This is the USC Listproc archive of AAPORTNET 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
AAPORTNET volunteer host

Begin archive:

 Archive aapornet, file log9910.
 Part 1/1, total size 513298 bytes:
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
Thank you.

Paul Beatty
Chair, Conference Operations Committee
Richard Morin leaves for an interesting assignment 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."


Morin can be reached at morinr@clark.net.

Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company

>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 Matlin" <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
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 equivalent to "mileage?"
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

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company
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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.
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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.
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 discovery.
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 discovery 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 relevant to the current discussion. I have not corrected the typos. This is exactly how it came to me.
My Name is D. Warrington. 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 emphysema 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 advantage and get out ahead of Philip Morris on October 13th.

Best of Luck -- A Friend

-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-
>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Wed Oct  6 12:00:32 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 MAA24226 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Oct 1999 12:00:30 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (user-2iveakk.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.42.148])
    by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA09492
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 6 Oct 1999 15:00:47 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <4.1.19991006145216.00bc3500@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1999 15:04:32 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Big tobacco and the right to data
In-Reply-To: <3.0.1.32.19991006092846.0069da20@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
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 discovery 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-38lf34.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
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
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
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
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_5mLFW29Uw1bTFwwKuqgyw)
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.

Fred Solop

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

>From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Mon Oct 11 07:40:58 1999
Received: from mwmhc03.worldnet.att.net (mwmhc03.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.38])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
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
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

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>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
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, $1.96 \times \sqrt{PQ/N}$, 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)
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
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

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).

>From Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU Wed Oct 13 14:05:49 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 OAA14172 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 13 Oct 1999 14:05:47 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from conversion.mailgate.nau.edu by mailgate.nau.edu (PMDF V5.2-32 #39840) id <0FJK004017W8MD@mailgate.nau.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Wed, 13 Oct 1999 14:05:19 -0700 (MST)
Received: from computer (ts8-5.ppp.nau.edu [134.114.14.142])
    by mailgate.nau.edu (PMDF V5.2-32 #39840)
    with SMTP id <0FJK00KX07VS9L@mailgate.nau.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed,
13 Oct 1999 14:04:43 -0700 (MST)
Date: Wed, 13 Oct 1999 14:04:08 -0700
From: Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU>
Subject: McCain Ahead of Bush in Arizona
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
John McCain has pulled ahead of George Bush, Jr. in Arizona.

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
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 health 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
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.


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
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?
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 information 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"
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 (EYEORE.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])
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 MILTGOLD@aol.com Mon Oct 18 20:59:50 1999
Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
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 occurrence (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).
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

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Tue Oct 19 03:12:04 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 DAA22855 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 03:12:04 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from oemcomputer (ts16-4.homenet.ohio-state.edu [140.254.113.75])
  by mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id GAA20097
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 06:12:02 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 19 Oct 1999 06:12:02 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199910191012.GAA20097@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: 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 initially 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 initial 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 initially, but rather another member of the household.

And, sorry to learn of this "harassment" you are experiencing from your IRB.
Please reply directly to Tim Johnson at timj@srl.uic.edu

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 (EYEORE.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
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.

Received: from usc.edu (listproc@localhost [127.0.0.1])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
   id PAA02832; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 15:21:38 -0700 (PDT)
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])
   by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id RAA12907
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 17:19:05 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from main-Message_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU
   with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 18 Oct 1999 17:11:38 -0500
Message-Id: <s80b54ca.098@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Date: Mon, 18 Oct 1999 17:18:56 -0500
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
Precedence: bulk
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

>From Sharon.Riley@arbitron.com Tue Oct 19 07:36:17 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 HAA24157 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 07:36:16 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id KAA07767; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 10:21:55 -0400 (EDT)
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 occurrence (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
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

>From cswhite@uiuc.edu Tue Oct 19 08:42:01 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 IAA24202 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Oct 1999 08:42:01 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by ntx1.cso.uiuc.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Speaking of refusals and their codes, I have been attempting to use the AAPOR disposition codes as presented in documentation for Sawtooth Software's Wincaiti 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 Wincaiti 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
The codes in the AAPOR Standard Definitions are only final disposition codes. Thus, refusals are final refusals, 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
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
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: <744DBC8BC3FBDO1192C200A0C96BA7BD0114A38E@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.
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
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 separately in studies where we are explicitly selecting a respondent 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 person 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.

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
"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

From cswhite@uiuc.edu Wed Oct 20 18:11:10 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 SAA12777 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 20 Oct 1999 18:11:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by ntx1.cso.uiuc.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
    id <TSRA2PWJ>; Wed, 20 Oct 1999 20:11:08 -0500
Message-ID: <744DBC8BC3FBD01192C200A0C96BA7BD0114A391@ntx1.cso.uiuc.edu>
From: Carolyn White <cswhite@uiuc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: refusal at household = refusal of selected respondent?
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 respondent 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 person 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@aeom.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
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
>From Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com Thu Oct 21 10:55:37 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 KAA20721 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 10:55:35 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id NAA25168; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 13:41:10
-0400 (EDT)
Received: from arbmdex.arbitron.com(198.40.5.5) by vulcan.arbitron.com via
smap (4.1)
    id xma025132; Thu, 21 Oct 99 13:40:15 -0400
Received: by arbmdex.arbitron.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
    id <47YWSRMD>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 13:56:25 -0400
Message-ID: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B301419B2C@arbmdex.arbitron.com>
From: "Cralley, Marla" <Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com>
To: ""aapornet@usc.edu"" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Surveying children
Date: Thu, 21 Oct 1999 13:56:22 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
I found the questionnaire we used for a project several years ago. I am attaching 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"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAABAAAAANQAAAAAAA
AA
EAAANwAAAAA+///AAAAADQAAAAAD////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////
EAAANwAAAAA+///
///////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////
pcEAWQAJBAAAABK/AAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAqwxAAA4AYmpiavNX81cAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
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/uscd) 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
Re: 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/us) with ESMTP
    id LAA23068 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 11:44:36 -0700 (PDT)
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us) with ESMTP
    id LAA27348 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Oct 1999 11:44:37 -0700 (PDT)
(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 Megopolitan, 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:
I am concluding a small project searching for journal articles or other sources about methodology issues in surveying public officials.
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
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
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

______________________________________________________________
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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 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.

-----------------------------
- Copyright 1999 The Chronicle of Higher Education
-----------------------------
- ******

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Thu Oct 21 21:08:33 1999
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

sloth@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208
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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
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Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:36:53 -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.
Subject: Re: Capital Punishment

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline
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 death 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
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?"
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 almaa
k.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.166])
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Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1999 11:09:24 -0700 (PDT)
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).
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
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Subject: Surveys of older Americans
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Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
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
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D. You rock. D.

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
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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
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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 v u. 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 lifespaces, 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

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 by the NY Times
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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 options.)
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
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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
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

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 death penalty?

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>
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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?"

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 millennium 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

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
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>
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).
Among likely California voters

-- Open primary preferences where Democratic and Republican candidates are listed on one ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Gore</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bradley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Dole</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McCain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Forbes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Beatty</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Bauer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrin Hatch</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Keyes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/undecided</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- Image ratings of Democratic presidential candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Gore</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bradley</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
> 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
> 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
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
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.
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
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;
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 usage, racial issues and so on. Using cooperation rates, once we contact students we routinely get over a 90% cooperation 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
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>
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)

mailto:gulicke@slhn.org

gulicke@slhn.org
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 Public 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.
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.
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
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 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)
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 interpreting 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.
>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

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
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
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.

Here are a couple. I don't know how current they are.
http://www.politicalresources.com/

Look for "calendar" on this cnn page.


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 -0700 (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
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 10  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
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 form
>
> 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 11  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
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
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
Warren,

I just 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
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

The final Keystone Philadelphia mayoral poll for this election cycle can be found under Survey Releases at: http://www.millersv.edu/~politics
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--
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.primaries.html
State primaries
<H4>Alabama</H4>
GOP primary: June 6, 2000
Democratic primary: June 6, 2000

<H4>Alaska</H4>
GOP caucuses/straw poll: January 24, 2000
Democratic caucuses: March 25, 2000

<H4>Arizona</H4>
GOP primary: February 22, 2000
Democratic caucuses: March 11, 2000 **tentative

<H4>Arkansas</H4>
GOP primary: May 23, 2000
Democratic primary: May 23, 2000

<H4>California</H4>
GOP primary: March 7, 2000
Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

<H4>Colorado</H4>
GOP primary: March 10, 2000
Democratic primary: March 10, 2000

<H4>Connecticut</H4>
GOP primary: March 7, 2000
Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

<H4>Delaware</H4>
GOP caucuses: February 15, 2000 **party run<br>
Democratic primary: February 12, 2000 **tentative<br>

<H4>Florida</H4>
GOP primary: March 14, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: March 14, 2000<br>

<H4>Georgia</H4>
GOP primary: March 7, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: March 7, 2000<br>

<H4>Hawaii</H4>
GOP caucuses: February 1-7, 2000 **tentative<br>
Democratic caucuses: March 7, 2000<br>

<H4>Idaho</H4>
GOP primary: May 23, 2000<br>
Democratic caucuses: March 7, 2000<br>

<H4>Illinois</H4>
GOP primary: March 21, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: March 21, 2000<br>

<H4>Indiana</H4>
GOP primary: May 2, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: May 2, 2000<br>

<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
<H4>Michigan</H4>
GOP primary: February 22, 2000
Democratic caucuses: March 11, 2000

<H4>Minnesota</H4>
GOP caucuses/straw poll: March 7, 2000
Democratic caucuses: March 7, 2000

<H4>Mississippi</H4>
GOP primary: March 14, 2000
Democratic primary: March 14, 2000

<H4>Missouri</H4>
GOP primary: March 7, 2000
Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

<H4>Montana</H4>
GOP primary: June 6, 2000
Democratic primary: June 6, 2000

<H4>Nebraska</H4>
GOP primary: May 9, 2000
Democratic primary: May 9, 2000

<H4>Nevada</H4>
GOP caucuses: May 25, 2000
Democratic caucuses: March 12, 2000
<H4>New Hampshire</H4>
GOP primary: February 1, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: February 1, 2000<br>

<H4>New Jersey</H4>
GOP primary: June 6, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: June 6, 2000<br>

<H4>New Mexico</H4>
GOP primary: June 6, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: June 6, 2000<br>

<H4>New York</H4>
GOP primary: March 7, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: March 7, 2000<br>

<H4>North Carolina</H4>
GOP primary: May 2, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: May 2, 2000<br>

<H4>North Dakota</H4>
GOP caucuses: February 29, 2000<br>
Democratic caucuses: March 7, 2000<br>
Ohio
GOP primary: March 7, 2000
Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

Oklahoma
GOP primary: March 14, 2000
Democratic primary: March 14, 2000

Oregon
GOP primary: May 16, 2000
Democratic primary: May 16, 2000

Pennsylvania
GOP primary: April 25, 2000
Democratic primary: April 25, 2000

Rhode Island
GOP primary: March 7, 2000
Democratic primary: March 7, 2000

South Carolina
GOP primary: February 19, 2000
Democratic caucuses: March 7, 2000
<H4>South Dakota</H4>
GOP primary: June 6, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: June 6, 2000<br><br>
<H4>Tennessee</H4>
GOP primary: March 14, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: March 14, 2000<br><br>
<H4>Texas</H4>
GOP primary: March 14, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: March 14, 2000<br><br>
<H4>Utah</H4>
GOP primary: March 10, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: March 10, 2000<br><br>
<H4>Vermont</H4>
GOP primary: March 7, 2000<br>
Democratic primary: March 7, 2000<br><br>
<H4>Virginia</H4>

Virginia's GOP selects only a portion of its delegates on February 29,
Republicans hold congressional district conventions to choose another portion of their delegates between May 12-June 13, 2000.

The 135 cities and counties in Virginia hold Democratic caucuses on either April 15 or April 17 to choose a portion of their delegates.

Democrats hold congressional district conventions to choose another portion of their delegates May 13-27, 2000.

**Washington**

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**

**Washington DC**

GOP primary: May 2, 2000
Democratic primary: May 2, 2000

West Virginia

GOP primary: May 9, 2000
Democratic primary: May 9, 2000

Wisconsin

GOP primary: April 4, 2000
Democratic primary: April 4, 2000

Wyoming

GOP primary: March 10, 2000
Democratic caucuses: March 10, 2000

</BODY>
</HTML>
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.prime
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 delegates; 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)

*****

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Oct 28 15:18:21 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 PAA14701 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 15:18:20 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
  by almaak.usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id PAA11155 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 28 Oct 1999 15:18:19 -0700
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.
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>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Assistant Professor Position, Cornell (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9910290802080.23013-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---------- 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.
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 Longworth House Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515-4611 Phone: (202) 25-2931 Fax: (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 with our 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 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.
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)
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
> 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
>From mtrau@umich.edu Sat Oct 30 14:29:20 1999
Received: from donkeykong.gpcc.itd.umich.edu
(ssmtp@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
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
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 Definitions 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 hkassarj@ucla.edu Sun Oct 31 17:07:33 1999
Received: from serval.noc.ucla.edu (serval.noc.ucla.edu [169.232.10.12])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id RAA21227 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 31 Oct 1999 17:07:33 -0800 (PST)
Received: from ycxfssto (comserv3-12.anderson.ucla.edu [164.67.166.126])
    by serval.noc.ucla.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id RAA09805
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 31 Oct 1999 17:07:27 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <19991101010107.RAA09805@serval.noc.ucla.edu>
X-Sender: hkassar@pop.ben2.ucla.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
Date: Sun, 31 Oct 1999 17:08:46 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
This (a bill for a surcharge 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.
>
>
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 with our 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 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.
This (a bill for a surcharge 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.

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 with our 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 whose 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 friends and relatives to write to their congressman and say "No" 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.

</font></html>

>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>
At 5:08 PM -0800 10/31/99, H.H. Kassarjian wrote:
This (a bill for a surcharge 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 favorite 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