wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOsAAAAAAAA

AAAAAADrAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA6wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOsAAAAAAAAAAAAAADzAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

/QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAMAAA+EaAEAAwAAD4TQ

AgADAAAPhIYBBQAACiYAC0YUAAURAAomAAtGDQAAAQAAABoCEgAAAxIAAGcSAABoEgAAqxIAAKwS

AAAcEwAAHRMAAJoTAACbEwAAsxMAAMwTAADNEwAAShQAAEsUAABjFAAAfRQAAH4UAADhFAAA4hQA

APIUAAACFQAAxUAAJkVAACaFQAAsxUAAOUVAADmFQAACBYAAFUWAABWFgAAdBYAAHUWAACwFgAA

sRYAANgWAAD7FgAAKBcAACkXAACNFwAAjhcAANEXAADSFwAAQhgAAEMYAAC6GAAAuxgAANMYAADs

GAAA7RgAAGQZAABlGQAAfRkAAJYZAACXGQAATxoAAFAaAAAAGwAAARsAAKYbAACnGwAA5RsAAOYb

AAALHAAADBwAADYcAAA3HAAAYhwAAGMcAAClHAAAphwAAKccAACoHAAAqRwAAKocAACrHAAA/v7+

/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+

/v7+/v7+/v7+/v7+AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAgEBS6sSAACsEgAAHBMAAB0TAACaEwAAmxMA

ALMTAADMEwAAzRMAAEoUAABLFAAAYxQAAH0UAAB+FAAA4RQAAOIUAADyFAAAhUAAAMVAACZ

ALMTAADMEwAAzRMAAEoUAABLFAAAYxQAAH0UAAB+FQAA

mhUAALMVAADlFQAA5hUAAAgWAABVFgAAVhYAAPsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAPYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD7AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPsAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAPYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD7AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+AAAA

AAAAAAD7AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD7AAAAAAAAAAAA

+wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADqAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQA

+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAA

AAA

AAAA9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
OYA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAADmAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAwAAD4SGAQURAAomAAtGF
gAF

AAAKJgALRhYAAAEAAAUAAAomAAtGFAAAAwAAD4RoAQAaVhYAAHQWAAB1FgAAsBYAALEWAADYFgAA
+xYAACgXAAApFwAAjRcAAI4XAADRFwAA0hcAAEIYAABDGAAAuhgAALsYAADTGAAA7BgAAO0Y

+AABk

GQAAZRkAAH0ZAACWGQAAlxkAAE8aAABQGgAA+wAAAAAAAAAAAAPsAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2
GQAAZRkAAH0ZAACWGQAAlxkAAE8aAABQGgAA+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAA8gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPIAAAAAAAAAAAAAADyAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA8gAAAAAAAA
AA

AAAAAPIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOwAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
Ds

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD2AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7AAAAA
AA

AAAAAAAAAOwAAAAAAAAAAAAAADsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AADwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOwAAAAAAAAAAAAAADsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA5
wAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAPAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABQAACiYAC0YYAAADAAAPhGg
B

AAEAAAADAAAPhNACBQAACiYAC0YWAAADAAAPhIYBABpQGgAAABsAAAEbAACmGwAApxsAAOUbAAD
m

GwAACxwAAAwcAAA2HAAANxwAAGIcAABjHAAApRwAAKYcAACnHAAAqBwAAKkcAACqHAAAqxwAAP0A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD4AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA+AAAA

AAAAAAAA9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAAAAAAAA
AAA

APQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD9AA
AA

AAAAAAAAAAAA/QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD9AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/QAAAAAAA
AA

AAAAAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAERAAADAAAPhGgBBQAACiYAC0YYAAABAAAAEygAB1ABAAhQAQAmUAEAH7DQLyCw4D0hsAgH

IrAIByOQoAUkkKAFJbAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEgASAAoAAQBbAA8AAgAAAAAAAAoAABA8f8
C

ACgAAAAGAE4AbwByAG0AYQBsAAAAAgAAAAgAQ0oYAG1ICQQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA8AEFA

8v+hADwAAAAWAEQAZQBmAGEAdQBsAHQAIABQAGEAcgBhAGcAcgBhAHAAaAAgAEYAbwBuAHQA

8v+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAALgA+QAEA8gAuAAAABQBUAGkAdABsAGsAGUAAAAFAA8AAyQBAAwAQ0ocAE9KAgBR

AAAAAAAAAAAALgA+SgIA

NABKQAEAAgE0AAAACABTAHUAYgB0AGkAdABsAGUAAAAFABAAAyQBAAwAQ0ocAE9KAgBRSgIAMgBC

QAEAEgEyAAAACQBCAG8AZAB5ACAAVABlAHgAdAAAAAAIAEQAMAENKHABPSgIAUUoCAAAAAACrGAAA

DAAAMgAACQD/////AAQAAKscAAAPAAAAAAQAAHgHAABiCwAAIg8AAKsSAABWFgAAUBoAAKscAAAQ

AAAAEgAAABMAAAAUAAAAFgAAABcAAAAYAAAAAQAAAISAACrHAAAEQAAABUAAAAAAAAAehUAAHwV

AACtGAAABwAEAAcAAAAAADYBAAA+AQAARwEAAE8BAAB9AgAAgwIAAF4GAABmBgAAbwYAAHcG

AACtGAAABwAEAAcAAAAAADYBAAA+AACm

BwAArAcAALsLAADDCwAAzAsAANQLAAAEDQAACg0AAOgQAADwEAAA+RAAAAERAAAqEgAAMBIA

BwAArAcAALsLAADDCwAAzAsAANQLAAAEDQAACg0AAOgQAADwEAAA+AGUV

AAB9FQAA5hcAAO4XAAAMGAAAFBgAADcYAAA/GAAArRgAAAcAGgAHABoABwAaAAcAGgAHABoABwAa

AAcAGgAHABoABwAaAAcAGgAHABoABwAaAAcAGgAHABoABwAaAAcABAAHABoABwAaAAcAGgAHAP//EAAAABAATQBhAHIAbABhACAARAAuACAAQwByAGEAbABsAGUAUAyAEMAOgBcAFcASQBOAEQATwBXAFMAXABUAEUAUATQBQAFwAQQB1AHQAbwBSAGUAYwBvAHYAYZQByAHkAIABzAGEAdgBlACAAbwBmACAARABvAGMAdQBtAGUAbgB0ADEALgBhAHMAZAAQAE0AYQByAGwAYQAgAEQALgAgAEMAcgBhAGwAbABlAHkAHABDADoAXABBN

AHkAIABEAG8AYwB1AG0AZQBuAHQAcwBcAEMAaABpAGwAZABByAGUAbgAgAGQAbwBjABAATQBhAHIA

bABhACAARAAuACAAQwByAGEAbABsAGUAeQAcAEMAOgBcAE0AeQAgAEQAbwBjAHUAbQBlAG4AdABz

AFwAQwBoAGkAbABkAHIAZQBuAC4AZABvAGMACABBAHIAYgBpAHQAcgBvAG4ADwBBADoAXABDAGgA

aQBsAGQAcgBlAG4ALgBkAG8AYwAIAEEAcgBiAGkAdAByAG8AbgAxAEMAOgBcAFcASQBOAEQATwBX

AFMAXABUAEUATQBQQAFwAQQB1AHQAbwBSAGUAYwBvAHYAZQByAHkAIABzAGEAdgBlACAAbwBmACAA

QwBoAGkAbABkAHIAZQBuAC4AYQBzAGQAACABBAHIAYgBpAHQAcgBvAG4AMQBDADoAXABBXAEkATgBE

AE8AVwBTAFwAVABFAE0AUABcAEEAdQB0AG8AUgBlAGMAbwB2AGUAcgB5ACAAcwBhAHYAZQAgAG8A

ZgAgAEMAaABpAGwAZAByAGUAUAbgAuAGEAcwBkAAgAQQByAGIAaAB0AHIAbwBuADEAQwA6AFwAVwBJ

AE4ARABPAFcAUwBcAFQARQBNAFAAXABBAHUAdABvAFIAZQBjAG8AdgBlAHIAeQAgAHMAYQB2AGUA

IABvAGYAIABDAGgAaQBsAGQAcgBlAG4ALgBhAHMAZAAIAEEAcgBiAGkAdAByAG8AbgAxAEMAOgBc

AE0AeQAgAEQAbwBjAHUAbQBlAG4AdABzAFwAUwBQAEUAQwBJAEEATABTAFwAQwBoAGkAbABkAHIA

ZQBuAFwAQwBoAGkAbABkAHIAZQBuAC4AZABvAGMAGACnTB4H3AOu8P8PAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAEA0m/5CAIPkNn/DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAFEW2Ask7brr/w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AQBUZp4OxrGwhv8PAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAa06zNbw/vrz/DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAB

AJRgrzfmSMjI/w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAMFdk8IBqsN/8P/w//D/8P/w//D/8P/w//DwEA

0lC0PWg5Qo//DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABADVfyD0PAAkE/w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAh

Lt8+HKAAHP8PAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAtx9JP6bFBHP/DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAB

Lt8+AF0b

OELcA67w/w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAnK8FGHLSGqP8PAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAh1tS

S8axsIb/DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAPlenE9oOUKP/w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQCpc1pW

aDlCj/8PAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEA6E5MXqbFBHP/DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAOgy5l8c

oAAc/w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQB5bBFiDwAJBP8PAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAxnqbYyTt

uuv/DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABALoukXCmxQRz/w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQD1ThN0Npg
K

2P8PAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAWWj6dKbFBHP/DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAxGz3nmSMj
I

/w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAOAAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAREAAAD4RoARGEm
P4V

xgUAAWgBBjUIADYIAE9KAABRSgAAbygAAgAAAC4AHAAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAA

AA+EaAERhJj+FcYFAAFoAQYCAAAALgAPAAAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAREAAAD4Ro

AA+EaAERhJj+ARGE

mP4VxgUAAWgBBjUIADYIAE9KAABRSgAAbygAAgAAAC4AFAAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

ERAAAA+EaAERhJj+FcYFAAFoAQY1CAA2CABPSgAAUUoAAG8oAAIAAAAuABsAAAAAAEAAAAA

ERAAAA+EaAERhJj+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAABEQAAAPhGgBEYSY/hXGBQABaAEGNQgANggAT0oAAFFKAABvKAACAAAALgAQAAAA

AAABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAD4RoARGEmP4VxgUAAWgBBgIAAAuAAIAAAAAAAEAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAMQAAAPhIYBEYR6/hXGBQABhgEGbygAAgAAAC4ACAAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAERAAAA+EaAERhJj+FcYFAAFoAQY1CAA2CABPSgAAUUoAAG8oAAIAAAAuAAEA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAERAAAA+EaAERhJj+AAAA

AAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAPhGgBEYSY/hXGBQABaAEGAgAAAC4AFQAAAAAAQAAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAA+EaAERhJj+FcYFAAFoAQYCAAAALgADAAAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAA+EaAERhJj+AAAA

AAAAAAAREAAAD4RoARGEmP4VxgUAAWgBBjUIADYIAE9KAABRSgAAbygAAgAAAC4ADgAAAAAAQAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAERAAAA+EaAERhJj+FcYFAAFoAQY1CAA2CABPSgAAUUoAAG8oAAIA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAERAAAA+EaAERhJj+AAAu

AAEAAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABEQAAAPhGgBEYSY/hXGBQABaAEGNQgANggAT0oAAFFK

AABvKAACAAAALgAUAAAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAREAAAD4RoARGEmP4VxgUAAWgBBjUI

ADYIAE9KAABRSgAAbygAAgAAAC4ACAAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAERAAAA+EaAERhJj+

FcYFAAFoAQY1CAA2CABPSgAAUUoAAG8oAAIAAAAuAAgAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABEQ

AAAPhGgBEYSY/hXGBQABaAEGNQgANggAT0oAAFFKAABvKAACAAAALgADAAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAREAAAD4RoARGEmP4VxgUAAWgBBjUIADYIAE9KAABRSgAAbygAAgAAAC4AFQAAAAA

AQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAA+EaAERhJj+FcYFAAFoAQYCAAAALgABAAAAAABAAAA

AQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAA+EaAERhJj+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAD4RoARGEmP4VxgUAAWgBBgIAAAAuAA8AAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAABEQAAAPhGgBEYSY/hXGBQABaAEGNQgANggAT0oAAFFKAABvKAACAAAALgADAAAAAABAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAREAAAD4RoARGEmP4VxgUAAWgBBjUIADYIAE9KAABRSgAAbygAAgAAAC4A

BwAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAERAAAA+EaAERhJj+FcYFAAFoAQY1CAA2CABPSgAA

BwAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAERAAAA+EaAERhJj+UUoA

AG8oAAIAAAAuAAMAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABEQAAAPhGgBEYSY/hXGBQABaAEGNQg
A

NggAT0oAAFFKAABvKAACAAAALgAQAAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAD4RoARGEmP4V

xgUAAWgBBgIAAAAuABgAAAB5bBFiAAAAAAAAAAAAAANV/IPQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAwV2TwAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAnK8FGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAWWj6dAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALoukXAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
C3

H0k/AAAAAAAAAAAAAA6E5MXgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPVOE3QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD5XpxPAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAAA0lC0PQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAKlzWlYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABdGzhCAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAp0we

BwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAFEW2AsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADGeptjAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAh1tSSwAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAFRmng4AAAAAAAAAAAAAAABrTrM1AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAlGCvNwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAxGz3k
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAADoMuZfAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAIS7fPgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAANJv+QgAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAADoMuZfAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAIS7fPgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAANJv+AAAA

AAD//

///xgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD/QAOAAQB8FQAAfBUAANQi5Q
DG

AMYAfBUAAAEAAAB6FQAAAAAAAAIQAAAAAAAAKsYAADAAAAIAEAAAAMAAABHFpABAAACAgYDBQQF

AgMEAwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAVABpAG0AZQBzACAATgBlAHcAIABSAG8AbQBhAG4A

AAA1FpABAgAFBQECAQcGAgUHAAAAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAAIAAAAAUwB5AG0AYgBvAGwAAAAz
JpABAAACCwYEAgICAgIEAwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAQQByAGkAYQBsAAAAIgAEAPAI

iBgAANACAABoAQAAAACdSjmGnUo5hmlKOYYCAAAAAACRAwAAVxQAAAEACgAAAAQAAxArAAAAAAA

AAAAAAABAAEAAAABAAAAAAAMEiAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAKUGw
Ae0

ALQAgAAyMAAAEAAZAGQAAAAZAAAA+hgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

ALQAgAAyMAAAEAAZAGQAAAAZAAAA+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACAAAAAAD//xIAAAAAAAAAFgBDAGgAaQBs
s

AGQAcgBlAG4AGSBzACAAUgBhAGQAaQBvACAAUwB0AHUAZAB5AAAAAAAAABAATQBhAHIAbABhACAA

RAAuACAAQwByAGEAbABBsAGUAeQAIAEEAcgBiAGkAdAByAG8AbgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD+/wAABAACAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAA4IWf8vlP

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD+aBCr

kQgAKyez2TAAAACMAQAAEQAAAAEAAACQAAAAgAAAJgAAAADAAAAuAAAAAQAAADEAAAABQAAAOA
A

AAAHAAAA7AAAAAgAAAAAAQAACQAAABQBAAASAAAAIAEAAAoAAAA8AQAACwAAAEgBAAAMAAAAVA
EA

AA0AAAABgAQAADgAAAGwBAAAPAAAAdAEAABAAAAB8AQAAEwAAAIQBAAACAAAA5AQAAB4AAAAXAAA
A

Q2hpbGRyZW46ScyBSYWRpbyBTdHVkeQAAHgAAAAEAAAAAaGlsHgAAABEAAABNYXJsYSBELiBDcmFs

bGV5AFN0dR4AAAABAAAAAGFybB4AAAALAAAATm9ybWFsLmRvABhgAAAAkAAABBcmJpdHJvbgB0

AGEeAAAAAgAAADIAYmkeAAAAEwAAAE1pY3Jvc29mdCBXb3JkIDguMAB1QAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAA

AAA+lfPI+r4BQAAAABeMqjP+r4BQAAAABeMqjP+r4BAwAAAAEAAAADAAAAkQMAAAMAAABX

AAA+lfPI+r4BQAAAABeMqjP+r4BQAAAABeMqjP+FAAA

AwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/v8AAAQAAgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAALVzdWcLhsQk5cIACss+a5E

AAAABdXN1ZwuGxCTlwgAKyz5rkQBAAAAAQAADAAAAAEAAABoAAAADwAAAHAAAAAFAAAAfAAAAAYA

AACEAAAAEQAAAIwAAAAXAAAAlAAAAAsAAACcAAAAEAAAAKQAAAATAAAArAAAABYAAAC0AAAADQAA

ALwAAAAMAAAA3wAAAAIAAADkBAAAHgAAAIAAAAgAHIAAwAAACsAAAADAAAACgAAAAMAAAD6GAAA
A

AwAAAGoQCAALAAAAAAAAsAAAAAAAACwAAAAAAAALAAAAAAAAB4QAAABAAAAFwAAAENoa
Wxk

cmVuknMgUmFkaW8gU3R1ZHkkADBAAAAIAAAAeAAAABgAAAFRpdGxlAAMAAAABAAAAAAAmAAAAA
MA

AAAAAAAAIAAAAAEAAAA2AAAAAgAAAD4AAAABAAAAAgAAAAoAAABfUElEX0dVSUQAAgAAAOQEAABB

AAAATgAAAHsANwBDADAAAQQBDAEIAQQA3AC0ANgA2ADcANwAtADEAMQBEACAMALQBBADgANgBDAC
0A

QwA5AEEAOAA3ADAANwA5ADcAMwBFAEUAfQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAEAAAACAAAAAwAAAAQAAAAFAAAABgAAAAcAAAAIAAAACQAAAAoAAAALAAAADAAAAA0AAAA
O

AAAADwAAABAAAAARAAAAEgAAABMAAAAUAAAAFQAAABYAAAAXAAAAGAAAABkAAAD+////GwAA

AAAADwAAABAAAAARAAAAEgAAABMAAAAUAAAAFQAAABYAAAAXAAAAGAAAABkAAAD+ABwA

AAAdAAAAHgAAAB8AAAAgAAAAIQAAACIAAAAjAAAA/v///yUAAAAmAAAAJwAAACgAAAApAAAAKgAA

ACsAAAD+////LQAAAC4AAAAvAAAAMAAAADEAAAAyAAAAMwAAAP7////9////NgAAAP7////+

ACsAAAD+////

/v//

//

//

//

//

////UgBvAG8AdAAgAEUAbgB0AHIAeQAAAAAAAIEmaG0QAE15IERvY3VtZW50cwBNWURPQ1V+McBo

TAAGBADwTDtEABYABQH//////////wMAAAAGCQIAAAAAMAAAAAAABGAAAAACD1nya++r4BIHyY

ws/6vgE4AAAAgAAAAAAAAAxAFQAYQBiAGwAZQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADgACAP/////////wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABoAAAC0EwAAAAAAFcAbwByAGQARABvAGMAdQBtAGUAbgB0AA
AA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAaAAIBBQAAAP/////////AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACoyAAAAAAABQBTAHUAbQBtAGA
EA

cgB5AEkAbgBmAG8AcgBtAGEAdABpAG8AbgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACgAAgEC

AAAABAAAAP////8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAkAAAAABAAAAA
A

AAAFAEQAbwBjAjAHUAbQBlAG4AdABTAHUAbQBtAGEAcgB5AEkAbgBmAG8AcgBtAGEAdABpAG8AbgAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAOAACAf////////////////wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAACwAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAEAQwBvAG0AcABPAGIAag+AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAASAAIBAQAAAAYAAAD/////AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGoAAAAAAAATwBiAGoAZQBjAHQAUABvAG8AbAAAAAAAAAA
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABYAAQD//////////////8AAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACB8mMLP+r4BIHyYws/6vgEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACB8mMLP+AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
P//

////////////wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAEAAAD+//

AAEAAAD+////

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

AQD+/wMKAAD/////BgkCAAAAAADAAAAAAAAARhgAAABNaWNyb3NvZnQgV29yZCBEb2N1bWVu

AQD+dAAK

AAAATVNXb3JkRG9jABAAAABXb3JkLkRvY3VtZW50LjgA9DmycQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AA=

------_=_NextPart_000_01BF1BED.97820AE0--

>From Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com Thu Oct 21 10:56:35 1999

Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])

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

    id KAA21471 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 10:56:34 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id NAA25247; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 13:42:10

-0400 (EDT)

Received: from arbmdex.arbitron.com(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via

smap (4.1)

    id xma025202; Thu, 21 Oct 99 13:41:35 -0400

Received: by arbmdex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

    id <47YWSRMJ>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 13:57:46 -0400

Message-ID: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B301419B2D@arbmdex.arbitron.com>

From: "Cralley, Marla" <Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com>

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

Subject: Recall: Surveying children

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 1999 13:57:43 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain

Cralley, Marla would like to recall the message, "Surveying children".

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Oct 21 11:44:37 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

    id LAA23068 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 11:44:36 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

    id LAA27348 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 11:44:37 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 1999 11:44:37 -0700 (PDT)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Of Significance (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9910211142250.10848-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

---------- Forwarded message ----------

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 1999 13:27:01 -0400

From: patricia_j_doyle/dsd/hq/boc_at_boc@CCMAIL.CENSUS.GOV

Subject: Of Significance

Of Significance...

A Call for Papers

A new publication, Of Significance..., will focus on confidentiality and disclosure in its second issue. We invite you to contribute to this publication through the preparation of an article directed to consumers of public data in general and users of public use data in particular. Issues of interest for this issue include:

Policy: What policies currently govern release of social science research information and where might those policies go in the future?

Practice: What techniques are currently available to anonymize data for release to the public and what are their impacts on analysis?

Prognostication: What might the future bring in light of the nearly universal access provided by the internet?

The article should be 5 to 10 pages in length single-spaced, two-column format. It should also be written for an audience with a keen interest in the impact of privacy and confidentiality requirements on data availability and use but for whom the technical topics of disclosure protection are somewhat unfamiliar.

We encourage you to contribute to this important publication.

To do so, please submit an abstract (one page or less) by

November 1, 1999, to:

Pat Doyle, Survey Improvement Coordinator

Demographic Surveys Division

Room 3334-3

Census Bureau

Washington DC 20233

 GOTOBUTTON BM_1_

patricia.j.doyle@ccmail.census.gov

Questions or comments may be directed to any one of the guest

editors for this edition of Of Significance...

Pat Doyle (301-457-3822, email address above)

Jerry Gates (301-457-2515,

gerald.w.gates@ccmail.census.gov)

Laura Zayatz (301-457-4955,

laura.zayatz@ccmail.census.gov)

Of Significance is sponsored by the Association of Public Data

Users (APDU). The first issue focused on statistical literacy

is currently in press. Publication of an article in Of

Significance does not preclude publication elsewhere.

****

Hi,

I'm looking for some help on a survey we want to do on "the Millennium." I

started at the normal place--looking to see what was done the last time.

But the two Graduate Assistants working on the project are adamant that

there is nothing good to look at from the last Millennium and we should

start from scratch.

We want to ask our sample of New Jerseyans to look ahead over the next 10

years or so and tell us what they expect across a variety of life

realms: work, family & friends, society as a whole, science, technology &

communication, health & other quality of life concerns. I'd appreciate

hearing from anybody who has conducted similar surveys in the recent past.

Please respond directly to me rather than to the listserv. Thanks. Cliff

Zukin

--

Cliff Zukin   Rutgers University   e-mail: zukin@rci.rutgers.edu

Chair & Graduate Director * Department of Public Policy

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

33 Livingston Ave., Suite 202 *   New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1980

732/932-2499 x 712 (Of) * 732/932-1107 (Fx)

Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton Poll * Eagleton Inst. of Politics 185 Ryders

Lane * New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557 732/932-9384 x 247 (Of) *

732/932-1551 (Fx)

WHAT'S NEW IN FEDERAL STATISTICS

October 21, 1999

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Requests Comments on the Proposed

Changes to Standards for Defining Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Areas

On October 20, OMB released the recommendations from the Metropolitan Area

Standards Review Committee (MASRC) for changes to OMB's standards for

defining metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas. This is the first major

revision of these concepts since 1970, when OMB developed new areas such as

Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSA's) and Metropolitan Statistical

Areas (MSA's). MASRC has recommended a Core-Based Statistical Areas (CBSAs)

classification to replace the current Metropolitan Area

(MA) classification. The cores (densely settled concentrations of

population) for this classification would be Census Bureau defined urbanized

areas and smaller densely settled "settlement clusters." The settlement clusters are new areas to be identified for the 2000 Census. CBSAs would be defined around these cores. This CBSA classification has three types of areas based on the total population of all cores in the CBSA: 1) Megapolitan Areas defined around cores of at least 1,000,000 population; 2) Macropolitan Areas defined around cores of 50,000 to 999,999 population; and 3) Micropolitan Areas defined around cores of 10,000 to 49,999 population. Those counties containing the cores, should become the central counties of the CBSA's. Territory outside of Megapolitan, Macropolitan and Micropolitan Areas would be termed "Outside CBSAs." The MASRC has recommended the use of counties and equivalent entities as the building blocks for statistical areas throughout the United States and Puerto Rico, including the use of counties as the primary building blocks for statistical areas in New England. MASRC also recommended that Minor Civil Divisions (MCDs) be used as building blocks for an alternative set of statistical areas for the New England States only. A single threshold of 25 percent to establish qualifying linkages between outlying counties and counties containing the CBSA cores has also been recommended.

OMB has allowed sixty (60) days for comments. To ensure consideration during the final decision making process, written comments must be received no later than December 20, 1999. The Comments should be sent to James D. Fitzsimmons, U.S. Bureau of the Census, IPC-Population Division, Washington, DC 20233-8860. The final standards will be announced by April 1, 2000. The actual areas, based upon 2000 Census commuting information will probably be available in 2003.

The full text of the release is available from the COPAFS home page at: http://members.aol.com/copafs/metro99, and also at the OMB home page at:

http://www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/fedreg/msa-recommend.pdf

****

I am concluding a small project searching for journal articles or other

sources about methodology issues in surveying public officials. &Public

officials 8 are defined loosely as non-elected government employees at upper

managerial or policy-making levels. Of course, this is just a special case

of organizational/business establishment surveys; that literature covers

most of the relevant topics.

There seems to be very little methodological work that deals specifically

with +public officials , surveys, or how survey methods for them might

differ (if at all) from those for surveying high level members of

non-government organizations. I ,ve contacted several of you individually.

This note is a final call before I end the study.

If anyone knows of specific articles, sources or researchers who have done

survey methods work in this area (in either the U.S. or other countries),

I ,d very much appreciate any leads or references. Please respond directly

to me, not to the list.

Johnny Blair

Jblair@srcmail.umd.edu

>From rkrughoff@checkbook.org Thu Oct 21 18:46:19 1999

Received: from mail.checkbook.org ([209.249.111.33])

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

    id SAA20818 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 18:46:17 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by mail.checkbook.org from localhost

   (router,SLMail V3.2); Thu, 21 Oct 1999 21:47:41 -0400

Received: from CSS [216.200.84.23]

Job Announcement

Survey Research Director

The Center for the Study of Services (CSS), a nonprofit consumer research

organization, seeks an experienced survey research director to assume

responsibility for surveys of consumers and professionals to be used in

evaluations of the performance of health plans, hospitals, nursing homes,

physicians, and other health care providers, and occasional evaluations of

other types of service providers.

Typical recent projects have been a survey of 400,000 members of 350

different HMOs for their evaluations of the care and services provided, a

survey of 260,000 physicians for their ratings of their peers, a survey of

15,000 health plan disenrollees from 40 plans to assess reasons for disenrollment from each plan, and a survey of 20,000 asthma patients for their evaluation of the care provided by each of 25 physician groups.

Results of surveys are used by states and other clients in preparing report cards and are used in CSS's own publications, such as Consumers' CHECKBOOK magazine, the Guide to Top Doctors, and the Consumers' Guide to Health Plans.

The Survey Research Director will be responsible for projects from conception to completion, including the administration of the surveys and analysis and presentation of results.

CSS's survey operations are conducted with a small, lean in-house staff. Lettershop services, most data entry, all CATI interviewing, and various other operations are contracted out to a select group of vendors.

Candidates must demonstrate technical knowledge spanning the entire survey and analysis process; ability to hire, train, and manage staff and outside vendors; and ability to write clearly and persuasively.

Excellent salary and benefits.

Send letter and resume to:

Center for the Study of Services

Attn: PK2

733 15th Street, NW, Suite 820

Washington, DC 20005

Or fax to: PK2 at (202) 347-4000

Or e-mail to technical@checkbook.org   Subject: Attn: PK2

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Thu Oct 21 18:50:10 1999

Received: from imo-d06.mx.aol.com (imo-d06.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.38])

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

   id SAA23180 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 18:50:09 -0700

(PDT)

From: MILTGOLD@aol.com

Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com

   by imo-d06.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5VPR0oVAgF (4427);

   Thu, 21 Oct 1999 21:49:32 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <0.36cb569b.25411cab@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 1999 21:49:31 EDT

Subject: Survey Software for Use on the Internet

To: aapornet@usc.edu, SRMSNET@umdd.umd.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 3.0.1 for Mac sub 79

I pass along this item I just saw on the Infobeat Finance Daily-Internet

newsletter I subscribe to via e-mail. I have no affiliation with this

product, but it may be of interest to others.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

Research Statistician

U. S. Dept. of Justice

miltgold@aol.com

****

** Va. tech agency offers free survey tool

Virginia's Internet Technology Innovation Center announced it will make
available SurveySuite, electronic survey software free via the Internet at
http://intercom.virginia.edu/SurveySuite. Internet TIC, established by the
state's Center of Innovative technology, is a partnership among 11 research
groups at four Virginia universities.

>From Mangrovehk@aol.com Thu Oct 21 19:23:29 1999

Received: from imo22.mx.aol.com (imo22.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.66])

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

   id TAA10819 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 19:23:26 -0700

(PDT)

From: Mangrovehk@aol.com

Received: from Mangrovehk@aol.com

   by imo22.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5ZGQa19964 (4403)

   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 22:22:47 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <0.8ae64cc9.25412477@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 1999 22:22:47 EDT

Subject: Re: SURVEYS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 62

You might try Lance deHaven-Smith at University of Florida. He has a web

site that you can find by simply searching on his name via Yahoo.

Helene Klein

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Oct 21 20:40:38 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

    id UAA11906 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 20:40:38 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

    id UAA06390 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 20:40:37 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 1999 20:40:37 -0700 (PDT)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Sociology: Is the Discipline in Crisis? (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9910212028050.3041-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

        Copyright 1999 The Chronicle of Higher Education

The Chronicle of Higher Education, 15 October 1999, p. B4

Soul-Searching in Sociology: Is the Discipline in Crisis?

By JOE R. FEAGIN

Professor of sociology at the University of Florida and
President of the American Sociological Association.

Most members of the American Sociological Association are proud of their discipline's intellectual diversity. However, a recent controversy over the editorship of the American Sociological Review, the A.S.A.'s flagship journal, indicates that the majority of the association's leadership lags somewhat behind the membership in progressing toward goals of greater intellectual diversity and democracy in the A.S.A.'s operations.

Viewed narrowly, the A.S.R. debate is over which editors should be at the helm of the nation's leading sociology journal, which is also the association's official journal. The controversy, however, reflects much broader, long-simmering tensions within the discipline that parallel frictions within other social sciences and society at large.

Most sociologists who do qualitative and theoretical research -- particularly those who study issues regarding race, ethnicity, gender, class, and sexuality -- oppose the heavy emphasis that the A.S.A.'s establishment puts on quantitatively analyzed survey research. That

opposition is only in part about the dominance of a certain research method. It is also fueled by a recognition that much mainstream research has drifted away from the urgent moral and practical concerns voiced by critical sociologists since the first decades of this century.

At first sight, the latest A.S.A. flap has to do with questionable procedures by its governing council, the clout of an elected publications committee, the qualifications and visions of proposed editors, and the association leadership's receptivity to criticism and reform. But, fundamentally, the issues that the A.S.A. is facing are the same ones facing the nation as a whole. Will we continue to allow traditional elites in large institutions to control important discourse and decisions? Or will we take our democratic traditions seriously, and significantly open up that dialogue and decision making to the larger population? However the immediate questions regarding a single sociology journal are resolved, both the narrow and the broader debates, I believe, are necessary and constructive.

The strength of sociology has long resided in its intellectual diversity. Sociology was the first discipline in the United States to undertake serious studies of racial and gender inequality, and one of the first to include serious research on a range of other issues, such as class inequality, bias against gays and lesbians, and age discrimination. Sociologists have been among the sharpest analysts and critics of U.S. society, from the early commentaries of W.E.B. Du Bois on racism to the analyses of gender relations by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and from recent assessments of the American ruling class by G. William Domhoff to Arlie R. Hochschild's explorations of worker alienation and the management of emotions.

>From the beginning, sociology has included a rich variety of

>qualitative and

quantitative research methods. However, since World War II, many leading

sociologists have stressed the need for sociology to standardize and develop

more methodological rigor. They have called for the use of advanced

statistical techniques, survey and demographic methods, and positivistic

generalization -- the testing of rigidly framed, deductive propositions by

quantitative data and methods.

Many sociologists have taken the command for statistical rigor to heart.

Indeed, one reason why sociology does not currently have more social impact

is its over-emphasis on advanced statistical methods and a neutrality toward

society's marked inequalities. Like other social scientists, too many

sociologists have lost touch with the moral and practical concerns from

which our field emanated.

How did the shift away from broader concerns come about? In tour-de-force

articles in the book A Critique of Contemporary American Sociology (General

Hall, 1993), Gideon Sjoberg, of the University of Texas, and Ted R. Vaughan,

now retired from the University of Missouri, demonstrated that, since World

War II, sociology has been reshaped into a discipline whose most prestigious

members are often linked to government agencies, foundations, or other

bureaucracies that supply much of the money for social research. In the past

several decades, members of major Ph.D.-granting sociology departments --

such as the University of Wisconsin, Indiana University, and Pennsylvania

State University, among numerous others -- have become heavily dependent on

research grants provided by those bureaucracies.

Before World War II, the majority of sociologists conducted research

projects

-- usually with little outside financing -- that primarily used qualitative techniques or descriptive-statistical measures, such as percentages and medians, that were understandable to the educated layperson. The discipline's primary concern was with addressing specific societal problems and working toward an understanding of their causes and development. After the war, federal agencies and foundations began backing social-science research on a large scale. Partly because survey and other research projects using advanced statistical methods enjoyed the respectable patina of "hard science," and partly because those projects rarely raised fundamental questions about major institutions, they were favored by the large underwriters of social research. Although regularly challenged, the quantitative orientation gained a central position within U.S. sociology.

Many sociologists and other social scientists fashioned themselves into grant-seeking entrepreneurs, with their own narrow professional networks and readily identifiable niches of inquiry. Often their research goals have coincided with the establishment-oriented interests of the bureaucratic benefactors. Concurrently, there has been relatively little large-scale backing of qualitative projects, especially those of researchers who question mainstream institutions.

Large-scale federal and corporate financing brought the major Ph.D.-granting departments into prominence. Today, those powerful research departments attract well-published sociologists and many graduate students, control major publications such as the A.S.R., and act as gatekeepers for much sociological research and debate.

There are, of course, many quantitative researchers who are reflective and critical. The problem is not quantification per se, but the all too

frequently unreflective use of quantitative methods without consideration of the research's social context, societal relevance, or uncritical assumptions.

In other words, the postwar accommodation of money sources that prefer to support only certain research topics and quantitative methods has often bred superficiality in sociology -- as well as in some other social sciences, such as political science. The social survey, a prevailing research technique, typically involves surface-level readings of human behavior. A great deal of of what sociologists and other social scientists know is from these short survey questions, framed by researchers who have no direct contact with their research subjects.

For example, much survey research suggests that white people's attitudes toward African Americans have become much more liberal in recent decades. Yet the brief survey questions typically used in such research are problematic as an indication of the real views of white Americans.

Recent research by the Texas A&M sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva on white students at three major universities found that racial attitudes expressed on short-answer survey items were often different from those expressed by respondents in interviews allowing more-detailed commentary. On a short survey item, eight in 10 of the 400-plus students said they approved of marriages between black people and white people. When a smaller, representative group from the same institutions was interviewed in depth, fewer than one-third still approved of racial intermarriage. Given the time to explain, the majority expressed reservations about marriage across the color line. Respondents might indicate in a survey question that they didn't have a problem with intermarriage, but in a longer interview would back off

from that view and say they wouldn't want it to happen in their families. That kind of in-depth interviewing, a traditional qualitative approach, often reveals the deep realities of social life that quantitative survey research alone cannot measure.

The control of mainstream journals by quantitatively oriented sociologists has driven those who primarily use other methods to publish their innovative work in books or in specialty journals. Today, as a result, there is a mainstream "article sociology" and a "book sociology," with striking differences in style, methods, and subject matter. Such bifurcation is also evident in political science and economics.

The discourses of the two sociologies are, to a remarkable degree, non-overlapping. In mainstream journals like the A.S.R., establishment editors rarely publish qualitative or theoretical research, especially research involving critical approaches. Those approaches are often used by scholars who have been marginalized -- including many female, black, Latino, Asian, gay, Marxist, and working-class sociologists. For decades, those researchers have capably and critically dissected the dominant society -- and the sociological profession as well. Examples include the brilliant black sociologist Oliver C. Cox, whose groundbreaking book on racial conflict, Caste, Class, & Race: A Study in Social Dynamics (Doubleday, 1948), has only lately received attention from U.S. sociologists. A more recent example is the work of Dorothy E. Smith, whose critical feminist analyses are presented in her book The Everyday World As Problematic: A Feminist Sociology (Northeastern University Press, 1987).

Interestingly, even mainstream introductory sociology textbooks draw heavily on the book-sociology research for much of their content, because book

sociology often provides more-interesting data on, and analyses of, the day-to-day quandaries of contemporary society.

Until the mid-1960s, the American Sociology Review was a more intellectually and methodologically diverse journal than it has been since. As late as summer 1964, one large issue of the journal featured five major conceptual articles on social evolution and historical change, including essays by leading theorists such as Talcott Parsons and Robert Bellah, both of whom were on the faculty of Harvard University. Not one of those essays had any quantitative apparatus, and not one would probably have been published in the A.S.R. in recent decades.

Since the 1970s, numerous sociologists have complained about the dominance of hyper-quantitative research in the major journals, and several esteemed sociologists have organized informal boycotts of A.S.R. subscriptions among their colleagues. The recent conflict over the journal's editorship should be seen against that background, not as a professional clash out of the blue.

In January, Walter Allen -- a distinguished sociologist at the University of California at Los Angeles, recent nominee for president of the American Sociological Association, recent member of the A.S.A. council, and an African American -- was nominated by the A.S.A. publications committee's eight voting members for the editorship of the A.S.R. In a close vote, that nomination was rejected by the council's 19 voting members, who also rejected the committee's second choice, Jerry Jacobs, of the University of Pennsylvania, in favor of two candidates the committee had not recommended. The council majority chose two co-editors from the University of Wisconsin at Madison -- Charles Camic and Franklin D. Wilson -- and thereby returned

the A.S.R. to a leading quantitative department, the only one to control the journal three times since the 1960s. While no one questions Camic's or Wilson's academic credentials, for many sociologists, the journal's return to Wisconsin indicated an elitist and establishment mindset among the association's leaders (The Chronicle, September 3).

In council discussions, a major argument made against Allen was that he had not published articles in the A.S.R. or the American Journal of Sociology, another major journal of the discipline. Yet Allen -- whom I supported for the editorship in the council discussions -- has published six dozen research chapters and articles in important books and distinguished journals, including the Harvard Educational Review and Signs. A researcher whose work often deals with education, family, and racial relations, Allen has spent his entire career in top-10 departments (Michigan, North Carolina, U.C.L.A.). He has served on the editorial boards of many journals and has extensive administrative experience with journals and large research grants.

Even though several council members sought more time to review the new candidates properly, the council majority pushed through a decision on the editorship much too rapidly.

Walter Allen was the best candidate for the editorship, in my opinion, because he offered a well-devised strategy for diversifying the A.S.R.'s content and for democratizing its editorial operations. Envisioning a dynamic and reinvigorated journal, Allen proposed the creation of an intellectually diverse team of six deputy editors with expertise in a range of qualitative, quantitative, and theoretical research. Those editors would have included sociologists who are female, black, Asian, or Latino. The

strong deputy-editor structure would have resembled that of the Administrative Science Quarterly, one of the best-run journals in social science. The proposed editors were to have substantial authority in handling reviews of papers -- including selection of reviewers and correspondence with authors -- all in consultation with the editor. Such a system would very likely have insured that papers submitted by scholars doing research into currently underrepresented topics would be evaluated by respected peers, well-informed in those specialties.

One of the proposed deputy editors was Patricia Hill Collins, of the University of Cincinnati, a leading scholar in critical theory. In her perceptive new book, Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice (University of Minnesota Press, 1998), Collins argues that intellectuals who break with conventional wisdom are more of a threat to the establishment than their numbers might suggest. Allen and his proposed deputy editors apparently were such a threat.

In addition to being hasty and, I think, unwise, the council's rejection of the publications-committee recommendations was unprecedented. It triggered months of controversy, resulting in an intense business meeting at the association's annual conference in August, in Chicago. As many as 400 sociologists turned out at the 7 a.m. meeting to debate the issue. Many A.S.A. members indicated that they were upset that a leading sociologist with impeccable credentials was not considered qualified by the council majority to be the A.S.R.'s editor. The members passed, overwhelmingly, a resolution calling for a reconsideration and reversal of the council's decision. In addition, Judith Auerbach, of the National Institutes of Health -- president of Sociologists for Women in Society -- called for more democracy in A.S.A. operations, recommending a task force to re-examine the

elimination of the association's elected committee on committees and suggesting the reinstitution of regional representation on the committee on nominations. That motion passed nearly unanimously.

At a subsequent council meeting, a majority of council members voted to stick with their original decision on the A.S.R. editorship and supported the membership's motion for a task force on restoring the committee on committees. Concerned about the membership's strong criticism, the council did pass several resolutions acknowledging the need for greater intellectual diversity in the A.S.R., and called on the new co-editors to take that need into consideration. The council also called for a conference to study the journal's future direction.

Today, the debate continues, with some A.S.A. members coming to the support of the council majority's decisions, and others pressing for more changes in the direction of greater diversity and democracy. Last month, for example, the executive committee of the Association of Black Sociologists issued a statement condemning the editorial decisions of the A.S.A. council's majority. The statement concluded that the council's failure to take remedial action in response to the business meeting has caused many sociologists to have little confidence in future actions of the council on issues of diversity and inclusion.

As unnerving as the discord is, the debate over diversity and democracy at the A.S.R. -- and in the association and the profession generally -- is healthy, and would be so in any social science. It indicates growing input from the membership as to how the discipline should be organized and governed. It also reflects the profession's soul-searching attempts to evaluate and, if necessary, to correct its course, a self-reflective

tradition that is one of sociology's recurring virtues.

One of the attractions of being in a discipline that includes the study of such subjects as justice, equality, and freedom is that the societal issues we probe as researchers also are relevant to our professional deliberations. We can practice what we preach -- try to encourage new intellectual voices and to structure our associations democratically. Sometimes we succeed; sometimes we fail. But if we look in the mirror and find that the reflection is sometimes a little ungainly, we should remember that we are, or can be, models for a more diverse and democratic society.

It is in that light -- even as we may flinch at the heat and untidiness of our current disputes -- that we also can pause, just briefly, to congratulate ourselves on having them.

Joe R. Feagin is a professor of sociology at the University of Florida and president of the American Sociological Association.

****

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Thu Oct 21 21:08:33 1999

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])

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

    id VAA22446 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 21:08:32 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (garnet1-fi.acns.fsu.edu

[192.168.197.1])

    by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id AAA157714

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 00:08:28 -0400

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial853.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.35.243])

    by garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id AAA37390

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 00:08:27 -0400

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 00:08:27 -0400

Message-Id: <199910220408.AAA37390@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: SURVEYS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

no! no! He is at FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY (the other one) in Public

Administration. Tallahassee Fl 32306-1440. 850-487-1870

ldsmith@garnet.fsu.edu

Susan

At 10:22 PM 10/21/1999 EDT, you wrote:

>You might try Lance deHaven-Smith at University of Florida. He has a

>web

>site that you can find by simply searching on his name via Yahoo.

>

>Helene Klein

>

>

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

Susan Losh, PhD.

Department of Sociology

Florida State University

Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000

   850-644-1753 Office

   850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

FAX 850-644-6208

In Gallup and Harris polls this year, 71% were in favor of the death penalty
and about 22% were opposed.
(Source:http://www.pollingreport.com/crime.htm) Lopsided support has been
evident in polls they conducted over recent years. (Favor/oppose the death
penalty is the most common form for this question.)

But when Gallup asks another question, asking people to choose between the
death penalty and life in prison with no chance of parole as the penalty for
murder, only 56% chose the death penalty and 38% chose life in prison with
no chance of parole. This was the outcome in 1999.

Lower support for the death penalty has been the trend over recent years
when asked as a preference between two possible sentences by Gallup. (This
alternate question has been asked in a split-sample design or in separate
polls not including the favor/oppose death penalty question.)

Has any Aaporite out there experimented with these alternate wordings? I

suspect that when the question is simply yes/no to the death penalty, more

people are in favor because they believe the alternative is that the

offender will be paroled in a few years.

Has anyone followed up a yes/no death penalty question with a question

asking why they are in favor? I would appreciate any experience anyone may

have asking these alternate questions or any theories on why there is a

difference in support between the two question forms.

Nick Panagakis

>From stewart.132@osu.edu Fri Oct 22 08:39:01 1999

Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu

[128.146.214.33])

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

    id IAA27545 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 08:38:59 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ers.sbs.ohio-state.edu (ers.sbs.ohio-state.edu

[128.146.93.18])

    by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA06776

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:36:01 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19991022113853.0105097c@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: stewart.132@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu

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

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:38:53 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Erik Stewart <stewart.132@osu.edu>

We've engaged in this work in Ohio and have found similar patterns. In a

telephone survey we conducted in 1997 we found that 75% of Ohioans favor the

death penalty for convicted murderers (Q item = Do you favor or oppose the

death penalty for persons convicted of murder) while 17% were opposed and 8%

expressed ambivalence. When asked "If convicted 1st degree murderers in

Ohio could be sentenced to life in prison without parole, and also be

required to work in prison industries for money that would go to the

families of their victims, would you prefer this as an alternative to the

death penalty?" 59% of respondents supported the use of this alternative,

while 31% did not support it and 9% reported being unsure. We also posed

the question "How likely do you believe it is for an innocent person to be

wrongly convicted and executed?" rotating this item with the previously

mentioned item and as might be expected, found a slight order effect such

that when the wrongly executed item appeared prior to the alternative to the

death penalty item, there were higher levels of support shown for the

alternative option. I'm afraid that we haven't taken our work to the level

of obtaining information as to why people specifically support/oppose use of

the death penalty.

At 09:53 AM 10/22/99 +0000, you wrote:

>In Gallup and Harris polls this year, 71% were in favor of the death

>penalty and about 22% were opposed.

>(Source:http://www.pollingreport.com/crime.htm) Lopsided support has

>been evident in polls they conducted over recent years. (Favor/oppose

>the death penalty is the most common form for this question.)

>

>But when Gallup asks another question, asking people to choose between

>the death penalty and life in prison with no chance of parole as the

>penalty for murder, only 56% chose the death penalty and 38% chose life

>in prison with no chance of parole. This was the outcome in 1999.

>

>Lower support for the death penalty has been the trend over recent

>years when asked as a preference between two possible sentences by

>Gallup. (This alternate question has been asked in a split-sample

>design or in separate polls not including the favor/oppose death

>penalty question.)

>

>Has any Aaporite out there experimented with these alternate wordings?

>I suspect that when the question is simply yes/no to the death penalty,

>more people are in favor because they believe the alternative is that

>the offender will be paroled in a few years.

>

>Has anyone followed up a yes/no death penalty question with a question

>asking why they are in favor? I would appreciate any experience anyone

>may have asking these alternate questions or any theories on why there

>is a difference in support between the two question forms.

>

>Nick Panagakis

>

>

>

>

Erik R. Stewart, Ph.D.

Assistant Director for Operations

OSU Center for Survey Research

3045 Derby Hall

154 N. Oval Mall

Columbus, Ohio 43210-1330

614-292-6672

Has anyone ever explored with the public the issue of the cost to taxpayers

of incarceration for life versus the death penalty (which itself is costly

due to multiple appeals). Did this have an impact on opinions of the dealth

penalty?

Erik Stewart <stewart.132@osu.edu> on 10/22/99 11:38:53 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: Re: Capital Punishment

We've engaged in this work in Ohio and have found similar patterns. In a

telephone survey we conducted in 1997 we found that 75% of Ohioans favor the

death penalty for convicted murderers (Q item = Do you favor or oppose the

death penalty for persons convicted of murder) while 17% were opposed and 8%

expressed ambivalence. When asked "If convicted 1st degree murderers in

Ohio could be sentenced to life in prison without parole, and also be

required to work in prison industries for money that would go to the

families of their victims, would you prefer this as an alternative to the

death penalty?" 59% of respondents supported the use of this alternative,

while 31% did not support it and 9% reported being unsure. We also posed

the question "How likely do you believe it is for an innocent person to be

wrongly convicted and executed?" rotating this item with the previously

mentioned item and as might be expected, found a slight order effect such

that when the wrongly executed item appeared prior to the alternative to the

death penalty item, there were higher levels of support shown for the

alternative option. I'm afraid that we haven't taken our work to the level

of obtaining information as to why people specifically support/oppose use of

the death penalty.

At 09:53 AM 10/22/99 +0000, you wrote:

>In Gallup and Harris polls this year, 71% were in favor of the death

>penalty and about 22% were opposed.

>(Source:http://www.pollingreport.com/crime.htm) Lopsided support has

>been evident in polls they conducted over recent years. (Favor/oppose

>the death penalty is the most common form for this question.)

>

>But when Gallup asks another question, asking people to choose between

>the death penalty and life in prison with no chance of parole as the

>penalty for murder, only 56% chose the death penalty and 38% chose life

>in prison with no chance of parole. This was the outcome in 1999.

>

>Lower support for the death penalty has been the trend over recent

>years when asked as a preference between two possible sentences by

>Gallup. (This alternate question has been asked in a split-sample

>design or in separate polls not including the favor/oppose death

>penalty question.)

>

>Has any Aaporite out there experimented with these alternate wordings?

>I suspect that when the question is simply yes/no to the death penalty,

>more people are in favor because they believe the alternative is that

>the offender will be paroled in a few years.

>

>Has anyone followed up a yes/no death penalty question with a question

>asking why they are in favor? I would appreciate any experience anyone

>may have asking these alternate questions or any theories on why there

>is a difference in support between the two question forms.

>

>Nick Panagakis

>

>

>

>

Erik R. Stewart, Ph.D.

Assistant Director for Operations

OSU Center for Survey Research

3045 Derby Hall

154 N. Oval Mall

Columbus, Ohio 43210-1330

614-292-6672

_____

____

            Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

_____

____

October 22, 1999

ADVERTISING

Selling to Children, or Manipulating Them?

By CONSTANCE L. HAYS

DEPLORING what they see as an unfair and conflict-ridden manipulation of the young, a group of psychologists and other professionals has called on the American Psychological Association to restrict the use of psychological research by advertisers pitching toys, video games, snack food and other products to children.

The letter, written by Gary Ruskin, who heads Commercial Alert, a Washington-based advocacy group, and Allen D. Kanner, a clinical psychologist at the Wright Institute in Berkeley, Calif., was sent to the association's president late last month. It urges the association to issue a formal denunciation of the use of psychological techniques in marketing and advertising to children, and asks for amendments to the association's code of ethics that would address the issue.

The letter, which was signed by 60 psychologists and other professionals with affiliations ranging from Sonoma State University to Harvard Medical School, also calls for "an ongoing campaign to probe, review and confront the use of psychological research in advertising and marketing to children," which would include promoting strategies to shield children from "commercial manipulation and exploitation" by psychologists.

"Regrettably, a large gap has arisen between A.P.A.'s mission and the drift of the profession into helping corporations influence children for the purpose of selling products to them," the letter stated.

A spokeswoman for the association said the matter had been referred to its internal board on children, youth and family issues, and that the board was scheduled to meet in March.

"Certainly there's no mention of the issue in our code of conduct," said the spokeswoman, Rhea K. Farberman, adding that the points raised in the letter had not been brought before the association before.

Dr. Kanner said he wrote the letter after becoming concerned, through his own conversations with children and teen-age patients, that they were, as a group, blatantly materialistic. "I'll ask kids what they want to do when they grow up, and lots of times they'll tell me, 'Make money,' " he said.

As for psychologists' role in that, he said research conducted at the university level was frequently deployed in developing commercials and other pitches to children. Since the stated mission of the American Psychological Association is "to improve the condition of both the individual and society," he concluded that permitting research to be used in advertising to children presented a conflict.

"They are taking this very sophisticated understanding of children's relationships and what they respond to, and then really tailoring it to the advertisement and refining it," he said. "There's no indication that it's helping kids with their relationships at all, but rather that it's manipulating them."

Timothy J. Kasser, an associate professor of psychology at Knox College in Galesburg, Ill., who signed the letter, said he did so because he

saw "a great deal of collusion between some members of psychology and marketing, advertising and entrepreneurial firms that are working together to try to understand how best to sell things to kids."

Dr. Kasser said his research with a colleague, Richard Ryan of the University of Rochester, had concluded that people who value goals like money, fame and beauty are not only more depressed than others, but also report more behavioral problems and physical discomfort, as well as scoring lower on measures of vitality and self-actualization.

For children, the consequences can be similarly damaging, Dr. Kasser said. "When advertisers are using psychological principles to sell products to children, they are not only selling that product, but they are also selling a larger value system that says making money and using your money for the purchase of material things will make you happy," he said. "That's what is really behind almost every commercial message, that this product will make you feel happy, or loved, or safe and secure. My feeling is that it is manipulation to use children's needs to get them to buy these products."

Not every psychologist feels the same way. "The

whole point is, if you're going to market to kids, do it responsibly and there are a whole lot of opportunities to make a positive difference," said Dan S. Acuff, who holds a doctorate in psychology and runs a company called Youth Market Systems Consulting in Sherman Oaks, Calif.

Dr. Acuff, who called the goals stated in the letter "anti-free enterprise," published a book titled "What Kids Buy and Why" in 1997 that offers insights into how to create a successful children's product. Included are discussions of neocortical development, in which children start to rely more on intellect, logic and reasoning and less on fantasy for their decision making. That, Dr. Acuff notes, in italics, "has critical implications for product and program development as well as marketing and advertising to kids in the 8-through-12 age range."

But there is a line psychologists should draw, he added this week. "We turn down opportunities that would be damaging to kids," he said, "like toys with serious weapons in them -- guns, bombs, rifles and things like that." Fantasy weapons, like those carried by He-Man and Star Wars figures, were acceptable to him, he added, but those based on "modern technological weapons" were not.

Ms. Farberman, the association's spokeswoman, said psychological techniques were also being used for "socially redeeming issues," like advertising campaigns to urge people not to drink and drive. "It's important not to lose sight of that," she said.

Julie A. Halpin, the chief executive of Geppetto Group, which specializes in children's advertising, said psychologists were important in helping her company understand children and their capabilities. "For example, we learned that 6- and 7-year-olds don't understand double-entendres," she said. "They are simply trying to learn one meaning of a word at that age. So advertising copy that uses double-entendres as a clever device would not be appropriate, or effective. It's things like that that help us do the best job we can do."

Still, Dr. Kasser raised a question: "Maybe we're helping the economy, but is that our mission as a discipline?"

_____

____

_____

____

****

>From mcdonald.221@osu.edu Fri Oct 22 10:26:56 1999

Received: from mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu

[128.146.214.30])

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

    id KAA05336 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 10:26:55 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ns1 ([128.146.105.241])

    by mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id NAA16726

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 13:26:54 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19991022132547.008b4c40@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: mcdonald.221@pop.service.ohio-state.edu

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

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 13:25:47 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Dan McDonald <mcdonald.221@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: Millennium Surveys

In-Reply-To: <380F6326.358F7F3D@rci.rutgers.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Well, I would check the Domesday Book. Even though it was a retrospective

study, the methodology was quite sophisticated for its time, and it was less

than 100 years after the millenium change.

At 03:01 PM 10/21/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Hi,

>I'm looking for some help on a survey we want to do on "the

>Millennium." I started at the normal place--looking to see what was

>done the last time. But the two Graduate Assistants working on the

>project are adamant that there is nothing good to look at from the last

>Millennium and we should start from scratch.

>

>We want to ask our sample of New Jerseyans to look ahead over the next

>10 years or so and tell us what they expect across a variety of life

>realms: work, family & friends, society as a whole, science,

>technology & communication, health & other quality of life concerns.

>I'd appreciate hearing from anybody who has conducted similar surveys

>in the recent past.

>

>Please respond directly to me rather than to the listserv. Thanks.

>Cliff Zukin

>

>--

>Cliff Zukin   Rutgers University   e-mail: zukin@rci.rutgers.edu

>

>Chair & Graduate Director * Department of Public Policy Edward J.

>Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

>33 Livingston Ave., Suite 202 *   New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1980

>732/932-2499 x 712 (Of) * 732/932-1107 (Fx)

>

>Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton Poll * Eagleton Inst. of Politics 185

>Ryders Lane * New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557 732/932-9384 x 247 (Of) *

>732/932-1551 (Fx)

>

>

>

>

Dan McDonald

Professor

3080 Derby Hall

154 North Oval Mall

School of Journalism and Communication

The Ohio State University

Columbus, OH 43210-1339

(614) 292-5811

mcdonald.221@osu.edu

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Oct 22 11:09:26 1999

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

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

    id LAA09760 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:09:25 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

    id LAA26457 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:09:24 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:09:24 -0700 (PDT)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Field Poll on Presidential Race

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9910221031190.8116-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

_____

_____

The San Francisco Chronicle

OCTOBER 20, 1999, WEDNESDAY, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A3

Either Gore or Bradley Would Tie Bush in State;

Presidential Field Poll shows gains by ex-Jersey senator

Carla Marinucci, Chronicle Political Writer

Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush remain locked in a statistical dead heat in the 2000 presidential race among California voters, but an increasing number of them now believe Democratic challenger Bill Bradley would be a stronger candidate against the GOP front-runner, a new Field Poll shows.

Bush has kept an iron grip on GOP support in the nation's most populous state, where he is the preferred candidate of 45 percent of likely Republican voters -- more than the combined totals of his six other challengers, the poll shows. Gore maintains a strong lead among likely Democratic voters, 45-17 over Bradley, with 5 percent now supporting actor Warren Beatty and a full third still undecided.

BRADLEY GAINING

If the presidential election were held tomorrow, Bush and Gore would be locked in a statistical tie, 47 to 46 percent, with 7 percent undecided, the poll showed. But significantly, for the first time, a Bradley-Bush matchup also puts the former U.S. senator from New Jersey in a statistical 46-to-45 tie with the Texas governor, with 9 percent undecided.

"If there's been a constant through the year, it's that Bush and Gore have been battling it out with no change going on. What Bush has to worry about now is that his lead against Bradley is evaporating -- from 19 points to an even trial heat" since March, said Field Poll director Mark DiCamillo.

With five months to go before the 2000 primary, the strength of both Gore and Bradley against Bush are crucial indicators of Democratic fortunes in California, a key battleground in the 2000 presidential race. Gore has

visited the state 59 times since becoming vice president, and Bush and

Bradley have tried hard to increase their visibility here in recent months

-- apparently with success.

MOMENTUM FOR ALTERNATIVE

Bradley's improved general election standings come because among

Californians "he's increasingly perceived as a potentially stronger

candidate against Bush," said DiCamillo. "Gore seems to be 15 to 20 points

behind the leading Republican (in many national polls), and that's sending

some shock waves among Democrats, and creates a momentum looking for an

alternative. Up to this point, there wasn't one."

Bradley also "has a very positive image among Democrats, Republican voters

and nonpartisans," said DiCamillo. "A third of the electorate have no

opinion of Bradley -- and even with that, he equals Bush's strength in the

general election. That says there's a lot of room for even further growth in

the Bradley vote."

GOOD NEWS FOR GORE

The latest Field Poll did have some good news for Gore: He retains

overwhelming support of the state's Democratic base for the March primary,

the contest with the clout to deliver him the Democratic presidential

nomination.

"He's 28 points ahead in the California Democratic primary. He maintains a

solid lead. He's well-liked by state Democrats," DiCamillo said. "The

(Gore) problem is with the broader electorate, not California Democratic

primary voters. From the Gore perspective, it's, Let's take one task at a time.' "

Other findings of the Field Poll:

-- In a Republican primary, Bush leads his competition with 45 percent of the support among likely GOP voters. That compares to Elizabeth Dole (10 percent), John McCain (8 percent), Steve Forbes (6 percent), Gary Bauer (3 percent), Alan Keyes (3 percent) and Orrin Hatch (1 percent). Bush's rivals appear to have stagnant support, and Forbes actually has lost 2 percentage points since the last poll, in August.

-- On the Democratic side, Gore still retains a nearly 3-to-1 lead over Bradley, 45-17. But it has slipped since August, when it was 51 to 18. Actor Warren Beatty has managed to increase his support to 5 percent since he made his Hollywood speech on Democratic values last month. But he's viewed more negatively than positively -- 41 to 33 percent among Democratic voters, and by a 2-to-1 ratio among likely California voters as a whole.

-- The "wild bunch" of Reform Party candidates appear to have one thing in common: They're viewed more negatively than positively among California voters. Minnesota Gov. Jesse Ventura leads Reform hopefuls in a presidential race with a favorability rating of 34 percent, compared to Ross Perot (24), Pat Buchanan (19) and Donald Trump (18).

-- In three-way races, Buchanan appears to take votes away from Bush, while the others hurt Gore. With close margins, the Texas governor wins Bush-Gore-Ventura (43-40-11); Bush-Gore-Perot (45-44-6) and Bush-Gore-Trump (45-44-6), but comes out a loser in Bush-Gore-Buchanan (43-46-6).

CHRONICLE GRAPHIC

FIELD POLL

Among likely California voters

-- Open primary preferences where

Democratic and Republican candidates are listed on one ballot

Candidate	March**	August	October
Al Gore	26 %	29 %	26 %
George W. Bush	24	24	24
Bill Bradley	6	11	12
Elizabeth Dole	15	7	8
John McCain	3	5	7
Steve Forbes	3	4	5
Warren Beatty	n/a	2	3
Gary Bauer	1	1	2
Orrin Hatch	n/a	1	1
Alan Keyes	1	*	1
Other/undecided	24	16	11

-- Image ratings of Democratic presidential candidates

Favorable Unfavorable No Opinion

Al Gore   49 %   43   8

Bill Bradley   54 %   14   32

Warren Beatty   24 %   52   24

-- Simulated general election presidential preferences

Al Gore   46 %

George W. Bush   47

Undecided   7

Bill Bradley   45 %

George W. Bush   46

Undecided   9

The poll was conducted October 8-17 by the Field Institute.

The results are based on a telephone survey of 1,010 California adults,

including 514 registered voters deemed likely to vote in next year's primary

election. Ninety five percent of the results from the likely voter sample

have a sampling error of + or - 4.5 percentage points, findings for likely

Democratic voters have a sampling error of + or - 6.5 points, while findings

for likely GOP voters have a sampling error of + or - 7.2 points.

** March findings based on all registered voters

****

Please respond to Vicky Ko at VKo@Mail1.VNSNY.org.

My colleagues and I at the Visiting Nurse Service of NY are interested in

finding survey results that show older Americans' (50 years and older) views

and general attitudes towards aging, retirement, "aging in place" and what

they view as an "elder friendly" community. I would appreciate any

references to specific surveys that have been done or organizations (other

than AARP) that are likely to have asked these types of questions of this

segment of the population.

Thank you!

Felicia Mebane, Ph.D.

Senior Research Fellow

Department of Health Policy and Administration

Harvard School of Public Health

Kresge 3, Room 419

677 Huntington Avenue

Boston, MA 02115

(617) 432-4501

>From DRouner@vines.colostate.edu Fri Oct 22 11:25:44 1999

Received: from rifle.ACNS.ColoState.EDU (rifle.ACNS.ColoState.EDU

[129.82.100.100])

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

　　id LAA21502 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:25:43 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from vines.colostate.edu (vines.ColoState.EDU [129.82.100.99]) by

rifle.ACNS.ColoState.EDU (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id MAA22519 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 12:27:05 -0600

Received: by vines.colostate.edu with VINES-ISMTP; Fri, 22 Oct 99 12:25:50

-0600

D. You rock. D.

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

Well, I would check the Domesday Book. Even though it was a retrospective
study, the methodology was quite sophisticated for its time, and it was less
than 100 years after the millenium change.

At 03:01 PM 10/21/99 -0400, you wrote:
>Hi,
>I'm looking for some help on a survey we want to do on "the
>Millennium." I started at the normal place--looking to see what was
>done the last time. But the two Graduate Assistants working on the
>project are adamant that there is nothing good to look at from the last
>Millennium and we should start from scratch.

>

>We want to ask our sample of New Jerseyans to look ahead over the next

>10 years or so and tell us what they expect across a variety of life

>realms: work, family & friends, society as a whole, science,

>technology & communication, health & other quality of life concerns.

>I'd appreciate hearing from anybody who has conducted similar surveys

>in the recent past.

>

>Please respond directly to me rather than to the listserv. Thanks.

>Cliff Zukin

>

>--

>Cliff Zukin   Rutgers University   e-mail: zukin@rci.rutgers.edu

>

>Chair & Graduate Director * Department of Public Policy Edward J.

>Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

>33 Livingston Ave., Suite 202 *   New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1980

>732/932-2499 x 712 (Of) * 732/932-1107 (Fx)

>

>Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton Poll * Eagleton Inst. of Politics 185

>Ryders Lane * New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557 732/932-9384 x 247 (Of) *

>732/932-1551 (Fx)

>

>

>

>

Dan McDonald

Professor

3080 Derby Hall

154 North Oval Mall

School of Journalism and Communication

The Ohio State University

Columbus, OH 43210-1339

(614) 292-5811

mcdonald.221@osu.edu

- - - - - - - - - - - - End of Original Message - - - - - - - - - - - -

>From RoniRosner@aol.com Fri Oct 22 13:14:35 1999

Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.4])

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

   id NAA18828 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 13:14:34 -0700

(PDT)

From: RoniRosner@aol.com

Received: from RoniRosner@aol.com

   by imo14.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v23.6.) id 5IRSa02563 (3957)

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 16:13:38 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <0.47f0f9ae.25421f71@aol.com>

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 16:13:37 EDT

Subject: DICK MORRIS,INSIDERS GUIDE TO CAMPAIGN 2000,NYAAPOR MTG

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 215

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id NAA18829

NEW YORK AAPOR & the MEDIA STUDIES CENTER

present an Evening Meeting

Date .... Monday, 1 November 1999

Reception .... 5:30 p.m.

Presentation ..... 6:00 -- 7:30 p.m.

Place .... Newseum/NY (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, $15*

(* free if joining at the meeting)

INSIDERS GUIDE TO CAMPAIGN 2000

Dick Morris, political consultant and author of The New Prince

Few people are better positioned to offer insights into what will be going
on behind the scenes as the 2000 political campaign unfolds than political
strategist Dick Morris, whom Time magazine recently called the most
influential private citizen in America.

Based on more than two decades of research into the political attitudes of
American voters, Mr. Morris will address such issues as:

* What are voters looking for in their candidates in 2000?

* What will be the major items on the political agenda during Campaign

2000?

* What strategies can we expect the candidates to use?

* How and when do candidates use polls to develop strategy and tactics?

* To what extent are politicians able to manipulate news coverage?

* Is relentless polling driving idealism and vision out of politics?

Mr. Morris has worked as a political advisor to politicians of both parties.

He was political advisor to Bill Clinton when Clinton was governor of

Arkansas in 1978 and continued as an advisor to President Clinton through

his re-election in 1996. Mr. Morris is the author of the recently published

book, The New Prince, a bold how-to guide for today's politicians and

political candidates, written in the spirit of Niccolo Machiavelli's

classic,

The

Prince. He is also a regular commentator on Fox News.

BUILDING SECURITY CANNOT ADMIT ANYONE WHOSE NAME IS NOT

ON OUR LIST!! If you are planning to attend, respond by Wed., 27 Oct.

    E-mail RoniRosner@aol.com Or, if you must, call 722-5333

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Fri Oct 22 14:19:09 1999

Received: from imo24.mx.aol.com (imo24.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.68])

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

    id OAA11367 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 22 Oct 1999 14:19:08 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

Jim:

There's so much that could be (and has been) said about this, but reading

what you circulated left me with nothing so much as a strong sense of d j

vu. In March of 1979, I was one of two CBS witnesses who appeared in the

course of formal FTC hearings into a great many facets of advertising

directed to children. At that time, so much of this same ground was covered

and covered and covered yet again to the point of absolute revulsion on the

parts of all sides to the controversy.

It was more than a little incongruous to hear quoted from the lips of

lawyers, advertising people, broadcast-types like me (who was also a

psychologist by training, which in helped in this particular venue),

dentists, candy and cereal manufacturers -- that gang -- the thinking of

Jean

Piaget on the cognitive limitations of children's information-processing

capacities. And, yes, the charge of instilling great gobs of materialism

into television-viewing kids was on the table as well. Really, there wasn't

any issue that wasn't on the table -- except for the question of how

non-broadcast children's media (comic books, Jack and Jill, Highlights for

Children, etc.) would handle this windfall that seemed about to drop in

their

collective laps.

The charge of psychological manipulation was very much present and talked

about in terms reminiscent of Vance Packard. The focus then was mainly on

production techniques used to make children's products look more appealing

than they really were.   In the case of toys, for example, those practices

--

together with the absence of batteries (about which the viewer was advised

but in language said to be so obscure as to be meaningless) once the toy was

actually acquired -- were held to lead inexorably to two unfortunate

outcomes. One, the obvious disappointment on the part of the child; the

other, flowing directly from that disappointment, carried more dire

implications. Namely, the development of cynicism, first about the rewards

to be expected from products advertised on television (which may not have

been such an awful thing); but second a cynicism ("skepticism" was the term

favored by the ads' defenders) that extended to advertising but also to much

else in the child's lifespace, including parents, teachers, religious

leaders, and so forth.

So this has had a pretty thorough airing. Unless we're aware of new

techniques and procedures of mind-manipulation to bend the child to the will

of those with products and services to sell to him or her, then there are

one

or two other child-related problems which the petitioning psychologists and

other well-intentioned groups might be better advised to seek remedy.

Best --

Phil Harding

paharding7@aol.com

This article appeared in today's NY Times Advertising section. Although the

focus is on marketing to children, it could conceivably have other

implications for research among kids in general.

Dick Halpern

October 22, 1999

ADVERTISING

Selling to Children, or Manipulating Them?

Related Article

Advertising: Addenda (Oct. 22, 1999)

By CONSTANCE L. HAYS

DEPLORING what they see as an unfair and conflict-ridden

manipulation of the young, a group of psychologists and

other

professionals has called on the American Psychological

Association

to restrict the use of psychological research by advertisers

pitching toys,

video games, snack food and other products to children.

The letter, written by Gary Ruskin, who heads Commercial Alert, a

Washington-based advocacy group, and Allen D. Kanner, a clinical

psychologist at the Wright Institute in Berkeley, Calif., was

sent to the

association's president late last month. It urges the

association to issue a

formal denunciation of the use of psychological techniques in

marketing

and advertising to children, and asks for amendments to the

association's

code of ethics that would address the issue.

The letter, which was signed by 60 psychologists and other

professionals

with affiliations ranging from Sonoma State University to

Harvard Medical

School, also calls for "an ongoing campaign to probe, review and

confront

the use of psychological research in advertising and marketing

to children,"

which would include promoting strategies to shield children from

"commercial manipulation and exploitation" by psychologists.

"Regrettably, a large gap has arisen between A.P.A.'s mission

and the drift

of the profession into helping corporations influence children

for the

purpose of selling products to them," the letter stated.

A spokeswoman for the association said the matter had been referred to
its internal board on children, youth and family issues, and that the board
was scheduled to meet in March.

"Certainly there's no mention of the issue in our code of conduct," said the
spokeswoman, Rhea K. Farberman, adding that the points raised in the
letter had not been brought before the association before.

Dr. Kanner said he wrote the letter after becoming concerned, through his
own conversations with children and teen-age patients, that they were, as a
group, blatantly materialistic. "I'll ask kids what they want to do when they
grow up, and lots of times they'll tell me, 'Make money,' " he said.

As for psychologists' role in that, he said research conducted at the
university level was frequently deployed in developing commercials and
other pitches to children. Since the stated mission of the American

Psychological Association is "to improve the condition of both the individual

and society," he concluded that permitting research to be used in

advertising to children presented a conflict.

"They are taking this very sophisticated understanding of children's

relationships and what they respond to, and then really tailoring it to the

advertisement and refining it," he said. "There's no indication that it's

helping kids with their relationships at all, but rather that it's manipulating

them."

Timothy J. Kasser, an associate professor of psychology at Knox College

in Galesburg, Ill., who signed the letter, said he did so because he saw "a

great deal of collusion between some members of psychology and

marketing, advertising and entrepreneurial firms that are working together

to try to understand how best to sell things to kids."

Dr. Kasser said his research with a colleague, Richard Ryan of the

University of Rochester, had concluded that people who value goals like

money, fame and beauty are not only more depressed than others,

but also

report more behavioral problems and physical discomfort, as well as

scoring lower on measures of vitality and self-actualization.

For children, the consequences can be similarly damaging, Dr. Kasser said.

"When advertisers are using psychological principles to sell products to

children, they are not only selling that product, but they are also selling a

larger value system that says making money and using your money for the

purchase of material things will make you happy," he said. "That's what is

really behind almost every commercial message, that this product will

make you feel happy, or loved, or safe and secure. My feeling is that it is

manipulation to use children's needs to get them to buy these products."

Not every psychologist feels the same way. "The whole point is, if you're

going to market to kids, do it responsibly and there are a whole lot of

opportunities to make a positive difference," said Dan S. Acuff, who holds

a doctorate in psychology and runs a company called Youth Market

Systems Consulting in Sherman Oaks, Calif.

Dr. Acuff, who called the goals stated in the letter "anti-free
enterprise,"
published a book titled "What Kids Buy and Why" in 1997 that
offers
insights into how to create a successful children's product.
Included are
discussions of neocortical development, in which children start
to rely more
on intellect, logic and reasoning and less on fantasy for their
decision
making. That, Dr. Acuff notes, in italics, "has critical
implications for
product and program development as well as marketing and
advertising to
kids in the 8-through-12 age range."

But there is a line psychologists should draw, he added this
week. "We turn
down opportunities that would be damaging to kids," he said,
"like toys with
serious weapons in them -- guns, bombs, rifles and things like
that."
Fantasy weapons, like those carried by He-Man and Star Wars
figures,
were acceptable to him, he added, but those based on "modern
technological weapons" were not.

Ms. Farberman, the association's spokeswoman, said psychological

techniques were also being used for "socially redeeming issues,"
like

advertising campaigns to urge people not to drink and drive.
"It's important

not to lose sight of that," she said.

Julie A. Halpin, the chief executive of Geppetto Group, which
specializes in

children's advertising, said psychologists were important in
helping her

company understand children and their capabilities. "For example,
we

learned that 6- and 7-year-olds don't understand
double-entendres," she

said. "They are simply trying to learn one meaning of a word at
that age.

So advertising copy that uses double-entendres as a clever
device would

not be appropriate, or effective. It's things like that that
help us do the best

job we can do."

Still, Dr. Kasser raised a question: "Maybe we're helping the
economy, but

is that our mission as a discipline?"

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology

3837 Courtyard Drive

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

rshalpern@mindspring.com

phone/fax 770 434 4121

References: <3.0.1.32.19991022113853.0105097c@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu>

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="------------9A405175195597778F0984F8"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--------------9A405175195597778F0984F8

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Aaporites-

In addition to Erik's reply below, I have also attached a summary of polls

by an advocacy group showing that many polls have yielded many/more people

favoring life in prison without parole over the death penalty when given

that choice in a question.

Thanks Erik

Erik Stewart wrote:

> We've engaged in this work in Ohio and have found similar patterns.

> In a telephone survey we conducted in 1997 we found that 75% of

> Ohioans favor the death penalty for convicted murderers (Q item = Do

> you favor or oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder)

> while 17% were opposed and 8% expressed ambivalence. When asked "If

> convicted 1st degree murderers in Ohio could be sentenced to life in

> prison without parole, and also be required to work in prison

> industries for money that would go to the families of their victims,

> would you prefer this as an alternative to the death penalty?" 59% of

> respondents supported the use of this alternative, while 31% did not

> support it and 9% reported being unsure. We also posed the question

> "How likely do you believe it is for an innocent person to be wrongly

> convicted and executed?" rotating this item with the previously

> mentioned item and as might be expected, found a slight order effect

> such that when the wrongly executed item appeared prior to the

> alternative to the death penalty item, there were higher levels of

> support shown for the alternative option. I'm afraid that we haven't

> taken our work to the level of obtaining information as to why people

> specifically support/oppose use of the death penalty.

>

> At 09:53 AM 10/22/99 +0000, you wrote:

> >In Gallup and Harris polls this year, 71% were in favor of the death

> >penalty and about 22% were opposed.

> >(Source:http://www.pollingreport.com/crime.htm) Lopsided support has

> >been evident in polls they conducted over recent years. (Favor/oppose

> >the death penalty is the most common form for this question.)

> >

> >But when Gallup asks another question, asking people to choose

> >between the death penalty and life in prison with no chance of parole

> >as the penalty for murder, only 56% chose the death penalty and 38%

> >chose life in prison with no chance of parole. This was the outcome

> >in 1999.

> >

> >Lower support for the death penalty has been the trend over recent

> >years when asked as a preference between two possible sentences by

> >Gallup. (This alternate question has been asked in a split-sample

> >design or in separate polls not including the favor/oppose death

> >penalty question.)

> >

> >Has any Aaporite out there experimented with these alternate

> >wordings? I suspect that when the question is simply yes/no to the

> >death penalty, more people are in favor because they believe the

> >alternative is that the offender will be paroled in a few years.

> >

> >Has anyone followed up a yes/no death penalty question with a

> >question asking why they are in favor? I would appreciate any

> >experience anyone may have asking these alternate questions or any

> >theories on why there is a difference in support between the two

> >question forms.

> >

> >Nick Panagakis

> >

> >

> >

> >

> Erik R. Stewart, Ph.D.

> Assistant Director for Operations

> OSU Center for Survey Research

> 3045 Derby Hall

> 154 N. Oval Mall

> Columbus, Ohio 43210-1330

>

> 614-292-6672

--------------9A405175195597778F0984F8

Content-Type: application/rtf; x-mac-type="5736424E";

x-mac-creator="4D535744"; name="Death Penalty Info Poll Summary"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Content-Description: Unknown Document

Content-Disposition: inline;

 filename="Death Penalty Info Poll Summary"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOwADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAAAQAAAAA
AAAAEAAAAgAAAAEAAAD+////AAAAAAAAD///////////////////////////////////
///
///
///
///
///
///
///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AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAACAAUA//////8DAAAAAkCAAAAADAAAAAAAARgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAIA+
kVBtHb8BAwAAAEACAAAAAAAAQBDAG8AbQBwAE8AYgBqAqAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABIAAgH//////////8AAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAXAAAAAAAAABXAG8AcgBkAEQAbwBjAHUA
bQBlAG4AdAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGgACAf//
//8EAAAA/////wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAAI2AAA
AAAAAE8AYgBqAGUAYwB0AFAAbwBvAGwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAWAAEBAQAAAAIAAAD/////AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACAPpFQ
bR2/AYA+kVBtHb8BAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAP7///8DAAAABAAAAUAAAAGAAAABwAAAgA
AAD+//
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///8BAP7/
AgABAP////8ACQIAAAAAAMAAAAAAABGHAAAAE1pY3Jvc29mdCBXb3JkIDYuMCBEb2N1bWVu
dAD+////TkI2VxAAAABXb3JkLkRvY3VtZW50LjYAAAAAAA7AAP//gAJAAYAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAQAAAAEAAAAAAAQAP7/AAADCgEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAADyn4XgT/kQaKuR
CAArJ7PZMAAAAHQBAAANAAAABwAAAJgAAAAIAAAA4AAAAAEAAAD3AAAADAAAAP0AAAALAAAA
CQEAAA0AAAAVAQAADwAAACEBAAAQAAAAKQEAAAoAAAAxAQAAEgAAAD0BAAAOAAAAWgEAAAkA
AABiAQAAEwAAAGwBAAD/////////////////////////////////////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2tYAAAAAAADa1gAAAAAAANrWAAAAAAAA2tYAAAAAAAn1wAAAgAAACnXAAAAAAAAKdcAAAAA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bnRp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Y2FucyBFbWJyYWNlIEFsdGVybmF0aXZlcyB0byB0aGUgRGVhdGggNGVuYWx0eSAtIFB1Ymxp

YyBzdXBwb3J0IGZvciB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBkcm9wcyB0byBiZWxvdyA1MCBwZXJj

ZW50DXdoZW4gdm90ZXJzIGFyZSBvZmZlcmVkIGFsdGVybmF0aXZlIHNlbnRlbmNlcy4gTW9y

ZSBwZW9wbGUgd291bGQgc3VwcG9ydA1saWZlIHdpdGhvdXQgcGFyb2xlIHBsdXMgcmVzdGl0

dWlvbiB0byB0aGUgdmljdGltJ3MgZmFtaWx5IHRoYW4gd291bGQgY2hvb3NlDXRoZSBkZWF0

aCBwZW5hbHR5Lg1lbW1hZ2VkIE9uIHRoZSBGcm9udCBMaW5lOiBMYXcgRW5mb3JjZW1lbnQg

Vmlld3Mgb24gdGhlIERlYXRoIFBlbmFsdHkgLSBBBDTE5OTUgSGFyd CBSZWNlYXJjaCBQb2xs

IG9mIHBvbGljZSBjaGllZnMgaW4gdGhlIFUuUy4gZm91bmQgdGhhdCB0aGUgbWFqb3JpdHkN

b2YgdGhlIGNoaWVmcyBkbyBub3QgYmVsaWV2ZSB0aGF0IHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGlz

IGFuIGVmZmVjdGl2ZSBsYXcNZW5mb3JjZW1lbnQgdG9vbC4NICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAg

ICAgICAgIFJlY2VudCBQb2xsIEZpbmRpbmdzDVtbWFnZV0gQW5udWFsIFN1cnZleSBS

ZXN1bHRzIE9uCgAWdhaW4gU2hvd2BWaXJnaW5pYXMgIEzhdm9yIG9mDUFsdGVybmF0

aXZlcyB0byB0aGUgRGVhdGgg UGVuYWx0eQ0gICAqIFN1cnZleSByZXN1bHRzIGZyb20gdGhl

IFF1YWxpdHkgb2YgTGlmZSBpbiBWaXJnaW5pYSBQb2xsIHNob3cgdGhhdCAgIHN1cHBv

cnQgZm9yIFZpcmdpbmlhJ3MgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBoYXMgZHJvcHBlZC4gV2hpbiBzdXJ2

ZXllcnMgYXNrZWQNICAgICA1MTQgcmVzcG9uZGVudHMgaWYgdGhleSBzdXBwb3J0ZWQgdGhl

IGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHksIDc0JSBhZ3JlZWQuIFRoaXMNICAgICBpcyB0aGUgbG93ZXN0IHBl

cmNlbnRhZ2UgdG8gcmVzcG9uZCBpbiBmYXZvciBvZiB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBpbiA3

DSAgICAgeWVhcnMuDSAgICogRm9yIHRoZSA3dGggY29uc2VjdXRpdmUgeWVhciwgcmVzdWx0

cyBhbHNvIHNob3cgdGhhdCBwaXJnaW5pYW5zIHByZWZlciAgICAgIGFsdGVybmF0aXZlcyB0

byB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eS4gV2hlbiBhc2tlZCBhYm91dCB0aGUgYWx0ZXJuYXRpdmUg

b2YNICAgIGxpZWUgd2l0aG91dCBwYXJvbGUgYW5kIG1pbnQ=

IHZpY3RpbXMnIGZhbWlsaWVzIGluc3RlYWQgb2YgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkNKDMzJSku

IFRoZSBwb2xsIHdhcyBjb25kdWN0ZWQgYnkgRVBJQy9NUkUuIFBvbGxxdGVyIEVkIFNhcnBv

bHVzIHNhaWQ6ICJJdCdzDXRoZSBsb3dlc3Qgc3VwcG9ydCBmb3IgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFs

dHkgSSd2ZSBzZWVuLiIgTWljaGlnYW4ncyBIb3VzZSBvZg1SZXByZXNlbnRhdGl2ZXMgb3Zl

cndoZWxtaW5nbHkgZGVmZWF0ZWQgYSByZXNvbHV0aW9uIHJlZ2VudGx5IHRvIHJlc3RvcmUg

dGhlDWRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkuIChUaGUgRmxpbnQgSm91cm5hbCw1LzEvOTkpDQ1bSW1hZ2Vd

IEFjY29yZGluZyB0byBhIHBvbGwgYnkgdGhlIENoaWNhZ28gVHJpYnVuZSwgc3VwcG9ydCBm

b3IgdGhlIGRlYXRoDXBlbmFsdHkgaW4gSWxsaW5vaXMgaGFzIGRyb3BwZWQgMTMgcGVyY2Vu

dGFnZSBwb2ludHMgaW4gdGhlIGxhc3QgZml2ZSB5ZWFycywNYW5kIGEgbWFqb3JpdHkgb2Yg

dm90ZXJzICg1NCUpIGZhdm9ycyBhIG1vcmF0b3JpdW0gb24gYWxsIGV4ZWN1dGlvbnMgaW4g

dGhlDXN0YXRlLiBGZXdlciB0aGFuGhhbGYgb2YgdGhlIHJlc3BvbmRlbnRzLS00OSUtLXNh

aWQgdGhleSBiZWxpZXZlIHRoZSBkZWF0aA1wZW5hbHR5IGRldGVycyBjcmltZS4gKENoaWNh

Z28gVHJpYnVuZSwgMy8yOC85OSkNW0ltYWdlXSBBIHJlY2VudCBwb2xsIGluIFRleGFzIHNo

b3dlZCB0aGF0IG9ubHkgYSBiYXJlIG1ham9yaXR5ICg1MyUpIHN1cHBvcnQgdGhlIGRlYXRo

IHBlbmFsdHkgaWYgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHJvdyBpbm1hdGUgaGFzICJjaG93biBzaWducyBvZg10

dXJuaW5nIGhpcyBvciBoZXIgbGlmZSBhcm91bmQuIiAoVGhlIFRleGFzIFBvbGwsIEY0LiBX

b3J0aCBTdGFyIFRlbGVncmFtLA0xLzE0Lzk5KSAoUGhvdG86IFNyLiBIZWxlbiBQcmVqZWFu

IChsLikgYW5kIEthcmxhIEZheWUgVHVja2VyLCBleGVjdXRlZCBpbmg1UZXhhcywgMTk5OCkN

DVtJbWFnZV0gQWx0aG91Z2ggcHJldmlvdXMgb3BpbmlvbiBwb2xscyBoYXZlIGluZGljYXRl

ZCBvdmVyIDcwJSBzdXBwb3J0IGZvci10aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBpbiBEYW5hZGEsIHRo

YXQgc3VwcG9ydCBoYXMgZHJhbWF0aWNhbGx5IGRyb3BwZWQuIEEgcmVjZW50DXBvbGwgc2hv

d2VkIGFuIGV2ZW4gc3BsaXQgb24gdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgZ2VuZWFyaHkuIEB3aXRo

IDQ4JQ1zdXBwb3J0aW5nIGl0IGFuZCA0NyUgb3Bwb3NpbmcgaXQuIFdoZW4gYXNrZWQgd2hp

Y2ggc2VudGVuY2UgdGhleSB3b3VsZA1mYXZvciBmb3IgdGhlIG1vc3Qgc2VyaW91cyBjcmlt

ZXMsIDUzJSBzdXBwb3J0ZWQgYSBsaWZlIHNlbnRlbmNlIGFzIG9ubx5DTQyJSBzdXBwb3J0

ZWQgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkuIChNb250cmVhbCBHYXppdHRlLCAxMi8zMS85OSkNDVtJ

bWFnZV0gQSBuZXcgc3VydmV5IHNob3dzIHRoYXQgcmVjaWluYWucyBjb250aW51ZS0byBz

dXBwb3J0IGxpZmUgd2l0aG91dA1wYXJvbGUgb3ZlciB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eS4gV2hl

biBnaXZlbiB0aGUgb3B0aW9uIG9mIGxpZmUgd2l0dCB0aGUNCG9zc2liaWxpdHkgb2Yg

cGFyb2xlIGZvciBhIG1pbmltdW0gb2YgMjUgeWVhcnMgYXMgd2VsbCBhcyByZXN0aXR1dGlv

biB0bw10aGUgdmljdGltJ3MgZmFtaWx5LCBzdXBwb3J0IHdhcyBhdCA1NC44JS4gKFF1YWxp

dHkgb2YgTGlmZSBpbiBBaXJnaW5pYQ1Qb2xsLCBBdWd1c3QgMTMsIDE5OTkpIChTZWUgVmly

Z2luaWFucyBmb3IgQWx0ZXJuYXRpdmVzIHRvIHRoZSBEZWF0aDFQZW5hbHR5KQ0NW0ltYWdl

XSBJbiBhIHJlY2VudCBwb2xsIHRha2VuIGFmdGVyIE4uWS4ncyBmaXJzdCBkZWF0aCBzZW50

ZW5jZSBzaW5jZSB0aGUgcGFzc2FnZSBvZiBpdHMgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBsYXcgaW4gMTk5

NSwgbW9zdCBOZXcgWW9ya2VycyBmYXZvcmVkIGxpZmUgc2VudGVuY2VzIGZvciAxc3QgZWdn

cmVlIG11cmRlciByYXRoZXIgdGhhbiB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eTogZ2llIGNob3NlIHRo

ZQ1kZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5LCA0NCUgb3B0ZWQgZm9yIGxpZmUgd2l0aG91dCBwYXJvbGUsIGFu

ZCA5JSBwcmVmZXJyZWQgbGlmZSB3aXRoDWEgY2hhbmNlIG9mIHBhcm9sZSBhcnQgdGhlIGFw

cm9wcmlhdGUgc2VudGVuY2UuIChRdWVubmlwaWFjIENvbGxlZ2UgUG9sbCxNXNzb2MuIFBy

ZXNzLCA2LzE3Lzk4KQ0NW0ltYWdlXSBBIG5ldyBTY3JpcHBzIEhvd2FyZCBOZXdzIFBvbGwg

aW4gVGV4YXMgcmVwb3J0cyB0aGF0IHN1cHBvcnQgZm9yIHRoZQ1kZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGlu

IHRoYXQgc3RhdGUgaGFzIGRyb3BwZWQgdG8gaXRzIGxvd2VzdCBpbiB0aHJlZSBkZWNhZGVz

Lg1TdXBwb3J0IGZvciB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBkcm9wcGVkIHRvIDY4JSwgMTggcGVy

Y2VudGFnZSBwb2ludHMgbG93ZXINdGhhbiBpbiAxOTk0LCB3aGVuIGl0IHdhcyA4NiUuIE9w

cG9zaXRpb24gdG8gdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgaGFzDWRvdWJsZWQgc2luY2UgMjAwJSwg

ZnJvbSA3JSBpbiAxOTk0IHRvIDI2JSBjdXJyZW50bHkuIEEgbGFyZ2UgbWFqb3JpdHkgb2Yg

NzIlIGZhdm9yZWQgY2hhbmdpbmcgVGV4YXMgbGF3IHRvIGxldCBqdXJpZXMgc2VudGVuY2Ug

b2YgbGlmZSB3aXRob3V0IHBhcm9sZS4gT25seSBhYm91dA1oYWxmIG9mIFRleGFucyBiZWxp

ZXZlIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGhlbHBzIHByZXZlbnQgY3JpbWUuIFRoZSBwb2xsIGhh

ZCBhIG1hcmdpbiBvZiBlcnJvciBvZiAzJS4gKEhvdXN0b24gQ2hyb25pY2xlLCAzLzE1Lzk4KQ

LiAuDQ1bSW1hZ2VdIEEgTmV3IFlvcmsgUG9sbCBhZ2FpbiBjb25maXJtcyB0aGF0IG1vcmUg

cGVvcGxlIHdvdWxkIHByZWZlciB0aGUgc2VudGVuY2Ugb2YgbGlmZSB3aXRob3V0IHBhcm9s

ZSB0aGFuIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGZvciB0aG9zZSBjb252aWN0ZWQgb2YgMXN0IGRl

Z3JlZSBtdXJkZXIuIDQ0JSBzdXBwb3J0ZWQgTFdPIHdoaWxlIG9ubHkgMzglIHN1cHBvcnQ

ZWQgYSBkZWF0aDFzZW50ZW5jZS4gQSBtYWpvcml0eSBvZiBOZXcgWW9ya2VycyBiZWxpZXZl

IHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGhhcyBubyBlZmZlY3RDb24gcHJldmVudGluZyBtdXJkZXJz

LiAoTlkgUG9zdCwgMy8yNy85OCkuDQ1bSW1hZ2VdICBOZXdyb2xsIHJlbGVhc2VkIGJ5

IHRoZSBEYWxsYXMgTW9ybmluZyBOZXdzICgxLzIyLzk4KSByZXZlYWxlZA10aGF0IHRoZSBt

YWpvcml0eSBvZiBUZXhhbnMgYXJlIHVuY2VydGFpbiBhYm91dCBleGVjdXRpbmcgS2FybGEg

RmF5ZSBUdWNrZXIuDTMzJSBzYWlkIHRoZXkgZGlkbid0Gtub3cgd2hldGhlciBzaGUgc2hv

dWxkIGJlIGV4ZWN1dGVkIG9yIHNlcnZlIGxpZmUgaW4cHJpc29uIGFuZCBhbm90aGVyIDIy

JSBzYWlkIGhlciBzZW50ZW5jZSBzaG91bGQgYmUgY29tbXV0ZWQuIE9ubHkgNDUlDXN1cHBv

cnRlZCB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBmb3IgTXMuIFR1Y2tlciwgZGVzcGl0ZSB0aGUgZmFj

dCB0aGF0IDc1JSBzYXkNdGhleSBzdXBwb3J0IHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGluIHRoZW9y

eS4gU2VlIG90aGVyIG9waW5pb24gcG9sbHMgYW5kIHdvbWVuDWFuZCB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVu

YWx0eS4NDVtJbWFnZV0gTW9yZSBBbWVyaWNhbnMgZmF2b3JlIGxpZmUgb3ZlciBkZWF0Ggg

Zm9yIFRlcnJ5IE5pY2hvbHMuIEEgcmVjZW50DUdhbGx1cCBwb2xsIGZvdW5kIHRoYXQgNDYl

IG9mIGFkdWx0cyBzdXJ2ZWllZCBiZWxpZXZlZCBNci4gTmljaG9scyBzaG91bGQgYmUNc2Vu

dGVuY2VkIHRvIGVpdGhlciBsaWZlIGluIHByaXNvbiBvciBhIGxlc3NlciBzZW50ZW5jZSAo

NDIlIGxpZmU7IDQlDWxlc3Nlci4gIE9ubHkgNDUlIGJlbGlldmVkIGhlIHNob3VsZCBiZSBz

ZW50ZW5jZWQgdG8gZGVhdGguIChOWSBUaW1lcywwNMS8xMS85OCkuIFRoYXQgcmVzdWx0IG1p

cnJvcnMgd2lkZXNwcmVhZCBzdXBwb3J0IGZvciBsaWZlIHdpdGhvdXQgcGFyb2xlDXNlbnRl

bmNlcyBpbiBvdGhlciBwb2xscyBsYXN0IHllYXIuDQ1bSW1hZ2VdIDUyJSBvZiBBbWVyaWNh

bnMgZG8gbm90IGJlbGlldmUgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgZGV0ZXJzIHBlb3BsZSBmcm9t

DWNvbW1pdHRpbmcgY3JpbWUgKFRpbWUgTWFnYXppbmUsIDE5OTcpDVtJbWFnZV0gNjAlIGRv

IG5vdCBiZWxpZXZlIHZlbmdlYW5jZSBpcyBhIGxlZ2l0aW1hdGUgcmVhc29uIGZvciBwdXR0

aW5nIENbXVyZGVyZXIgdG8gZGVhdGggKFRpbWUgTWFnYXppbmUsIDE5OTcpDVtJbWFnZV0g

NDklIGJlbGlldmUgYmxhY2tzIGFyZSBtb3JlIGxpa2VseSB0aGFuIHdoaXRlcyB0byByZWNl

aXZlIHRoZSBkZWF0aA1wZW5hbHR5IGZvciB0aGUgc2FtZSBjcmltZSAoTmV3c3dlZWssIDE5

OTcpDVtJbWFnZV0gNzUlIG9mIG5vbi13aGl0ZXMgYWdyZWUgdGhhdCBibGFja3MgYXJlIG1v

cmUgbGlrZWx5IHRoYW4gd2hpdGVzIHRvIHJlY2VpdmUgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgZm9y

IHRoZSBzYW1lIGNyaW1lIChOZXdzd2VlaywgMTk5NykNW4tYWdlXSBPbmx5IDYxIABmYXZv

cmVkIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGZvciBUaW1vdGh5IE1jVmVpZ2ggKENOTiBQb2xsLA0x

OTk3KQ1bSW1hZ2VdICBiBhbiBPaGlvIFN0YXRlIFVuaXZlcnNpdHkgcG9sbCByZWxlYXNl

ZCBPY3RvYmVyIDEsIDE5OTcsIDU5JSBvZg1PaGlvYW5zIHNhaWQgdGhleSB3b3VsZCBzdXBw

b3J0IEgbGlmZSB3aXRob3V0IHBhcm9sZSBzZW50ZW5jZSBwbHVzDW1hbmRhdG9yeSByZXN0

aXR1dGlvbiBhcyBhbiBhbhHRlcm5hdGl2ZSB0byB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eS4gMzElIHdl

cmUgbm90DWluIHN1cHBvcnQgb2YgdGhpcyBhbHRlcm5hdGl2ZS4gNDYlIG9mIHRoZSByZXNw

b25kZW50cyB0aG91Z2h0IGl0IGxpa2VseQ10aGF0IGFuIGlubm9jZW50IHBlcnNvbiBjb3Vs

ZCBiZSBjb252aWN0ZWQgYW5kIGV4ZWN1dGVkLg1Jdh2VdICBPbmx5IDM3IHBlcmNlbnQg

b2YgTmV3IFlvcmsgdm90ZXJzIHN1cHBvcnQgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHksDWNvbXBhcmVk

IHRvIDQ1IHBlcmNlbnQgd2hvIGZhdm9yIGxpZmUgaW4gcHJpc29uIHdpdGggbm8gY2hhbmNl

IG9mIHBhcm9sZS1hY2NvcmRpbmcgdG8gdGhlIFF1aW5uaXBpYWMgQ29sbGVnZSBQb2xsaW5n

IEluc3RpdHV0ZSBpbiBhIHByZXNzIHJlbGVhc2UsDVNlcHRlbWJlciAyNCwgMTk5Ny4gQW5v

dGhlciAxMiBwZXJjZW50IG9mIE5ldyBZb3JrZXJzIGZhdm9yIGxpZmUgaW4gcHJpc29uDXdp

dGggYSBjaGFuY2Ugb2YgcGFyb2xlLCB5aWVsZGluZyBhIHRvdGFsIG9mIDU3IHBlcmNlbnQg

Zm9yIG5vbi1kZWF0aDFwZW5hbHR5IG9wdGlvbnMuIEJ5IGEgMjI2YcGVyY2VudCBtYXJn

aW4sIE5ldyBZb3JrZXJzIGRvIG5vdCB0aGluayB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBoYXMgbWFk

ZSB0aGUgU3RhdGUgc2FmZXIgc2luY2UgaXQgd2FzIGFkb3B0ZWQgaW4gMTk5NS4gVGhlIVF1

aW5uaXBpYWMgUG9sBpcyBhbW9uZyB0aGUgbW9zdCB3aWRlbHkgY2l0ZWQgcG9sbHMgaW4g

dGhlIE5ldyBZb3JrIGFyZWEuDUluIE5ldyBZb3JrIENpdHkgb25seSBjll Zhdm9yZWQg

dGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkuDVtbWFnZV0gIFRoZSBDZW50ZXIgZm9yIFN1cnZleSBSZXNl

YXJjaChdCBWaXJnaW5pYSBUZWNoIHJlcG9ydHMgdGhhdCA1NyUgb2NVilyZ2luaWFucyBz

dXBwb3J0cyB0aGUgYWx0ZXJuYXRpdmUgdG8gdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgb2YgbGlmZSBp

biBwcmlzb24Nd2l0aCBubyBjaGFuY2Ugb2YgcGFyb2xlIGZvciAyNSB5ZWFycyBwbHVzIHJl

c3RpdHV0aW9uIHRvIHRoZSB2aWN0aW0ncw1mYW1pbHkuIE92ZXIgNzUlIG9mIHRob3NlIHBv

bGxlZCBvcHBvc2VkIGZpcmdpbmlhJ3MgbGF3IHdoaWNoIHBlcmVudHMgdHRoZQ1hY2N1c2Vk

IGZyb20gaW50cm9kdWNpbmcgbmV3IGV2aWRlbmNlIG9mIGlubm9jZW5jZS4yMSBkYXlzIGFm

dGVyIHRyaWFsLg0oUXVhbGl0eSBvZiBMaWZlIGluIFZBIFN1cnZleSwgMTk5Ny4uDVtJbWFn

ZV0gQSByZWNlbnQgb3BpbmlvbiBwb2xsIGluIEtlbnR1Y2t5IHJlcGxpY2F0ZWQgd2hhdCBo

YXMgYmVlbiBzaG93biBpbng1zdGF0ZSBwb2xscyBhcm91bmQgdGhlIGNvdW50cnk6IHBlb3Bs

ZSBzdXBwb3J0IHRoZSBhdHRlcm5hdGl2ZSBzZW50ZW5jZSBvZ1saWZlIHdpdGhvdXQgcGFy

b2xlIG92ZXIgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkuIEEgVW5pdmVyc2l0eSBvZiBMb3Vpc3ZpbGxl

IHBvbgNZm91bnQgdGhhdCA0MiUgc3VwcG9ydGVkIGxpZmUgd2l0aG91dCBwYXJvbGUsIHdo

aWxlIG9ubHkgMzUlIHN1cHBvcnRlZCB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eS4gKEtlbnR1Y2t5IHdl

Sm91cm5hbCwgNy8xMy85NykuDQ0IAJcApqAFp7AE3KVlAC3ACQQAAAAAZQAAAAAAAQAAAQAB

AAMAAPoiAAA9MQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPofAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAwAABqAAAAADAAAGoAAABqMAAAAAAAGowAAAAAAAAajAAAAAAABqMAAA

AAAAAGowAAAUAAAAfjAAAAAAAAB+MAAAAAAAAH4wAAAAAAAAfjAAAAAAAAB+MAAAAAAAAH4w

AAAQAAAAjjAAABwAAAB+MAAAAAAAAKowAAA/AAAAqjAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAKowAAAAAAAA

qjAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAKowAAAAAAAAqjAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAKowAAAAAAAAqjAAAAAA

AACqMAAAAAAAAKowAAAAAAAAqjAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAKowAAAAAAAA6TAAAFQAAAA9MQAA

AAAAAKowAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGowAAAAAAAAqjAAAAAAAAAABIAFAACAAQA

qjAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAKowAAAAAAAAqjAAAAAA

AACqMAAAAAAAAGowAAAAAAAAajAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACqMAAA

AAAAAKowAAAAAAAAqjAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAKowAAAAAAAAajAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAGow

AAAAAAAAqjAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAB+MAAAAAAAAH4wAAAAAAAA

ajAAAAAAAABqMAAAAAAAAGowAAAAAAAAajAAAAAAAACqMAAAAAAAAKowAAAAAAAAqjAAAAAA

AACqMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAICAgICAgICAg

ICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICBbSW1hZ2VdСAgICAgICAgICAgICBQdWJs

aWMgT3BpbmlvbiBBYm91dCB0aGUgRGVhdGggUGVuYWx0eTbSW1hZ2VdIE1vcmUgcGVvcGxl

IHN1cHBvcnQgYWx0ZXJuYXRpdmVzIHRvIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IChjaGFydCkNW0t

YWdlXSBQb2xpY2UgY2hpZWZzIHBsYWNlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgbGFzdCBpbiByZWR1Y2lu

ZyB2aW9sZW50IGNyaW1lDShjaGFydClbSW1hZ2VdW0ltYWdlXTogICAgICAgICAgICAg

ICAgICAgICAgICAgIERQSUMgUmVwb3J0c1tSW1hZ2VdIFNlbnRlbmNpbmcgZm9yIExp

ZmU6IEFtZXJpY2FucyBFbWJyYWNlIEFsdGVybmF0aXZlcyB0byB0aGUgRGVhdGggNGVuYWx0

eSAtIFB1YmxpYyBzdXBwb3J0IGZvciB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBkcm9wcyB0byBiZWxv

dyA1MCBwZXJjZW50DXdoZW4gdm90ZXJzIGFyZSBvZmZlcmVkIGFsdGVybmF0aXZlIHNlbnRl

bmNlcy4gTW9yZSBwZW9wbGUgd291bGQgc3VwcG9ydA1saWZlIHdpdGhvdXQgcGFyb2xlIHBs

dXMgcmVzdGl0dWlvbiB0byB0aGUgdmljdGltJ3MgZmFtaWx5IHRoYW4gd291bGQgY2hvb3Nl

DXRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5Lg1bSW1hZ2VdIE9uIHRoZSBGcm9udCBMaW5lOiBMYXcgRW5m

b3JjZW1lbnQgVmlld3Mgb24gdGhlIERlYXRoIFBlbmFsdHkgLSBBIDE5OTUgSGFydCBBBZXNl

YXJjaCBQb2xsIG9mIHBvbGljZSBjaGllZnMgaW4gdGhlIFUuUy4gZm91bmQgdGhhdCB0aGUg

bWFqb3JpdHkNb2YgdGhlIGNoaWVmcyBkbyBub3QgYmVsaWV2ZSB0aGF0IHRoZSBkZWF0aCBw

ZW5hbHR5IGlzIGFuIGVmZmVjdGl2ZSBsYXcNZW5mb3JjZW1lbnQgdG9vbC4NICAgICAgICAg

ICAgICAgICAgICAgIFJlY2VudCBQb2xsIEZpbmRpbmdzDVtJbWFnZV0gQW5udWFs

IFN1cnZleSBSZXN1bHRzIE9uY2UgQWdhaW4gU2hvd2luaW5pYXNzIGluIEZhdm9yIG9m

DUFsdGVybmF0aXZlcyB0byB0aGUgRGVhdGggUGVuYWx0eQ0gICAqIFN1cnZleSByZXN1bHRz

IGZyb20gdGhlIFF1YWxpdHkgb2YgTGlmZSBpbiBWaXJnaW5pYSBQb2xsIHNob3cgdGhhdA0g

ICAgIHN1cHBvcnQgZm9yIFZpcmdpbmlhJ3MgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBoYXMgZHJvcHBlZC4g

V2hlbiBzdXJ2ZXlvcnMgYXNrZWQNICAgIA1MTQgcmVzcG9uZGVudHMgaWYgdGhleSBzdXBw

b3J0ZWQgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHksIDc0JSBhZ3JlZWQuIFRoaXMNICAgIGlzIHRoZSAg

bG93ZXN0IHBlcmNlbnRhZ2UgdG8gcmVzcG9uZCBpbiBmYXZvciBvZiB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVu

YWx0eSBpbiA3DSAgICAgeWVhcnMuDSAgICogRm9yIHRoZSA3dGggY29uc2VjdXRpdmUgeWVh

ciwgcmVzdWx0cyBhbHNvIHNob3cgdGhhdCBwcmVmZWcg0IAgIGFsdGVy

bmF0aXZlcyB0byB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eS4gV2hlbiBhc2tlZCBhYm91dCB0aGUgYWx0

ZXJuYXRpdmUgb2YNICAgIBsaWZlIHdpdGggbm8gcG9zc2liaWxpdHkgb2YgcGFyb2xlIGZv

ciBhIG1pbmltdW0gb2YgMjUgeWVhcnMgY29tYmluZWQNICAgIB3aXRoIHJlc3RpdHV0aW9u

IGZvciB0aGUgdmljdGltcyBmYW1pbGllcywgNTQuOCUgYWdyZWVkIHdpdGlDSAgICAg

YWx0ZXJuYXRpdmUgYW5kIDQwLjUlIGRpc2FncmVlZC4NNFByZXNzIHJlbGVhc2UsIFZpcmdp

bmlhbnMgZm9yIEFsdGVybmF0aXZlcyB0byB0aGUgRGVhdGggUGVuYWx0eSwgOC8xMy85OSkN

W0ltYWdlXSBBIHJlY2VudCBwb2xsLCBtaWNoaWdhbiBpbmRpY2F0ZWQgdGhhdCBzdXBwbw

cnQgZm9yIHRoZSBkZWF0aA1wZW5hbHR5IGlzIGRlY2xpbmluZyBhbW9uZyB0aGUgbWFqb3JpdHk

IG9mIHJlc2lkZW50cyAoNTYlKSB3b3VsZCBwcmVmZXIgYSBsaWZlIXNlbnRlbmNlIGFuZCBw

YXltZW50IHRvIHZpY3RpbXMnIGZhbWlsaWVzIGluc3RlYWQgb2YgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFs

dHkNKDMzJSkuIFRoZSBwb2xsIHdhcyBjb25kdWN0ZWQgYnkgRVBJQy9NVUkuIFBvbGxzdGVy

IEVkIFNhcmJvdHVzIHNhaWQ6ICJJdCdzDXRoZSBsb3dlc3Qgc3VwcG9ydCBmb3IgdGhlIGRl

YXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgSSd2ZSBzZWVuLiIgTWljaGlnYW4ncyBib3NlIG9mdDFSZXByZXNlbnRh

dGl2ZXMgb3ZlcndoZWxtaW5nbHkgZGVmZWF0ZWQgYSByZXNvbHV0aW9uIHJlY2VudGx5IHRv

IHJlc3RvcmUgdGhlDWRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkuIChUaGUgRmxpbnQgSm91cm5hbCwxLzEvOTkp

DVtJbWFnZV0gQWNjb3JkaW5nIHRvIGEgcG9sbCBieSB0aGUgQ2hpY2FnbyBUcmlidW5lLCBz

dXBwb3J0IGZvciB0aGUgZGVhdGgNcGVuYWx0eSBpbiBJbGxpbm9pcyBoYXMgZHJvcHBlZCAx

MyBwZXJjZW50YWdllIHBvaW50cyBpbiB0aGUgbGFzdCBmaXZlIHllYXJzLA1hbmQgYSBtYWpv

cml0eSBvZiB2b3RlcnMgKDU0JSkgZmF2b3JzIGEgbW9yYXRvcml1bSBvbiBhbGwgZXhlY3V0

aW9ucyBpbiB0aGUgU3RhdGUuIEZld2VyIHRoYW4gaGFsZiBvZiB0aGUgcmVzcG9uZGVudHMt

LTQ5JS0tc2FpZCB0aGV5IGJlbGlldmUgdGhlIGRlYXRoDXBlbmFsdHkgZGV0ZXJzIGNyaW1l

LiAoQ2hpY2FnbyBUcmlidW5lLCAzLzI4Lzk5KQ1bSW1hZ2VdIEEgcmVjZW50IHBvbGwgaW4g

VGV4YXMgc2hvd2VkIHRoYXQgb25seSBhIGpham9yaXR5KDUzJSkNc3VwcG9ydCB0

aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eSBpZiB0aGUgZGVhdGggcm93IGlubWF0ZSBoYXMgInNob3duIHNp

Z25zIG9mDXR1cm5pbmcgaXMgb3IgaGlzIGxpZmUgYXJvdW5kLiIChUaGUgVGV4YXMgUG9s

bCwgRnQuIFdvcnRoIFN0YXIgVGVsZWdyYW0sDTEvMTQvOTkpIChaG90bzogU3IuIEhlbGVu

IFByZWplYW4gKGwuKSBhbmQgS2FyGEgRmF5ZSBUdWNrZXIsIGV4ZWN1dGVkIGluDVRleGFz

LCAxOTk4KQ1bSW1hZ2VdIEFsZGhvdWdoIHByZXZpb3VzIG9waW5pb24gcG9sbHMgaGF2ZSBp

bmRpY2F0ZWQgb3ZlciA3MCUgc3VwcG9ydCBmb3INdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgaW4gQ2Fu

YWRhLCB0aGF0IHN1cHBvcnQgaGFzIGRyYW1hdGljYWxseSBkcm9wcGVkLiBBIHJlY2VudA1w

b2xsIHNob3dlZCBhbiBldmVuIHNwbGl0IG9uIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGdlbmVyYWxs

eSwgd2l0aCA0OCUNc3VwcG9ydGluZyBpdCBhbmQgNDclIG9wcG9zaW5nIGl0LiBXaGVuIGFz

a2VkIHdoaWNoIHNlbnRlbmNlIHRoZXkgd291bGQCZmF2b3IgZm9yIHRoZSBtb3N0IHNlcmlv

dXMgY3JpbWVzLCA1MyUgc3VwcG9ydGVkIGEgbGlmZSBzZW50ZW5jZSBhbmQgb25seQ00MiUg

c3VwcG9ydGVkIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5LiAoTW9udHJlYWwgR2F6ZXR0ZSwgMTIvMzEv

OTgpDVtJbWFnZV0gQSBuZXcgc3VydmV5IHNob3dzIHRoYXQgcmVnaW9uYWwucyBjb250aW51

ZSB0byBzdXBwb3J0IGxpZmUgd2l0aG91dA1wYXJvbGUgb3ZlciB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0

eS4gV2hlbiBnaXZlbiB0aGUgb3B0aW9uIG9mIGxpZmUgd2l0aG91dCB0aGUNcG9zc2liaWxp

dHkgb2YgcGFyb2xlIGZvciBhIG1pbml0dW0gb2YgMjUgeWVhcnMgYXMgd2VsbCBhcyByZXN0

aXR1dGlvbiB0bw10aGUgdmljdGltJ3MgZmFtaWx5LCBzdXBwb3J0IHdhcyBhdCA1NC44JS4g

KEF1YWxpdHkgb2YgTGlmZSBpbiBWaXJnaW5pYQ1Qb2xsLCBBdWd1c3QgMTMsIDE5OTkpIChT

ZWUgVmlyZ2luaWEuIGZvciBBbx0ZXJuYXRpdmVzIHRvIHRoZSBEZWF0a1QZW5hbHR5KQ1b

SW1hZ2VdIEluIGEgcmVjZW50IHBvbGwgdGFrZW4gYWY0ZXIgTi5ZLidzIGZpcnN0IGRlYXRo

IHNlbnRlbmNlIHNpbmNlIHRoZQ1wYXNzYWdlIG9mIGl0cyBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGxhdyBp

biAxOTk1LCBtb3N0IE5ldyBZb3JrZXJzIGZhdm9yZWQgbGlmZQ1zZW50ZW5jZXMgZm9yIDFz

dCBkZWdyZWUgbXVyZGVyIHJhdGhlciB0aGFuIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5OiAzOCUgY2hv

c2UgdGhlDWRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHksIDQ0JSBvcHRlZCBmb3IgbGlmZSB3aXRob3V0IHBhcm9s

ZSwgYW5kIDklIHByZWZlcnJlZCBsaWZlIHdpdGggNYBjaGFuY2Ugb2YgcGFyb2xlIGFzIHRo

ZSBhcHByb3ByaWF0ZSBzZW50ZW5jZS4gKFF1aW5uaXBpYWMgQ29sbGVnZSBQb2xsLA1Bc3Nv

Yy4gUHJlc3MsIDYvMTcvOTgpDVtJbWFnZV0gQSBuZXcgU2NyaXBwcyBIb3dhcmQgTmV3cyBQ

b2xsIGluIFRleGFzIHJlcG9ydHMgdGhhdCBzdXBwb3J0IGZvciB0aGUNZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0

eSBpbiB0aGF0IHN0YXRlIGhhcyBkcm9wcGVkIHRvIGl0cyBsb3dlc3QgaW4gdGhyZWUgZGVj

YWRlcy4NU3VwcG9ydCBmb3IgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgZHJvcHBlZCB0byA2OCUsIDE4

IHBlcmNlbnRhZ2UgcG9pbnRzIGxvd2VyDXRoYW4gaW4gMTk5NCwgd2hlbiBpdCB3YXMgODYl

LiBPcHBvc2l0aW9uIHRvIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGhhcyBncm93biBieQ1vdmVyIDI1

MCUsIGZyb20gNyUgaW4gMTk5NC0byAyNiUgY3VycmVudGx5LiBBIGxhcmdlIG1ham9yaXR5

IG9mIDcyJSBmYXZvcmVkDWNoYW5naW5nIHRleGFzIGxhdyB0byBpbmNsdWRlIEgc2VudGVu

Y2Ugb2YgbGlmZSB3aXRob3V0IHBhcm9sZS4gT25seSBhYm91dA1oYWxmIG9mIHRleGFucyBi

ZWxpZXZlIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGhlbHBzIHByZXZlbnQgY3JpbWUuIFRoZSBwb2xs

IGhhZCBhDW1hcmdpbiBvZiBlcnJvciBvZiAzJS4gKEhvdXN0b24gQ2hyb25pY2xlLCAzLzE1

Lzk4KS4gLg1bSW1hZ2VdIEEgTmV3IFlvcmsgcG9sbCBhZ2FpbiBjb25maXJtcyB0aGF0IG1v

cmUgcGVvcGxlIHdvdWxkIHByZWZlciB0aGUNc2VudGVuY2Ugb2YgbGlmZSB3aXRob3V0IHBh

cm9sZSB0aGFuIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGZvciB0aG9zZSBjb252aWN0ZWQNb2YgMXN0

IGRlZ3JlZSBtdXJkZXIuDQ0JIHsdXBwb3J0ZWQgTFdPUCB3aGlsZSBvbmx5IDM4JSBzdXBw

b3J0ZWQgYSBkZWF0aA1zZW50ZW5jZS4gQSBtYWpvcml0eSBvZiBOZXcgWW9ya2VycyBiZWxp

ZXZlIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGhhcyBubyBlZmZlY3QNb24gcHJldmVudGluZyBtdXJk

ZXJzLiAoTlkgUG9zdCwgMy8yNy85OCkuDVtJbWFnZV0gEgbmV3IHBvbGwgcmVsZWFzZWQg

YnkgdGhlIERhbGxhcyBNb3JuaW5nIE5ld3MgKDEvMjIvOTgpIHJldmVhbGVkDXRoYXQgdGhl

IG1ham9yaXR5IG9mIFRleGFucyBhcmUgdW5jZXJ0YWluIGFib3V0IGV4ZWN1dGluZyBLYXJs

YSBGYXllIFR1Y2tlci4NMzMlIHNhaWQgdGhleSBkaWRuJ3Qga25vdyB3aGV0aGVyIHNoZSBz

aG91bGQgYmUgZXhlY3V0ZWQgb3Igc2VydmUgbGlmZSBpbi1wcmlzb24gYW5kIG5vdGhlcg1

MjIlIHNhaWQgaGVyIHNlbnRlbmNlIHNob3VsZCBiZSBjb21tdXRlZC4gT25seSA0NSUNc3Vw

cG9ydGVkIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGZvciBNcy4gVHVja2VyLCBkZXNwaXRlIHRoZSBm

YWN0IHRoYXQgNzUlIHNheQ10aGV5IHN1cHBvcnQgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgaW4gdGhl

b3J5LiBTZWUgb3RoZXIgb3BpbmlvbiBwb2xscyBhbmQgd29tZW4NYW5kIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBw

ZW5hbHR5Lg1bSW1hZ2VdIE1vcmUgQW1lcmljYW5zIGZhdm9yZWQgbGlmZSBvdmVyIGRlYXRo

IGZvciBUZXJyeSBOaWNob2xzLiBBIHJlY2VudA1HYWxsdXAgcG9sbCBmb3VuZCB0aGF0IDQ2

JSBvZiBhZHVsdHMgc3VydmV5ZWQgYmVsaWV2ZWQgTXIuIE5pY2hvbHMgc2hvdWxkIGJldWU

bnRlbmNlZCB0byBlaXRoZXIgbGlmZSBpbiBwcmlzb24gb3IgYSBsZXNzZXIgc2VudGVuY2Ug

KDQyJSBsaWZlOyA0JCsZXNzZXIpLiBPbmx5IDQ1JSBiZWxpZXZlZCBoZSBzaG91bGQgYmUg

c2VudGVuY2VkIHRvIGRlYXRoLiAoTlkgVGltZXMsDTEvMTEvOTgpLiBUaGF0IHJlc3VsdCBt

aXJyb3JzIHdpZGVzcHJlYWQgc3VwcG9ydCBmb3IgbGlmZSB3aXRob3V0IHBhcm9sZC1zZW50

ZW5jZXMgaW4gb3RoZXIgcG9sbHMgbGFzdCB5ZWFyLg1bSW1hZ2VdIDUyJSBvZiBBBBWVyaWNh

bnMgZG8gbm90IGJlbGlldmUgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgZGV0ZXJzIHBlb3BsZSBmcm9t

DWNvbW1pdHRpbmcgY3JpbWUgKFRpbWUgTWFnYXppbmUsIDE5OTcpDVtJbWFnZV0gNjAlIGRv

IG5vdCBiZWxpZXZlIHZlbmdlYW5jZSBpcyBhIGxlZ2l0aW1hdGUgcmVhc29uIGZvciBwdXR0

aW5nIENbXVyZGVyZXIgdG8gZGVhdGggKFRpbWUgTWFnYXppbmUsIDE5OTcpDVtJbWFnZV0g

NDklIGJlbGlldmUgYmxhY2tzIGFyZSBtb3JlIGxpa2VseSB0aGFuIHdoaXRlcyB0byByZWNl

aXZlIHRoZSBkZWF0aDNwZW5hbHR5IGZvciB0aGUgc2FtZSBjcmltZSAoTnV3c3dlZWssIDE5

OTcpDVtJbWFnZV0gNzUlIG9mIG5vbi13aGl0ZXMgYWdyZWUgdGhhdCBibGFjazMgYXJlIG1v

cmUgbGlrZWx5IHRoYW4gd2hpdGVzIHRvDXJlY2VpdmUgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHkgZm9y

IHRoZSBzYW1lIGNyaW1lIChOZXdzd2VlaywgMTk5NykNW50YWdlIObmx5IDYxIGZhdm9y

cmVkIHRoZSBkZWF0aCBwZW5hbHR5IGZvciBUaW1vdGh5IE1jVmVpZ2ggKENOOThBQb2xsLA0x

OTk3KQ1bSW1hZ2VdICBJbiBhbiBPaGlvIFN0YXRlIFVuaXZlcnNpdHkgcG9sbCByZWxlYXNl

ZCBPY3RvYmVyIDEsIDE5OTcsIDU5JSBvZg1PaGlvYW5zIHNhaWQgdGhleSB3b3VsZCBzdXBw

b3J0IGEgbGlmZSB3aXRob3V0IHBhcm9sZSBzZW50ZW5jZSBwbHVzDW1hbmRhdG9yeSByZXN0

aXR1dGlvbiBhcyBhbiBhbHRlcm5hdGl2ZSB0byB0aGUgZGVhdGggcGVuYWx0eS4gMzElIHdl

cmUgbm90DWluIHN1cHBvcnQgb2YgdGhpcyBhbHRlcm5hdGl2ZS4gNDYlIG9mIHRoZSByZXNw

b25kZW50cyB0aG91Z2h0IGl0IGxpa2VseC0haGF0IGFuIGlubm9jZW50IHBlcnNvbiBjb3Vs

ZCBiZSBjb252aWN0ZWQgYW5kIGV4ZWN1dGVkLg1bSW1hZ2VdIE3IHBlcmNlbnQg

b2YgTmV3IFlvcmsgdm90ZXJzIHN1cHBvcnQgdGhlIGRlYXRoIHBlbmFsdHksDWNvbXBhcmVk

IHRvIDQ1IHBlcmNlbnQgd2hvIGZhdm9yIGxpZmUgaW4gcHJpc29uIHdpdGhvdXQgbm8gY2hhbmNl

IG9mIHBhcm9sZ1hY2NvcmRpbmcgdG8gdGhlIFF1aW5uaXBpYWMgQ29sbGVnZSBQb2xsaW5n

IEluc3RpdHV0ZSBpbiBhIHByZXNzIHJlbGVhc2UsDVJlcHRlbWJlciAyNCwgMTk3NCBgQW5v
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C/0AAAxKAAAMlgAADOIAAA0TAAANWQAADZ8AAA3qAAAONQAADkIAAA6OAAAO2wAADx4AAA9m
AAAPsAAAD+4AABA6AAAQgwAAEM0AABEVAAARWgAAEWMAABGuAAAR9gAAEkMAABKQAAAS2gAA
EvEAABM+AAAThgAAE88AABQbAAAUaAAAFLQAABUBAAAVOAAAFYEAABXMAAAWFgAAFmIAABaN
AAAW2AAAFyUAABdvAAAXtQAAF/8AABhLAAAYYgAAGK0AABj6AAAZQAAAGYcAABnQAAAZ9AAA
GkEAABpoAAAasgAAGtoAABsmAAAbUgAAG50AABvb+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5
+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5
+fn5+fn5+fn5+fn5+fkAAAAC10AA2EECWIBYwAUAGIAABvbAAAcJQAAHCsAABx2
AAAcugAAHQUAAB1OAAAdhwAAHc4AAB4XAAAeYQAAHqwAAB7yAAAfOwAAH4QAAB/PAAAgBQAA
IFIAACCdAAAg5AAAIS8AACF3AAAhnQAAIekAACI0AAAigAAAIssAACL5AAAi+vn5+fn5+fn5
+fn5+fn5+fn5+fkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALXQAD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AADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAA
AAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADn
AAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAA
AOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAA
AAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGAAAFAAAAPAPJgAMAtAFoAhwC0AOEBDgE7AWgBlQHCAe8CHAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAACkAABf/AAAYSwAAGGIAABitAAAY+gAAGUAAABmHAAAZ0AAAGfQAABpBAAAaaAAA
GrIAABraAAAbJgAAG1IAABudAAAb2wAAHCUAABwrAAAcdgAAHLoAAB0FAAAdTgAAHYcAAB3O
AAAeFwAAHmEAAB6sAAAe8gAAHzsAAB+EAAAfzwAAIAUAACBSAAAgnQAAIOQAACEvAAAhdwAA
IZ0AACHpAAAiNAAAIoDnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAA
AADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAA
AAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADn
AAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAA
AOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAA
AAAA5wAAAAAAAOcAAAAAAADnAAAAAAAA5wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAUAAAA8A8mAAwC0AWg
CHALQA4QEOATsBaAGVAcIB7wIcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAKQAAIoAAACLLAAAi+QAAIvrnAAAA
AAAA5wAAAAAAAOUAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAQAAABgAABQAAADwDyYADALQBaAIcAtADhAQ4BOwFoAZUBwgHvAhwAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAADDgAPAAgAAQBLAA8AAAAABoAAEDx/wIAGgAGTm9ybWFsAAIAAAAAADAGEJBAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAiAEFA8v+hACIAFkRlZmF1bHQgUGFyYWdyYXBoIEZvbnQAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAD6HwAAAD6IgAAAAAAAAAAMAANsbAAD6IgAAEgATAAADAAATDQAA/xcAAIAi
AAD6IgAAFAAVABYAFwA/ABUGkAFNAFRpbWVzIE5ldyBSb21hbgBMBpABAgBTeW1ib2wAACwYA

AE0AQXJpYWwADQYBkAEAQ291cmllcgAhAAQAAAAAAAA0AIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAADAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
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///
///
///
///
///
////////////////////////////////8AAwAAxQYAAMYGAADAJQAApssAAPz4/PYAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACdQEAB10DAF4BYgEFXQMAYgEABAAD

AAAoAwAAYgMAAKgDAACpAwAAQgQAAI4EAADbBAAAJgUAAHAFAAC4BQAAAQYAAE4GAACZBgAA

xgYAAMcGAAD0BgAAPQcAAIYHAADPBwAAHAgAAC8IAAB5CAAAxggAAA4JAAAgCQAAUQkAAJYJ

AAC4CQAAAoAAEwKAACXCgAA4woAAO8KAAA7CwAAhwsAANILAAAYDAAAPgwAAIkMAACKDAAA

0AwAAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAKAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADn

AAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXw

AOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGA

JfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcA

AYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA

5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAAAAAAAAAABgAABTwAAAADyYADNACoAVwCEALEA7gELAT

gBZQGSAc8B7AIQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAp0AwAAB0NAABkDQAAsA0AAPkNAABGDgAAcA4AAHEO

AAC7DgAACA8AAFQPAACgDwAA0Q8AABcQAABdEAAAqBAAAPMQAAAAEQAAAREAAE0RAACaEQAA

3REAACUSAABvEgAArRIAAK4SAAD6EgAAQxMAAI0TAADVEwAAGhQAACMUAAAkFAAAbxQAALcU

AAAEFQAAURUAAJsVAACyFQAAsxUAAAAWAABIFgAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wAB

gCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADn

AAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXw

AOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGA

JfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcA

AYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8AAAAAAAAAAA

GAAAFPAAAAAPJgAM0AKgBXAIQAsQDuAQsBOAFlAZIBzwHsAhAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAClIFgAA

kRYAAN0WAAAqFwAAdhcAAMMXAAD6FwAA+xcAAEQYAACPGAAA2RgAACUZAABQGQAAURkAAJwZ

AADpGQAAMxoAAHkaAADDGgAADxsAACYbAAAnGwAAchsAAL8bAAAFHAAATBwAAJUcAAC5HAAA

uhwAAAcdAAAuHQAAeB0AAKAdAADsHQAAGB4AAGMeAAChHgAA6x4AAPEeAAA8HwAAgB8AAMsf

AADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wAB

gCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADn

AAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXw

AOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGA

JfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcA

AYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAU8AAAAA8mAAzQAqAFcAhACxAO4BCwE4AW

UBkgHPAewCEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAKcsfAAAUIAAATSAAAJQgAADdlAAAJyEAAHIhAAC4IQAA

ASIAAEoiAACVIgAAyyIAABgjAABjIwAAqiMAAPUjAAA9JAAAYyQAAK8kAAD6JAAARiUAAJEl

AAC/JQAAwCUAAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcA

AYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA

5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl8ADnAAGAJfAA5wABgCXwAOcAAYAl

8ADlAAGAJfAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAABgA

ABTwAAAADyYADNACoAVwCEALEA7gELATgBZQGSAc8B7AIQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAXDgAPAAgA

AQBLAA8AAAAABoAAEDx/wIAGgAGTm9ybWFsAAIAAAADAGEJBAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAiAEFA8v+hACIAFkRlZmF1bHQgUGFyYWdyYXBoIEZvbnQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADAIgAA

BwDAJQAABwDKJQAAAwAEIP//AQAAIP//AgAEIP//AwAAAAAA0QwAAEwZAADAIgAAAABGAAAA

AQBJAAAAgAAAAAAAMAAKbLAABmAAADAADQDAAAASBYAAMsfAADAJQAAZwBoAGkAagBNAA5O

aWNrIFBhbmFnYWtpcczNYWNpbnRvc2ggSEQ6RGVza3RvcCBGb2xkZXI6RGVhdGggUGVuYWx0

eSBJbmZvIFBvbGwgU3VbWFyef9AAYABALoZAAC6GQAACgABAAEAuhkAAAAAC5GQAAKQAI

AF0C+QE/ABUGkAFNAFRpbWVzIE5ldyBSb21hbgAMBgAAgBTeW1ib2wACwYAAE0AQXJpYWwA

DQaQAU0AQ291cmllcgAhAAQAAQAIAAAA0AIAAAAAAAAAAAAADruzrGAAAAAAIABgAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAADAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAJAMAAAAIgAAAAA

AAAADk5pY2sgUGFuYWdha2lzAAAAAAAAAAAANDPEeChsRrhAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7

AAP//gAJAAYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAEAAAAAAAQAAAAAIAAAAB/////gAAAAAAAA

//

//

//

//

//
//
//
///w==

--------------9A405175195597778F0984F8--

>From zukin@rci.rutgers.edu Sat Oct 23 17:30:20 1999

Received: from gehenna1.rutgers.edu (gehenna1.rutgers.edu [165.230.116.154])

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

    id RAA09963 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 23 Oct 1999 17:30:18 -0700

(PDT)

Received: (qmail 7851 invoked by alias); 24 Oct 1999 00:30:17 -0000

Received: (qmail 7834 invoked from network); 24 Oct 1999 00:30:06 -0000

Received: from the-network-asy-4.rutgers.edu (HELO rci.rutgers.edu)

(128.6.248.4)

  by gehenna1.rutgers.edu with SMTP; 24 Oct 1999 00:30:06 -0000

Message-ID: <3812533C.A5424360@rci.rutgers.edu>

Date: Sat, 23 Oct 1999 20:30:54 -0400

From: Cliff Zukin <zukin@rci.rutgers.edu>

Reply-To: zukin@rci.rutgers.edu

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-DIAL (Win95; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: death penalty

References: <199910230708.AAA19266@usc.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

We just finished a death penalty poll in NJ, where we did ask a closed ended list of reasons of WHY people favored cap. punishment (to those who said they favored it). The release can be found at www.rci.rutgers.edu/~eaglepol. When there, click on the "Star Ledger Eagleton Poll" and then on the death penalty release. Cliff Zukin

aapornet@usc.edu wrote:

>   AAPORNET Digest 1222

>

> Topics covered in this issue include:

>

> 1) Capital Punishment

>   by Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

> 2) Re: Capital Punishment

>   by Erik Stewart <stewart.132@osu.edu>

> 3) Re: Capital Punishment

>   by "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>

> 4) Psychologists Are Revolting

>   by James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

> 5) Re: Millennium Surveys

>   by Dan McDonald <mcdonald.221@osu.edu>

> 6) Field Poll on Presidential Race

>   by James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

> 7) Surveys of older Americans

>   by Felicia Mebane <fmebane@hsph.harvard.edu>

> 8) Re: Millennium Surveys

>   by "Donna Rouner" <DRouner@vines.colostate.edu>

> 9) DICK MORRIS,INSIDERS GUIDE TO CAMPAIGN 2000,NYAAPOR MTG

>   by RoniRosner@aol.com

> 10) Re: Psychologists Are Revolting

>   by PAHARDING7@aol.com

> 11) Selling to Children, or Manipulating Them?

>   by dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

>

>

> ---

> --

>

> Subject: Capital Punishment

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 09:53:24 +0000

> From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> In Gallup and Harris polls this year, 71% were in favor of the death

> penalty and about 22% were opposed.

> (Source:http://www.pollingreport.com/crime.htm) Lopsided support has

> been evident in polls they conducted over recent years. (Favor/oppose

> the death penalty is the most common form for this question.)

>

> But when Gallup asks another question, asking people to choose between

> the death penalty and life in prison with no chance of parole as the

> penalty for murder, only 56% chose the death penalty and 38% chose

> life in prison with no chance of parole. This was the outcome in 1999.

>

> Lower support for the death penalty has been the trend over recent

> years when asked as a preference between two possible sentences by

> Gallup. (This alternate question has been asked in a split-sample

> design or in separate polls not including the favor/oppose death

> penalty question.)

>

> Has any Aaporite out there experimented with these alternate wordings?

> I suspect that when the question is simply yes/no to the death

> penalty, more people are in favor because they believe the alternative

> is that the offender will be paroled in a few years.

>

> Has anyone followed up a yes/no death penalty question with a question

> asking why they are in favor? I would appreciate any experience anyone

> may have asking these alternate questions or any theories on why there

> is a difference in support between the two question forms.

>

> Nick Panagakis

>

>

> --

> --

>

> Subject: Re: Capital Punishment

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:38:53 -0400

> From: Erik Stewart <stewart.132@osu.edu>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> We've engaged in this work in Ohio and have found similar patterns.

> In a telephone survey we conducted in 1997 we found that 75% of

> Ohioans favor the death penalty for convicted murderers (Q item = Do

> you favor or oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder)

> while 17% were opposed and 8% expressed ambivalence. When asked "If

> convicted 1st degree murderers in Ohio could be sentenced to life in

> prison without parole, and also be required to work in prison

> industries for money that would go to the families of their victims,

> would you prefer this as an alternative to the death penalty?" 59% of

> respondents supported the use of this alternative, while 31% did not

> support it and 9% reported being unsure. We also posed the question

> "How likely do you believe it is for an innocent person to be wrongly

> convicted and executed?" rotating this item with the previously

> mentioned item and as might be expected, found a slight order effect

> such that when the wrongly executed item appeared prior to the

> alternative to the death penalty item, there were higher levels of

> support shown for the alternative option. I'm afraid that we haven't

> taken our work to the level of obtaining information as to why people

> specifically support/oppose use of the death penalty.

>

> At 09:53 AM 10/22/99 +0000, you wrote:

> >In Gallup and Harris polls this year, 71% were in favor of the death

> >penalty and about 22% were opposed.

> >(Source:http://www.pollingreport.com/crime.htm) Lopsided support has

> >been evident in polls they conducted over recent years. (Favor/oppose

> >the death penalty is the most common form for this question.)

> >

> >But when Gallup asks another question, asking people to choose

> >between the death penalty and life in prison with no chance of parole

> >as the penalty for murder, only 56% chose the death penalty and 38%

> >chose life in prison with no chance of parole. This was the outcome

> >in 1999.

> >

> >Lower support for the death penalty has been the trend over recent

> >years when asked as a preference between two possible sentences by

> >Gallup. (This alternate question has been asked in a split-sample

> >design or in separate polls not including the favor/oppose death

> >penalty question.)

> >

> >Has any Aaporite out there experimented with these alternate

> >wordings? I suspect that when the question is simply yes/no to the

> >death penalty, more people are in favor because they believe the

> >alternative is that the offender will be paroled in a few years.

> >

> >Has anyone followed up a yes/no death penalty question with a

> >question asking why they are in favor? I would appreciate any

> >experience anyone may have asking these alternate questions or any

> >theories on why there is a difference in support between the two

> >question forms.

> >

> >Nick Panagakis

> >

> >

> >

> >

> Erik R. Stewart, Ph.D.

> Assistant Director for Operations

> OSU Center for Survey Research

> 3045 Derby Hall

> 154 N. Oval Mall

> Columbus, Ohio 43210-1330

>

> 614-292-6672

>

>

> ---

> --

>

> Subject: Re: Capital Punishment

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:41:04 -0400

> From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> Has anyone ever explored with the public the issue of the cost to

> taxpayers of incarceration for life versus the death penalty (which

> itself is costly due to multiple appeals). Did this have an impact on

> opinions of the dealth penalty?

>

> Erik Stewart <stewart.132@osu.edu> on 10/22/99 11:38:53 AM

>

> Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

>

> Subject: Re: Capital Punishment

>

> We've engaged in this work in Ohio and have found similar patterns.

> In a telephone survey we conducted in 1997 we found that 75% of

> Ohioans favor the death penalty for convicted murderers (Q item = Do

> you favor or oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder)

> while 17% were opposed and 8% expressed ambivalence. When asked "If

> convicted 1st degree murderers in Ohio could be sentenced to life in

> prison without parole, and also be required to work in prison

> industries for money that would go to the families of their victims,

> would you prefer this as an alternative to the death penalty?" 59% of

> respondents supported the use of this alternative, while 31% did not

> support it and 9% reported being unsure. We also posed the question

> "How likely do you believe it is for an innocent person to be wrongly

> convicted and executed?" rotating this item with the previously

> mentioned item and as might be expected, found a slight order effect

> such that when the wrongly executed item appeared prior to the

> alternative to the death penalty item, there were higher levels of

> support shown for the alternative option. I'm afraid that we haven't

> taken our work to the level of obtaining information as to why people

> specifically support/oppose use of the death penalty.

>

> At 09:53 AM 10/22/99 +0000, you wrote:

> >In Gallup and Harris polls this year, 71% were in favor of the death

> >penalty and about 22% were opposed.

> >(Source:http://www.pollingreport.com/crime.htm) Lopsided support has

> >been evident in polls they conducted over recent years. (Favor/oppose

> >the death penalty is the most common form for this question.)

> >

> >But when Gallup asks another question, asking people to choose

> >between the death penalty and life in prison with no chance of parole

> >as the penalty for murder, only 56% chose the death penalty and 38%

> >chose life in prison with no chance of parole. This was the outcome

> >in 1999.

> >

> >Lower support for the death penalty has been the trend over recent

> >years when asked as a preference between two possible sentences by

> >Gallup. (This alternate question has been asked in a split-sample

> >design or in separate polls not including the favor/oppose death

> >penalty question.)

> >

> >Has any Aaporite out there experimented with these alternate

> >wordings? I suspect that when the question is simply yes/no to the

> >death penalty, more people are in favor because they believe the

> >alternative is that the offender will be paroled in a few years.

> >

> >Has anyone followed up a yes/no death penalty question with a

> >question asking why they are in favor? I would appreciate any

> >experience anyone may have asking these alternate questions or any

> >theories on why there is a difference in support between the two

> >question forms.

> >

> >Nick Panagakis

> >

> >

> >

> >

> Erik R. Stewart, Ph.D.

> Assistant Director for Operations

> OSU Center for Survey Research

> 3045 Derby Hall

> 154 N. Oval Mall

> Columbus, Ohio 43210-1330

>

> 614-292-6672

>

>

> --

> --

>

> Subject: Psychologists Are Revolting

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 09:32:04 -0700 (PDT)

> From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

> To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

>

> _____

> _____

>

>   Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

> _____

> _____

>

>   October 22, 1999

>

>   ADVERTISING

>

>   Selling to Children, or Manipulating Them?

>

>   By CONSTANCE L. HAYS

>

>   DEPLORING what they see as an unfair and

>   conflict-ridden manipulation of the young, a

>   group of psychologists and other professionals

>   has called on the American Psychological

> Association to restrict the use of psychological

> research by advertisers pitching toys, video

> games, snack food and other products to children.

>

> The letter, written by Gary Ruskin, who heads

> Commercial Alert, a Washington-based advocacy

> group, and Allen D. Kanner, a clinical

> psychologist at the Wright Institute in Berkeley,

> Calif., was sent to the association's president

> late last month. It urges the association to

> issue a formal denunciation of the use of

> psychological techniques in marketing and

> advertising to children, and asks for amendments

> to the association's code of ethics that would

> address the issue.

>

> The letter, which was signed by 60 psychologists

> and other professionals with affiliations ranging

> from Sonoma State University to Harvard Medical

> School, also calls for "an ongoing campaign to

> probe, review and confront the use of

> psychological research in advertising and

> marketing to children," which would include

> promoting strategies to shield children from

> "commercial manipulation and exploitation" by

> psychologists.

>

> "Regrettably, a large gap has arisen between

> A.P.A.'s mission and the drift of the profession

> into helping corporations influence children for

> the purpose of selling products to them," the

> letter stated.

>

> A spokeswoman for the association said the matter

> had been referred to its internal board on

> children, youth and family issues, and that the

> board was scheduled to meet in March.

>

> "Certainly there's no mention of the issue in our

> code of conduct," said the spokeswoman, Rhea K.

> Farberman, adding that the points raised in the

> letter had not been brought before the

> association before.

>

> Dr. Kanner said he wrote the letter after

> becoming concerned, through his own conversations

> with children and teen-age patients, that they

> were, as a group, blatantly materialistic. "I'll

> ask kids what they want to do when they grow up,

> and lots of times they'll tell me, 'Make money,'

> " he said.

>

> As for psychologists' role in that, he said

> research conducted at the university level was

> frequently deployed in developing commercials and

> other pitches to children. Since the stated

> mission of the American Psychological Association

> is "to improve the condition of both the

> individual and society," he concluded that
>
> permitting research to be used in advertising to
>
> children presented a conflict.
>
> "They are taking this very sophisticated
>
> understanding of children's relationships and
>
> what they respond to, and then really tailoring
>
> it to the advertisement and refining it," he
>
> said. "There's no indication that it's helping
>
> kids with their relationships at all, but rather
>
> that it's manipulating them."
>
> Timothy J. Kasser, an associate professor of
>
> psychology at Knox College in Galesburg, Ill.,
>
> who signed the letter, said he did so because he
>
> saw "a great deal of collusion between some
>
> members of psychology and marketing, advertising
>
> and entrepreneurial firms that are working
>
> together to try to understand how best to sell
>
> things to kids."
>
> Dr. Kasser said his research with a colleague,
>
> Richard Ryan of the University of Rochester, had
>
> concluded that people who value goals like money,
>
> fame and beauty are not only more depressed than
>
> others, but also report more behavioral problems
>
> and physical discomfort, as well as scoring lower
>
> on measures of vitality and self-actualization.
>

> For children, the consequences can be similarly

> damaging, Dr. Kasser said. "When advertisers are

> using psychological principles to sell products

> to children, they are not only selling that

> product, but they are also selling a larger value

> system that says making money and using your

> money for the purchase of material things will

> make you happy," he said. "That's what is really

> behind almost every commercial message, that this

> product will make you feel happy, or loved, or

> safe and secure. My feeling is that it is

> manipulation to use children's needs to get them

> to buy these products."

>

> Not every psychologist feels the same way. "The

> whole point is, if you're going to market to

> kids, do it responsibly and there are a whole lot

> of opportunities to make a positive difference,"

> said Dan S. Acuff, who holds a doctorate in

> psychology and runs a company called Youth Market

> Systems Consulting in Sherman Oaks, Calif.

>

> Dr. Acuff, who called the goals stated in the

> letter "anti-free enterprise," published a book

> titled "What Kids Buy and Why" in 1997 that

> offers insights into how to create a successful

> children's product. Included are discussions of

> neocortical development, in which children start

> to rely more on intellect, logic and reasoning

>   and less on fantasy for their decision making.

>   That, Dr. Acuff notes, in italics, "has critical

>   implications for product and program development

>   as well as marketing and advertising to kids in

>   the 8-through-12 age range."

>

>   But there is a line psychologists should draw, he

>   added this week. "We turn down opportunities that

>   would be damaging to kids," he said, "like toys

>   with serious weapons in them -- guns, bombs,

>   rifles and things like that." Fantasy weapons,

>   like those carried by He-Man and Star Wars

>   figures, were acceptable to him, he added, but

>   those based on "modern technological weapons"

>   were not.

>

>   Ms. Farberman, the association's spokeswoman,

>   said psychological techniques were also being

>   used for "socially redeeming issues," like

>   advertising campaigns to urge people not to drink

>   and drive. "It's important not to lose sight of

>   that," she said.

>

>   Julie A. Halpin, the chief executive of Geppetto

>   Group, which specializes in children's

>   advertising, said psychologists were important in

>   helping her company understand children and their

>   capabilities. "For example, we learned that 6-

>   and 7-year-olds don't understand

>   double-entendres," she said. "They are simply

>   trying to learn one meaning of a word at that

>   age. So advertising copy that uses

>   double-entendres as a clever device would not be

>   appropriate, or effective. It's things like that

>   that help us do the best job we can do."

>

>   Still, Dr. Kasser raised a question: "Maybe we're

>   helping the economy, but is that our mission as a

>   discipline?"

>

> _____

> _____

>

>   Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

> _____

> _____

>

> *******

>

>

> --

> --

>

> Subject: Re: Millennium Surveys

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 13:25:47 -0400

> From: Dan McDonald <mcdonald.221@osu.edu>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> Well, I would check the Domesday Book. Even though it was a

> retrospective study, the methodology was quite sophisticated for its

> time, and it was less than 100 years after the millenium change.

>

> At 03:01 PM 10/21/99 -0400, you wrote:

> >Hi,

> >I'm looking for some help on a survey we want to do on "the

> >Millennium." I started at the normal place--looking to see what was

> >done the last time. But the two Graduate Assistants working on the

> >project are adamant that there is nothing good to look at from the

> >last Millennium and we should start from scratch.

> >

> >We want to ask our sample of New Jerseyans to look ahead over the

> >next 10 years or so and tell us what they expect across a variety of

> >life

> >realms: work, family & friends, society as a whole, science, technology

> >& communication, health & other quality of life concerns. I'd

> >appreciate hearing from anybody who has conducted similar surveys in the

> >recent past.

> >

> >Please respond directly to me rather than to the listserv. Thanks.

> >Cliff Zukin

> >

> >--

> >Cliff Zukin   Rutgers University   e-mail: zukin@rci.rutgers.edu

> >

> >Chair & Graduate Director * Department of Public Policy Edward J.

> >Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

> >33 Livingston Ave., Suite 202 *   New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1980

> >732/932-2499 x 712 (Of) * 732/932-1107 (Fx)

> >

> >Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton Poll * Eagleton Inst. of Politics 185

> >Ryders Lane * New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557 732/932-9384 x 247 (Of)

> >* 732/932-1551 (Fx)

> >

> >

> >

> >

> Dan McDonald

> Professor

> 3080 Derby Hall

> 154 North Oval Mall

> School of Journalism and Communication

> The Ohio State University

> Columbus, OH 43210-1339

>

> (614) 292-5811

> mcdonald.221@osu.edu

>

>

> --

> --

>

> Subject: Field Poll on Presidential Race

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:09:24 -0700 (PDT)

> From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

> To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

>

>

>   The San Francisco Chronicle

>

>   OCTOBER 20, 1999, WEDNESDAY, FINAL EDITION

>

> SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A3

>

>   Either Gore or Bradley Would Tie Bush in State;

>   Presidential Field Poll shows gains by ex-Jersey senator

>

> Carla Marinucci, Chronicle Political Writer

>

> Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush remain locked in

> a statistical dead heat in the 2000 presidential race among California

> voters, but an increasing number of them now believe Democratic

> challenger Bill Bradley would be a stronger candidate against the GOP

> front-runner, a new Field Poll shows.

>

> Bush has kept an iron grip on GOP support in the nation's most

> populous state, where he is the preferred candidate of 45 percent of

> likely Republican voters -- more than the combined totals of his six

> other challengers, the poll shows. Gore maintains a strong lead among

> likely Democratic voters, 45-17 over Bradley, with 5 percent now

> supporting actor Warren Beatty and a full third still undecided.

>

> BRADLEY GAINING

>

> If the presidential election were held tomorrow, Bush and Gore would

> be locked in a statistical tie, 47 to 46 percent, with 7 percent

> undecided, the poll showed. But significantly, for the first time, a

> Bradley-Bush matchup also puts the former U.S. senator from New Jersey

> in a statistical 46-to-45 tie with the Texas governor, with 9 percent

> undecided.

>

> "If there's been a constant through the year, it's that Bush and Gore

> have been battling it out with no change going on. What Bush has to

> worry about now is that his lead against Bradley is evaporating --

> from 19 points to an even trial heat" since March, said Field Poll

> director Mark DiCamillo.

>

> With five months to go before the 2000 primary, the strength of both

> Gore and Bradley against Bush are crucial indicators of Democratic

> fortunes in California, a key battleground in the 2000 presidential

> race. Gore has visited the state 59 times since becoming vice

> president, and Bush and Bradley have tried hard to increase their

> visibility here in recent months -- apparently with success.

>

> MOMENTUM FOR ALTERNATIVE

>

> Bradley's improved general election standings come because among

> Californians "he's increasingly perceived as a potentially stronger

> candidate against Bush," said DiCamillo. "Gore seems to be 15 to 20

> points behind the leading Republican (in many national polls), and

> that's sending some shock waves among Democrats, and creates a

> momentum looking for an alternative. Up to this point, there wasn't

> one."

>

> Bradley also "has a very positive image among Democrats, Republican

> voters and nonpartisans," said DiCamillo. "A third of the electorate

> have no opinion of Bradley -- and even with that, he equals Bush's

> strength in the general election. That says there's a lot of room for

> even further growth in the Bradley vote."

>

> GOOD NEWS FOR GORE

>

> The latest Field Poll did have some good news for Gore: He retains

> overwhelming support of the state's Democratic base for the March

> primary, the contest with the clout to deliver him the Democratic

> presidential nomination.

>

> "He's 28 points ahead in the California Democratic primary. He

> maintains a solid lead. He's well-liked by state Democrats," DiCamillo

> said. "The

> (Gore) problem is with the broader electorate, not California Democratic

> primary voters. From the Gore perspective, it's, Let's take one task at a

> time.' "

>

> Other findings of the Field Poll:

>

> -- In a Republican primary, Bush leads his competition with 45 percent

> of the support among likely GOP voters. That compares to Elizabeth

> Dole (10 percent), John McCain (8 percent), Steve Forbes (6 percent),

> Gary Bauer (3 percent), Alan Keyes (3 percent) and Orrin Hatch (1

> percent). Bush's rivals appear to have stagnant support, and Forbes

> actually has lost 2 percentage points since the last poll, in August.

>

> -- On the Democratic side, Gore still retains a nearly 3-to-1 lead

> over Bradley, 45-17. But it has slipped since August, when it was 51

> to 18. Actor Warren Beatty has managed to increase his support to 5

> percent since he made his Hollywood speech on Democratic values last

> month. But he's viewed more negatively than positively -- 41 to 33

> percent among Democratic voters, and by a 2-to-1 ratio among likely

> California voters as a whole.

>

> -- The "wild bunch" of Reform Party candidates appear to have one

> thing in common: They're viewed more negatively than positively among

> California voters. Minnesota Gov. Jesse Ventura leads Reform hopefuls

> in a presidential race with a favorability rating of 34 percent,

> compared to Ross Perot (24), Pat Buchanan (19) and Donald Trump (18).

>

> -- In three-way races, Buchanan appears to take votes away from Bush,

> while the others hurt Gore. With close margins, the Texas governor

> wins Bush-Gore-Ventura (43-40-11); Bush-Gore-Perot (45-44-6) and

> Bush-Gore-Trump (45-44-6), but comes out a loser in Bush-Gore-Buchanan

> (43-46-6).

>

> -----------------------

>

> CHRONICLE GRAPHIC

>

> FIELD POLL

>

> Among likely California voters

>

> -- Open primary preferences where

>

> Democratic and Republican candidates are listed on one ballot

>

> Candidate   March** August October

>

> Al Gore   26 %   29 %   26 %

> George W. Bush 24   24   24

> Bill Bradley   6   11   12

> Elizabeth Dole 15   7   8

> John McCain   3   5   7

> Steve Forbes   3   4   5

> Warren Beatty   n/a   2   3

> Gary Bauer   1   1   2

> Orrin Hatch   n/a   1   1

> Alan Keyes   1   *   1

> Other/undecided 24   16   11

>

> -- Image ratings of Democratic presidential candidates

>

>   Favorable Unfavorable No Opinion

>

> Al Gore   49 %   43   8

> Bill Bradley   54 %   14   32

> Warren Beatty   24 %   52   24

>

> -- Simulated general election presidential preferences

>

> Al Gore   46 %

> George W. Bush   47

> Undecided   7

>

> Bill Bradley   45 %

> George W. Bush   46

> Undecided   9

>

> The poll was conducted October 8-17 by the Field Institute. The

> results are based on a telephone survey of 1,010 California adults,

> including 514 registered voters deemed likely to vote in next year's

> primary election. Ninety five percent of the results from the likely

> voter sample have a sampling error of + or - 4.5 percentage points,

> findings for likely Democratic voters have a sampling error of + or -

> 6.5 points, while findings for likely GOP voters have a sampling error

> of + or - 7.2 points.

>

> ** March findings based on all registered voters

>

> _____

> ____

>

>   Copyright (C) 1999, The Chronicle Publishing Co., All Rights

> Reserved

> _____

> ____

>

> *******

>

>

> ---

> --

>

> Subject: Surveys of older Americans

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 14:08:47 -0400

> From: Felicia Mebane <fmebane@hsph.harvard.edu>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> Please respond to Vicky Ko at VKo@Mail1.VNSNY.org.

>

> My colleagues and I at the Visiting Nurse Service of NY are interested

> in finding survey results that show older Americans' (50 years and

> older) views and general attitudes towards aging, retirement, "aging

> in place" and what they view as an "elder friendly" community. I

> would appreciate any references to specific surveys that have been

> done or organizations (other than AARP) that are likely to have asked

> these types of questions of this segment of the population.

>

> Thank you!

> Felicia Mebane, Ph.D.

> Senior Research Fellow

> Department of Health Policy and Administration

> Harvard School of Public Health

> Kresge 3, Room 419

> 677 Huntington Avenue

> Boston, MA 02115

> (617) 432-4501

>

>

> --

> --

>

> Subject: Re: Millennium Surveys

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 99 12:26:02 -0600

> From: "Donna Rouner" <DRouner@vines.colostate.edu>

> To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

>

> D. You rock. D.

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

> - Well, I would check the Domesday Book. Even though it was a

> retrospective study, the methodology was quite sophisticated for its

> time, and it was less than 100 years after the millenium change.

>

> At 03:01 PM 10/21/99 -0400, you wrote:

> >Hi,

> >I'm looking for some help on a survey we want to do on "the

> >Millennium." I started at the normal place--looking to see what was

> >done the last time. But the two Graduate Assistants working on the

> >project are adamant that there is nothing good to look at from the

> >last Millennium and we should start from scratch.

> >

> >We want to ask our sample of New Jerseyans to look ahead over the

> >next 10 years or so and tell us what they expect across a variety of

> >life

> >realms: work, family & friends, society as a whole, science, technology

> >& communication, health & other quality of life concerns. I'd

> >appreciate hearing from anybody who has conducted similar surveys in the

> >recent past.

> >

> >Please respond directly to me rather than to the listserv. Thanks.

> >Cliff Zukin

> >

> >--

> >Cliff Zukin   Rutgers University   e-mail: zukin@rci.rutgers.edu

> >

> >Chair & Graduate Director * Department of Public Policy Edward J.

> >Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

> >33 Livingston Ave., Suite 202 *   New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1980

> >732/932-2499 x 712 (Of) * 732/932-1107 (Fx)

> >

> >Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton Poll * Eagleton Inst. of Politics 185

> >Ryders Lane * New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557 732/932-9384 x 247 (Of)

> >* 732/932-1551 (Fx)

> >

> >

> >

> >

> Dan McDonald

> Professor

> 3080 Derby Hall

> 154 North Oval Mall

> School of Journalism and Communication

> The Ohio State University

> Columbus, OH 43210-1339

>

> (614) 292-5811

> mcdonald.221@osu.edu

>

> - - - - - - - - - - - End of Original Message - - - - - - - - - - -

> -

>

>

> --

> --

>

> Subject: DICK MORRIS,INSIDERS GUIDE TO CAMPAIGN 2000,NYAAPOR MTG

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 16:13:37 EDT

> From: RoniRosner@aol.com

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> NEW YORK AAPOR & the MEDIA STUDIES CENTER

>   present an Evening Meeting

>

> Date .... Monday, 1 November 1999

> Reception .... 5:30 p.m.

> Presentation ..... 6:00 -- 7:30 p.m.

> Place .... Newseum/NY (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, $15*

>   (* free if joining at the meeting)

>

>   INSIDERS GUIDE TO CAMPAIGN 2000

>   Dick Morris, political consultant and author of The New

> Prince

>

> Few people are better positioned to offer insights into what will be

> going on behind the scenes as the 2000 political campaign unfolds than

> political strategist Dick Morris, whom Time magazine recently called

> the most influential private citizen in America.

>

> Based on more than two decades of research into the political

> attitudes of American voters, Mr. Morris will address such issues as:

>

> * What are voters looking for in their candidates in 2000?

>

> * What will be the major items on the political agenda during Campaign

>   2000?

>

> * What strategies can we expect the candidates to use?

>

> * How and when do candidates use polls to develop strategy and

> tactics?

>

> * To what extent are politicians able to manipulate news coverage?

>

> * Is relentless polling driving idealism and vision out of politics?

>

> Mr. Morris has worked as a political advisor to politicians of both

> parties. He was political advisor to Bill Clinton when Clinton was

> governor of Arkansas in 1978 and continued as an advisor to President

> Clinton through his re-election in 1996. Mr. Morris is the author of

> the recently published book, The New Prince, a bold how-to guide for

> today's politicians and political candidates, written in the spirit of

> Niccolo Machiavelli's classic, The Prince. He is also a regular

> commentator on Fox News.

>

> BUILDING SECURITY CANNOT ADMIT ANYONE WHOSE NAME IS NOT

> ON OUR LIST!! If you are planning to attend, respond by Wed., 27 Oct.

>   E-mail RoniRosner@aol.com Or, if you must, call 722-5333

>

>

> --

> --

>

> Subject: Re: Psychologists Are Revolting

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 17:18:32 EDT

> From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> Jim:

>

> There's so much that could be (and has been) said about this, but

> reading what you circulated left me with nothing so much as a strong

> sense of d j vu. In March of 1979, I was one of two CBS witnesses

> who appeared in the course of formal FTC hearings into a great many

> facets of advertising directed to children. At that time, so much of

> this same ground was covered and covered and covered yet again to the

> point of absolute revulsion on the parts of all sides to the

> controversy.

>

> It was more than a little incongruous to hear quoted from the lips of

> lawyers, advertising people, broadcast-types like me (who was also a

> psychologist by training, which in helped in this particular venue),

> dentists, candy and cereal manufacturers -- that gang -- the thinking

> of Jean Piaget on the cognitive limitations of children's

> information-processing capacities. And, yes, the charge of instilling

> great gobs of materialism into television-viewing kids was on the

> table as well. Really, there wasn't any issue that wasn't on the

> table -- except for the question of how non-broadcast children's media

> (comic books, Jack and Jill, Highlights for Children, etc.) would

> handle this windfall that seemed about to drop in their collective

> laps.

>

> The charge of psychological manipulation was very much present and

> talked about in terms reminiscent of Vance Packard. The focus then

> was mainly on production techniques used to make children's products look

more appealing

> than they really were.   In the case of toys, for example, those practices

--

> together with the absence of batteries (about which the viewer was

> advised but in language said to be so obscure as to be meaningless)

> once the toy was actually acquired -- were held to lead inexorably to

> two unfortunate outcomes. One, the obvious disappointment on the part

> of the child; the other, flowing directly from that disappointment,

> carried more dire implications. Namely, the development of cynicism,

> first about the rewards to be expected from products advertised on

> television (which may not have been such an awful thing); but second a

> cynicism ("skepticism" was the term favored by the ads' defenders)

> that extended to advertising but also to much else in the child's

> lifespace, including parents, teachers, religious leaders, and so

> forth.

>

> So this has had a pretty thorough airing. Unless we're aware of new

> techniques and procedures of mind-manipulation to bend the child to

> the will of those with products and services to sell to him or her,

> then there are one or two other child-related problems which the

> petitioning psychologists and other well-intentioned groups might be

> better advised to seek remedy.

>

> Best --

>

> Phil Harding

> paharding7@aol.com

>

>

> --

> --

>

> Subject: Selling to Children, or Manipulating Them?

> Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 21:25:24 -0400

> From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>

> This article appeared in today's NY Times Advertising section.

> Although the focus is on marketing to children, it could conceivably

> have other implications for research among kids in general.

>

> Dick Halpern

>

> October 22, 1999

>

>   ADVERTISING

>

>   Selling to Children, or Manipulating Them?

>

>   Related Article

>   Advertising: Addenda (Oct. 22, 1999)

>

>   By CONSTANCE L. HAYS

>

>   DEPLORING what they see as an unfair and conflict-ridden

>   manipulation of the young, a group of psychologists and

other

>   professionals has called on the American Psychological

> Association

>   to restrict the use of psychological research by

> advertisers pitching toys,

>   video games, snack food and other products to children.

>

>   The letter, written by Gary Ruskin, who heads Commercial Alert,

a

>   Washington-based advocacy group, and Allen D. Kanner, a

clinical

>   psychologist at the Wright Institute in Berkeley, Calif.,

> was sent to the

> association's president late last month. It urges the

> association to issue a

> formal denunciation of the use of psychological techniques

> in marketing

> and advertising to children, and asks for amendments to the

> association's

> code of ethics that would address the issue.

>

> The letter, which was signed by 60 psychologists and other

> professionals

> with affiliations ranging from Sonoma State University to

> Harvard Medical

> School, also calls for "an ongoing campaign to probe,

> review and confront

> the use of psychological research in advertising and

> marketing to children,"

> which would include promoting strategies to shield children

from

> "commercial manipulation and exploitation" by

> psychologists.

>

> "Regrettably, a large gap has arisen between A.P.A.'s

> mission and the drift

> of the profession into helping corporations influence

> children for the

> purpose of selling products to them," the letter stated.

>

> A spokeswoman for the association said the matter had been

> referred to

>   its internal board on children, youth and family issues,

> and that the board

>   was scheduled to meet in March.

>

>   "Certainly there's no mention of the issue in our code of

> conduct," said the

>   spokeswoman, Rhea K. Farberman, adding that the points raised

in the

>   letter had not been brought before the association before.

>

>   Dr. Kanner said he wrote the letter after becoming

> concerned, through his

>   own conversations with children and teen-age patients, that

> they were, as a

>   group, blatantly materialistic. "I'll ask kids what they

> want to do when they

>   grow up, and lots of times they'll tell me, 'Make money,' "

> he said.

>

>   As for psychologists' role in that, he said research

> conducted at the

>   university level was frequently deployed in developing

> commercials and

>   other pitches to children. Since the stated mission of the

American

>   Psychological Association is "to improve the condition of

> both the individual

>   and society," he concluded that permitting research to be used

in

> advertising to children presented a conflict.
>
> "They are taking this very sophisticated understanding of
children's
> relationships and what they respond to, and then really
> tailoring it to the
> advertisement and refining it," he said. "There's no
> indication that it's
> helping kids with their relationships at all, but rather
> that it's manipulating
> them."
>
> Timothy J. Kasser, an associate professor of psychology at
> Knox College
> in Galesburg, Ill., who signed the letter, said he did so
> because he saw "a
> great deal of collusion between some members of psychology and
> marketing, advertising and entrepreneurial firms that are
> working together
> to try to understand how best to sell things to kids."
>
> Dr. Kasser said his research with a colleague, Richard Ryan of
the
> University of Rochester, had concluded that people who
> value goals like
> money, fame and beauty are not only more depressed than
> others, but also
> report more behavioral problems and physical discomfort, as
well as

> scoring lower on measures of vitality and
> self-actualization.
>
> For children, the consequences can be similarly damaging,
> Dr. Kasser said.
> "When advertisers are using psychological principles to
> sell products to
> children, they are not only selling that product, but they
> are also selling a
> larger value system that says making money and using your
> money for the
> purchase of material things will make you happy," he said.
> "That's what is
> really behind almost every commercial message, that this
> product will
> make you feel happy, or loved, or safe and secure. My
> feeling is that it is
> manipulation to use children's needs to get them to buy
> these products."
>
> Not every psychologist feels the same way. "The whole point
> is, if you're
> going to market to kids, do it responsibly and there are a
> whole lot of
> opportunities to make a positive difference," said Dan S.
> Acuff, who holds
> a doctorate in psychology and runs a company called Youth
Market
> Systems Consulting in Sherman Oaks, Calif.

>

> Dr. Acuff, who called the goals stated in the letter

> "anti-free enterprise,"

> published a book titled "What Kids Buy and Why" in 1997 that

offers

> insights into how to create a successful children's

> product. Included are

> discussions of neocortical development, in which children

> start to rely more

> on intellect, logic and reasoning and less on fantasy for

> their decision

> making. That, Dr. Acuff notes, in italics, "has critical

> implications for

> product and program development as well as marketing and

> advertising to

> kids in the 8-through-12 age range."

>

> But there is a line psychologists should draw, he added

> this week. "We turn

> down opportunities that would be damaging to kids," he

> said, "like toys with

> serious weapons in them -- guns, bombs, rifles and things

> like that."

> Fantasy weapons, like those carried by He-Man and Star Wars

figures,

> were acceptable to him, he added, but those based on "modern

> technological weapons" were not.

>

> Ms. Farberman, the association's spokeswoman, said

psychological

> techniques were also being used for "socially redeeming

> issues," like

> advertising campaigns to urge people not to drink and

> drive. "It's important

> not to lose sight of that," she said.

>

> Julie A. Halpin, the chief executive of Geppetto Group,

> which specializes in

> children's advertising, said psychologists were important

> in helping her

> company understand children and their capabilities. "For example, we

> learned that 6- and 7-year-olds don't understand

> double-entendres," she

> said. "They are simply trying to learn one meaning of a

> word at that age.

> So advertising copy that uses double-entendres as a clever

> device would

> not be appropriate, or effective. It's things like that

> that help us do the best

> job we can do."

>

> Still, Dr. Kasser raised a question: "Maybe we're helping

> the economy, but

> is that our mission as a discipline?"

>

>

> ----------

> Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

> Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

> Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology

> 3837 Courtyard Drive

> Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

> rshalpern@mindspring.com

> phone/fax 770 434 4121

>

> ----------

>From cshettle@erols.com Sun Oct 24 08:15:33 1999

Received: from smtp3.erols.com (smtp3.erols.com [207.172.3.236])

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

    id IAA13460 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 24 Oct 1999 08:15:32 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from cshettle (207-172-53-251.s251.tnt4.brd.va.dialup.rcn.com

[207.172.53.251])

    by smtp3.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id LAA12450

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 24 Oct 1999 11:15:29 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <3813212D.34E0@erols.com>

Date: Sun, 24 Oct 1999 11:09:33 -0400

From: "Carolyn F. Shettle" <cshettle@erols.com>

Reply-To: cshettle@erols.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-KC032698 (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Vacancy Announcement

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

Opportunity to join the D.C. Office of Temple University's Institute for

Survey Research. This is a small office responsible for several federally

funded projects in the areas of immigration, science education, the

environment and health. We are currently expanding our staff to meet the

demands of new projects and are looking for one or more individuals to work

with us. Minimum qualifications: Bachelors Degree and 4 years of experience,

Masters Degree and 2 years of experience or a Doctorate. Experience needed

in several of the following

areas: questionnaire design, interviewing methods, data analysis, report

writing, proposal preparation, literature review, survey sampling,

qualitative research techniques, client consultations, project management or

meeting coordination.

Send a cover letter stating salary requirements and a curriculum vitae

to: Mel Kollander, Institute for Survey Research, Temple University, 4646

40th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20016. Fax: 202-537-6873. E-Mail:

mellk@erols.com

From: Dave Lambert <Dave.Lambert@intersearch.tnsofres.com>

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

Subject: Re: Position Announcement

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 1999 09:45:03 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

Content-Type: text/plain;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

PROJECT DIRECTOR POSITION

TNS Intersearch, one of the world's leading polling and market research firms is seeking a Project Director for their Polling and Government Research Group.

Taylor Nelson Sofres is a leading provider of political and social opinion polls, especially for institutions, political parties and the media, in more than 20 countries in Europe, the US and Asia. TNS Intersearch, based in Horsham PA, conducts polling research for leading U.S. news organizations.

This individual would assist in all phases of project management, specifically in the area of public opinion research during the year 2000 political season. Job responsibilities include assisting with study design, questionnaire implementation, interviewer instruction and data delivery for daily, nightly and weekly tracking studies during the busy election cycle.

Candidates should possess their B.A degree in Political Science, Communications, Journalism or a related field and have a strong interest in the American electoral process. Any knowledge of SPSS is a plus.

All interested candidates should send a resume to:

dave.lambert@intersearch.tnsofres.com

>From mlongstr@comp.uark.edu Mon Oct 25 08:53:28 1999

Received: from comp.uark.edu (mlongstr@comp.uark.edu [130.184.252.197])

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

   id IAA12791 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Oct 1999 08:53:27 -0700

(PDT)

Received: (from mlongstr@localhost)

   by comp.uark.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) id KAA26426;

   Mon, 25 Oct 1999 10:53:26 -0500 (CDT)

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 1999 10:53:26 -0500 (CDT)

From: Molly Longstreth <mlongstr@comp.uark.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: incentives for students

Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.10.9910251050420.14959-100000@comp.uark.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

For those with universities, what are your policies with respect to offering

incentives for students to respond to administrative surveys? What are your

experiences? Thank you for your thoughts. Molly

Molly Longstreth, Ph.D.   University of Arkansas

Director   Fayetteville, AR 72701

Survey Research Center   501-575-4222

ADSB 100A   Fax: 501-575-4753

>From t00001@STCLOUDSTATE.EDU Mon Oct 25 10:10:31 1999

We have done over 12 telephone surveys of SCSU students with the goal of at
least 500 complete interviews for each. We have done two system surveys of
the seven state universities. At first our surveys were telephone paper and
pencil instruments from our lab but now we use our cati system.

Topics ranges from student fees, health surveys, computer useage, racial
issues and so on. Using coopertion rates, once we contact students we
routinely get over a 90% coopertion rate. So, I don't think you need much
of an incentive. Your bigger problem may be developing a good list. Our

administrative computer center draws our samples. However, as good as they

are students are very mobile and lists get dated.

a system At 10:53 AM 10/25/1999 -0500, you wrote:

>For those with universities, what are your policies with respect to

>offering incentives for students to respond to administrative surveys?

>What are your experiences? Thank you for your thoughts. Molly

>

>Molly Longstreth, Ph.D.   University of Arkansas

>Director   Fayetteville, AR 72701

>Survey Research Center   501-575-4222

>ADSB 100A   Fax: 501-575-4753

>

>

==

Dr. Steve Frank, Department of Political Science

St. Cloud State University St. Cloud, MN. 56301

FAX (320)-654-5422   VOICE (320)-255-4131

email t00001@stcloudstate.edu OR sfsurvey@stcloudstate.edu

Homepage: http://tigger.stcloud.msus.edu/~t00001/

Prelaw Homepage: http://condor.stcloud.msus.edu/~prelaw/

SCSU Survey Homepage: http://tigger.stcloud.msus.edu/scsusurvey/

So what this Jefferson dude was saying is: We left this England place

because it was bogus. If we don't get us some cool rules pronto, we'll just

be bogus too. Jeff Spicoli Fast Times At Ridgemont High

>From gulicke@slhn.org Mon Oct 25 10:49:23 1999

Received: from ntserver.slhn.org (ntserver.slhn.org [205.147.244.5])

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

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand

this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

What would be an acceptable response rate for a mail out survey in a

population aged 70 and above? Elizabeth P. Gulick Quality Coordinator St.

Luke's Hospital 801 Ostrum St. Bethlehem, PA 18015

(610) 954 - 4129

(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)

gulicke@slhn.org <mailto:gulicke@slhn.org>

------_=_NextPart_001_01BF1F11.2D6FE078

Content-Type: text/html;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">

<META NAME="Generator" CONTENT="MS Exchange Server version 5.5.2448.0">

<TITLE>Response rates in elderly population</TITLE> </HEAD> <BODY>

<P><FONT SIZE=2 FACE="Arial">What would be an acceptable response rate for a

mail out survey in a population aged 70 and above?</FONT>
<B><I><FONT

SIZE=2 FACE="Tahoma">Elizabeth P. Gulick</FONT></I></B>
<FONT SIZE=2

FACE="Tahoma">Quality Coordinator</FONT>
<FONT SIZE=2 FACE="Tahoma">St.

Luke's Hospital</FONT>
<FONT SIZE=2 FACE="Tahoma">801 Ostrum St.</FONT>

<FONT SIZE=2 FACE="Tahoma">Bethlehem, PA&nbsp; 18015</FONT>
<FONT

SIZE=2 FACE="Tahoma">(610) 954 - 4129</FONT>
<FONT SIZE=2

FACE="Tahoma">(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)</FONT>
<A

HREF="mailto:gulicke@slhn.org"><U><FONT COLOR="#0000FF" SIZE=2

FACE="Tahoma">gulicke@slhn.org</FONT></U></A>

</P>

</BODY>

</HTML>

------_=_NextPart_001_01BF1F11.2D6FE078--

>From hendersp@BATTELLE.ORG Mon Oct 25 10:55:39 1999

Received: from bclcl1.im.battelle.org (bclcl1.im.battelle.org [131.167.1.2])

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

Computer Programmer - IMMEDIATE

Battelle, a world leader in research and technology, has an immediate

opening for an experienced programmer to develop systems in support of

epidemiologic and evaluation research conducted at the Centers for Publish

Health Research and Evaluation (CPHRE).

Position requires a minimum of 5 years programming experience and 3 years

using Visual Basic and Access to design, code, debug, and maintain

user-friendly stand-alone applications. Some experience with hardware and

software support on a network is a plus.

Successful applicant should be self-motivated, good interpersonal skills,

and able to translate project design into applications that can easily be

used by project members at all levels of experience. The working

environment is Windows 95 workstations on a Windows NT network, using

Microsoft Office 97 products.

Battelle offers a comprehensive package of salary and benefits. If

qualified, please submit a cover letter and resume to: Ms. Judy Aubuchon

Battelle 1101 Olivette Executive Parkway, Suite 200 St. Louis, MO 63132 Fax

314-993-5163 aubuchon@battelle.org

Battelle is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer M/F/D/V.

Message-id:

<CAD5FA6C4518D311B14800A0C98439DF1D275A@ns-bco-mse5.im.battelle.org>

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Battelle, a world leader in research and technology, has an opening in

support of Battelle's Centers for Public Health Research and Evaluation

(CPHRE). This position is located in our St. Louis office.

RESEARCH PROJECT DIRECTOR

Research Project Director needed for health research firm in Olivette, MO.

PhD or DrPH in epidemiology or related field and at least five years

experience in managing government contracts and /or private industry funded

clinical trials required. Position involves research design, data

collection and management, providing technical direction to project staff,

making significant contribution to business development efforts and

financial management of projects. Must have a proven track record of

managing multiple, diverse, complex tasks simultaneously.

Battelle offers a comprehensive package of salary and benefits. If

qualified, please mail, email, or fax a cover letter and resume to : Judy

Aubuchon, Office Administrator, Battelle, 1101 Olivette Executive Parkway,

Suite 200, St. Louis, MO 63132. Fax 314-993-5163 aubuchon@battelle.org.

Battelle is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer M/F/D/V.

>From jpearson@stanford.edu Mon Oct 25 11:43:41 1999

Received: from smtp2.Stanford.EDU (smtp2.Stanford.EDU [171.64.14.23])

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

    id LAA22742 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Oct 1999 11:43:40 -0700

(PDT)

I've done quite a few focus groups with Stanford students, and have never
needed to offer incentives. I've done perhaps over 100 focus groups with
alumni and have never needed incentives (even for groups conducted
exclusively with doctors and lawyers for the Med School and Law School).
Alumni respond very well when they feel their alma mater values them for
their thoughts, opinions, and ideas...and not just for their money. And
alumni (at least Stanford alumni) are not shy about speaking up.

I've also done two surveys with Stanford students, using random samples --
one with incentives and one without. The response rate was just about the
same (about two-thirds) on both. Both surveys were done on the web --
invitations to the sample were sent by e-mail, and the link to the survey
was right there for them to click on. (All our students have e-mail
addresses and all have web access.) The link took them to the authorization
page, and once authorized, they were taken to the survey.

There are a few keys, I think, that may be more important than incentives:

1) Have the e-mail invitation come from someone the students know and respect. One of my surveys was done for the Vice Provost for Student Affairs, and the other was for the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. The students knew and liked both of them, and I think responded to their names more than they would have responded to mine.

2) Clearly articulate in the invitation how the survey is salient to their own interests...and how the results will be used. Make it clear that you're not just wasting their time, that the survey WILL be used to better inform those making policy decisions (if this is true. If not, good luck). Like many people, students want to be heard. As large and complex as your institution may be, it is smaller than the nation as a whole -- so students can be persuaded that their participation in the survey can make a difference. If they are frustrated at all, it's with the focused nature of a survey: Written with specific objectives in mind, the surveys measure only certain things. So there will be some students who express disappointment that other areas were not investigated (and mistakenly feel the survey missed the point).

3) Schedule the survey very carefully. Obviously, make sure exams or other major events don't conflict. But also make sure other surveys are not being conducted at about the same time. (I was amazed at how many surveys our students were being bombarded with -- from housing and dining, residential education, the advising center, etc etc.)

4) Follow up with non-respondents, just as you would on a mail survey -- but

with a much more accelerated timetable. On the web, you will get the bulk of your completed interviews directly after each e-mailing. For instance, one of my surveys was with a sample of 800. The invitation was sent one day at noon, and by 5pm we had 100 completes. By the next morning, another 60 had completed it. By that afternoon, only another 12 had completed it. By the next morning, only another 13 had completed it. When I sent a reminder to the non-respondents one afternoon, we got another 128 completions by morning. Then it trickled off again. Same thing happened when I sent the final reminder -- 93 more completions very quickly, and then it trickled off. I think that with web surveys, people either respond fairly immediately or else they delete the message. I don't think too many save the message in order to respond later. Students seem to check their e-mail most at lunch time and at night.

5) As with any market, response from the most connected and involved students will be greater than response from more disinterested students. In one survey, I got a 70% response rate from the cohort that had participated in an intimate and intense program called Sophomore College; the response rate for the non-Sophomore College sample was 57%.

6) If you do web surveys, have a techie available AT ALL TIMES. Server glitches do crop up -- I know that more students tried to do my surveys than the completion rates indicated. I received phone calls and e-mails from students who had technical problems. Some were able to finally do the surveys, but others gave up after experiencing repeated problems. Even with the pre-testing I did, the old cliche applied: Still a few bugs in the system!

By the way, my only expense on my web surveys was the few bucks charged by

the techies. I'm sure I have plenty of other observations about surveying

students, but this is what comes to mind at the moment.

Jerold Pearson, '75

Director of Market Research

Stanford University

650-723-9186

jpearson@stanford.edu

http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/

>From langley@pop.uky.edu Mon Oct 25 12:09:51 1999

Received: from smtp.uky.edu (smtp.uky.edu [128.163.2.17])

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

    id MAA14322 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Oct 1999 12:09:50 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from pop.uky.edu (pop.uky.edu [128.163.2.16])

    by smtp.uky.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id PAA56238

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Oct 1999 15:09:49 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from nc.gws.uky.edu (rgs51.gws.uky.edu [128.163.30.142])

    by pop.uky.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id PAA10482

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 25 Oct 1999 15:09:49 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.32.19991025150948.006ebcb4@pop.uky.edu>

X-Sender: langley@pop.uky.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 1999 15:09:49 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Ronald E. Langley" <langley@pop.uky.edu>

Subject: Re: incentives for students

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

We typically do not offer incentives to students unless it is a particularly

long survey, and even then it is something modest such as a coupon for $1 or

$2 off a meal at one of the on-campus food outlets. On surveys about

sensitive topics and behaviors, students are more than willing to respond

without incentives as long as we convince them of anonymity.

At 10:53 AM 10/25/1999 -0500, you wrote:

>For those with universities, what are your policies with respect to

>offering incentives for students to respond to administrative surveys?

>What are your experiences? Thank you for your thoughts. Molly

>

>Molly Longstreth, Ph.D.   University of Arkansas

>Director   Fayetteville, AR 72701

>Survey Research Center   501-575-4222

>ADSB 100A   Fax: 501-575-4753

>

>

Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D.   Phone: (606)257-4684

Director, Survey Research Center   FAX: (606) 323-1972

University of Kentucky   Pager: 288-5771

403 Breckinridge Hall   langley@pop.uky.edu

Lexington, KY 40506-0056

    http://www.rgs.uky.edu/src/srchome.htm

>From RobFarbman@aol.com Mon Oct 25 13:08:38 1999

Received: from imo-d08.mx.aol.com (imo-d08.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.40])

Market Research Analyst

Edison Media Research, a small, rapidly growing market research company

located in Central New Jersey is seeking an experienced research analyst.

In

this position you will be responsible for coordinating research projects

from

questionnaire development through data analysis and presentation.

We are looking for a college graduate with 1-3 years experience in market or

media research. The ideal candidate should be detail-oriented and

self-motivated, with the ability to handle multiple tasks in a fast-paced

environment. An interest in media, music and pop culture is a plus.

Computer skills essential.

We offer competitive salary and benefits package including 401(k) with

employer match and employer-paid health insurance.

Edison Media Research conducts survey research and provides strategic

information to radio stations, television stations, newspapers, cable

networks, record labels and other media organizations.

Edison Media Research has been recognized by Advertising Age as one of the

fastest growing research companies in America. Our clients include CBS

News,

CNN,

The Country Music Association, Maverick Records, The New York Times,

The Cleveland Cavs, Sony Music, Time-Life Music, The Washington Post and

over

200 radio stations.

Please mail, fax or email resume, which must include salary requirements to:

Edison Media Research

6 West Cliff Street

Somerville, NJ 08876

Fax: 908-707-4740

rfarbman@edisonresearch.com

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Tue Oct 26 04:04:04 1999

Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu

[128.146.214.32])

At 01:48 PM 10/25/99 -0400, you wrote:

>What would be an acceptable response rate for a mail out survey in a

>population aged 70 and above? Elizabeth P. Gulick

>Quality Coordinator

>St. Luke's Hospital

>801 Ostrum St.

>Bethlehem, PA 18015

>(610) 954 - 4129

>(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)

>gulicke@slhn.org <mailto:gulicke@slhn.org>

>

Elizabeth,

The concern really should be "what is the likelihood of nonresponse error at different response rates for this (or any) population?"

The question posed about response rates cannot be answered statistically unless one knows or can estimate something about the likelihood that the nonresponders at different response rate levels are meaningfully different from the responders.

However, from a "political" standpoint, your client (probably at least somewhat in ignorance) expects a certain response rate in order to consider the research credible.

Good luck.

>From ande271@attglobal.net Tue Oct 26 08:16:32 1999
Received: from out2.prserv.net (out2.prserv.net [165.87.194.229])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA11250 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Oct 1999 08:16:31 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (slip-32-100-113-221.ny.us.prserv.net
[32.100.113.221])
    by out2.prserv.net (/) with SMTP id PAA47674
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Oct 1999 15:16:26 GMT
Message-ID: <3815F108.75C6@attglobal.net>
Date: Tue, 26 Oct 1999 11:20:56 -0700
From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@attglobal.net>
Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: [Fwd: Re: Response rates in elderly population]

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="------------4CB14A374EE2"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--------------4CB14A374EE2

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Professor Lavrakas may not be aware that Ms. Gulick conducts her own research. I am guessing that the mail survey she refers to is probably of discharged patients. The response is probably quite low in this case, due to the nature of the survey as well as to the ages of the prospective respondents. These post-hospital evaluations would be much more useful if several attempts to obtain responses were made. A reminder post card, and possibly a follow-up telephone call to at least a few of the non-responders should be attempted.

Comparing responders with non-responders as to length of stay, diagnosis, and family status among other variables should give a clearer idea of whether responders are different from non-responders. Also, try comparing first responders with "prompted" responders. There are several steps that can be taken in interpeting the results if there is considerable bias (meaning, here, difference between responders and non-responders). Other AAPor members may be able to help at that point or may have additional experience with post-hospital evaluation surveys.

If I am mistaken and this is not what the survey of older people is about, I

apologize for guessing.

--------------4CB14A374EE2

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from usc.edu [128.125.253.136] by in5.prserv.net id

940936468.155040-1 ; Tue, 26 Oct 1999 11:14:28 +0000

Received: from usc.edu (listproc@localhost [127.0.0.1])

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

    id EAA00908; Tue, 26 Oct 1999 04:04:15 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu

[128.146.214.32])

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

    id EAA00812 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Oct 1999 04:04:01 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from pjl1 (pjl1.sbs.ohio-state.edu [128.146.93.67])

    by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id HAA10303

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Oct 1999 07:04:00 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19991026110345.008952b8@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 1999 07:03:45 -0400

Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

Precedence: bulk

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Response rates in elderly population

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

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

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

X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

At 01:48 PM 10/25/99 -0400, you wrote:

>What would be an acceptable response rate for a mail out survey in a

>population aged 70 and above? Elizabeth P. Gulick

>Quality Coordinator

>St. Luke's Hospital

>801 Ostrum St.

>Bethlehem, PA 18015

>(610) 954 - 4129

>(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)

>gulicke@slhn.org <mailto:gulicke@slhn.org>

>

Elizabeth,

The concern really should be "what is the likelihood of nonresponse error at

different response rates for this (or any) population?"

The question posed about response rates cannot be answered statistically

unless one knows or can estimate something about the likelihood that the

nonresponders at different response rate levels are meaningfully different

from the responders.

However, from a "political" standpoint, your client (probably at least

somewhat in ignorance) expects a certain response rate in order to consider

the research credible.

Good luck.

--------------4CB14A374EE2--

>From zukin@rci.rutgers.edu Tue Oct 26 13:04:14 1999

Received: from gehenna0.rutgers.edu (gehenna0.rutgers.edu [165.230.116.155])

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

   id NAA09483 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 26 Oct 1999 13:04:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: (qmail 11529 invoked by alias); 26 Oct 1999 20:03:51 -0000

Received: (qmail 11521 invoked from network); 26 Oct 1999 20:03:51 -0000

Received: from dpp273.rutgers.edu (HELO rci.rutgers.edu) (165.230.50.130)

  by gehenna0.rutgers.edu with SMTP; 26 Oct 1999 20:03:51 -0000

Message-ID: <38160A77.A85D1D8A@rci.rutgers.edu>

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 1999 16:09:28 -0400

From: Cliff Zukin <zukin@rci.rutgers.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win98; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Job Announcement

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I'm posting this for a sister agency at Rutgers. Apologies for

cross-postings.

Survey Research Analyst. The Center for State Health Policy within the

Institute for Health, Health Care Policy, and Aging Research at Rutgers

University seeks a survey research analyst to conduct surveys to gather data

for the analysis of state health policy issues. The Survey Research Analyst

will design and implement surveys to support Center research and policy

analysis projects, analyze survey data, and maintain archive of health

survey instruments. Requires master's degree in a social science or a

public health field with one year of survey design/analysis experience, or

bachelor's degree in social science or public health and four years of

survey design/analysis experience. Must have strong working knowledge of

statistical analysis software and basic PC applications. Health care survey

experience preferred desirable. Salary commensurate with qualifications and

experience. Applicants should send a resume to University Human Resources,

Rutgers the State University of New Jersey, 56 Bevier Road, Piscataway, NJ

08854-8010.

Please reference job posting #RU225.   .

--

Cliff Zukin   Rutgers University   e-mail: zukin@rci.rutgers.edu

Chair & Graduate Director * Department of Public Policy

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

33 Livingston Ave., Suite 202 *   New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1980

732/932-2499 x 712 (Of) * 732/932-1107 (Fx)

Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton Poll * Eagleton Inst. of Politics 185 Ryders

Lane * New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8557 732/932-9384 x 247 (Of) *

732/932-1551 (Fx)

Anyone know a website that lists the current state schedule for

U.S. Presidential primaries?

Please respond: HOEYD@SUNYNASSAU.EDU

Thank you

>From bthompson@directionsrsch.com Wed Oct 27 08:01:00 1999

Received: from proxy.directionsrsch.com (IDENT:root@dri74.directionsrsch.com

[206.112.196.74])

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

    id IAA11341 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 08:00:54 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from drione.directionsrsch.com

    by proxy.directionsrsch.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id KAA20599

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 10:09:32 -0400

Received: by drione.directionsrsch.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.3 (733.2

10-16-1998)) id 85256817.00521925 ; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 10:56:43 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI

From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <85256817.00521708.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 1999 10:56:37 -0400

Subject: Re: Presidential Primary Schedule

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

You might try the Republican National Committee or Democratic National

Committee home pages.

>From mkshares@mcs.net Wed Oct 27 08:18:21 1999

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

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

    id IAA20378 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 08:18:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P12-Chi-Dial-4.pool.mcs.net [205.253.224.204]) by

Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id KAA09817 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Wed, 27 Oct 1999 10:18:18 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <3816D169.66A8BF56@mcs.net>

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 1999 10:18:23 +0000

From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Presidential Primary Schedule

References: <5CA2C2D6BE2@nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Here are a couple. I don't know how current they are.

http://www.politicalresources.com/

Look for "calendar" on this cnn page.

http://cnn.com/ELECTION/2000/

DION HOEY wrote:

> Anyone know a website that lists the current state schedule for U.S.

> Presidential primaries?

>

> Please respond: HOEYD@SUNYNASSAU.EDU

>

> Thank you

>From janisrussell@yahoo.com Wed Oct 27 08:35:11 1999

Received: from web805.mail.yahoo.com (web805.mail.yahoo.com [128.11.23.65])

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

    id IAA02008 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 08:34:56 -0700

(PDT)

Message-ID: <19991027153438.20362.rocketmail@web805.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [208.233.17.171] by web805.mail.yahoo.com; Wed, 27 Oct 1999

08:34:38 PDT

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 1999 08:34:38 -0700 (PDT)

From: Janis Russell <janisrussell@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Presidential Primary Schedule

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

This is a current site updated 9/14/99

http://www.fec.gov/pages/2kdates.htm

--- DION HOEY <hoeyd@sunynassau.edu> wrote:

> Anyone know a website that lists the current state

> schedule for

> U.S. Presidential primaries?

>

> Please respond: HOEYD@SUNYNASSAU.EDU

>

> Thank you

>

>

=====

_____

Do You Yahoo!?

Bid and sell for free at http://auctions.yahoo.com

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Oct 27 11:54:00 1999

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

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

    id LAA11330 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 11:54:00 -0700

(PDT)

2000 PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY DATES (as of Sept. 14, 1999)

JANUARY

    January   22   Louisiana (Republican, in caucus; not yet formally

set)

    January 31 Iowa (in caucus; not yet formally set)

FEBRUARY

    February 8 New Hampshire (not yet formally set)

February 12 Delaware (not yet formally set)

February 19 South Carolina (Republican)

February 22 Arizona (Republican)

      Michigan (both parties; Democrat may shift)

February 26 American Samoa (Republican, in caucus)

      Guam (Republican, in caucus)

      South Carolina (Democrat)

      Virgin Islands (Republican, in caucus)

February 29 North Dakota (Republican, in caucus)

      Washington

      Virginia (both parties; Democrat may shift)

   MARCH

March 5   Puerto Rico (Republican)

March 7   California

      Connecticut

      Georgia

      Hawaii (Democrat, in caucus)

      Maine

      Maryland

      Massachusetts

      Minnesota (in caucus)

      Missouri

New York

North Dakota (Democrat, in caucus)

Ohio

Rhode Island

Vermont

March 10   Colorado

Utah

Wyoming (in caucus)

March 11   Arizona (Democrat))

Michigan (Democrat, in caucus)

March 12   Puerto Rico (Democrat)

March 14   Florida

Louisiana (both parties; Republican may shift)

Mississippi

Oklahoma

Tennessee

Texas

March 21   Illinois

APRIL

April 4   Kansas

Wisconsin

April 25   Pennsylvania

MAY

May nd   Virginia (Democrat, in caucus; not yet formally set)

May 2   District of Columbia
        Indiana
        North Carolina

May 9   Nebraska
        West Virginia

May 16   Oregon

May 19   Alaska (Republican, caucus in convention)
        Hawaii (Republican, in caucus)

May 19-21   Nevada (Democrat, caucus in convention)

May 20   Alaska (Democrat, caucus in convention)

May 23   Arkansas
        Idaho
        Kentucky

May 25   Nevada (Republican, caucus in convention)

JUNE

June 6   Alabama

            Montana

            New Jersey

            New Mexico

            South Dakota

****

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Wed Oct 27 12:19:27 1999

Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net

[207.69.200.246])

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

    id MAA00516 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 12:19:24 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-2ive4p0.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.19.32])

    by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id PAA08108

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 15:18:58 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991027152120.00c1b600@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 1999 15:22:34 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

Subject: Re: 2000 PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY DATES

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9910271142020.21481-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

This is outdated. Subtract one week from each of the first three events.

some of the other dates have changed also.

At 11:53 AM 10/27/99 -0700, you wrote:

> 2000 PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY DATES (as of Sept. 14, 1999)

>

>

> JANUARY

>

> January 22   Louisiana (Republican, in caucus; not yet

> formally set)

>

> January 31   Iowa (in caucus; not yet formally set)

>

> FEBRUARY

>

> February 8   New Hampshire (not yet formally set)

>

> February 12   Delaware (not yet formally set)

>

> February 19   South Carolina (Republican)

>

> February 22   Arizona (Republican)

>   Michigan (both parties; Democrat may shift)

>

> February 26   American Samoa (Republican, in caucus)

>   Guam (Republican, in caucus)

>   South Carolina (Democrat)

>   Virgin Islands (Republican, in caucus)

>

> February 29   North Dakota (Republican, in caucus)

>   Washington

>   Virginia (both parties; Democrat may shift)

>

>   MARCH

>

> March 5   Puerto Rico (Republican)

>

> March 7   California

>   Connecticut

>   Georgia

>   Hawaii (Democrat, in caucus)

>   Maine

>   Maryland

>   Massachusetts

>   Minnesota (in caucus)

>   Missouri

>   New York

>   North Dakota (Democrat, in caucus)

>   Ohio

>   Rhode Island

>   Vermont

>

> March 10   Colorado

>   Utah

>   Wyoming (in caucus)

>

> March 11   Arizona (Democrat))

>   Michigan (Democrat, in caucus)

>

> March 12   Puerto Rico (Democrat)

>

> March 14   Florida

>   Louisiana (both parties; Republican may shift)

>   Mississippi

>   Oklahoma

>   Tennessee

>   Texas

>

> March 21   Illinois

>

>   APRIL

>

> April 4   Kansas

>   Wisconsin

>

> April 25   Pennsylvania

>

>   MAY

>

> May nd   Virginia (Democrat, in caucus; not yet formally

set)

>

> May 2   District of Columbia

>   Indiana

>   North Carolina

>

> May 9   Nebraska

>   West Virginia

>

> May 16   Oregon

>

> May 19   Alaska (Republican, caucus in convention)

>   Hawaii (Republican, in caucus)

>

> May 19-21   Nevada (Democrat, caucus in convention)

>

> May 20   Alaska (Democrat, caucus in convention)

>

> May 23   Arkansas

>   Idaho

>   Kentucky

>

> May 25   Nevada (Republican, caucus in convention)

>

>   JUNE

>

> June 6   Alabama

>   Montana

>   New Jersey

>   New Mexico

>   South Dakota

>

>*******

Mitofsky International

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From David_Moore@gallup.com Wed Oct 27 12:32:09 1999

Received: from fw ([63.71.157.115])

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

    id MAA13992 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 12:32:08 -0700

(PDT)

From: David_Moore@gallup.com

Received: from exchng1.gallup.com (gallup.com [198.175.140.73])

    by fw (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id OAA17198

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 14:31:35 -0500 (CDT)

Received: by gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

    id <VCWY6BRR>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 14:31:36 -0500

Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90992355@EXCHNG3>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: 2000 PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY DATES

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 1999 14:31:33 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

The New Hampshire Primary is formally set for February 1 and the Iowa

Caucuses will definitely be (or has been) set for 8 days earlier. Because

Delaware was having the audacity to set its primary just 4 days after NH,

rather than the 7 days required by NH law, NH was forced to move its primary

date up a week...to retain its "First-in-the Nation" primary status.

David W. Moore

The Gallup Organization

47 Hulfish Street

Princeton, NJ 08542

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

From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 1999 1:54 PM

To: AAPORNET

Subject: 2000 PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY DATES

2000 PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY DATES (as of Sept. 14, 1999)

JANUARY

January   22   Louisiana (Republican, in caucus; not yet formally set)

January 31 Iowa (in caucus; not yet formally set)

FEBRUARY

February 8 New Hampshire (not yet formally set)

February 12 Delaware (not yet formally set)

February 19 South Carolina (Republican)

February 22 Arizona (Republican)
    Michigan (both parties; Democrat may shift)

February 26 American Samoa (Republican, in caucus)
    Guam (Republican, in caucus)
    South Carolina (Democrat)
    Virgin Islands (Republican, in caucus)

February 29 North Dakota (Republican, in caucus)
    Washington
    Virginia (both parties; Democrat may shift)

MARCH

March 5   Puerto Rico (Republican)

March 7   California

Connecticut

Georgia

Hawaii (Democrat, in caucus)

Maine

Maryland

Massachusetts

Minnesota (in caucus)

Missouri

New York

North Dakota (Democrat, in caucus)

Ohio

Rhode Island

Vermont

March 10   Colorado

Utah

Wyoming (in caucus)

March 11   Arizona (Democrat))

Michigan (Democrat, in caucus)

March 12   Puerto Rico (Democrat)

March 14   Florida

Louisiana (both parties; Republican may shift)

Mississippi

Oklahoma

Tennessee

Texas

March 21   Illinois

APRIL

April 4   Kansas

Wisconsin

April 25   Pennsylvania

MAY

May nd   Virginia (Democrat, in caucus; not yet formally set)

May 2   District of Columbia

Indiana

North Carolina

May 9   Nebraska

West Virginia

May 16   Oregon

May 19   Alaska (Republican, caucus in convention)

Hawaii (Republican, in caucus)

May 19-21   Nevada (Democrat, caucus in convention)

May 20   Alaska (Democrat, caucus in convention)

May 23   Arkansas

        Idaho

        Kentucky

May 25   Nevada (Republican, caucus in convention)

    JUNE

June 6   Alabama

        Montana

        New Jersey

        New Mexico

        South Dakota

****

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Wed Oct 27 21:49:40 1999

Received: from smtp5.mindspring.com (smtp5.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])

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

    id VAA13054 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 27 Oct 1999 21:49:35 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from warrenmi (user-2ive51v.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.20.63])

    by smtp5.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id AAA24487

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 00:49:35 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991028004710.01f031f0@pop.mindspring.com>

Rob,

The coding of the open end responses was fine. I reordered the categories

so they were the same from one group to the next in order to facilitate

comparisons. Thanks for doing it so quickly.

I will be back in New York Nov. 11. Off to a conference and the Mexican

presidential election on Nov 7th.

     warren

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031

212 980-3107 fax

e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Thu Oct 28 05:01:22 1999

Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu

[128.146.214.33])

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

    id FAA23046 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 05:01:21 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from oemcomputer (ts14-2.homenet.ohio-state.edu [140.254.113.41])

    by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id HAA25404

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 07:58:18 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 1999 07:58:18 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <199910281158.HAA25404@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="iso-8859-1"

To: aapornet@usc.edu

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

Subject: Re: Market/Media Research Analyst Position

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id FAA23047

Warren,

I juts finished reading the paper on the plane yesterday. I will look for
you here today to chat briefly about our thoughts. I did not find the paper
very easy to read.

At 12:49 AM 10/28/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Rob,

>The coding of the open end responses was fine. I reordered the

>categories

>so they were the same from one group to the next in order to facilitate

>comparisons. Thanks for doing it so quickly.

>

>I will be back in New York Nov. 11. Off to a conference and the Mexican

>presidential election on Nov 7th.

>   warren

>

>MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL

>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

>New York, NY 10022

>

>212 980-3031

>212 980-3107 fax

>

>e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com

>

>

>

>From tmadonna@marauder.millersv.edu Thu Oct 28 05:24:19 1999

Received: from marauder.millersv.edu (marauder.millersv.edu [192.206.29.9])

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

    id FAA27919 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 05:24:18 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from terry ([166.66.16.160])

    by marauder.millersv.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id IAA15065

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 08:25:22 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <004801bf213e$ef926160$a01042a6@millersv.edu>

From: "Terry Madonna" <tmadonna@marauder.millersv.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Keystone Poll - Philadelphia Mayor Race

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 1999 08:21:12 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

    boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0045_01BF211D.6565C5C0"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2014.211

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_0045_01BF211D.6565C5C0

Content-Type: text/plain;

    charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The final Keystone Philadelphia mayoral poll for this election cycle can =

be found under Survey Releases at: http://www.millersv.edu/~politics

This mayoral election is one of the year's most important elections. = Not

only will it be more expensive than any other big city election in the

country, with spending in the 25-million dollar range, but it will be = more

expensive than the gubernatorial elections being held this year.

The survey finds that either candidate could emerge as the winner next =

week, which raises the possibility of a Republican becoming mayor of another

= major city, despite a 4 to 1 voter registration deficit.

If you are interested in receiving survey release information by e-mail,

please notify me.

Terry Madonna, Director tmadonna@marauder.millersv.edu

Center for Politics & Public Affairs

Millersville University

------=_NextPart_000_0045_01BF211D.6565C5C0

Content-Type: text/html;

   charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN"> <HTML><HEAD>

<META content=3D"text/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1" =

http-equiv=3DContent-Type> <META content=3D"MSHTML 5.00.2614.3401"

name=3DGENERATOR> <STYLE></STYLE> </HEAD> <BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2>The final Keystone Philadelphia mayoral poll for = this

election=20 cycle can be
found under Survey Releases at: <A=20

href=3D"http://www.millersv.edu/~politics">http://www.millersv.edu/~polit=

ics</A>

This=20

mayoral election is one of the year's most important elections. =20

Not
only will it be more expensive than any other big city election =

in=20 the
country, with spending in the 25-million dollar range, but it =

will be=20 more
expensive than the gubernatorial elections being held

this=20 year.

The survey finds that either candidate could emerge as

the = winner=20 next week,
which raises the possibility of a Republican

becoming = mayor of=20 another major
city, despite a 4 to 1 voter

registration = deficit.

If=20 you are interested in receiving survey

release information by = e-mail,
please=20 notify me.

Terry

Madonna, Director <A=20

href=3D"mailto:tmadonna@marauder.millersv.edu">tmadonna@marauder.millersv=

.edu</A>
Center=20

for Politics & Public Affairs
Millersville=20

University

</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>

------=_NextPart_000_0045_01BF211D.6565C5C0--

>From mkshares@mcs.net Thu Oct 28 07:03:05 1999

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

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

    id HAA05850 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 07:03:04 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P3-Chi-Dial-6.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.67]) by

Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id JAA27615 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Thu, 28 Oct 1999 09:03:02 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <38181144.50B7EE32@mcs.net>

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 1999 09:03:04 +0000

From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: 2000 PRESIDENTIAL DATES

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="------------AAEDBA7F4C461219ED3EAEEE"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--------------AAEDBA7F4C461219ED3EAEEE

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This calendar from CNN appears to be more current on the early dates..

Differences from the e-mailed calendar from members appear for:

IA - Dems. & GOP; NH - Dems. & GOP; MI - Dems; SC - Dems.; AK - Dems. & GOP;

HI - GOP; ID - Dems; and NV - Dems.

http://cnn.com/interactive/allpolitics/9907/primaries/content/state.primarie

s.html

--------------AAEDBA7F4C461219ED3EAEEE

Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii; name="state.primaries.html"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline;

 filename="state.primaries.html"

Content-Base: "http://cnn.com/interactive/allpolitics

/9907/primaries/content/state.prima

ries.html"

Content-Location: "http://cnn.com/interactive/allpolitics

/9907/primaries/content/state.prima

ries.html"

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<TITLE>CNN - Content</TITLE>

<SCRIPT LANGUAGE="Javascript" SRC="/virtual/1998/code/cnn.js"></SCRIPT>

<LINK REL="stylesheet" HREF="/virtual/1998/code/cnn.css" TYPE="text/css">

</HEAD>

<BODY BGCOLOR="#003366" TEXT="#000000" LINK="#3366CC" VLINK="#3366CC"

ALINK="#000000"> <center> <TABLE bgcolor="#FFFFFF" CELLPADDING=2

CELLSPACING=0 BORDER=0 HSPACE="5" VSPACE="5" width="95%"> <TR> <TD

valign=top> <!--===========HEADLINE==========-->

State primaries

<!--===========/HEADLINE=========-->

<!--===========CAPTION=========-->

<FONT SIZE="2" FACE="verdana,sans-serif">

<P>

Alabama

GOP primary: June 6, 2000

Democratic primary: June 6, 2000

Alaska

GOP caucuses/straw poll: January 24, 2000

Democratic caucuses: March 25, 2000

Arizona

GOP primary: February 22, 2000

Democratic caucuses: March 11, 2000 **tentative

Arkansas

GOP primary: May 23, 2000

Democratic primary: May 23, 2000

California

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

Colorado

GOP primary: March 10, 2000

Democratic primary: March 10, 2000

Connecticut

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

Delaware

GOP caucuses: February 15, 2000 **party run

Democratic primary: February 12, 2000 **tentative

<H4>Florida</H4>

GOP primary: March 14, 2000

Democratic primary: March 14, 2000

<H4>Georgia</H4>

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

<H4>Hawaii</H4>

GOP caucuses: February 1-7, 2000 **tentative

Democratic caucuses: March 7, 2000

<H4>Idaho</H4>

GOP primary: May 23, 2000

Democratic caucuses: March 7, 2000

<H4>Illinois</H4>

GOP primary: March 21, 2000

Democratic primary: March 21, 2000

<H4>Indiana</H4>

GOP primary: May 2, 2000

Democratic primary: May 2, 2000

<H4>Iowa</H4>

GOP caucuses: January 24, 2000

Democratic caucuses: January 24, 2000

<H4>Kansas</H4>

GOP primary: April 4, 2000

Democratic primary: April 4, 2000

<H4>Kentucky</H4>

GOP primary: May 23, 2000

Democratic primary: May 23, 2000

<H4>Louisiana</H4>

GOP caucuses: January 15, 2000 --

21 out of 28 delegates chosen

GOP primary: March 14, 2000 --

7 out of 28 delegates chosen

Democratic primary: March 14, 2000

<H4>Maine</H4>

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

<H4>Maryland</H4>

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

<H4>Massachusetts</H4>

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

Michigan

GOP primary: February 22, 2000

Democratic caucuses: March 11, 2000

Minnesota

GOP caucuses/straw poll: March 7, 2000

Democratic caucuses: March 7, 2000

Mississippi

GOP primary: March 14, 2000

Democratic primary: March 14, 2000

Missouri

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

Montana

GOP primary: June 6, 2000

Democratic primary: June 6, 2000

Nebraska

GOP primary: May 9, 2000

Democratic primary: May 9, 2000

Nevada

GOP caucuses: May 25, 2000

Democratic caucuses: March 12, 2000

<H4>New Hampshire</H4>

GOP primary: February 1, 2000

Democratic primary: February 1, 2000

<H4>New Jersey</H4>

GOP primary: June 6, 2000

Democratic primary: June 6, 2000

<H4>New Mexico</H4>

GOP primary: June 6, 2000

Democratic primary: June 6, 2000

<H4>New York</H4>

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

<H4>North Carolina</H4>

GOP primary: May 2, 2000

Democratic primary: May 2, 2000

<H4>North Dakota</H4>

GOP caucuses: February 29, 2000

Democratic caucuses: March 7, 2000

<H4>Ohio</H4>

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

<H4>Oklahoma</H4>

GOP primary: March 14, 2000

Democratic primary: March 14, 2000

<H4>Oregon</H4>

GOP primary: May 16, 2000

Democratic primary: May 16, 2000

<H4>Pennsylvania</H4>

GOP primary: April 25, 2000

Democratic primary: April 25, 2000

<H4>Rhode Island</H4>

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

<H4>South Carolina</H4>

GOP primary: February 19, 2000

Democratic caucuses: March 7, 2000

<H4>South Dakota</H4>

GOP primary: June 6, 2000

Democratic primary: June 6, 2000

<H4>Tennessee</H4>

GOP primary: March 14, 2000

Democratic primary: March 14, 2000

<H4>Texas</H4>

GOP primary: March 14, 2000

Democratic primary: March 14, 2000

<H4>Utah</H4>

GOP primary: March 10, 2000

Democratic primary: March 10, 2000

<H4>Vermont</H4>

GOP primary: March 7, 2000

Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

<H4>Virginia</H4>

<P>

Virginia's GOP selects only a portion of its delegates on February 29,

2000. </P>

<P>

Republicans hold congressional district conventions to choose another

portion of their delegates between May 12-June 13, 2000 </P>

<P>

The 135 cities and counties in Virginia hold Democratic caucuses on either

April 15 or April 17 to choose a portion of their delegates.

</P>

<P>

Democrats hold congressional district conventions to choose another portion

of their delegates May 13-27, 2000 </P>

<H4>Washington </H4>

GOP primary: February 29, 2000 --

12 of 37 delegates to be chosen

Democratic primary: February 29, 2000 --

40 percent of delegates to be chosen

GOP caucuses: March 7, 2000 --

remaining 25 delegates chosen

Democrats: March 7, 2000 --

remaining delegates chosen

**DNC does not approve of this plan may penalize the state

<H4>Washington DC</H4>

GOP primary: May 2, 2000

Democratic primary: May 2, 2000

<H4>West Virginia</H4>

GOP primary: May 9, 2000

Democratic primary: May 9, 2000

<H4>Wisconsin</H4>

GOP primary: April 4, 2000

Democratic primary: April 4, 2000

<H4>Wyoming</H4>

GOP primary: March 10, 2000

Democratic caucuses: March 10, 2000

</FONT>

<!--===========/CAPTION=========-->

</td>

</tr>

</TABLE>

</center>

</BODY>

</HTML>

--------------AAEDBA7F4C461219ED3EAEEE--

>From mkshares@mcs.net Thu Oct 28 09:20:44 1999

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

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

    id JAA18635 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 09:20:43 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P3-Chi-Dial-6.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.67]) by

Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id LAA10128 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Thu, 28 Oct 1999 11:20:42 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <38183187.62A8EA2E@mcs.net>

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 1999 11:20:51 +0000

From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY DATES

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

One of the calendars I referred to yesterday, the one from CNN, appears to

be more current on the early dates. They may be more current on later dates

as well.

http://cnn.com/interactive/allpolitics/9907/primaries/content/state.primarie

s.html

Differences from the e-mailed calendar some members sent appear for:

IA - Dems. & GOP; NH - Dems. & GOP; MI - Dems; SC - Dems.; AK - Dems. & GOP;

HI - GOP; ID - Dems; and NV - Dems.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Oct 28 10:22:45 1999

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

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

   id KAA09115 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 10:22:45 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

   id KAA12591 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 10:22:45 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 1999 10:22:45 -0700 (PDT)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: REVISION: 2000 Presidential Primary Dates

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9910281016560.10817-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

2000 PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY DATES

(as of October 28, 1999; revisions by Warren Mitofsky,

David Moore, and Nick Panagakis)

Please send changes to: beniger@rcf.usc.edu

(include source of information)

JANUARY

January 15 Louisiana (Republican, 21 of 28 delegates)

January 24 Alaska (Republican, caucus/straw poll in convention)

Iowa (both parties, in caucus)

FEBRUARY

February 1 New Hampshire

February 1-7   Hawaii (Republican, in caucus; not yet formally set)

February 12 Delaware (Democrat; not yet formally set)

February 15 Delaware (Republican; party run)

February 19 South Carolina (Republican)

February 22 Arizona (Republican)

Michigan (Republican)

February 26 American Samoa (Republican, in caucus)

      Guam (Republican, in caucus)

      Virgin Islands (Republican, in caucus)

February 29 North Dakota (Republican, in caucus)

      Virginia (Republican, portion of delegates only)

      Washington State (Democrat, 40% of delegates;

       Republican, 12 of 37 delegates)

MARCH

March 5   Puerto Rico (Republican)

March 7   California

      Connecticut

      Georgia

      Hawaii (Democrat, in caucus)

      Idaho (Democrat, in caucus)

      Maine

      Maryland

      Massachusetts

      Minnesota (Democrat, in caucus; Republican in

       caucus/straw poll)

      Missouri

      New York

      North Dakota (Democrat, in caucus)

      Ohio

      Rhode Island

South Carolina (Democrat, in caucus)

Vermont

Washington State (Democrat, remaining 60% of dele-
gates; Republican, remaining 25 of 37 delegates)

March 10   Colorado

Utah

Wyoming (in caucus)

March 11   Arizona (Democrat, in caucus; not yet formally set)

Michigan (Democrat, in caucus)

March 12   Nevada (Democrat, caucus in convention)

Puerto Rico (Democrat)

March 14   Florida

Louisiana (Democrat; Republican, 7 of 28 delegates)

Mississippi

Oklahoma

Tennessee

Texas

March 21   Illinois

March 25   Alaska (Democrat, caucus in convention)

APRIL

April 4   Kansas

Wisconsin

April 15   Virginia (Democrat, some of 135 cities, counties

caucus to choose portion of delegates)

April 17   Virginia (Democrat, rest of 135 cities, counties

caucus to choose another portion of delegates)

April 25   Pennsylvania

   MAY

May 2   District of Columbia

        Indiana

        North Carolina

May 9   Nebraska

        West Virginia

May 12-June 13   Virginia (Republican, congressional district

conventions, for remaining portion of delegates)

May 13-27   Virginia (Democrat, congressional district

conventions, for remaining portion of delegates)

May 16   Oregon

May 23   Arkansas

        Idaho (Republican)

Kentucky

May 25   Nevada (Republican, caucus in convention)

May 27   Virginia (Democrat, congressional district

          conventions, for remaining delegates, end)

     JUNE

June 6   Alabama

          Montana

          New Jersey

          New Mexico

          South Dakota

June 13   Virginia (Republican, congressional district

          conventions, for remaining delegates, end)

****

(PDT)

I find the following suggestive of possible applications to systematic

research via the Web. As it stands, it lacks a sampling frame, not to

mention that the instrument used can easily influence the behavior of

interest before that has been measured. Nevertheless, if someone should

tell these people about, say, capture-recapture--who can say?

As of 3:08 pm PST today, October 28, the site, www.wheresgeorge.com ,

reported:

       59,584 registered users

      889,805 registered bills

    $ 5,169,185 in U.S. currency

So what do you think--any ideas for more serious applications?

         -- Jim

_____

___

_____

___

October 28, 1999

Making It Easy to Find Where the Money Goes

By JULIE FLAHERTY

George was first spotted in Bremerton, Wash. He
attended an arts festival in Seattle, made his
way to a coffee shop in Jackson Hole, Wyo., and
was last seen in Salt Lake City.

This particular George is a 1995-series
one-dollar bill, and his biography is made
possible by the Where's George? Web site, which
has thousands of people tracking their money as
it circulates through the economy.

Users type in their ZIP codes and the serial
numbers of any United States denomination up to
$100. Then they write "www.wheresgeorge.com" on
the bills and go out and spend them, banking on

the possibility that future owners will be
curious enough to visit the site and update the
bills' travel history.

So far, 55,000 people have entered nearly 900,000
bills, or more than $5 million worth of currency.

No, the site does not have a ticker clicking off
the Federal deficit or political statements about
the evils of consumerism. Hank Eskin, the
34-year-old database programming consultant who
founded the site two years ago, said he had
simply come up with the idea while pondering his
pocket change and its destiny.

"It's a fun diversion," Mr. Eskin said. "Some
people would call it a useless diversion."

It is also the kind of diversion that could be
possible only through the Web. Once a bill is
registered, the site reports the time between
sightings, the distance traveled and any comments
from the finders. "I got this at a strip club in
Brooklyn," someone wrote about one wild single. A
man in Bakersfield, Calif., who found a
registered dollar bill the day after a major
tremor wrote that it "survived the earthquake
with the courage of a C note."

On the site's forum, chatters compare "hit rates"-- the percentage of bills they send out that are reported found. Four percent is considered a good return. Serious players buy Where's George? rubber stamps ($15 through the Web site) to make marking bills easier.

"I never thought it would get to this, but people are obsessed by it," Mr. Eskin said. "They'll come home and stamp and enter bills before going out to dinner to spend them. They'll get all their spouse's bills and mark them and put them back." A man in New Jersey has stamped more than 60,000 singles.

Joshua McGee, a software engineer in Thousand Oaks, Calif., said the site had changed his spending patterns. "I used to use my debit card whenever I could," he said. "Now I intentionally pay for things with cash."

He said he had once purchased a VCR with a stack of ones. "I asked the cashier, 'Could you use any singles?' which is a wonderful entrapment phrase," Mr. McGee said. He tracks his bills with a map, marking hits with pushpins. He had to expand to a world map when a Swedish exchange student took one of his bills overseas.

There is competition to get the most hits from the most interesting places. As in any game, some players try to cheat. Mr. Eskin continually updates his validation process for the 10,000 bills that are entered into his system daily, weeding out serial numbers that are obviously false or bills entered repeatedly by a person trying to claim a better hit ratio. Purposely bringing bills to other states and recording them there is considered out of bounds, as is passing them back and forth between family members in different parts of the country.

"We do like to be sure that the bills actually enter circulation," Mr. Eskin said.

Some spenders adopt creative strategies: taping a bill to a balloon and letting it fly, leaving a 20-dollar bill in a book in a bookstore or putting a bill in a bottle and throwing it into a lake.

"It's self-advertising, which is really intriguing," Mr. Eskin said. "I don't know of many businesses that do that. A friend of mind at work said why don't I just stamp 'Saab' on all my dollar bills and advertise Saab? Well, you can, but what's the point?"

While Mr. Eskin, who has an M.B.A. from the Wharton School, would love to run his own business, for now the site is just a break-even hobby. Advertisements on the site cover some of the cost of the server, but not the 20 to 30 hours a week he spends maintaining the site and answering questions, including the inevitable one.

"Every other day," he said, "I'll get an E-mail from somebody who asks, 'Don't you know that defacing currency is illegal?' "

It can be, he said, if it renders the bill unfit to be reissued -- by cutting off numbers to change the denomination, for instance, or altering serial numbers. But stamping "Where's George" on a bill doesn't destroy the bill, Mr. Eskin said.

"It's still a dollar bill," he said. "You can still spend it."

Claudia Dickens, a spokeswoman for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, agreed. "According to the laws as they stand now, the practice is not illegal," she said.

Even at $4.8 million, the marked money amounts to

less than one-thousandth of 1 percent of the currency in circulation. And the Secret Service, which enforces the defacement law, has not bothered Mr. Eskin. "They've got better things to do," he said. "They want to catch counterfeiters counterfeiting billions of dollars."

It might be that very defiance of authority, that feeling of control over something produced by the Government that fuels peoples' fascination with the site. It also fuels suspicion of Big Brother.

"Every now and then someone will write in, 'Did anyone ever think this is just a big conspiracy by the Government to track where our money goes?' " Mr. Eskin said. "And a lot of time some of the regulars will answer: 'No, the Government's not running it. They couldn't build anything like this if they wanted to.' "

_____

____

Related Sites

These sites are not part of The New York Times on the Web, and The Times has no control over their content or availability.

www.wheresgeorge.com

_____

____

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

_____

____

****

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Thu Oct 28 22:12:35 1999

Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net

[207.69.200.246])

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

    id WAA12528 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 22:12:34 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from Wmitofsky.compuserve.com (sfr-pci-pqs-vty134.as.wcom.net

[216.192.26.134])

    by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id BAA25035

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Oct 1999 01:12:30 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19991029011140.0097cf00@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 1999 01:14:11 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

Subject: More Internet Polling

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

>

>

> From The Guardian, Manchester and London, October 28:

>

>"If you'd like to air your views online and get paid for it, note that

>MORI (Market and Opinion Research International) is offering beenz to

>people who join its e-public research panel. You can fill in the

>registration form at www.e-public.co.uk. Beenz is a rewards system like

>supermarket points or Air Miles, and e-MORI plans to give away 15

>million of them to people who register and complete surveys."

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Oct 29 08:09:44 1999

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

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

   id IAA21638 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Oct 1999 08:09:43 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

   id IAA25209 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Oct 1999 08:09:43 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 1999 08:09:43 -0700 (PDT)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

---------- Forwarded message ----------

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 1999 10:28:22 -0400 (EDT)

Subject: Assistant Professor Position, Cornell (fwd)

New York State College of Human Ecology

A Statutory College of the State University

at Cornell University Ithaca, New York, 14853

DEPARTMENT OF POLICY ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT

SOCIAL WELFARE EVALUATION

Level: Assistant Professor, tenure track

Starting Date: July 2000

Description: The Department of Policy Analysis and Management seeks to fill a tenure-track position in social welfare evaluation with 50% research and 50% teaching responsibilities. The candidate will undertake a program of evaluation and field-based research on social welfare policies and programs. Relevant research would include topics like: evaluation of health and human service organizations; management and evaluation of the implementation of welfare reform; community-based, participatory approaches to evaluation of social welfare services. Teaching and advising responsibilities support an undergraduate major and graduate field in Policy Analysis and Management, which includes the Sloan Program in Health Services Administration. The candidate will be expected to teach, among other things, a core graduate course in qualitative and mixed methods approaches to policy analysis and management.

Qualifications: A Ph.D. in a discipline or field such as sociology, social work, ethnography, health or related policy sciences, with strong expertise in field-based research is required. Candidates need a strong background in program evaluation methodology, and must demonstrate expertise in collection and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data including mixed method empirical strategies.

Salary: Negotiable depending on experience and qualifications.

Competitive benefit package.

Location: Position is in an applied, multidisciplinary department with

faculty members drawn from economics, sociology, social work, evaluation,

psychology, public health and urban planning. There is ample opportunity

for faculty cooperation and interaction, not only within the department but

across the university.

Contact: We will begin reviewing applications December 1, 1999, but

continue to accept applications until the positions are filled. Send resume,

samples of research, and three letters of recommendation to:

Richard V. Burkhauser, Chair

Department of Policy Analysis & Management

N134 MVR Hall, Cornell University

Ithaca, NY, 14853-4401

Telephone: 607-255-2097

Fax: 607-255-4071

Cornell University is an equal opportunity/affirmative action educator and

employer

****

Fellow AAPOR Members,

Last night about 8:00 PST, my two youngest research assistants, under my

close supervision, first discovered a report of egregious research involving

human subjects, apparently conducted via the World Wide Web.

The study seems in flagrant violation of virtually every known standard of

ethical and scientifically competent research, involving as it does--or so

it would appear--unauthorized intrusion into private homes, observation of

human subjects without their consent, and mass publication of personal data

on individuals. I report this here on AAPORNET for possible action by the

AAPOR Council.

Here is perhaps the single most incriminating section of the report:

Everywhere, creatures

Are falling asleep.

The Collapsible Frink

Just collapsed in a heap.

And, by adding the Frink

To the others before,

I am able to give you

The Who's-Asleep-Score:

Right now, forty thousand

Four hundred and four

Creatures are happily,

Deeply in slumber.

I think you'll agree

That's a whopping fine number.

Counting up sleepers..?

Just how do we do it..?

Really quite simple. There's nothing much to it.

We find out how many, we learn the amount

By an Audio-Telly-o-Tally-o Count.

On a mountain, halfway between Reno and Rome,

We have a machine in a plexiglass dome

Which listens and looks into everyone's home.

And whenever it sees a new sleeper go flop,

It jiggles and lets a new Biggel-Ball drop.

Our chap counts these balls as they plup in a cup.

And that's how we know who is down and who's up.

Do you talk in your sleep..?

It's a wonderful sport

And I have some news of this sport to report.

The World-Champion Sleep-Talkers, Jo and Mo Redd-Zoff,

Have just gone to sleep and they're talking their heads off...

There's much more, as you might imagine, but this is the worst of it I

think, by AAPOR standards. The chief investigator is one Theodore Seuss

Geisel, working out of Southern California and at least claiming a doctorate

(he often appears in print with "Dr." in front of his middle name, used

alone). The report cited above is formally titled "Sleep Book," and

occasionally "Dr. Seuss's Sleep Book". Suspiciously enough, for a formal

research report, the publication has no subtitle.

Please note that there's no need to thank me nor my two research assistants,

Katherine and Ann, for uncovering this study and reporting it to AAPOR

Council. We know that any one of you AAPOR members would have done the same

thing, under similar circumstances.

But if there should be any one of you who might read our message here and

not be as deeply troubled by Geisel's sleep research as are the three of us

investigators, we wish to say this to you: If we ourselves do not put an

end to such abuses as these, of the Internet, World Wide Web and similarly

powerful, diffused and global communication technologies of the

future, who will ever stop such abuses--and when--and where are we all

headed if abuses such as these are not stopped?

With tricks, treats, and a Happy Halloween, we are yours,

         -- Katherine, Ann and Jim Beniger

****

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Fri Oct 29 12:58:44 1999

Received: from imsety.oit.unc.edu (imsety.oit.unc.edu [152.2.21.99])

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

    id MAA02081 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Oct 1999 12:58:43 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from login4.isis.unc.edu (pmeyer@login4.isis.unc.edu

[152.2.25.134])

    by imsety.oit.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id PAA25642

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 29 Oct 1999 15:58:49 -0400 (EDT)

Received: (from pmeyer@localhost)

    by login4.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) id PAA48340;

    Fri, 29 Oct 1999 15:58:42 -0400

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 1999 15:58:41 -0400 (EDT)

From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>

   Thanks, Jim. I've forwarded the case to our local IRB chair and nominated

you for the Orson Wells Award! Cheers, P.

==

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085

CB 3365 Carroll Hall   Fax: 919 962-1549

University of North Carolina   Cell: 919 906-3425

Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365   http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

==

Message-Id: <199910301756.NAA21783@mail1.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: Possible surcharge on emails

I received this message from a fellow faculty member and am passing it along

to AAPORnet.

I do not know anything about the validity of the arguments the author of the

message makes and will appreciate hearing from anyone on AAPORnet that might

let us know if this is a real threat.

>>

>> Subject: FW: Post office-Government wants to charge for E-mail use

>>PLEASE

>> READ- THIS IS NOT A CHAIN LETTER U.S. House of Representatives 1207

>>Lo ngworthHouse Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515-4611 Phone:

>>(202) 2

>> 25-2931Fax: (202) 225-2944

>>

>>

>> Please read carefully if you intend to stay online and continue using

>> email: The last few months have revealed an alarming trend in the

>> Government of the United States attempting to quietly push through

>> legislation that will affect your use of the Internet.

>>

>> Under proposed legislation the U.S. Postal Service will be

>> attempting to bilk email users out of "alternate postage fees". Bill

>> 602P will permit the Federal Govt to charge a 5 cent surcharge on

>> every email delivered, by billing Internet Service Providers at

>> source. The consumer would then be billed in turn by the ISP.

>>

>> Washington D.C. lawyer Richard Stepp is working without pay to

>> prevent this legislation from becoming law.

>>

>> The U.S. Postal Service is claiming that lost revenue due to the

>> proliferation of email is costing nearly $230,000,000 in revenue per

>> year. You may have noticed their recent ad campaign "There is

>> nothing like a letter". Since the average citizen received about 10

>> pieces of email per day in 1998, the cost to the typical individual

>> would be an additional 50 cents per day, or over $180 dollars per

>> year, above and beyond their regular Internet costs. Note that this

>> would be money paid directly to the U.S. Postal Service for a service

>> they do not even provide. The whole point of the Internet is

>> democracy and non-interference.

>>

>> If the federal government is permitted to tamper withour liberties

>>by adding a surcharge to email, who knows where it will end. You are

>>already paying an exorbitant price for snail mail because of

>>bureaucratic efficiency. It currently takes up to 6 days for a letter

>>to be delivered from New York to Buffalo. If the U.S. Postal Service

>>is allowed to tinker with email, it will mark the

>> end of the "free" Internet in the United States.   One

>> congressman, Tony Schnell AE has even suggested a twenty to forty

>>dollar per month surcharge on all Internet service" above and beyond

>>the government's proposed email charges. Note that most of the major

>>newspapers have ignored the story, the only exception being the

>>Washingtonian which called the idea of email surcharge "a useful

>>concept who's time has come" (March 6th 1999 Editorial.

>>

>> Don't sit by and watch your freedoms erode away!

>>

>> Send this e-mail to EVERYONE on your list, and tell all your a

>> friends and relatives to write to their congressman and say "No" to

>> Bill 602P. It will only take a few moments of your time, and could

>> very well be instrumental in killing a bill we don't want.

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Sat Oct 30 11:56:27 1999

Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (shiva.hunter.cuny.edu [146.95.128.96])

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

    id LAA02154 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 30 Oct 1999 11:56:26 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from kathman.bellatlantic.com

(client-151-202-23-5.bellatlantic.net [151.202.23.5])

    by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id PAA26402

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 30 Oct 1999 15:00:33 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.2.1.19991030144913.00a3bbe0@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

At 01:56 PM 10/30/99 -0400, Paul J. Lavrakas wrote:

>I received this message from a fellow faculty member and am passing it

>along to AAPORnet. I do not know anything about the validity of the

>arguments the author of the message makes and will appreciate hearing

>from anyone on AAPORnet that might let us know if this is a real

>threat. .....

This is an e-mail hoax which has been circulating for a while. The language

itself has written hoax all over it and a quick check at web sites like

"Thomas" (http://thomas.loc.gov/) shows that there is no such bill

"602P". If a real lawyer would be working on this, he/she would cite

legislation appropriately. There is a Senate bill 602 (S. 602) but this

deals with a provision to bar hidden taxes (rather than adding one). MK.

>From mark@bisconti.com Sat Oct 30 12:10:39 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

    id MAA06182 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 30 Oct 1999 12:10:38 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from markbri (ip250.washington13.dc.pub-ip.psi.net

[38.30.214.250]) by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange

Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)

   id VZVWPH5Q; Sat, 30 Oct 1999 15:10:48 -0400

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Possible surcharge on emails

Date: Sat, 30 Oct 1999 14:54:14 -0400

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCJKFIDCKOFNAEEOEPOCKAA.mark@bisconti.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

   charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

In-Reply-To: <4.2.1.19991030144913.00a3bbe0@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Thanks Manfred, I also got this E-mail and was told it was not accurate by a

friend on the Hill, but it keeps coming from various sources and each time I

wonder about it. The "Washington Afro-American" this week wrote an article

suggesting the same surcharge... so it is alarming people. I wonder how

many E-mails or calls this notice triggers to elected officials. Maybe it

will have a "preventative" effect... or, maybe when a bill actually emerges

nobody will believe it and it will pass quickly! Mark Richards

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of

Manfred Kuechler

Sent: Saturday, October 30, 1999 2:59 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Possible surcharge on emails

At 01:56 PM 10/30/99 -0400, Paul J. Lavrakas wrote:

>I received this message from a fellow faculty member and am passing it

along

>to AAPORnet.

>I do not know anything about the validity of the arguments the author

>of

the

>message makes and will appreciate hearing from anyone on AAPORnet that

might

>let us know if this is a real threat. .....

This is an e-mail hoax which has been circulating for a while. The language

itself has written hoax all over it and a quick check at web sites like

"Thomas" (http://thomas.loc.gov/) shows that there is no such bill "602P".

If a real lawyer would be working on this, he/she would cite legislation

appropriately. There is a Senate bill 602 (S. 602) but this deals with a

provision to bar hidden taxes (rather than adding one). MK.

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sat Oct 30 12:19:38 1999

Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])

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

    id MAA08963 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 30 Oct 1999 12:19:37 -0700

Dear All:

I was glad to see Manfred's Posting. I think people in the public opinion
and communication business should be a little more careful about circulating
what might turn out to be groundless unsourced rumours.

It seems the e-mail has a lower standard than real communications.

In the past few weeks, I got this message twice, two variants of the Good
Times Virus, and some silly things about Y2K. Then there is the free Walt
Disney vacation, which has arrived at our computer at least 6 times. Though
in four cases sent to other members of my family.

Much stuff on the internet is really unverified and unverifiable.

I don't think people should send on such messages unless they would be

willing to act on them themselves. The trick comes with the free offers

from Microsoft and/or Disney or the supposed virus warnings.
Then

sending them on has little or no consequences.

Some people now think that warnings about Y2K will cause more disruption

than Y2K itself.

Maybe we should study rumours instead of repeating them :).

Andy Beveridge

Mark Richards wrote:

>

> Thanks Manfred, I also got this E-mail and was told it was not

> accurate by a friend on the Hill, but it keeps coming from various

> sources and each time I wonder about it. The "Washington

> Afro-American" this week wrote an article suggesting the same

> surcharge... so it is alarming people. I wonder how many E-mails or

> calls this notice triggers to elected officials. Maybe it will have a

> "preventative" effect... or, maybe when a bill actually emerges nobody

> will believe it and it will pass quickly! Mark Richards

>

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

> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf

> Of Manfred Kuechler

> Sent: Saturday, October 30, 1999 2:59 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: Possible surcharge on emails

>

> At 01:56 PM 10/30/99 -0400, Paul J. Lavrakas wrote:

> >I received this message from a fellow faculty member and am passing

> >it

> along

> >to AAPORnet.

> >I do not know anything about the validity of the arguments the author

> >of

> the

> >message makes and will appreciate hearing from anyone on AAPORnet

> >that

> might

> >let us know if this is a real threat. .....

>

> This is an e-mail hoax which has been circulating for a while. The

> language itself has written hoax all over it and a quick check at web

> sites like "Thomas" (http://thomas.loc.gov/) shows that there is no

> such bill "602P". If a real lawyer would be working on this, he/she

> would cite legislation appropriately. There is a Senate bill 602 (S.

> 602) but this deals with a provision to bar hidden taxes (rather than

> adding one). MK.

--

Andrew A. Beveridge   Home Office

209 Kissena Hall   50 Merriam Avenue

Department of Sociology   Bronxville, NY 10708

Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237

Flushing, NY 11367-1597   Fax: 914-337-8210

Phone: 718-997-2837   E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu

Fax: 718-997-2820   Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

>From mtrau@umich.edu Sat Oct 30 14:29:20 1999

Received: from donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu

(smtp@donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.163])

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

    id OAA16108 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 30 Oct 1999 14:29:19 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from seawolf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@seawolf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu

[141.211.2.153])

    by donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id

RAA15628

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 30 Oct 1999 17:29:18 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (mtrau@localhost)

    by seawolf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id

RAA00993

    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 30 Oct 1999 17:29:16 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Sat, 30 Oct 1999 17:29:16 -0400 (EDT)

From: Michael W Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>

X-Sender: mtrau@seawolf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: An Important AAPOR Matter

Message-ID:

<Pine.SOL.4.10.9910301727200.782-100000@seawolf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Dear AAPORNET Subscriber:

Greetings from Portland and the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse. This is an exciting and stimulating gathering of almost 500 survey researchers interested in such issues as unit and item nonresponse, techniques for increasing response rates, and imputation methods for nonresponse adjustment.

There are many AAPOR members here, including several Council members. And there has actually been a meeting of two AAPOR committees that are dealing with issues of the standards for disclosure and possible revisions to the AAPOR Standard Definitions. The committee members who convened were Janice Ballou, Paul Lavrakas, Betsy Martin, Tom Smith, and Warren Mitofsky; Rob Daves has been serving as well but is not in Portland. These committees are working toward a conversation at our January Council meeting that will be based upon the attached memo from Tom Smith to the Council. The Council will give this proposal very serious consideration, and then it may ask the membership to vote on it as well.

However, as a prelude to our conversation, the Council is interested in receiving comments and reactions to the proposal, as well as in obtaining information about the feasibility of requiring conformity to the proposed standard definitions. For that reason, I have been asked to post the Smith proposal on AAPORNET for comment and to solicit information on the feasibility of applying the standard definitions.

We are interested 1) in whether or not anyone has tried to apply the

standard definitions to compute response rates for their own surveys or 2) whether anyone would be interested in trying to apply the standard definitions to their own work. If so, would you be willing to communicate the results of such an effort to Warren Mitofsky (mitofsky@mindspring.com). Warren is the current Standards Chair and the Council member who will lead the discussion at the January Council meeting. He will also assume responsibility for communicating any comments or reactions he receives to the other members of the committee.

I also hope there will be vigorous discussion of the proposal on AAPORNET. If the Council and the membership adopt this recommendation, this will be one of the most important decisions we have taken in recent years. We want to know what you think.

Mike Traugott

A Note on the AAPOR Code

Tom W. Smith

NORC, University of Chicago

May, 1999

Revised June, 1999

The AAPOR Standards of Minimal Disclosure require the distribution of...

"5. Size of sample and ,if applicable, completion rates and information on eligibility criteria and screening procedures."

1. "Completion rates" is not mentioned in the Standard Definition publication, nor is it used in a dozen major works on survey methods and sampling that I consulted. But from two sources that do use it, we can determine what AAPOR's code is calling for.

a. The CASRO Response Rates report (p. 8) says that "Completion Rate is to be considered as a collective term that is used to designate how well a task has been accomplished. In general, completion rates are used to measure how well the various components involved in a sample survey are accomplished." The CASRO report adds, "In determining a response rate, completion rates are used to evaluate the component steps. These component steps are then combined to form the response rate."

b. Lessler and Kalsbeek (1992, p. 368-369), in Nonsampling Error is Surveys note 11 definitions of completion rates, including 8 cited in the CASRO report. These cover a range of meanings and include both cooperation and response rates as defined in Standard Definitions as well as others things such as eligibility rate.

I believe that the "completion rates" in the AAPOR code should be understood to cover all outcome rates as defined in Standard Definitions. That is, "completion rates" is the same as "outcome rates" in that document and refers to the family of distinct rates (response, nonresponse, cooperation, refusal, etc.) that may be calculated based on the final disposition of sample cases.

I propose that a) Council adopt this understanding of the term "completion rates" and b) in the next edition of Standard Definition a line be added saying that completion rates are the range of figures herein referred to as outcome rates.

2. "if applicable" is a potentially dangerous loophole. It is my understanding that it was added to cover convenience samples and other non-probability designs for which completion rates could not be calculated. What AAPOR means is illustrated by a similar passage in Best Practices...

"12. Disclose all methods of the survey to permit evaluation and replication...A comprehensive list of the elements proposed for disclosure...includes...

documentation and a full description, if applicable, of any response or completion rates cited (for quota designs, the number of refusals)..."

Thus, completion rates should be reported for all surveys using designs that are open to the calculation of such rates and even for designs that don't permit the calculation of all such rates (e.g. quota samples), appropriate rates should be presented.

The danger is that "if applicable" could be interpreted in other ways

such as, "if they exist" or "if available."

I propose that AAPOR Council adopt an interpretation of "if applicable" that (as a first cut) says something like...

Completion rates should be disclosed in all cases in which a survey design is open to the calculation of such rates. This would typically include all random or full-probability samples (e.g. RDD telephone surveys). For sample designs that do not employ such a design (e.g. block quota samples), appropriate outcome figures such as the number of attempted cases, the number of completed cases, and the number of refusals should be routinely reported.

From: "H.H. Kassarjian" <hkassarj@ucla.edu>

Subject: Re: Possible surcharge on emails

In-Reply-To: <199910301756.NAA21783@mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

    types="text/plain,text/html";

    boundary="====================_989234==_.ALT"

--====================_989234==_.ALT

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

This (a bill for a surharge on e-mail) is an urban legend that has been

going around for a couple of years. It has been discredited, I understand.

There is a site on the Net that lists these sorts of urban legends and

checks them out but I have forgotten the address. Does anyone have have it

so that list members can check it out themselves. Hal Kassarjian

****

At 01:56 PM 10/30/1999 -0400, you wrote:

>I received this message from a fellow faculty member and am passing it

>along to AAPORnet.

>

>I do not know anything about the validity of the arguments the author

>of the message makes and will appreciate hearing from anyone on

>AAPORnet that might let us know if this is a real threat.

>

>

>>>

>>> Subject: FW: Post office-Government wants to charge for E-mail use

>>>PLEASE

>>> READ- THIS IS NOT A CHAIN LETTER U.S. House of Representatives 1207

>>>Lo ngworthHouse Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515-4611 Phone:

>>>(202) 2

>>> 25-2931Fax: (202) 225-2944

>>>

>>>

>>> Please read carefully if you intend to stay online and continue

>>> using email: The last few months have revealed an alarming trend in

>>> the Government of the United States attempting to quietly push

>>> through legislation that will affect your use of the Internet.

>>>

>>> Under proposed legislation the U.S. Postal Service will be

>>> attempting to bilk email users out of "alternate postage fees". Bill

>>> 602P will permit the Federal Govt to charge a 5 cent surcharge on

>>> every email delivered, by billing Internet Service Providers at

>>> source. The consumer would then be billed in turn by the ISP.

>>>

>>> Washington D.C. lawyer Richard Stepp is working without pay to

>>> prevent this legislation from becoming law.

>>>

>>> The U.S. Postal Service is claiming that lost revenue due to the

>>> proliferation of email is costing nearly $230,000,000 in revenue per

>>> year. You may have noticed their recent ad campaign "There is

>>> nothing like a letter". Since the average citizen received about 10

>>> pieces of email per day in 1998, the cost to the typical individual

>>> would be an additional 50 cents per day, or over $180 dollars per

>>> year, above and beyond their regular Internet costs. Note that this

>>> would be money paid directly to the U.S. Postal Service for a

>>> service they do not even provide. The whole point of the Internet

>>> is democracy and non-interference.

>>>

>>> If the federal government is permitted to tamper withour liberties

>>>by adding a surcharge to email, who knows where it will end. You are

>>>already paying an exorbitant price for snail mail because of

>>>bureaucratic efficiency. It currently takes up to 6 days for a letter

>>>to be delivered from New York to Buffalo. If the U.S. Postal Service

>>>is allowed to tinker with email, it will mark the

>>> end of the "free" Internet in the United States.   One

>>> congressman, Tony Schnell AE has even suggested a twenty to forty

>>>dollar per month surcharge on all Internet service" above and beyond

>>>the government's proposed email charges. Note that most of the

>>>major newspapers have ignored the story, the only exception being

>>>the Washingtonian which called the idea of email surcharge "a useful

>>>concept who's time has come" (March 6th 1999 Editorial.

>>>

>>> Don't sit by and watch your freedoms erode away!

>>>

>>> Send this e-mail to EVERYONE on your list, and tell all your a

>>> friends and relatives to write to their congressman and say "No" to

>>> Bill 602P. It will only take a few moments of your time, and could

>>> very well be instrumental in killing a bill we don't want.

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>

--=====================_989234==_.ALT

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

<html>
<font size=3>This (a bill for a surharge on e-mail) is an urban legend that has been going around for a couple of years. It has been discredited, I understand. There is a site on the Net that lists these sorts of urban legends and checks them out but I have forgotten the address. Does anyone have have it so that list members can check it out themselves.
 Hal Kassarjian
 ****

 At 01:56 PM 10/30/1999 -0400, you wrote:
 >I received this message from a fellow faculty member and am passing it along
 >to AAPORnet.
 >
 >I do not know anything about the validity of the arguments the author of the
 >message makes and will appreciate hearing from anyone on AAPORnet that might
 >let us know if this is a real threat.
 >
 >
 >>>
 >>> Subject: FW: Post office-Government wants to charge for E-mail use
 >>>PLEASE
 >>> READ- THIS IS NOT A CHAIN LETTER U.S. House of Representatives 1207 Lo
 >>> ngworthHouse Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515-4611

Phone: (202) 2
>>> 25-2931Fax: (202) 225-2944
>>>
>>>
>>> Please read carefully if you intend to stay online and continue
 >>> using email: The last few months have revealed an alarming trend
 >>> in the Government of the United States attempting to quietly push
 >>> through legislation that will affect your use of the Internet.
 >>>
 >>>

Under proposed legislation the U.S. Postal Service will be
>>> attempting to bilk email users out of "alternate postage
fees".
 >>> Bill 602P will permit the Federal Govt to
charge a 5 cent
 >>> surcharge on every email delivered, by
billing Internet Service
 >>> Providers at source. The
consumer would then be billed in turn
 >>> by the ISP.
>>>
 >>> Washington D.C. lawyer Richard Stepp is
working without pay to
 >>> prevent this legislation from
becoming law.
 >>>
 >>> The U.S. Postal Service is
claiming that lost revenue due to the
 >>> proliferation of
email is costing nearly $230,000,000 in revenue
 >>> per
year. You may have noticed their recent ad campaign "There is
>>> nothing like a letter". Since the average citizen
received
 >>> about 10 pieces of email per day in 1998, the cost
to the typical
 >>> individual would be an additional 50 cents
per day, or over $180
 >>> dollars per year, above and beyond
their regular Internet costs.
 >>> Note that this would be money
paid directly to the U.S. Postal
 >>> Service for a service they
do not even provide. The whole point
 >>> of the Internet
is democracy and non-interference.
 >>>
 >>> If the
federal government is permitted to tamper withour
 >>> liberties
by adding a surcharge to email, who knows where it will end.
>>> You are already paying an exorbitant price for snail mail
>>> because of bureaucratic efficiency. It currently takes up to 6
days for
 >>>a letter to be delivered from New York to Buffalo.
If the U.S.
 >>> Postal Service is allowed to tinker with email,
it will mark the
 >>> end of the "free" Internet in
the United States.   One
 >>> congressman, Tony
Schnell AE has even suggested a twenty to forty
 >>> dollar per

month surcharge on all Internet service" above and
 >>>

beyond the government's proposed email charges. Note that most

>>> of the major newspapers have ignored the story, the only

>>> exception being the Washingtonian which called the idea of

email
 >>> surcharge "a useful concept who's

time has come" (March 6th 1999
 >>> Editorial.

>>>
 >>> Don't sit by and watch your freedoms erode

away!
 >>>
 >>> Send this e-mail to EVERYONE on your

list, and tell all your
 >>> a friends and relatives to write to

their congressman and say "No" to
 >>> Bill

602P. It will only take a few moments of your time, and could

>>> very well be instrumental in killing a bill we don't want.

>>>
 >>>
 >>>
 >>>

>>>
 > </html>

--=====================_989234==_.ALT--

>From rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu Sun Oct 31 19:23:21 1999

Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])

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

    id TAA00557 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 31 Oct 1999 19:23:21 -0800

(PST)

Received: from [128.104.52.200] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu

      id VAA275092 (8.9.1/50); Sun, 31 Oct 1999 21:23:17 -0600

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Message-Id: <v04011703b442b8079fd0@[128.104.52.200]>

In-Reply-To: <199911010107.RAA09805@serval.noc.ucla.edu>

References: <199910301756.NAA21783@mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu>

Date: Sun, 31 Oct 1999 21:23:12 -0600

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu>

Subject: Re: Possible surcharge on emails

At 5:08 PM -0800 10/31/99, H.H. Kassarjian wrote:

This (a bill for a surharge on e-mail) is an urban legend that has been

going around for a couple of years. It has been discredited, I understand.

There is a site on the Net that lists these sorts of urban legends and

checks them out but I have forgotten the address. Does anyone have have it

so that list members can check it out themselves. Hal Kassarjian

****

Yes, my favoritie is urbanlegends.com

http://urbanlegends.about.com/culture/beliefs/urbanlegends

this is what they have posted on the subject:

 Posted: 05/22/99

 Here's an item straight out of the hoax recycling bin. A "new" email

forward claims that the U.S. Postal Service is attempting to levy a 5-cent

surcharge on every email delivered within the United States.

 Funny thing is, a virtually identical message circulating one month ago

claimed that the same thing was about to happen in Canada.

 False, in both cases (see comments below).

================

Other sites include this one from the Department of Energy

http://ciac.llnl.gov/ciac/CIACHoaxes.html

Others:

The AFU & Urban Legends Archive

http://www.urbanlegends.com/

Tales of the Wooden Spoon

http://snopes.simplenet.com/spoons/

The Hoaxkill service: Let's get rid of hoaxes now!

http://hoaxkill.com/index2.shtml

Computer Virus Myths home page

http://kumite.com/myths/

Robert Godfrey

UW-Madison