
Date: Sun, 1 Oct 2000 00:58:02 -0400
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: In Theory
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

The issue as I see it is that response rates have deteriorated a lot over the past ten years, intensifying the need for AAPOR to encourage discussion about this trend and its implications for our work, and to better inform the clients, media, other sponsors who pay for and use the results of our work.

I am personally uncomfortable with the way in which we are handling (avoiding, actually) the characterization of response rates. Some examples:

One is what I call, "In theory." The two innocuous words found in newspaper sidebars explaining the mechanics and statistics of the survey being reported. It is disingenuous to say the least to think that the average newspaper reader has any comprehension of what those two words mean. (I refer to the fact that the sampling error reported applies under conditions of 100 percent participation which we all know never happens.) Yes, there is often additional language about "the practical challenges of conducting a survey" but, again, the average reader is clueless. I guess the average journalist is too, the way they talk and write about it. If you want to be nasty (which someone called me just today), you'd label this intellectual dishonesty.

A second response is arrogance. Here we have those who place the burden of proof on the other side. This is called, Until you can prove that non-responders are different from those who respond, you have no basis for even labeling this a problem. After all, everything we've done is "scientific" -- so go away with this gripe.

A third is obfuscation. Look at the AAPOR press release on response rates. Read it from the perspective of the average person who wants to find out a little more about a remark that, say, 70 percent of the people contacted for a survey refused to participate. Most readers would stop half way down the page, feeling this is too complicated to stay with. "Plus, I can see that it's not going to answer my question. Gee, this is complex; maybe my question can't really be answered." (This is not to say that the work referred to there is unimportant. It's just that the piece, shall we say, stops a little short of the important questions.) Having been issued as a press release, it can be viewed by the public as a statement that this is all AAPOR has to say about response rates.

A particularly annoying practice recently has been to denigrate out-of-favor methodologies (web, mail, whatever) because of their "notoriously low response rates'" (wink) -- but then be unwilling to answer

the question of what constitutes an acceptable response rate.

So what you have in these situations are just different ways of avoiding an important issue. In the meanwhile, everyone and their brother is eating our lunch. Every web site begs you to "Take our survey!" People like Zagat and others with no apparent training smell paydirt in "surveys" and publish and sell like crazy. Even Amazon.com will let you review your own book (or your friend's) and then tabulate the stars. What we would call standards are in a state of free-fall.

We need to have more discussion of the important issues and stop the avoidance and denial. In over a year on aapornet I think I have seen only two pertinent entries on this issue. One was from H. O'Neill remarking that maybe we are shooting ourselves in the feet because our questionnaires are so long and poorly constructed. (Not particularly true for the polling side but definitely true in market research.) The other was prepublication of the Pew study looking at findings from the same survey with two different response levels. (One got the feeling that this was going to be a deus ex machina for some, but I guess we'll have to wait for publication. And we'll have data to argue over.)

The statistics we hide behind are over a hundred years old and apply only "in theory." They don't apply in practice -- especially with the response rates we try so hard to ignore. Does that mean that we have nowhere to turn -- that, God forbid, we're not really "scientists?"

The late Paul Erdos said that a survey should have a response rate of at least 51 percent. Why? "Because then I can stand in front of my client and say that more people filled out the questionnaire than threw it away." Not tremendously statistical -- but, to me, it's an honest reply to a valid question and, arguably, has merit. In my own work, I use this boilerplate: "The response rate for the survey was XX percent. This is equal to or above industry standards for a study of this type and means that the potential for distortion due to non-response is acceptably small." (The preceding stated when applicable, of course.) On the market research side, this is enough to satisfy most clients who are used to making decisions under conditions of uncertainty. I guess it's not that simple on the polling side, however.

The above are two very crude methods for addressing the issue of characterization. Neither is statistical (quantitative, yes). What I look to AAPOR for is help in clearing away the hypocrisy that pretends we operate in a world that does not exist, and assistance in building a new, realistic and defensible logic of interpretation.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

Date: Sun, 01 Oct 2000 11:32:38 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Incumbent Polls
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----
FC092347F04CBF93A2590C86"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format. -----
FC092347F04CBF93A2590C86
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="-----
1954089089CCE47A5B5F1396"

-----1954089089CCE47A5B5F1396
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-
creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For those of you polling incumbent races this year - especially those with
lop-sided support for the incumbent - the passage below
from a recent report cautioning our client about what these results mean may
be useful. We have been using this caveat for many
years.

You will note in the report excerpt below, WI incumbent Senator Herb Kohl's
current poll result is compared with his poll numbers
and election outcome in 1994. Attached is a spreadsheet of another 100
incumbent polls from 1994 along with a memo discussing those
results.

Note that we are not allocating the undecided vote. This is only a
precautionary statement which I believe properly characterizes
the results in order to prepare the reader for the election outcome and out
of
fairness to challengers

Nick

REPORT EXCERPT

Incumbents

The poll covered the Senate race in which an incumbent is seeking reelection.

Based on our prior analyses of hundreds of incumbent polls, most undecided
voters appear to decide in favor of the challenger in
about 70% of polls. As a consequence, point spreads should not be used to
characterize these races. Equal or near-split of undecided
voters, implicit when point spreads are used to characterize results, are
actually exceptions rather than the rule. When an
incumbent leads in polls, as they usually do, the race is usually closer than
it appears, closer than the point spread suggests.

I believe this happens because undecided voters are not undecided between the
candidates but undecided about the incumbent, the
candidate they know best, the one with a public record. Another way of
understanding this is that it is easier to decide whether or
not to vote for a well-known incumbent than for a lesser known, relatively

unfamiliar challenger. Decisions to vote for the candidate they know best are made earlier.

Senate Race

With 64% of the vote vs. 23% for his challenger in the table below, Kohl begins the campaign season as a very formidable incumbent. Even 31% of Republicans would vote for him. But if this poll was taken just before the election, the election outcome is likely to be closer than it appears below with John Gillespie picking up most of the undecided vote.

In our late August, 1994 poll, Kohl led Robert Welch 62% to 21%. By late October, he led 56% to 31%. But on election day, he won by 58% to 41%.

-----1954089089CCE47A5B5F1396
Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en"> <html> For those of you polling incumbent races this year - especially those with lop-sided support for the incumbent - the passage below from a recent report cautioning our client about what these results mean may be useful. We have been using this caveat for many years. <p>You will note in the report excerpt below, WI incumbent Senator Herb Kohl's current poll result is compared with his poll numbers and election outcome in 1994. Attached is a spreadsheet of another 100 incumbent polls from 1994 along with a memo discussing those results. <p>Note that we are not allocating the undecided vote. This is only a precautionary statement which I believe properly characterizes the results in order to prepare the reader for the election outcome and out of fairness to challengers
<p>Nick <p>REPORT EXCERPT <p><u>Incumbents</u> <p>The poll covered the Senate race in which an incumbent is seeking reelection. <p>Based on our prior analyses of hundreds of incumbent polls, most undecided voters appear to decide in favor of the challenger in about 70% of polls. As a consequence, point spreads should not be used to characterize these races. Equal or near-split of undecided voters, implicit when point spreads are used to characterize results, are actually exceptions rather than the rule. When an incumbent leads in polls, as they usually do, the race is usually closer than it appears, closer than the point spread suggests. <p>I believe this happens because undecided voters are not undecided between the candidates but undecided about the incumbent, the candidate they know best, the one with a public record. Another way of understanding this is that it is easier to decide whether or not to vote for a well-known incumbent than for a lesser known, relatively unfamiliar challenger. Decisions to vote for the candidate they know best are made earlier. <p><u>Senate Race</u> <p>With 64% of the vote vs. 23% for his challenger in the table below, Kohl begins the campaign season as a very formidable incumbent. Even 31% of Republicans would vote for him. But if this poll was taken just before the election, the election outcome is
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AAAABAAAAQAAAAIEAAADBAABAQAAAkEAAAKBAAACwQAABAEAAASBAHAQAAB0EAABSBA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JCIjLCMjMFwPqgAAcAHSIkIiMsIyMwLjAwXyk7XCgiJCIjLCMjMC4wMFwPqgQlAAgAiIk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AAgAAAAAABNAHoAAQAAwAAASwBLAAAAAL4Aj8/37/gwxiCXkDZwUoA/wAAgAAASwB
LAAAAAL4Aj8AAEAABkAAAAQABAQEAAAABJw8AAQABAPBcRgAAAAAaOAAgQGQAAAA
AABAAAAAQAQAAAAAChACIAAQBPAAEAQAQCAIAAAAAA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AAAAEQAYQAACgAAAQwACAIQABoAAAAARABgBAAAEQAABfEIIAhAAGwAAABEAGAEAAIxnAAGh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 LAIABQAIAMAREVWAQIGAAIABGajAAQCDAAcAAcAHQAEAE5BTUUEAgwA
AgAIACIABABQT0xMBAIMAAIACQAIAAQARUxXfQwQCCwACAAoAIgADAERFVgECBgACAAAsAIgAE
AgwAAgAMACIABABQT0xMBAIMAAIADQAIAAQARUxXfQwECBgACAA4AGAAEAg0AAgAQAEUABQBF
ULJPUgQCJAADAAAAKAgCAFRvIENoYwxsZW5nZXI7IDcxIFBvbGx1IDcwJTtoBAGYAAwABACsA
BAIJAAMAaAw6AAEAJQCCQADAAQA0gABACUEAgSAAwAFADoAAwArLy2+AAoAAwAGADsAOwAH
AAQCCQADAAgAOgABACUEAgkAAwAJADoAAQAlBAI LAAMACgA6AAMAKy8tvgAKAAMACwA6ACIA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 SAAYAAgAcAAoATGF1dGvUyYnVyZ70AEgAGAAMAHAAAETAHAAAELA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BQABBAAMAAECBgAKAA4ANAAEAhsACgAPABYAewBTdC4gTm9yYmVydCBDb2xsZWdlBgAbAAoA
EABGAAAAAAAAABhACAALAAX/BQABBAAQAAQCCgALAAAAFgACAE5ZBAIUAAAsAAQAWAAwAT2N0
IDMxLU5vdiAxBAIQAAAsAAgAcAAgATW95bml0YW69ABIACwADABwAAIBMQBwAAIBLQAQABgAb
AAsABQAlAAAAAAAAAADACAALAr/BQABBAAFAAQCDgALAAcAHAAGAENhc3Ryb70AEgALAAgA
HAAAADtAHA AAAEVCAGABsACwAKACUAAAAAAAAALkAIAAsADP8FAAE EAAoAAQIGAAAsACwAl
AAYAGwALAAwAJgAAAAAAAA+QAgACwAN/wUAAQQADAAGABsACwANACYAAAAAAAAAKkAIAAsA
EP8FAAE EAAwAAQIGAAAsADgA0AAQCGAALAA8AFgAQAFdDQlMtVFYvTlkgVG1tZXMGABsACwAQ
AEYAAAAAAAAIUIAIAAwAbf8FAAE EABAABAIKAAwAAAAWAAIASUwEAg8ADAABABYABwBob3Yg
NC01BAINAaAAgAcAAUARWRnYXK9ABIADAADABwAAIBQQBwAAABQQAQABgAbAAwABQAlAAAA
AAAAAADACAAMAAR/BQABBAAFAAQCDgAMAACAHAAGAE5ldhNjaL0AEgAMAAGAHAAAAD1AHAAA
AEFACQAGABsADA AKACUAAAAAAAAAIkAIAAwADP8FAAE EAAoAAQIGAAwAlAAYAGwAMAaWA
JgAAAAAAAAIBEQAgADAAN/wUAAQQADAAGABsADAANACYAAAAAAAAAAPkAIAAwEP8FAAE EAAwA
AQIGAAwADgA0AAQCGwAMAA8AFgATAERhaWx5SGVYyYwXkL1dMUy9EYXkGABsADAAQAEYAAAA
AAAAFkAIAA0Abf8FAAE EABAABAIKAA0AAAAWAAIAV0kEAhEADQABABYACQBPy3QgMTYtMTgE
AgwADQACABwABABLb2hsvQASAA0AAwAcAACATUAcAAAATUAEAYAGwANAAUAJQAAAAAAAAADw
vwgADQAK/wUAAQQABQAEAg0ADQAHABwABQBxZwXjaL0AEgANAAGAHAAAAD1AHAAAGERACQAG
ABsADQAKACUAAAAAAAAAKEAIAA0ADP8FAAE EAAoAAQIGAA0ACwAlAAYAGwANAaWAJgAAAAA
AAA+QAgADQAN/wUAAQQADAAGABsADQANACYAAAAAAAAAMUAIAA0AEP8FAAE EAAwAAQIGAA0A
DgA0AAQCGGANAA8AFgASAE1pbHcuIFN1bnRpbmVsL1BNUgYAGwANABAARgAAAAAAAAAaQAgA
DgAF/wUAAQQAEAAEAgOAdgAAABYAAgBOWQQCEQAQOAAEFgAJAE9jdCAyNi0yOQQCDQAOAAIA
HAAFAEN1b21vvQASAA4AAwAcAAAAR0AcAACARkAEAYAGwAOAAUAJQAAAAAAAAADwvwgADgAK
/wUAAQQABQAEAg4ADgAHABwABgBQYXRha2m9ABIADgAIAABwAAABDQBwAAIBIQAKABgAbAA4A
CgAlAAAAAAAAACZACAAOAAz/BQABBAAKAAECBgAOAAAsAJQAGABsADgAMACYAAAAAAAAAIEAI
AA4ADf8FAAE EAAwABgAbAA4ADQAmAAAAAAAAABDACA0ABD/BQABBAAAMAH4CCgAOAA4ANQAA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 EAAoAAQIGABAACwAlAAYAGwAQAAwAJgAAAAAAAAAYQAgAEAAAN/wUAAQQA
DAAGABsAEAAANACYAAAAAAAAAEMAIABAAEP8FAAE EAAwAfgIKABAADgAlAAAAEEAEAh0AEAAP
ABYAFQBIYXJyaXMvRGFpbHl0ZXdzL1dOQkMGABsAEAAQAEYAAAAAAAAAFEAIBEBbf8FAAE
ABAABAIKABEAAA WAAIAT0gEAhEAEQABACwACQBPy3QgMTktMjKEAhEAEQACABwACQBWb2lu
b3ZpY2i9ABI AEQADABwAAEBSQBwAAABSQAQABgAbABEABQAlAAAAAAAAAP/CAARAAR/BQAB
BAFAAQCDQARAACAHAAFAEJ1cmNovQASABEACAAcAAAAMEAcAAAAOUAJAAYAGwARAAoAJQAA
AAAAAAAAiQAgAEQAM/wUAAQQACgABAgYAEQALACUABgAbABEADAaMAAAAAAAAAAGExACAARAA3/
BQABBAAAMAAAYAGwARAA0AJgAAAAAAAAIBHQAgAEQAQ/wUAAQQADAABAgYAEQAQADQABAIcABEA
DwAWABQAVW5pdi5DaW5uLi9DaW5uL1Bvc3QGABsAEQAQAEYAAAAAAAAAFEAIBIABf8FAAE
ABAABAIKABIAAA WAAIAQ0EEAhEAEgABAC0ACQBPy3QgMjgtMzEEAhEAEgACABwACQBZw1u
c3RlaW69ABI AEgADABwAAABIQBwAAIBHQQAQABgAbABIABQAKAAAAAAAAAP/CAASAAR/BQAB
BAFAAQCEgASAAcAHAAKAEh1ZmZpbmd0b269ABI AEgAIABwAAABDQBwAAIBGQAkABgAbABIA
CgAlAAAAAAAAABxACAASAAz/BQABBAAKAAECBgASAAAsAJQAGABsAEgAMACYAAAAAAAAAJEAI
ABIADf8FAAE EAAwABgAbABIADQAmAAAAAAAAAABACAASABD/BQABBAAAMAAECBgASAA4ANAAE
Ag8AEgAPABYABwBLQ0FMLVRWBgAbABIAEABGAAAAAAAAAABBACAATAAX/BQABBAAQAAQCCgAT
AAAAFgACAENPBAlUABMAAQAWAAwAT2N0IDMwLU5vdiAxBAINABMAAgAcAAUAUm9tZXK9ABIA
EwADABwAAABMQBwAAIBLQAQABgAbABMABQAlAAAAAAAAAP/CAATAAR/BQABBAAFAAQCDgAT
AAcAHAAGAEJ1bnNvbr0AEgATAAGAHAAAAEFHAAAAGENACQAGABsAEwAKACUAAAAAAAAAFEAIB
ABMADP8FAAE EAAoAAQIGABMACwAlAAYAGwATAAwAJgAAAAAAAA2QAQAEwAN/wUAAQQADAAG
ABsAEwANACYAAAAAAAAAMEAIBMAEP8FAAE EAAwAAQIGABMADgA0AAQCEwATAA8AFgALAERl
bnZlciBQb3N0BgAbABMAEABGAAAAAAAAAAhACAUAAX/BQABBAAQAAQCCgAUAAAAFgACAENB
BAIRABQAAQAtAAkAT2N0IDE3LTE5BAIRABQAAGAcAAkARmVpbN0ZW1uvQASABQAAwAcAAAA
SEAcAACAR0AEAYAGwAUAAUAJAAAAAAAAADwvwgAFAAK/wUAAQQABQAEAhIAFAAHABwACgBI
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AAAAkAcAACAS0AEAYAGwAvAAUAJQAAAAAAAAAIQAgALwAK/wUAARwABQAEAg4ALwAHABwA
BgBCZW5zb269ABIALwAIABwAAAA9QBwAAIBDQAKABgAbAC8ACgAlAAAAAAAAACRACAAvAAz/
BQABFgAKAAECBgAvAAsAJQAGABsALwAMACYAAAAAAAAAN0AIAC8ADf8FAAEjAAwABgAbAC8A
DQAmAAAAAAAAADBACAAvABD/BQABIgANAAECBgAvAA4ANAAEhSALwAPABYAewBSb2NreSBN
b3VudGFpbibOZXdzBgAbAC8AEABGAAAAAAAAAAxACAaAAAX/BQABJAAQAAQCCgAwAAAAFgAC
AEdBBAIUADAAQAWAAwAT2N0IDMxLU5vdiAxBAIOADAAAgAcAAyATWl.sbgVYvQASADAAAwAc
AAAASEAcAACASUAEAYAGwAAUAJQAAAAAAAAAIQAgAMAAK/wUAARwABQAEAg8AMAAHABwA
BwBNaWxsbmVYvQASADAACAAcAACAREAcAACASEAJAAYAGwAAoAJQAAAAAAAAAgQAAMAAM
/wUAARYACgABAgYAMAALACUABgAbADAADAAMAAAAAAAAABxACAaAA3/BQABIwAMAAYAGwAw
AA0AJgAAAAAAAAAQAgAMAAQ/wUAASIAADQABAgYAMAEOADQABAI PADADwAWAAcAV1hJQS1U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 PADADwAWAAcAV1RIUi1UVgYAGwAzABAARgAAAAAAAAADwPwGANAFA/wUAASQA
EAAEAgOANAAABYAAGBGTAQCEQA0AAEFgAJAE9jdCAYNi0yNwQCDgA0AAIAHAAAGENoaWxl
c70AEgA0AAMAHAAAEhAHAAAGElABAAGABsANAFAcUAAAAAAAAACEAIAEQAcv8FAEEcAAUA
BAIMADQABwAcAAQAQnVzaL0AEgA0AAgAHAAAGeZAHAAAGeHACQAGABsANAAKACUAAAAAAAA
EEAIAEQADP8FAAEWAAoAAQIGADQACwAlAAyAGwA0AAwAJgAAAAAAAAAIQAgANAAN/wUAASMA
DAAGABsANAANACYAAAAAAAAAEIAEQAE8FAAEiAA0AAQIGADQADgA0AAQCGAA0AA8AFgAQ
AE9ybGFuZG8gU2VudGluZWwGABsANAQAQAEYAAAAAAAAA4D8IADUABf8FAAEkABAABAIKADUA
AAWAAIAT0gEAhEANQABACwACQBPY3QgMTgtMjAEAhEANQACABwACQBwB2lUb3ZpY2i9ABIA
NQADABwAAEBRQBwAAABSQAQABgAbADUABQAlAAAAAAAAAAhACAa1AAr/BQABHAAFAAQCDQA1
AAcAHAAFAEJ1cmNovQASADUACAAcAAAAANUAcAAAAOUAJAAYAGwA1AAoAJQAAAAAAAAAQAgA
NQAM/wUAARYACgABAgYANQALACUABgAbADUADAAMAAAAAAAAAEhACAa1AA3/BQABIwAMAAYA
GwA1AA0AJgAAAAAIBHQAgANQAQ/wUAASIAADQABAgYANQAOADQABAI dADUADwAWABUAR2Fs
bHVwL0NvbHVtYnVzIERpc3AuBgAbADUAEABGAAAAAAAAAOA/CAA2AAx/BQABJAAQAAQCCgA2
AAAAFgACAELMBAIRADYAAQAsAAkAT2N0IDI5LTMxBAINADYAAgAcAAUARWRnYXK9ABIANGAD
ABwAAABOQBwAAABQQQAQABgAbADYABQAlAAAAAAAAABBACAA2AAr/BQABHAAFAAQCDgA2AAcA
HAAGAE5ldHNjaL0AEgA2AAgAHAAADpAHAAAEFACQAGABsANgAKACUAAAAAAAAAIEAIAIDYA
DP8FAAE2AAoAvAQUADYASgAKCgMVCgBMAMD/EkAwP4EAQIGADYACwAlAAyAGwA2AAwAJgAA
AAAAAABBQAgANgAN/wUAASMDAAGABsANgANACYAAAAAAAAAPkAIAIDYAEP8FAAEiAA0AAQIG
ADYADgA0AAQCI AA2AA8AFgAYAENoZ29Ucmli dW5lL01hcmtldFNoYXJlcwYAGwA2ABAARgAA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ADgADgA0AAQCDwA4AA8AFgAHAETES0EtVfYgABsAOAAQAEYAAAAAAAA4D8IADkAbf8FAAEk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 dXRjaG1zb269ABIAOWADABwAAABMQBwA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 PAD0ABwAcAAcATW1sbG51cr0AEgA9AAgAHAAAgERAHAAAgEhA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AAAAGEIAIEAACv8FAAEcAAUABAIQAEABWAcAAgATWNNaWxsYW69ABIAQAAIABWAAIBCQBWA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 AEIADf8FAAEjAAwABgAbAEIADQAmAAAAAAAAADFCABCABD/BQABIgANAAEC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RAAMAAYAGwBJAA0AJgAAAAAAAAA2QAgASQAQ/wUAAS IADQABAgYASQAOADcABAIGAEkADwAW
ABgAQ2hnb1RyaWJ1bmUvTWFya2V0U2hhcmVzBgAbAEkAEABGAAAAAAAAAOA/CABKAAX/BQAB
RAAQAQCCgBKAAAAFgACAFdBBAIRAEoAAQAWAAkAT2N0IDE0LTE2BAIOAEoAAgAcAAYAR29y
dG9uvQASAEoAAwAcAACARkAcAAAATEAEAYAGwBKAAUAJQAAAAAAAAAAmQAgASgAK/wUAARwA
BQAEAgwASgAHABwABABTAw1zvQASAEoACAAcAAAAP0AcAAAARkAJAAYAGwBKAAoAJQAAAAA
AAAqQAgASgAM/wUAATYACgABAgYASgALACUABgAbAEoADAAmAAAAAAAAACxACABKAA3/BQAB
RAAMAAYAGwBKAA0AJgAAAAAAAAA0QAgASgAQ/wUAAS IADQABAgYASgAOADQABAIbAEoADwAW
ABMAU2VhdHRsZSBQb3N0LU1udGVsLgYAGwBKABAARgAAAAAAAAADwPwgATAAF/wUAAUQAEAAE
AiYASwAAACoAHgBVbmR1Y2lkZWRzIFNwbG10OyA0IFBvbGxzLCA0JTtoBAGYASwABACsAAQIG
AEsABQAlAL4AEABLAooAJQAlACYAJgA0AA4AAQIGAEsAEABDAAQCCgBMAAAAFgACAE10BAIU
AEWAAQAWAAWAT2N0IDMwLU5vdiAxBAIPAEWAAgAcAAcAQ2FybHNVbr0AEgBMAAAHAAAgE1A
HAAAA9ABAAGABsATAAFACUAAAAAAAAACEAIAEwAcv8FAAFMAAUAvAQUAEwATwAFBQMECgBM
AMD/EkwAwP4EBAINAEwABwAcAAUATWfydHm9ABIATAAIABwAAAA+QBwAAI BAQAkABgAbAEwA
CgAlAAAAAAAAAhACABMAAz/BQABTAAKALwEFABMAE8ACgoDBAoATADA/xJMAMD+BAECBgBM
AAsAJQAGABsATAAMACYAAAAAAAAAPUAIAEwAdf8FAAFMAAwAvAQTAEWATwAMDQMICQBMAMD3
TADA/AQGABsATAANACKAAAAAAAAAPUAIAEwAEP8FAAFMAAwAAQIGAEwADgA0AAQCHABMAA8A
FgAUAFN0UGF1bCBQaW9uZWVyIFByZXNzBgAbAEwAEABHAAAAAAAAAAAAACABNAAX/BQABTAAQ
ALwEGwBMAE8AEBADBBEATADA+kwAwPUEGRDMzB4CAAYEAg0ATQAAABYABQBWVCBDRAQCEQBN
AAEFfG AJAE9jdCAyNC0yNQCCDwBNAAIAHAAHAFNhbMrlcnO9ABIATQADABwAAABHQBWAAABJ
QAQABgAbAE0ABQAlAAAAAAAAABBACABNAAr/BQABTAAFAAQCDwBNAAcAHAHAENhcnJvbGy9
ABIATQAIABwAAIBFQBwAAIBHQAKABgAbAE0ACgAlAAAAAAAAABBACABNAAz/BQABTAAKAAEC
BgBNAAsAJQAGABsATQAMACYAAAAAAAAACEAIAE0Adf8FAAFMAAwABgAbAE0ADQAvAAAAAAAA
AAhACABNABD/BQABTAAMAAECBgBNAA4ANAAEAhkATQAPABYAEQBCZWNrZXIgwSW5zaXRpdHV0
ZQYAGwBNABAARwAAAAAAAAAAAAAgATgAF/wUAAUwAEAAEAg0ATgAAABYABQBXQTVDRACQEQBO
AAEFfG AJAE9jdCAyNi0yNwQCDQBOAAIAHAAFAEZvzGV5vQASAE4AAwAcAAAARkAcAACASEAE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 AAAWAAIAQ0EEAhEAUQABABYACQBPY3QgMjItMjUEAg4AUQACABwABgBX
aWxzZ269ABIAUQADABwAAABKQBwAAIBLQAQABgAbAFEABQAlAAAAAAAAAAhACABRAAr/BQAB
UQAFALwEFABRAGoABQUDGgoATADA/xJMAMD+BAQCDQBRAAcAHAFAEJyb3duvQASAFEACAAC
AACARUAcAACAREAJAAYAGwBRAAoAJQAAAAAAAAAAwAgAUQAM/wUAAVEACgC8BBQAUQBqAAoK
AxoKAewAwP8STADA/gQBAGYAUQALACUABgAbAFEADAAMAAAAAAAAACJACABRAA3/BQABUQAM
ALwEEwBRAGoADA0DNAkATADA90wAwPwEBgAbAFEADQApAAAAAAAAACxACABRABD/BQABUQAM
AAECBgBRAA4ANAAEAhAAUQAPABYACABMQSBUaW1lcwYAGwBRABAARgAAAAAAAAAAEWAgAUgAF
/wUAAVEAEAC8BBsAUQBqABAQAxoRAEWAwPpMAMD1BBkQzMweAgAGBAIKAFIAAAWAAIAQ0EE
AhEAUgABABYACQBPY3QgMjEtMzAEAg4AUgACABwABgBXaWxzZ269ABIAUgADABwAAABJQBwA
AIBLQAQABgAbAFIABQAlAAAAAAAAABRACABSAAr/BQABUQAFAAQCDQBSAAcAHAFAEJyb3du
vQASAFIACAACACAREAcAACAREAJAAYAGwBSAAoAJQAAAAAAAAAAAAAgAUgAM/wUAAVEACgAB
AgYAUgALACUABgAbAFIADAAMAAAAAAAAACJACABSAA3/BQABUQAMAAYAGwBSAA0AKQAAAAA
AAAsQAgAUgAQ/wUAAVEADAABAgYAUgAOADQABAI SAFIADwAWAAoARml1lbGQgUG9sbAYAGwBS
ABAARgAAAAAAAAAAEWAgAUwAF/wUAAVEAEAAEAg0AUwAAABYAAgBNQQCFABTAAEFfGAMAE9j
dCAzMS1Ob3YgMQQCDwBTAAIAHAAHAEt1bm5lZHM9ABI AUwADABwAAIBKQBwAAABNQAQABgAb
AFMABQAlAAAAAAAAABRACABTAAr/BQABUQAFAAQCDGbtAAcAHAAGAFJvbW5leB0AEgBTAAgA
HAAAAENAHAAAgERACQAGABsAUwAKACUAAAAAAAAACEAIAFMADP8FAAFRAAoAAQIGAFMACwAl
AAYAGwBTAAwAJgAAAAAAAAAUQAgAUwAN/wUAAVEADAAGABsAUwANACKAAAAAAAAAMUAIAFMA
EP8FAAFRAAwAAQIGAFMADgA0AAQCFABTAA8AFgAMAEJvc3RvbiBHbG9iZQYAGwBTABAARgAA
AAAAADwvwgAVAAF/wUAAVEAEAAEAg0AVAAAABYAAgBBWgQCEQBUAEEAFfG AJAE9jdCAyOC0z

MQQCEQBUAAlAHAAJAFN5bWluz3Rvbr0AEgBUAAMAHAAAAAEhAAAAgEpABAAGABsVAFAACUA
AAAAAAAAAFEAIAFQACv8FAAFRAAUABAINAFQABwAcAAUAQmFzaGG9ABIIVAAIABWAAABEQBwA
AABGQAKABgAbAFQACgAlAAAAAAAAABBACABUAAz/BQABUQAKAAECBgBUAAsAJQAGABsVAAM
ACYAAAAAAAAAIEIAFQADf8FAAFRAAwABgAbAFQADQAmAAAAAAAAACJACABUABD/BQABUQAM
AAECBgBUAA4ANgAEAg8VAAPABYABwBLUE5YLVRWBgAbAFQAEABGAAAAAAAAAOC/CABVAAX/
BQABUQAQAQCCGbvAAAAFgACAENBBAlRAFUAAQAWAAkAT2N0IDI4LTMxBAlOAFUAAgAcAAYA
V21sc29uvQASAFUAAwAcAACASEAcAACAS0AEAYAGwBVAAUAJQAAAAAAAAAYQAgAVQAK/wUA
AVEABQAEAg0AVQAHABwABQBCcm93br0AEgBVAAgAHAAAgENAHAAAgERACQAGABsAVQAKACUA
AAAAAAAAEAIAFUADP8FAAFRAAaAAQIGAFUACwAlAAYAGwBVAAwAJgAAAAAAAAAQAgAVQAN
/wUAAVEADAAGABsAVQANACKAAAAAAAALEAIAFUAEp8FAAFRAAAQIGAFUADgA0AAQCdWBV
AA8AFgAHAETDQUwtVFYgABsAVQAQAEYAAAAAAAAAMAIAFYABf8FAAFRABAABAIKAFYAAAAW
AAIAVFgEAhEAVgABABYACQBPY3QgMTUtMTcEAhEAAVgACABwACQBI dXRjaGlzb269ABIAVgAD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UQAQAAQCCgBeAAAAFgACAE5IBAIRAF4AAQAsAAkAT2N0IDMwLTMxBAlPAF4AAgAcAAcATWVy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Does anyone have any experience or suggestions for tracking children. The methods typically used for an adult population (telephone book, credit reports, etc) will not work for youth.

Please email me directly at LIND@IOPA.SC.EDU

Thank you,

Katherine Lind
Asst. Director
SRL - USC

Do You Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Photos - 35mm Quality Prints, Now Get 15 Free!
<http://photos.yahoo.com/>

Date: Mon, 2 Oct 2000 10:03:39 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: NPR/Kaiser/Kennedy School on "Right Direction" vs "Wrong Track"
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010020935290.7633-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

For "Election Findings"--including discussion of "right direction" (44%) versus "wrong track" (47%) respondents--scroll down.....
-- Jim

Copyright (C) 1999 by National Public Radio, Washington, D.C.

<http://www.npr.org/programs/specials/poll/govt/summary.html>

Telephone survey conducted May 26-June 25, 2000

Americans Distrust Government, but Want It to Do More

NPR/Kaiser/Kennedy School Poll Points to Paradox

Americans may say they distrust government, but a new survey by NPR, the Kaiser Family Foundation, and Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government casts doubt on what they really mean when they say that: Most Americans, the survey found, want more government involvement and more government regulation to solve the nation's problems. The survey found that nearly a quarter of

American adults believe that the federal government is a major threat to their personal rights and freedoms, and nearly half think it is at least some threat. Likewise, the survey found that nearly six out of 10 Americans believe that the federal government does what is right only some of the time, and another 10 percent say it never does what is right. Despite those negative feelings, however, Americans are more confident than they were five years ago that the federal government can be effective, and they would like to see the government do more in a wide range of areas. Although Americans don't seem to draw many distinctions between different levels of government, they not surprisingly feel they have more control over their state and local governments and generally trust those governments more than the federal government. Nevertheless, the NPR/Kaiser/Kennedy School Poll found that more Americans feel the federal government has a lot of impact on their daily lives than feel that way about their state or local governments. The poll found that African-Americans are much less likely to trust their state and local governments than whites are. Only about a quarter of African-Americans say they trust their state government to do what is right just about always or most of the time; more than 40% of whites feel that way. Latinos are more likely to trust all levels of government. The poll found the November election to be particularly fluid, not only because 5-10% of Americans say they have yet to make up their minds, but also because nearly a third of voters who have made up their minds say they might change them before Election Day.

Key findings include:

Views on the Role of Government Government as sausage-making: Americans like what government does, but hate the way they think it does it. In many ways Americans' love-hate relationship with government is the difference between the specific, which they "love," and the general, which they "hate." For instance, 60% of Americans say government has gone too far in regulating business and interfering with the free enterprise system, but when asked about specific areas that the government now regulates or could regulate - from automobile safety to health care to TV content - Americans are much more likely to say there is not enough regulation than they are to say there is too much. Indeed, most Americans have positive views about many federal government programs, from education programs (66%) to drug enforcement (59%) to food stamps (53%). In many areas they want more government involvement - for example, to reduce poverty (69%), to ensure clean air and water (67%), and to set minimum education standards (64%) - and very few Americans want less or no government involvement in the areas surveyed. But when asked general questions about government, Americans have extremely negative views. Only 29% trust the federal government to do what is right almost always or most of the time. And a majority of Americans (55%) considers government corruption a very important problem (another 34% think it is a somewhat important problem, and only 9% think it is not very

important or not important at all).

Americans offer a wide range of reasons for why they don't trust the federal government. As major reasons for their distrust, a majority points to government waste and inefficiency (73%), partisan bickering (68%), special interests having too much influence (65%), a lack of honesty and integrity among elected officials (64%), and high taxes (57%). Given a list of 11 possible reasons for distrust, fewer than 20% said any one of them was not a reason.

Confidence in government efficiency has increased in the last five years. In 1995, only 39% of Americans said that when the government in Washington sets out to solve a problem, they are confident the problem will actually be solved. Today that number is 51%. This is not a historical high, just well above the mid-'90s figure. What's more, a large majority (62%) says that religious, charitable and community organizations can do a better job than government of providing services to people in need.

Nearly half of all Americans believe that the federal government threatens their personal rights and freedoms. Nearly a quarter of all Americans (23%) think this is a major threat. Fewer Americans think their state and local governments threaten their personal rights and freedoms. But there is a significant racial difference here. Although whites and African-Americans are equally likely to think the federal government is a threat, African-Americans are significantly more likely to think their state and local governments are a threat. Interestingly, Latinos are not particularly likely to believe that any government is a threat. Nearly a third of Republicans (32%) say that the federal government presents a major threat to them.

Government Threatens Personal Rights and Freedoms
Percent answering major or minor threat

	Total	White	Black	Latino
Federal	46	48	45	37
State	31	29	42	25
Local	26	24	39	25

The survey found similar racial differences when respondents were asked how much they trusted different levels of government to "do what is right." African-Americans were significantly less trusting of their state and local governments than whites were.

Trust Government to "Do What Is Right"
Percent answering "just about always" or "most of the time"

	Total	White	Black	Latino
Federal	29	29	25	36

State	39	41	27	42
Local	39	41	29	42

Latinos are the most positive about the federal government; white Americans are the most critical. Americans of Latino or Hispanic backgrounds are a diverse group, and other studies have shown that they differ on specific issues. However, this survey supports others that show general agreement in this area. For instance, Latinos (62%) more than African-Americans (52%) and whites (49%) are confident in the federal government's ability to solve problems.

White Americans and Latinos are more positive than African-Americans in their views of state and local government. Whites (66%) and Latinos (64%) have more confidence than African-Americans (56%) in their state government's ability to solve problems. Whites (68%) and Latinos (65%) are also more likely than African-Americans (52%) to have confidence in their local government. In addition, African-Americans have less confidence than other groups in the courts. Nearly two in five African-Americans (37%), compared with one-quarter of whites (24%) and Latinos (24%), have very little confidence in the courts.

Contrary to common wisdom, Americans say that the federal government has more impact on their daily lives than their state or local governments. Indeed, more Americans (41%) say that the federal government has a lot of impact on their daily lives than either their state (30%) or local (30%) governments. This impact may not be positive for everyone, as three in five (61%) of people who say that the federal government has a lot of impact also say it is a threat to their personal liberties. But Americans feel it even though they also believe their voice is more likely to be heard by state or local officials and even though they trust their state and local governments more.

There are distinct differences between Republicans and Democrats on what is the proper role and scope of government. When it comes to activities of the federal government, Democrats are much more likely than Republicans to want more federal government involvement to reduce poverty (85% of Democrats want more involvement compared with 49% of Republicans), to ensure access to affordable health care (88% compared with 53%), and to make sure that food and medicines are safe (84% compared with 59%). Democrats (47%) are also much less likely than Republicans (73%) to say that the government has gone too far in regulating business.

Election Findings

A substantial proportion (39%) of adults most likely to vote in the next election say they are undecided or might change their minds before Election Day. "Soft" voters make up about the same percentage of the Gore (35%) and Bush (34%) camps. Pluralities of these voters describe themselves as Independents (36%) and moderate in their political

opinions (40%). Generally, these voters' views tend to coincide with the "hard" voters in their respective camps, with Bush supporters saying that a candidate's leadership abilities or character are more important than issues in determining their vote, and Gore supporters saying that issues are more important. The presidential contest was a statistical dead heat at the time of the poll.

The public is divided on whether things in the nation are headed in the right direction (44%) or are on the wrong track (47%). Americans who see the nation headed in the right direction are, in general, more positive about government at all levels, and they say the main thing going right in the nation today is the economy. They also are more trusting of and more confident in government than are those who think the country is on the wrong track. Foremost in the minds of those who feel that the nation is on the wrong track, on the other hand, is a broad underlying concern with what they see as the social disintegration of the nation. They point to a number of items that touch on this, such as the breakdown of the family, out-of-control youth, corrupt politicians, and so on. Nearly seven in 10 (69%) give the government credit for what's going right, but eight in 10 (80%) blame it for what's going wrong.

Satisfaction with the economy is widespread. Not surprisingly, the vast majority of Americans earning \$50,000 or more (87%) are satisfied with the economy. But fully three in five (61%) of those earning less than \$20,000 - this survey's lowest income category - are also satisfied. These low-income people say they are satisfied with the economy despite the fact that 70% of them say that their own personal financial situation is staying the same or getting worse.

In general, respondents are more likely to credit the Democrats for the positive nature of the economy and the Republicans for a better moral climate when they held the White House. Two in five respondents (39%) credit the Clinton administration for today's prosperity; one-quarter

(25%) give credit to the Republican administrations of the 1980s, and about the same proportion (28%) say that other things are more important. However, the Republicans win on another question: Close to half (45%) of all Americans say that the moral climate in the United States was better in the 1980s; only 16% of respondents say that the country's moral climate was better during the 1990s.

The public views the two presidential rivals as essentially status quo candidates when it comes to the role of the government. Neither is seen as wanting to expand or shrink the size of the federal government. Half of those surveyed (49%) say that if elected, Governor Bush will keep government about the same as it is now, and roughly the same proportion

(51%) say this of Vice President Gore. Of those who expect some change in the role of government, most believe that Gore will expand the role of government and Bush will shrink it.

Methodology

The NPR/Kaiser/Kennedy School Poll is an ongoing project of National Public Radio, the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, and Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. Representatives of the three sponsors worked together to develop the survey questionnaire and to analyze the results, with NPR maintaining sole editorial control over its broadcasts on the surveys. The project team includes:

From NPR - Marcus D. Rosenbaum, Special Projects Editor
From the Kaiser Family Foundation - Drew Altman, President
and Chief Executive Officer; Mollyann Brodie, Vice President,
Director of Public Opinion and Media Research
From the Kennedy School - Robert J. Blendon, a Harvard
University Professor who holds joint appointments in the
School of Public Health and the Kennedy School of Government;
John Benson, Deputy Director for Public Opinion and
Health/Social Policy at the Harvard School of Public Health;
Stephen R. Pelletier, Research Coordinator for Health/Social
Policy at the Harvard School of Public Health

The results of this project are based on a telephone survey conducted May 26-June 25, 2000, among a nationally representative sample of 1,557 respondents 18 years of age and older, including an oversample of 177 Hispanics and 175 African-Americans (results are weighted to reflect the actual distribution in the nation). Field work by ICR/International Communications Research of Media, PA. The margin of sampling error is plus or minus 3 percentage points. For results based on subsets of respondents, the margin of error is higher.

Copyright (C) 1999 by National Public Radio, Washington, D.C.

Date: Mon, 2 Oct 2000 15:35:52 -0400
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: 3 questions and FYI
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBAEJACLAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

1. Is anyone aware of recent numbers about readership of different sections of newspapers? Specifically, readership of op eds, editorials and letters to editor?
2. Is anyone aware of recent U.S. data on energy policy issues?
3. Is anyone aware of U.S. mainland data on awareness that Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens, and support for various status options for Puerto Rico (independence, statehood, improved Commonwealth)? Also, research among Puerto Ricans, comparing those living on the U.S. mainland to those living in Puerto Rico.

FYI: Pre-Debate survey <http://survey.harrispollonline.com/j12467.htm> of the Commission on Presidential Debates <http://www.debates.org/index.php>. The site is being circulated by E-mail as a way to try to influence the topics to be covered during the debates (there is one open-ended question).

Thanks, Mark Richards

=====
Date: Mon, 02 Oct 2000 22:58:51 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: LA Times: Studios Hired Teens to Pitch 'R' Film to Kids
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0009300840450.4025-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Jim's comments are well put. Like science in general, marketing research can be used for ethical as well as unethical purposes -- for good and for evil. For the movie studios to claim that they are only marketing R rated films to those 17 and over but conduct research with kids much younger is clearly deceptive and dishonest. The purpose is clear: to more efficiently market R rated films to young kids. Sadly, this seems not very different from the practices of the tobacco companies for over five decades. Market research was regularly conducted (possibly still is) to determine what worked and what didn't. Marketing tobacco products to young kids was a pretty well recognized practice despite their continued denials.....along with their denial that nicotine is addictive.

While I personally feel that the use of market/opinion research for these purposes is less than ethical and inimical to the well being of our society, these are my ethics and my judgements which may or may not be shared by others. At this point, however, we begin to swim in the deep mud of ethical and moral judgements....and I'm not sure that this is a path that AAPOR wants or should take. There are many products on the market which are not regarded by some as healthy, either mentally or physically. But, market research is often used to better define the wants and needs of potential consumers. Where do we draw the line?

Dick Halpern

At 12:44 PM 9/30/00, you wrote:

> The following story appears on the front page of this
> morning's Los Angeles Times, above the fold. It is of
> obvious news value, following the Senate Commerce Committee
> hearings earlier this week--prompted by a Federal Trade
> Commission report earlier in the month--which reviewed, in
> part, Hollywood's marketing of R-rated films. At those
> hearings, a group of Hollywood executives agreed that they
> should not target teenagers under age 17 in their marketing
> of R-rated films.

> Despite the story's obvious news value of the moment,
> however, it is even more valuable for its rare glimpse into
> the behind-the-scenes research and marketing practices of
> large Hollywood studios. We can only wonder why it takes
> such moments as these--courtesy of the FTC and the Senate
> Commerce Committee--for the news media to "obtain" such
> "previously undisclosed," "internal studio documents."

> These documents disclose that "Hollywood's top research
> company," according to the Times, conducted a survey of
> "a general cross-section of 438 moviegoers 12 to 20 years
> old," as the Times story itself quotes from the documents
> now in its possession, in order to test two television
> commercials for the film "Disturbing Behavior," a 1998
> release. "Disturbing Behavior" is described by the Times
> as a "violent R-rated film," and therefore supposedly not
> available to most of those included in a sample of 12-to-
> 20-year-olds (namely those 12-16 years old).

> Keep in mind that it is *not* the inclusion of 12-16-
> year-olds in the sample that is in question here, but
> rather the application of the results to the marketing
> of a "violent R-rated film" which they are not--as the
> client for this research well knows--allowed to view.
> There is absolutely no question that such research is
> legal, the question raised here is whether--given the
> likely applications of the research--it is professionally
> ethical, or whether market research is a profession at
> all (something I trust all of us would much prefer to be
> the case).

> I post this message, somewhat unusual for AAPORNET, I
> admit, to see whether any of you think our venerable
> organization might make some productive response--whether
> short- or long-term or both--to the questions I would hope
> might arise, as a result of this rare glimpse into
> corporate research, about both the ethical and moral
> responsibilities, if any, of any social, survey or market
> research firm that might agree to conduct research such
> as this.

-- Jim

Copyright 2000 Los Angeles

Times

http://www.latimes.com/news/nation/updates/lat_ftc000930.htm

Saturday, September 30, 2000

Studio Hired Teens to Pitch 'R' Film to Kids

Marketing: Documents illustrate the methods used to lure underage viewers to theaters to boost the take for "Disturbing Behavior."

By JAMES BATES and GREG MILLER, Times Staff Writers

Hollywood's expertise in driving kids into theaters to see violent R-rated films by pulling strings to create buzz among teens is vividly illustrated with MGM/UA's promotion of the 1998 movie "Disturbing Behavior," internal studio documents reveal.

In Southern California, it hired teenagers to pass out merchandise at underage hangouts. A summer program for hundreds of teens at New York City's American Academy of Dramatic Arts was called a "perfect demo-hit." The studio staked out popular teen skating spots, such as Manhattan's Chelsea Piers. In Seattle, it hired a promoter, nicknamed "Super Dave" because he "specializes in the underage dance club scene."

The campaign was for a film that earned an R rating from the Motion Picture Assn. of America for sexuality, drugs and strong violence, including scenes showing the killing of a policeman, a violent supermarket rampage, a woman smashing her head into a mirror and a high school jock who snaps a girl's neck, killing her.

The documents show that MGM/UA marketers went to great lengths to orchestrate a word-of-mouth campaign to make sure underage teens were aware of the movie. The previously undisclosed documents, obtained Friday by The Times, provide the most detailed and damaging accounts yet in the federal investigation into how Hollywood markets violent movies to teens.

"In promoting 'Disturbing Behavior,' our goal was to find the elusive teen target audience and make sure everyone between the ages of 12-18 was exposed to the film," wrote MGM publicist Lamya Souryal in a lengthy memo describing the efforts.

Souryal went on to explain how teenagers were organized into special teams and paid to distribute "Disturbing Behavior" bracelets, bumper stickers and posters at Los Angeles and Orange County hangouts, such as Santa Monica's Third Street Promenade, Westwood, Old Town Pasadena and the Lab in Costa Mesa.

> In New York, popular teen skating spots, such as the Chelsea
> Piers and along the Hudson River, were choice targets. A summer
> program for hundreds of teens at the American Academy of Dramatic
> Arts was considered a "perfect demo-hit."

> Also targeted were "all-age nightclubs, which attract huge teen
> crowds," a "trendy Philadelphia teen hangout," "teen hangout areas" in
> Atlanta and "a juice/dance bar catering to underage kids." So were
> "teen-specific retail outlets, promotional partners and community
> organizations" that included cheerleading camps and even driver
> education classes.

> Earlier this week, a contrite group of Hollywood executives at a
> Senate Commerce Committee hearing agreed that they should not target
> teenagers under age 17 when marketing R-rated films. The hearing came
> in the wake of a scathing Federal Trade Commission report earlier
> this month that concluded studios systematically did just that.

> The MGM memo, contained in FTC records, shows in explicit detail
> how Hollywood has refined the art of selling violent, R-rated films
> to youths as young as 12. Other FTC documents show that MGM did not
> have a corner on those techniques.

> One FTC document for "The Mimic," a 1997 film from Walt Disney's
> Miramax unit rated R for terror, violence and language, describes
> plans to distribute fliers and posters for the film to dozens of
> youth organizations, including Camp Fire Boys & Girls and Girl
> Scouts.

> A Paramount Pictures memo on "media strategies" for its John
> Travolta film "The General's Daughter," rated R for violence and rape,
> describes the studio's plans for buying TV commercials targeted at
> "the 12-24 (skewing male)" audience, and recommends spot radio ads
> likely to produce a "good delivery of teens."

> On Friday, MGM Vice Chairman Chris McGurk reiterated a pledge he
> made to the Senate hearing earlier in the week that company managers
> who took over the studio last year have put into place new procedures
> aimed at eliminating any similar problems.

> " 'Disturbing Behavior' was something that occurred two years
> ago and doesn't reflect our current marketing practices," McGurk
> said. "Even before the benefit of 20/20 hindsight, that's a movie
> this current management team would never have greenlit. Clearly there
> were problems in our marketing."

> Disney spokesman John Dreyer called the Miramax marketing moves
> "regrettable lapses in judgment." He added that Miramax, a division
> known for edgier, controversial films, has agreed to tighter
> marketing policies aimed at preventing such abuses that Disney
> unveiled in the wake of the FTC report.

> Paramount Pictures Vice Chairman Rob Friedman said that "The
> General's Daughter" wasn't targeted to teens under age 17, and that
> less than 3% of the audience was in that age group. He added that the
> inclusion of teens in the Paramount memo stems from the way
> advertising agencies buy blocks of time that often encompass a wide

> range of age groups.

>

> Asked about the "Disturbing Behavior" marketing plan, Rich Taylor, spokesman for the MPAA, said, "If you look at the records of any industry and corporation, you're going to find an indication of poor judgment written by someone who demonstrated poor judgment."

>

> Taylor also reiterated pledges by Hollywood's studios to do better.

>

> "There are things we are not going to defend," Taylor said. "The key thing is to move forward and to do what we can do to prevent egregious mistakes . . . in the future."

>

> One thing the documents also show is a symbiotic relationship between studios and radio stations in promoting R-rated films to teens. For Miramax's "The Faculty," listeners to radio station contests won free tickets to see the film for their best "why you stayed home from school today" excuse.

>

> When "Disturbing Behavior" was promoted in Hawaii, one radio station gave away movie passes and promotional items to teenagers at beaches and malls. "Kids had to describe what they thought their parents would say is the teens' most disturbing behavior," according to the MGM memo. Still another radio station passed out promotional materials for "Disturbing Behavior" during "A Family Festival" in Griffith Park that drew more than 1,000 people.

>

> In recent years, the making and marketing of films to teens has become a Hollywood obsession, with teen horror films among the most popular in the wake of such successes as the "Scream" franchise and films such as "I Know What You Did Last Summer." The films feature young stars, often from popular TV shows, and usually include good doses of sex and violence.

>

> "Disturbing Behavior" was to be such a film. Starring Katie Holmes, one of the stars of the popular teen drama "Dawson's Creek" on the WB, the movie was about outcasts who encounter a high school full of clean-cut students who turn out to be zombie-like because of electronic brain implants. Just before the film was released, Larry Gleason of MGM described it to The Times as a "Stepford Wives" for teens.

>

> National Research Group Inc., Hollywood's top research company, tested two television commercials for "Disturbing Behavior" by surveying "a general cross-section of 438 moviegoers 12 to 20 years old."

>

> The internal memo and other reports, copies of which were sent to the company's top executives at the time, list numerous ways that teens were aggressively targeted. Radio promotions were targeted during the strongest teen listening hours, and the studio worked with stations to host "Disturbing Behavior" nights at "all-age nightclubs" which attract huge teen crowds.

>

> "Super Dave," the Seattle promoter, "has tied us into several area underage nightclubs and community sponsored dances for

> high-school-age teens," documents read. Promotional materials also
> were distributed at a three-day Seattle festival attracting 500,000
> people, of which "most are teens."
>
> Ironically, for all of MGM's efforts "Disturbing Behavior" was
> no "Scream." Not only was the movie skewered by critics--Leonard
> Maltin called it "teen-targeted dreck"--it also was a box-office dud,
> grossing only \$17 million domestically.
>
>-----
> Copyright 2000 Los Angeles
> Times
>-----

=====
Date: Tue, 3 Oct 2000 10:14:44 -0500
From: "Edward Horowitz" <ehorowit@facstaff.wisc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: survey research software
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0149_01C02D22.C071DF00"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0149_01C02D22.C071DF00
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

We are looking for software for the implementation of dual paper/Web =
surveys. In our search, we have been unable to find software
that would = allow easy text entry of a semantic differential scale with dual
anchors = (or the use of dual anchors for any type of
question), that easily = converted to html. Although we can implement this
with Perseus Survey = Solutions (the software we are
currently testing) by editing the html = document to add a column on the far
right for the second anchor, we = would rather find
software that can easily do both with one entry = process. =20

I would appreciate if anyone has a solution for this problem, or can point us
to software packages that might facilitate this=20
process. Please reply directly to me. Many thanks.

Edward Horowitz
Assistant Professor
Department of Communications
University of Oklahoma
horowitz@ou.edu
#405-325-5946

succinctly, we need to know the prevalence of the behavior among under-agers. In other words, even if they can get in easily, are they taking advantage?

Then there is the argument that "I cannot control what my child sees outside my home", i.e., somebody else doesn't know how to parent. Again, we need to know if this is a prevalent means of seeing R-rated films.

What I would REALLY like to know is what kind of control actually occurs IN THE HOME. You need parents of children age 16 and under. In the past (time period of your choice) have you take your child to see an R-rated picture? Which ones? Have you rented an R-rated picture to view at home? Which ones? Did you allow your children to view any of those films? Which ones? Do you subscribe to a "premium television channel" with programming that includes essentially unedited R-rated movies? What movies have you watched on this channel? Does your child have his/her own television set? With a VCR? With the same cable channels? Yeah, you need to ask the same questions of the under-agers too.

My suspicions are that a) childrens' viewing may actually mirror their parents', and b) that parents may actually be paying to bring the very content they are trying to control into their own homes. Maybe these data exist already and I'm completely wrong. Great, please point me in the right direction! If not, then there is lot's of shooting in the dark, as usual.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu <mailto:lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

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

From: dick halpern [SMTP:rshalpern@mindspring.com]

Sent: Monday, October 02, 2000 7:59 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: LA Times: Studios Hired Teens to Pitch 'R' Film

to Kids

Jim's comments are well put. Like science in general, marketing research can be used for ethical as well as unethical purposes -- for good and for evil. For the movie studios to claim that they are only marketing R rated films to those 17 and over but conduct research with kids much younger is clearly deceptive and dishonest. The purpose is clear: to more efficiently market R rated films to young kids. Sadly, this seems not very different from the practices of the tobacco companies for over five decades. Market research was regularly conducted (possibly still is) to determine what

worked and what didn't. Marketing tobacco products to young kids was a pretty well recognized practice despite their continued denials.....along with their denial that nicotine is addictive.

While I personally feel that the use of market/opinion research for these purposes is less than ethical and inimical to the well being of our society, these are my ethics and my judgements which may or may not be shared by others. At this point, however, we begin to swim in the deep mud of ethical and moral judgements....and I'm not sure that this is a path that AAPOR wants or should take. There are many products on the market which are not regarded by some as healthy, either mentally or physically. But, market research is often used to better define the wants and needs of potential consumers. Where do we draw the line?

Dick Halpern

At 12:44 PM 9/30/00, you wrote:

> The following story appears on the front page of this
> morning's Los Angeles Times, above the fold. It is of
> obvious news value, following the Senate Commerce
Committee
> hearings earlier this week--prompted by a Federal Trade
> Commission report earlier in the month--which reviewed, in
> part, Hollywood's marketing of R-rated films. At those
> hearings, a group of Hollywood executives agreed that they
> should not target teenagers under age 17 in their
marketing
> of R-rated films.
>
> Despite the story's obvious news value of the moment,
> however, it is even more valuable for its rare glimpse
into
> the behind-the-scenes research and marketing practices of
> large Hollywood studios. We can only wonder why it takes
> such moments as these--courtesy of the FTC and the Senate
> Commerce Committee--for the news media to "obtain" such
> "previously undisclosed," "internal studio documents."
>
> These documents disclose that "Hollywood's top research
> company," according to the Times, conducted a survey of
> "a general cross-section of 438 moviegoers 12 to 20 years
> old," as the Times story itself quotes from the documents
> now in its possession, in order to test two television
> commercials for the film "Disturbing Behavior," a 1998
> release. "Disturbing Behavior" is described by the Times
> as a "violent R-rated film," and therefore supposedly not
> available to most of those included in a sample of 12-to-
> 20-year-olds (namely those 12-16 years old).

>
>
> Keep in mind that it is *not* the inclusion of 12-16-
> year-olds in the sample that is in question here, but
> rather the application of the results to the marketing
> of a "violent R-rated film" which they are not--as the
> client for this research well knows--allowed to view.
> There is absolutely no question that such research is
> legal, the question raised here is whether--given the
> likely applications of the research--it is professionally
> ethical, or whether market research is a profession at
> all (something I trust all of us would much prefer to be
> the case).
>
> I post this message, somewhat unusual for AAPORNET, I
> admit, to see whether any of you think our venerable
> organization might make some productive response--whether
> short- or long-term or both--to the questions I would hope
> might arise, as a result of this rare glimpse into
> corporate research, about both the ethical and moral
> responsibilities, if any, of any social, survey or market
> research firm that might agree to conduct research such
> as this.
>
> -- Jim
>

>-----
>-----
> Copyright 2000 Los Angeles
> Times

>-----
>-----
>
> http://www.latimes.com/news/nation/updates/lat_ftc000930.htm
>
> Saturday, September 30, 2000
>
>
> Studio Hired Teens to Pitch 'R' Film to Kids
>
> Marketing: Documents illustrate the methods
> used to lure underage viewers to theaters
> to boost the take for "Disturbing Behavior."
>
> By JAMES BATES and GREG MILLER, Times Staff Writers
>
>
> Hollywood's expertise in driving kids into theaters to see
violent
> R-rated films by pulling strings to create buzz among teens is
vividly
> illustrated with MGM/UA's promotion of the 1998 movie "Disturbing
> Behavior," internal studio documents reveal.
>
> In Southern California, it hired teenagers to pass out
merchandise

> at underage hangouts. A summer program for hundreds of teens at New
York
> City's American Academy of Dramatic Arts was called a "perfect demo-
hit."
> The studio staked out popular teen skating spots, such as
Manhattan's
> Chelsea Piers. In Seattle, it hired a promoter, nicknamed "Super
Dave"
> because he "specializes in the underage dance club scene."
>
> The campaign was for a film that earned an R rating from the
Motion
> Picture Assn. of America for sexuality, drugs and strong violence,
> including scenes showing the killing of a policeman, a violent
> supermarket rampage, a woman smashing her head into a mirror and a
high
> school jock who snaps a girl's neck, killing her.
>
> The documents show that MGM/UA marketeers went to great
lengths to
> orchestrate a word-of-mouth campaign to make sure underage teens
were
> aware of the movie. The previously undisclosed documents, obtained
Friday
> by The Times, provide the most detailed and damaging accounts yet in
the
> federal investigation into how Hollywood markets violent movies to
teens.
>
> "In promoting 'Disturbing Behavior,' our goal was to find
the
> elusive teen target audience and make sure everyone between the ages
of
> 12-18 was exposed to the film," wrote MGM publicist Lamya Souryal in
a
> lengthy memo describing the efforts.
>
> Souryal went on to explain how teenagers were organized into
special
> teams and paid to distribute "Disturbing Behavior" bracelets, bumper
> stickers and posters at Los Angeles and Orange County hangouts, such
as
> Santa Monica's Third Street Promenade, Westwood, Old Town Pasadena
and
> the Lab in Costa Mesa.
>
> In New York, popular teen skating spots, such as the Chelsea
Piers
> and along the Hudson River, were choice targets. A summer program
for
> hundreds of teens at the American Academy of Dramatic Arts was
considered
> a "perfect demo-hit."
>
> Also targeted were "all-age nightclubs, which attract huge
teen
> crowds," a "trendy Philadelphia teen hangout," "teen hangout areas"

in
> Atlanta and "a juice/dance bar catering to underage kids." So were
> "teen-specific retail outlets, promotional partners and community
> organizations" that included cheerleading camps and even driver
education
> classes.
>
> Earlier this week, a contrite group of Hollywood executives
at a
> Senate Commerce Committee hearing agreed that they should not target
> teenagers under age 17 when marketing R-rated films. The hearing
came
in
> the wake of a scathing Federal Trade Commission report earlier this
month
> that concluded studios systematically did just that.
>
> The MGM memo, contained in FTC records, shows in explicit
detail how
> Hollywood has refined the art of selling violent, R-rated films to
youths
> as young as 12. Other FTC documents show that MGM did not have a
corner
> on those techniques.
>
> One FTC document for "The Mimic," a 1997 film from Walt
Disney's
> Miramax unit rated R for terror, violence and language, describes
plans
> to distribute fliers and posters for the film to dozens of youth
> organizations, including Camp Fire Boys & Girls and Girl Scouts.
>
> A Paramount Pictures memo on "media strategies" for its John
> Travolta film "The General's Daughter," rated R for violence and
rape,
> describes the studio's plans for buying TV commercials targeted at
"the
> 12-24 (skewing male)" audience, and recommends spot radio ads likely
to
> produce a "good delivery of teens."
>
> On Friday, MGM Vice Chairman Chris McGurk reiterated a
pledge he
> made to the Senate hearing earlier in the week that company managers
who
> took over the studio last year have put into place new procedures
aimed
> at eliminating any similar problems.
>
> " 'Disturbing Behavior' was something that occurred two
years ago
> and doesn't reflect our current marketing practices," McGurk said.
"Even
> before the benefit of 20/20 hindsight, that's a movie this current
> management team would never have greenlit. Clearly there were
problems in
> our marketing."

>
> Disney spokesman John Dreyer called the Miramax marketing
moves
> "regrettable lapses in judgment." He added that Miramax, a division
known
> for edgier, controversial films, has agreed to tighter marketing
policies
> aimed at preventing such abuses that Disney unveiled in the wake of
the
> FTC report.
>
> Paramount Pictures Vice Chairman Rob Friedman said that "The
> General's Daughter" wasn't targeted to teens under age 17, and that
less
> than 3% of the audience was in that age group. He added that the
> inclusion of teens in the Paramount memo stems from the way
advertising
> agencies buy blocks of time that often encompass a wide range of age
> groups.
>
> Asked about the "Disturbing Behavior" marketing plan, Rich
Taylor,
> spokesman for the MPAA, said, "If you look at the records of any
industry
> and corporation, you're going to find an indication of poor judgment
> written by someone who demonstrated poor judgment."
>
> Taylor also reiterated pledges by Hollywood's studios to do
better.
>
> "There are things we are not going to defend," Taylor said.
"The key
> thing is to move forward and to do what we can do to prevent
egregious
> mistakes . . . in the future."
>
> One thing the documents also show is a symbiotic
relationship
> between studios and radio stations in promoting R-rated films to
teens.
> For Miramax's "The Faculty," listeners to radio station contests won
free
> tickets to see the film for their best "why you stayed home from
school
> today" excuse.
>
> When "Disturbing Behavior" was promoted in Hawaii, one radio
station
> gave away movie passes and promotional items to teenagers at beaches
and
> malls. "Kids had to describe what they thought their parents would
say is
> the teens' most disturbing behavior," according to the MGM memo.
Still
> another radio station passed out promotional materials for
"Disturbing
> Behavior" during "A Family Festival" in Griffith Park that drew more

than
> 1,000 people.
>
> In recent years, the making and marketing of films to teens
has
> become a Hollywood obsession, with teen horror films among the most
> popular in the wake of such successes as the "Scream" franchise and
films
> such as "I Know What You Did Last Summer." The films feature young
stars,
> often from popular TV shows, and usually include good doses of sex
and
> violence.
>
> "Disturbing Behavior" was to be such a film. Starring Katie
Holmes,
> one of the stars of the popular teen drama "Dawson's Creek" on the
WB,
> the movie was about outcasts who encounter a high school full of
> clean-cut students who turn out to be zombie-like because of
electronic
> brain implants. Just before the film was released, Larry Gleason of
MGM
> described it to The Times as a "Stepford Wives" for teens.
>
> National Research Group Inc., Hollywood's top research
company,
> tested two television commercials for "Disturbing Behavior" by
surveying
> "a general cross-section of 438 moviegoers 12 to 20 years old."
>
> The internal memo and other reports, copies of which were
sent to
> the company's top executives at the time, list numerous ways that
teens
> were aggressively targeted. Radio promotions were targeted during
the
> strongest teen listening hours, and the studio worked with stations
to
> host "Disturbing Behavior" nights at "all-age nightclubs which
attract
> huge teen crowds."
>
> "Super Dave," the Seattle promoter, "has tied us into
several area
> underage nightclubs and community sponsored dances for high-school-
age
> teens," documents read. Promotional materials also were distributed
at a
> three-day Seattle festival attracting 500,000 people, of which "most
are
> teens."
>
> Ironically, for all of MGM's efforts "Disturbing Behavior"
was no
> "Scream." Not only was the movie skewered by critics--Leonard Maltin
> called it "teen-targeted dreck"--it also was a box-office dud,

grossing
> only \$17 million domestically.
>

>-----
>-----
> Copyright 2000 Los Angeles
> Times

>-----
>-----

=====
Date: Tue, 03 Oct 2000 14:05:21 -0400
From: "Colleen K Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: RE: LA Times: Studios Hired Teens to Pitch 'R' Film to Kids
Message-ID: <39D9D4FF.24180.19D13009@localhost>
In-reply-to: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A21302A37A74@psg.ucsf.edu>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)

I'm not sure this is an on-topic issue for AAPORNET, once we get away from the ethical concerns in the application of market research, which Jim brought up. But it's an interesting can of worms.

On 3 Oct 2000, at 8:42, LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu wrote:

>[...]
> Right now, the focus is on R-rated films, so let's stick with that.
>The contention is that under-agers can get in to see R-rated films
>anytime they want, the theaters would rather sell tickets than be
>cops.

Well, there are two other sources for kids to see R-rated films against their parents' wishes and out of parental control.

One is the public library. The American Library Association's "freedom to read" policy prohibits discrimination by age. This means that young people can check out R-rated (or worse) videos, and the parent only finds out when the kid loses the tape, and mom and dad are expected to pay for it.

Another is the public schools. My kids had the opportunity to see "Glory" and "Schindler's List." After enough parents protested, the school district did finally come up with a policy that required parent permission...but then there are other peer pressure issues. Once one of my daughters made the decision not see an R-rated film. She was in high school and didn't even bother to bring the form home; it was her call. The teacher put her desk in the hall (rather than allowing her to go to the library or some other less obvious remedy) and made disparaging comments about her closed-mindedness.

>
> What I would REALLY like to know is what kind of control actually
> occurs IN THE HOME. You need parents of children age 16 and under. In

> the past (time period of your choice) have you take your child to see
> an R-rated picture?

Nope.

> Which ones? Have you rented an R-rated picture to view at home? Which
> ones?

I confess, I have seen two R-rated movies in the last 25 years I've
been a mom. One was Redford's ORDINARY PEOPLE. The other
was WITNESS with Harrison Ford. I did let the teenagers see
WITNESS.

> Do you
> subscribe to a "premium television channel" with programming that
> includes essentially unedited R-rated movies?

No. And I put off getting cable at all for more than 10 years
because of concerns about television in general and "free
weekends" of premium movies. We survived on PBS and ABC
until I got a job where I had to watch the school board meetings.

> My suspicions are that a) childrens' viewing may actually mirror their
> parents', and b) that parents may actually be paying to bring the very
> content they are trying to control into their own homes. Maybe these
> data exist already and I'm completely wrong. Great, please point me in
> the right direction! If not, then there is lot's of shooting in the
> dark, as usual.

The problem, of course, is that there is so little data because
communication researchers don't want to conduct studies that
might conflict with the first amendment. When I attended my first
symposium on Journalism and Mass Communication, someone
presented findings about correlations between MTV viewing and
disturbing behavior in high-school-aged boys (i.e. not wanting a
female supervisor at work, not viewing rape as a crime). One of the
prominent professors in the room criticized the work, saying that
we should not be doing this kind of research.

Someone with the status and seniority of Dolf Zillman can get away
with it (and every parent should read his paper on shifting
preferences in pornography consumption)...but for a non-tenured
faculty to even try to get funding would be academic suicide.

Colleen K. Porter
mom to Phillip (25), Julia (21), Rebecca (19), Elaine (9), Lorissa (7)

=====
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: RE: LA Times: Studios Hired Teens to Pitch 'R' Film to Kids
In-Reply-To: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A21302A37A74@psg.ucsf.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="====_2100420==_ .ALT"

-----_2100420==_ .ALT

whether opinion researchers, as professionals, should be guided by some as yet unwritten code of conduct with respect to these matters --- but this gets us on the slippery slope of widely differing judgements about appropriateness. Again, is this where AAPOR wants to be?

 Dick Halpern

<x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep> *****
 Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
 Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
 3837 Courtyard Drive
 Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
 rshalpern@mindspring.com
 phone/fax 770 434 4121
 *****</html>

-----=_2100420==_ .ALT--

=====
Date: Tue, 3 Oct 2000 16:43:48 -0400
From: "Cralley, Marla" <Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Dr. Deming and Sample Balancing
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
 boundary="----=_NextPart_000_01C02D7A.A1C00350"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----=_NextPart_000_01C02D7A.A1C00350
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

Help!

If anyone knows how I can get a copy of the Dr. Deming's rules for sample balancing I would appreciate it if you would let me know. It would be absolutely fabulous if you can send them to me electronically.

Thanks.

.
Marla Cralley
Sr. Project Leader
Methods Analysis and Consulting
The Arbitron Company
Marla.cralley@arbitron.com
410-312-8449

<<Cralley, Marla.vcf>>

-----=_NextPart_000_01C02D7A.A1C00350
Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
 name="Cralley, Marla.vcf"

Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="Cralley, Marla.vcf"

BEGIN:VCARD
VERSION:2.1
N:Cralley;Marla
FN:Cralley, Marla
ORG:Arbitron;E039
TEL;WORK;VOICE:410-312-8449
ADR;WORK;;CMBARB;9705 Patuxent Woods Dr;Columbia;MD;21046;USA
LABEL;WORK;ENCODING=QUOTED-PRINTABLE:CMBARB=0D=0A9705 Patuxent Woods
Dr=0D=0AColumbia, MD 21046=0D=0AUSA
EMAIL;PREF;INTERNET:Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com
REV:20000831T021046Z
END:VCARD

-----=_NextPart_000_01C02D7A.A1C00350--

=====
Date: Tue, 03 Oct 2000 20:26:10 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Dr. Deming and Sample Balancing
References: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B302A51B7A@arbmex.arbitron.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The relevant information is spelled out in Deming's book "Statistical Adjustment of Data" which is currently available in a Dover paperback edition.

The specific rules you want are provided in Chapter VII, "Adjusting Sample Frequencies to Marginal Totals." Most computer programs for sample balancing are based to some extent on the method developed by F.F. Stephan in collaboration with Deming and summarized by Deming toward the end of that chapter, although the actual algorithms used by different programs vary, of course.

There were two relevant papers published in the Annals of Mathematical Statistics that I have not read, but are now available online from JSTOR, if you belong to an institution that can access that database.

1) W.E. Deming & F.F. Stephan: "On a least squares adjustment of a sampled frequency table when the expected marginal totals are known" (Ann.Math.Stat. 1940, Vol. XI, pp427-444).

2) F.F. Stephan: "An iterative method of adjusting sample frequency tables when expected marginal totals are known" (Ann.Math.Stat. 1942, Vol. XIII, pp166-178).

I would personally be grateful if some kind AAPORNET member with access to JSTOR through their institution could email me these two papers, preferably in Adobe Acrobat (.pdf) format.

Jan Werner

"Cralley, Marla" wrote:

>
> Help!
>
> If anyone knows how I can get a copy of the Dr. Deming's rules for
> sample balancing I would appreciate it if you would let me know. It
> would be absolutely fabulous if you can send them to me
> electronically.
>
> Thanks.
>
> .
> Marla Cralley
> Sr. Project Leader
> Methods Analysis and Consulting
> The Arbitron Company
> Marla.cralley@arbitron.com
> 410-312-8449
>
> <<Cralley, Marla.vcf>>

Date: Tue, 3 Oct 2000 23:58:26 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: CNN: GORE GETS SLIGHT EDGE IN DEBATE PERFORMANCE POLL
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010032333470.9628-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

(C) 2000 Cable News Network. All Rights Reserved.

<http://edition.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/10/04/flash.poll/index.html>

Web posted at: 12:59 a.m. EDT (0459 GMT)
October 4, 2000

GORE GETS SLIGHT EDGE IN DEBATE PERFORMANCE POLL

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- After the first presidential debate of the fall campaign, a CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll indicates a slight plurality of voters thought Vice President Al Gore did a better job than Texas Gov. George W. Bush -- but the debate appears to have had little effect on voter support.

Interviews with 435 voters who watched Tuesday night's debate revealed that 48 percent felt Gore did the best job in the debate, while 41 percent felt Bush performed best.

The survey was of registered voters, not the more tightly screened likely voters of the CNN/USA Today/Gallup daily tracking poll, and had a margin of error of plus or minus 4 percent. All interviews were conducted after the debate concluded at 10:30 p.m. EDT.

Large majorities of voters in the poll thought the debate performances of both candidates were "excellent" or "good." And more voters than not felt more confident in both candidates' ability to lead the nation. Notably, however, fully 96 percent of those surveyed said "No" to the question: "Did the debate make you switch your vote?"

Tuesday's CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll indicated a neck-and-neck race going into tonight's campaign contest, with the Democratic and Republican rivals locked in the tightest presidential race in two decades. In the poll, Gore had 46 percent and Bush had 44 percent.

CNN/USA TODAY/GALLUP POLL

October 3

Who Did the Best Job In the Debate?

Gore 48%
Bush 41

Sampling error: +/-4% pts

CNN/USA TODAY/GALLUP POLL

October 3

How Did Bush Do?

Excellent 20%
Good 50
Only fair 27
Poor 3

Sampling error: +/-4% pts

CNN/USA TODAY/GALLUP POLL

October 3

How Did Gore Do?

Excellent 25%
Good 51

Only fair 20
Poor 4

Sampling error: +/-4% pts

CNN/USA TODAY/GALLUP POLL

October 3

Effect of Debate on Your Opinion of Bush

More favorable 34%
Less favorable 14
No effect 52

Sampling error: +/-4% pts

CNN/USA TODAY/GALLUP POLL

October 3

Effect of Debate on Your Opinion of Gore

More favorable 27%
Less favorable 18
No effect 55

Sampling error: +/-4% pts

CNN/USA TODAY/GALLUP POLL

October 3

Did the Debate Make You Switch Your Vote?

Yes 3%
No 96

Sampling error: +/-4% pts

CNN/USA TODAY/GALLUP POLL

October 3

Confidence in Bush's Ability to Handle the Presidency

More confident 40%
Less confident 20
No change 38

Sampling error: +/-4% pts

CNN/USA TODAY/GALLUP POLL

October 3

Confidence in Gore's Ability to Handle the Presidency

More confident	35%
Less confident	15
No change	50

Sampling error: +/-4% pts

(C) 2000 Cable News Network. All Rights Reserved.

Date: Wed, 4 Oct 2000 07:09:57 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: Gore Fares Better In 2 of 3 Polls
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGC PFJBPAELJCEAA.and y@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

>From Yahoo:

Gore Fares Better In 2 of 3 Polls

By WILL LESTER, Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) - Democrat Al Gore (news - web sites) may have had the edge over Republican George W. Bush (news - web sites) from debate watchers in two of three instant polls, but both candidates apparently improved their image with voters.

Vice President Gore was judged to have performed better in the debates in a CBS News poll of 812 registered voters by 56 percent to 42 percent for the Texas governor. Gore was seen to have performed better by 48 percent to 41 percent for Bush in a CNN-USA Today-Gallup poll of 435 registered voters who watched the debate.

And the two were ranked about even in an ABC News poll - women favored Gore,

while men favored Bush.

One measure that may have helped Bush: A third in the CNN-USA Today-Gallup poll had a better impression of him after the debate, while a fourth had a better impression of Gore.

The ABC News poll of 491 registered voters showed no significant change in candidate preference. They were about evenly split before the debate, 48 percent for Bush and 45 percent for Gore, and the numbers barely budged.

The CBS poll, conducted online among a random sample of viewers who were given

WebTV to participate, showed that Bush still has to convince more voters that he has adequately prepared for the job of president.

Just over half, 54 percent, said he has adequately prepared for the job compared with 70 percent who said that of Gore. That's about the same results the two got on that question in a regular CBS-New York Times poll released Monday.

The polls had error margins of 4 percentage points, but they are not considered a measure of settled public opinion. They are measures of instant, emotional reaction that don't always hold up over time.

Public opinion about polls can take several days to develop, based on discussions among friends and co-workers, news coverage and further consideration by the viewer of what was seen and heard. And true public opinion includes the effects of such debates on all voters, not just debate watchers.

Andrew A. Beveridge
209 Kissena Hall
Department of Sociology
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY
Flushing, NY 11367-1597
Phone: 718-997-2837
Fax: 718-997-2820
E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Website: <http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps>

Home Office
50 Merriam Avenue
Bronxville, NY 10708
Phone: 914-337-6237
Fax: 914-337-8210

Date: Wed, 4 Oct 2000 09:34:38 -0400
From: John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com>
To: "AAPORnet List server (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: CBS News poll by email?
MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="----_=_NextPart_001_01C02E07.DA8BD400"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C02E07.DA8BD400
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Was I only half awake this morning listening to CBS news radio, or did I correctly hear that CBS News had conducted a poll by email?

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C02E07.DA8BD400
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN"> <HTML><HEAD>
<META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html";
charset=iso-8859-1">

<META content="MSHTML 5.00.2919.6307" name=GENERATOR></HEAD> <BODY>
<DIV><FONT
face=Arial size=2>Was
I only half
awake this morning listening to CBS news radio, or did I correctly hear that
CBS
News had conducted a poll by email?</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C02E07.DA8BD400--

=====
Date: Wed, 4 Oct 2000 09:45:28 -0400
From: anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu
Received: from ksgfiona.harvard.edu (kskfiona.harvard.edu [128.103.190.184])
by ackroyd.harvard.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTMP id JAA26864
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Oct 2000 09:43:25 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from ksg.harvard.edu (ksghmail2.harvard.edu [128.103.190.33])
by ksgfiona.harvard.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3) with ESMTMP id JAA12762
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Oct 2000 09:42:50 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: Re: CBS News poll by email?
To: aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.3 March 21, 2000
Message-ID: <OF283242DA.F50EF665-ON8525696E.004B7AA7@harvard.edu>
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on KSGMTA/KSG(Release 5.0.3 |March 21, 2000)
at 10/04/2000 09:45:34 AM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

CBS worked with Knowledge Networks (formerly InterSurvey) using their web-based Internet panel to conduct a post-debate poll.

jmittchell@elementusa.com@usc.edu on 10/04/2000 09:34:38 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

Sent by: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc:
Subject: CBS News poll by email?

Was I only half awake this morning listening to CBS news radio, or did I correctly hear that CBS News had conducted a poll by email?

=====
Date: Wed, 4 Oct 2000 09:43:25 -0400
From: John Mitchell <jmittchell@elementusa.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email?
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I knew that CBS was working with Knowledge Networks. But the journalist *did* present it as a poll by "email".
I wonder whether CBS News Poll will respond to the mistake or let it slide?

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

From: anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu [mailto:anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 9:45 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: CBS News poll by email?

CBS worked with Knowledge Networks (formerly InterSurvey) using their web-based Internet panel to conduct a post-debate poll.

jmittchell@elementusa.com@usc.edu on 10/04/2000 09:34:38 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

Sent by: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc:
Subject: CBS News poll by email?

Was I only half awake this morning listening to CBS news radio, or did I correctly hear that CBS News had conducted a poll by email?

```
=====
Date: Wed, 4 Oct 2000 09:48:10 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email?
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGC PFJBP AELKCEAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
        boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0002_01C02DE8.34C01500"
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
In-Reply-To: <714D7E686BC9D311BB2000508B8BFE5E40A25E@ELEMENTNT02>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
```

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

```
-----_NextPart_000_0002_01C02DE8.34C01500
Content-Type: text/plain;
        charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
```

No, they used Knowledge Networks panel (using WEB-TV). It is a pre-screened demographically representative panel. The former intersurv.

Andy

```
-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of John Mitchell
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 9:35 AM
To: AAPORnet List server (E-mail)
Subject: CBS News poll by email?
```

Was I only half awake this morning listening to CBS news radio, or did I correctly hear that CBS News had conducted a poll by email?

```
-----_NextPart_000_0002_01C02DE8.34C01500
Content-Type: text/html;
        charset="iso-8859-1"
```

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN"> <HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1"> <META content=3D"MSHTML 5.50.4207.2601"
name=3DGENERATOR></HEAD> <BODY> <DIV><SPAN
class=3D665224713-04102000><FONT face=3DArial color=3D#0000ff =
size=3D2>No,=20 they used Knowledge Networks panel (using
WEB-TV).&nbsp; It is a = pre-screened=20 demographically representative
panel.</FONT></SPAN></DIV> <DIV><SPAN
class=3D665224713-04102000><FONT face=3DArial color=3D#0000ff =
size=3D2>The=20 former intersurv.</FONT></SPAN></DIV> <DIV><SPAN
class=3D665224713-04102000><FONT face=3DArial color=3D#0000ff =
size=3D2></FONT></SPAN>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><SPAN class=3D665224713-04102000><FONT face=3DArial color=3D#0000ff =
size=3D2>Andy</FONT></SPAN></DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE dir=3Dltr style=3D"MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
  <DIV class=3DOutlookMessageHeader dir=3Dltr align=3Dleft><FONT =
face=3DTahoma=20
  size=3D2>-----Original Message-----<BR><B>From:</B> = owner-
aapornet@usc.edu=20
  [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]<B>On Behalf Of </B>John=20
  Mitchell<BR><B>Sent:</B> Wednesday, October 04, 2000 9:35 =
AM<BR><B>To:</B>=20
  AAPORnet List server (E-mail)<BR><B>Subject:</B> CBS News poll by=20
  email?<BR><BR></FONT></DIV>
  <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><SPAN class=3D771423713-04102000>Was = I
  only half=20
  awake this morning listening to CBS news radio, or did I correctly = hear
  that=20
  CBS News had conducted a poll by=20
  email?</SPAN></FONT></DIV></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>
```

-----=_NextPart_000_0002_01C02DE8.34C01500--

```
=====
Date: Wed, 04 Oct 2000 09:52:36 -0500
From: Kathy Frankovic <KAF@cbsnews.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email? -Reply
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline
```

If yo can tell me what time you heard the radio report, I will make a point of talking with the appropriate correspondent.

Kathy Frankovic

```
>>> John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com> 10/04/00 08:43am >>>
I knew that CBS was working with Knowledge Networks. But the journalist
*did* present it as a poll by "email".
I wonder whether CBS News Poll will respond to the mistake or let it slide?
```

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

From: anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu [mailto:anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 9:45 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: CBS News poll by email?

CBS worked with Knowledge Networks (formerly InterSurvey) using their web-based Internet panel to conduct a post-debate poll.

jmittchell@elementusa.com@usc.edu on 10/04/2000 09:34:38 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

Sent by: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc:
Subject: CBS News poll by email?

Was I only half awake this morning listening to CBS news radio, or did I correctly hear that CBS News had conducted a poll by email?

Date: Wed, 4 Oct 2000 09:53:49 -0400
From: John Mitchell <jmittchell@elementusa.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email? -Reply
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

It was the 6:30 report, with Sarah presenting the results.

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

From: Kathy Frankovic [mailto:KAF@cbsnews.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 10:53 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email? -Reply

If yo can tell me what time you heard the radio report, I will make a point of

talking with the appropriate correspondent.

Kathy Frankovic

>>> John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com> 10/04/00 08:43am >>>
I knew that CBS was working with Knowledge Networks. But the journalist
did present it as a poll by "email".
I wonder whether CBS News Poll will respond to the mistake or let it slide?

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

From: anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu [mailto:anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 9:45 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: CBS News poll by email?

CBS worked with Knowledge Networks (formerly InterSurvey) using their web-based Internet panel to conduct a post-debate poll.

jmitchell@elementusa.com@usc.edu on 10/04/2000 09:34:38 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

Sent by: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc:
Subject: CBS News poll by email?

Was I only half awake this morning listening to CBS news radio, or did I correctly hear that CBS News had conducted a poll by email?

Date: Wed, 04 Oct 2000 08:30:56 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Rands <rrands@cfmc.com>
Subject: Re: CNN: GORE GETS SLIGHT EDGE IN DEBATE PERFORMANCE POLL
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010032333470.9628-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

My wife decided to participate in one of the debate polls last night. Here is her comment:

<<

As if watching the debate hadn't been frustrating enough...I went to the Website of the Commission on Presidential Debates and attempted to take their online survey about my responses to the debate. First, it's one of those long, one-page things that makes a person keep scrolling down the page.

Well, I ploughed through the questions and then attempted to submit my completed survey, but it came back with a red message telling me I hadn't completed all the questions. Mind you, it didn't tell me *which* question I had failed to answer. So I scrolled down through the whole thing, only to find that it had erased my answers. (My *careful, well considered* answers, I might add -- these were not easy, quick questions; they required evaluating policy issues, social issues, and international issues for the next debate.)

So I went back to the beginning and took it again. It gave me the same error message. I scrolled down through and found one answer that either I'd missed answering (not likely, because I was being very careful), or it had erased. I answered it, submitted the survey a second time, and this time it "took." It then took me to a demographics screen, also another long scrolling business, which I went through carefully. When I attempted to submit the demographic answers, it AGAIN told me I hadn't answered all the questions (I know I did this time), and so I attempted to scroll down to see what it had erased this time.

But life is not so simple. Instead of giving me the demographic screen again, it took me back to the beginning of the entire survey -- and all of my answers were now blank.

<<I have deleted the remainder of her comments for reasons you can probably guess>>

Richard Rands

```
=====  
Date: Wed, 04 Oct 2000 11:52:34 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Listserv  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
        boundary="====_53400464==_ .ALT"
```

```
-----_53400464==_ .ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed
```

Did I get dropped from aapornet. I have not received anything for 6 days.

Warren J. Mitofsky
2211 Broadway - Apt. 6LN
New York, NY 10024

```
212 496-2945 212 496-0846 FAX  
-----_53400464==_ .ALT  
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"
```

<html>

Did I get dropped from aapornet. I have not received anything for 6 days.

<x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep> Warren J. Mitofsky
 2211 Broadway - Apt. 6LN
 New York, NY 10024

 212 496-2945 212 496-0846 FAX </html>

-----=_53400464==_.ALT--

Date: Wed, 4 Oct 2000 13:43:09 -0400
Subject: Poll Watchers
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Claudia Deane" <deanec@washpost.com>
Message-ID: <OFF073F65C.61DA88D0-ON8525696E.00613835@washpost.com>
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on inetmail1/TWP(Release 5.0.3 |March 21, 2000) at 10/04/2000 01:43:16 PM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com at:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A9293-2000Oct4.html>

Date: Wed, 4 Oct 2000 18:26:11 -0400
From: John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email? -Reply
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

In order to avoid confusion, I was surprised that CBS News Poll would be doing email polls and intended to point out that beyond the issues we all deal with of choosing appropriate methodologies, once a study is released, the press does have a tendency to take the ball and, thinking they are running with it, fumble it completely. The journalist in question presented a survey done using the Knowledge Networks panel as a survey by email. I have been lynched by the press in this way before.

I would not call into question CBS' ability to choose methods appropriate for polling the public, and did not intend my earlier post to mean that.

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

From: John Mitchell [mailto:jmitchell@elementusa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 9:54 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email? -Reply

It was the 6:30 report, with Sarah presenting the results.

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

From: Kathy Frankovic [mailto:KAF@cbsnews.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 10:53 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email? -Reply

If yo can tell me what time you heard the radio report, I will make a point of talking with the appropriate correspondent.

Kathy Frankovic

>>> John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com> 10/04/00 08:43am >>>
I knew that CBS was working with Knowledge Networks. But the journalist *did* present it as a poll by "email".
I wonder whether CBS News Poll will respond to the mistake or let it slide?

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

From: anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu [mailto:anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 9:45 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: CBS News poll by email?

CBS worked with Knowledge Networks (formerly InterSurvey) using their web-based Internet panel to conduct a post-debate poll.

jmitchell@elementusa.com@usc.edu on 10/04/2000 09:34:38 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

Sent by: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc:
Subject: CBS News poll by email?

Was I only half awake this morning listening to CBS news radio, or did I correctly hear that CBS News had conducted a poll by email?

Date: Wed, 04 Oct 2000 22:36:34 -0400
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: This is very significant
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Some recent AAPORNET discussions about statistical significance fade into insignificance in comparison with a current one involving the high stakes of that Big Science, particle physics. I recommend a peek at the "News Focus" piece in the 29 September 2000 Science, "CERN's Gamble Shows Perils, Rewards of Playing the Odds." Here's one quote:

Discoveries that seem statistically unassailable can vanish overnight, while flimsier looking findings have entered the award rosters and the textbooks without cavil. Qualitative factors, such as the reputation of a team of scientists, whether a finding conforms to prevailing theory, and how and why the team announces a discovery, can determine whether it wins the Nobel Prize or languishes as an also ran (p.2260).

Here's another quote:

Going by statistics, if physicists discovered a new five-sigma [standard deviations] every 10,000 years. In fact, the history of high-energy physics is littered with five-sigma mirages (p. 2262).

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 4 Oct 2000 22:58:49 -0400 (EDT)
From: Bruce Altschuler <altschul@Oswego.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: George Magazine (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.21.0010042245150.2726-100000@rocky.oswego.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Earlier today I received this inquiry. Although I declined to participate, I thought members of our list would be interested in learning about (would warned be a better word?) this forthcoming article in GEORGE.

Bruce Altschuler

SUNY Oswego

> > > > George Magazine is writing a piece for its December/January
> > > > issue
entitled "Winners and Losers." What we are doing is compiling a list of
people and organizations that have been involved in the
2000 campaign, and deciphering who comes out as having benefitted/not
benefitted as a result of this campaign. I received your name
from one of our contributors, Sasha Issenberg, as someone who might be able
to offer helpful insight into the impact of pollsters
on this election. If you have time, we would greatly appreciate your comments
to the following questions. Thanks very much in
advance.

> > > >
> > > >

> > > > As stated above, which pollsters do you see will have emerged on
> > > > top
after this campaign is over, regardless of who wins?

> > > >
> > > >
> > > >

> > > > Who has made a name for himself/themselves, and not necessarily
through their own efforts?

> > > >
> > > >
> > > >

> > > > Who do you think has made the greatest impact, become a
> > > > household
name, as a result of being involved in election 2000? Do you think others
would agree with you (those in the political field, not,
and both)?

> > > >
> > > >
> > > >

> > > > What do you base your opinions on? Why do you feel these
people/organizations have made impacts, whether positive/negative?

> > > >
> > > >
> > > >

> > > > Is there anyone else unique who's really caught your eye?

> > > >
> > > >
> > > >

> > > > Is there anyone who's really messed up, made a fool of himself,
someone you'd never trust again should he become involved in future election
campaigns?

> > > >
> > > >
> > > >

> > > > Finally, I have a list supplied by our writer of some pollsters,
and would like to ask your opinion of how they've fared, and how you think
they'll finish come election day:

> > > >

> > > > Geoff Garin, Democratic pollster for candidates

> > > > Celinda Lake, Democratic pollster, does work for Voter.com Ed

> > > > Goeas, GOP pollster, does work for Voter.com Kellyanne

> > > > Fitzpatrick, GOP pollster, has consulted Bush campaign Neil

> > > > Oxman, Democratic pollster, based in Philadelphia
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Is there anyone else you recommend we speak with? Also, since
> > > > we'd
like to use your comments in our magazine, are you willing to go on the
record? If not, we understand, and sincerely appreciate your
time and attention to this subject.
> > > >
All best,

Ellen L. Boyer
George Magazine

(212) 767-6224, ph
(212) 489-4592, fx

Date: Thu, 05 Oct 2000 08:53:56 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Post-Debate polls: A comparison of 7 polls
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

For my current class in "Basic Research Methods" I put together an overview
of seven post-debate polls (4 serious and 3 junk polls) as a case study in
how sampling and administration may affect the results. Feel free to visit
my course web page and take a look at this document:
http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/pub/eres/SOC240.00_KUECHLER/debate-polls.htm
All relevant information is on the first page, the rest is just backup
documentation (screen shots).

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

Date: Thu, 5 Oct 2000 09:38:54 -0400
From: John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email?
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I want to be very clear that the mistaken presentation about the CBS News
Poll
was a journalist error, and that no one at CBS News
Poll, including Sarah Dutton or Kathy Frankovic, made any statement
suggesting

that they had conducted a poll by email.

I apologize for any confusion this may have caused.

John Mitchell

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

From: John Mitchell [mailto:jmitchell@elementusa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 6:26 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email? -Reply

In order to avoid confusion, I was surprised that CBS News Poll would be doing email polls and intended to point out that beyond the issues we all deal with of choosing appropriate methodologies, once a study is released, the press does have a tendency to take the ball and, thinking they are running with it, fumble it completely. The journalist in question presented a survey done using the Knowledge Networks panel as a survey by email. I have been lynched by the press in this way before.

I would not call into question CBS' ability to choose methods appropriate for polling the public, and did not intend my earlier post to mean that.

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

From: John Mitchell [mailto:jmitchell@elementusa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 9:54 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email? -Reply

It was the 6:30 report, with Sarah presenting the results.

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

From: Kathy Frankovic [mailto:KAF@cbsnews.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 10:53 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: CBS News poll by email? -Reply

If yo can tell me what time you heard the radio report, I will make a point of talking with the appropriate correspondent.

Kathy Frankovic

>>> John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com> 10/04/00 08:43am >>>
I knew that CBS was working with Knowledge Networks. But the journalist *did* present it as a poll by "email".
I wonder whether CBS News Poll will respond to the mistake or let it slide?

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

From: anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu [mailto:anna_greenberg@Harvard.Edu]

Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2000 9:45 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: CBS News poll by email?

CBS worked with Knowledge Networks (formerly InterSurvey) using their web-based Internet panel to conduct a post-debate poll.

jmittchell@elementusa.com@usc.edu on 10/04/2000 09:34:38 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

Sent by: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc:
Subject: CBS News poll by email?

Was I only half awake this morning listening to CBS news radio, or did I correctly hear that CBS News had conducted a poll by email?

=====
Date: Thu, 5 Oct 2000 13:39:30 -0400
From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Reminder: Oct. 11 Wash.-Balt. Chapter Seminar!
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

Greetings, fellow Chapter members & friends!

October 11: Colonias on the US/Mexico Border: Barriers to Enumeration in Census 2000, by Manuel de la Puente and David Stemper, U.S. Bureau of the Census

RSVP EXTENDED TO FRIDAY OCTOBER 6:

To be placed on the visitor's list, send e-mail to
audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com
or call Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413
by FRIDAY, October 6.

DETAILED INFO ON THE SESSION APPEARS BELOW

We hope to see you there!

Rob Santos
Chapter President

Topic: Colonias on the US/Mexico Border: Barriers to
Enumeration in Census 2000

When: Wednesday, October 11, 2000, 12:30-1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Manuel de la Puente and David Stemper, U.S. Bureau of the
Census

Location: BLS Cognitive Lab, Room 2990 (Second Floor)
Postal Square Building
2 Massachusetts Ave., NE
Washington, DC
(Enter on First St., NE, and bring a photo ID)

Metro: Union Station, Red Line

RSVP: To be placed on the visitor's list, send e-mail to
audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com or
call Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 by Thursday, October 5.

Abstract: Colonias are unincorporated, generally low income
residential subdivisions, lacking basic infrastructure and
services (e.g., paved roads and public water systems) along the border
between
the U.S. and Mexico. The population in these settlements can range from 50
to over 15,000 persons. A recent unofficial estimate of the total population
in Colonias totaled 1.2 million persons.

This presentation presents findings from ethnographic studies and focus
groups
conducted in four colonias in three southwestern
states. The U.S. Census Bureau initiated and executed this research in
conjunction with Census 2000 in order to identify and
understand barriers to census enumeration in colonias. The presentation will
draw on ethnographic reports and focus groups with
colonia residents, census enumerators, and crew leaders in order to discuss
barriers to census enumeration in colonias and present
an assessment of census procedures from the point of view of census
enumerators and crew leaders. The presentation will conclude by
discussing how the knowledge obtained from this research can be used by the
Census Bureau to develop appropriate enumeration
procedures and effective outreach and promotion programs for colonias.

Note: If you want a direct e-mail notice of these meetings in
the future, please contact dc-aapor.admin@erols.com

Date: Thu, 5 Oct 2000 14:20:37 -0400
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Company Sets Out To Poll the World
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain

<http://news.excite.com/news/ap/001004/16/poll-of-the-world>

And some highlights

(AP) - 3Com Inc. plans to use the Internet to poll people around the world for their views on sex, education, dreams and other personal topics.

The computer networking company said Wednesday it is working with the Harris Poll and technology leaders such as Sun Microsystems Inc. and Oracle Corp., to carry out its "Planet Project" over four days next month.

"The poll is the biggest, fastest, most sophisticated survey of its kind ever attempted," said 3Com's chief executive, Bruce Claflin, in a statement "It's a bold demonstration of how technology can be used to foster greater understanding across geographic, cultural and economic barriers."

SNIP

It is possible that a respondent could participate more than once, so the poll will not be statistically valid.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

=====
Date: Thu, 05 Oct 2000 14:49:30 -0400
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Is "Dead Heat" Immortal?
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="-----
48DE7D87624C6E393C64DB68"

-----48DE7D87624C6E393C64DB68
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In case anyone thought "Dead Heat" went west after the recent assaults on it by our colleagues in the "prestige press," the following shows that it just went slightly south.

> Tight race for Senate, poll shows
> Women voters could hold key
>
> Richmond Times-Dispatch

> October 5, 2000
> BY JEFF E. SCHAPIRO
>
>
> U.S. Sen. Charles S. Robb, D-Va., and Republican challenger George
> Allen are locked in a statistical dead heat, according to a
> Times-Dispatch/NBC12 poll that suggests undecided women voters could
> swing the contest as it enters its monthlong finale.
>
> Allen, a popular former governor, was preferred by 45 percent to 42
> percent for Robb, who is seeking a third six-year term in Washington.
> Because the 3 percentage-point spread between the candidates is within
> the survey's margin of error of 4.4 percentage points, the Robb-Allen
> battle could be considered a statistical tie.
>
> The poll for the newspaper and Richmond television station WWBT is
> based on telephone interviews with 507 registered voters who said that
> they are likely to cast ballots on Nov. 7. It was conducted Sept. 22
> through Monday by the research department of Media General Inc.,
> parent company of The Times-Dispatch.
>

-----48DE7D87624C6E393C64DB68
Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en"> <html> In case  
anyone thought "Dead Heat" went west after the recent  
assaults on it by our colleagues in the "prestige press,"&nbsp; the following  
shows that it just went slightly south. <blockquote  
TYPE=CITE> <pre>Tight race for Senate, poll shows Women voters could hold key
```

Richmond Times-Dispatch
October 5, 2000
BY JEFF E. SCHAPIRO

U.S. Sen. Charles S. Robb, D-Va., and Republican challenger George Allen are
locked in a statistical dead heat, according to a
Times-Dispatch/NBC12 poll that suggests undecided women voters could swing
the
contest as it enters its monthlong finale.

Allen, a popular former governor, was preferred by 45 percent to 42 percent
for Robb, who is seeking a third six-year term in
Washington. Because the 3 percentage-point spread between the candidates is
within the survey's margin of error of 4.4 percentage
points, the Robb-Allen battle could be considered a statistical tie.

The poll for the newspaper and Richmond television station WWBT is based on
telephone interviews with 507 registered voters who said
that they are likely to cast ballots on Nov. 7. It was conducted Sept. 22
through Monday by the research department of Media General
Inc., parent company of The Times-Dispatch.</pre> </blockquote> </html>

-----48DE7D87624C6E393C64DB68--

=====
Date: Thu, 05 Oct 2000 17:03:05 -0700
From: Janet Bridges <snobrid@louisiana.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7C-CCK-MCD {C-UDP; EBM-APPLE} (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: middle class
References: <OFF073F65C.61DA88D0-ON8525696E.00613835@washpost.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Does anyone know the current definition of "middle class" according to our political candidates? Adjusted or gross income?

--

JANET A. BRIDGES
Associate Professor and
BoRSF Professor of Communication
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
(formerly University of Southwestern Louisiana)
Lafayette LA 70504-3650
337-482-6142 (telephone)
337-482-6104 (FAX)

=====
Date: Thu, 5 Oct 2000 19:42:57 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>
Subject: likely voters
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

Are the algorithms for determining likely voters published? I sure can't find it on the Gallup website. Is this info proprietary?

Doug Henwood

=====
Date: Thu, 05 Oct 2000 20:46:51 -0400
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Post-Debate polls: A comparison of 7 polls
References: <4.3.2.7.2.20001005084535.00af0c00@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I drafted an off-list message to Kuechler thanking him for sharing with us the excellent display he prepared for his students, but decided it would be better to post the thanks to the list.

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu.

Manfred Kuechler wrote:

> For my current class in "Basic Research Methods" I put together an
> overview of seven post-debate polls (4 serious and 3 junk polls) as a
> case study in how sampling and administration may affect the results.
> Feel free to visit my course web page and take a look at this
> document:
> http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/pub/eres/SOC240.00_KUECHLER/debate-polls.htm
> All relevant information is on the first page, the rest is just backup
> documentation (screen shots).
>
> Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
> <http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

Date: Thu, 5 Oct 2000 20:04:01 -0700
From: "Michael O'Neil" <mikeoneil@earthlink.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <p04330104b602c2612c14@[216.254.77.128]>
Subject: Re: likely voters
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Part of the Gallup algorithmys (enough to give you an idea of what they do, but not enough to replicate) were published some years ago (over 10 years ago, if I remember correctly). Author either Irving Crespi (or possibly Paul Perry).

Mike O'Neil
mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu
www.oneilresearch.com

----- Original Message -----
From: "Doug Henwood" <dhenwood@panix.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Thursday, October 05, 2000 4:42 PM
Subject: likely voters

> Are the algorithms for determining likely voters published? I sure
> can't find it on the Gallup website. Is this info proprietary?
>
> Doug Henwood
>

=====
Date: Fri, 6 Oct 2000 01:11:54 -0700
From: "Michael O'Neil" <mikeoneil@earthlink.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <OFF073F65C.61DA88D0-ON8525696E.00613835@washpost.com>
<39DD16B9.E4122836@louisiana.edu>
Subject: Re: middle class
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

I don't think any of the candidates have any reason to define middle class. It is a symbolic reference that is extremely powerful since the vast majority of the population considers itself middle class. (I remember somewhere reading research that showed an extraordinary proportion of the population identifying with the term, including people who most demographers would classify as wealthy. Sorry, I don't recall the citation; I am sure someone in AAPORNET will).

So if I am a candidate who is able to present myself as representing the interests of the "middle class" I speak in terms that resonate with all but a tiny minority of voters. If I get the votes of the middle class, I win--with perhaps 85% of the vote. The other guy can represent the wealthy and the poor.

Mike O'Neil
mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu
www.oneilresearch.com
----- Original Message -----
From: "Janet Bridges" <snobrid@louisiana.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Thursday, October 05, 2000 5:03 PM
Subject: middle class

> Does anyone know the current definition of "middle class" according to
> our political candidates? Adjusted or gross income?
> --
> JANET A. BRIDGES
> Associate Professor and
> BoRSF Professor of Communication
> University of Louisiana at Lafayette
> (formerly University of Southwestern Louisiana)
> Lafayette LA 70504-3650
> 337-482-6142 (telephone)
> 337-482-6104 (FAX)
>
>
>

=====
Date: Fri, 6 Oct 2000 08:16:23 -0400
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: likely voters
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2651.58)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

I also point you to Rob Daves' recent chapter, "Who Will Vote? Ascertaining Likelihood to Vote and Modeling a Probable Electorate in Preelection Polls", in ELECTION POLLS, THE NEWS MEDIA, AND DEMOCRACY (Eds. Lavrakas & Traugott), Chatham House Pub., NY, 2000.

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

From: Michael O'Neil [mailto:mikeoneil@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 05, 2000 11:04 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: likely voters

Part of the Gallup algorithms (enough to give you an idea of what they do, but not enough to replicate) were published some years ago (over 10 years ago, if I remember correctly). Author either Irving Crespi (or possibly Paul Perry).

Mike O'Neil
mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu
www.oneilresearch.com

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

From: "Doug Henwood" <dhenwood@panix.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Thursday, October 05, 2000 4:42 PM
Subject: likely voters

> Are the algorithms for determining likely voters published? I sure
> can't find it on the Gallup website. Is this info proprietary?
>
> Doug Henwood
>

=====
Date: Fri, 6 Oct 2000 09:47:37 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: More on Likely Voters and Non-Response
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCPCFJBPKEMOCEAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Dear All:

Like Manfred, I have been using the disparate poll results in my methods courses, though mine is at Queens College, not Hunter. Plainly, the material on the "results of the Gore debate" raise very interesting issues and show the difference between volunteer samples and RDD phone or the equivalent Web Sample. Even among the four legitimate polls there were very big differences. Obviously getting people on the phone or the Web in the evening is difficult.

But just looking at tracking poll numbers, the last couple of days one finds the following:

CNN/Gallup/USAToday Gore 51 Bush 40 Nader 2 Buchanan 1. Frank Newport was just on CNN.

Zogby/MSNBC/Reuters Gore 46 Bush 41 Nader 6 Buchanan 1.

Voter.com/Battlegroun/Celinda Lake/Ed Goes
Gore 41 Bush 43 Nader 4 Buchanan 1

The CNN poll has Gore well ahead, Zogby has a fairly steady lead, and Voter.com may have had Gore ahead one time but has constantly had Bush ahead by a tiny amount.

The number of reasons for these disparities are many. Voter.com posted a memo indicating why they are more likely to eliminate Democratic leaning voters from their poll. They also use an "unaided" ballot question first, and, of course, more Bush voters know who is running.

But not knowing anything about non-response, call back policies, the use of likely voter models in these actual polls, it is impossible to tell what is going on.

Does anybody know? This goes to the inherent bias in any or all of these polls. But one or another must be biased systematically.

Andy Beveridge

Date: Fri, 06 Oct 2000 10:07:48 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: Re: Post-Debate polls: A comparison of 7 polls
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Thanks for the kind words (both on this list and in private messages) in response to my posting yesterday. After having used the material in two sections of my methods class, I added some explanations and a third round of results for the junk polls (and cleaned up some wording). Those who took an interest (and especially those who are teaching related courses) may want to get the updated version. The URL is still the same:
http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/pub/eres/SOC240.00_KUECHLER/debate-polls.htm

Two quick notes (triggered by private messages):

1. If the link does not seem to work, make sure that your mail program did not split the URL into two lines. The URL/link must end in "...KUECHLER/debate-polls.htm" and must not have any embedded spaces or LF/CR characters.
2. I always consider teaching materials that I produce as freely available to everyone; so, if you like, download, edit, amend, ... However, some acknowledgment (of origin) would be appreciated.

Manfred Kuechler, Sociology Department at Hunter College (CUNY)
<http://maxweber.hunter.cuny.edu/socio/faculty/kuech.html>

Date: Fri, 06 Oct 2000 10:48:23 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: likely voters
References:
<F9BC190B7DE9D111965000805FA7C60B0389C269@nmrusnysx1.dun.nielsen.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Polls of likely voters make the assumption that the sampling frame is not the total population of eligible voters, but a purposively defined universe of "likely voters." This, in turn, means that results are not projectable to the electorate, but only to that judgementally selected subgroup.

In other words, the accuracy of results among likely voters reflects not so much on the statistical accuracy of the poll, but on the pollster's cleverness in guessing just which group of voters is most likely to turn out to vote this time.

Given responses rates in polls today, this is most likely (pun intended) a better way to pick winners than trying to project from a real random sample, but one should not claim that the results have are in any way statistically projectable to the outcome.

On the first page of his awful book, *One Nation, After All*, Alan Wolfe writes, "According to the General Social Survey, at no time between 1972 and 1994 did more than 10 percent of the American population classify themselves as either lower class or upper class." He says this to prove that the rest, 90%, are middle class. But they're not. Wolfe forgot to say that over the same period, half the unnamed rest called themselves, quaintly, working class.

But Wolfe is a man on a mission - to probe the middle-class American mind and find it largely free of alienation and bigotry, and to pronounce the Culture Wars largely the figment of politicians and intellectuals. Wolfe's Americans are tolerant (except for the queers), open hearted (except for the wrong kind of immigrants), striving, and utterly depoliticized. To take the measure of middle-class thought, Wolfe and his "Middle Class Morality Project" assembled a sample of 200 people drawn from 10 suburbs, and polled and interviewed them. And since America is a suburban nation, these thoughts, such as they are, become what "we" think - a we as spurious as USA Today's, and no more sophisticated.

It's not very fruitful to kick around a bad book unless it's representative of something, and Wolfe's crystallizes the stupidity of so much of American political discourse. In both this book and our public speech, class almost never appears (except maybe as a lifestyle choice). Everything is framed as a "moral" issue rather than a political one, an individual question of right and wrong rather than a matter for collective action. Politics becomes a cuss word. For Wolfe's middle-class moralists, religion is marvellous as long as it's not "political"; ditto multicultural education, even. How can those things ever be anything but political? Don't they involve issues of social power and prestige, of who belongs to a society and who doesn't? But, no, Wolfe and his subjects drain both religion and multicultural education of all their interesting content, rendering each just another consumer preference, another marketing niche. After all, a little multiculturalism, says one of Wolfe's interviewees, can help you pick the right global mutual fund!

Technically, Wolfe's Middle Class Morality Project is a joke. His 200 respondents are meant to stand for about 50 million suburban households; his 24 black respondents get to speak for the entire "black middle class." He scores the interviews impressionistically; there's no way to control for, or even second-guess, his bias in drafting the questions or inventing the categories. But even if his picture of "middle-class" suburbia were accurate, it's a stretch to call that representative of the way a mythic unitary "America" thinks. Suburbanites are less than half the U.S. population, and affluent suburbanites of Wolfe's sort are still less. Just 1.5% of his sample has an income under \$15,000, compared with almost 10% of the U.S. population; people with incomes between \$15,000 and \$50,000 are greatly underrepresented, and those with incomes over \$50,000, well under half the population, are two-thirds of his sample. Over three-quarters are married, compared with just over half of U.S. adults, and just 1% appear to be gay.

For Wolfe, the book is an act of penitence for having rejected middle-class suburbia as a youth. Now, as a grownup, he's discovered

its charms. Wolfe has taken quite a political journey over the years. Once a radical, Wolfe moved to the right starting in the late 1980s (around the time he moved to Scarsdale). In 1989, he published a book denouncing Swedish social democracy as harmful to family values - around the time he was dean of the New School and purged the Marxists and other troublemakers from the economics department and replace them with big-name mainstreamers. Though he's long gone, New Schoolers still use phrases like "damaging and rotten" to describe the Wolfe years. It takes some repressive effort to produce the blandness that Wolfe reveres.

Of course, Wolfe didn't invent the middle-class thought he portrays; you do hear manifestations it all over the place, even among people who should know better (including Wolfe). These Americans are "religious," but their religion makes no particular demands on them. It doesn't matter what religion you are really, as long as you're something (except an atheist, or presumably a Satanist, but that doesn't come up). Wolfe's people seem tolerant less out of conviction than out of indecisiveness; as he helpfully writes: "Ambivalence - call it confusion if you want to - can be described as the default position for the American middle class; everything else being equal, people simply cannot make up their minds." No wonder politics is a bad word in their lexicon; it does require some making up of the mind. People believe contradictory or nonsensical things - they love capitalism, but hate the fact that it destroys "community"; affirmative action would be fine if it were for "everybody" - without feeling any urge to think through, much less resolve the contradiction.

Tolerance finds its limits in Wolfe-world on one topic: homosexuality. One respondent refused even to talk about the issue, while "others responded with nervous laughter, confusion, or expressions of pity." On most issues, says Wolfe, his people feel that differences can be "talked out." But not this one. Why? Is this good or bad? Wolfe never says; mulling this one over might get in the way of his reconciliation with suburbia.

Wolfe's people do complain about overwork, a lack of time. Though the reasons for this are, to use that cuss word, political - a direct consequence of what the New York Times's Germany correspondent Alan Cowell (approvingly) called "the American approach of working longer for less" - Wolfe & Co. seem to accept this state of affairs as natural, if unfortunate, like a nasty heat wave or a killer tornado. Unions are nice, but in the past, as an object of "nostalgia," appropriate for the day when you had twelve-hour days and child labor; those things are back, but Wolfe didn't interview too many Chinatown garment workers. Besides, "solidarity can become counterproductive," once you understand "the need of business to adapt to changing economic circumstances."

Wolfe faultously interprets the harried situation of his middle class as "a moral squeeze rather than an economic one," because "to politicize family issues" would "run against the grain of middle-class sensibility." But the amount of time people have to work and the expense and availability of child care - forces that shape

"family issues" - are political from the start, and only the status quo is served by blinding yourself to that fact.

No, the American middle class, or at least Wolfe's version of it, isn't interested in the big questions. Their religion is tepid; their tolerance, contentless; and their taste in virtues is decidedly "modest," "writ small." "Virtue, like religion, cannot be equated with politics, for that would lead to division and discord." The horror! Better to stick to the safe ground of mediocrity and mere decency.

If the American middle really is this blandly tolerant, who keeps electing all those yahoos to public office? Can't be the downscale - they don't vote; can't be the upper class - there aren't enough of them. Maybe behind the apolitical contentment lurks a lot more alienation and rage than Wolfe can see. But on the face of it, it's amazing how much his middle America sounds like, of all things, the USSR in its heyday, post-Gulag and pre-Gorby. Here's Henri Lefebvre's description of the moral code of Homo sovieticus from the early 1960s:

"This code can be summed up in a few words: love of work (and work well done, fully productive in the interests of socialist society), love of family, love of the socialist fatherland. A moral code like this holds the essential answer to every human problem, and its principles proclaim that all such problems have been resolved. One virtue it values above all others: being a 'decent' sort of person, in the way that the good husband, the good father, the good workman, the good citizen are 'decent sorts of people....'"

Change "socialist" to "American," and you've pretty much got it.

"In a nutshell," Wolfe summarizes, "what middle-class Americans find distinctive about America is that it enables them to be middle class. Unlike India or Japan, the very rich and the very poor are smaller classes here, and opportunity enables those with the desire and the capacity to better their lot in life." He is, of course, wrong. India is poor in absolute terms, but, according to World Bank figures, the country's distribution of income isn't all that different from the U.S. (The poorest fifth of Indians actually have almost twice the share of national income as the poorest share of Americans). And of all the First World countries, the U.S. has the most polarized distribution of income, the smallest middle class (measured relative to average incomes), an average level of mobility overall, and a terrible record on upward mobility out of the income basement.

Objectively speaking, then, the U.S. is one of the most class-divided societies on earth, a fact that has faded from public discourse, though it hasn't completely gone from consciousness. As Wolfe says (only to drop the point), "In 1939, while America was experiencing a Great Depression right out of Karl Marx's playbook, 25 percent of the American people believed that the interests of employers and employees were opposed, while 56 percent believed they were basically the same. By 1994, when unions and class consciousness were in steep decline, the percentage of those who believed that employers and employees had opposite interest had increased to 45 percent, while

those who thought they were the same had decreased to 40 percent." Class consciousness, or at least identification, hasn't completely evaporated.

In 1949, Richard Center asked a sample of Americans to place themselves in one of four classes - middle, lower, working, or upper. (In that order. Things listed first have an advantage.) Just over half - 51% - said working class. In 1996, the General Social Survey (GSS), a near-yearly inventory of what the masses own, think, and feel, asking substantially the same question as Center (but in order going from lower to upper), 45% said working class - after decades of farewells to the working class. An equal share said middle class; 6%, lower; and 4%, upper. Two ABC polls that year asking people to place themselves in either of two classes found 55% working class, 44%, middle. A New York Times poll that year found 8% lower class; 47%, working; 40%, middle, and 3% upper.

A look at occupational distributions suggest that some people may be flattering themselves. If you assume that the middle class, in strictly labor market terms, consists of middle managers, professionals, and the upper reaches of sales, service, and production workers, then it accounts for about 28% of the employed population. Senior managers account for an upper class of 3%. (If you want to include lawyers and doctors in the upper class, shift 1% up from the middle.) That leaves a balance of 69% working class. In the government's monthly survey of private employers, over 80% of workers are classed as production or nonsupervisory.

Where do myths of near-universal middleness come from? In their very useful book (useful, among other things, as an antidote to Wolfe's idiocies), *The American Perception of Class*, Reeve Vanneman and Lynn Weber Cannon argue in *The American Perception of Class* show that the Wolfe-ish tendency to assimilate the upper reaches of the working into a broad, prosperous, and generally content middle class is a habit of the more upscale among us. People at sub-elite levels tend to draw the major social division between the upper class and everyone else, while the elite sees a broadly prosperous middle with a small underclass beneath them. Vanneman and Cannon, working with their own original research as well as crunching the raw GSS data, show surprisingly little regional or even ethnic/racial difference in these fundamental class perceptions.

They also show that people name their class based on some rather simple criteria - one's supervisory role at work, and, not unrelatedly, the prominence of mental rather than manual labor on the job. So a building superintendent may supervise others, but since the work still dirties the fingernails dirty, it's basically a working class job. And while data entry may be clean, indoor work, it still involves little thought or discretion, so it too, though some might call it white collar, is still a working class job.

Vanneman and Cannon quote a steelworker from a 1940 study who put the class divide very succinctly: society is divided into the "figuring-out group" and the "handling things group." Within those groups, he conceded, "there's a lot of divisions too, but those aren't real class divisions." Further, he said, "sometimes, you know, a man who's a real skilled artisan will be getting more money than

that [figuring-out] fellow, but it isn't always the money that makes the difference; it's the fact that you're figuring out things or you ain't." Few intellectuals who spend their life studying social organization could hardly outdo this formulation in both its precision and nuance.

So, to define "middle class" using these guidelines, you'd have to take the middleness seriously: the middle class stands between the big owners and the line workers - giving orders, yes, but also taking them, filling in the operational details for corporate strategies decided upon several notches up the executive ladder. And even the most senior executives of the biggest companies - CEOs of Fortune 500 companies - who in many ways are the embodiment of the upper class, still have to answer to their shareholders. If the shareholders have to answer to anyone, I haven't found out who yet.

For the moment, though, we're too busy pretending we're all shareholders now to talk about divisions between Wall Street and almost everyone else - though it'll be very interesting to see how that changes when the great bull market finally dies. (Will masses of dispossed mutual fund speculators take over Fidelity headquarters, demanding restitution?) But underneath the apparent placidity of American class relations, there still lurks plenty of awareness that some of us work for others of us, and that even "middle class" prosperity can be a very tenuous thing. The usefulness of books like Wolfe's is to try to keep all that potential trouble buried under a dense layer of constructed amity and narcotic cliché.

Date: Fri, 6 Oct 2000 13:25:06 -0400
Message-ID: <002867FB.C22051@abtassoc.com>
From: Joe Wislar@abtassoc.com (Joe Wislar)
Subject: Cell Phones
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Is anyone asking about cell phone usage in a survey? If so, I'd like to see a copy of the questions.

Thanks,
Joe Wislar
Survey Director
Abt Associates

Date: Fri, 06 Oct 2000 17:05:43 -0400
Subject: Re: likely voters
From: "Ward Kay" <rakekay@erols.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-version: 1.0
X-Priority: 3
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Message-Id: <E13hebw-0007is-00@smtp03.mrf.mail.rcn.net>

The problem with any formula to determine likely voters is that largest variance in many elections is voter turnout itself. My last polling experience 10 years ago was the Michigan governor's race in which I can post hoc tell you that the incumbent Democrat Jim Blanchard was the overwhelming favorite of the non-voters. Voter turnout was very low in the city of Detroit. I've seen similar patterns in other elections and think that couching election predictions in terms of turnout could benefit both the electorate and the process. That is "hard-core voters" those who vote at every election would be the "minimum turnout result." Typical voters (those who vote only in major elections) and Special-motivation voters (those who only vote for "exciting" elections -- close races, very popular (or unpopular) candidates, and real pocketbook ballot measures). The pollster could then report that if turnout is low the results would be ...; if the turnout is typical the results would be...; and if turnout is higher than normal the results would be.... If there is great variation among the groups, it might make some people think that their vote counts.

>From: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net>
>To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
>Subject: Re: likely voters
>Date: Fri, Oct 6, 2000, 11:16 AM
>

> A couple years ago we were faced with a similar question (how best to
> define "likely voters" in order to best predict local election
> outcomes).

>
> I contacted half a dozen of AAPOR's best know election pollsters and
> (bless your hearts) heard back from each. There were some creative
> formulas involving a variety of variables, most of which are included
> in the POQ review article on preelection survey methods by Voss,
> Gelman and King (59:1, Spring, 1995).

>
> However, the candid advice from AAPOR's brain trust held true: it's
> fun to try out all kinds of complicated models, but the most robust
> measure is to simply use candidate choice responses from registered
> voters.

>
> It proved to work well for us.

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

=====
Date: Fri, 6 Oct 2000 17:07:17 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>
Subject: Re: likely voters
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

Is it possible that likely voter algorithms are underweighting Nader's appeal, since it's quite possible that his supporters have historically ben alienated and (self-)disenfranchised?

Doug Henwood

Date: Sat, 07 Oct 2000 15:59:19 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Those polls!
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <39DF8096.E9B0FE57@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <SIMEON.10009211832.C@gj9k20b.config.mail.virginia.edu>

Dear colleagues,

Given that it is just one month before the Presidential election, and we haven't seen one this close probably for about two decades or so, can anyone help me in explaining to my classes why we are seeing such wild swings in the polls, and such differing results? I know, of course, that there will be differences depending upon how the questions are asked, whether there is probing, etc., but there even seems to be swings in the same polls over time. For example, our colleagues at Gallup show in their tracking polls two instances in the past few weeks where Al Gore has gone from an 11 point lead to a 2-3 point deficit. Since these results are outside the margin of error, do we have any information on who these "roving voters" are? Are they even the same people in each case?

I know that several newspaper articles have addressed this question, but can we hear from some of the opinions of our own polling experts about the state of the race, who the "roving voters" are, etc.? At least for those of us who are teaching this material this semester, it would be a great help.

Sincerely,

Frank Louis Rusciano
email at rusciano@rider.edu

P.S. I am not necessarily asking for anyone to "call" the race at this point;
I understand that professional ethics might prevent such an answer, and anyway, there's too much of that kind of speculation at this point. I'm more interested in the movement of undecideds, if that's driving these results.

Date: Sat, 07 Oct 2000 14:51:44 -0700
From: Norbert Schwarz <nschwarz@umich.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Research question

Message-ID: <267695124.970930304@pc-casbs-156.Stanford.EDU>
X-Mailer: Mulberry (Win32) [1.4.3, s/n S-399020]
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Dear Colleagues:

I am writing to ask for your help in locating materials that may be relevant to an apparently common bias in public opinion.

Across many topics, there is a discrepancy between the perception of an issue at the national level and the personal/ specific/ close-to-home level. E.g., Americans distrust Congress in general, but trust their own representative. They say that crime is a big problem, but not in their own neighborhood. Minorities report that discrimination against their group is high, yet they also report that their own personal experiences weren't as bad. Americans support the death penalty in general, but less so in any specific case. In all these examples, the judgment pertaining to the general/national level is more extreme than the judgment pertaining to the specific/personal/neighborhood level.

I'm interested in understanding this phenomenon but found it difficult to locate relevant research. I'd therefore appreciate:

- examples
- references to publications
- advice on data sets that bear on the above or related examples, in particular data sets that might be available for secondary analysis

Please respond to me at nschwarz@umich.edu, not to the list. I'll compile a summary of the responses I receive and will post that summary in a couple weeks.

Thanks very much for your help!

Best,
Norbert Schwarz
.....
Norbert Schwarz
University of Michigan
nschwarz@umich.edu

On sabbatical 8/2000 through 6/2001:
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
75 Alta Road
Stanford, CA 94305-8090

650-321-2052, Ext. 240 voice
650-321-1192 fax
760-875-9883 voice & fax messages, delivered by e-mail (most reliable)

=====
Date: Sat, 07 Oct 2000 17:07:33 -0700 (PDT)

By ALISON MITCHELL

WASHINGTON -- And now for a modest proposal: Ban all political polling between now and Election Day.

The first presidential debate last week demonstrated at numbing length the extent to which polling is consuming both politics and journalism. Like human semaphores, Gov. George W. Bush and Vice President Al Gore kept signaling each and every poll-determined swing group that they were on their side.

There were dueling prescription drug plans for the elderly and education plans to woo the suburban soccer moms. Mr. Gore's denunciations of "tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent" of Americans were aimed at the lower middle class, while Mr. Bush's rejected "old-style Washington politics" in a bid for independents.

Next came the post-debate blizzard of media polls. MSNBC, with the help of the Republican pollster Frank Luntz, had 36 avowedly undecided voters in the swing state of Missouri using dials to record their reaction to every word of the debate. Fox News and SpeakOut.com were running a "Rate the Debate" forum via the Internet. CBS's online poll proclaimed Mr. Gore the winner by 56 to 42 percent. NBC's overnight poll gave it to Mr. Gore 46 percent to 36 percent. And ABC's snap poll said that Mr. Gore had won 42 percent to 39 percent. (In a bracing moment of on-air rebellion the ABC anchor Peter Jennings announced and then brazenly dismissed his own network's instant telephone poll as unscientific and meaningless).

So addicted has the political class become to polls that politicians shudder at the very idea of a survey-free October. Gov. George E. Pataki of New York, who was working the crowded press room in Boston before last Tuesday's debate, laughed aloud at the idea and said, "I don't think you could ever enforce it."

Bill Curry, a former aide to President Clinton, who has also run for office in Connecticut, said, "I'm just bothered by the image of the candidates actually reading actual entrails and how hard it would be on small farm animals."

But what if polls really were banned? "We'd be spared huge amounts of false explanations for why the candidates are going up and down," Mr. Kristol said. And Tom Rosenstiel, the director of the Project for Excellence in Journalism, suggested the nation's political journalism might improve. "Journalists have abdicated the responsibility of listening to voters in favor of listening to polls as the primary diviner of meaning in political coverage," Mr. Rosenstiel said. "We use polls as a crutch and it's weakening other skills we have."

For years now, polls and focus groups have been creating an echo-chamber effect in politics where candidates all address the same issues and speak with the same poll-tested words until every candidate seems indistinguishable. President Clinton even had the audacity in 1996 to take a standard poll question - is the country on the right track? - and turn it into a campaign theme, perhaps in a circular effort to influence the answer to the polling question. "We're on the right track and we're not going back," he cheerily thundered on his whistlestop train tour to the Democratic convention.

The emphasis on polling is now so pervasive within political campaigns that that they may be actively deterring original ideas. "It's always a danger in a democracy that politicians become flatterers instead of leaders," said William Kristol, the editor of The Weekly Standard, who was former Vice President Dan Quayle's chief of staff. "Pollsters don't understand that you can move public opinion. For candidates spending too much on polls it's like driving looking in the rearview mirror. You don't see what you can change."

Mr. Bush likes to proclaim he "won't be swayed by polls and focus groups." But then he turned around and started talking about an "education recession," a phrase Republicans proudly said was carefully poll- tested. He is no worse an offender than Mr. Gore.

News organizations have been equally seduced. These days are not just running polls, they are now running daily tracking polls

measuring every
on tiny mood swing of the electorate. And the race is being reported
through the prism of the polls.

was All spring when Mr. Bush was ahead in the surveys, his campaign
confident and being called masterful, his victory inevitable, his strategists
in command. By August, Senator Phil Gramm, a fellow Texas
Republican, announced, "I'm expecting our governor to win by maybe
double digits."

driven. Mr. Gore was seen as wooden and, horror of horrors, as poll
the Many thought he was fading from the race. Yet come September, as
fatal polls shifted, Mr. Bush became the hapless one, his malapropisms
bold and his aides reactive, while Mr. Gore had metamorphosed into a
for Gore," risk taker gleaming with a winner's confidence. "I've called it
Magazine, Lawrence O'Donnell Jr., a contributing editor for New York
unstoppable at this said on the "Hardball" television show. "I think he's
point."

and Andrew Kohut, the director of the Pew Research Center for People
to find the Press, said that journalists this year were scouring polls
them to backup for the narratives they wanted to write rather than using
polls now learn about the nuances of public opinion. "There are so many
what that if you look around you can find something that underscores
herd journalism thinks is happening," Mr. Kohut said.

of ordaining He noted that an astute student of polls in the spring, instead
fixed. "You Mr. Bush, would have recognized that public opinion was not
"that would have seen how much volatility there was," Mr. Kohut said,
you can't trust this Bush lead."

what polls Michael R. Kagay, who directs the News Survey Department of The
New York Times, said that The Times has a policy of minimizing the
horse-race aspect of its polls in its coverage, and focusing on
general rule show about the attitudes of the electorate. He said that as a
The Times does not put the horse-race matchup in either the first
paragraph of a story or in the headline.

If there is one bright spot this year, it may be that the voters themselves almost seem like they want to confound everyone. Just when Mr. Gore looked like he was out of the race, the public swung his way. When Mr. Bush appeared in danger of permanently falling behind, he caught up. "People are contrarian in a certain way," Mr. Kristol said, celebrating the twists and turns of this year's race. "They keep wanting to do the opposite of what the polls tell them they want to do. The voters are less susceptible to herd mentality than the pundits."

Date: Mon, 09 Oct 2000 07:16:37 -0500
To: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: Scott Althaus <salthaus@uiuc.edu>
Subject: Re: More on Likely Voters and Non-Response
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

>But not knowing anything about non-response, call back policies, the
>use of likely voter models in these actual polls, it is impossible to
>tell what is going on.

>

>Does anybody know? This goes to the inherent bias in any or all of
>these polls. But one or another must be biased systematically.

In response to Andy Beveridge's query, I was selected this past Friday evening to be a respondent for the Zogby/Reuters poll. When the call came in, I was busy putting my kids to bed, but I told the interviewer that I would be free in half an hour and would be happy to answer her questions at that time. She said she would call again, but no callback ever came. As with all inferences drawn from a sample of N=1 observations, perhaps my experience is not illustrative of standard Zogby/Reuters practices. But if this survey is not even attempting callbacks among willing respondents, one has to wonder how this choice might influence the validity of its results....

On the Web front, one explanation for the similar findings among the Web "polls" which declared Bush the debate winner may come from the organized efforts of the national parties to tip the findings of such polls in their favor. Regarding the findings reported by Manfred Kuechler, my e-mail address has somehow found its way into a Republican National Committee e-mail list that included the following message, posted at 12:30pm on October 3rd:

>The first presidential debate of Election 2000 will be held tonight and
>will be televised on the ABC, CBS, Fox and CNN networks at 9 pm EST (check
>the local time in your region).

>

>Given the "leanings" of the members of the media, already we are seeing
>efforts to down play Al Gore's killer debate tactics so as to lower
>expectations for his performance.
>
>Moreover, we are hearing that many liberal left wing groups will be
>trying
>to stack the vote in favor of the Democratic candidate by bombarding the
>various news websites which will be polling immediately following the
>debate.
>
>In addition to watching the debate, you should log on to:
>
><http://www.cnn.com/allpolitics>
>
>
>or alternatively go online at:
>
><http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/>
>
>
>and express your support for who you think won the debate!
>
>The Democrats and their left wing allies are very good at organizing
>such
>guerilla efforts. We are alerting you to give you the opportunity as an
>individual to be heard as loudly as these liberal special interest groups.
>
>Please log on tonight: Vote after the debate and make your voice heard!
>
>Sincerely,
>
>Jim Nicholson
>Chairman
>Republican National Committee
>
>
>P.S. If you have not encouraged a fellow Republican to sign up at
><http://www.echampions2000.com>, please do so today. We are in the home
>stretch and expect to face a number of vicious opposition rumors as
>Election Day nears. By signing up for the GOP's central communications
>web line, we can link millions of concerned Republicans instantaneously to
>defeat the coming onslaught of Democratic cyber terror tactics.

Scott Althaus

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Speech Communication
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Office: (217) 333-8968
Fax: (217) 244-1598
Mail: 702 S. Wright St., Rm. 244
Urbana, IL 61801 USA

E-mail: salthaus@uiuc.edu

```
=====
Date: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 11:06:42 -0500 (CDT)
From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
Message-Id: <200010091606.e99G6gL01501@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Calling sampling experts-not poll related
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-MD5: UgZeDTZ/5KKAS4G3XTK/yw==
```

Hi Experts,

I'm looking at a study that first selected schools from a list of schools in the US (stratified by region, and other characteristics). Then students in the school were selected to be interviewed.

The study literature says it is a national sample of high school kids of that age. The literature does not qualify the statement to indicate it is a national sample of high school kids of that age THAT ARE IN SCHOOL. Since the dropout rate is so high for certain groups and in some urban high schools, I thought this selection process might bias the data.

Is it possible to create weights so that kids who could have never been selected by the sampling frame (e.g., high school dropouts) are represented in the sample? That is, is it possible (and probable) that this claim of being a national sample of high school kids of this age is a valid claim?

Thank you for your help.

Carolyn S. White, PhD
Program Coordinator, CCSO
Asst Prof of Sociology
1304 W. Springfield Ave.
University of Illinois
Urbana, Il 61822
Voice: 217-333-6751

email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

```
=====
Date: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 12:16:00 -0400
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Calling sampling experts-not poll related
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
```

charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Wouldn't high school kids be . . . in high school?

I think there would be a problem only if the study was described as a survey among "youth" or some such other term that does not imply that they were students.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Monday, October 09, 2000 12:08 PM
Subject: Calling sampling experts-not poll related

>Hi Experts,

>

>I'm looking at a study that first selected schools from a list of schools in the
>US (stratified by region, and other characteristics). Then students in the
>school were selected to be interviewed.

>

>The study literature says it is a national sample of high school kids of that

>age. The literature does not qualify the statement to indicate it is a national

>sample of high school kids of that age THAT ARE IN SCHOOL. Since the dropout

>rate is so high for certain groups and in some urban high schools, I thought

>this selection process might bias the data.

>

>Is it possible to create weights so that kids who could have never been selected

>by the sampling frame (e.g., high school dropouts) are represented in the
>sample? That is, is it possible (and probable) that this claim of being a
>national sample of high school kids of this age is a valid claim?

>

>Thank you for your help.

>

>Carolyn S. White, PhD
>Program Coordinator, CCSO
>Asst Prof of Sociology
>1304 W. Springfield Ave.
>University of Illinois
>Urbana, Il 61822
>Voice: 217-333-6751

>

>email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

>
>
>
>

Date: Mon, 09 Oct 2000 12:27:51 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Mike Kagay <kagay@nytimes.com>
Subject: Re: Research question on Local vs. National
In-Reply-To: <267695124.970930304@pc-casbs-156.Stanford.EDU>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

All best wishes.

See Tom Smith's article "Why Our Neck of the Woods Is Better than the Forest" in The Public Perspective, June/July 1998,

Cheers, - Mike K.

At 02:51 PM 10/7/00 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>I am writing to ask for your help in locating materials that may be
>relevant to an apparently common bias in public opinion.

>

>Across many topics, there is a discrepancy between the perception of an
>issue at the national level and the personal/ specific/ close-to-home
>level. E.g., Americans distrust Congress in general, but trust their own
>representative. They say that crime is a big problem, but not in their own
>neighborhood. Minorities report that discrimination against their group is
>high, yet they also report that their own personal experiences weren't as
>bad. Americans support the death penalty in general, but less so in any
>specific case. In all these examples, the judgment pertaining to the
>general/national level is more extreme than the judgment pertaining to the
>specific/personal/neighborhood level.

>

>I'm interested in understanding this phenomenon but found it difficult to
>locate relevant research. I'd therefore appreciate:

>

>- examples

>- references to publications

>- advice on data sets that bear on the above or related examples, in
>particular data sets that might be available for secondary analysis

>

>Please respond to me at nschwarz@umich.edu, not to the list. I'll compile a
>summary of the responses I receive and will post that summary in a couple
>weeks.

>

>Thanks very much for your help!

>

>Best,

>Norbert Schwarz
>.....
>Norbert Schwarz
>University of Michigan
>nschwarz@umich.edu
>
>On sabbatical 8/2000 through 6/2001:
>Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
>75 Alta Road
>Stanford, CA 94305-8090
>
>650-321-2052, Ext. 240 voice
>650-321-1192 fax
>760-875-9883 voice & fax messages, delivered by e-mail (most reliable)
>

Date: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 09:37:07 -0700
From: "MJS" <sullivan@fsc-research.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Calling sampling experts-not poll related
Message-ID: <39E191C3.9867.5A3ADC2@localhost>
In-reply-to: <200010091606.e99G6gL01501@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

In a word, no.

Date sent: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 11:06:42 -0500 (CDT)
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Calling sampling experts-not poll related

Hi Experts,

I'm looking at a study that first selected schools from a list of schools in the US (stratified by region, and other characteristics). Then students in the school were selected to be interviewed.

The study literature says it is a national sample of high school kids of that age. The literature does not qualify the statement to indicate it is a national sample of high school kids of that age THAT ARE IN SCHOOL. Since the dropout rate is so high for certain groups and in some urban high schools, I thought this selection process might bias the data.

Is it possible to create weights so that kids who could have never been selected by the sampling frame (e.g., high school dropouts) are represented in the sample? That is, is it possible (and probable) that this claim of being a national sample of high school kids of this age is a valid claim?

Thank you for your help.

Carolyn S. White, PhD
Program Coordinator, CCSO
Asst Prof of Sociology
1304 W. Springfield Ave.
University of Illinois
Urbana, Il 61822
Voice: 217-333-6751

email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

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.

Date: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 12:37:21 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: RE: Calling sampling experts-not poll related
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCPCFJBPKEOHCEAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <002301c0320c\$37db7720\$0be4c3d1@default>

Dear Carolyn:

There is no good way to "adjust" for such sampling biases.

Another very big problem with this sort of survey is the design effect. Since you are using cluster sampling, probably both of schools and classes, and kids in either are more like the other kids in either than they are with other kids, one often gets a much higher effective standard error or putting it another way a much lower effective sample size than you would think.

The two ways to handle this are with software such as SUDAAN (see RTI.ORG), SPSS and

Stata handle this also. It is called complex sampling. The design effect, for instance, in Monitoring the Future (the HS drug survey that is carried out in the manner) is as high as 6 for some variables. (The effective sample size is one-sixth the total sample size.)

Or you should using Hierarchical Linear (or non-linear) modeling techniques. Major work is Bryk and Raudenbush, Hierarchical Linear Modeling. There are several packages to handle this, the most commonly used PROC MIXED in SAS, HLM and MLWin.

The latter two have WEBSites.

Aren't you glad you asked?

Andy Beveridge

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of James P. Murphy
Sent: Monday, October 09, 2000 12:16 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Calling sampling experts-not poll related

Wouldn't high school kids be . . . in high school?

I think there would be a problem only if the study was described as a survey among "youth" or some such other term that does not imply that they were students.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Monday, October 09, 2000 12:08 PM
Subject: Calling sampling experts-not poll related

>Hi Experts,

>

>I'm looking at a study that first selected schools from a list of schools in the

>US (stratified by region, and other characteristics). Then students in the >school were selected to be interviewed.

>

>The study literature says it is a national sample of high school kids of that

>age. The literature does not qualify the statement to indicate it is a national

>sample of high school kids of that age THAT ARE IN SCHOOL. Since the dropout

>rate is so high for certain groups and in some urban high schools, I
thought
>this selection process might bias the data.
>
>Is it possible to create weights so that kids who could have never been
selected
>by the sampling frame (e.g., high school dropouts) are represented in the
>sample? That is, is it possible (and probable) that this claim of being a
>national sample of high school kids of this age is a valid claim?
>
>Thank you for your help.
>
>Carolyn S. White, PhD
>Program Coordinator, CCSO
>Asst Prof of Sociology
>1304 W. Springfield Ave.
>University of Illinois
>Urbana, Il 61822
>Voice: 217-333-6751
>
>email: cswhite@uiuc.edu
>
>
>
>

Date: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 12:03:13 -0500 (CDT)
From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
Message-Id: <200010091703.e99H3DT07885@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: sampling schools
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-MD5: FjQvgu9sXea8zpQzjuWAKw==

Experts,

Thank you for your quick answers.

I went back to the source; the literature written by the study team does
always
appear to say a "nationally representative sample of adolescents in grades 7
to
12." The paper I'm looking at is not always so careful -- the "in grades 7 to
12
got omitted".

Rob Daves' point that home-schooled students in those grades may not have
been
represented in the sampling frame is a good one. The school list was taken
from
QED and looking at QED's' description of their database,
www.qeddata.com/guide.htm, there is no mention that the rosters include home

schooled kids getting some services there.

Carolyn S. White, PhD
Program Coordinator, CCSO
Asst Prof of Sociology
1304 W. Springfield Ave.
University of Illinois
Urbana, Il 61822
Voice: 217-333-6751

email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

```
=====  
Date: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 12:13:29 -0500 (CDT)  
From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>  
Message-Id: <200010091713.e99HDTk08975@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Calling sampling experts-not poll related  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-MD5: y4oV5XcS1n94nig+pAuWtg==
```

Thank you for your comments regarding the complex sampling.

The study is the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health and there is a paper (well hidden at the ADD Health web site) that tells potential users of the data how to set up STATA or SUDAAN jobs to use the data (and why a regular ole SAS job may not be correct).

Carolyn S. White, PhD
Program Coordinator, CCSO
Asst Prof of Sociology
1304 W. Springfield Ave.
University of Illinois
Urbana, Il 61822
Voice: 217-333-6751

email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

```
=====  
Date: Mon, 09 Oct 2000 10:18:30 -0700  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Wei Yen <weiyen@ucla.edu>  
Subject: Address Change Stats  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed
```

A friend of mine asked me to post this question on the AAPORNET and I hope someone out there has an answer or can point to a lead.

-- What is the percent of address changes among the general population at 3-month, 6-month, and 9-month intervals?

Thanks in advance for your help.

Wei Yen

Date: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 13:31:41 -0400
From: "Nancy Belden" <nancybelden@brspoll.com>
To: "aapornet" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Catholic voters
Message-ID: <NEBBIDL GALNEGBHACIMHGEFNCFAA.nancybelden@brspoll.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
X-SLUIDL: 58C6C5A7-9C5911D4-9BF80010-4B0F537B

To AAPOR Net:

Does anyone have (or have a source for) data on Catholic voters by their race/ethnicity? Gender or age?

Any help would be much appreciated. Thanks -- Nancy Belden

nancybelden@brspoll.com

Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

202 822 6090

Date: Mon, 09 Oct 2000 18:21:38 +0100
From: "Worc" <Worc@mori.com>
To: <rshalpern@mindspring.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: A Modest Poll Proposal
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-7
Content-Disposition: inline
X-Guinevere: 1.0.13 ; MORI Ltd
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id LAA25863

Yes, like in France, where the publication of polls are banned for the seven days before elections, to give the politicians the opportunity to lie to the voters about their private polls, and the bankers and money changes accesss to private polling that enables them to start false rumours in the sure knowledge of what their data is showing, and for newspapers, like the Sunday Times in London who commissioned me to do a poll for publication of the day of the referendum on Maastricht in France, but not in the French edition of course, but carried by the BBC and other radio and television news broadcasts into France.

Banning polls sounds like a good idea to undemocratic pollsters, more interested in making lots of dosh from their bank and other private clients (a bank once offered me ten times what I charged a newspaper to run a parallel poll but giving them the data one hour before the poll was released to the television and radio outlets, so they could make a killing on exchange rate fluctuations during that hour). It also sounds good to politicians and spin doctors who want to manipulate the electorate, as happened in France in 1982, and, sadly, in the Fulbright/Bumpers primary so many years ago when the Fulbright people leaked the results of their 'private poll' which showed fulbright ahead. When he lost to Dale Bumpers, his people then admitted they had made up the 'private poll'.

Banning polls; no thanks. Luckily for Americans, it would never get past the courts under the 1st amendment protection. It didn't in Belgium either, where a brave editor published during the black out period and dared the government to take him to court, as freedom of information is guaranteed under the Belgian constitution. It didn't in Canada several years ago, when the Canadian poll was published on the internet outside of Canada, and the Toronto Globe and Mail printed where Canadians should surf to if they wanted to see what Canadians thought (and it was later overturned by the Canadian Supreme Court.

It's a point of view; I'm glad the United States has a free press who can print such an illiberal idea which has currency among people who haven't really thought about the implications of their illiberality.

As ole Abe Lincoln said: 'Trust the people'.

>>> rshalpern@mindspring.com 08/10/00 19:41:39 >>>
From today' NY
Times:

THE NATION

A Modest Poll Proposal

By ALISON MITCHELL

WASHINGTON -- And now for a modest proposal: Ban all political polling between now and Election Day.

length
journalism. Like
they
education
at the
Washington

The first presidential debate last week demonstrated at numbing the extent to which polling is consuming both politics and human semaphores, Gov. George W. Bush and Vice President Al Gore kept signaling each and every poll- determined swing group that were on their side.

undecided
their reaction to
proclaimed
gave it
that

There were dueling prescription drug plans for the elderly and plans to woo the suburban soccer moms. Mr. Gore's denunciations of "tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent" of Americans were aimed lower middle class, while Mr. Bush's rejected "old-style politics" in a bid for independents.

politicians
and said,
for office
candidates
small farm
animals."

Next came the post-debate blizzard of media polls. MSNBC, with the help of the Republican pollster Frank Luntz, had 36 avowedly voters in the swing state of Missouri using dials to record every word of the debate. Fox News and SpeakOut.com were running a "Rate the Debate" forum via the Internet. CBS's online poll proclaimed Mr. Gore the winner by 56 to 42 percent. NBC's overnight poll gave it to Mr. Gore 46 percent to 36 percent. And ABC's snap poll said that Mr. Gore had won 42 percent to 39 percent. (In a bracing moment of on-air rebellion the ABC anchor Peter Jennings announced and then brazenly dismissed his own network's instant telephone poll as unscientific and meaningless).

amounts of
down," Mr.

So addicted has the political class become to polls that politicians shudder at the very idea of a survey-free October. Gov. George E. Pataki of New York, who was working the crowded press room in Boston before last Tuesday's debate, laughed aloud at the idea and said, "I don't think you could ever enforce it."

Bill Curry, a former aide to President Clinton, who has also run for office in Connecticut, said, "I'm just bothered by the image of the candidates actually reading actual entrails and how hard it would be on small farm animals."

But what if polls really were banned? "We'd be spared huge amounts of false explanations for why the candidates are going up and down," Mr. Kristol said. And Tom Rosenstiel, the director of the Project for

Excellence in Journalism, suggested the nation's political journalism might improve. "Journalists have abdicated the responsibility of listening to voters in favor of listening to polls as the primary diviner of meaning in political coverage," Mr. Rosenstiel said. "We use polls as a crutch and it's weakening other skills we have."

For years now, polls and focus groups have been creating an echo-chamber effect in politics where candidates all address the same issues and speak with the same poll-tested words until every candidate seems indistinguishable. President Clinton even had the audacity in 1996 to take a standard poll question "is the country on the right track?" and turn it into a campaign theme, perhaps in a circular effort to influence the answer to the polling question. "We're on the right track and we're not going back," he cheerily thundered on his whistlestop train tour to the Democratic convention.

The emphasis on polling is now so pervasive within political campaigns that that they may be actively deterring original ideas. "It's always a danger in a democracy that politicians become flatterers instead of leaders," said William Kristol, the editor of The Weekly Standard, who was former Vice President Dan Quayle's chief of staff. "Pollsters don't understand that you can move public opinion. For candidates spending too much on polls it's like driving looking in the rearview mirror. You don't see what you can change."

Mr. Bush likes to proclaim he "won't be swayed by polls and focus groups." But then he turned around and started talking about an "education recession," a phrase Republicans proudly said was carefully poll-tested. He is no worse an offender than Mr. Gore.

News organizations have been equally seduced. These days are not just running polls, they are now running daily tracking polls measuring every tiny mood swing of the electorate. And the race is being reported on through the prism of the polls.

was
confident and
being called masterful, his victory inevitable, his strategists
in command. By August, Senator Phil Gramm, a fellow Texas
Republican, announced, "I'm expecting our governor to win by maybe
double digits."

driven.
the
fatal
bold
for Gore,"
Magazine,
unstoppable at this
point."
Mr. Gore was seen as wooden and, horror of horrors, as poll
Many thought he was fading from the race. Yet come September, as
polls shifted, Mr. Bush became the hapless one, his malapropisms
and his aides reactive, while Mr. Gore had metamorphosed into a
risk taker gleaming with a winner's confidence. "I've called it
Lawrence O'Donnell Jr., a contributing editor for New York
said on the "Hardball" television show. "I think he's

and
to find
them to
polls now
what
herd journalism thinks is happening," Mr. Kohut said.
Andrew Kohut, the director of the Pew Research Center for People
the Press, said that journalists this year were scouring polls
backup for the narratives they wanted to write rather than using
learn about the nuances of public opinion. "There are so many
that if you look around you can find something that underscores

of ordaining
fixed. "You
"that
you can't trust this Bush lead."
He noted that an astute student of polls in the spring, instead
Mr. Bush, would have recognized that public opinion was not
would have seen how much volatility there was," Mr. Kohut said,

what polls
general rule
The Times does not put the horse-race matchup in either the first
paragraph of a story or in the headline.
Michael R. Kagay, who directs the News Survey Department of The
New York Times, said that The Times has a policy of minimizing the
horse-race aspect of its polls in its coverage, and focusing on
show about the attitudes of the electorate. He said that as a

themselves
Gore
If there is one bright spot this year, it may be that the voters
almost seem like they want to confound everyone. Just when Mr.

looked like he was out of the race, the public swung his way.
When Mr. Bush appeared in danger of permanently falling behind, he caught up.
"People are contrarian in a certain way," Mr. Kristol said, celebrating the twists and turns of this year's race. "They keep wanting to do the opposite of what the polls tell them they want to do. The voters are less susceptible to herd mentality than the pundits."

Market & Opinion Research International Limited
95 Southwark Street
London SE1 0HX

Tel: +44 (0) 207 928 5955
Fax: +44 (0) 207 955 0070/1/2

Disclaimer

This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of MORI Limited.

If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please either notify the MORI Systems Helpdesk by telephone on 44 (0) 207 928 5955 or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.

=====
Date: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 16:28:47 -0400
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Address Change Stats
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2651.58)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

-----Original Message-----
From: Wei Yen [mailto:weiyen@ucla.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 09, 2000 1:18 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Address Change Stats

A friend of mine asked me to post this question on the AAPORNET and I hope someone out there has an answer or can point to a lead.

-- What is the percent of address changes among the general population at 3-month, 6-month, and 9-month intervals?

Thanks in advance for your help.

Wei Yen

```
=====
Date: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 14:18:49 -0700
From: "Du, Can" <candu@rand.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Address Change Stats
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
        charset="ISO-8859-1"
```

Paul,

Your response message did not have any text in it. I am very interested in these address change stats as well. Could you send your response to me as well? Thanks

Can Du
RAND

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

```
From: Lavrakas, Paul [mailto:pjlavrakas@tvratings.com]
Sent: Monday, October 09, 2000 1:29 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: Address Change Stats
```

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

```
From: Wei Yen [mailto:weiyen@ucla.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 09, 2000 1:18 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Address Change Stats
```

A friend of mine asked me to post this question on the AAPORNET and I hope someone out there has an answer or can point to a lead.

-- What is the percent of address changes among the general population at 3-month, 6-month, and 9-month intervals?

Thanks in advance for your help.

Wei Yen

```
=====
```

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 08:42:28 -0400
From: "Andy White" <awhite@nas.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <85256974.0045F6D0.00@smtpmta.nas.edu>
Subject: [Fwd: FW: Leslie Kish (fwd)]
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Mon, 9 Oct 2000 14:45:27 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Howard A. Kimeldorf" <hkimel@umich.edu>
To: soc.all.fac@umich.edu, socgrad.all@umich.edu
Subject: FW: Leslie Kish (fwd)

Dear Faculty, Students, and Staff:

I am saddened to report that Leslie Kish, one our department's shining lights, passed away over the weekend. We will be sending flowers along with our regrets.

I'm also forwarding a message from David Featherman, whose thoughts capture how important Leslie was to all of us.

Howard

----- Forwarded message -----

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

> From: David Featherman
> Sent: Monday, October 09, 2000 11:06 AM
> To: Outlook users
> Subject: Leslie Kish

>
> Colleagues of the Institute
>

> I am deeply saddened to convey the news that Leslie Kish died over the
> weekend. Leslie died of complications from recent surgery but to the end
> he was his feisty, life-affirming self. We shall mourn this tremendous
> loss to our intellectual community and to the corps of pioneers of survey
> research. More than that, however, we have lost a mentor to us all, a
> guide, a friend. How fortunate we were, just a few months ago, to be able
> to share the joy of Leslie's 90th birthday with him and his family, to
> praise his gigantic scientific stature, and to embrace him for the warm
> generosity of his intellectual companionship. We shall miss him, even more
> than we now can imagine.

>
> The Kish family will welcome friends on Tuesday, October 10, in the
> Community Room at 1050 Wall Street, from 7-9pm and again on Thursday,
> October 12, from 3-5pm. The Kish family would like the entire ISR family
> to feel welcome to stop by.

>
> We are working with Rhea and Leslie's family to schedule a memorial
> service. More details will follow soon.

>

> Meanwhile, I am sure all of us send our deepest condolences to dear Rhea
> and to the family.
>
> dlf
>
> David L. Featherman, Director and
> Professor of Sociology and Psychology
> Institute for Social Research
> The University of Michigan
> 426 Thompson Street
> Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106-1248
> <http://www.isr.umich.edu>
> Tel: 734/764-8364 Fax: 734/764-2377
>
>
>
>

=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 09:44:31 EDT
From: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: from RoniRosner@aol.com
by imo-r01.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.26.) id 5.82.1459586 (6932)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 10 Oct 2000 09:44:32 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <82.1459586.2714773f@aol.com>
Subject: "ESSENTIALS of WEIGHTING..." -- 11/3 NYAAPOR WORKSHOP
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 120

PLEASE E-MAIL RoniRosner@aol.com ONLY, NOT AAPORNET
RSVP by Friday, 27 October

THIS AFTERNOON WORKSHOP IS BEING GRACIOUSLY CO-
SPONSORED BY SURVEY SAMPLING, INC. OF FAIRFIELD, CT

Date.....Friday, 3 November 2000
Presentation.....1:30 p.m. sharp -- 4:30 p.m.
Refreshments break...about 3 p.m.
Place.....The New York Academy of Medicine/Rm 440
.....1216 Fifth Avenue, entrance on 103rd
Street

The Academy, an historic landmark, is across from the Central Park
Conservatory Garden, on Museum Mile. We suggest taking the #6 to
96th & Lexington Ave., or any Madison Ave. bus (except #30). Public
parking is on Madison @ 105th.

ESSENTIALS of WEIGHTING for PROBABILITY SAMPLES

Dr. J. Michael Brick, Westat

On the heels of our successful "Survey Research 101" and its requests for more in-depth sessions, we are offering this seminar as part of a continuing series on methodological issues.

We are delighted to have Michael Brick, who received rave reviews at the National conference for this workshop, present it to NYAAPOR. Designed for researchers who understand the basics of sampling, but aren't sampling experts, Mike's course will include:

- * A non-technical, non-mathematical overview of the principles and practices of weighting
- * Definitions and explanations of probability sampling methods
- * Examples drawn from well-known sample surveys such as the Current Population Survey and the National Household Education Survey

Dr. J. Michael Brick is a Vice President at Westat, Research Associate Professor at the Joint Program in Survey Methodology at the University of Maryland, and a Fellow of the American Statistical Association. Dr. Brick has over 25 years experience in sample design and estimation for a wide variety of sample survey designs.

ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE RESERVATION ONLY. These sessions tend to fill up quickly, so reserve early! E-MAIL RoniRosner@aol.com, or call if you must (212/722-5333).

Return the form with your cheque by Friday, 27 Oct.. Pre-paid fees are on the return form below. Fees at the door are: \$50 (individual members), \$65 (nonmembers), \$30 (student members), \$40 (student nonmembers, HLMs). Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

I will attend the NYAAPOR afternoon workshop on Friday, 3 November 2000 with _____ additional guests.

NAME _____
OFFICE PHONE _____
HOME PHONE _____
E-MAIL _____
AFFILIATION _____
GUEST'S NAME _____

PREPAID FEES:
Members (individual): \$40 _____ Student members: \$25 _____
Nonmembers: \$55 _____ Student nonmembers, HLMs: \$35 _____

Pre-paid form & cheque (payable to NYAAPOR) must arrive by 27 Oct.
Send to:
Roni Rosner, 1235 Park Avenue, #7C, New York, New York 10128-1759

=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 08:25:19 -0700
From: "MJS" <sullivan@fsc-research.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Recent polling results
Message-ID: <39E2D26F.23058.A887B34@localhost>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

On Larry King live last night Ed Rollins and some other spin doctors were on discussing yesterday's release of the CNN/USA Today poll showing Mr. Bush ahead by something like 9 percentage points. One of the discussants indicated that about 10 days ago he was behind in the same poll by a similar amount. Is it possible that public opinion and intentions are so volatile in the electorate at this point that they have shifted almost 20 points in the last 10 days? I doubt it.

The variation in point estimates from poll to poll are understandable given the art involved in selecting "likely voters", but variations like this within the same poll are simply astonishing. I think we have managed to demonstrate to the public beyond a reasonable doubt that the precision estimates supplied in news poll reports are meaningless.

I am often called upon to explain to lay people how relatively small samples can produce accurate estimates of statistical parameters for very large populations. One of the examples I have used to drive the point home in the past is the national sampling used in political opinion polling. I don't think I'm going to be able to use that one any more after this election.

AAPOR has established a protocol for calculating and reporting non-response. Maybe we should develop a soup-to-nuts protocol for political polling.

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.

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 11:43:26 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: RE: Recent polling results
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCPCFJBPOEPDCEAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
In-Reply-To: <39E2D26F.23058.A887B34@localhost>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

I have been looking hard at the results, also. I think that the Celinda Lake Goeas Battleground Poll is not as volatile, since they weight it towards likely voters on the RDD (translation homeowner and GOP), and they use an "unaided" ballot question.

I don't know how hard they push the undecided.

Zogby uses all sorts of stuff he won't share, but they may be somewhat similar to Lake-Goeas, except for the "unaided ballot".

CNN, I suspect, pushes the undecided harder. Still a movement from 10 points up to 8 points down in a few days, seems hard to believe.

The non-tracking polls released over the weekend, also had it very close.

The debate certainly did not help Gore's relative favorability rating!!

Andy

```
=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 10:44:17 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Recent polling results
References: <39E2D26F.23058.A887B34@localhost>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
```

See <http://www.usatoday.com/news/poll1001.htm>

Wouldn't you call this an 8-point shift, not 20? What was once an 8-point Gore lead at the beginning of the month has now become an 8-point lead; i.e., 8% *shifted* from Gore to Bush.

It's still a lot of volatility.

I noticed that the undecideds were quite low. Was a "hard push" question used? What were the results excluding these leaners? There may not be a lot of conviction out there.

Another question could be: What was the partisan make-up of the sample from poll to poll? Any unusual changes there?

Nick

MJS wrote:

> On Larry King live last night Ed Rollins and some other spin
> doctors were on discussing yesterday's release of the CNN/USA
> Today poll showing Mr. Bush ahead by something like 9
> percentage points. One of the discussants indicated that about 10
> days ago he was behind in the same poll by a similar amount. Is it
> possible that public opinion and intentions are so volatile in the
> electorate at this point that they have shifted almost 20 points in
> the last 10 days? I doubt it.
>
> The variation in point estimates from poll to poll are understandable
> given the art involved in selecting "likely voters", but variations like
> this within the same poll are simply astonishing. I think we have
> managed to demonstrate to the public beyond a reasonable doubt
> that the precision estimates supplied in news poll reports are
> meaningless.
>
> I am often called upon to explain to lay people how relatively small
> samples can produce accurate estimates of statistical parameters
> for very large populations. One of the examples I have used to
> drive the point home in the past is the national sampling used in
> political opinion polling. I don't think I'm going to be able to use
> that one any more after this election.
>
> AAPOR has established a protocol for calculating and reporting
> non-response. Maybe we should develop a soup-to-nuts protocol
> for political polling.
>
> 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.

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 10:52:03 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Recent polling results
References: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGC PFJBPOEPDCEAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I believe in an earlier Morin column it was pointed out that Lake Goeas also weight by party which could add stability. They make Dems equal to GOPs.

Party composition was described as a "mystery" in that column. The real mystery is making Dems equal to GOPs. I believe Dems have outnumbered GOPs ever since late 1994 - unless someone has national data showing otherwise.

Nick

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

> I have been looking hard at the results, also. I think that the Celinda
> Lake Goeas
> Battleground Poll is not as volatile, since they weight it towards likely
> voters on
> the RDD (translation homeowner and GOP), and they use an "unaided" ballot
> question.
>
> I don't know how hard they push the undecided.
>
> Zogby uses all sorts of stuff he won't share, but they may be somewhat
> similar to
> Lake-Goeas, except for the "unaided ballot".
>
> CNN, I suspect, pushes the undecided harder. Still a movement from 10
> points up
> to 8 points down in a few days, seems hard to believe.
>
> The non-tracking polls released over the weekend, also had it very close.
>
> The debate certainly did not help Gore's relative favorability rating!!
>
> Andy

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 09:00:58 -0700
From: "MJS" <sullivan@fsc-research.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: RE: Recent polling results
CC: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Message-ID: <39E2DACA.18048.AA920AA@localhost>
In-reply-to: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCPCFJBPOEPDCEAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
References: <39E2D26F.23058.A887B34@localhost>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

I think you may be right about the trend. Given the apparent timing of the shift, I can't help but think that the VP debates did something to galvanize independents and undecided parties who are normally inclined to vote Republican into "likely voters".

Date sent: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 11:43:26 -0400

Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Copies to: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: RE: Recent polling results

I have been looking hard at the results, also. I think that the Celinda Lake Goeas Battleground Poll is not as volatile, since they weight it towards likely voters on the RDD (translation homeowner and GOP), and they use an "unaided" ballot question.

I don't know how hard they push the undecided.

Zogby uses all sorts of stuff he won't share, but they may be somewhat similar to Lake-Goeas, except for the "unaided ballot".

CNN, I suspect, pushes the undecided harder. Still a movement from 10 points up to 8 points down in a few days, seems hard to believe.

The non-tracking polls released over the weekend, also had it very close.

The debate certainly did not help Gore's relative favorability rating!!

Andy

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.

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 10:09:47 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The New 3 P's: Politics, Polling and Profiling
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010100958030.19764-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The three URLs at the bottom might be particularly useful to those with an interest in this topic, which shows no sign that it will go away any time soon.

-- Jim

=====

THE INDUSTRY STANDARD'S
M E D I A G R O K
A Review of Press Coverage of the Internet Economy

=====

| <http://www.thestandard.com> |

Tuesday, October 10, 2000

Politics and Profiling

Polls show that people are concerned about losing control of their private data, especially online. In this political season the media are rehashing the privacy issue and probing the ways politicians do a bit of privacy violating of their own.

The San Francisco Chronicle's Henry Norr surveyed the privacy surveys in his piece on pending privacy legislation now stalled in Sen. John McCain's Commerce Committee. Norr concludes that legislators seem more attuned to the data-gatherers than to the people. The legislation most likely to pass puts the burden on Web surfers to "opt out" of data collection at every site they visit. Norr sounds almost wistful when he quotes Sen. Ernest Hollings: "Any privacy legislation that doesn't include 'opt-in' is simply whistling Dixie."

The Associated Press asked the two major-party presidential candidates for a statement about privacy. Gov. Bush favors legislation protecting financial and medical data and criminalizing identity theft. Vice President Gore advocates industry self-regulation.

Whatever the candidates say on the record about personal privacy, both parties make plentiful use of information technology to reach voters with personalized pitches. Such political profiling is not new - it goes back at least to the earliest days of Ralph Reed and the Christian Coalition. The Washington Post went page one with a 27-paragraph story by John Mintz and Robert O'Harrow Jr. that covered the Republican National Committee (whose data-collection activities are headed by that selfsame Ralph Reed), Hillary Clinton's campaign and the national Democrats. Mintz and O'Harrow quoted a Missouri Republican operative on the care the party takes not to wave political profiling in voters' faces: "You're not telling them you know they're pro-life," he said. "You're sending them a pro-life message." - Keith Dawson

Fig Leaf vs. Shield on Privacy

http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2000/10/09/BU39923.DTL&type=tech_article

Candidates on the Issues: Internet Privacy (AP)

http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/news/archive/2000/10/06/politics0313EDT0457.DTL&type=tech_article

Software Digs Deep Into Lives of Voters

<http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A40787-2000Oct9.html>

=====
Copyright 2000 The Industry Standard
=====

=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 10:39:00 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu>
Subject: Re: Calling sampling experts-not poll related
In-Reply-To: <200010091606.e99G6gL01501@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>

Due to school and student nonparticipation, national school-based surveys do not necessarily even yield representative samples of students. For example, in the 1998 Monitoring the Future Survey (MTFS) only 51% of the schools that were originally sampled opted to participate in the survey, and only 82% of the 12th graders within these sampled schools completed the survey yielding an overall response rate of about 42%. (This particular survey should not be singled out as it is exemplary in many regards; however, these data happen to be handy).

Of course, low response rates do not necessarily mean biased survey results; however, if either source of nonparticipation is nonrandom, the survey results could be biased. Perhaps, more troubling for surveys like this one is the concern that such biases may vary over time which could confound the interpretation of trend data. For example in the MTFS, although the student response rate has been stable over time, the school participation rate has been as high as 72% (in 1984 and 1987).

The MTFS researchers believe that school nonparticipation is random within strata (based on schools' reasons for nonparticipation) and attempt to correct for school-level biases by replacing schools that don't participate with additional schools from the same strata. However, in the absence of drug use response data from a sample of nonparticipating schools this assumption could be problematic.

The MTFS researchers address student nonparticipation by contrasting responses of students who report high absenteeism with those who report low absenteeism. They report that overweighting responses of high absentee students relative to low absentee students has little effect on overall drug use prevalence estimates. This analysis assumes that high absentee students who participate are suitable proxies for student nonparticipants. The high absentee students may be good proxies for some nonparticipants; however, I suspect there are other reasons for nonparticipation that are related to drug use (both positively and negatively).

In sum, we need to develop better methods for understanding sources of

nonparticipation in school-based surveys and better statistical models to correct for potential biases in order to generate more accurate estimates of high school students' behavior.

At 11:06 AM 10/9/00 -0500, you wrote:

<blockquote type=cite cite>Hi Experts,

I'm looking at a study that first selected schools from a list of schools in the

US (stratified by region, and other characteristics). Then students in the

school were selected to be interviewed.

The study literature says it is a national sample of high school kids of that

age. The literature does not qualify the statement to indicate it is a national

sample of high school kids of that age THAT ARE IN SCHOOL. Since the dropout

rate is so high for certain groups and in some urban high schools, I thought

this selection process might bias the data.

Is it possible to create weights so that kids who could have never been selected

by the sampling frame (e.g., high school dropouts) are represented in the

sample? That is, is it possible (and probable) that this claim of being a

national sample of high school kids of this age is a valid claim?

Thank you for your help.

Carolyn S. White, PhD

Program Coordinator, CCSO

Asst Prof of Sociology

1304 W. Springfield Ave.

University of Illinois

Urbana, Il 61822

Voice: 217-333-6751

email: cswhite@uiuc.edu</blockquote>

=====

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

Director

Center for Family and Community Health

School of Public Health

University of California, Berkeley

WWW:
http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH

===== </html>

=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 14:54:53 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Recent polling results
References: <39E2D26F.23058.A887B34@localhost>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>From E.J. Dionne's column in today's Washington Post:

This is the election in which the voters should fire the pollsters
or the pollsters should fire the voters. The polls are unstable and
frequently contradict each other. Old rules fly out the window.

Jan Werner

MJS wrote:

>
> On Larry King live last night Ed Rollins and some other spin
> doctors were on discussing yesterday's release of the CNN/USA
> Today poll showing Mr. Bush ahead by something like 9
> percentage points. One of the discussants indicated that about 10
> days ago he was behind in the same poll by a similar amount. Is it
> possible that public opinion and intentions are so volatile in the
> electorate at this point that they have shifted almost 20 points in
> the last 10 days? I doubt it.
>
> The variation in point estimates from poll to poll are understandable
> given the art involved in selecting "likely voters", but variations like
> this within the same poll are simply astonishing. I think we have
> managed to demonstrate to the public beyond a reasonable doubt
> that the precision estimates supplied in news poll reports are
> meaningless.
>
> I am often called upon to explain to lay people how relatively small
> samples can produce accurate estimates of statistical parameters
> for very large populations. One of the examples I have used to
> drive the point home in the past is the national sampling used in
> political opinion polling. I don't think I'm going to be able to use
> that one any more after this election.
>
> AAPOR has established a protocol for calculating and reporting
> non-response. Maybe we should develop a soup-to-nuts protocol
> for political polling.
>
> 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.

=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 17:18:12 EDT
From: HOneill1536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill1536@aol.com
by imo-r09.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.26.) id 5.ba.bf829e4 (4251)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 10 Oct 2000 17:18:15 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <ba.bf829e4.2714e194@aol.com>
Subject: Re: Recent polling results
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 106

AAPOR will overstep its bounds if it even considers establishing a soup-to-nuts protocol for political polling. Next there will be a call for the same thing for every other kind of research. This is not the mission of AAPOR. I'm not so worried about the "soup," it's the "nuts" that concern me.

Harry O'Neill

=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 17:47:28 -0400
From: "Colleen K. Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: when a project dies...
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I thought I might share something painful that happened to me a few months ago, in case it might help anyone else going through a similar trial.

It really took place in July, a few days after my son's wedding. So I found out by email. A survey had been in the field for a week, and the client canceled it. No discussion, no real explanation.

The untimeliness of it all tore at my soul. We all know about those disappointments that happen when a really neat potential client visits the office and never calls back. Or a grant proposal over which we've slaved fails to get funded (always being the very next one down on the list, of course.) They are part of the territory, and I've always been half-psyched for them.

But we'd already signed a contract, and made the "show and tell" visit to demonstrate the questionnaire. I played the respondent, and put on my ultimate "cute" mode. The reaction was very positive and several agencies were looking forward to the data.

But like any state government, our clients have their own political struggles, and our project was just caught in the crossfire.

Since that project was my *raison d'être*, I was ("oh, by the way...")

out of a job.

Yes, I risked this when I chose to be a soft money person, going from project to project. I need the flexibility and part-time hours. But usually there are seasons to these things. I thought I was busy through April, with plenty of time to line up something else. To be left adrift in July was harder.

Actually, I wasn't abandoned. When my boss told me the grim news, he didn't even mention my future. I thought it was because he considered me disposable. He apparently thought he'd find something for me to do. I didn't want to be one of those clingy types who tries to stay around to the last minute, so I brought up how I wouldn't be needed anymore...it came across like I was abandoning him.

I spent a lot of days in shock, and just crying at the loss. It seems shallow to think that I'm what I do, rather than who I am. But what I do is a big part of who I am, and it was devastating to lose that sense of competence, of belonging, of contributing, of being needed.

The irony is that my family doesn't even need my income, and I have another job as a part-time editorial writer. I can't even imagine the despair of being a family breadwinner who has that extra pressure.

But I loved being a project coordinator! I'm one of those countless people with a mere master's degree who work in academia supporting and assisting faculty in their research.

We answer the phone when an outraged respondent calls, threatening to sue the University. We call to make sure the subcontractor's check was issued. We fill out the FedEx form to send a manuscript off for review, because the graduate students are all on break and the secretary has the flu, and the work has to get done.

We put on a suit and give a PowerPoint presentation to clients. We put on headphones and conduct an interview ourselves, to make sure that the questionnaire flows easily. We put on a smile to cajole that clerk in Contracts and Grants to process our invoice first.

The clerical staff thinks we're being uppity because we call faculty by their first names. The faculty appreciate us as an extra pair of eyes and hands. The interviewers snap to attention when we enter the phone room, because our name is the one they give out to problematic cases.

Well, the happy news is that I have another project to coordinate. It's not the most interesting project in the world, But it's research, and I like the people with whom I'll be working.

So I survived again, and it won't be the last time I'm "between engagements" if I stay in this crazy "bid'ness" (which is the preferred pronunciation here in the South.) I know, I need to get over those feelings of lacking personal worth if I don't have a title....Maybe next time I should write a book or something different instead of mindlessly just looking for another research position.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
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 32610-0195

=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 14:46:06 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Bush and Gore campaigns to debate privacy
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010101432200.15282-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Internet privacy seems to be the hot campaign topic of at least the day. Perhaps a few AAPORNETters from around DC might wish to attend the Dem vs. Rep debate hosted by Amitai Etzioni and report back to our list on what happens, if anything.

-- Jim

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 17:03:07 -0400
From: Declan McCullagh <declan@well.com>
To: politech@politechbot.com
Subject: Bush and Gore campaigns to debate privacy; Rep. Vento dead at 60

<http://www.cluebot.com/article.pl?sid=00/10/10/2031205&mode=nested>

Bush and Gore Campaigns Will Debate Privacy
posted by cicero on Tuesday October 10, @03:22PM

Representatives of the George W. Bush and Al Gore campaigns will debate privacy in Washington on October 16. Now, the candidates themselves aren't going to be there, but a privacy debate is still a first. A related one happened today at the Brookings Institution, when Sen. Robert Bennett (for Bush) and Robert Shapiro, Commerce Department undersecretary (for Gore) tangled over "technology and the global economy." There's one odd thing about the Bush-Gore privacy debate: It's being hosted by Amitai Etzioni of George Washington University, a "communitarian" who's deeply suspicious of proposals to limit government surveillance, and an unusual choice for a moderator. See below for details. Also see Gore and Bush and Ralph Nader on privacy.

<http://www.cluebot.com/article.pl?sid=00/10/10/215207&mode=nested>

Rep. Bruce Vento Dies of Cancer at 60
posted by cicero on Tuesday October 10, @04:00PM
from the environmental-and-privacy-activist dept.

CNN is reporting that Rep. Bruce Vento, a Minnesota Democrat, died Tuesday afternoon. Vento, who died of cancer at 60 and was not running for re-election, is best known for his work on environmental issues, and former Vice President Walter Mondale and the Sierra Club lauded his work. Vento also spent years trying to regulate corporations' privacy practices. Among the bills he introduced in that area are H.R.313 and H.R.2882. The former says websites may no longer share "personally identifiable information" about their visitors without prior "written consent" -- a phrase that once attracted the sobriquet of a "chronologically-backward" bill. Vento also co-sponsored SAFE, a bill to relax encryption export controls, and H.R.306, which would prohibit genetic discrimination.

POLITECH -- the moderated mailing list of politics and technology

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 15:03:14 -0700
From: "MJS" <sullivan@fsc-research.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Recent polling results
Message-ID: <39E32FB2.15521.BF4DA17@localhost>
In-reply-to: <ba.bf829e4.2714e194@aol.com>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Whatever would be wrong with publishing a consensus based standard measurement protocol? The engineering and scientific disciplines don't seem to have a problem with this approach. Is the situation we are in now, where we really have no way to compare the results taken from different polls, preferable to one in which you could at least tell whether the measurements were taken in the same fashion? What exactly is AAPOR's business, if it is not to advocate reasonable standards for its members and others measuring public opinion?

Date sent: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 17:18:12 EDT
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: HOneill1536@aol.com
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Recent polling results

AAPOR will overstep its bounds if it even considers establishing a

soup-to-nuts protocol for political polling. Next there will be a call for the same thing for every other kind of research. This is not the mission of AAPOR. I'm not so worried about the "soup," it's the "nuts" that concern me.

Harry O'Neill

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.

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 19:09:35 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Lemann on Luntz
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The current double issue of The New Yorker magazine, dated Oct. 16 & 23 and billed as "The Politics Issue," contains an article by Nicholas Lemann on Frank Luntz titled "The Word Lab: Why All Candidates Sound Alike."

The article confirmed my prior opinions that Nicholas Lemann knows little of what he writes about and that whether or not Frank Luntz knows anything about opinion research, he is a brilliant salesman who capitalizes on the conceits of his clients to sell them whatever they want to hear as if it were divine revelation.

Luntz got the magazine to pay his out-of-pocket expenses to run one of his "Word Lab" focus groups for Lemann by agreeing not to charge a fee on top of that. That is the kind of PR coup that seasoned flacks can only dream of. Luntz also got the NY Times magazine to run a feature on him last year, showing that this was no fluke.

The event was held in Towson, MD, and Lemann blithely states that "Luntz had barred self-described liberals from the group, to correct for the tendency of Marylanders to skew to the left of the country as a whole." In other words, Luntz relied on the old trick of using a biased focus group to impress the client, and Lemann was too dim to understand that he was being used.

What the article does reveal is that Luntz was molded by Arthur Finkelstein and Richard Wirthlin, which probably explains much of his casual disregard for the truth. Luntz is also portrayed as a great fan of George Orwell, which probably has the author of "Politics and the

English Language" spinning in his grave.

Jan Werner

```
=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 17:00:25 -0700 (PDT)
From: Robert Eisinger <eisinger@lclark.edu>
To: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
cc: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Lemann on Luntz
In-Reply-To: <39E3A1AF.CED1783A@jwdp.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.10.10010101612080.12852-100000@haystack.lclark.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
```

TO: AAPORNET
CC: Jan Werner

Dear Jan Werner,

Why the ad hominem attack on Arthur Finklestein and Richard Wirthlin?

While I am thankful that you alerted me (and other aapornetters) to the New Yorker article about Frank Luntz, I find your criticism of Finklestein and Wirthlin unnecessary.

-Robert Eisinger
Lewis & Clark College

On Tue, 10 Oct 2000, Jan Werner wrote:

```
> The current double issue of The New Yorker magazine, dated Oct. 16 & 23
> and billed as "The Politics Issue," contains an article by Nicholas
> Lemann on Frank Luntz titled "The Word Lab: Why All Candidates Sound
> Alike."
>
> The article confirmed my prior opinions that Nicholas Lemann knows
> little of what he writes about and that whether or not Frank Luntz knows
> anything about opinion research, he is a brilliant salesman who
> capitalizes on the conceits of his clients to sell them whatever they
> want to hear as if it were divine revelation.
>
> Luntz got the magazine to pay his out-of-pocket expenses to run one of
> his "Word Lab" focus groups for Lemann by agreeing not to charge a fee
> on top of that. That is the kind of PR coup that seasoned flacks can
> only dream of. Luntz also got the NY Times magazine to run a feature on
> him last year, showing that this was no fluke.
>
> The event was held in Towson, MD, and Lemann blithely states that "Luntz
> had barred self-described liberals from the group, to correct for the
> tendency of Marylanders to skew to the left of the country as a whole."
> In other words, Luntz relied on the old trick of using a biased focus
> group to impress the client, and Lemann was too dim to understand that
> he was being used.
>
> What the article does reveal is that Luntz was molded by Arthur
```

> Finkelstein and Richard Wirthlin, which probably explains much of his
> casual disregard for the truth. Luntz is also portrayed as a great fan
> of George Orwell, which probably has the author of "Politics and the
> English Language" spinning in his grave.
>
> Jan Werner
>

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 22:25:46 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Discrepancy Found in US Sex Survey
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The following AP article appears in a number of newspapers today. It provides a fascinating example of an extreme case of coverage error in a sample surveys.

Discrepancy Found in US Sex Survey

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Surveys measuring the total number of sex partners among men and among women have for years suggested that men had more partners than women.

This result has puzzled social scientists since the surveys should show equal numbers of partners because each time a man has a new partner, so does a woman. A new sexual partnership should add one to each side of the equation.

A new study may explain the flaw: The surveys failed to measure the sexual activity of prostitutes, thus reducing the number of sex partners reported on the women's side of the equation.

``The number of partners that (heterosexual) men have had must be equal to the number of partners that (heterosexual) women have had,' said Devon Brewer of the University of Washington. ``Each new partner for a man is also a new partner for a woman. So, in reality, it must be equal. By definition.''

But the General Social Surveys, conducted by the University of Chicago, and the National Health and Social Life Survey, funded by private foundations, found that men were claiming up to 74 percent more

partners than women.

The government uses these data to design public health programs to combat sexual diseases.

Brewer said social scientists, scrambling to explain the embarrassing inconsistency, suggested two possible solutions to the discrepancy -- survey subjects were lying, or a fundamental flaw existed in the way the data were being collected.

``One explanation was that men are boasting or bragging about their number of partners and that women were being modest,'' said Brewer.

That may be true, he said, but a study he co-authored in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences says the biggest cause of the discrepancy is that the surveys ignored the professionals: women who sell sex for profit.

``We found these high-activity women, prostitutes, were inadvertently excluded by the design of the surveys,'' said Brewer, whose study appears Tuesday in PNAS.

Brewer said the national surveys covered ``households'' and not dwellings like jails, motels, shelters and rooming houses, where prostitutes are more apt to work. Surveyors usually rang doorbells at evening, on weekends and holidays, when most prostitutes are working, unavailable for interviews, Brewer said.

To test his theory, Brewer's group used other studies to estimate about 23 prostitutes for every 100,000 people in the United States and an average per-prostitute client list of 694 male sex partners a year.

``Some have far more and some have far fewer, but that is a representative sample,'' Brewer said.

Applying these estimates to the national surveys brought final numbers for sexual partners into about equal balance, said Brewer.

Male prostitutes were not included, he said, because few women buy sex from men.

Tom Smith, director of the General Social Survey at the University of Chicago, said Brewer's study ``offers a likely explanation for at least part of the discrepancy,'' but there are other factors.

Smith said that about 10 percent of the discrepancy may be because the survey did not seek responses

from sexually active juveniles. This would create a bias, for example, because males over 18 might report sex with young females, but the survey would not include balancing reports from underage girls.

Also, Smith believes that another 10 percent of the bias may come from gender-based attitudes toward sexual surveys, with men overreporting, women underreporting.

The GSS, first published in 1988, is paid for, in part, by the National Science Foundation. Smith said the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention use the data to help design and target public health campaigns to control sexually spread diseases.

Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 22:37:42 -0400
Message-Id: <200010110237.WAA14078@garnet2.acns.fsu.edu>
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Discrepancy Found in US Sex Survey

Wait a second! Doesn't this logic suggest that there are equal numbers of adult men and women? But there aren't. There are more women than men.

Therefore, because men have more partners to choose from, it does NOT mean that every time a man has a new partner, a woman does too. A man may have a new partner at the same time that several women have zero partners.

With unequal sex ratios, men could report more partners than women even without factoring in the prostitute ratio (although I am not ruling that out).

Susan

At 10:25 PM 10/10/2000 -0400, you wrote:

>The following AP article appears in a number of newspapers today. It
>provides a fascinating example of an extreme case of coverage error in a
>sample surveys.

>

>_____

>

> Discrepancy Found in US Sex Survey

>

> By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

>

> WASHINGTON (AP) -- Surveys measuring the total
> number of sex partners among men and among women
> have for years suggested that men had more partners
> than women.

>

> This result has puzzled social scientists since the
> surveys should show equal numbers of partners
> because each time a man has a new partner, so does

> a woman. A new sexual partnership should add one to
> each side of the equation.
>
> A new study may explain the flaw: The surveys failed to
> measure the sexual activity of prostitutes, thus
> reducing the number of sex partners reported on the
> women's side of the equation.
>
> ``The number of partners that (heterosexual) men have
> had must be equal to the number of partners that
> (heterosexual) women have had,'' said Devon Brewer
> of the University of Washington. ``Each new partner for
> a man is also a new partner for a woman. So, in reality,
> it must be equal. By definition.''
>
> But the General Social Surveys, conducted by the
> University of Chicago, and the National Health and
> Social Life Survey, funded by private foundations,
> found that men were claiming up to 74 percent more
> partners than women.
>
> The government uses these data to design public
> health programs to combat sexual diseases.
>
> Brewer said social scientists, scrambling to explain the
> embarrassing inconsistency, suggested two possible
> solutions to the discrepancy -- survey subjects were
> lying, or a fundamental flaw existed in the way the data
> were being collected.
>
> ``One explanation was that men are boasting or
> bragging about their number of partners and that
> women were being modest,'' said Brewer.
>
> That may be true, he said, but a study he co-authored
> in the Proceedings of the National Academy of
> Sciences says the biggest cause of the discrepancy is
> that the surveys ignored the professionals: women who
> sell sex for profit.
>
> ``We found these high-activity women, prostitutes,
> were inadvertently excluded by the design of the
> surveys,'' said Brewer, whose study appears Tuesday
> in PNAS.
>
> Brewer said the national surveys covered
> ``households'' and not dwellings like jails, motels,
> shelters and rooming houses, where prostitutes are
> more apt to work. Surveyors usually rang doorbells at
> evening, on weekends and holidays, when most
> prostitutes are working, unavailable for interviews,
> Brewer said.
>
> To test his theory, Brewer's group used other studies
> to estimate about 23 prostitutes for every 100,000
> people in the United States and an average
> per-prostitute client list of 694 male sex partners a

> year.
>
> ``Some have far more and some have far fewer, but
> that is a representative sample,' ' Brewer said.
>
> Applying these estimates to the national surveys
> brought final numbers for sexual partners into about
> equal balance, said Brewer.
>
> Male prostitutes were not included, he said, because
> few women buy sex from men.
>
> Tom Smith, director of the General Social Survey at the
> University of Chicago, said Brewer's study ``offers a
> likely explanation for at least part of the discrepancy,' '
> but there are other factors.
>
> Smith said that about 10 percent of the discrepancy
> may be because the survey did not seek responses
> from sexually active juveniles. This would create a
> bias, for example, because males over 18 might report
> sex with young females, but the survey would not
> include balancing reports from underage girls.
>
> Also, Smith believes that another 10 percent of the bias
> may come from gender-based attitudes toward sexual
> surveys, with men overreporting, women
> underreporting.
>
> The GSS, first published in 1988, is paid for, in part, by
> the National Science Foundation. Smith said the
> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention use the
> data to help design and target public health campaigns
> to control sexually spread diseases.
>
>

Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at:
<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>

850-644-8778
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I HAVE JUST JOINED THE FACULTY AT:

The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 22:55:34 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: The New 3 P's: Politics, Polling and Profiling
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010100958030.19764-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The first two web sites suggested by Jim produced these error messages:
(<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/>) and
(<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/news/archive/>)

>Item Not Found

>

>The article or page you requested was not found. If this link was sent to
>you via e-mail or posted on another website, it was
>probably incorrectly formatted.

>

>If the link that gave you the error appeared on one of The Gate's pages,
>please mail us and let us know at webmaster@sfgate.com.

A

> Fig Leaf vs. Shield on Privacy
> [http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/
> 2000/10/09/BU39923.DTL&type=tech_article](http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2000/10/09/BU39923.DTL&type=tech_article)

>

> Candidates on the Issues: Internet Privacy (AP)
> [http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/news/archive/
> 2000/10/06/politics0313EDT0457.DTL&type=tech_article](http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/news/archive/2000/10/06/politics0313EDT0457.DTL&type=tech_article)

>

> Software Digs Deep Into Lives of Voters
> <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A40787-2000Oct9.html>

>

>

>=====
> Copyright 2000 The Industry Standard
>=====

>

>

>*****

=====
Date: Tue, 10 Oct 2000 20:17:04 -0700 (PDT)
From: Patricia Gwartney <PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: cognitive "maps" of emotive terms
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01JV6NS4N8X68WWC6N@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>

charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

First of all, it's not clear that -- arithmetically -- there is a discrepancy.

The popular version of the Chicago study ("Sex in America") states that 33% of males have had 10+ sex partners since age 18, while only 9% of females have had that many. While this appears on the surface to be a large difference, I see nowhere in the report that the claim is made that the average numbers of partners differ by gender. (Perhaps it appears in their bigger volume.) So for the sake of argument it is conceivable that a subset of the 9% of women have had a very large number of partners while the average number among males in the 33% is lower and thus the two averages could be identical, as logic implies they should be.

Prostitution seems a little far fetched as an explanation, especially since the Chicago questionnaire asked "if you ever had sex with a person you paid" -- so presumably they would have said something about that.

In their discussion of the generally conservative sexual behavior of Americans they make one statement that suggests another interpretation: "Only a few percent of the population had as many as five partners for sexual intercourse in the past year and many of these were people who were never married and were not living with anyone. They were mostly young and mostly male." (p. 103).

If gay males are more sexually active, as has been reported, than gay females, then this would be a source of "demographically unreciprocated" sexual activity in that there would be no female counterparts to many of the relationships tabulated. And most studies show the incidence of homosexuality a good bit higher (like 2X) among males than females. So with estimates of male homosexuality approaching 10% in some studies, this would be a non-trivial factor. (Yes, the Chicago study implies that some questions were specifically about opposite sex partners but their main summary -- Table 6, p.102-103 -- has no such qualification.)

Other notions --

The study found that most of a person's "numbers" are racked up in youth -- including, increasingly, prior to age 18, which was the threshold for the question about adult partners. Maybe males push the envelope a little in answering the question, while women want to forget?

Or just differences in how the two groups feel about sex may affect how they answer the questions. Consider these numbers (same study) on reasons for having first sexual intercourse. (Keep in mind -- these are virtually all "matched" incidences -- one man and one woman talking about the same event.)

AFFECTION FOR PARTNER
Men - 25%
Women - 48%

PHYSICAL PLEASURE

Men - 12%

Women - 3%

CURIOSITY/READINESS FOR SEX

Men - 51%

Women - 24%

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Date: Tuesday, October 10, 2000 10:26 PM

Subject: Discrepancy Found in US Sex Survey

>The following AP article appears in a number of newspapers today. It
>provides a fascinating example of an extreme case of coverage error in a
>sample surveys.

>

>

> _____
> Discrepancy Found in US Sex Survey

>

> By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

>

> WASHINGTON (AP) -- Surveys measuring the total
> number of sex partners among men and among women
> have for years suggested that men had more partners
> than women.

>

> This result has puzzled social scientists since the
> surveys should show equal numbers of partners
> because each time a man has a new partner, so does
> a woman. A new sexual partnership should add one to
> each side of the equation.

>

> A new study may explain the flaw: The surveys failed to
> measure the sexual activity of prostitutes, thus
> reducing the number of sex partners reported on the
> women's side of the equation.

>

> ``The number of partners that (heterosexual) men have
> had must be equal to the number of partners that
> (heterosexual) women have had,'' said Devon Brewer
> of the University of Washington. ``Each new partner for
> a man is also a new partner for a woman. So, in reality,
> it must be equal. By definition.''

>

> But the General Social Surveys, conducted by the
> University of Chicago, and the National Health and
> Social Life Survey, funded by private foundations,
> found that men were claiming up to 74 percent more
> partners than women.

>
> The government uses these data to design public
> health programs to combat sexual diseases.
>
> Brewer said social scientists, scrambling to explain the
> embarrassing inconsistency, suggested two possible
> solutions to the discrepancy -- survey subjects were
> lying, or a fundamental flaw existed in the way the data
> were being collected.
>
> ``One explanation was that men are boasting or
> bragging about their number of partners and that
> women were being modest,'' said Brewer.
>
> That may be true, he said, but a study he co-authored
> in the Proceedings of the National Academy of
> Sciences says the biggest cause of the discrepancy is
> that the surveys ignored the professionals: women who
> sell sex for profit.
>
> ``We found these high-activity women, prostitutes,
> were inadvertently excluded by the design of the
> surveys,'' said Brewer, whose study appears Tuesday
> in PNAS.
>
> Brewer said the national surveys covered
> ``households'' and not dwellings like jails, motels,
> shelters and rooming houses, where prostitutes are
> more apt to work. Surveyors usually rang doorbells at
> evening, on weekends and holidays, when most
> prostitutes are working, unavailable for interviews,
> Brewer said.
>
> To test his theory, Brewer's group used other studies
> to estimate about 23 prostitutes for every 100,000
> people in the United States and an average
> per-prostitute client list of 694 male sex partners a
> year.
>
> ``Some have far more and some have far fewer, but
> that is a representative sample,'' Brewer said.
>
> Applying these estimates to the national surveys
> brought final numbers for sexual partners into about
> equal balance, said Brewer.
>
> Male prostitutes were not included, he said, because
> few women buy sex from men.
>
> Tom Smith, director of the General Social Survey at the
> University of Chicago, said Brewer's study ``offers a
> likely explanation for at least part of the discrepancy,''
> but there are other factors.
>
> Smith said that about 10 percent of the discrepancy
> may be because the survey did not seek responses
> from sexually active juveniles. This would create a

> bias, for example, because males over 18 might report
> sex with young females, but the survey would not
> include balancing reports from underage girls.
>
> Also, Smith believes that another 10 percent of the bias
> may come from gender-based attitudes toward sexual
> surveys, with men overreporting, women
> underreporting.
>
> The GSS, first published in 1988, is paid for, in part, by
> the National Science Foundation. Smith said the
> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention use the
> data to help design and target public health campaigns
> to control sexually spread diseases.
>

Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 09:04:31 -0400
From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <85256975.0047D3D9.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
Subject: Re: Lemann on Luntz
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

Luntz did work for Wirthlin at one time, and while Wirthlin himself is viewed with great regard by many, his employee was not. As for Finklestein, he is known as the kind of pollster who is a bit more "biased" than most. His favorite (and often only) strategy advice for his GOP clients is "Call him a liberal!" which doesn't always work.

This kind story confirms what I and others have said before...Luntz is a great salesman, his research quality may be another story.

Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 14:07:04 -0400
Subject: Poll Watchers
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Claudia Deane" <deanec@washpost.com>
Message-ID: <OF40ADE428.A094E91A-ON85256975.0063609D@washpost.com>
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on inetmail1/TWP(Release 5.0.3 |March 21, 2000) at 10/11/2000 02:06:53 PM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com at:

<http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A51737-2000Oct11.html>

=====
Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 10:21:53 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Request for Proposals (RFP): The Art of Community and Civic
Networking
(fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010111011290.19962-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 00:27:13 -0700
From: Richard Civille <rciville@civicnet.org>
Subject: Request for Proposals (RFP): The Art of Community and Civic
Networking

Good morning:

The Center for Civic Networking is pleased to announce a Request for Proposals (RFP) open to individual practitioners who can rapidly investigate current, challenging and even difficult issues concerning sustainability of civic or community networking projects. Applications are due by 9:00 PM, Pacific Standard Time, November 13, 2000. Five awards to conduct special studies will be announced in January 2001. The studies will be of an intensive, short-term nature, to ensure that results are timely within rapidly changing market conditions.

Ars Portalis, a new project of the Center for Civic Networking, is being conducted under a special research contract with the Telecommunications Opportunity Program of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration. Please visit the Ars Portalis website, at <http://www.arsportalis.org> for further information. The website includes application materials, frequently asked questions, background information and a subscription form to sign up to the Ars Portalis announcement list. Please feel free to use the contact form on the website to get in touch if you are interested in applying and would like to discuss ideas.

Ars Portalis, from the Latin, suggests "the arts of the city gates." The term evokes the skills, methods and techniques ('ars') involved in using the Internet as a way to evoke community -- a sense of place.

City gates of old ("portalis") were built not only for public defense, but also to define a sense of boundary; the geographic nature of a community, and evokes the sense that "All are welcome who pass this way."

While this initial round of Ars Portalis awards is limited to projects conducted in the United States, the issues that will be tackled and the projects addressed are global in dimension. The Ars Portalis web-site will be used throughout the studies to help researchers collaborate and conduct requests for comments (RFC) among their peers and local community stakeholders everywhere.

In this way, Ars Portalis will help foster linkages among a growing group of

> A
> > Fig Leaf vs. Shield on Privacy
> > http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2000/10/09/BU39923.DTL&type=tech_article
> >
> > Candidates on the Issues: Internet Privacy (AP)
> > http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/news/archive/2000/10/06/politics0313EDT0457.DTL&type=tech_article
> >
> > Software Digs Deep Into Lives of Voters
> > <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A40787-2000Oct9.html>
> >
> >

> >=====
> > Copyright 2000 The Industry Standard
> >=====
> >
> >
> >
> >*****
> >
> >

=====
Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 15:00:44 -0400
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Poll Watchers
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain

I am curious to know what other readers think of the explanation of the volatility of Gallup's recent polling numbers as discussed extensively in the Washington Post Poll Watchers article.

The explanation certainly fits the case (and it does correspond with my quite limited experience with likely voters and party affiliation). But I wonder why this volatility doesn't effect other polling organizations to the same degree?

Is it in fact something specific in Gallup's likely voter model? Or something else?

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Claudia Deane [SMTP:deanec@washpost.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2000 2:07 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Poll Watchers

>
> The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com at:
>
> <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A51737-2000Oct11.html>

=====
Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 15:14:43 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Does Money Buy Happiness?
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="=====_16201614==_ .ALT"

-----_16201614==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

This is an interesting analysis which suggests that for many folks the increase in economic well being has not resulted in a commensurate increase in happiness. Women, according to the analysis have grown less content over time despite females' big strides in employment and educational attainment. Could these attitudes possibly contribute to the gender differences reported between Bush and Gore?

Business Week: October 16, 2000
Department: Economic Trends

Does Money Buy Happiness?

-- By Gene Koretz

In recent decades, living standards in the U.S. have risen markedly, with per capita income up by 75% in real terms since 1970. So you might think that Americans would be a lot more content and satisfied with their lives, particularly since material success looms so large in the nation's psyche.

As it happens, numerous surveys suggest that Americans have actually been growing less happy. And the cause, report David G. Blanchflower and Andrew J. Oswald in a new National Bureau of Economic Research study, appears to be a cluster of social trends that far overshadow income gains.

The study's focus is the highly detailed annual General Social Survey of the U.S. Between 1972 and 1998, the GSS shows a steady decline from 34% to 30% in the share of Americans describing themselves as "very happy." Using statistical analysis, the two economists try to figure out why.

Other things being equal, they do find that higher incomes bring more happiness, but the impact is surprisingly weak. Other factors such as gender and marital status weigh more heavily.

For one thing, it is women rather than men who have grown significantly less content over time, despite females' big strides in employment and educational attainment. Women still appear somewhat happier than men after adjustments are made for multiple factors affecting happiness, but the gap, says Blanchflower, "is narrowing, as women's economic roles become more like men's."

Second, marital status seems to be a major determinant of satisfaction. Not only are married folks happier than others, but those who are separated are the least happy, followed closely by those who are widowed or divorced. Further, the impact of marital breakups appears to endure over the years--and generations. People in second marriages report lower levels of well-being than those in first marriages, and those whose parents were divorced when they were kids are also less content.

Such findings confirm more intensive research by psychologists on the negative effects of divorce on children much later in life. They also suggest that the rise in divorce rates and the decline in marriage are both taking a large toll on Americans' happiness.

On the economic front, the study indicates that being unemployed dampens happiness almost as much as being divorced. Moreover, the researchers find that relative income--that is, how far one's income is above or below the average in his or her state--has a substantial impact on reported well-being.

Other intriguing findings include the fact that happiness peaks at age 18, declines until age 40, and then moves higher--though never approaching the joy of youth. But the study clearly raises more questions than it answers.

At the very least, it suggests that those who think income gains alone guarantee greater happiness are deluding themselves. And it implies that some apparent aspects of the New Economy--such as more bouts of unemployment and greater income inequality--carry significant psychological costs.

copyright @Business Week

-----_16201614==_.ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

```
<html>
<font face="arial" size=2 color="#000000">This is an interesting analysis
which suggests that for many folks the increase in economic well being
has not resulted in a commensurate increase in happiness. Women,
according to the analysis have grown less content over time
</font><font color="#000000">despite females' big strides in employment
and educational attainment.</font><font size=2 color="#000000"> Could
these attitudes possibly contribute to the gender differences reported
between Bush and Gore?<br>
<br>
<br>
</font><font color="#000000"><a name="TOP"></a>Business Week: October 16,
2000<br>
Department: Economic Trends<br>
<br>
</font><font size=4>Does Money Buy Happiness?<br>
<br>
</font><font color="#000000">-- By Gene Koretz<br>
<br>
```

In recent decades, living standards in the U.S. have risen markedly, with per capita income up by 75% in real terms since 1970. So you might think that Americans would be a lot more content and satisfied with their lives, particularly since material success looms so large in the nation's

psyche.

As it happens, numerous surveys suggest that Americans have actually been growing less happy. And the cause, report David G. Blanchflower and Andrew J. Oswald in a new National Bureau of Economic Research study, appears to be a cluster of social trends that far overshadow income gains.

The study's focus is the highly detailed annual General Social Survey of the U.S. Between 1972 and 1998, the GSS shows a steady decline from 34% to 30% in the share of Americans describing themselves as "very happy." Using statistical analysis, the two economists try to figure out why.

Other things being equal, they do find that higher incomes bring more happiness, but the impact is surprisingly weak. Other factors such as gender and marital status weigh more heavily.

For one thing, it is women rather than men who have grown significantly less content over time, despite females' big strides in employment and educational attainment. Women still appear somewhat happier than men after adjustments are made for multiple factors affecting happiness, but the gap, says Blanchflower, "is narrowing, as women's economic roles become more like men's."

Second, marital status seems to be a major determinant of satisfaction. Not only are married folks happier than others, but those who are separated are the least happy, followed closely by those who are widowed or divorced. Further, the impact of marital breakups appears to endure over the years--and generations. People in second marriages report lower levels of well-being than those in first marriages, and those whose parents were divorced when they were kids are also less content.

Such findings confirm more intensive research by psychologists on the negative effects of divorce on children much later in life. They also suggest that the rise in divorce rates and the decline in marriage are both taking a large toll on Americans' happiness.

On the economic front, the study indicates that being unemployed dampens happiness almost as much as being divorced. Moreover, the researchers find that relative income--that is, how far one's income is above or below the average in his or her state--has a substantial impact on reported well-being.

Other intriguing findings include the fact that happiness peaks at age 18, declines until age 40, and then moves higher--though never approaching the joy of youth. But the study clearly raises more questions than it answers.

At the very least, it suggests that those who think income gains alone guarantee greater happiness are deluding themselves. And it implies that some apparent aspects of the New Economy--such as more bouts of unemployment and greater income inequality--carry significant psychological costs.

copyright @Business Week

</html>

-----_16201614==_ .ALT--

=====
Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 15:24:49 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Why the rapid swings in undecided votes?
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="===== _16808054==_ .ALT"

-----_16808054==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

With the polls showing Bush and Gore virtually neck in neck but with swing voters swinging back and forth at a seemingly rapid rate we keep wondering why. Maureen Dowd, in her weekly column in the NY Times, seems may have put her finger on as good an explanation as any:

"What has this race come to in the final stretch? It isn't turning only on issues. Vast chunks of voters are being swayed by a kiss, a sigh, a roll of the eyes, a smirk, a befuddled stare."

The rest of her column is very funny -- she takes both candidates apart. Only worrisome thing is that they are both candidates for the highest office in the land.

Lord only knows what we are in for tonight!

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

-----_16808054==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>
With the polls showing Bush and Gore virtually neck in neck but with swing voters swinging back and forth at a seemingly rapid rate we keep wondering why. Maureen Dowd, in her weekly column in the NY Times, seems may have put her finger on as good an explanation as any:

"What has this race come to in the final stretch? It isn't turning

only on issues. Vast chunks of voters are being swayed by a kiss, a

sigh, a roll of the eyes, a smirk, a befuddled stare."

The rest of her column is very funny -- she takes both candidates apart.
Only worrisome thing is that they are both candidates for the highest
office in the land.

Lord only knows what we are in for tonight!

Dick Halpern

<x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep>

<font size=1
color="#0000FF">*****
*

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

*****</ht
m
l>

-----_16808054==_.ALT--

=====
Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 14:38:21 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Poll Watchers
References: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098F31@AS_SERVER>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-
creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

RE: "But I wonder why this volatility doesn't effect other polling
organizations to the same degree?"

>From Morin's Sept 20 column, A Poll Less Traveled, which was discussed here
two weeks ago regarding the Voter.com poll: "Goeas and Lake adjust, or
"weight," their survey results so that 35 percent of their tweaked sample are
Democrats and 35 percent are Republicans."

As for the Reuters poll, according to John Zogby's Polling Report article
shortly after the 1996 election, he weighted too his sample in 1996 about
equally between Democrats and Republicans. (Don't know what his weights are
now.)

This procedure in tracking polls will reduce volatility - but may have little to do with validity.

Also see: http://www.ncpp.org/weight_data.htm

Nick

Leo Simonetta wrote:

> I am curious to know what other readers think of the explanation of the
> volatility
> of Gallup's recent polling numbers as discussed extensively in the
> Washington Post
> Poll Watchers article.
>
> The explanation certainly fits the case (and it does correspond with my
> quite limited
> experience with likely voters and party affiliation). But I wonder why this
> volatility
> doesn't effect other polling organizations to the same degree?
>
> Is it in fact something specific in Gallup's likely voter model? Or
> something else?
>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, Inc.
> simonetta@artsci.com
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Claudia Deane [SMTP:deanec@washpost.com]
> > Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2000 2:07 PM
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Poll Watchers
> >
> > The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com at:
> >
> > <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A51737-2000Oct11.html>

```
=====
Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 15:37:58 -0400
To: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: The New 3 P's: Politics, Polling and Profiling
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010110933200.19962-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
References: <5.0.0.25.2.20001010225229.02c90da0@mail.mindspring.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed
```

Jim,

What you are saying is true. But, it does not explain the error message. When a particular site is listed as containing a particular article, is it not too much to expect that the article will be there....and that the listed site won't, instead, generate an error message! Is that unreasonable?

Dick

At 12:41 PM 10/11/00, you wrote:

>Dick,

>

>The Websites of most major newspapers--including the Washington Post and
>the San Francisco Chronicle (sfgate.com)--include both archives and
>engines by which these might be searched by author, title, subject, date,
>keywords, and text.

>

-- Jim

>

>*****

>

>On Tue, 10 Oct 2000, dick halpern wrote:

>

> > The first two web sites suggested by Jim produced these error messages:
> > (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/>) and
> > (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/news/archive/>)

> >

> > >Item Not Found

> > >

> > >The article or page you requested was not found. If this link was sent
to

> > >you via e-mail or posted on another website, it was

> > >probably incorrectly formatted.

> > >

> > >If the link that gave you the error appeared on one of The Gate's pages,
> > >please mail us and let us know at webmaster@sfgate.com.

> >

> >

> > A

> > > Fig Leaf vs. Shield on Privacy

> > > [http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/
2000/10/09/BU39923.DTL&type=tech_article](http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2000/10/09/BU39923.DTL&type=tech_article)

> > >

> > > Candidates on the Issues: Internet Privacy (AP)

> > > [http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/news/archive/
2000/10/06/politics0313EDT0457.DTL&type=tech_article](http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/news/archive/2000/10/06/politics0313EDT0457.DTL&type=tech_article)

> > >

> > > Software Digs Deep Into Lives of Voters

> > > <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A40787-2000Oct9.html>

> > >

> >

=====
Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 14:51:04 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: RE: Poll Watchers
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-7
Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id MAA02433

Yes, other polls are affected by this phenomenon.

In a state where political party is a state of mind, not a category on the registered voter books, we see fluctuations in party ID all the time. And events i;½ such as a hotly contested Democratic primary with no corresponding Republican race i;½ can punch up the usual fluctuations even more. For example, right after the Minnesota gubernatorial primary election in 1998, Humphrey led Coleman and Ventura by 20 points, but the lead was short-lived, and was fueled in part by by independents traveling to the Democratic camp for a short while.

Was it real? Yep. Was it a "bad poll" because of it? Nope. It measured what was out there at the time i;½ a snapshot.

But generally in the Northstar State, those professing a Democrat state of mind total 45%-50%; the percentage of those professing a Republican state of rarely gets above 40%. We've noticed that lots of things affect party ID, including a Jesse Ventura eruption and the primary scenario described above.

Do we weight for this? No, because there's no population parameter that we can use. (Some have suggested using annual averages for Democrats and for Republicans the year before as a population parameter; I trust the laws of statistics and not that type of voodoo.)

I tip my hat to Rich's and Claudia's astute observations.

Cheers.

Rob

Robert P. Daves
Director of Strategic & News Research
Star Tribune
daves@startribune.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488

v: 612.673-7278
f: 612.673-4359
e:

=====
Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 17:01:16 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Poll Watchers
References: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098F31@AS_SERVER>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The CNN/Gallup poll is a rolling 3-day poll of "790 likely voters" over a 3-day period, using a new sample each day. This would seem to indicate a sample size of about 265 "likely voters" each day, and little or nothing by way of follow-ups.

I personally don't find it surprising that such a small sample interviewed over such a short period of time would show enormous volatility as compared to polls that spend a little more time collecting data from a larger sample.

Jan Werner

Leo Simonetta wrote:

>
> I am curious to know what other readers think of the explanation of the
> volatility
> of Gallup's recent polling numbers as discussed extensively in the
> Washington Post
> Poll Watchers article.
>
> The explanation certainly fits the case (and it does correspond with my
> quite limited
> experience with likely voters and party affiliation). But I wonder why this
> volatility
> doesn't effect other polling organizations to the same degree?
>
> Is it in fact something specific in Gallup's likely voter model? Or
> something else?
>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, Inc.
> simonetta@artsci.com
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Claudia Deane [SMTP:deanec@washpost.com]
> > Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2000 2:07 PM
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Poll Watchers
> >
> > The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com at:
> >
> > <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A51737-2000Oct11.html>

Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 16:29:01 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>
Subject: Fwd: Re: Poll Watchers
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

The folks at Gallup can undoubtedly provide more and better details, but to nip a misapprehension in the bud, as I understand it, the Gallup tracking effort is a ROLLING (emphasis added) effort in which new cases are indeed continuously added, but those not reached at first are called back on subsequent occasions. The numbers reported each day drop the results from the first day of the "old" period and add in those from the last day of the new. It is true that this means the day to day differences are mostly a function of the difference of yesterday's results compared to those of three days ago, but it is NOT true that each day is a "one day wonder".

Don

On Wed, 11 OCT, Jan Werner wrote.

>The CNN/Gallup poll is a rolling 3-day poll of "790 likely voters" over
>a 3-day period, using a new sample each day. This would seem to
>indicate a sample size of about 265 "likely voters" each day, and little
>or nothing by way of follow-ups.

>

>I personally don't find it surprising that such a small sample
>interviewed over such a short period of time would show enormous
>volatility as compared to polls that spend a little more time collecting
>data from a larger sample.

>

>Jan Werner

>

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705
608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 16:45:52 -0700
From: Janet Bridges <snobrid@louisiana.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7C-CCK-MCD {C-UDP; EBM-APPLE} (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: cognitive "maps" of emotive terms
References: <01JV6NS4N8X68WWC6N@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Pedhauzer and Schmelkin mention the Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory -- 50 items, although they have some problems with the instrument..

Patricia Gwartney wrote:

=====
Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 18:05:26 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: [Fwd: Re: Poll Watchers]
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

My understanding is that the sample is not "new" each day. Call backs are made using previously attempted numbers.

The process was described by a Gallup spokesperson in a 1996 Public Perspective article.

Jan Werner wrote:

> The CNN/Gallup poll is a rolling 3-day poll of "790 likely voters" over
> a 3-day period, using a new sample each day. This would seem to
> indicate a sample size of about 265 "likely voters" each day, and little
> or nothing by way of follow-ups.

>
> I personally don't find it surprising that such a small sample
> interviewed over such a short period of time would show enormous
> volatility as compared to polls that spend a little more time collecting
> data from a larger sample.

> Jan Werner

> _____
>
> Leo Simonetta wrote:

> >
> > I am curious to know what other readers think of the explanation of the
> > volatility
> > of Gallup's recent polling numbers as discussed extensively in the
> > Washington Post
> > Poll Watchers article.

> >
> > The explanation certainly fits the case (and it does correspond with my
> > quite limited
> > experience with likely voters and party affiliation). But I wonder why
> this

> > volatility
> > doesn't effect other polling organizations to the same degree?

> >
> > Is it in fact something specific in Gallup's likely voter model? Or
> > something else?

> >

> > --
> > Leo G. Simonetta
> > Art & Science Group, Inc.
> > simonetta@artsci.com
> >
> > > -----Original Message-----
> > > From: Claudia Deane [SMTP:deanec@washpost.com]
> > > Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2000 2:07 PM
> > > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > > Subject: Poll Watchers
> > >
> > > The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com at:
> > >
> > > <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A51737-2000Oct11.html>

Date: Thu, 12 Oct 2000 06:58:35 EDT
From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo-d05.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.26.) id 5.3b.b109f1f (6621);
Thu, 12 Oct 2000 06:58:35 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <3b.b109f1f.2716f35b@aol.com>
Subject: Recent Polling Newspaper Cartoon
To: aapornet@usc.edu
CC: SueDGold@aol.com
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Mac - Post-GM sub 147

Some of you may have seen the October 10 Washington Post and other syndicated newspaper cartoon "Speed Bump" (syndicated by 2000Creators Syndicate, Inc, its cartoons found at www.speedbump.com).

The cartoon shows a male about to enter the "Polling Research Center" and stopping to read the sign on its front door: "Hours: 9 AM-5 PM, Margin of Error +/-23 Minutes"

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

Date: Thu, 12 Oct 2000 08:14:08 -0400
From: "Andy White" <awhite@nas.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu, GSSLIST@inet.ed.gov
Message-ID: <85256976.00436485.00@smtpmta.nas.edu>
Subject: SRMSNET Digest - 10 Oct 2000 to 11 Oct 2000
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

Date: Wed, 11 Oct 2000 05:16:36 -0700
From: "Pedro J. Saavedra" <psaavedr@CATHOLIC.ORG>

Subject: Kish obituary

A colleague passed me this obituary from the Ann Arbor News. I had to add paragraph breaks and may not have done it as in the original.

=====
Leslie Kish, professor emeritus of sociology at the University of Michigan
And
research scientist emeritus of the university's Institute for Social
Research,
died quietly on October 7, 2000. His death came after a long period of
hospitalization, which he faced with characteristic energy and courage. Thus
ended a long and productive life, marked by tremendous vitality, commitment
to
humanitarian values, and a bottomless curiosity about the world in all its
aspects. A few months before his death, Leslie's family, colleagues, former
students and many friends had gathered to celebrate his 90th birthday and
the
creation of a university fund, in his honor, for the training of foreign
students in population sampling.

Kish was born in 1910 in Poprad, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire,
now
in Slovakia. In 1925 the family, parents and four children, migrated to the
United States and settled in New York, but in less than a year Leslie's
father
died, suddenly and unexpectedly. The family decision to remain in the United
States meant that the two eldest would have to find work and that their high
school and college educations would have to be entirely through night
school.

In 1937 Leslie had less than one year of undergraduate college
work to complete. Deeply concerned with the threat of a fascist sweep through
Europe, however, he interrupted his studies and went to Spain as a volunteer
in
the International Brigade, to fight for the Spanish Loyalists. He returned
to
the United States in 1939 and graduated from the night City College of New
York
with a degree in mathematics (Phi Beta Kappa). He then moved to Washington,
where he was first employed at the Bureau of the Census and then as a
statistician at the Department of Agriculture. There he joined the group of
social scientists who were creating a survey research facility within that
department.

Again, his career was interrupted by war; from 1942 to 1945 he served in the
U.S. Army Air Corps as a meteorologist. He
rejoined his colleagues in the Department of Agriculture in 1945, and in 1947
moved with several of them to the University of Michigan, where together
they
founded the Institute for Social Research. During his early years at
Michigan,
Kish combined full-time statistical work with the completion of an M.A. in
mathematical statistics (1948) and a Ph.D. in sociology (1952).

Throughout his long career at the university, Kish concentrated on the theory

and practice of scientific sampling of populations. His 1965 book, Survey Sampling, a classic still in wide use, is referred to by students and faculty as the bible. In 1948 he initiated a summer program for training foreign statisticians in population sampling, which has generated a large international

body of loyal alumni in more than 100 countries. Kish's scholarly writing and innovative research in sampling continued undiminished after his formal retirement from the university in 1981. He was in great demand as an expert consultant throughout the world and in response traveled extensively and enthusiastically.

Among the many honors and awards that came to him during his long career were designation as the Russell lecturer, the University of Michigan's highest mark of recognition for a faculty member; election to the presidency of the American Statistical Association, election as a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the Royal Statistical Society of England. To these were added, in his retirement years, election as an Honorary Fellow of the International Statistical Institute and as an Honorary Member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He also received an honorary doctorate from the University of Bologna on the occasion of its 900th anniversary.

Dr. Kish is survived by Rhea, his loving wife of 53 years; his daughters, Carla and Andrea Kish; his son-in-law, Jon Stephens; his granddaughter, Nora Leslie Kish Stephens; and his sister, Magda Bondy. At his request, his body was donated to the University's medical school and there will be no funeral service. A memorial service to celebrate his life will be announced for a later date. Meanwhile, the Kish family will welcome friends on Tuesday, October 10 in the Community Room at 1050 Wall Street from 7-9 p.m., and again on Thursday, October 12 from 3-5 p.m. Those who wish to make contributions in Leslie's honor may contribute to the University of Michigan with designation for the Leslie Kish International Fellows Fund. An alternative choice, also close to Leslie's heart and representative of his values, is the Council for a Livable World, 110 Maryland Ave NE, Washington, DC 20002.

--

=====

Date: Thu, 12 Oct 2000 10:46:52 -0400
From: John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com>
To: "'jwerner@jwdp.com'" <jwerner@jwdp.com>, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Poll Watchers
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

For what it's worth, my household was contacted by Gallup last Thursday. My wife answered, said it wasn't a good time, and hung up. Sunday evening they called back and I picked up and answered the poll. Some of the questions seemed outdated (about troubles in Yugoslavia that had already passed), but others regarding the election were valid (but were also valid last Thursday). I don't know how and whether they used the sample - as a recontact for something other than the daily tracking poll? As new sample for the current day?

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2000 5:01 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Poll Watchers

The CNN/Gallup poll is a rolling 3-day poll of "790 likely voters" over a 3-day period, using a new sample each day. This would seem to indicate a sample size of about 265 "likely voters" each day, and little or nothing by way of follow-ups.

I personally don't find it surprising that such a small sample interviewed over such a short period of time would show enormous volatility as compared to polls that spend a little more time collecting data from a larger sample.

Jan Werner

Leo Simonetta wrote:

>
> I am curious to know what other readers think of the explanation of the
> volatility
> of Gallup's recent polling numbers as discussed extensively in the
> Washington Post
> Poll Watchers article.
>
> The explanation certainly fits the case (and it does correspond with my
> quite limited
> experience with likely voters and party affiliation). But I wonder why
> this
> volatility
> doesn't effect other polling organizations to the same degree?
>
> Is it in fact something specific in Gallup's likely voter model? Or
> something else?

>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, Inc.
> simonetta@artsci.com
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Claudia Deane [SMTP:deanec@washpost.com]
> > Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2000 2:07 PM
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Poll Watchers
> >
> > The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com at:
> >
> > <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A51737-2000Oct11.html>

Date: Thu, 12 Oct 2000 10:13:14 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Poll Watchers
References: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098F31@AS_SERVER>
<39E47B46.1DD34994@mcs.net> <39E5415C.EF5A70F3@jwdp.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

But the two samples are different in terms of composition by party ID as indicated in Morin's piece.

Battleground/Voter.com/Goeas-Lake polls weight their samples each day to make Dems = GOPs, clearly a variable most highly associated with candidate preference as implied in Morin's article. Such weighting may reduce "volatility" day-to-day but validity still remains the question.

http://www.ncpp.org/weight_data.htm

Jan Werner wrote:

> Except for the fact that Gallup uses a 3-day cume and Battleground a
> 4-day cume, it would appear that the two tracking polls are nearly
> identical in scope, sample size and time frame. Yet Gallup has recently
> shown tremendous volatility while Battleground has been extremely
> consistent during the same period.
>
> One gets the impression that they are sampling different populations,
> which may well be the case if their definitions of "likely voters" vary
> greatly. This, in turn, underscores the importance of reporting the
> margin of error as being relevant to the population of likely voters (as

> defined by the poll), and not necessarily to the general population.
>
> Weighting can either reduce or increase volatility, depending on what
> gets adjusted down or up, but unless there is a known need to compensate
> for some difficulty in reaching specific subgroups, a weight range large
> enough to cause that kind of effect usually indicates that the sample is
> not particularly representative to begin with.
>
> Jan Werner
> _____
>
> Nick Panagakis wrote:
> >
> > RE: "But I wonder why this volatility doesn't effect other polling
> > organizations to the same degree?"
> >
> > >From Morin's Sept 20 column, A Poll Less Traveled, which was discussed
> here
> > two weeks ago regarding the Voter.com poll: "Goeas and Lake adjust, or
> > "weight," their survey results so that 35 percent of their tweaked sample
> are
> > Democrats and 35 percent are Republicans."
> >
> > As for the Reuters poll, according to John Zogby's Polling Report article
> > shortly after the 1996 election, he weighted too his sample in 1996 about
> > equally between Democrats and Republicans. (Don't know what his weights
> are
> > now.)
> >
> > This procedure in tracking polls will reduce volatility - but may have
> little
> > to do with validity.
> >
> > Also see: http://www.ncpp.org/weight_data.htm
> >
> > Nick
> >
> > Leo Simonetta wrote:
> >
> > > I am curious to know what other readers think of the explanation of the
> > > volatility
> > > of Gallup's recent polling numbers as discussed extensively in the
> > > Washington Post
> > > Poll Watchers article.
> > >
> > > The explanation certainly fits the case (and it does correspond with my
> > > quite limited
> > > experience with likely voters and party affiliation). But I wonder why
> this
> > > volatility
> > > doesn't effect other polling organizations to the same degree?
> > >
> > > Is it in fact something specific in Gallup's likely voter model? Or
> > > something else?
> > >
> > > --
> > > Leo G. Simonetta

> > > Art & Science Group, Inc.
> > > simonetta@artsci.com
> > >
> > > > -----Original Message-----
> > > > From: Claudia Deane [SMTP:deanec@washpost.com]
> > > > Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2000 2:07 PM
> > > > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > > > Subject: Poll Watchers
> > > >
> > > > The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com
at:
> > > >
> > > > <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A51737-2000Oct11.html>

Date: Thu, 12 Oct 2000 17:30:09 -0500
From: David_Moore@gallup.com
Received: by exchng2.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <TPQLVANZ>; Thu, 12 Oct 2000 17:30:13 -0500
Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F900119FFFD@EXCHNG3>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Gallup Tracking Poll
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Several comments have been made about the CNN/USA Today Gallup tracking poll, and I thought it might be helpful to clarify some of the procedures that we use.

The tracking poll is based on what is essentially a continuous sampling design, with some new sample added each night and some old sample called back each night. Because of the continuous nature of the design, we are in fact able to make numerous call-backs. While we have set up a minimum 5-call design, in fact for many respondents we make more than the 5 calls required by the design before they are dropped.

During the past five weeks (through last Sunday), Gallup completed interviews with 14,228 respondents. The percentages of interviews completed on each call are shown below:

31.4% of interviews completed on 1st call
21.4% on 2nd call
14.5% on 3rd call
10.7% on 4th call
7.1% on 5th call
5.1% on 6th call
4.1% on 7th call
5.7% on 8th call or higher

The CASRO response rate for the continuous sampling since it began in September is currently 40%.

The Gallup likely voter model assumes that 50% of our national sample of adults will turn out to vote. Each respondent who is registered to vote (or

says he/she does not need to register) is administered a set of likely voter questions that results in a 7-point likely voter scale, where each respondent gets a score of anywhere from zero (a default assigned to those who are not registered, or who do not intend to vote) to 7 (most likely to vote). Based on that scale, we include 50% of the respondents into the likely voter model. Typically, that includes all of the respondents who score a 7, and a proportion of those who score a 6.

Thus, for example, about 40% of the national sample scores a 7 and 17% scores a 6 (hypothetical -- but not far off reality on some days). That means we need to get 10% of the national sample out of category 6 to go with the 40% in category 7 to make up the total of 50%. Since we actually have 17% of the sample in category 6, we weight that category with .5882 (10/17) and we weight category 7 with a '1' -- while categories 0 through 5 get a weight of zero. The net result is a weighted sample that represents half of the national sample.

When we calculate the number of respondents included as "likely voters" we count the full number of respondents included in categories 6 and 7, even though we typically weight the category 6 respondents to about .5 or so. That means that our raw number of respondents on whom we base the likely voter results is typically about 700 or so over a three-day period.

Interest in the election and likelihood of voting are two measures that help constitute the likely voter scale, so when interest wanes among one party and surges in the other (as can happen during a party convention, or in the wake of a debate where one candidate is seen as much better), the proportion of Democrats and Republicans in the sample of likely voters can vary as well. Gallup does not weight its sample by party -- sometimes Republicans outnumber Democrats by several percentage points and sometimes Democrats outnumber Republicans by several percentage points. If we weighted by party, the fluctuations we show in the ballot would be considerably dampened, but we do not know for certain what the actual distribution will be on election day and are reluctant to assume it will be the same as in other elections. If on election day, one party or the other has been particularly energized or, conversely, de-energized, our model would reflect that fact. If it turns out that competition is so intense that both parties are equally energized, that should be reflected in our model as well.

David W. Moore
The Gallup Organization
47 Hulfish Street
Princeton, NJ 08542
(609) 924-9600
david_moore@gallup.com

Jan Werner wrote:

> The CNN/Gallup poll is a rolling 3-day poll of "790 likely voters" over
> a 3-day period, using a new sample each day. This would seem to
> indicate a sample size of about 265 "likely voters" each day, and little
> or nothing by way of follow-ups.
>
> I personally don't find it surprising that such a small sample

> interviewed over such a short period of time would show enormous
> volatility as compared to polls that spend a little more time collecting
> data from a larger sample.
>
> Jan Werner
>

Date: Thu, 12 Oct 2000 20:24:41 EDT
From: Irv Crespi <IrvCrespi@aol.com>
Received: from IrvCrespi@aol.com
by imo-r15.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.31.) id 5.99.b4f5b2b (3318)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 12 Oct 2000 20:24:42 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <99.b4f5b2b.2717b049@aol.com>
Subject: Re: More on Likely Voters and Non-Response
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 125

While the Specifics are not spelled out in detail, you can get the general method and some detail of the Gallup turnout method developed by Paul Perry some fifty Years ago in the series of POQ articles \that he wrote in the sixties. My Pre-Election Polling has some further information. Irviing Crespi

P

the

```
=====
Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 09:18:53 -0400
From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Wash.-Balt. Chapter Seminars for November
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
        charset="iso-8859-1"
```

Greetings from DC, AAPOR colleagues!

For the month of November, the AAPOR Washington-Baltimore Chapter is pleased to offer three seminars to its members and friends. The titles and presenters are listed below. Separate announcements with abstracts, locations and RSVP instructions will follow shortly.

The Chapter would like to extend special note of thanks to our colleagues/friends in the Washington Statistical Society. DC-AAPOR and WSS have worked together as partners (via co-sponsorship of seminars) to expand and diversify our collective offerings to members of either organization. Through our joint efforts, services to our members have increased beyond the usual once-a-month event. Please take advantage and enjoy! And do not hesitate to suggest topics and/or speakers you would like to see.

Rob Santos
DC-AAPOR Chapter President

Seminar #1: Interdisciplinary Survey Research Involving the Computer and Cognitive Sciences: "Unraveling the Seam Effect," by Lance J. Rips, Northwestern University; and "The Gold Standard of Question Quality on Surveys: Experts, Computer Tools, Versus Statistical Indices" by Arthur Graesser, The University of Memphis.

When: Thursday, November 2, 2000, 3:00-4:30 p.m. ** NOTE
SPECIAL TIME **

Seminar #2: Advances in Telephone Sample Designs, by Clyde Tucker, Bureau of Labor Statistics and Jim Lepkowski, University of Michigan

When: Thursday, November 16, 2000, 12:30-2:00 p.m.

Seminar #3: Measuring Sexual Orientation in Health Surveys: Lesbian Health Research Issues, by Judith Bradford, Virginia Commonwealth University; Sylvia Fisher, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Debra Brody and Kristen Miller, National Center for Health Statistics

When: Tuesday, November 28, 2000, 12:30-2:00 p.m.

Have questions or comments? Contact: Rob Santos, DC-AAPOR Chapter President at 202 261-5291, or email at rsantos@ui.urban.org

=====
Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 09:25:13 -0400
From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Wash.-Balt. Chapter Seminar -- Nov. 2
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

Seminar #1:

Topic: Interdisciplinary Survey Research Involving the Computer and Cognitive Sciences: "Unraveling the Seam Effect," and "The Gold Standard of Question Quality on Surveys: Experts, Computer Tools, Versus Statistical Indices"

When: Thursday, November 2, 2000, 3:00-4:30 p.m. ** NOTE SPECIAL TIME **

Speakers: Lance J. Rips, Northwestern University and Arthur Graesser, The University of Memphis

Location: BLS Conference and Training Center, Room #1
(Basement/lower level)
Postal Square Building, 2 Massachusetts Ave., NE
Washington, DC (Enter on First St., NE, and bring a photo ID)

Metro: Union Station, Red Line

RSVP: To be placed on the visitor's list, send e-mail to audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com or call Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 by Monday, October 30.

Abstracts: (Rips) Panel surveys sometimes ask respondents for data from several different intervals within a longer reference period. Findings from such surveys often show larger changes from one month to the next when the data come from two different interviews than from the same interview. We have studied this seam effect experimentally in a setting that allows us to control the information that respondents should report. The results of the experiments are consistent with a theory in

which the seam difference is due to two factors: (a) respondents' forgetting information within the response interval, and (b) their bias in reporting when they can no longer remember correct answers.

(Graesser) We have developed a computer tool (called QUAID) that assists survey methodologists in improving the wording, syntax, and semantics of survey questions. We have performed analyses that assess these problems on a corpus of surveys. There has been a persistent challenge in our assessments of the validity of QUAID's critiques: What is the gold standard for determining whether a question has a particular problem. A computer tool can perform complex computations, but the question remains whether the output is valid. This presentation addresses the challenges of performance evaluation when there is no defensible gold standard for question quality.

```
=====
Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 09:27:36 -0400
From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Wash.-Balt. Chapter Seminar -- Nov. 16
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
        charset="iso-8859-1"
```

Topic: Advances in Telephone Sample Designs

Date & Time: Thursday, November 16, 2000, 12:30-2:00 p.m.

Speaker: Clyde Tucker, Bureau of Labor Statistics
Jim Lepkowski, University of Michigan

Location: BLS Cognitive Lab, Room 2990 (second floor)
Postal Square Building
2 Massachusetts Ave., NE
Washington, DC
(Enter on First St., NE, and bring a photo ID)

Metro: Union Station, Red Line

RSVP: To be placed on the visitors list, send e-mail to
audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com
or call Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 by Monday, November 13.

Abstract:

List-assisted RDD designs became popular in the late 1980s and early 90s. Work done by BLS and the University of Michigan resulted in the development of the underlying theory for these designs as well as the evaluation of various alternative sampling plans to optimize the method. This work was documented in an article by Robert Casady and James Lepkowski in the June 1993 issue of Survey Methodology. Recent research by Jim Lepkowski, Clyde Tucker, and Linda Piekarski to

re-evaluate these designs in light of the significant changes in the telephone system over the last decade will be presented.

=====
Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 09:29:37 -0400
From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Wash.-Balt. Chapter Seminar -- Nov. 28
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

Topic: Measuring Sexual Orientation in Health Surveys:
 Lesbian Health Research Issues

When: Tuesday, November 28, 2000, 12:30-2:00 p.m.

Speakers: Judith Bradford, Virginia Commonwealth University
 Sylvia Fisher, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and
 Debra Brody and Kristen Miller, National Center for Health
Statistics

Location: BLS Conference and Training Center, Room #8,
 (Basement/lower level)
 Postal Square Building, 2 Massachusetts Ave., NE
 Washington, DC (Enter on First St., NE, and bring a photo
ID)

Metro: Union Station, Red Line

RSVP: To be placed on the visitor's list, send e-mail to
audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com or call
Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 by Tuesday, November 21.

Abstracts: (Bradford) National interest in lesbian health has
accelerated as a result of the 1999 Institute of Medicine report
"Lesbian Health: Current Assessment and Future Directions." A
DHHS-sponsored March 2000 Scientific Workshop on Lesbian Health
recommended activities to develop effective measures and include them on
national surveys. These, plus current efforts to expand inclusion of
LGBT populations in Healthy People 2010 will be reviewed; opportunities
for participation will be discussed.

(Fisher) A Needs Assessment Study of LBT Women: The Relationship
Between Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity, Health-Seeking Behaviors,
and Perceived Quality of Care Issues. We report the results of an
extensive needs assessment survey of approximately 700 lesbian,
bisexual, and transgendered (LBT) women in the Washington DC area under
the auspices of the Lesbian Services Program (LSP) at Whitman-Walker
Clinic.

(Brody and Miller) Sexual behavior and orientation questions in a
national survey: challenges and opportunities. The current National
Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES, 2000+) contains new

questions on same-sex sexual behavior and sexual orientation for men and women 18-59 years of age. Questions are administered, in both English and Spanish, using the audio-computer assisted self-interview technique. Preliminary data from the current NHANES and findings from exploratory work by the NCHS Questionnaire Design Laboratory will be discussed. The independent study evaluates existing questions on this sensitive topic in relationship to cognitive processes (i.e., the methods used to construct answers and the meanings attributed to key words) and will provide an opportunity to refine and develop additional questions for NHANES and other national surveys.

Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 10:15:28 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Peter Miller <p-miller@nwu.edu>
Subject: AAPOR 2001 Call for Participation
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_6408248==_ .ALT"

-----_6408248==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Please forgive redundancy in this posting. I have had some inquiries on conference proposal submission procedures following an earlier announcement of the Call for Participation. To submit a proposal for the conference, go to the AAPOR website and click on Conference 2001 (in the pop-up box that appears when you direct your mouse to Conferences). Or, you can follow the direct link to the proposal submission page in the section on "Proposal Submission Process" below. Here is the entire Call for Participation, in case you did not get it (or if you deleted it). Look forward to hearing from you. PM

"MAKING CONNECTIONS - PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH
PROFESSIONALS AND THE PUBLIC"
CALL FOR CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION

The American Association for Public Opinion Research will hold its 56th annual conference at the Hilton Montreal Bonaventure in Montreal, Quebec, May 17-20, 2001. AAPOR's Conference Committee seeks proposals for papers, poster presentations, panels and round tables that will illuminate important research questions and promote the development of our profession.

Papers, posters, 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 organize panel proposals with common themes.

CONFERENCE THEME

AAPOR's annual conference is the place for academic, commercial and governmental public opinion and survey researchers to 'make connections.' The 2001 meeting in Montreal is a particularly good opportunity for researchers from the U.S. and Canada, as well as researchers from other countries, to share experiences, research innovations and comparative data.

Following the historic voting in Mexico, national elections will have made big news in the U.S. and Canada by next spring. Trade policy (NAFTA), environmental issues, health care delivery and financing, media effects, culture policy and other matters are subjects of continuing debate among North Americans. In the U.S and Canada, regional differences in political attitudes, religion, ethnicity, language, economic well-being and lifestyle are notable. Papers and panels that offer data on public opinion in these and other areas will be part of the conference agenda.

The Montreal meeting will explore methodological challenges that cut across national boundaries. Research on response and nonresponse error stemming from questionnaires, interviewers and survey modes, cultural factors that affect response to surveys, and methodological problems presented by multilingual populations are increasingly important topics. The U.S. Census in 2000 and the Canadian Census in 2001 offer many interesting points of comparison. The impact of technology on survey research, including the expanding variety of computer and Internet-based data collection modalities, will be a major focus of the conference.

Making connections with respondents is a vital and increasingly difficult part of our business. Presentations on techniques for increasing survey participation and for understanding nonresponse effects are encouraged. And making connections with consumers of poll and survey information has never been more important. We welcome presentations on media coverage of polls and surveys, and innovations in communicating survey findings to general audiences.

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION PROCESS

Proposals for the conference should be submitted electronically to www.aapor.org/conference/submission.html by December 11, 2000. A special form has been created on the website to gather information about each proposal. Please fill in all information requested on the form. You will receive confirmation of your submission automatically by email.

The proposal submission form asks for author contact information, the type of presentation (paper, poster, paper or poster, panel/round table), title, keywords describing the content of the presentation, an abstract of no more than 300 words and any special audio-visual equipment requests.

Papers are formal presentations of original research that are grouped with other similar papers to constitute a panel. In presenting papers, authors are provided 10-15 minutes during the panel to address an assembled audience. A discussant is assigned to each panel to comment on the papers individually and as a group.

Poster presentations are less formal - but not less rigorous or substantive presentations of original research. Rather than delivering an address before an assembled audience, poster authors present their work interactively to groups of interested people with the aid of a visual display that summarizes research findings. Posters are displayed in a central location at specially designated times during the conference so that attendees can peruse the visual displays and converse with the authors.

Round Tables are organized discussions of issues that are important to the public opinion research community. The discussion may be led by an individual, or by a group of interested persons. Formal papers are not presented. Round table discussions on ethical aspects of survey research - e.g., human subjects protection, reporting of response rates - have been a prominent part of AAPOR conferences in recent years.

Proposals will be accepted for all of these forms of conference participation.

The proposal submission form on the AAPOR website asks submitters to designate the type of presentation as part of the proposal.

Authors who only wish to have their proposal considered for a formal paper presentation should select the "Paper" option. Those who only wish to be considered for a poster presentation should select the "Poster" option. Those who wish to be considered for either a paper or poster presentation should select the "Paper or Poster" option.

Space on the program is limited. Some excellent proposals for formal paper presentations that cannot be integrated into panels will not be accepted. Authors have a greater chance of participating on the program if they are willing to be considered for either a paper or poster presentation.

Panel proposals involve recruiting 3-4 paper presentation proposals with a common theme. The panel proposal should contain a short statement discussing the issues to be addressed in the panel and their importance, and an abstract for each of the papers proposed. The panel organizer should provide all of this material in a single submission.

Round Table proposals should detail the topic to be discussed and its importance to the field of public opinion research. The proposal should also provide the names and affiliations of discussion leader(s).

Each proposal will be evaluated by at least two reviewers and final decisions about the program will be made by the end of January 2001. You will be notified about the status of your proposal shortly thereafter.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

We will evaluate the proposals for the quality, originality and completeness of the work represented in them. The AAPOR program should include cutting-edge research and presentations that further the development of the profession. Proposals should evidence careful preparation and should represent work that is well underway,

lifestyle are notable. Papers and panels that offer data on public opinion in these and
other areas will be part of the conference agenda.

The Montreal meeting will explore methodological challenges that cut across national
boundaries. Research on response and nonresponse error stemming from questionnaires,
interviewers and survey modes, cultural factors that affect response to surveys, and
methodological problems presented by multilingual populations are increasingly important
topics. The U.S. Census in 2000 and the Canadian Census in 2001 offer many
interesting points of comparison. The impact of technology on survey research, including
the expanding variety of computer and Internet-based data collection modalities, will be
a major focus of the conference.

Making connections with respondents is a vital and increasingly difficult part of our
business. Presentations on techniques for increasing survey participation and for
understanding nonresponse effects are encouraged. And making connections with
consumers of poll and survey information has never been more important. We welcome
presentations on media coverage of polls and surveys, and innovations in communicating
survey findings to general audiences.

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION PROCESS

Proposals for the conference should be submitted electronically to

www.aapor.org/conference/submission.html
by December 11, 2000. A special form
has been created on the website to gather information about each proposal. Please fill in
all information requested on the form. You will receive confirmation of your submission
automatically by email.

The proposal submission form asks for author contact information, the type of
presentation (paper, poster, paper or poster, panel/round table), title, keywords
describing the content of the presentation, an abstract of no more than 300 words and
any special audio-visual equipment requests.

Papers are formal presentations of original research that are grouped with other similar
papers to constitute a panel. In presenting papers, authors are provided 10-
15

minutes
p
;
;
p
;
;
p
;
;
p
;
;
audience. A discussant is assigned to each
panel to comment on the papers individually and as a group.

Poster presentations are less formal - but not less rigorous or substantive presentations
of original research. Rather than delivering an address before an assembled audience,
poster authors present their work interactively to groups of interested people with the aid
of a visual display that summarizes research findings. Posters are displayed in a central
location at specially designated times during the conference so that attendees can peruse
the visual displays and converse with the authors.

Round Tables are organized discussions of issues that are important to the public
opinion research community. The discussion may be led by an individual, or by a group
of interested persons. Formal papers are not presented. Round table discussions on
ethical aspects of survey research - e.g., human subjects protection, reporting of
response rates - have been a prominent part of AAPOR conferences in recent years.

Proposals will be accepted for all of these forms of conference participation.
The
proposal submission form on the AAPOR website asks submitters to designate the
type
of presentation as part of the proposal.

Authors who only wish to have their proposal considered for a formal paper presentation
should select the "Paper" option. Those who only wish to be considered for a poster
presentation should select the "Poster" option. Those who wish to be considered for
either a paper or poster presentation should select the "Paper or Poster" option.

Space on the program is limited. Some excellent proposals for formal paper presentations that cannot be integrated into panels will not be accepted. Authors have a greater chance of participating on the program if they are willing to be considered for either a paper or poster presentation.

Panel proposals involve recruiting 3-4 paper presentation proposals with a common theme. The panel proposal should contain a short statement discussing the issues addressed in the panel and their importance, and an abstract for each of the papers proposed. The panel organizer should provide all of this material in a single submission.

Round Table proposals should detail the topic to be discussed and its importance to the field of public opinion research. The proposal should also provide the names and affiliations of discussion leader(s).

Each proposal will be evaluated by at least two reviewers and final decisions about the program will be made by the end of January 2001. You will be notified about the status of your proposal shortly thereafter.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

We will evaluate the proposals for the quality, originality and completeness of the work represented in them. The AAPOR program should include cutting-edge research and presentations that further the development of the profession. Proposals should evidence careful preparation and should represent work that is well underway rather than research that may not reach an acceptable stage of completion by the time full conference papers are due at the beginning of May, 2001.

Multiple proposals may be submitted, but it is unlikely that more than one proposal will be accepted from any given researcher or research team. Proposals should not be duplicative of one another.

SPECIAL AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

All meeting rooms will have overhead projectors, screens and microphones as

appropriate. Authors of poster presentations will be provided with poster board and an

easel. Special equipment requests -- for 35mm slide projectors, data projectors (e.g. for

PowerPoint or on-line presentations), audiotape recorders or VCRs - should be indicated

on the proposal submission form. While we cannot guarantee access to these types of

equipment, we will endeavor to meet special requests within budgetary constraints.

SUBMISSIONS FROM COMMERCIAL RESEARCHERS

We particularly encourage the submission of proposals by professionals working

in the

commercial sector. Please feel free to contact the conference chair with ideas

that may

depart from the normal conference paper format.

INQUIRIES

Please contact the conference chair, Peter Miller, at p-miller@nwu.edu with any

questions concerning the conference or the proposal submission process.

</html>

-----_6408248==_.ALT--

=====
Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 10:38:01 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Peter Miller <p-miller@nwu.edu>

Subject: Student Paper Competition Announcement

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Apologies if you have already received this notice. We would appreciate your spreading the word to eligible students. The 2001 Award is given in memory of Seymour Sudman. Here is the full text of the announcement:

ANNUAL AAPOR STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION

Open to Current Students and Recent Degree Recipients

The American Association for Public Opinion Research will award its 35th Annual

Student Paper Prize this year. This year's award is given in memory of Seymour Sudman,

distinguished survey methodologist, AAPOR past-president and AAPOR Award

winner who passed away earlier this year. The prize is open both to current students (graduate or undergraduate) and to those who graduate during calendar year 2000. The research must have been substantially completed while the author(s) was enrolled in a degree program. AAPOR will consider papers in any field related to the study of public opinion, broadly defined, or to the theory and methods of survey and market research, including statistical techniques used in such research. Past winners have come from many fields, including political science, communication, psychology, sociology, and survey methods.

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

A prize of \$500 will be awarded to the winning paper at the AAPOR annual conference, which will be held May 17-20, 2001 in Montreal, Quebec. The author of the paper will deliver it as part of the conference program. His or her travel expenses to the meeting will be paid by the Association (if there is more than one author, the travel expenses of only one will be paid). In addition, one or more papers may receive an Honorable Mention designation.

The entries will be judged by a panel of survey researchers selected from AAPOR's membership, including researchers drawn from the academic, government, and commercial sectors.

To be considered for the award, please send FIVE COPIES of the paper, TO ARRIVE BY DECEMBER 11, 2000, to this year's Chair of the Student Paper Competition:

Dr. Daniel M. Merkle
ABC News
7 West 66th Street
7th Floor
New York, NY 10023

Please include your name, mailing address, telephone number(s), and an e-mail address. You will receive confirmation that your paper has been received. Final decisions about the winner and the inclusion of papers in the program will

be made by
early February. You will be notified about the status of your paper shortly
thereafter.

```
=====
Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 09:19:14 -0700
From: "H. Stuart Elway" <hstuart@elwayresearch.com>
To: "'AAPORNET'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Party ID
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="-----_NextPart_000_00F4_01C034F6.A76E5980"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4
```

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

```
-----_NextPart_000_00F4_01C034F6.A76E5980
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
```

Out here in Washington, the last "blanket primary" state, where no one =
has to declare their party affiliation to any one any time, party ID has =
fluctuated thusly since January in our monthly polls of registered =
voters (N=3D400): Democrats high=3D37% in Sept, low =3D27% in May ; =
Republicans high=3D35% in February; low=3D24% in March (!?);=20
Independents high=3D38% in June; low=3D27% in Sept.

We measure Party ID with this question: "If you had to register by =
party in order to vote would you register as a (rotated): Democrat, =
Republican or Independent?"=20
=20

Meanwhile the race for President has gone from even in April (39-38 =
Bush) to Bush in July (36-29) to Gore in September (44-37)
Not for nothing is Washington considered a swing state.

Stuart Elway
Elway Research, Inc.
206/264-1500
NEW E-MAIL: hstuart@elwayresearch.com
Website: www.elwayresearch.com

```
-----_NextPart_000_00F4_01C034F6.A76E5980
Content-Type: text/html;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
```

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

```
<META content=3Dtext/html;charset=3Diso-8859-1 =
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<META content=3D'"MSHTML 4.72.2106.6"' name=3DGENERATOR>
</HEAD>
```

<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>
<DIV>
<DIV>Out here in Washington, =
the last=20
"blanket primary" state, where no one has to declare their =
party=20
affiliation to any one any time, party ID has fluctuated thusly since =
January in=20
our monthly polls of registered voters (N=400): Democrats high=37% =
in Sept, low=20
=27% in May ; Republicans high=35% in February; low=24% in March =
(!?)=20
</DIV>
<DIV>Independents high=38% =
in June;=20
low=27% in Sept.</DIV>
<DIV> <FONT =
color=#000000=20
face=Arial size=12> We measure Party ID with this question: =
"If you=20
had to register by party in order to vote would you register as a=20
(rotated): Democrat, Republican or=20
Independent?" </DIV>
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 =
face=Arial=20
size=12> </DIV>
<DIV>Meanwhile the race for =
President has=20
gone from even in April (39-38 Bush) to Bush in July (36-29) to Gore in=20
September (44-37)</DIV>
<DIV><FONT =
color=#000000 face=Arial=20
size=12>Not for nothing is Washington considered a swing =
state.</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT =
face=Arial size=12>Stuart=20
Elway</DIV></DIV>
<DIV>Elway Research,=20
Inc.
206/264-1500
NEW E-MAIL: <A=20
href=#"mailto:hstuart@elwayresearch.com">hstuart@elwayresearch.com<B=
R>Website: =20
<A=20
href=#"http://www.elwayresearch.com">www.elwayresearch.com</D=
IV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_00F4_01C034F6.A76E5980--

=====
Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 12:45:01 -0400
From: John Hall <JHall@mathematica-mpr.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Positions Available (Statisticians and Programmers)
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Apologies for cross posting.

John Hall

Mathematica Policy Research

STATISTICIANS/ STATISTICAL PROGRAMMERS

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., nationally recognized for its public policy and survey research, has openings in its Princeton, NJ office for mid- and entry-level statisticians and programmers with master's degrees in statistics, computer science or related fields.

The successful applicants will be involved in survey design, frame construction, sample selection, weight calculation, missing data imputation, and statistical and methodological analyses. Desirable attributes for applicants include familiarity with statistical software (particularly SAS), knowledge of survey sampling methods, and computer programming skills. For the statistician positions, candid dates with courses or experience in survey sampling and methodology are preferred.

Applicants for the programmer positions should have strong programming skills and those with course work or experience in statistics are preferred.

Mathematica offers a competitive salary and benefits package, an on-site fitness center, and three weeks vacation. Please visit our web site at: <http://www.mathematica-mpr.com> for additional information. Candidates should submit a resume, salary requirements, and references to: Shannan Gonzalez, Human Resources Dept., Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. P.O. Box 2393, Princeton, NJ 08543-2393, Fax: (609) 799-0005, e-mail: Personnel-NJ@mathematica-mpr.com.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 16:04:09 -0400

From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>

Subject: Caveat Emptor

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-id: <39E76AB9.957B9D0C@rider.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

X-Accept-Language: en

References: <OF40ADE428.A094E91A-ON85256975.0063609D@washpost.com>

Fellow AAPORneters:

Perhaps a comment is due to the news media about polls, instant or otherwise, about who "won" the Presidential debates. In the first debate, Gore supposedly "won", but lost ground in the polls. In the second debate, Bush supposedly "won", and the jury is still out. My problem is that the news media picks up on these polls of who "won" or "lost" with little mention of the initial screener question: "Did you watch the debate?" If the audience contains more Gore supporters one night or more Bush supporters another night, that will affect the outcome. This point is especially important, since the audience for the second Presidential debate apparently shrunk by about 10 million from the first (if my memory serves me correctly); that would mean it shrunk by almost one-quarter (again if memory serves me well). If this shrinkage disproportionately favors one candidate, we may not be getting an accurate picture of who won the debate if a random sample of viewers watched it.

Now, of course, viewership is never "random", but the media should take care in interpreting "winning" or "losing" as an explanation for movement one way or another in the polls.

Frank Rusciano
Department of Political Science
Rider University
email at rusciano@rider.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 16:14:01 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>
Subject: Re: Caveat Emptor
In-Reply-To: <39E76AB9.957B9D0C@rider.edu>
References: <OF40ADE428.A094E91A-ON85256975.0063609D@washpost.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

"Who won the debate" is a question apart from "what impact did the debate have on your preference". It is not that one is better than the other, they are just two different -- if related -- questions. The question of different "audiences" is not unimportant, but the distinction between these two dimensions goes well beyond it. And I specifically recall initial polling that Gore was seen as winning debate number one (or at least more people said he won than said Bush did) but very large majorities denying it affected whatever preference they had. Further, the impact of a debate will go well beyond those who saw it, once it filters back around through conversations around the water cooler, back fence, etc., not to mention what pundits say.

Don Ferree

At 04:04 PM 10/13/2000 -0400, Frank Rusciano wrote
>Fellow AAPORneters:
>
>Perhaps a comment is due to the news media about polls, instant or
>otherwise, about who "won" the Presidential debates... ..the media should
>take
>care in interpreting "winning" or "losing" as an explanation for movement
>one way or another in the polls.
>
>Frank Rusciano
>Department of Political Science
>Rider University
>email at rusciano@rider.edu
>

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705

608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 17:39:59 -0400
From: Eric Zeidman <eric.zeidman@vnsusa.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Palestinian/Arab-Americans
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1461.28)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

This was a question posted on another list that I thought someone from AAPOR might be able to answer:

DO YOU KNOW WHERE I CAN GET STATISTICAL FIGURES ABOUT ARAB
AMERICAN/PALESTINIAN AMERICAN IN THE UNITED STATES. EG: HOW MANY RESIDING IN
AREA x; INCOME; POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT; ETC
THANK YOU
LUCY

Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 14:42:17 -0700
From: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Caveat Emptor
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Frank is right - but I listened to CNN yesterday and they made a big point in explaining that there were more GOP respondents in their poll and that could be the reason why Bush did better at who won the debate. But that is why doing such instant polls could be troublesome. The jury is out yet as to whom benefited from the debates. Let's see what happens over the weekend when tracking polls will drop some of the pre-debate interviews.

Susan Pinkus

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

From: Frank Rusciano [SMTP:rusciano@rider.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2000 1:04 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Caveat Emptor

Fellow AAPORneters:

Perhaps a comment is due to the news media about polls, instant or otherwise, about who "won" the Presidential debates. In the first debate,

Gore supposedly "won", but lost ground in the polls. In the second debate, Bush supposedly "won", and the jury is still out. My problem is that the news media picks up on these polls of who "won" or "lost" with little mention of the initial screener question: "Did you watch the debate?" If the audience contains more Gore supporters one night or more Bush supporters another night, that will affect the outcome. This point is especially important, since the audience for the second Presidential debate apparently shrunk by about 10 million from the first (if my memory serves me correctly); that would mean it shrunk by almost one-quarter (again if memory serves me well). If this shrinkage disproportionately favors one candidate, we may not be getting an accurate picture of who won the debate if a random sample of viewers watched it.

Now, of course, viewership is never "random", but the media should take care in interpreting "winning" or "losing" as an explanation for movement one way or another in the polls.

Frank Rusciano
Department of Political Science
Rider University
email at rusciano@rider.edu

Date: Fri, 13 Oct 2000 17:41:54 -0400
From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <85256977.007731BC.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
Subject: Re: Palestinian/Arab-Americans
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

Aside from obvious US government agencies, they might try the Arab American Chamber of Congress, the National Council on US-Arab Relations or the Arab American Anti-Discrimination Committee. I assume all would have at least DC or NY addresses.

Date: Sat, 14 Oct 2000 07:47:33 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: No subject was specified.
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Candidate poll picture is confusing

By Will Lester
The Associated Press

October 11, 2000 8:18 PM EDT

WASHINGTON (AP) -- There are more polls than ever, more media competition to make the most of them, and less voter commitment to the candidates than in many years.

All of that adds up to a sometimes confusing poll picture this year:

- When most polls in September after the Democratic convention showed Democrat Al Gore taking a lead, the Voter.com Battleground poll, done jointly by a Democratic and Republican campaign pollster, showed the race was closer than others did - or Republican George W. Bush up slightly.
- The CNN-USA Today-Gallup tracking poll a week ago showed Gore up by 11 points, then Bush was up by 8 points three days later.
- Instant polls on the first presidential debate said Gore had won, yet Bush seemed to rise in support in the next few days.

Are campaign polls less trustworthy this year?

``I don't think the problem is with the polls, but with the way they are used by journalists and the way they are affecting the process along the way,' said Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. ``Some pollsters have joined the media circus and polls are less often used ... to give voice to how the people feel and more as part of an increasing tabloid form of reporting politics.''

``Tabloid pollsters,' he said, include some who conduct instant focus groups on television, even equipping people with dials to measure emotional response to debates or speeches.

The shifts in the campaign polls are magnified by the closeness of the

race

and the lack of commitment of many swing voters, said members of a panel

about whether election polls can be trusted. About a fifth of the voters in the

latest Pew poll said they could switch to the other candidate.

``There isn't volatility, but there is a continuing indecision by a lot of

people,'' said Marvin Kalb, executive director of the Shorenstein Center on

the Press, Politics and Public Policy. ``They simply are not blown away by

either of these candidates.``

Humphrey Taylor, chairman of the Harris Poll, said despite the frequent

complaints about polls and the importance they are given in the media, they

serve an important role.

``When there are no polls, and there weren't in the last few weeks of the

Dewey-Truman campaign, then the public can be seriously misinformed,`` he

said. He was referring to the famous blunder in 1948, when polls mistakenly

predicted a big victory by Republican Thomas Dewey over President Truman.

And he noted the track record of the major polls - averaged together - has

been good in coming close to projecting the final outcome of elections

within a couple of points over the past few decades.

But panelists cautioned about several causes of confusion:

-Most public polls rely on taking a random sample of public opinion and

then weighting it by demographic factors such as age, race, gender or education level. Other polls, including the Voter.com Battleground, also

weight by party identification, which can mute the attitude shifts that can

show up in polls.

-Tracking polls, which include rolling samples from three or four days, can

see dramatic shifts if one candidate or the other has a very good day.

-The sheer number of polls, including several tracking polls this year, helps

create a sense of volatility. And news reporters sometimes search for a poll

number that fits their theme of the day, Kohut said.

Overnight polls like the debate polls should be viewed only in context as an emotional reaction to the event, not as settled public opinion, the pollsters said.

``There's nothing wrong with taking your blood pressure after you run four miles,`` Kohut said. ``But it doesn't say much about what your blood pressure really is, nor do these polls conducted one or two days after a debate ... say much about public opinion in any lasting way. They confuse the heck out of people.``

Copyright 2000 The Associated Press

Date: Sun, 15 Oct 2000 09:51:11 -0400
From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
Received: by notesmail1.csuohio.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.6 (890.1 7-16-1999))
id 85256979.004C1AA0 ; Sun, 15 Oct 2000
09:51:15 -0400
X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <85256979.004C19B7.00@notesmail1.csuohio.edu>
Subject: debate and the foreign press
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

I attended the Winston-Salem debate with four other authors of debate books. We were interviewed by some 12 members of the European press based in Washington, DC. They questioned our "romance" with polls and our low voter turnout. I asked them what they and their countrymen/women thought about the candidates. Each correspondent could not understand how George W. Bush became a candidate. They claimed that their politicians, diplomats and the majority of citizens in their countries want Gore to win the election.

Date: Sun, 15 Oct 2000 22:19:22 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: 6 in 10 Say Prescription Drugs "Very Important" Issue in Presidential

Vote
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010152206120.7014-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright 2000 Los Angeles Times

<http://www.latimes.com/wires/20001015/tCB00V0827.html>

Sunday, October 15, 2000

Poll: Prescription Drugs Major Issue

By WILL LESTER, Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON--About six in 10 Americans consider prescription drugs a "very important" issue in their vote for president, an Associated Press poll indicates, and about that many say either they or someone in their family takes such medicines regularly.

Mary Jane Byrd of Alturas, Fla., said she and her husband have managed to pay for their many prescriptions so far but "there will come a time when it will eat up our savings."

"We're also concerned for a lot of other people who are older than us and just on Social Security," said Byrd, 53, noting that her mother has to live hours away so she can be closer to a health maintenance organization that will cover her drug costs.

Two-thirds of people over 55--one of the most active voting groups--consider prescription drugs very important in their vote, according to the poll conducted for the AP by ICR of Media, Pa.

Four of five people with incomes under \$15,000--a group less likely to vote--consider the issue very important. Women and blacks were more likely to feel that way than men and whites.

Asked what issue was most important in deciding how to vote, 23 percent said education, which usually leads such lists. Moral values was second, followed by Social Security and Medicare. The poll of 1,007 adults was taken Oct. 4/8 and has an error margin of 3 percentage points.

The high cost of prescription drugs isn't just a sore point for seniors, however.

Tisha McGuire, a 19 -year-old insurance clerk at a doctor's office in Lufkin, Texas, already understands the importance of affordable medicine.

"I live with my grandfather, and we take care of him ... he's on a heart transplant list and we don't get any help with his medication," she said, noting that some patients at her office struggle with their

medicine bills. "There are older people who come who can't pay for them."

Asked which presidential candidate would do a better job of handling prescription drugs for seniors, 46 percent said Democrat Al Gore and 33 percent said Republican George W. Bush. Among Republicans, 21 percent said Gore would be better, and 10 percent of Democrats said Bush.

Gore has proposed prescription drug help to all seniors in the Medicare program; Bush would help the elderly poor and subsidize choice in drug plans for other Medicare beneficiaries.

Bush supporters were about evenly split on whether prescription drugs are very important in their vote considerations, while Gore supporters said by 3 -to-1 that it was very important.

"I get the feeling they want people to be dependent on government," said Republican Robert McCain, a retired correctional officer in Kinston, N.C. "It would be nice to have the coverage, but can they really afford it?"

Pam Sheaf, a 35 -year-old Republican from Sumter, S.C., thinks Bush would be better. Married to a retired serviceman, she hopes Bush's promise to strengthen the military includes health care.

"We've lost a lot of medical benefits in the military," she said.

A fourth of those polled said they have had problems in the past year paying medical bills, and this group was more inclined, 69 percent, to think prescription drugs were a very important issue. Of those who have not faced such difficulties, about half thought the issue was very important.

For some, the issue has other implications.

Democrat John Cavadeas, a 63 -year-old janitor living on Michigan's Upper Peninsula, said high medicine prices are keeping him from retiring. A bottle of heartburn pills initially cost him \$600 for a three-month supply, though the price has dropped to \$285, he said.

"I think they ought to help people who are retired," Cavadeas said. "I don't know what will happen when I retire. There's no problem as long as I keep working. I plan to hang on for a while."

<http://www.latimes.com/wires/20001015/tCB00V0827.html>

Copyright 2000 Los Angeles Times

Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 07:57:21 -0400
From: "Safir, Adam" <ASafir@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: I Hear America Ringing
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

>From the Washington Post Style section:

I Hear America Ringing

By Dana Milbank
Washington Post Staff Writer
Monday, October 16, 2000; Page C01
<http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A13480-2000Oct15.html>

UTICA, N.Y. -- Genesee Street, running south from downtown, becomes a Religion Row. There's the steeple of First Presbyterian Church and the yellow-brick Temple Beth El on your left. On the right, you'll pass Saviour Lutheran Church. Then, just before the Church of our Lady of Lourdes and the Church of the Nazarene, right next to the AMF Pin-o-Rama bowling alley, is a Cathedral of our Civic Religion.

This is the headquarters of Zogby International, pollsters.

In this election season, the operation is a frenzied factory of public opinion, tracking every hiccup and sigh in the presidential race. Callers begin at 9 a.m. and end at midnight, when number-crunchers figure out who's winning and release the Reuters/MSNBC/Zogby daily tracking poll to the breathless media.

In politics this year, polling is everything. The results of these surveys drive the candidates' moves and the press coverage, which may, in turn, influence the election's outcome. For this reason, I have made a pilgrimage here to worship at the altar of public opinion.

The dinner hour is approaching. I put on my headset and push the button that tells the computer to dial a number. I call Washington state--no answer. I call Colorado--answering machine. I call Kansas--no reply. I call Michigan, where a man shouts "No!" and hangs up. I click "refusal--hostile" on my computer, and forge on.

My success doesn't improve much over the next hour. I get busy tones in Ohio and Kansas, disconnected numbers in Montana and Illinois, no answer in Virginia, Kentucky, Maine, Oklahoma and Massachusetts, a fax machine and a call-waiting "privacy manager" in Ohio, and a tree and shrub service in Upstate New York. In New York City, a woman advises me, "Sweetheart, you're in the middle of our dinner," and another hangs up on me. A Virginia man, shouting over a crying baby, exclaims "Excuse me? Nah!" Click. A California woman asks me, "No habla espanol?" A New Jersey woman informs me: "I'm one of Jehovah's Witnesses and there are certain things we don't do."

My hour of calling produces only one hit in 25 attempts: a 51-year-old woman in Cincinnati who is for Bush. The result of my piece of the tracking poll:

Bush: 100 percent

Everyone else: 0 percent

Margin of error: +/- 98 percent

Apparently, I'm not cut out for this. "You did a couple of things we would yell at our interviewers for," explains Steven McLaughlin, my tutor. "You've got to read your script word for word," he tells me.

But perhaps I shouldn't feel bad. With all the busy signals and disconnected numbers, it takes Zogby callers nearly 6,000 calls to get 400 complete responses. Only 35 percent of people reached by phone answer pollsters' questions, a number that has declined from 65 percent 15 years ago. Answering machines, caller ID, and telemarketers poisoning the well have made poll-taking difficult. Even among those reached, it becomes immediately obvious that a large number of our countrymen have only the vaguest notion that there's an election happening.

But such cynicism is not necessarily warranted. Though large numbers of Americans are ill-informed, ill-mannered and ill-prepared to choose a leader, when you add them up, something magical happens. Individuals are transformed into a wise and noble creature: the American electorate. The polls, in their aggregate, invariably show a temperate and thoughtful nation. It would make de Tocqueville smile.

"There's a collective wisdom that emerges," says John Zogby, who started his firm in the 1980s. "When it all adds up there's a clear message. The community is never stupid."

Still, Zogby is the first to acknowledge polling's shortcomings. The polls, particularly daily ones, are just snapshots. "We're not predicting," Zogby says. "You can't read too much into the day-to-day change or try to read causality into it."

But the press tends to look for some fault in the declining candidate to justify a poll drop. The explosion of cable and Internet news outlets, which commission polls and hype the results, exacerbates the problem. "Having it govern the way a campaign gets covered is dangerous," Zogby says. "It becomes a tremendous disservice."

Another caveat: While polls are good at measuring trends, the numbers tend to reflect the pollsters' hunches as much as the respondents' answers. The raw numbers in a poll are meaningless until "weighted" (certain categories of voters are over- or under-emphasized) to mirror the population and to reflect the pollster's guess about who will vote. Most poll watchers don't realize that a Bush lead in raw numbers can become a Gore lead in weighted numbers.

"Twenty percent of this business is art, 80 percent is science," Zogby says. "Ultimately, you have to make a call about who's going to turn out to vote." Pollsters adjust their responses by gender, race, religion, age, region and income. The time of day a call is made, the response rate, how the questions are phrased and ordered, the suggestiveness of the questioner, and how a pollster defines a "likely voter" and "undecided" can all alter the results. Zogby controversially also weighs party identification, which he gauges through a series of questions.

Some other pollsters think Zogby favors Republicans (he says he's a Democrat and works for both sides). But Zogby has a good record among the three major public tracking polls. In 1996, he got Clinton's eight-point victory exactly right. Lately, his tracking poll has had a smoother pattern than the Gallup tracking poll (which recently galloped 18 points in a couple of days) and has been more consistent with larger polls than the Voter.com/Battleground tracking poll.

Zogby's calling center is a collection of 94 cubicles in a decrepit, dank office building abandoned by the phone company. The callers, whose pay starts at \$6.25 an hour, are a mixture of students, retirees, immigrants from Eastern Europe and part-timers with day jobs. The place smells of pizza or whatever else is in the break area, which also includes a snack machine that sells Chicken Cordon Bleu. One woman's lapdog naps on the floor of her cubicle as she makes calls.

"Hello, my name is Fanny and I'm doing a poll of U.S. voters for Reuters News Agency and Zogby International," says Fanny George, a retired nurse. She calls numbers that pop up on her screen courtesy of the "computer-aided telephone interview," or CATI system, pronounced "Katie." CATI sends Fanny plenty of duds: no answer, a law office, a couple of refusals. But George, an expert caller with a grandmother's gentle voice, completes interviews at the clip of three per hour. Each one requires her to give voters choices for president that most have never heard of: Harry Browne, John Hagelin, Howard Phillips and David McReynolds.

As night approaches, there are 50 callers in the room, and a round of "Very likely? Somewhat likely? Unlikely?" rises from din. The callers struggle with a confounded electorate. Mark Carchedi interviews a woman who can't understand what he means when he asks how likely she is to vote. Later comes the man who agrees to offer his phone number in case a reporter wants to ask about the poll. "Your area code?" Carchedi asks. The respondent doesn't respond. "What's your area code?" Nothing. "Sir, do you have an area code? . . . Area code! . . . What's your area code? . . . If somebody's calling you long-distance, what do they dial?" Carchedi finally procures the desired digits.

Callers here have heard it all: Many get obscenities and propositions, one polled Rodney Dangerfield, one respondent believed he was Jesus, another one put her dog on the phone, and one woman asked to describe her status as "married wanting to get divorced."

By 9 p.m., Frank Calaprice, a night supervisor, has begun to keep careful track of the tracking poll. He has met his quota of 93 responses from Zone 1 (Eastern) and must get 11 more in Zone 2 (Midwest) and 13 more in Zone 3 (South) by 10 p.m., when he turns his attentions to Zone 4 (California). He watches the tally on his computer, shifting callers from other Zogby polls as needed. He completes his last call in Zone 3 at 9:58, with two minutes to spare.

"It's very nerve-racking," Calaprice says. At 10 p.m., he begins to work on getting 26 more responses from the West Coast. By 11 p.m., he has 10 to go. He could add callers and finish the whole thing in five minutes, but he's been instructed that this could skew results. "I know there's a logic to everything they do," he says. "I just don't personally know what it is."

"I'm going in," says Joe Mazloom.

It's midnight, and Mazloom, a wild-haired young man wearing bluejeans and a T-shirt, enters the response database and commands his computer to "export off CATI system." After a brief scare before midnight--several West Coast respondents don't respond because of the baseball playoffs--Calaprice has reached his 400-call quota, and it's time to crunch numbers.

In his office, next to the Cordon Bleu snack machine, Mazloom hits a few buttons and pulls up the day's raw numbers: Bush leads Gore by 44.6 percent to 40.1 percent overall, and 49.1 percent to 42.9 percent in a hypothetical two-way matchup. That gives an unweighted three-day average of 44.2 for Bush and 42.8 for Gore, and a three-day average in the two-way race of 47.3 for Bush and 45.1 for Gore.

Now the fun begins. Mazloom begins to balance the day's sample so it conforms with Zogby's hunches (based on exit polls from previous elections) about which type of people will show up on election days. Republicans, men and Jews are overrepresented in the day's sample, while African Americans and young voters must be doubled. Mazloom whips through spreadsheets, hitting buttons, adjusting regions, typing incomprehensible numbers (1071 0.805, 499 0.483). After several runs, the sample is weighted: slightly more women and Democrats, a quarter Catholic, more than a quarter elderly, and four-fifths white.

The weighted results invert the findings: Now Gore leads in the three-day average, 45.0 to 41.0; in the two-way race, Gore leads 47.5 to 44.5. The inversion, Mazloom says, comes mostly from the weighting for party identification.

Mazloom sends the results to a bleary-eyed Alan Crockett, Zogby's press man, waiting in his office to write the 2 a.m. press release. "The midnights are killing my social life," he says. Crockett slaps on the 3 percent margin of error and fields a call from Zogby, who dictates the day's headline and a quote. "RACE NOW JUST A 4-POINT LEAD," the release says. "Make no mistake about it, this is a very tight race."

By daybreak, political reporters everywhere will be using the results to do just what Zogby warned against: to find a reason why one candidate is doing badly and the other is doing well.

© 2000 The Washington Post Company

```
=====
Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 20:33:10 -0500
From: Vijay_Talluri@gallup.com
Received: by exchn7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
        id <TSXQP85Z>; Mon, 16 Oct 2000 20:33:11 -0500
Message-ID: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE4A562BE@exchn7.gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Palestinian/Arab-Americans
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
        charset="iso-8859-1"
```

I recall that the Zogby Poll recently did a survey on Arab/Americans and/or

Muslim Americans.

Vijay Talluri
Research Director, The Gallup Organization

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

From: Eric Zeidman [mailto:eric.zeidman@vnsusa.org]
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2000 5:40 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Palestinian/Arab-Americans

This was a question posted on another list that I thought someone from AAPOR might be able to answer:

DO YOU KNOW WHERE I CAN GET STATISTICAL FIGURES ABOUT ARAB
AMERICAN/PALESTINIAN AMERICAN IN THE UNITED STATES. EG: HOW MANY RESIDING IN

AREA x; INCOME; POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT; ETC
THANK YOU
LUCY

=====
Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 09:35:45 -0400 (EDT)
From: Bruce Altschuler <altschul@Oswego.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: debate and the foreign press
In-Reply-To: <85256979.004C19B7.00@notesmail1.csuohio.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.21.0010160929430.24648-100000@rocky.oswego.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The preference of foreign officials for continuing existing administrations, the people that they are familiar with warts and all, is a phenomenon that has existed for some time. During Watergate, foreign leaders, media and even the public wondered how we could even think of removing President Nixon over something as seemingly trivial as Watergate. They couldn't understand how we could have nominated and elected someone as inexperienced as Jimmy Carter in 1976 but by 1980 their preferences had shifted to Carter as they couldn't understand how we could have chosen an actor as a presidential nominee, especially one as ignorant about foreign affairs as Reagan. Thus, the support of the relatively known quantity Gore over Bush by foreign observers and leaders should not be a surprise.

Bruce Altschuler
SUNY Oswego

On Sun, 15 Oct 2000 s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu wrote:

>
>
> I attended the Winston-Salem debate with four other authors of debate books.
We

> were interviewed by some 12 members of the European press based in
Washington,
> DC. They questioned our "romance" with polls and our low voter turnout. I
asked
> them what they and their countrymen/women thought about the candidates.
Each
> correspondent could not understand how George W. Bush became a candidate.
They
> claimed that their politicians, diplomats and the majority of citizens in
their
> countries want Gore to win the election.
>
>

=====
Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 09:41:50 -0400
From: "Andy White" <awhite@nas.edu>
To: SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU, aapornet@usc.edu, GSSLIST@inet.ed.gov
cc: cynomus@erols.com
Message-ID: <8525697A.004B6B77.00@smtpmta.nas.edu>
Subject: National Academies Christine Mirzayan Internship Program
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: multipart/mixed;
 Boundary="0__=PpHkYFgX0VsbgtNj70jg8MxCQNCgffblj0JfXtpIbFTU6LLhQjwEen3y"
Content-Disposition: inline

--0__=PpHkYFgX0VsbgtNj70jg8MxCQNCgffblj0JfXtpIbFTU6LLhQjwEen3y
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE CHRISTINE MIRZAYAN INTERNSHIP PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL
ACADEMIES, WASHINGTON, DC

This Internship Program of the National Academies is designed to engage
graduate
and postdoctoral students in science and technology policy and to familiarize
them with the interactions among science, technology, and government. As a
result, students -- in the fields of science, engineering, medical,
veterinary,
business, and law -- develop essential skills different from those attained in
academia, which will help them make the transition from being a graduate
student
to becoming a professional.

For the year 2001, the internship program will comprise two sessions:
January
16-April 6 and June 4-August 10. To apply, candidates should submit the
application and one letter of reference; the application and reference form
are
available on the Web at <http://national-academies.org/internship>. The
deadline
for receipt of materials is November 1, 2000 for the January program and
March
1, 2001 for the June program. Additional details about the program and how
to

join our mailing list are also available on the Web site. Questions should be directed to: internship@nas.edu.

Here is what four former interns said about the program:

"This is an important career building opportunity for people interested in the scientific community outside academia. Even if you plan to pursue a traditional academic track, seeing science from a policy perspective is very enlightening.

There is something valuable in this experience for first year grad students to recent PhD

```
--0__=PpHkYFgX0VsbgtNj70jg8MxCQNCgffbljOJfXtpIbFTU6LLhQjwEen3y
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
```

's. Come with an open mind and expect to learn more than you bargained for."

"The National Academies Internship has been one of the most valuable life experiences I have had thus far. The scope of the influence of the Academies in helping shape science, medical and engineering related policy is amazing to witness. Through this internship, I have learned more about my work as a social scientist than I imagined, and I have a better sense of how my research can relate to public policy."

"The Internship program provides an exceptional opportunity for scientists to explore various facets of scholarly research and policymaking. As an intern, you will work with an eclectic mix of highly educated, diverse intellectuals who help advance the future of science. You will leave not only armed with important and influential contacts but also with invaluable skills and experiences."

"This program will open your mind to a world rarely envisioned from the confines of laboratory bench work. I learned an immeasurable amount about the policy and politics behind science and after the internship opens your mind, it opens career doors."

=

--0__=PpHkYFgX0VsbgtNj70jg8MxCQNCgffbljOJfXtpIbFTU6LLhQjwEen3y--

=====
Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 06:54:02 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: First Federal Statistical Budget Passed (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010160652240.26202-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 09:36:28 EDT
From: COPAFS@aol.com
Subject: First Federal Statistical Budget Passed

The first of the top 12 federal statistical agency budgets was passed on Friday. The Energy Information Administration received \$75.7 million dollars, \$700,000 greater than the President's request.

The Energy Information Administration (EIA) collects, analyzes, and disseminates information on energy resources, production, distribution, consumption, technology, and related international, economic, and financial matters. EIA produces reports with statistical time series, projections of future energy trends, analyses of topical energy issues, and supports the energy information requirements of the Department of Energy and other federal agencies. The primary customers of EIA services are public policy makers in the Department of Energy and the Congress. Other customers include other federal agencies, state and local governments, the energy industry, educational institutions, the news media, and the public.

For FY 2001, funding is requested to: (1) overhaul the natural gas and electricity surveys and data systems to recognize and accommodate the changes in the natural gas and electricity industries brought on by deregulation and restructuring; (2) update EIA's 20-year-old energy consumption surveys; (3) enhance EIA's international analysis capabilities in order to assess carbon mitigation, permit trading, and other global climate change issues; (4) reverse the deterioration in data quality and accuracy in crude oil, diesel, gasoline, and natural gas production surveys; and (5) continue development and integration of energy survey data collection and processing to reduce the costs and improve the timeliness of energy data.

For further information on the status of federal statistical budgets, go to Federal Statistical Budgets for FY2001 on our web site:
<http://members.aol.com/copafs>

Sincerely,

Ed Spar
Executive Director

Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 10:09:46 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: FW: NYTimes.com Article: Why Polls Are Fickle
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCPCFJBPIECFCFAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Dear All: This appears on todays OP-Ed page.
Surely someone should answer it.

Andy Beveridge

October 16, 2000

By CHARLES F. MANSKI

CHICAGO One week Al Gore leads in the polls, the next week George W. Bush does, and the week after that they switch again. Or in the same week, one major pollster picks Mr. Gore and another picks Mr. Bush. It may be a close race, but it is doubtful that the voters are really as capricious as they have seemed this fall. What may be skewing our picture of their preferences are the questions the polls are asking.

When voters know for sure whom they want, there's little room for misinterpretation. They pick their candidates, and the pollster reports them. But the words of the questions make a big difference when voters are not so sure. And this year, in a close race, uncertain voters are swaying the overall poll results.

Pollsters ask Americans to specify the candidate they "lean toward" or are "more likely to vote for" or "would vote for if the election were held today." The problem is that these questions don't let respondents express uncertainty adequately. Someone leaning slightly toward Mr. Bush, for example, will be indistinguishable in the poll results from the stalwart who would never consider voting for anyone else. The next week, that uncertain voter might lean toward Mr. Gore.

One way to find out more about the level of a voter's certainty is to ask. Most people have little difficulty, once the concept is introduced to them, placing a percentage value on their feelings about a particular question. And by incorporating these

percentages, a pollster can produce results that more accurately reflect a complex picture.

Suppose, for example, that 60 percent of voters surveyed in a poll say they are more likely to vote for Mr. Gore than for Mr. Bush. One voter may be 90 percent certain, while another, encouraged by a poll questioner to quantify his inclination, says he feels 52 percent sure. A week later, Mr. Bush appears on "The Daily Show," and the second voter, liking what he sees, changes his mind and begins, very tentatively, to feel that he might vote for Mr. Bush. When he is polled a second time, his answer helps give Mr. Bush a bounce in the polls. But how reliable is the voter who sways with the latest television appearance and, if asked to quantify his certainty, gives it only 52 percent?

A poll that asks, "Are you more likely to vote for Al Gore?" would give a more accurate reading of the electorate's mood if it also asked, "How likely?" Results could be reported like this: 35 percent of eligible voters say they are more than 80 percent likely to vote for Bush. The Bush campaign would know, then, that it could probably count on these voters. And if 10 percent of eligible voters said they were more than 50 percent likely but less than 80 percent likely to vote for Mr. Bush, his people would know they shouldn't count on these voters yet.

Adoption of this technique, called probabilistic polling, should eliminate not only the artificial swings in poll findings, but the need for pollsters to devise such coarse categories as "likely voters" and "undecided voters." Respondents would themselves report how likely they are to vote and how certain they are of their preference.

Many pollsters subscribe to a conventional wisdom that people would be unable or unwilling to respond to this sort of probabilistic question. In the last 10 years, however, psychologists and economists have accumulated substantial positive experience with such questions, using them to learn how Americans perceive many aspects of their future. The nationwide Health and Retirement Study elicits probabilistic expectations of retirement, bequests and mortality from older Americans. My own annual nationwide "Survey of Economic Expectations" elicits answers from a cross section of Americans about their perception of the percentage chance that they will lose their jobs, have health insurance coverage or be victims of crime in the year ahead.

There is good reason to think that probabilistic polling would have similar success in politics giving not only candidates, but the public, a more accurate idea of how a race is going. Personally, I'd give it a 90 percent chance.

Charles F. Manski is professor of economics and a fellow of the Institute for Policy Research at Northwestern University.

=====
Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 10:15:56 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: debate and the foreign press
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <39EB0D9C.22D654A7@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <Pine.SOL.4.21.0010160929430.24648-100000@rocky.oswego.edu>

Actually, my experience in Germany was that they were not too enthusiastic about Carter or Reagan (I'm not sure about Bush, because I wasn't there to ask). Generally speaking, they liked Clinton (although, with a nod to Bruce, they could not understand what all the "fuss" was about Monica Lewinsky), mostly because he was young and intelligent.

One interesting note-- John F. Kennedy remained one of the most popular Presidents in Germany according to poll results, even in 1995, and even among respondents who weren't born when he was alive!

Frank Rusciano

Bruce Altschuler wrote:

> The preference of foreign officials for continuing existing
> administrations, the people that they are familiar with warts and all, is
> a phenomenon that has existed for some time. During Watergate, foreign
> leaders, media and even the public wondered how we could even think of
> removing President Nixon over something as seemingly trivial as
> Watergate. They couldn't understand how we could have nominated and
> elected someone as inexperienced as Jimmy Carter in 1976 but by 1980 their
> preferences had shifted to Carter as they couldn't understand how we could
> have chosen an actor as a presidential nominee, especially one as ignorant
> about foreign affairs as Reagan. Thus, the support of the relatively known
> quantity Gore over Bush by foreign observers and leaders should not be a
> surprise.

> Bruce Altschuler
> SUNY Oswego

>

> On Sun, 15 Oct 2000 s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu wrote:

>

> >

> >

> > I attended the Winston-Salem debate with four other authors of debate

books. We
> > were interviewed by some 12 members of the European press based in
Washington,
> > DC. They questioned our "romance" with polls and our low voter turnout.
I
asked
> > them what they and their countrymen/women thought about the candidates.
Each
> > correspondent could not understand how George W. Bush became a candidate.
They
> > claimed that their politicians, diplomats and the majority of citizens in
their
> > countries want Gore to win the election.
> >
> >

Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 10:28:05 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Palestinian/Arab-Americans
References: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE4A562BE@exchn7.gallup.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Pollster John Zogby's brother James is the founder and president of the Arab American Institute, which would be a good place to start for anyone seeking statistics on Arab Americans.

Their web site is at <http://www.aaiusa.org>

Jan Werner

Vijay_Talluri@gallup.com wrote:

>
> I recall that the Zogby Poll recently did a survey on Arab/Americans and/or
> Muslim Americans.
>
> Vijay Talluri
> Research Director, The Gallup Organization
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Eric Zeidman [mailto:eric.zeidman@vnsusa.org]
> Sent: Friday, October 13, 2000 5:40 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Palestinian/Arab-Americans
>
> This was a question posted on another list that I thought someone from
AAPOR
> might be able to answer:
>

> DO YOU KNOW WHERE I CAN GET STATISTICAL FIGURES ABOUT ARAB
> AMERICAN/PALESTINIAN AMERICAN IN THE UNITED STATES. EG: HOW MANY RESIDING
IN
>
> AREA x; INCOME; POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT; ETC
> THANK YOU
> LUCY

=====
Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 11:39:11 -0400
From: Murray Edelman <murray.edelman@vnsusa.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: AAPOR Press Release-- Mistakes, Exaggeration Mark Media Use of Fo
cus Groups on Presidential Debate
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1461.28)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="----=_NextPart_001_01C03787.3B205C10"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand
this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----=_NextPart_001_01C03787.3B205C10
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

AAPOR has just sent out the following press release.=A0 Look for it on =
the web
later today.
=A0I want to acknowledge the work of Larry McGill in producing this =
statement
from those of us with so many thoughts and so little time.=20
=A0
For Immediate Release
October 16, 2000
=A0
Mistakes, Exaggeration Mark Media Use of Focus Groups on Presidential =
Debate
=A0
ANN ARBOR--Several news media organizations misrepresented the results =
of
focus groups and other non-scientific samples of public opinion after =
last
Wednesday's presidential debates, according to officials of the =
American
Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), the leading =
professional
association for public opinion researchers.
=A0
"As we look ahead to the next presidential debate, we urge journalists =
to
pay special attention to how they portray the results of focus groups =
and
other instant measures of voters' reactions to the debate," said Murray
Edelman, president of AAPOR and editorial director of Voter News =
Service.=A0

"All too often, journalists will state correctly that the results of such samples are not scientific, then go ahead and report them and analyze them as though they were."

=A0

Fox News, for example, reported the results of a "FOXNews.com-Speakout.com instant response analysis," in which visitors to their web site were invited to register their reaction to the candidates' comments during the debate.=A0 A

Fox News Channel correspondent said of the people who participated in the interactive exercise, "This is not a scientific sample, but it is an accurate representation of what Democrats, Republicans and Independents thought, who saw the debate."

=A0

"The Fox News correspondent was right when he said that this sample was not scientific, but wrong when he characterized it as an accurate representation," said Edelman.=A0 "Measurements of public opinion that are based on the views of people who visit a web site don't reflect the opinions of anyone other than those people who participated."

=A0

Various methodological problems associated with web-based surveys were elucidated in an earlier news release issued by AAPOR on September 28, 2000.=A0 It can be viewed at www.aapor.org.

=A0

Several television networks, including CNN, NBC and MSNBC, featured interviews with members of focus groups of "undecided voters" in their post-debate analyses, in an attempt to assess the debate's impact upon such voters.=A0 But in at least two instances, the correspondents made confusing or misleading statements about the groups.

=A0

On MSNBC's post-debate analysis, correspondent Sara James introduced a group of six "undecided voters" in Tampa, Florida, by saying that these people were "by no means representative of undecided voters across the United States, but are a fairly good cross-section of undecided voters in this region of the battle-ground state of Florida."=A0=20

=A0

"Six people is neither a representative sample of undecided American voters nor a meaningful cross-section of any group of any size at all," said Michael Traugott, past president of AAPOR and=A0 professor of communication studies at the University of Michigan.=A0 "Terms such as these have the potential to be very misleading when not used with care.=A0 In this case, these were simply six people from Tampa, Florida, each expressing their own

opinions.=A0 Nothing more can legitimately be said about who, if =
anybody, they
might represent."=20

=A0

Results of focus groups can be mischaracterized in other ways as =
well.=A0

Based on the opinions of his focus group in Cincinnati, MSNBC analyst =
Frank

Luntz declared that "we have a clear winner in this debate."=A0 Then, =
to

support that headline, he asked members of his group to raise their =
hands in

response to the question, "Who thought George Bush did better than you
expected he would?" to which nearly all members raised their hands.=A0=20

=A0

"This is not the same question as 'Who do you think won the debate?'" =
said

Edelman.=A0 "It is perfectly possible for focus group participants who =
thought

Al Gore won the debate also to agree that George Bush did better than =
they

thought he would."

=A0

While nuances of question wording can be debated, this particular issue =
is

compounded by the fact that, in his introduction of Luntz, MSNBC anchor
Brian Williams referred to him only as a "political pollster," making =

no

reference to Luntz's long-standing affiliation with the Republican =
Party.

=A0

In 1997, AAPOR found Luntz to be in violation of the Association's Code =
of

Professional Ethics and Practices for "repeatedly refusing to make =
public

essential facts about his research on public attitudes about the
Republicans' 'Contract with America.'"=A0 The text of AAPOR's statement

censuring Luntz can be found on the Association's web site at =

www.aapor.org.

=A0

Many news organizations are using focus groups as a way to supplement =
their

political coverage by adding a human dimension to their stories. =

Compared to

a telephone survey, a focus group is a low-cost technique for =

illustrating

how citizens are reacting to political events, issues, and candidates =
by

showing or referring to real people and their opinions.

=A0

A focus group is assembled from a group of people who often share some
characteristic such as the fact that they remain undecided about their =
vote

choice, they voted for a particular candidate in a previous election, =
or

they are of the same gender or race.=A0 The conversation in a focus =
group is

unlike a structured interview because it is based upon responses to =
broad,
open-end questions.=A0 Sometimes the discussion can be affected by an
especially vocal participant.
=A0
The problem with focus groups arises when news organizations try to
generalize from such a conversation to the attitudes or opinions of the
general public or likely voters from a small hand picked set of focus =
group
participants.=A0 While focus groups can illustrate how some people feel =
about
issues or candidates, a group of 10 to 20 individuals cannot be used to
represent a larger population of citizens.
=A0
Reporters should refrain from describing or characterizing the results =
of a
focus group conversation as "representative" of or "reflecting" what =
the
general public thinks or even what a specific subgroup thinks.=A0 A =
focus
group conversation is just about how a particular group of people =
reacted to
a series of questions they were asked by a specific moderator.
=A0
About AAPOR: The American Association for Public Opinion Research is =
the
primary professional association representing public opinion =
researchers,
and has a strong interest in protecting and strengthening the =
credibility of
survey research.=A0 Founded in 1947, AAPOR is an organization of over =
1,500
professionals from government agencies, colleges and universities,
non-profit organizations, and commercial polling firms who are engaged =
or
interested in the methods and applications of public opinion and survey
research.
=A0
For additional information, contact:
=A0
Murray Edelman, AAPOR President
Don Dillman, AAPOR Vice President and President-Elect
Michael Traugott, AAPOR Past President
=A0
=A0

-----_NextPart_001_01C03787.3B205C10
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<html xmlns:o=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" =
xmlns:w=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word" =
xmlns=3D"http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40">

<head>
<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; =

charset=3Diso-8859-1">

```
<meta name=3DProgId content=3DWord.Document>
<meta name=3DGenerator content=3D"Microsoft Word 9">
<meta name=3DOriginator content=3D"Microsoft Word 9">
<link rel=3DFile-List href=3D"cid:filelist.xml@01C03765.87614FA0">
<title>DRAFT</title>
<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
  <o:DocumentProperties>
    <o:Template>Normal</o:Template>
    <o:Revision>3</o:Revision>
    <o:TotalTime>1</o:TotalTime>
    <o:Created>2000-10-15T15:07:00Z</o:Created>
    <o:LastSaved>2000-10-16T13:35:00Z</o:LastSaved>
    <o:Pages>1</o:Pages>
    <o:Words>978</o:Words>
    <o:Characters>5580</o:Characters>
    <o:Company>George Mason University</o:Company>
    <o:Lines>46</o:Lines>
    <o:Paragraphs>11</o:Paragraphs>
    <o:CharactersWithSpaces>6852</o:CharactersWithSpaces>
    <o:Version>9.2720</o:Version>
  </o:DocumentProperties>
  <o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
    <o:DoNotRelyOnCSS/>
  </o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
</xml><![endif]--><!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
  <w:WordDocument>
    <w:View>Normal</w:View>
    <w:EnvelopeVis/>
    <w:Compatibility>
      <w:FootnoteLayoutLikeWW8/>
      <w:ShapeLayoutLikeWW8/>
      <w:AlignTablesRowByRow/>
      <w:ForgetLastTabAlignment/>
      <w:DoNotUseHTMLParagraphAutoSpacing/>
      <w:LayoutRawTableWidth/>
      <w:LayoutTableRowsApart/>
    </w:Compatibility>
    <w:DoNotOptimizeForBrowser/>
  </w:WordDocument>
</xml><![endif]-->
<style>
<!--
  /* Font Definitions */
@font-face
  {font-family:"MS Mincho";
  panose-1:0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0;
  mso-font-alt:"\FF2D\FF33 \660E\671D";
  mso-font-charset:128;
  mso-generic-font-family:roman;
  mso-font-format:other;
  mso-font-pitch:fixed;
  mso-font-signature:1 134676480 16 0 131072 0;}
@font-face
  {font-family:"\@MS Mincho";
```

```

panose-1:0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0;
mso-font-charset:128;
mso-generic-font-family:roman;
mso-font-format:other;
mso-font-pitch:fixed;
mso-font-signature:1 134676480 16 0 131072 0;}
/* Style Definitions */
p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal
    {mso-style-parent:"";
margin:0in;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
p.MsoIndex1, li.MsoIndex1, div.MsoIndex1
    {mso-style-update:auto;
mso-style-next:Normal;
margin-top:0in;
margin-right:0in;
margin-bottom:0in;
margin-left:12.0pt;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
text-indent:-12.0pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
p.MsoIndex2, li.MsoIndex2, div.MsoIndex2
    {mso-style-update:auto;
mso-style-next:Normal;
margin-top:0in;
margin-right:0in;
margin-bottom:0in;
margin-left:24.0pt;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
text-indent:-12.0pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
p.MsoIndex3, li.MsoIndex3, div.MsoIndex3
    {mso-style-update:auto;
mso-style-next:Normal;
margin-top:0in;
margin-right:0in;
margin-bottom:0in;
margin-left:.5in;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
text-indent:-12.0pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
p.MsoIndex4, li.MsoIndex4, div.MsoIndex4
    {mso-style-update:auto;
mso-style-next:Normal;

```

```
margin-top:0in;
margin-right:0in;
margin-bottom:0in;
margin-left:48.0pt;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
text-indent:-12.0pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
p.MsoIndex5, li.MsoIndex5, div.MsoIndex5
{mso-style-update:auto;
mso-style-next:Normal;
margin-top:0in;
margin-right:0in;
margin-bottom:0in;
margin-left:60.0pt;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
text-indent:-12.0pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
p.MsoIndex6, li.MsoIndex6, div.MsoIndex6
{mso-style-update:auto;
mso-style-next:Normal;
margin-top:0in;
margin-right:0in;
margin-bottom:0in;
margin-left:1.0in;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
text-indent:-12.0pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
p.MsoIndex7, li.MsoIndex7, div.MsoIndex7
{mso-style-update:auto;
mso-style-next:Normal;
margin-top:0in;
margin-right:0in;
margin-bottom:0in;
margin-left:84.0pt;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
text-indent:-12.0pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
p.MsoIndex8, li.MsoIndex8, div.MsoIndex8
{mso-style-update:auto;
mso-style-next:Normal;
margin-top:0in;
margin-right:0in;
margin-bottom:0in;
margin-left:96.0pt;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
```

```

text-indent:-12.0pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
p.MsoIndex9, li.MsoIndex9, div.MsoIndex9
{mso-style-update:auto;
mso-style-next:Normal;
margin-top:0in;
margin-right:0in;
margin-bottom:0in;
margin-left:1.5in;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
text-indent:-12.0pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
p.MsoIndexHeading, li.MsoIndexHeading, div.MsoIndexHeading
{mso-style-next:"Index 1";
margin:0in;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
strong
{mso-bidi-font-weight:normal;}
p.MsoPlainText, li.MsoPlainText, div.MsoPlainText
{margin:0in;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:10.0pt;
font-family:"Courier New";
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
@page Section1
{size:8.5in 11.0in;
margin:1.0in 65.95pt 1.0in 65.95pt;
mso-header-margin:.5in;
mso-footer-margin:.5in;
mso-paper-source:0;}
div.Section1
{page:Section1;}
-->
</style>
</head>

<body lang=3DEN-US style=3D'tab-interval:.5in'>

<div class=3DSection1>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><font size=3D3 face=3D"Times New Roman"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"MS Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier =
New"'>AAPOR
has just sent out the following press release.<span =

```

style=3D"mso-spacerun:
yes"> Look for it on the web later =
today.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"MS Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier =
New"'> I want to acknowledge the work =
of Larry
McGill in producing this statement from those of us with so many =
thoughts and
so little time. <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"MS Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier =
New"'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><b style=3D'mso-bidi-font-weight:normal'><font =
size=3D3
face=3D"Times New Roman"><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";mso-fareast-font-family:"MS =
Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:
"Courier New";font-weight:bold'>For Immediate =
Release<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><b style=3D'mso-bidi-font-weight:normal'><font =
size=3D3
face=3D"Times New Roman"><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-s=
ize:10.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";mso-fareast-font-family:"MS =
Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:
"Courier New";font-weight:bold'>October 16, =
2000<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"MS Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier =
New"'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><b style=3D'mso-bidi-font-weight:normal'><font =
size=3D3
face=3D"Times New Roman"><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";mso-fareast-font-family:"MS =
Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:
"Courier New";font-weight:bold'>Mistakes, Exaggeration Mark Media Use =
of Focus
Groups on Presidential Debate<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText>ANN ARBOR—Several news media organizations misrepresented the results = of focus groups and other non-scientific samples of public opinion after last Wednesday’s presidential debates, according to officials of the = American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), the leading = professional association for public opinion = researchers.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText>“As we look ahead to the next presidential debate, we urge journalists to pay = special attention to how they portray the results of focus groups and other = instant measures of voters’ reactions to the debate,” said Murray = Edelman, president of AAPOR and editorial director of Voter News Service. “All too often, journalists will = state correctly that the results of such samples are not scientific, then go = ahead and report them and analyze them as though they = were.”<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times = New Roman"; mso-fareast-font-family:"MS Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier =

New"><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier New"'>Fox News, for example, reported the =
results
of a “FOXNews.com-Speakout.com instant response analysis,” =
in which visitors to
their web site were invited to register their reaction to the =
candidates’ comments
during the debate. A Fox =
News
Channel correspondent said of the people who participated in the =
interactive
exercise, “This is not a scientific sample, but it is an accurate
representation of what Democrats, Republicans and Independents thought, =
who saw
the debate.”<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier New"'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier New"'>“The Fox News correspondent =
was right when
he said that this sample was not scientific, but wrong when he =
characterized it
as an accurate representation,” said Edelman.<span =
style=3D"mso-spacerun:
yes"> “Measurements of public opinion that are based =
on the views
of people who visit a web site don’t reflect the opinions of =
anyone other than
those people who participated.”<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier New"'><span style=3D"mso-spacerun:
yes"> <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier New"'>Various methodological problems =
associated
with web-based surveys were elucidated in an earlier news release =
issued by
AAPOR on September 28, 2000. =
It can

be viewed at www.aapor.org.

<p class=MsoPlainText><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><p></p>

<p class=MsoPlainText>Several television networks, including CNN, NBC and MSNBC, featured interviews with members of focus groups of “undecided voters” in their post-debate analyses, in an attempt to assess the debate's impact upon such voters. But in at least two instances, the correspondents made confusing or misleading statements about the groups.<p></p>

<p class=MsoPlainText><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><p></p>

<p class=MsoPlainText>On MSNBC's post-debate analysis, correspondent Sara James introduced a group of six “undecided voters” in Tampa, Florida, by saying that these people were “by no means representative of undecided voters across the United States, but are a fairly good cross-section of undecided voters in this region of the battle-ground state of Florida.” <p></p>

<p class=MsoPlainText><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><p></p>

<p class=MsoPlainText>“Six people is neither a representative sample of undecided American voters nor a meaningful cross-section of

any group of any size at all, said Michael Traugott, past president of AAPOR and professor of communication studies at the University of Michigan. Terms such as these have the potential to be very misleading when not used with care. In this case, these were simply six people from Tampa, Florida, each expressing their own opinions. Nothing more can legitimately be said about who, if anybody, they might represent.

</p>

<p class=MsoPlainText><![if !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]></p>

<p class=MsoPlainText>Results of focus groups can be mischaracterized in other ways as well. Based on the opinions of his focus group in Cincinnati, MSNBC analyst Frank Luntz declared that we have a clear winner in this debate. Then, to support that headline, he asked members of his group to raise their hands in response to the question, Who thought George Bush did better than you expected he would? to which nearly all members raised their hands. </p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText>“This is not the same = question as ‘Who do you think won the debate?’” said Edelman. “It is perfectly possible for focus group participants who = thought Al Gore won the debate also to agree that George Bush did better than they = thought he would.”<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText>While nuances of question wording = can be debated, this particular issue is compounded by the fact that, in his = introduction of Luntz, MSNBC anchor Brian Williams referred to him only as a = “political pollster,” making no reference to Luntz’s long-standing = affiliation with the Republican Party.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText>In 1997, AAPOR found Luntz to be in violation of the Association's Code of Professional Ethics and = Practices for “repeatedly refusing to make public essential facts about his = research on public attitudes about the Republicans' ‘Contract with = America.’" The text of AAPOR’s = statement censuring

Luntz can be found on the Association's web site at =
www.aapor.org.<font
size=3D3 face=3D"Times New Roman"><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:
10.0pt;font-family:"Times New Roman";mso-fareast-font-family:"MS =
Mincho";
mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier New"'><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"MS Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier =
New"'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"MS Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier =
New"'>Many
news organizations are using focus groups as a way to supplement their
political coverage by adding a human dimension to their stories. =
Compared to a
telephone survey, a focus group is a low-cost technique for =
illustrating how
citizens are reacting to political events, issues, and candidates by =
showing or
referring to real people and their =
opinions.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"MS Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier =
New"'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Times =
New Roman";
mso-fareast-font-family:"MS Mincho";mso-bidi-font-family:"Courier =
New"'>A focus
group is assembled from a group of people who often share some =
characteristic
such as the fact that they remain undecided about their vote choice, =
they voted
for a particular candidate in a previous election, or they are of the =
same
gender or race. The =
conversation
in a focus group is unlike a structured interview because it is based =
upon
responses to broad, open-end questions.<span style=3D"mso-spacerun: =
yes">
Sometimes the discussion can be affected by an especially vocal
participant.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText>The problem with focus groups arises when news organizations try to = generalize from such a conversation to the attitudes or opinions of the general public = or likely voters from a small hand picked set of focus group = participants. While focus groups can = illustrate how some people feel about issues or candidates, a group of 10 to 20 = individuals cannot be used to represent a larger population of = citizens.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoPlainText>Reporters should refrain from describing or characterizing the results of a focus = group conversation as "representative" of or "reflecting" = what the general public thinks or even what a specific subgroup thinks. A focus group conversation is = just about how a particular group of people reacted to a series of questions = they were asked by a specific moderator.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal> </p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><u>About AAPOR</u>: The American Association for Public Opinion Research is the primary professional = association

representing public opinion researchers, and has a strong interest in protecting and strengthening the credibility of survey research. Founded in 1947, AAPOR is an organization of over 1,500 professionals from government agencies, = colleges and universities, non-profit organizations, and commercial polling firms = who are engaged or interested in the methods and applications of public opinion = and survey research.</p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal>For additional information, contact:</p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal style=3D'margin-left:.25in'><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal style=3D'margin-left:.25in'>Murray Edelman, AAPOR = President</p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal style=3D'margin-left:.25in'>Don Dillman, AAPOR Vice President and = President-Elect</p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal style=3D'text-indent:.25in'>Michael Traugott, AAPOR Past = President</p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

</div>

</body>

</html>

=====
Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 10:52:26 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: debate and the foreign press
In-Reply-To: <39EB0D9C.22D654A7@rider.edu>
References: <Pine.SOL.4.21.0010160929430.24648-100000@rocky.oswego.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

If my memory serves me correctly many Europeans were astonished and could not understand Watergate in the early 70's. I lived in London at the time and was equally astonished that I had to explain why, under our system, what Nixon did was wrong and why the Watergate inquiry was legitimate. I only say this to illustrate that Europeans often don't see things that happen in our country or people in the same way as we do. I think the same could be said about the Bill and Monica soap opera in recent years as Frank Rusciano commented. Now, let's go to the Arabs and Israelis.....and why many of us find it difficult to understand why they have such very different and very deep seated perspectives which prevent them from coming to an agreement with a result that is so counter productive to their mutual interests -- from our point of view!

Dick Halpern

At 10:15 AM 10/16/00, you wrote:

>Actually, my experience in Germany was that they were not too enthusiastic
>about

>Carter or Reagan (I'm not sure about Bush, because I wasn't there to
>ask). Generally

>speaking, they liked Clinton (although, with a nod to Bruce, they could
>not understand

>what all the "fuss" was about Monica Lewinsky), mostly because he was
>young and
>intelligent.

>

>One interesting note-- John F. Kennedy remained one of the most popular
>Presidents in

>Germany according to poll results, even in 1995, and even among
>respondents who

>weren't born when he was alive!

>

>

>

>Bruce Altschuler wrote:

>

> > The preference of foreign officials for continuing existing
> > administrations, the people that they are familiar with warts and all, is
> > a phenomenon that has existed for some time. During Watergate, foreign
> > leaders, media and even the public wondered how we could even think of
> > removing President Nixon over something as seemingly trivial as
> > Watergate. They couldn't understand how we could have nominated and
> > elected someone as inexperienced as Jimmy Carter in 1976 but by 1980
their

> > preferences had shifted to Carter as they couldn't understand how we could
> > have chosen an actor as a presidential nominee, especially one as ignorant
> > about foreign affairs as Reagan. Thus, the support of the relatively known
> > quantity Gore over Bush by foreign observers and leaders should not be a
> > surprise.
> > Bruce Altschuler
> > SUNY Oswego
> >
> > On Sun, 15 Oct 2000 s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > I attended the Winston-Salem debate with four other authors of debate
> > > books. We
> > > were interviewed by some 12 members of the European press based in
> > > Washington,
> > > DC. They questioned our "romance" with polls and our low voter
> > > turnout. I asked
> > > them what they and their countrymen/women thought about the
> > > candidates. Each
> > > correspondent could not understand how George W. Bush became a
> > > candidate. They
> > > claimed that their politicians, diplomats and the majority of
> > > citizens in their
> > > countries want Gore to win the election.
> > >
> > >

=====
Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 15:38:43 -0400
From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
Received: by notesmail1.csuohio.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.6 (890.1 7-16-1999))
id 8525697A.006BEAEB ; Mon, 16 Oct 2000
15:38:44 -0400
X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <8525697A.006BEA9C.00@notesmail1.csuohio.edu>
Subject: Re: AAPOR Press Release-- Mistakes, Exaggeration Mark Media Use
of Focus Groups on Presidential Debate
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

I want to praise Edelman , et al for their excellent review of what's wrong today with many of the instant "public assessments" of how candidates performed in televised presidential debates. We ought to point these media personnel to other more reliable sources for their reports. The major problem is the perceived immediate need for the public's response to such questions as who won,

who did better, or who are you going to vote for now. It is not realistic to think that the media will change their behavior and not use these misguided assessments.

Best,

Sid

Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 14:14:11 -0700
From: "MJS" <sullivan@fsc-research.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: new subscriber
Message-ID: <39EB0D33.20363.196E6FC4@localhost>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

How does someone subscribe to AAPORNET?

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.

Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 17:36:24 -0500 (EST)
From: Alice Robbin <arobbin@indiana.edu>
X-Sender: arobbin@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: [AAI] Polls, Polls and More Polls... (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.3.96.1001016173451.18857C-200000@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: MULTIPART/ALTERNATIVE; BOUNDARY="-559023410-1804928587-971735784=:18857"
Content-ID: <Pine.GSO.3.96.1001016173451.18857D@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu>

This message is in MIME format. The first part should be readable text, while the remaining parts are likely unreadable without MIME-aware tools. Send mail to mime@docserver.cac.washington.edu for more info.

---559023410-1804928587-971735784=:18857
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-ID: <Pine.GSO.3.96.1001016173451.18857E@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu>

Earlier today someone asked about "Arab-Americans."
Below is a listserv summary issued by the Arab American Institute.

Alice Robbin/Indiana U
----- Forwarded message -----
Date: Mon, 16 Oct 2000 17:47:18 -0400
From: AAI Alert <aaialert@aaiusa.org>
To: undisclosed-recipients: ;
Subject: [AAI] Polls, Polls and More Polls...

=====
ARAB AMERICAN INSTITUTE
=====

With elections almost three weeks away and U.S. policy in the Middle East currently at the forefront of the national policy debate, this email will focus on data AAI has compiled from a series of recent polls so to better gauge the opinion of Arab Americans on the candidates and issues. And don't forget, if you haven't done so already, voice your own opinion in AAI's online poll at <<http://www.aaiusa.org>>.

ARAB AMERICAN VOTER PREFERENCE POLL 2000

A national poll of Arab American voters (October 3-8) shows Republican George W. Bush leading Al Gore by a 40 percent to 28 percent margin. Green Party candidate Ralph Nader (an Arab American) currently receives 15.5 percent of the Arab American vote, while another 14.5 percent are still undecided. To find out more about the results, log onto <<http://www.aaiusa.org/campaign2000/voterpreferncepoll.htm>>

ARAB AMERICAN BENCHMARK POLL STUDY

Ealier this year, Zogby International conducted a poll for AAI to explore the views and opinions of Arab Americans on a range of foreign and domestic policy issues. The study also served to sketch a portrait of the Arab American community's political characteristics. To download the entire study, log onto

<<http://www.aaiusa.org/aboutaai/publications/Poll%20Study.pdf>>

AAI ONLINE POLL

Who would you vote for as president? Which candidate do you think would better further Middle East peace efforts? Do you prefer Clinton or Lazio? Do you want to receive more email updates on the elections, candidates and issues that matter to Arab Americans? To voice your opinion on these important questions, log onto <<http://www.aaiusa.org>>.

Arab American Institute

1600 K Street, NW Suite 601
Washington, DC 20006
www.aaiusa.org <<http://www.aaiusa.org>>

---559023410-1804928587-971735784=:18857
Content-Type: TEXT/HTML; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE
Content-ID: <Pine.GSO.3.96.1001016173451.18857F@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu>
Content-Description:

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>
<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; =
charset=3DUS-ASCII">
<META NAME=3D"Generator" CONTENT=3D"MS Exchange Server version =
5.0.1457.3">
```


New Roman">

1600 K Street, NW Suite 601<FONT =
FACE=3D"Times New Roman">

Washington, DC 20006<FONT FACE=3D"Times =
New Roman">

<U></U><U>www.aaiusa.org <<A =
HREF=3D"http://www.aaiusa.org" =
TARGET=3D" _blank">http://www.aaiusa.org></U><FONT =
SIZE=3D2>

</P>

</BODY>
</HTML>
---559023410-1804928587-971735784=:18857--

=====
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 08:47:42 -1200
From: "James Bason" <jbason@arches.uga.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <4.1.20001013095050.00bdc60@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>
Subject: Re: AAPOR 2001 Call for Participation
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0056_01C03816.E9E52B40"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6700

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0056_01C03816.E9E52B40
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_001_0057_01C03816.E9E52B40"

-----_NextPart_001_0057_01C03816.E9E52B40
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi Teresa,

That's fine - no hurry on payment. I have attached a summary of the =
first 27 cases and those items you requested. I am going to code the =
meds for Q15.5 and I'll send that down. Hope this works for your =
presentation. I'll also send an update on number complete, as we have =
completed some more since I entered the data this past weekend.=20

Since we are only going to use 5 hospitals, do we want to get another =
complete from each of the 5? Also, we have only gotten one Spanish =
respondent thus far and they had callblock so we can't get through to =
them. Will we be getting more Spanish?=20

You can expect the coded med list and the update on completes later =
today.

Hope things are going well.

Jim.=20

James Bason, PhD
Director and Assistant Research Scientist
Survey Research Center
University of Georgia
jbaso@arches.uga.edu
706-542-6110
706-542-4057 FAX
114 Barrow Hall
Athens, GA 30602

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Peter Miller=20
To: aapornet@usc.edu=20
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2000 3:15 AM
Subject: AAPOR 2001 Call for Participation

Please forgive redundancy in this posting. I have had some inquiries =
on conference proposal submission procedures following an earlier =
announcement of the Call for Participation. To submit a proposal for =
the conference, go to the AAPOR website and click on Conference 2001 (in =
the pop-up box that appears when you direct your mouse to Conferences). =
Or, you can follow the direct link to the proposal submission page in =
the section on "Proposal Submission Process" below. Here is the entire =
Call for Participation, in case you did not get it (or if you deleted =
it). Look forward to hearing from you. PM

"MAKING CONNECTIONS - PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH
PROFESSIONALS AND THE PUBLIC"
CALL FOR CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION

The American Association for Public Opinion Research will hold its =
56th annual
conference at the Hilton Montreal Bonaventure in Montreal, Quebec, May =
17-20, 2001.
AAPOR's Conference Committee seeks proposals for papers, poster =
presentations,
panels and round tables that will illuminate important research =
questions and promote the
development of our profession.=20

Papers, posters, 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 organize panel proposals with common themes.=20

CONFERENCE THEME

=20

AAPOR's annual conference is the place for academic, commercial and governmental public opinion and survey researchers to 'make connections.' The 2001 meeting in Montreal is a particularly good opportunity for researchers from the U.S. and Canada, as well as researchers from other countries, to share experiences, research innovations and comparative data.=20

Following the historic voting in Mexico, national elections will have made big news in the U.S. and Canada by next spring. Trade policy (NAFTA), environmental issues, health care delivery and financing, media effects, culture policy and other matters are subjects of continuing debate among North Americans. In the U.S and Canada, regional differences in political attitudes, religion, ethnicity, language, economic well-being and lifestyle are notable. Papers and panels that offer data on public opinion in these and other areas will be part of the conference agenda.=20

The Montreal meeting will explore methodological challenges that cut across national boundaries. Research on response and nonresponse error stemming from questionnaires, interviewers and survey modes, cultural factors that affect response to surveys, and methodological problems presented by multilingual populations are increasingly important topics. The U.S. Census in 2000 and the Canadian Census in 2001 offer many interesting points of comparison. The impact of technology on survey research, including the expanding variety of computer and Internet-based data collection modalities, will be a major focus of the conference.=20

Making connections with respondents is a vital and increasingly difficult part of our business. Presentations on techniques for increasing survey participation and for understanding nonresponse effects are encouraged. And making connections with consumers of poll and survey information has never been more important. We welcome presentations on media coverage of polls and surveys, and innovations in communicating survey findings to general audiences.=20

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION PROCESS

Proposals for the conference should be submitted electronically to www.aapor.org/conference/submission.html by December 11, 2000. A special form

has been created on the website to gather information about each proposal. Please fill in all information requested on the form. You will receive confirmation of your submission automatically by email.=20

The proposal submission form asks for author contact information, the type of presentation (paper, poster, paper or poster, panel/round table), title, keywords describing the content of the presentation, an abstract of no more than 300 words and any special audio-visual equipment requests.=20

Papers are formal presentations of original research that are grouped with other similar papers to constitute a panel. In presenting papers, authors are provided 10-15 minutes during the panel to address an assembled audience. A discussant is assigned to each panel to comment on the papers individually and as a group.=20

Poster presentations are less formal - but not less rigorous or substantive presentations of original research. Rather than delivering an address before an assembled audience, poster authors present their work interactively to groups of interested people with the aid of a visual display that summarizes research findings. Posters are displayed in a central location at specially designated times during the conference so that attendees can peruse the visual displays and converse with the authors.=20

Round Tables are organized discussions of issues that are important to the public opinion research community. The discussion may be led by an individual, or by a group of interested persons. Formal papers are not presented. Round table discussions on ethical aspects of survey research - e.g., human subjects protection, response rates - have been a prominent part of AAPOR conferences in recent years.=20

Proposals will be accepted for all of these forms of conference participation. The proposal submission form on the AAPOR website asks submitters to designate the type of presentation as part of the proposal.=20

Authors who only wish to have their proposal considered for a formal paper presentation should select the "Paper" option. Those who only wish to be considered for a poster presentation should select the "Poster" option. Those who wish to be considered for

either a paper or poster presentation should select the "Paper or Poster" option.=20

Space on the program is limited. Some excellent proposals for formal paper presentations that cannot be integrated into panels will not be accepted. Authors have a greater chance of participating on the program if they are willing to be considered for either a paper or poster presentation.=20

Panel proposals involve recruiting 3-4 paper presentation proposals with a common theme. The panel proposal should contain a short statement discussing the issues to be addressed in the panel and their importance, and an abstract for each of the papers proposed. The panel organizer should provide all of this material in a single submission.=20

Round Table proposals should detail the topic to be discussed and its importance to the field of public opinion research. The proposal should also provide the names and affiliations of discussion leader(s).=20

Each proposal will be evaluated by at least two reviewers and final decisions about the program will be made by the end of January 2001. You will be notified about the status of your proposal shortly thereafter.=20

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

We will evaluate the proposals for the quality, originality and completeness of the work represented in them. The AAPOR program should include cutting-edge research and presentations that further the development of the profession. Proposals should evidence careful preparation and should represent work that is well underway, rather than research that may not reach an acceptable stage of completion by the time full conference papers are due at the beginning of May, 2001.=20

Multiple proposals may be submitted, but it is unlikely that more than one proposal will be accepted from any given researcher or research team. Proposals should not be duplicative of one another.=20

SPECIAL AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

All meeting rooms will have overhead projectors, screens and microphones as appropriate. Authors of poster presentations will be provided with =

poster board and an
easel. Special equipment requests -- for 35mm slide projectors, data =
projectors (e.g. for
PowerPoint or on-line presentations), audiotape recorders or VCRs - =
should be indicated
on the proposal submission form. While we cannot guarantee access to =
these types of
equipment, we will endeavor to meet special requests within budgetary =
constraints.=20

SUBMISSIONS FROM COMMERCIAL RESEARCHERS

We particularly encourage the submission of proposals by professionals =
working in the
commercial sector. Please feel free to contact the conference chair =
with ideas that may
depart from the normal conference paper format.=20

INQUIRIES

Please contact the conference chair, Peter Miller, at p-miller@nwu.edu =
with any
questions concerning the conference or the proposal submission =
process.=20

-----= NextPart_001_0057_01C03816.E9E52B40
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META content=3D"text/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1" =
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.00.2920.0" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Hi Teresa,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>That's fine - no hurry on payment. I =
have attached=20
a summary of the first 27 cases and those items you requested. I am =
going to=20
code the meds for Q15.5 and I'll send that down. Hope this works for =
your=20
presentation. I'll also send an update on number complete, as we have =
completed=20
some more since I entered the data this past weekend. </FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Since we are only going to use 5 =
hospitals, do we=20
want to get another complete from each of the 5? Also, we have only =
gotten one=20
Spanish respondent thus far and they had callblock so we can't get =
through to=20
them. Will we be getting more Spanish? </FONT></DIV>
```

<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>You can expect the coded med list =
and the=20
update on completes later today.</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>Hope things are going =
well.</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>Jim. </DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>James Bason, PhD
Director and Assistant Research =
Scientist
Survey=20
Research Center
University of Georgia
<A=20
href=3D"mailto:jbason@arches.uga.edu">jbason@arches.uga.edu
706-54=
2-6110
706-542-4057=20
FAX
114 Barrow Hall
Athens, GA 30602
</DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE=20
style=3D"BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-RIGHT: =
0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; PADDING-RIGHT: 0px">
<DIV style=3D"FONT: 10pt arial">----- Original Message ----- </DIV>
<DIV=20
style=3D"BACKGROUND: #e4e4e4; FONT: 10pt arial; font-color: =
black">From:=20
Peter =
Miller=20
</DIV>
<DIV style=3D"FONT: 10pt arial">To: <A =
href=3D"mailto:aapornet@usc.edu"=20
title=3Daapornet@usc.edu>aapornet@usc.edu </DIV>
<DIV style=3D"FONT: 10pt arial">Sent: Friday, October 13, 2000 =
3:15=20
AM</DIV>
<DIV style=3D"FONT: 10pt arial">Subject: AAPOR 2001 Call for=20
Participation</DIV>
<DIV>
</DIV>Please forgive redundancy in this posting. I have =
had=20
some inquiries on conference proposal submission procedures following =
an=20
earlier announcement of the Call for Participation. To submit a =
proposal=20
for the conference, go to the AAPOR website and click on Conference =
2001 (in=20
the pop-up box that appears when you direct your mouse to=20
Conferences). Or, you can follow the direct link to the =
proposal=20
submission page in the section on "Proposal Submission Process" =
below.
=20
Here is the entire Call for Participation, in case you did not get it =
(or if=20
you deleted it). Look forward to hearing from you. =20
PM

"MAKING CONNECTIONS - PUBLIC OPINION=20
RESEARCH
PROFESSIONALS AND THE PUBLIC"
CALL FOR CONFERENCE=20
PARTICIPATION

The American Association for Public Opinion =
Research will=20
hold its 56th annual
conference at the Hilton Montreal Bonaventure =
in=20
Montreal, Quebec, May 17-20, 2001.
AAPOR's Conference Committee =

field of public opinion research. The proposal should also provide the names and affiliations of discussion leader(s). Each proposal will be evaluated by at least two reviewers and final decisions about the program will be made by the end of January 2001. You will be notified about the status of your proposal shortly thereafter. PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA We will evaluate the proposals for the quality, originality and completeness of the work represented in them. The AAPOR program should include cutting-edge research and presentations that further the development of the profession. Proposals should evidence careful preparation and should represent work that is well underway, rather than research that may not reach an acceptable stage of completion by the time full conference papers are due at the beginning of May, 2001. Multiple proposals may be submitted, but it is unlikely that more than one proposal will be accepted from any given researcher or research team. Proposals should not be duplicative of one another. SPECIAL AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT REQUESTS All meeting rooms will have overhead projectors, screens and microphones as appropriate. Authors of poster presentations will be provided with poster board and an easel. Special equipment requests -- for 35mm slide projectors, data projectors (e.g. for PowerPoint or on-line presentations), audiotape recorders or VCRs -- should be indicated on the proposal submission form. While we cannot guarantee access to these types of equipment, we will endeavor to meet special requests within budgetary constraints. SUBMISSIONS FROM COMMERCIAL RESEARCHERS We particularly encourage the submission of proposals by professionals working in the commercial sector. Please feel free to contact the conference chair with ideas that may depart from the normal conference paper format. INQUIRIES Please contact the conference chair, Peter Miller, at p-miller@nwu.edu with any questions concerning the conference or the proposal submission process.

gAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAA
AICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICY
AAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAA
ADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAA
AAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAA
AAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAA
gAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAA
AICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICY
AAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAA
ADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAICYAAAAADAA
AAAAAAAAAAgAAAAIAABAAA8QwAAAcAAAAABAAAKAUAAHsGAABVCAANQkAAHQKAADpCwAA8QwAAAgA
AAKAAACwAAAwAAAAANAADdGAAAA8AAAAABAAA8QwAAAkAAAAAAAEgAAABkAAADLAQAA1AEA
APMIAAAHABwBwAcAAcAAAAAAMAAAAEAAAArgMAALQDAABnBQAACUAABEIAAAZCAAA8wgAAAcA
OgAHADoABwA6AAcAOgAHAP//BAAAAAsASgBhAG0AZQBzACAAQgBhAHMABwBuAGMAQwA6AFwARABv
AGMADQbtAGUAbgB0AHMAIABhAG4AZAAGAFMAZQB0AHQAAQBuAGcAcwBcAGoAYgBhAHMABwBuAFwA
QQBwAHAABABpAGMAYQB0AGkAbwBuACAARABhAHQAYQBcAE0AaQBjAHIAbwBzAG8AZgB0AFwAVwBv
AHIAZABcAEEDQB0AG8AUgB1AGMABwB2AGUAcgB5ACAAcwBhAHYAZQAgAG8AZgAgAEQAbwBjAHUA
bQB1AG4AdAAxAc4AYQBzAGQACwBKAGEAbQB1AHMAIABCAGEAcwBvAG4AEQBBDADoAXABhAFMAVABI
AE0AQQBUAEEAQgBTAC4AZABvAGMAAwAzZDQXTpRW1P8P/w//D/8P/w//D/8P/w//DxAAOD9xL07L
Mkf/D/8P/w//D/8P/w//D/8P/w8QAJFDokdetqYE/w//D/8P/w//D/8P/w//D/8PEAAAAAAAAAAB
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADGAAAD4S0DxGETPEVxgUAAbQPb16EtA9ghLTxbygAAQAAAAEAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABMYAAAPhKAFEYSY/hXGBQABoAUGXoSgBWCeMP5PSgMAUEoAAFFK
AwBeSgAAbygAAQDY8AEAAAAcggEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAPhHAIEYRM/xXGBQABcAgG
XoRwCGCETP8CAAIAlgABAAAAIABAAAAAIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGAAAD4RACxGEMp4VxgUAUAl
B16EQAtghJj+AgADAC4AAQAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABgAAA+EEA4RhJj+FcYFAAEQ
DgZehBAOYISY/gIABAuAAEAAAAcggEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAPhOAOEYRM/xXGBQAB
4BAGXoTgEGCETP8CAAUAlgABAAAAIABAAAAAIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGAAAD4SwExGEMp4VxgUA
AbATB16EsBNghJj+AgAGAC4AAQAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABgAAA+EgBYRhJj+FcYF
AAGAFgZehIAWYISY/gIABwAuAAEAAAAcggEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAPhFAZEYRM/xXG
BQABUBkGXoRQGWCETP8CAAGALgADAAAAFwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAATGAAAD4TQAhGEMp4V
xgUAAdACB16E0AJghJj+T0oDAFBKAABRSgMAXkoAAG8oAAEA2PABAAAF4AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAALGAAAD4SgBRGEMp4VxgUAaAFB16EoAVghJj+T0oEAFFKBABvKAABAG8AAQAAABeAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACxgAAA+EcAgRhJj+FcYFAAFwCAZehHAIYISY/k9KAwBRsgMABygAAQCn
8AEAAAAxgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAPhEALeYSY/hXGBQABQAsGXoRAC2CEMP5PSgEA
UUoBAG8oAAEAt/ABAAAF4AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALGAAAD4QQDhGEMp4VxgUAAAOB16E
EA5ghJj+T0oEAFFKBABvKAABAG8AAQAAABeAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACxgAAA+E4BARhJj+
FcYFAAHgEAZehOAOYISY/k9KAwBRsgMABygAAQCn8AEAAAAxgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
sYAAAPhLATEYSY/hXGBQABsBMGXoSWE2CEMP5PSgEAUUoBAG8oAAEAt/ABAAAF4AAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAALGAAAD4SAFhGEMp4VxgUAAYAWB16EgBZghJj+T0oEAFFKBABvKAABAG8AAQAAABeA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACxgAAA+EUBkRhJj+FcYFAAFQgQZehFAZYISY/k9KAwBRsgMABygA
AQcn8AoAAAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAPhEwOEYQc8xXGBQABTA4GXoRMDmCEHPNv
KAABAAAAQAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABgAAA+EoAURhJj+FcYFAAGBQZehKAFYISY
/gIAAQAUAAEAAAAcggEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAPhHAIEYRM/xXGBQABcAgGXoRwCGCE
TP8CAAIAlgABAAAAIABAAAAAIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGAAAD4RACxGEMp4VxgUAUAlB16EQAtg
hJj+AgADAC4AAQAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABgAAA+EEA4RhJj+FcYFAAEQDgZehBAO
YISY/gIABAuAAEAAAAcggEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAPhOAOEYRM/xXGBQAB4BAGXoTg
EGCETP8CAAUAlgABAAAAIABAAAAAIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGAAAD4SwExGEMp4VxgUAAbATB16E
sBNghJj+AgAGAC4AAQAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABgAAA+EgBYRhJj+FcYFAAGAFgZe
hIAWYISY/gIABwAuAAEAAAAcggEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAPhFAZEYRM/xXGBQABUBkG
XoRQGWCETP8CAAGALgADAAAAOD9xLwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADNkNBcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACRQ6JHAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAA//////////8DAAAAAAAAAAAAA//8DAAAAEgDUMLZHGoKA7BsACQQPAAkE

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_006D_01C03817.7E0F2960
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Please excuse the previous post. I sent the wrong attachment to the =
wrong address. My apologies.

Jim.

James Bason, PhD
Director and Assistant Research Scientist
Survey Research Center
University of Georgia
jbason@arches.uga.edu
706-542-6110
706-542-4057 FAX
114 Barrow Hall
Athens, GA 30602

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Peter Miller=20
To: aapornet@usc.edu=20
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2000 3:15 AM
Subject: AAPOR 2001 Call for Participation

Please forgive redundancy in this posting. I have had some inquiries =
on conference proposal submission procedures following an earlier =
announcement of the Call for Participation. To submit a proposal for =
the conference, go to the AAPOR website and click on Conference 2001 (in =
the pop-up box that appears when you direct your mouse to Conferences). =
Or, you can follow the direct link to the proposal submission page in =
the section on "Proposal Submission Process" below. Here is the entire =
Call for Participation, in case you did not get it (or if you deleted =
it). Look forward to hearing from you. PM

"MAKING CONNECTIONS - PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH
PROFESSIONALS AND THE PUBLIC"
CALL FOR CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION

The American Association for Public Opinion Research will hold its =
56th annual
conference at the Hilton Montreal Bonaventure in Montreal, Quebec, May =
17-20, 2001.

AAPOR's Conference Committee seeks proposals for papers, poster =
presentations,
panels and round tables that will illuminate important research =
questions and promote the
development of our profession.=20

Papers, posters, 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 organize panel proposals with common themes.=20

CONFERENCE THEME

=20

AAPOR's annual conference is the place for academic, commercial and governmental public opinion and survey researchers to 'make connections.' The 2001 meeting in

Montreal is a particularly good opportunity for researchers from the U.S. and Canada, as well as researchers from other countries, to share experiences, research innovations and comparative data.=20

Following the historic voting in Mexico, national elections will have made big news in the U.S. and Canada by next spring. Trade policy (NAFTA), environmental issues, health care delivery and financing, media effects, culture policy and other matters are subjects of continuing debate among North Americans. In the U.S and Canada, regional differences in political attitudes, religion, ethnicity, language, economic well-being and lifestyle are notable. Papers and panels that offer data on public opinion in these and other areas will be part of the conference agenda.=20

The Montreal meeting will explore methodological challenges that cut across national boundaries. Research on response and nonresponse error stemming from questionnaires, interviewers and survey modes, cultural factors that affect response to surveys, and methodological problems presented by multilingual populations are increasingly important topics. The U.S. Census in 2000 and the Canadian Census in 2001 offer many interesting points of comparison. The impact of technology on survey research, including the expanding variety of computer and Internet-based data collection modalities, will be a major focus of the conference.=20

Making connections with respondents is a vital and increasingly difficult part of our business. Presentations on techniques for increasing survey participation and for understanding nonresponse effects are encouraged. And making connections with consumers of poll and survey information has never been more important. We welcome presentations on media coverage of polls and surveys, and innovations in communicating

survey findings to general audiences.=20

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION PROCESS

Proposals for the conference should be submitted electronically to www.aapor.org/conference/submission.html by December 11, 2000. A special form has been created on the website to gather information about each proposal. Please fill in all information requested on the form. You will receive confirmation of your submission automatically by email.=20

The proposal submission form asks for author contact information, the type of presentation (paper, poster, paper or poster, panel/round table), title, keywords describing the content of the presentation, an abstract of no more than 300 words and any special audio-visual equipment requests.=20

Papers are formal presentations of original research that are grouped with other similar papers to constitute a panel. In presenting papers, authors are provided 10-15 minutes during the panel to address an assembled audience. A discussant is assigned to each panel to comment on the papers individually and as a group.=20

Poster presentations are less formal - but not less rigorous or substantive presentations of original research. Rather than delivering an address before an assembled audience, poster authors present their work interactively to groups of interested people with the aid of a visual display that summarizes research findings. Posters are displayed in a central location at specially designated times during the conference so that attendees can peruse the visual displays and converse with the authors.=20

Round Tables are organized discussions of issues that are important to the public opinion research community. The discussion may be led by an individual, or by a group of interested persons. Formal papers are not presented. Round table discussions on ethical aspects of survey research - e.g., human subjects protection, reporting of response rates - have been a prominent part of AAPOR conferences in recent years.=20

Proposals will be accepted for all of these forms of conference participation. The proposal submission form on the AAPOR website asks submitters to designate the type of presentation as part of the proposal.=20

Authors who only wish to have their proposal considered for a formal =
paper presentation
should select the "Paper" option. Those who only wish to be considered =
for a poster
presentation should select the "Poster" option. Those who wish to be =
considered for
either a paper or poster presentation should select the "Paper or =
Poster" option.=20

Space on the program is limited. Some excellent proposals for formal =
paper
presentations that cannot be integrated into panels will not be =
accepted. Authors have a
greater chance of participating on the program if they are willing to =
be considered for
either a paper or poster presentation.=20

Panel proposals involve recruiting 3-4 paper presentation proposals =
with a common
theme. The panel proposal should contain a short statement discussing =
the issues to be
addressed in the panel and their importance, and an abstract for each =
of the papers
proposed. The panel organizer should provide all of this material in a =
single submission.=20

Round Table proposals should detail the topic to be discussed and its =
importance to the
field of public opinion research. The proposal should =
also provide the names and
affiliations of discussion leader(s).=20

Each proposal will be evaluated by at least two reviewers and final =
decisions about the
program will be made by the end of January 2001. You will be notified =
about the status
of your proposal shortly thereafter.=20

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

We will evaluate the proposals for the quality, originality and =
completeness
of the work represented in them. The AAPOR program should include =
cutting-edge
research and presentations that further the development of the =
profession. Proposals
should evidence careful preparation and should represent work that is =
well underway,
rather than research that may not reach an acceptable stage of =
completion by the time
full conference papers are due at the beginning of May, 2001.=20

Multiple proposals may be submitted, but it is unlikely that more than =
one proposal will
be accepted from any given researcher or research team. Proposals =
should not be

duplicative of one another.=20

SPECIAL AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

All meeting rooms will have overhead projectors, screens and =
microphones as
appropriate. Authors of poster presentations will be provided with =
poster board and an
easel. Special equipment requests -- for 35mm slide projectors, data =
projectors (e.g. for
PowerPoint or on-line presentations), audiotape recorders or VCRs - =
should be indicated
on the proposal submission form. While we cannot guarantee access to =
these types of
equipment, we will endeavor to meet special requests within budgetary =
constraints.=20

SUBMISSIONS FROM COMMERCIAL RESEARCHERS

We particularly encourage the submission of proposals by professionals =
working in the
commercial sector. Please feel free to contact the conference chair =
with ideas that may
depart from the normal conference paper format.=20

INQUIRIES

Please contact the conference chair, Peter Miller, at p-miller@nwu.edu =
with any
questions concerning the conference or the proposal submission =
process.=20

-----=_NextPart_000_006D_01C03817.7E0F2960
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META content=3D"text/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1" =
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.00.2920.0" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Please excuse the previous post. I sent =
the wrong=20
attachment to the wrong address. My apologies.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Jim.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV>James Bason, PhD<BR>Director and Assistant Research =
Scientist<BR>Survey=20
Research Center<BR>University of Georgia<BR><A=20
href=3D"mailto:jbason@arches.uga.edu">jbason@arches.uga.edu</A><BR>706-54=
2-6110<BR>706-542-4057=20
FAX<BR>114 Barrow Hall<BR>Athens, GA 30602<BR></DIV>
```


include cutting-edge
research and presentations that further the=20
development of the profession. Proposals
should evidence careful=20
preparation and should represent work that is well underway,
rather =
than=20

research that may not reach an acceptable stage of completion by the=20
time
full conference papers are due at the beginning of May, 2001.=20

Multiple proposals may be submitted, but it is unlikely that =
more than=20

one proposal will
be accepted from any given researcher or research =
team.=20

Proposals should not be
duplicative of one another.

SPECIAL =

AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

All meeting rooms will have =
overhead=20

projectors, screens and microphones as
appropriate. Authors of =
poster=20

presentations will be provided with poster board and an
easel. =
Special=20

equipment requests -- for 35mm slide projectors, data projectors (e.g. =

for
PowerPoint or on-line presentations), audiotape recorders or =
VCRs --=20

should be indicated
on the proposal submission form. While we =
cannot=20

guarantee access to these types of
equipment, we will endeavor to =
meet=20

special requests within budgetary constraints.

SUBMISSIONS =
FROM=20

COMMERCIAL RESEARCHERS

We particularly encourage the submission =
of=20

proposals by professionals working in the
commercial sector. Please =
feel=20

free to contact the conference chair with ideas that may
depart =
from the=20

normal conference paper format.

INQUIRIES

Please =
contact the=20

conference chair, Peter Miller, at p-miller@nwu.edu with =
any
questions=20

concerning the conference or the proposal submission process.=20

</BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

-----_NextPart_000_006D_01C03817.7E0F2960--

=====
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 09:20:24 -0500
From: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Validating interviews

When validating interviews, is there a standard for the percent of
completed interviews that should be called back? Is there any
literature on this topic?

thanks,
Linda Owens

=====
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 08:11:49 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Linda Bourque <lbourque@ucla.edu>
Subject: Using laptops for self-administered questionnaires
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Dear AAPORites:

I need some help. Have any of you had respondents use a Clio or other similar small computer to fill out self-administered questionnaires in, for example, a clinic setting? If so, what has been your experience? Is there any pertinent research that you know of that has been reported in the literature? I would be particularly interested in a comparison of paper-and-pencil administration with the Clio or a similar device.

Thanks for any help that you can provide. Send response to lbourque@ucla.edu.

Linda Bourque

=====
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 11:58:56 -0400
From: Mark Lamias <mark@thinkologies.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Using laptops for self-administered questionnaires
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Dear Linda,

We have been using a Clio for many CASI interviews. If you would like more information, please visit our website or you may contact me directly.

--Mark Lamias
Business Intelligence Analyst
THINKologies, Inc.
<http://www.thinkologies.com>
<http://www.eportcard.com>
(404) 364-0045

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

From: Linda Bourque [mailto:lbourque@ucla.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2000 11:12 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Using laptops for self-administered questionnaires

Dear AAPORites:

I need some help. Have any of you had respondents use a Clio or other similar small computer to fill out self-administered questionnaires in, for example, a clinic setting? If so, what has been your experience? Is there

any pertinent research that you know of that has been reported in the literature? I would be particularly interested in a comparison of paper-and-pencil administration with the Clio or a similar device.

Thanks for any help that you can provide. Send response to lbourque@ucla.edu.

Linda Bourque

Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 12:16:46 -0400
From: Keith Neuman <kneuman@intouchsurvey.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Using laptops for self-administered questionnaires
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet E-mail/MAPI - 8.0.0.4211

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

From: Linda Bourque [SMTP:lbourque@ucla.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2000 11:12 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Using laptops for self-administered questionnaires

Dear AAPORites:

I need some help. Have any of you had respondents use a Clio or other similar small computer to fill out self-administered questionnaires in, for example, a clinic setting? If so, what has been your experience? Is there any pertinent research that you know of that has been reported in the literature? I would be particularly interested in a comparison of paper-and-pencil administration with the Clio or a similar device.

Thanks for any help that you can provide. Send response to lbourque@ucla.edu.

Linda Bourque

Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 12:04:51 -0400
From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <8525697B.00585652.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
Subject: Re: Validating interviews
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

The standard I've seen is 15%.

Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 12:09:06 -0400

From: "Howard Fienberg" <hfienberg@stats.org>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: a press query
Message-ID: <001401c03854\$adfcad40\$e471accf@howard>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

I just took a call from Steven Henn, of Marketplace Business Radio News. He would like to talk to anyone that does polling in the DC area -- I presume he means a pollster who includes DC residents in his sample (but he may also just be looking for a DC-based pollster).

If you can help him, please contact him ASAP.

Steven Henn's email is shenn@marketplace.org

Cheers,
Howard Fienberg
Research Analyst
The Statistical Assessment Service
2100 L. St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037

hfienberg@stats.org
<http://www.stats.org>
(202) 223-3193
FAX: 872-4014
ICQ#: 38550600

The Statistical Assessment Service is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization dedicated to improving public understanding of scientific and social research.

+++++

=====
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 13:03:40 EDT
From: HOneill1536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill1536@aol.com
 by imo-r16.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.31.) id 5.6e.3f3223c (4253)
 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Oct 2000 13:03:40 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <6e.3f3223c.271de06c@aol.com>
Subject: releases to the media
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 106

The National Council on Public Polls has been providing the media with releases on critical aspects of research and reporting throughout this campaign. I invite you to review these releases at www.ncpp.org

Harry

Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 16:13:50 -0400
From: "Schwartz, Jim" <Jim.Schwartz@ujc.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Palestinian/Arab-Americans
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

In 1998 I was asked by the American Muslim Foundation to serve (pro bono) on a Technical Advisory Committee for conducting a survey of the Muslim population in the US in 2000. I attended the one meeting that group held and provided, with Prof. Sidney Goldstein of Brown University, a model for how such a national survey could be conducted. The model is the "National Jewish Population Survey 2000" being sponsored by United Jewish Communities.

The preparations for and discussions during that meeting made it evident that there are currently no reliable statistics on the Muslim or Palestinian population in the US at the national level, and apparently also not at the regional or local level. Lacking the technical, organizational, and financial resources to properly conduct a survey of this rare population, the American Muslim Foundation decided to disband this Advisory Committee.

Jim Schwartz, Ph.D.
Research Director
United Jewish Communities
111 Eighth Avenue, Suite 11E
New York, NY 10011-5201
tel: (212) 284-6729
fax: (212) 284-6805
e-mail: jim.schwartz@ujc.org

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

From: Eric Zeidman [mailto:eric.zeidman@vnsusa.org]
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2000 5:40 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Palestinian/Arab-Americans

This was a question posted on another list that I thought someone from AAPOR might be able to answer:

DO YOU KNOW WHERE I CAN GET STATISTICAL FIGURES ABOUT ARAB
AMERICAN/PALESTINIAN AMERICAN IN THE UNITED STATES. EG: HOW MANY RESIDING IN
AREA x; INCOME; POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT; ETC
THANK YOU
LUCY

Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 16:29:11 -0400

From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Focus groups in France and Germany
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBGECHCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Can anyone direct me to excellent full service focus group researchers in France and Germany who provide English transcripts and/or reports and simultaneous translation? Thank you, Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com

Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2000 16:56:22 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Focus groups in France and Germany
In-Reply-To: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBGECHCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Mark,

One of your best bets is Mary and John Goodyear in London. They operate all over the world and do just what you have in mind. Look up their address in WAPOR's on line site.

Dick Halpern

At 04:29 PM 10/17/00, you wrote:

>Can anyone direct me to excellent full service focus group researchers in
>France and Germany who provide English transcripts and/or reports and
>simultaneous translation? Thank you, Mark Richards, mark@bisconti.com

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 05:52:10 -0700 (PDT)
From: Kat Lind <kat_lind99@yahoo.com>
Subject: OnLine and Downloadable Statistics Textbook
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

This is a really great resource for stats. I highly recommend checking it out and bookmarking as a "favorite".

Katherine "Kat" Lind

> Subject: OnLine and Downloadable Statistics Textbook
>
> If ever you are caught without a beginner to
> intermediate stat textbook,
> and for whatever reason, you feel a need, click on
> this site. Pick your
> subject and click again, to get a chapter on just
> about any area of
> statistics. Try the Data Mining Chapter. It is
> actually comprehensible!
>
> It's as good a resource as any general text, with a
> really good
> glossary, too. Well written, by the purveyors of
> Statistica.
>
> John
>
> Proper citation: StatSoft, Inc. (1999). Electronic
> Statistics Textbook.
> Tulsa, OK: StatSoft. WEB:
> <http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/stathome.html>.
>
> "This Electronic Statistics Textbook offers training
> in the
> understanding and application of statistics. The
> material was developed
> at the StatSoft R&D department based on many years
> of teaching
> undergraduate and graduate statistics courses and
> covers a wide variety
> of applications, including laboratory research
> (biomedical,
> agricultural, etc.), business statistics and
> forecasting, social science
> statistics and survey research, data mining,
> engineering and quality
> control applications, and many others.....
>
> "The complete Electronic Statistics Textbook can be
> downloaded for quick
> access from your local hard drive. Directions for
> correctly installing
> the textbook are also available.
>
>
>
>

=====

Katherine "Kat" Lind
Kat_Lind99@yahoo.com

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Messenger - Talk while you surf! It's FREE.

<http://im.yahoo.com/>

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 13:19:53 -0400

Subject: Poll Watchers

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Claudia Deane" <deanec@washpost.com>

Message-ID: <OF71D58484.D5B3A143-ON8525697C.005F090E@washpost.com>

X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on inetmail1/TWP(Release 5.0.3 |March 21, 2000) at 10/18/2000

01:19:24 PM

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id KAA05179

The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com at:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A31909-2000Oct18.html>

In this column:

? Final Scorecard: Who Won the Presidential Debates

? Out of Focus Groups

? The Samplemiser

? Robert Novak's Questionable Questions

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 16:39:38 -0400

From: "Chase Harrison" <chase@csra.uconn.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Job Opening

Message-ID: <NDBBIAJCGKIDOEHBNPOLOEMACKAA.chase@csra.uconn.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Survey Research Program Coordinator

University of Connecticut

Position based in Stamford, Connecticut

Under the general direction of designated supervisor will coordinate the Stamford Campus Certificate program in Survey Research Methodology. The position reports to the Director of the Center for Survey Research and Analysis, Storrs Campus. Duties include program coordination, program material development and program marketing. Duties will also include some

management of social science survey projects and coordination of all phases of assigned projects including: research proposals, project design, questionnaire writing, management of data collection process, data analysis, report writing and presentation of findings. Salary negotiable.

Submit: Resume and 3 letters of reference.
Contact: Christopher Barnes at 860-486-3002 or cebuconn@yahoo.com

Chris Barnes
Associate Director
Center for Survey Research and Analysis
University of Connecticut
U-32 341 Mansfield Rd. Room 408
Storrs, CT 06268

Phone: (860) 486-3002
FAX: (860) 486-6655
cebuconn@yahoo.com

=====
Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 16:32:17 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Stephen Pelletier <spelleti@hsph.harvard.edu>
Subject: Re: Job Opening
In-Reply-To: <NDBBIAJCGKIDOEHBNPOLOEMACKAA.chase@csra.uconn.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Why doesn't this A-Hole use his uconn e-mail address for this?
Should you forward this to Jason?

And, why the f--- should Barnes be looking at applications. This should be kenny's job.

Oy, what a f---ing place!
You gotta get out of there!
S

At 04:39 PM 10/18/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Survey Research Program Coordinator
>University of Connecticut
>Position based in Stamford, Connecticut
>
>

>Under the general direction of designated supervisor will coordinate the
>Stamford Campus Certificate program in Survey Research Methodology. The
>position reports to the Director of the Center for Survey Research and
>Analysis, Storrs Campus. Duties include program coordination, program
>material development and program marketing. Duties will also include some
>management of social science survey projects and coordination of all phases
>of assigned projects including: research proposals, project design,
>questionnaire writing, management of data collection process, data analysis,
>report writing and presentation of findings. Salary negotiable.
>

>Submit: Resume and 3 letters of reference.
>Contact: Christopher Barnes at 860-486-3002 or cebuconn@yahoo.com

>
>Chris Barnes
>Associate Director
>Center for Survey Research and Analysis
>University of Connecticut
>U-32 341 Mansfield Rd. Room 408
>Storrs, CT 06268
>
>Phone: (860) 486-3002
>FAX: (860) 486-6655
>cebuconn@yahoo.com
>

=====
Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 16:37:39 -0400
From: "Dumont, Bryan" <BDumont@apcoassoc.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Job Opening
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="----_=_NextPart_001_01C03943.45F65800"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C03943.45F65800
Content-Type: text/plain

oops!

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Stephen Pelletier [SMTP:spelleti@hsph.harvard.edu]
> Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2000 4:32 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Job Opening
>
> Why doesn't this A-Hole use his uconn e-mail address for this?
> Should you forward this to Jason?
>
> And, why the f--- should Barnes be looking at applications. This should
> be
> kenny's job.
> Oy, what a f---ing place!
> You gotta get out of there!
> S
>
>
> At 04:39 PM 10/18/00 -0400, you wrote:
> >Survey Research Program Coordinator
> >University of Connecticut
> >Position based in Stamford, Connecticut
> >
> >
> >Under the general direction of designated supervisor will coordinate the
> >Stamford Campus Certificate program in Survey Research Methodology. The
> >position reports to the Director of the Center for Survey Research and

> >Analysis, Storrs Campus. Duties include program coordination, program
> >material development and program marketing. Duties will also include some
> >management of social science survey projects and coordination of all
> phases
> >of assigned projects including: research proposals, project design,
> >questionnaire writing, management of data collection process, data
> analysis,
> >report writing and presentation of findings. Salary negotiable.
> >
> >Submit: Resume and 3 letters of reference.
> >Contact: Christopher Barnes at 860-486-3002 or cebuconn@yahoo.com
> >
> >Chris Barnes
> >Associate Director
> >Center for Survey Research and Analysis
> >University of Connecticut
> >U-32 341 Mansfield Rd. Room 408
> >Storrs, CT 06268
> >
> >Phone: (860) 486-3002
> >FAX: (860) 486-6655
> >cebuconn@yahoo.com
> >

----- _NextPart_001_01C03943.45F65800
Content-Type: text/html
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>
<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Dus-ascii">
<META NAME=3D"Generator" CONTENT=3D"MS Exchange Server version =
5.5.2650.12">
<TITLE>RE: Job Opening</TITLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY>

<P><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF" SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">oops!</FONT>
<UL>
<P><FONT SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">-----Original Message-----</FONT>
<BR><B><FONT SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">From:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></B> <FONT =
SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">Stephen Pelletier =
[SMTP:spelleti@hsph.harvard.edu]</FONT>
<BR><B><FONT SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">Sent:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></B> <FONT =
SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">Wednesday, October 18, 2000 4:32 PM</FONT>
<BR><B><FONT SIZE=3D1 =
FACE=3D"Arial">To:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></B> <FONT SIZE=3D1 =
FACE=3D"Arial">aapornet@usc.edu</FONT>
<BR><B><FONT SIZE=3D1 =
FACE=3D"Arial">Subject:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT>=
</B> <FONT SIZE=3D1 FACE=3D"Arial">Re: Job Opening</FONT>
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">Why doesn't this A-Hole use his uconn =
e-mail address for this?&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT>
```


> >Center for Survey Research and Analysis
> >University of Connecticut
> >U-32 341 Mansfield Rd. Room 408
> >Storrs, CT 06268
> >
> >Phone: (860) 486-3002
> >FAX: (860) 486-6655
> >cebuconn@yahoo.com
> >

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 17:12:21 -0400
From: "Howard Fienberg" <hfienberg@stats.org>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Intersurvey, Knowledge Networks, etc.
Message-ID: <002401c03948\$1cc86ea0\$be39accf@howard>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Has there been any academic or industry back-and-forth on this specific method of polling - giving everyone a computer so they can be polled over the Internet?

Cheers,
Howard Fienberg
STATS

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 17:16:26 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
From: Ashley Grosse <agrosse@umich.edu>
Subject: Re: Job Opening
In-Reply-To: <4.1.20001018163046.00a52c40@hsph.harvard.edu>
References: <NDBBIAJCGKIDOEHBNPOLOEMACKAA.chase@csra.uconn.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

To bring up an old issue, perhaps we could use a moderator for the list serve?

At 04:32 PM 10/18/2000 -0400, Stephen Pelletier wrote:

>Why doesn't this A-Hole use his uconn e-mail address for this?
>Should you forward this to Jason?
>

>And, why the f--- should Barnes be looking at applications. This should be
>kenny's job.

>Oy, what a f---ing place!
>You gotta get out of there!

>S
>
>
>At 04:39 PM 10/18/00 -0400, you wrote:
>>Survey Research Program Coordinator
>>University of Connecticut
>>Position based in Stamford, Connecticut
>>
>>
>>Under the general direction of designated supervisor will coordinate the
>>Stamford Campus Certificate program in Survey Research Methodology. The
>>position reports to the Director of the Center for Survey Research and
>>Analysis, Storrs Campus. Duties include program coordination, program
>>material development and program marketing. Duties will also include some
>>management of social science survey projects and coordination of all phases
>>of assigned projects including: research proposals, project design,
>>questionnaire writing, management of data collection process, data
analysis,
>>report writing and presentation of findings. Salary negotiable.
>>
>>Submit: Resume and 3 letters of reference.
>>Contact: Christopher Barnes at 860-486-3002 or cebuconn@yahoo.com
>>
>>Chris Barnes
>>Associate Director
>>Center for Survey Research and Analysis
>>University of Connecticut
>>U-32 341 Mansfield Rd. Room 408
>>Storrs, CT 06268
>>
>>Phone: (860) 486-3002
>>FAX: (860) 486-6655
>>cebuconn@yahoo.com
>>

Ashley Grosse
Director of Studies
National Election Studies
University of Michigan
ISR, office 4118
voice: 734.764.5494 fax: 734.764.3341

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 17:23:39 -0400 (EDT)
From: Bruce Altschuler <altschul@Oswego.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Job Opening
In-Reply-To: <4.1.20001018163046.00a52c40@hsph.harvard.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.21.0010181720400.22769-100000@rocky.oswego.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The author of this owes the members of this list a real apology. He also needs a lesson in email etiquette. Such language is inappropriate for any email even with the dashes and shorthand and even

if sent to the intended addressee.
Bruce Altschuler

On Wed, 18 Oct 2000, Stephen Pelletier wrote:

> Why doesn't this A-Hole use his uconn e-mail address for this?
> Should you forward this to Jason?
>
> And, why the f--- should Barnes be looking at applications. This should be
> kenny's job.
> Oy, what a f---ing place!
> You gotta get out of there!
> S
>
>
> At 04:39 PM 10/18/00 -0400, you wrote:
> >Survey Research Program Coordinator
> >University of Connecticut
> >Position based in Stamford, Connecticut
> >
> >
> >Under the general direction of designated supervisor will coordinate the
> >Stamford Campus Certificate program in Survey Research Methodology. The
> >position reports to the Director of the Center for Survey Research and
> >Analysis, Storrs Campus. Duties include program coordination, program
> >material development and program marketing. Duties will also include some
> >management of social science survey projects and coordination of all
> phases
> >of assigned projects including: research proposals, project design,
> >questionnaire writing, management of data collection process, data
> analysis,
> >report writing and presentation of findings. Salary negotiable.
> >
> >Submit: Resume and 3 letters of reference.
> >Contact: Christopher Barnes at 860-486-3002 or cebuconn@yahoo.com
> >
> >Chris Barnes
> >Associate Director
> >Center for Survey Research and Analysis
> >University of Connecticut
> >U-32 341 Mansfield Rd. Room 408
> >Storrs, CT 06268
> >
> >Phone: (860) 486-3002
> >FAX: (860) 486-6655
> >cebuconn@yahoo.com
> >
>

=====
Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 17:20:34 -0400
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Job Opening
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Content-Type: text/plain

It seems to me that moderating this group would not only be difficult because of the occasionally high traffic levels it would also be problematic

in the sense of determining whether a post is off-topic or unsuitable for the group. While everyone would agree that the post in question should be blocked there are other less clear cut questions - what seems partisan or ad hominum to one may seem balanced and benign to others.

Besides people usually learn to check their To: header after one good mistake.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

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

> From: Ashley Grosse [SMTP:agrosse@umich.edu]

> Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2000 5:16 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu; aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: Job Opening

>

> To bring up an old issue, perhaps we could use a moderator for the list
> serve?

>

>

> At 04:32 PM 10/18/2000 -0400, Stephen Pelletier wrote:

> >Why doesn't this A-Hole use his uconn e-mail address for this?

> >Should you forward this to Jason?

> >

> >And, why the f--- should Barnes be looking at applications. This should
> be

> >kenny's job.

> >Oy, what a f---ing place!

> >You gotta get out of there!

> >S

> >

> >

> >At 04:39 PM 10/18/00 -0400, you wrote:

> >>Survey Research Program Coordinator

> >>University of Connecticut

> >>Position based in Stamford, Connecticut

> >>

> >>

> >>Under the general direction of designated supervisor will coordinate the

> >>Stamford Campus Certificate program in Survey Research Methodology. The

> >>position reports to the Director of the Center for Survey Research and

> >>Analysis, Storrs Campus. Duties include program coordination, program

> >>material development and program marketing. Duties will also include
> some

> >>management of social science survey projects and coordination of all
> phases

> >>of assigned projects including: research proposals, project design,

> >>questionnaire writing, management of data collection process, data

> analysis,

> >>report writing and presentation of findings. Salary negotiable.
> >>
> >>Submit: Resume and 3 letters of reference.
> >>Contact: Christopher Barnes at 860-486-3002 or cebuconn@yahoo.com
> >>
> >>Chris Barnes
> >>Associate Director
> >>Center for Survey Research and Analysis
> >>University of Connecticut
> >>U-32 341 Mansfield Rd. Room 408
> >>Storrs, CT 06268
> >>
> >>Phone: (860) 486-3002
> >>FAX: (860) 486-6655
> >>cebuconn@yahoo.com
> >>
>
> *****
> Ashley Grosse
> Director of Studies
> National Election Studies
> University of Michigan
> ISR, office 4118
> voice: 734.764.5494 fax: 734.764.3341
> *****

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 17:30:22 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Barry A. Hollander" <barry@arches.uga.edu>
X-Sender: barry@archa14.cc.uga.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Job Opening
In-Reply-To: <4.1.20001018163046.00a52c40@hsph.harvard.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.10.10010181726390.41198-100000@archa14.cc.uga.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Wed, 18 Oct 2000, Stephen Pelletier wrote:

> ...a whole lot of stuff I've snipped, but really embarrassing...

Sometimes you check your email and it makes your day, if
for no other reason than you've done stuff like this yourself
and it's good to know others have done the same.

Barry A. Hollander	College of Journalism
Associate Professor	and Mass Communication
barry@arches.uga.edu	The University of Georgia
phone: 706.542.5027	Athens, GA 30602

web: <http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander>

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 18:05:25 -0400
From: "Jim Caplan" <caplanjr@bellsouth.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.SOL.4.21.0010181720400.22769-100000@rocky.oswego.edu>
Subject: Re: Job Opening
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Bruce,

Isn't copying the message back to the group equally offensive? Personally, while feeling bad for him, I found the image of one of our members walking around all day with a red face kind of humorous.

Jim Caplan

Miami

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

From: "Bruce Altschuler" <altschul@Oswego.EDU>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2000 5:23 PM

Subject: Re: Job Opening

The author of this owes the members of this list a real apology. He also needs a lesson in email etiquette. Such language is inappropriate for any email even with the dashes and shorthand and even if sent to the intended addressee.

Bruce Altschuler

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 17:19:21 -0500
From: "Cooney, Brendan" <brendan.cooney@strategyone.net>
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Job Opening
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

I think Jim makes a good point, and also addresses the monitoring/censorship issue. This poor guy is getting pilloried enough, and the indignation I might have felt at first is outweighed by the chuckling at his unfortunate miskey.

As for monitoring, most email interfaces have a "junk mail" option (Microsoft Outlook has this option). If a particular sender continues with unacceptable behavior, a mass movement to "junk" his or her address

effectively silences the offending address. Just a thought.

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

From: Jim Caplan [mailto:caplanjr@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2000 6:05 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Job Opening

Bruce,

Isn't copying the message back to the group equally offensive? Personally, while feeling bad for him, I found the image of one of our members walking around all day with a red face kind of humorous.

Jim Caplan
Miami

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 18:22:57 -0400
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Job Opening
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBAEDLCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098F5B@AS_SERVER>

Moderated lists can work, but they require a lot of time and effort on the part of an editor and you may lose the rapid turnaround that is a current feature of AAPORNET. Also, people will argue with the editor about what is acceptable and not, and it inevitably becomes a group discussion. Don't underestimate the self-policing power of the group to restrain members considered to be overstepping the bounds of the (mostly unwritten) group norms that emerge. But, accidents happen :) , and, in that case, the sender suffers the consequences of their private made public words while others hit "delete," learn, and pray to God they don't suffer the same embarrassment. (I confess, this was one of those "gasp!" and "smile" moments.) Cheer up-there was no virus attached! Mark

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 21:24:07 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: Job Opening
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <39EE4D37.3D99602A@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <NDBBIAJCGKIDOEHBNPOLLOEMACKAA.chase@csra.uconn.edu>
<4.1.20001018171354.00aa61e0@a.imap.itd.umich.edu>

With reference to the comment by Stephen Pelletier-- could we sometimes use a monitor? Yeah, big time....

Ashley Grosse wrote:

> To bring up an old issue, perhaps we could use a moderator for the list
> serve?
>
> At 04:32 PM 10/18/2000 -0400, Stephen Pelletier wrote:
> >Why doesn't this A-Hole use his uconn e-mail address for this?
> >Should you forward this to Jason?
> >
> >And, why the f--- should Barnes be looking at applications. This should
be
> >kenny's job.
> >Oy, what a f---ing place!
> >You gotta get out of there!
> >S
> >
> >
> >At 04:39 PM 10/18/00 -0400, you wrote:
> >>Survey Research Program Coordinator
> >>University of Connecticut
> >>Position based in Stamford, Connecticut
> >>
> >>
> >>Under the general direction of designated supervisor will coordinate the
> >>Stamford Campus Certificate program in Survey Research Methodology. The
> >>position reports to the Director of the Center for Survey Research and
> >>Analysis, Storrs Campus. Duties include program coordination, program
> >>material development and program marketing. Duties will also include some
> >>management of social science survey projects and coordination of all
phases
> >>of assigned projects including: research proposals, project design,
> >>questionnaire writing, management of data collection process, data
analysis,
> >>report writing and presentation of findings. Salary negotiable.
> >>
> >>Submit: Resume and 3 letters of reference.
> >>Contact: Christopher Barnes at 860-486-3002 or cebuconn@yahoo.com
> >>
> >>Chris Barnes
> >>Associate Director
> >>Center for Survey Research and Analysis
> >>University of Connecticut
> >>U-32 341 Mansfield Rd. Room 408
> >>Storrs, CT 06268
> >>
> >>Phone: (860) 486-3002
> >>FAX: (860) 486-6655
> >>cebuconn@yahoo.com

> >>
>
> *****
> Ashley Grosse
> Director of Studies
> National Election Studies
> University of Michigan
> ISR, office 4118
> voice: 734.764.5494 fax: 734.764.3341
> *****

=====
Date: Wed, 18 Oct 2000 20:44:15 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "H.H.Kassarjian" <HKassarj@ucla.edu>
Subject: Re: Poll Watchers
In-Reply-To: <OF71D58484.D5B3A143-ON8525697C.005F090E@washpost.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="===== _3496939== _ .ALT"

----- _3496939== _ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

As we watch the poll results roll in as to who won the debates, and listen to the spin doctors, it never ceases to amaze me the powerful effect selective perception has in these sorts of things. In 1960, after the third Kennedy-Nixon debate we were doing a poll for the Republican party. I added the question, "Who do you think is taller, Kennedy or Nixon (rotated)? If don't know, we tossed in a couple of probe questions such as, Go ahead and guess, who do you think is taller, Nixon or Kennedy? (Tallness we presumed was a positive characteristic, perhaps a big man for a big job, etc.)

The sample, if I remember right, was 3000 respondents whom we believed at that time, were representative of the general voting population. The results, as you might expect were dramatic. People intending to vote for Nixon thought Nixon was the taller candidate, and Kennedy voters thought Kennedy was taller. The No Opinion Voters gave a slight edge to Kennedy.

In case you are wondering, Kennedy was 6 feet 1/8 inch tall, while Nixon was 6 feet 0 inches. The difference of 1/8 inch.

It is also interesting that up to 1960, it had always been the taller of the two candidates that won the election, I understand going all the way back to the first contested elections. I don't know what happened since 1960, but surely L.B Johnson was the taller of the two. I presume Dukakas was the shorter. No opinion on Carter , and it seems to me that Reagan must have been a midget.

Hal Kassarjian

At 01:19 PM 10/18/2000 -0400, you wrote:
>The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com at:
>
><http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A31909-2000Oct18.html>

-----_3496939==_ .ALT--

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 07:57:19 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Stephen Pelletier <spelleti@hsph.harvard.edu>
Subject: Apology
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I want to apologize to all members of the list for imposing my sophomoric rant on you. It was wholly inappropriate and in bad taste. Again, my apologies to all.
Steve.

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 08:28:44 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Ronald E. Langley" <langley@pop.uky.edu>
Subject: Re: Poll Watchers
In-Reply-To: <4.3.2.7.2.20001018202400.00af8bd0@pop.bol.ucla.edu>
References: <OF71D58484.D5B3A143-ON8525697C.005F090E@washpost.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Madison was taller than his opponent???

At 08:44 PM 10/18/00 -0700, you wrote:

> It is also interesting that up to 1960, it had always been the
> taller of the two candidates that won the election, I understand going
> all the way back to the first contested elections. I don't know what
> happened since 1960, but surely L.B Johnson was the taller of the two. I
> presume Dukakas was the shorter. No opinion on Carter, and it seems to
> me that Reagan must have been a midget.

>
>Hal Kassarjian
>*****

>
>At 01:19 PM 10/18/2000 -0400, you wrote:

>>The latest Poll Watchers column is available on washingtonpost.com at:

>>
>><http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A31909-2000Oct18.html>

>
>*****

>Hal Kassarjian
>HKassarj@ucla.edu
>Phone: 1 (818) 784-5669
>FAX: 1 (818) 784-3325

Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D.
Director, Survey Research Center
University of Kentucky

Phone: (859) 257-4684
FAX: (859) 323-1972
Pager: 288-5771

302 Breckinridge Hall
Lexington, KY 40506-0056

langley@pop.uky.edu

<http://www.rgs.uky.edu/src>

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 09:13:38 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Marketplace on polling
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Yesterday's (10/18/2000) Marketplace program on public radio had a 5-minute segment on "The Business of Polling" in this election year.

The general drift was that polls influence elections because the media relies on them so much, and that the media is not critical enough in looking at pollsters and their connections before quoting results. Andy Kohut was interviewed.

Frank Luntz and John Zogby were particularly singled out for criticism, Luntz for misrepresenting himself and slanting results, and Zogby for his relentless self-promotion. AAPOR's censure of Luntz was noted.

The program can be heard through RealAudio at:
http://www.marketplace.org/shows/2000/10/rafiles/18_mpp.ram

The segment on polling starts about 15 minutes into the program.

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 09:41:58 -0400
From: Patricia Gallagher <Patricia.Gallagher@umb.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: OnLine and Downloadable Statistics Textbook
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Thanks!

Trish

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

From: Kat Lind [mailto:kate_lind99@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2000 8:52 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: OnLine and Downloadable Statistics Textbook

This is a really great resource for stats. I highly recommend checking it out and bookmarking as a "favorite".

Katherine "Kat" Lind

> Subject: OnLine and Downloadable Statistics Textbook
>
> If ever you are caught without a beginner to
> intermediate stat textbook,
> and for whatever reason, you feel a need, click on
> this site. Pick your
> subject and click again, to get a chapter on just
> about any area of
> statistics. Try the Data Mining Chapter. It is
> actually comprehensible!
>
> It's as good a resource as any general text, with a
> really good
> glossary, too. Well written, by the purveyers of
> Statistica.
>
> John
>
> Proper citation: StatSoft, Inc. (1999). Electronic
> Statistics Textbook.
> Tulsa, OK: StatSoft. WEB:
> <http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/stathome.html>.
>
> "This Electronic Statistics Textbook offers training
> in the
> understanding and application of statistics. The
> material was developed
> at the StatSoft R&D department based on many years
> of teaching
> undergraduate and graduate statistics courses and
> covers a wide variety
> of applications, including laboratory research
> (biomedical,
> agricultural, etc.), business statistics and
> forecasting, social science
> statistics and survey research, data mining,
> engineering and quality
> control applications, and many others.....
>
> "The complete Electronic Statistics Textbook can be
> downloaded for quick
> access from your local hard drive. Directions for
> correctly installing
> the textbook are also available.
>
>
>
>

=====

Katherine "Kat" Lind

Kat_Lind99@yahoo.com

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Messenger - Talk while you surf! It's FREE.

<http://im.yahoo.com/>

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 09:43:01 -0400
From: John Hall <JHall@mathematica-mpr.com>
To: "'Frank Rusciano'" <rusciano@rider.edu>, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Job Opening
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

So how many of you who want a monitor are willing to shell out the bucks? I don't think we could find anyone who would do it for free and do a good job of it! And even though I have complained to the list and directly to individuals about offensive or bothersome emails, I'm not willing to pay money (and no, my employer doesn't pay my dues) or spend time to have a monitored list.

John Hall
Senior Sampling Statistician
Mathematica Policy Research
600 Alexander Park
Princeton, NJ 08540
phone (609) 275-2357
fax (609) 799-0005
email jhall@mathematica-mpr.com

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

From: Frank Rusciano [mailto:rusciano@rider.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2000 9:24 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Job Opening

With reference to the comment by Stephen Pelletier-- could we sometimes use a monitor? Yeah, big time....

Ashley Grosse wrote:

> To bring up an old issue, perhaps we could use a moderator for the list
> serve?
>
>

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 09:17:28 -0500 (EST)
From: Alice Robbin <arobbin@indiana.edu>
X-Sender: arobbin@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: monitoring ourselves...
In-Reply-To: <897E2332A97AD311AEBB00508B116D5402104D80@mpr1>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.3.96.1001019091301.15450A-100000@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I think we have done quite well. There is no need for a monitor or moderated list. In the several years that we've had this listserv, I think it's remarkable how civilized we've been to/with each other. Mistakes happen sometimes, and we'd best err on the side of good will and generosity of spirit, which we've nearly always shown to each other. Cheers. Alice Robbin/Indiana U

On Thu, 19 Oct 2000, John Hall wrote:

> So how many of you who want a monitor are willing to shell out the bucks? I
> don't think we could find anyone who would do it for free and do a good job
> of it! And even though I have complained to the list and directly to
> individuals about offensive or bothersome emails, I'm not willing to pay
> money (and no, my employer doesn't pay my dues) or spend time to have a
> monitored list.
> John Hall
> Senior Sampling Statistician
> Mathematica Policy Research
> 600 Alexander Park
> Princeton, NJ 08540
> phone (609) 275-2357
> fax (609) 799-0005
> email jhall@mathematica-mpr.com
>

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 10:30:03 -0400
From: "Barry Hollander" <barry@arches.uga.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.3.96.1001019091301.15450A-100000@ariel.ucs.indiana.edu>
Subject: Re: monitoring ourselves...
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

The best police in any virtual community are the members themselves, not a sysop or moderator. The moderator usually becomes necessary only when the members of a virtual community can't get through to someone the cultural norms and values of a list, a MUD, a chat room, or any other bit of virtual space.

I've never seen this as a problem on AAPORnet. Indeed, the offender's quick apology shows that the present system works just fine.

Barry Hollander
Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
706.542.5027

email: barry@arches.uga.edu
web: <http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander>

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 10:34:17 -0400
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: monitoring ourselves...
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2651.58)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I agree fully with Alice's sentiments.

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

From: Alice Robbin [mailto:arobbin@indiana.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 19, 2000 10:17 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: monitoring ourselves...

I think we have done quite well. There is no need for a monitor or moderated list. In the several years that we've had this listserv, I think it's remarkable how civilized we've been to/with each other. Mistakes happen sometimes, and we'd best err on the side of good will and generosity of spirit, which we've nearly always shown to each other. Cheers. Alice Robbin/Indiana U

On Thu, 19 Oct 2000, John Hall wrote:

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 11:44:25 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: monitoring ourselves...
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <39EF16D9.700AE8F4@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References:
<F9BC190B7DE9D111965000805FA7C60B0389C2FB@nmrusnysx1.dun.nielsen.com>

Just for record, I also agree that we don't need a monitor. My comment "Yeah,

big time" was a weak attempt at political humor (remember Dick Cheney's remark when the "A--" expletive was used). As one who has made the mistake of posting to AAPORnet incorrectly at least twice, I think we can all have some good humor about embarrassments such as these.

Frank Rusciano

"Lavrakas, Paul" wrote:

> I agree fully with Alice's sentiments.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Alice Robbin [mailto:arobbin@indiana.edu]
> Sent: Thursday, October 19, 2000 10:17 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: monitoring ourselves...
>
> I think we have done quite well. There is no need for a monitor or
> moderated list. In the several years that we've had this listserv, I think
> it's remarkable how civilized we've been to/with each other. Mistakes
> happen sometimes, and we'd best err on the side of good will and
> generosity of spirit, which we've nearly always shown to each other.
> Cheers. Alice Robbin/Indiana U
>
> On Thu, 19 Oct 2000, John Hall wrote:

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 08:01:00 -0700
From: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@nevada.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Non-Response Conference/Portland, OR
Message-ID: <NEBBLOJLGLBGLGECJGANEEDOCBA.lamatsch@nevada.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
In-Reply-To: <39EF16D9.700AE8F4@rider.edu>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Does anybody know when the books from the Non-response Conference in Portland last year will be sent out?

tom

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.
Director
The Howard W. Cannon Center for Survey Research
University of Nevada - Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway - Box 455008
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-5008

Phone (702) 895-0167
Fax (702) 895-0165
Cellular (702) 561-8768
http://www.unlv.edu/Research_Centers/ccsr/

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 12:12:14 -0400
From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
Received: by notesmail1.csuohio.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.6 (890.1 7-16-1999))
id 8525697D.005903F5 ; Thu, 19 Oct 2000
12:12:17 -0400
X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <8525697D.00590311.00@notesmail1.csuohio.edu>
Subject: Re: Poll Watchers
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

Using height as a predictor of who would win the election is a tall order.

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 12:46:50 -0400
From: "Rich Grousset" <rich@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Telephone Survey Response Rate Calculation
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

I'm a grad student in the survey research program at UConn (Storrs campus). I'm trying to put together a paper discussing the issue of standardization of telephone survey response rate calculations in the survey research/polling industry. I gather that this has been discussed previously to some extent on this listserve. I don't mean to spark a redundant conversation, but if some of you have opinions about this subject, I would appreciate it if you would e-mail me! The things I'm interested in would include arguments for and against standardization (would standardization be a good thing? why or why not?), barriers to standardization, and actions that would need to be taken in order for standardized definitions of response rate to be used in practice and reported by research firms, the media, etc.

Thanks for your time! And by the way - what an interesting day to begin receiving AAPORnet messages ;)

Sincerely,
Rich Grousset

Graduate Assistant
The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 12:22:22 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Telephone Survey Response Rate Calculation
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-7
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id KAA19478

It will help you to take a look if you haven't already at AAPOR's book on Standard Definitions, which deals with standardizing outcome codes and rate calculations for several survey modes. It discusses the issues that you're interested in. It's online at <http://www.aapor.org>. A new edition will be available in printed form and on line later this year.

Rob Daves, chair
AAPOR Standard Definitions Committee

>>> "Rich Grousset" <rich@opinion.isi.uconn.edu> 10/19 10:46 AM >>>
I'm a grad student in the survey research program at UConn (Storrs campus). I'm trying to put together a paper discussing the issue of standardization of telephone survey response rate calculations in the survey research/polling industry. I gather that this has been discussed previously to some extent on this listserve. I don't mean to spark a redundant conversation, but if some of you have opinions about this subject, I would appreciate it if you would e-mail me! The things I'm interested in would include arguments for and against standardization (would standardization be a good thing? why or why not?), barriers to standardization, and actions that would need to be taken in order for standardized definitions of response rate to be used in practice and reported by research firms, the media, etc.

Thanks for your time! And by the way - what an interesting day to begin receiving AAPORnet messages ;)

Sincerely,
Rich Grousset

Graduate Assistant
The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 14:49:41 -0400
From: Stephen_Berry@marketstrategies.com
Received: from killdeer.marketstrategies.com (killdeer.marketstrategies.com [10.10.30.125])
by sharpie.marketstrategies.com (Pro-8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id OAA21068
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Oct 2000 14:39:43 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: Re: Telephone Survey Response Rate Calculation
To: aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.3 March 21, 2000
Message-ID: <OF16D5B46A.776959D4-ON8525697D.0066E107@marketstrategies.com>
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on Killdeer/MSI(Release 5.0.3 |March 21, 2000) at 10/19/2000 02:49:42 PM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Rich:

I assume you've seen the "Standard Definitions" publication from AAPOR for RDD surveys and in-person household surveys...I would argue strongly for standardization across the industry, but it's probably a pipe dream. Way too many times I've tried to compare data on methodology studies across different surveys, only to get that knowing feeling that the outcome codes were not at all in sync.

Response Rate

"Rich Grousset"
<rich@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>
Sent by: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
10/19/00 12:46 PM
Please respond to aapornet

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
cc:
Subject: Telephone Survey
Calculation

I'm a grad student in the survey research program at UConn (Storrs campus). I'm trying to put together a paper discussing the issue of standardization of telephone survey response rate calculations in the survey research/polling industry. I gather that this has been discussed previously to some extent on this listserve. I don't mean to spark a redundant conversation, but if some of you have opinions about this subject, I would appreciate it if you

would e-mail me! The things I'm interested would include arguments for and against standardization (would standardization be a good thing? why or why not?), barriers to standardization, and actions that would need to be taken in order for standardized definitions of response rate to be used in practice and reported by research firms, the media, etc.

Thanks for your time! And by the way - what an interesting day to begin receiving AAPORnet messages ;)

Sincerely,
Rich Grousset

Graduate Assistant
The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 15:13:21 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Telephone Survey Response Rate Calculation
In-Reply-To: <OF16D5B46A.776959D4-ON8525697D.0066E107@marketstrategies.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I would like to point out that there is an AAPOR statement on the reporting of response rate information. It can be found on the AAPOR web site under Ethics and Standards: http://www.aapor.org/ethics/response_rates.html It spells out the AAPOR policy and the reasons for the policy. The short version is that it requires survey organizations that want to comply with the AAPOR Code to make available on request the results of the disposition codes as defined in "Standard Definitions."
warren mitofsky

At 02:49 PM 10/19/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Rich:
>
>I assume you've seen the "Standard Definitions" publication from AAPOR for
>RDD surveys and in-person household surveys...I would argue strongly for
>standardization across the industry, but it's probably a pipe dream. Way
>too many times I've tried to compare data on methodology studies across
>different surveys, only to get that knowing feeling that the outcome codes
>were not at all in sync.
>
>
> "Rich
> Grousset"
> <rich@opinion.isi. To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 14:21:29 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Colleen King <kingx012@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Subject: RE: Job Opening
In-Reply-To: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBAEDLCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>
References: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098F5B@AS_SERVER>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Mark,

I agree with your comments. It is sad in a tight labor market to have such an exchange of words. I wonder how many qualified applicants read and said, "no thanks". All of the apologies and embarrassment can not change what was written and perceived about an organization.
Colleen King

At 06:22 PM 10/18/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Moderated lists can work, but they require a lot of time and effort on the
>part of an editor and you may lose the rapid turnaround that is a current
>feature of AAPORNET. Also, people will argue with the editor about what is
>acceptable and not, and it inevitably becomes a group discussion. Don't
>underestimate the self-policing power of the group to restrain members
>considered to be overstepping the bounds of the (mostly unwritten) group
>norms that emerge. But, accidents happen :) , and, in that case, the sender
>suffers the consequences of their private made public words while others hit
>"delete," learn, and pray to God they don't suffer the same embarrassment.
>(I confess, this was one of those "gasp!" and "smile" moments.) Cheer
>up-there was no virus attached! Mark
>
>
>
>
>

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 12:45:58 -0700
From: "#crcof" <crcof@ix.netcom.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: On a different Note: Final PAAPOR Conference Announcement
Message-ID: <01c03a05\$33ed2180\$880456d1@julie>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0028_01C039CA.878E4980"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.71.1712.3
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0028_01C039CA.878E4980
Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Make your reservations now for the upcoming:

Pacific Chapter -

American Association of Public Opinion Research Conference=20

November 30 - December 1, 2000

At the beautiful, Asilomar Conference Grounds

In Pacific Grove, California

Space is limited, so make your reservations NOW!

Conference Fee - \$ 50.00

Fee Includes: PAAPOR Membership,

Cocktails, Dinner on November 30,=20

plus Breakfast and Lunch on December 1

Short Course Fee - \$75.00

Dr. Jon Krosnick=20

on=20

Writing Better Questionnaires

November 30, 2000 from 2:00-6:00 PM

Make your room accommodations with the=20

Asilomar Conference Grounds at

(831) 642-4218

&

Send your conference fee made out to PAAPOR to:=20

Charlton Research Company

1460 Maria Lane, Suite 410

Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Attention: Lisa Luciano

If you have any questions, contact=20

Lisa Luciano at =

(925) 274-5900

-----=_NextPart_000_0028_01C039CA.878E4980

Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META content=3Dtext/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1 =
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>

<META content=3D'"MSHTML 4.71.1712.3"' name=3DGENERATOR>
</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

<DIV>

<P align=3Dcenter>Make your reservations now for the upcoming:</P>

<P align=3Dcenter></P>

<P align=3Dcenter>Pacific Chapter -</P>

<P align=3Dcenter>American Association of Public Opinion Research=20
Conference </P>

<P align=3Dcenter></P>

<P align=3Dcenter>November 30 - December 1, 2000</P>

<P align=3Dcenter>At the beautiful, Asilomar Conference Grounds</P>

<P align=3Dcenter>In Pacific Grove, California</P>

<P align=3Dcenter></P>

<P align=3Dcenter>Space is limited, so make your reservations =
NOW!</P>

<P align=3Dcenter></P>

<P align=3Dcenter>Conference Fee - \$ 50.00</P>

<P align=3Dcenter></P>

<P align=3Dcenter>Fee Includes: PAAPOR Membership,</P>

<P align=3Dcenter>Cocktails, Dinner on November 30, </P>

<P align=3Dcenter>plus Breakfast and Lunch<FONT=20

face=3DTimes> on December =
1</P><FONT=20

face=3DTimes>

<P align=3Dcenter></P>

<P align=3Dcenter> </P>

<P align=3Dcenter>Short Course Fee - \$75.00</P>

<P align=3Dcenter>Dr. Jon Krosnick </P>

<P align=3Dcenter>on </P>

<P align=3Dcenter>Writing Better Questionnaires</P>

<P align=3Dcenter>November 30, 2000 from 2:00-6:00 PM</P>

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Maybe I have missed this, but has anyone done an informative analysis of the 9-12% of the likely voters who report they are undecided? Or the larger group of voters who report they might still change their minds?

Are they primarily independents? Clustered in particular regions? Distinctive in their age, education, or economic status? Who did they vote for in 1996? Is there reason to think that they may not be likely voters at all?

Inquiring minds want to know.

-- E.P.

Eric Plutzer
Associate Professor of Political Science & Sociology
Penn State University
<http://polisci.la.psu.edu/faculty/plutzer/>

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 17:00:09 -0400
From: "Kirsten Cowal" <jkc18@columbia.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: unsubscribe me please
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0009_01C039EE.09F49F00"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0009_01C039EE.09F49F00
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Can you please unsubscribe me. Thank you.

Kirsten Cowal

-----_NextPart_000_0009_01C039EE.09F49F00
Content-Type: text/html;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">  
<HTML><HEAD>  
<META content=3D"text/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1" =  
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>  
<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.00.2614.3500" name=3DGENERATOR>
```

<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>
<DIV>Can you please unsubscribe me. =
Thank=20
you.</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>Kirsten =
Cowal</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0009_01C039EE.09F49F00--

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 14:15:18 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Fox News: Bush Moves Ahead in Electoral Count Poll
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010191407380.9024-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright 2000 Foxnews.com

http://foxnews.com/fn99/elections/101900/dome_fox_poll.sml

Fox News Thursday, October 19, 2000

Bush Moves Ahead in
Electoral Count Poll

The latest Fox News Electoral Vote Count poll puts Texas Gov. George W. Bush in the lead over Vice President Al Gore.

Bush now holds a 235 to 228 advantage over Gore, according to the poll, with 75 votes still considered "toss-ups." That represents a reversal from last week's poll, which showed Gore with a slim lead.

This week's poll has Bush with 205 "safe" electoral votes and 30 "leaning" his way. Gore polls 92 safe and 136 leaning.

The poll gives safe votes to a candidate who is comfortably ahead in state polling. Leaning votes are counted for states where a candidate's lead is slimmer.

Gore had 250 electoral votes last week that were considered safe or leaning to him, while Bush had 235. There were 53 toss-up electoral votes.

The latest numbers also show Bush shoring up his base, with North Carolina, Ohio, and Kentucky now being considered safe for the Republican

candidate.

Meanwhile, Gore's vote base has eroded, according to the poll. California, once considered a safe state for Gore, has now become a lean for Gore. And Washington, Iowa, and New Hampshire are now considered up for grabs after leaning towards Gore last week.

Less than three weeks remain until Election Day.

Popular Vote Shows Tight Race

An NBC News poll taken after the candidates' Wednesday night debate gave Bush a two-point edge over Gore, but still within the statistical margin of error. A Voter.com/Battleground poll gave Bush the same lead, but it was taken before the debate.

In the NBC poll, 44 percent of the respondents said moral and family values should be a greater priority of the next president, while only 28 percent cited maintaining economic growth and 25 percent said both. That marked a switch from a similar poll last month, when more respondents put economic growth as a priority above moral values.

The close race is also being reflected in the candidates' schedules. On Friday, Bush will campaign in New Hampshire and Maine, two states with just four electoral votes each. Pollsters project that Maine is leaning toward Gore but New Hampshire is still a tossup state.

Gore travels to Louisiana Friday, worth nine electoral votes. Though the state has long been viewed as Bush country, the visit will be Gore's second in recent weeks to the Pelican State.

The Associated Press contributed to this report

Copyright 2000 Foxnews.com

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 17:33:59 -0400
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Gore gains in new poll
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="-----5A328683EF292A895916CDA0"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.
-----5A328683EF292A895916CDA0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

More update.....

http://www.worldnetdaily.com/readerservice/printer_friendly.php3?item=http://
w

ww.worldnetdaily.com/bluesky_dougherty/20001019_xnjdo_gore_gains.shtml

-----5A328683EF292A895916CDA0

Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii;
name="20001019_xnjdo_gore_gains.shtml"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline;
filename="20001019_xnjdo_gore_gains.shtml"

Content-Base: "http://www.worldnetdaily.com/readerser
vice/printer_friendly.php3?item=htt
p://www.worldnetdaily.com/bluesky_d
ougherty/20001019_xnjdo_gore_gains.
shtml"

Content-Location: "http://www.worldnetdaily.com/readerser
vice/printer_friendly.php3?item=htt
p://www.worldnetdaily.com/bluesky_d
ougherty/20001019_xnjdo_gore_gains.
shtml"

<html>

<head>

<title>Gore gains in new poll</title>

<META HTTP-EQUIV="EXPIRES" CONTENT="0">

<META HTTP-EQUIV="Pragma" CONTENT="no-cache">

</head>

<body bgcolor="#FFFFFF">

<table border="0" cellpadding="0" cellspacing="0" align = "top">

<tr>

<td width="12%"> </td>

<td width="88%">

<p>This is
a

WorldNetDaily printer-friendly version of the article which
follows.

To view this item online, visit <a
href="http://www.worldnetdaily.com/bluesky_dougherty/20001019_xnjdo_gore_gain
s
.shtml">http://www.worldnetdaily.com/bluesky_dougherty
/20001019_xnjdo_gore_gains.shtml

</p>

<p>

Thursday, October 19, 2000</p>

<hr noshade size="1">

<p><font face="Verdana, Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif" size="-
1">ELECTION 2000

<font face="Palatino, Georgia, Times New Roman, Times, serif"

the same as they have been all week; Bush holds a two-point advantage over Gore, 42 to 40 percent, which is well within the survey's margin of error of 3.1 percent.

<p>Green Party nominee Ralph Nader received support from 5 percent and Reform Party candidate Patrick Buchanan was supported by 2 percent. Twelve percent of respondents remain undecided, analysts said.

<p>The Voter.com poll results are based on 1,000 phone responses gathered over four nights. The Voter.com Battleground poll released today is part of a series of tracking polls published each weekday until Election Day. The survey is conducted by Democratic pollster Celinda Lake of Lake, Snell, Perry & Associates and Republican pollster Ed Goeas of the Tarrance Group.

<p>"Gore continues to hold a slim lead over women, with 43 percent of women saying they would vote for the vice president and 39 percent for Bush," Voter.com analysts said. "And the Texas governor's lead among men remains steady, with 45 percent of males saying they would vote for Bush and 38 percent for the vice president."

<p>Elsewhere in Election 2000 issues, "respondents indicated a four-point edge for Democrats in the battle for control of Congress," Voter.com said.

<p>"On the 'generic ballot' question, 43 percent of the respondents said they would vote for the Democratic congressional candidate, while 39 percent said they'd support the Republican candidate," analysts found.

<p>In a Voter.com analysis <http://voter.worldnetdaily.com/home/news/article/0,1175,33-14479-,00.html> published this morning, the death earlier this week of Missouri Gov. Mel Carnahan, a two-term governor running against incumbent GOP Sen. John Ashcroft for the U.S. Senate, could harm the Democrats' chances of winning control of the Senate and even the White House.

<p>"With Missouri out of the equation, it becomes much harder to see how Democrats net the four seats (five if Gore wins, in which case Sen. Joe Lieberman, D-Conn., would be replaced by a GOPer) necessary to take control of the upper chamber," wrote Voter.com analyst Robert Schlesinger.

<p>"At the same time, Carnahan's death is a blow to Gore's efforts in Missouri," he said, because Democrats will lack the energy and enthusiasm to push for a victory.

<p><p> <hr noshade size="1" width = "16%">

<p>
<a href="http://www.worldnetdaily.com/bluesky_dougherty/20000828_xnjdo_the_new_p o

```
.shtml">
  Who is Portrait of America?</a>

<p>
  <a href="http://voter.worldnetdaily.com">
  Get complete election news coverage here</a> <BR>  </font>
  <hr noshade size="1">
  <font face="Verdana, Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif" size="1">
  To read more articles like this one, visit <a
href="http://www.worldnetdaily.com/">http://www.worldnetdaily.com/</a></font>
<br><br>

  </td>
  </tr>
  <p>
</table>
</body>
</html>
```

-----5A328683EF292A895916CDA0--

```
=====
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2000 23:01:27 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: NY Times on focus groups
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
```

The following article appeared in The New York Times today (10/19/2000).

It quotes several AAPOR members and specifically refers to the press release issued last week concerning instant polls and focus groups.

Those who believe that television news places entertainment above news values will find their worst prejudices confirmed by Stephen Capus, executive producer of "The News With Brian Williams."

The article is at <http://www.nytimes.com/2000/10/19/politics/19FOCU.html>

To Some Complaints, Focus Groups Emerge as Stars of the Fall Season

October 19, 2000
THE MEDIA
By PETER MARKS

WARREN, Mich., Oct. 18 Seventeen of those prized catches of the political season undecided voters from a swing state munched on

a buffet dinner of chicken and meatballs before the presidential debate on Tuesday as a CNN anchor and then a CNN news executive gave them their marching orders for the night.

"I'd like you to be as honest and open and candid as you can be," said the anchor, Wolf Blitzer. Lucy Spiegel, the network's vice president for weekend political programming, added: "We want your stories. We want how you feel, how you react. Just be yourselves, and that's just fine with us."

The 17 Michiganders carpenters and secretaries and homemakers from places like Pontiac and Westland and Inkster were about to make their bows as participants in the latest fad in television journalism: the on-air focus group.

Say goodbye to the man on the street. Television wants the crowd on the set.

Eager to outpace their rivals in gauging instantaneous reaction to convention speeches, campaign addresses and presidential debates, broadcast and cable news networks are gathering voters by the roomful as never before and extracting from them visceral responses to an event that has only just ended.

Newspapers do this sort of thing, too, as The New York Times did on Tuesday night with some 20 viewers in Michigan. Some have even used such panels to pick a debate winner. USA Today, for instance, assembled 10 undecided voters from the Chicago area to watch and respond on Tuesday night. (The result: most liked the vice president.) On its front page today, The Detroit News provided the second installment in its coverage of the post-debate reactions of a panel of Oakland County residents. (A dead heat.)

And it is not only group discussions that are providing instant opinion from small numbers of the electorate. Snap poll results are being reported on CBS, ABC and CNN within minutes of a debate's conclusion, and online focus groups are being used by the Fox News Channel for real-time analysis.

The incessant probing and sampling have contributed to something like a rush to judgment, some pollsters say, and the trend worries them. This week, in fact, the American Association for Public Opinion Research, an organization representing 1,500 academic, governmental and commercial pollsters, took the unusual step of publicly criticizing several news outlets for what it called mistakes and misrepresentations in the way they have used focus-group techniques.

The association's president, Murray Edelman, editorial director of the Voter News Service, which conducts exit polling on Election Day for a consortium of major networks, said the most troubling aspect of the craze surrounding focus groups was the effort to draw larger conclusions about the electorate as a whole.

"I think they're very useful tools for humanizing stories that journalists want to cover," said one polling expert, Michael Traugott, a political science professor at the University of

Michigan who has conducted focus groups for the news media. "The problem arises when a journalist makes a statement that attempts to generalize, or to say that based on these 12 people, Bush won or Gore won."

Mr. Traugott, a former president of the pollsters' association, pointed, for example, to NBC News's characterization of a focus group in Tampa, Fla., on the night of the second presidential debate as representing a fairly good cross-section of undecided voters in northern Florida.

The problem? The group consisted of six people, a number that Mr. Traugott said was representative of nothing. To which Mr. Edelman added: "It's faulty on all sorts of levels. There's no statistical basis to conclude anything."

The criticism flabbergasted some officials at NBC and its cable sister MSNBC, which conducts focus groups with the Republican pollster Frank Luntz.

"This group seems to think we're in the same business as they are," declared Stephen Capus, executive producer of "The News With Brian Williams." "I can only come to the conclusion that they feel threatened by seeing the faces and hearing the voices of real voters, and they would much rather we put people to sleep with charts and graphs."

From the video chronicle of game-show combatants on a deserted island off Malaysia to the public relations tactics of George W. Bush and Al Gore, "real people" is the mantra of the moment, and producers and editors are in businesses obsessed with trends. Their professions have also long sought better and better methods of tracking the vox populi, and with polls showing that this presidential election could be the tightest in 40 years, there is added pressure and interest in identifying and talking to voters who have yet to make up their minds.

In addition, the embrace of the focus group reflects a desire by the networks to turn the camera for a few minutes from the legions of talking heads that dominate political discourse on television. Joshua King, vice president for national affairs at Speakout.com, an opinion sampler that staged online "Rate the Debate" sessions with the Fox News Channel, says giving viewers the option of evaluating the candidates as they speak by registering responses on the Internet intensifies viewer interest in the democratic process.

What he monitors closely, Mr. King said, is how the network anchors and commentators interpret what these unscientifically self-selected focus-group participants are saying. "I watch that they say that this is not a scientific sample, that these are just the people watching the debate on Fox News, and it's only one part of the story."

Mr. Traugott and Mr. Edelman said they had no problem with the use of focus groups as long as such caveats were clearly expressed. In fact, both said that in debate analysis on Tuesday night, some networks seemed to take greater pains than before to explain to

viewers that the focus-group results bore no particular relation to the views of voters in their state or region.

Here in Warren, a blue-collar city about 45 minutes north of downtown Detroit, CNN brought together a group of voters it called "undecideds" and "persuadables," the latter being those who might be persuaded to alter their leanings. They were located for the network by the Gallup Poll, which surveyed voters in the Detroit area and asked whether they would mind if CNN contacted them. The network invited about 20 to Warren; a few did not show up.

Frank Newport, the poll's editor in chief, said focus groups, long a market research tool in industries trying to learn more about consumers' tastes, were a natural for journalism. "It's a valid place to give real feeling behind the numbers," he said. "It allows you to follow up and probe."

Mr. Blitzer, the CNN anchor, presided over the network's three post-debate focus groups, convened in highly contested states: Florida, Missouri and Michigan. At a production meeting on Tuesday afternoon in Warren, he and the focus-group segment's executive producer, Sue Bunda, talked over how to ensure that the views of the participants, who would watch the debate together on the CNN set in a historic one-room schoolhouse, were not contaminated by the assessments of television analysts.

"I don't want these people to be influenced and say, 'Oh, that Jeff Greenfield is a very smart guy,'" Mr. Blitzer said.

The decision was made to turn off the volume on the television after the debate ended and before the analysts could weigh in.

The participants, jittery at first, clutched pens and pads and took pages and pages of notes during the debate. As the cameras prepared to beam them to the nation, they fell utterly silent.

Mr. Blitzer's first on-air question was, "Tell me who you think won the debate." When the anchor mentioned Mr. Gore, 14 hands went up; 3 went up for Mr. Bush. Mr. Blitzer did not mention the count, and today Mr. Traugott, the Michigan professor, applauded the absence of any such tally on the air. Asking for a show of hands, Mr. Traugott said, was an acceptable way to stimulate discussion. The polling expert's verdict: "I'd say they were clean last night."

The participants seemed pleased, too. Adriana Valdes Vlastic, a legal-aid lawyer, said the experience had taught her a thing or two about how she might better assess candidates in the future. Perhaps through a neighborhood focus group.

"I think maybe in the future my husband and I should hold a gathering in our home," she said, "and watch the debate that way."

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 10:44:00 -0400
From: "Armsby, Polly P." <armsby@rti.org>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Presidential campaign strategy
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I am on a email list for a presidential campaign. Here is an excerpt from a message I received prior to Tuesday's debate.

"... Tonight is the third and final Presidential debate. We hope you'll be watching.

"During and after the debate -- and in the coming weeks -- please go online to some of the sites that are focusing on the election. ...

"During and after the debate tonight, turn on your computer and : ...

"Vote in online polls. Internet polls -- no matter how unscientific -- can influence viewers' perceptions of the debate. News organizations often mention their online poll results when they analyze the debates..."

They then listed about seven web sites with so-called polls.

While I know this is not a new topic or a new problem, I think the last two statements are indicative of the problems our industry faces and the misuse (and abuse?) of polls. Statements like these only reinforce misconceptions that polls and surveys are unscientific tools used to manipulate public opinion. Doesn't our association bear a greater responsibility in denouncing the use of completely unscientific polls? I have never worked on a political poll and am no expert on the subject, but I do pay close attention to media coverage of them. Despite recent AAPOR and NCPP press releases on the subject, I *very* rarely hear or see any coverage on the major networks criticizing this growing trend. Clearly our statements on this topic have not been loud enough.

Just wondering if anyone else feels the same,

Polly P. Armsby
Survey Research Division
Research Triangle Institute
3040 Cornwallis Rd.
P.O. Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194
(919) 485-2616

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 09:55:26 -0500
From: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])
by genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA03316
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Oct 2000 09:57:48 -0500
Received: from ccMail by norcmail.uchicago.edu (ccMail Link to SMTP
R8.30.00.7)
id AA972054031; Fri, 20 Oct 2000 10:00:31 -0500
Message-Id: <0010209720.AA972054031@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.30.00.7

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Presidential campaign strategy
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

These Internet abuses are only the latest in a long line of attempts to manipulate so-called polls. In the 1940s the Taft campaign found out the schedule of the newspaper straw poll that traveled the state and set up straw voting boxes in one town after another. The Taft campaign staged rallies in each town just before the straw poll arrived and encouraged supporters to cast both real and straw votes for Taft.

Reply Separator

Subject: Presidential campaign strategy
Author: <aapornet@usc.edu> at INTERNET
Date: 10/20/00 10:44 AM

I am on a email list for a presidential campaign. Here is an excerpt from a message I received prior to Tuesday's debate.

"... Tonight is the third and final Presidential debate. We hope you'll be watching.

"During and after the debate -- and in the coming weeks -- please go online to some of the sites that are focusing on the election. ...

"During and after the debate tonight, turn on your computer and : ...

"Vote in online polls. Internet polls -- no matter how unscientific -- can influence viewers' perceptions of the debate. News organizations often mention their online poll results when they analyze the debates..."

They then listed about seven web sites with so-called polls.

While I know this is not a new topic or a new problem, I think the last two statements are indicative of the problems our industry faces and the misuse (and abuse?) of polls. Statements like these only reinforce misconceptions that polls and surveys are unscientific tools used to manipulate public opinion. Doesn't our association bear a greater responsibility in denouncing the use of completely unscientific polls? I have never worked on a political poll and am no expert on the subject, but I do pay close attention to media coverage of them. Despite recent AAPOR and NCPP press releases on the subject, I *very* rarely hear or see any coverage on the major networks criticizing this growing trend. Clearly our statements on this topic have not been loud enough.

Just wondering if anyone else feels the same,

Polly P. Armsby
Survey Research Division
Research Triangle Institute

3040 Cornwallis Rd.
P.O. Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194
(919) 485-2616

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 10:53:37 -0400
From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <8525697E.0051D072.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
Subject: Re: Presidential campaign strategy
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

I too have received such an e-mail from a presidential campaign. They claim to know the "other side" is swamping these internet polls and ask you to do the same.

Unfortunatelly, political types exempt themselves from reasonable behavior at this time of year, so while AAPOR should take a stand, I don't know who will notice.

As it is, AAPOR's much needed statements on the way polls and focus groups have been misued in the campaign have had only modest effect and won't stop the behavior as long as ratings or money are involved. With the election as tight as it is, the media and the campaigns will use whatever tool they can to get the edge.

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 10:57:16 -0400
From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <8525697E.005225FE.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
Subject: New York Senate Race
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

Can anyone point me to the latest public polls on the New York Senate Race?

Bill Thompson
Senior Account Manager
Directions Research, Inc.

401 East Court Street, Suite 200
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
513-651-2990

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 10:59:25 -0500
Subject: Re: New York Senate Race
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Jeff Gulati" <ggulati@wellesley.edu>
References: <8525697E.005225FE.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
In-Reply-To: <8525697E.005225FE.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

To see the results of the latest Zogby poll:

<http://www.nypostonline.com/news/13928.htm>

Jeff

Jeff Gulati
Assistant Professor
Wellesley College
Dept. of Political Science

106 Central Street
Wellesley, MA 02481-8203
781-283-2209
http://www.wellesley.edu/Polisci/Faculty/faculty_staff.html#JG
ggulati@Wellesley.edu

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 10:57:20 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: tsilver@capaccess.org, sschier@carleton.edu, 75227.173@compuserve.com,
reide@email.usps.gov, djleary@iname.com, bhanley@ktca.org,
Subject: Minnesota Poll presidential results

Friends...

For those of you who keep up with Minnesota politics, you may be interested in the results of the latest Minnesota Poll, which shows Bush with 44%, Gore with 41%, and Ralph Nader with 8% support in the presidential race. Point your web browser to startribune.com/poll

Obviously, if you aren't interested, please excuse the intrusion.

Best wishes...

Rob

Robert P. Daves

v: 612.673-7278

Director of Strategic & News Research f: 612.673-4359
Star Tribune e:
daves@startribune.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 11:13:11 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Presidential campaign strategy
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 JAA18766

Long before 1940, parties were trying to manipulate polls. In Chicago during the 1900 presidential race between Bryan and McKinley, the Democrats advised the party faithful to not return the Chicago Record's postcard poll, which had been extremely accurate in the prior election. Now that e-technology has given news and political organizations easy access to unscientific straw polls it seems like a return to yesteryear, eh?

Rob

Robert P. Daves v: 612.673-7278
Director of Strategic & News Research f: 612.673-4359
Star Tribune e:
daves@startribune.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 12:19:38 -0400
From: Michael Massagli <mikemassagli@mediaone.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en]C-MOEATL (Win98; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Presidential campaign strategy
References: <89FDB122A0E0D2118D2E0090273FA8C504366C41@rtints26.rti.org>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Interesting observations...and I think the responses so far are typical ... "it's always been a problem...","...."no matter what we do or say, nothing will change..." in many ways the association is as apathetic as the electorate...in the face of blatant challenges to democracy and to scientific principles, we will just roll-over and continue to live off the money spent on polling and the money spent on our expert opinion criticizing the pollsters.

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 09:44:29 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: At last--a savior! Salvation is at hand!
In-Reply-To: <39F0709A.D1B16955@mediaone.net>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010200927070.24987-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Michael,

And your own suggestions for ending our collective apathy, getting us all up off our backs, and addressing the centuries-old problems associated with free elections in large nation states would be.....?

I'm confident that I speak for many in saying that we await your response, our apathetic faces now impatiently pressed to our screens, longing for your solutions to what you term the "blatant challenges to democracy and to scientific principles."

Me, I'm rolled back over, up on my feet once again, and ready to follow-- just show me the way!

-- Jim

On Fri, 20 Oct 2000, Michael Massagli wrote:

> Interesting observations...and I think the responses so far are typical
> ... "it's always been a problem...",...."no matter what we do or say,
> nothing will change..." in many ways the association is as apathetic
> as the electorate...in the face of blatant challenges to democracy and
> to scientific principles, we will just roll-over and continue to live
> off the money spent on polling and the money spent on our expert opinion
> criticizing the pollsters.

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 12:51:23 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)
From: tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu
Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa03558;
20 Oct 2000 12:48 EDT
Received: from gj9k20b.Virginia.EDU (bootp-55-134.bootp.Virginia.EDU
[128.143.55.134])
by tetra.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id MAA01412
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 20 Oct 2000 12:48:36 -0400 (EDT)
To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Presidential campaign strategy
In-Reply-To: <39F0709A.D1B16955@mediaone.net>
Message-ID: <SIMEON.10010201223.K@gj9k20b.config.mail.virginia.edu>
X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.4 Build (40)

as the electorate...in the face of blatant challenges to democracy and to scientific principles, we will just roll-over and continue to live off the money spent on polling and the money spent on our expert opinion criticizing the pollsters.

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 10:16:31 -0500
From: "Stephen M. Johnson" <johnsons@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: patient satisfaction
X-Sender: johnsons@oregon.uoregon.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3.0.6.32.20001020101631.01259510@oregon.uoregon.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Does anyone know of an instrument for measuring patient satisfaction with a surgical procedure? I am looking for something to use with patients where two different forms of anesthesia are used,
Thanks in advance
Steve Johnson
Oregon Survey Research Laboratory

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 13:31:06 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@afb.net>
Subject: Re: patient satisfaction
In-Reply-To: <3.0.6.32.20001020101631.01259510@oregon.uoregon.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Well, that seems too invasive a technique for most survey researchers -- never heard of using surgical instruments to assess opinions before! However, if the patients are under anesthesia, that may be the only way to get the information.

[Sorry folks -- couldn't resist. I hope a little humor does not fall outside the norms of this list.]

On a more serious note, you might check through the Agency for Healthcare Quality and Research (the U.S. agency that is part of Dept of Health & Human Services) because it has supported a series of projects measuring patient outcomes from various surgical procedures, and I believe has included satisfaction measures as part of the outcome measurement. The only specific area I know about is for cataract surgery, but there have been others.

Best, Corinne

At 10:16 AM 10/20/2000 -0500, you wrote:
>Does anyone know of an instrument for measuring patient satisfaction with a
>surgical procedure? I am looking for something to use with patients where
>two different forms of anesthesia are used,
>Thanks in advance
>Steve Johnson

>Oregon Survey Research Laboratory

Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.
Director of Policy Research & Program
Evaluation
American Foundation for the Blind

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 10:55:03 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Minnesota Poll presidential results
In-Reply-To: <s9f0252d.099@mail.startribune.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010201032100.4468-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Minnesota is currently one of CNN.com's 15 "tossup states," with a total of 158 electoral votes (MN has 10). The 15 states are:

AR	MO	PA
FL	NH	TN
IA	NM	WA
MI	NV	WI
MN	OR	WV

Clinton took Minnesota in both '92 and '96. Bush Sr. beat Dukakis there by only 53% to 46% in '88. Bush W. got only 63% in the Republic primary this year, compared to 20% for Keyes and 17% for McCain. Gore topped Bradley in Minnesota by 74% to 14%.

Based on all of the above, I conclude that if Rob Daves's polling is sound (which I doubt anyone could doubt), Gore must be considered as in serious danger of losing this election. I think, based on the best hard data we have at this moment, that we'd have to bet on Bush to defeat Gore--at least by electoral votes (all that counts), and at least given even odds. The election would still be close, however, which I think few now doubt.

But two-and-a-half weeks remain before the election--in politics just a few seconds short of an eternity.....

-- Jim

On Fri, 20 Oct 2000, Rob Daves wrote:

> Friends...

>

> For those of you who keep up with Minnesota politics, you may be
> interested in the results of the latest Minnesota Poll, which shows
> Bush with 44%, Gore with 41%, and Ralph Nader with 8% support in the

> presidential race. Point your web browser to startribune.com/poll
>
> Obviously, if you aren't interested, please excuse the intrusion.
>
> Best wishes...
>
> Rob
>
>
> Robert P. Daves v: 612.673-7278
> Director of Strategic & News Research f: 612.673-4359
> Star Tribune e:
> daves@startribune.com
> 425 Portland Av. S.
> Minneapolis MN USA 55488
>
>

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 14:04:13 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: The Empty Center of Campaign 2000
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_15504066==_ALT"

-----_15504066==_ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

An interesting analysis of election poll results to date by Andy Kohut in=20
today's NY Times, op-ed page.

Dick Halpern

The Empty Center of Campaign=20
2000

By ANDREW KOHUT

WASHINGTON -- If you are expecting to soon find out what=
the
election will turn on now that the debates are over,=20
you're going to
be disappointed. In fact, you may be puzzled about the whys of=
the
outcome even after we know the winner of campaign 2000.

This is a very different kind of election. Not only is it a=20
close race, but it's
one of the few elections in which the lead has gone back and=20
forth. The
presidential contests in 1960, 1968 and 1976 were all tight in=20
the end, but
they were not seesaw races. There were changes in the leader=20

over the course of the 1980 campaign, but ultimately this was not a close=20 election, and the message voters were sending was clear.

Campaign 2000 is a difficult one for voters because this=20 election is not about anything very much, even though we want it to be about=20 something. Consider what the voters face. There are no overarching issues.= Yes, people are concerned with health care, education, Social= Security, Medicare and other issues, but they feel far less urgency than=20 in past elections, when big foreign threats loomed or the economy was=20 less robust. And the failure of health- care reform in 1994 and the Gingrich=20 revolution in 1995 have soured the public's appetite for big changes from=20 Washington.

Voters generally judge this year's candidates favorably =97 in=20 fact, they give the field a better rating than they did in 1992 and 1996. But=20 there is not a lot of strong feeling one way or the other about Al Gore versus=20 George W. Bush. Neither man has been more able than the other to make a compelling case for his candidacy. Add to this the fact that the=20 central question of most elections is not being raised. Voters are not=20 being offered a referendum on the administration in power; that question is= being sidestepped by both camps. President Clinton's name was hardly mentioned in the third presidential debate.

No wonder as many as one in four voters still might change their=20 minds, and many could sit out the election altogether. Ordinary=20 Americans have nothing to hold onto this year unless they are partisan or=20 ideological. That is why all of the groups without strong political leanings have=20 been, and continue to be, on the fence. Independents, middle-income voters, suburbanites, white Catholics and other swing groups have been=20 evenly divided or just leaning one way or the other since the end of=20 the primaries last spring.

The swing groups are likely to have a variety of reasons for=20
coming to their
final decisions. Some strongly favor Mr. Gore on health care and=
=20
other
high-anxiety issues, but have trouble with his personality.=20
Others think Mr.
Bush might provide a refreshing change in tone in Washington,=20
but worry
about his qualifications and some of his positions on issues.

While the choices that different groups of swing voters make=20
won't be
based on whim, they might be highly idiosyncratic and may not=20
provide the
tight thematic narrative that analysts look for. That probably=20
won't slow
down the pundits. These days the meanings of elections are often
overread, if not misread, in a rush to blather. (Think about the=
=20
hard time
today's pundits might have had in 1960: Was Kennedy's win about=
=20
Quemoy
and Matsu or the missile gap =97 or was the election a personal=
=20
showdown
between Kennedy's style and Nixon's downbeat persona?)

There is a striking disconnect here. With Supreme Court=20
nominations on
the line, and control of Congress as well as the White House up=
=20
for grabs,
voters could be remaking Washington this Election Day. But if=
that
happens, they will have ambled in the new direction, rather than=
=20
striding
there purposefully.

Andrew Kohut is director of the Pew Research Center for People=
and
the Press.

Copyright NY Times Oct 20, 2000

-----_15504066==_.ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<html>
An interesting analysis of election poll results to date by Andy Kohut in
today's NY Times, op-ed page.

Minnesota is currently one of CNN.com's 15 "tossup states," with a total of 158 electoral votes (MN has 10). The 15 states are:

AR	MO	PA
FL	NH	TN
IA	NM	WA
MI	NV	WI
MN	OR	WV

Clinton took Minnesota in both '92 and '96. Bush Sr. beat Dukakis there by only 53% to 46% in '88. Bush W. got only 63% in the Republic primary this year, compared to 20% for Keyes and 17% for McCain. Gore topped Bradley in Minnesota by 74% to 14%.

Based on all of the above, I conclude that if Rob Daves's polling is sound (which I doubt anyone could doubt), Gore must be considered as in serious danger of losing this election. I think, based on the best hard data we have at this moment, that we'd have to bet on Bush to defeat Gore--at least by electoral votes (all that counts), and at least given even odds. The election would still be close, however, which I think few now doubt.

But two-and-a-half weeks remain before the election--in politics just a few seconds short of an eternity.....

-- Jim

On Fri, 20 Oct 2000, Rob Daves wrote:

> Friends...

>

> For those of you who keep up with Minnesota politics, you may be
> interested in the results of the latest Minnesota Poll, which shows
> Bush with 44%, Gore with 41%, and Ralph Nader with 8% support in the
> presidential race. Point your web browser to startribune.com/poll

>

> Obviously, if you aren't interested, please excuse the intrusion.

>

> Best wishes...

>

> Rob

>

>

> Robert P. Daves v: 612.673-7278

> Director of Strategic & News Research f: 612.673-4359

> Star Tribune e:

> daves@startribune.com

> 425 Portland Av. S.

> Minneapolis MN USA 55488

>

>

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 11:30:40 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Linda Bourque <lbourque@ucla.edu>
Subject: Re: patient satisfaction
In-Reply-To: <4.2.2.20001020132551.00a74ba0@popub.afb.net>
References: <3.0.6.32.20001020101631.01259510@oregon.uoregon.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Enough of Corinne!!

Do a MEDLARS search. Look in the journals Medical Care, Quality of Life Research, Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers, Psychological Assessment, etc.

Look for measures originally developed at Rand under the authorship of John Ware, Allyson Stewart, Bob Brook, Ronald Hays, Sheldon Greenfield, Sherrie Kaplan, Sandy Berry and others.

Linda Bourque

At 01:31 PM 10/20/00 -0400, you wrote:

>Well, that seems too invasive a technique for most survey researchers --
>never heard of using surgical instruments to assess opinions before!
>However, if the patients are under anesthesia, that may be the only way to
>get the information.

>

>[Sorry folks -- couldn't resist. I hope a little humor does not fall
>outside the norms of this list.]

>

>On a more serious note, you might check through the Agency for Healthcare
>Quality and Research (the U.S. agency that is part of Dept of Health &
>Human Services) because it has supported a series of projects measuring
>patient outcomes from various surgical procedures, and I believe has
>included satisfaction measures as part of the outcome measurement. The only
>specific area I know about is for cataract surgery, but there have been
others.

>

>Best, Corinne

>

>At 10:16 AM 10/20/2000 -0500, you wrote:

>>Does anyone know of an instrument for measuring patient satisfaction with a
>>surgical procedure? I am looking for something to use with patients where
>>two different forms of anesthesia are used,
>>Thanks in advance

>>Steve Johnson

>>Oregon Survey Research Laboratory

>

>Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.

>Director of Policy Research & Program

> Evaluation

>American Foundation for the Blind

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 14:39:26 -0400
From: "Colleen K. Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
Reply-To: cporter@hp.ufl.edu
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: At last--a savior! Salvation is at hand!
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010200927070.24987-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Lest we forget, I'd just like to point out that, despite the high volume of election-related stuff on AAPORNET recently, a lot of AAPORITES are **not** political pollsters. A lot of us do program evaluation or demographic work, and may not even feel qualified to give an "expert" opinion on political polls.

Please don't paint us all with a broad brush.

Colleen K. Porter

=====
Date: 20 Oct 2000 14:46:24 -0400
Message-ID: <-1240069315j_stanford@osba-ohio.org>
Sender: John Stanford <j_stanford@osba-ohio.org>
From: John Stanford <j_stanford@osba-ohio.org>
Subject: Re: The Empty Center of Campaign 2000
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
X-Mailer: QuickMail Pro 2.0.4 (Mac)
X-Priority: 3
MIME-Version: 1.0
Reply-To: John Stanford <j_stanford@osba-ohio.org>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id LAA11460

What is the web address for the article on why the instant polls fluctuate? The authors explained the fluctuation by pointing out the samples were biased toward one party or the other.

On Friday, October 20, 2000, dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com> wrote:
> An interesting analysis of election poll results to date by
> Andy Kohut in today's NY Times, op-ed page.
>
> Dick Halpern
>
> The Empty Center of Campaign 2000
>
> By ANDREW KOHUT
>
> WASHINGTON -- If you are expecting to soon find out what the

> election will turn on now that the debates are over, you're
going to
> be disappointed. In fact, you may be puzzled about the whys of the
> outcome even after we know the winner of campaign
>2000.
>
> This is a very different kind of election. Not only is it a close
race, but it's
> one of the few elections in which the lead has gone back and
forth.
The
> presidential contests in 1960, 1968 and 1976 were all tight in the
end, but
> they were not seesaw races. There were changes in the leader over
the
> course of the 1980 campaign, but ultimately this was not a close
election,
> and the message voters were sending was clear.
>
> Campaign 2000 is a difficult one for voters because this election
is not
> about anything very much, even though we want it to be about
something.
> Consider what the voters face. There are no overarching issues.
Yes,
> people are concerned with health care, education, Social Security,
> Medicare and other issues, but they feel far less urgency than in
past
> elections, when big foreign threats loomed or the economy was less
robust.
> And the failure of health- care reform in 1994 and the Gingrich
revolution
> in 1995 have soured the public's appetite for big
>changes from Washington.
>
> Voters generally judge this year's candidates favorably - in fact,
they give
> the field a better rating than they did in 1992 and 1996. But
there
is not a
> lot of strong feeling one way or the other about Al Gore versus
George W.
> Bush. Neither man has been more able than the other to make a
> compelling case for his candidacy. Add to this the fact that the
central
> question of most elections is not being raised. Voters are not
being offered
> a referendum on the administration in power; that question is
being
> sidestepped by both camps. President Clinton's name was hardly
> mentioned in the third presidential debate.
>
> No wonder as many as one in four voters still might change their
minds,
> and many could sit out the election altogether. Ordinary Americans
have
> nothing to hold onto this year unless they are partisan or

ideological. That is
> why all of the groups without strong political leanings have been,
and
> continue to be, on the fence. Independents, middle-income voters,
> suburbanites, white Catholics and other swing groups have been
evenly
> divided or just leaning one way or the other since the end of the
primaries
> last spring.
>
> The swing groups are likely to have a variety of reasons for
coming
to their
> final decisions. Some strongly favor Mr. Gore on health care and
other
> high-anxiety issues, but have trouble with his personality. Others
think Mr.
> Bush might provide a refreshing change in tone in Washington, but
worry
> about his qualifications and some of his positions on
>issues.
>
> While the choices that different groups of swing voters make won't
be
> based on whim, they might be highly idiosyncratic and may not
provide the
> tight thematic narrative that analysts look for. That probably
won't slow
> down the pundits. These days the meanings of elections are often
> overread, if not misread, in a rush to blather. (Think about the
hard time
> today's pundits might have had in 1960: Was Kennedy's win about
Quemoy
> and Matsu or the missile gap - or was the election a personal
showdown
> between Kennedy's style and Nixon's downbeat
>persona?)
>
> There is a striking disconnect here. With Supreme Court
nominations
on
> the line, and control of Congress as well as the White House up
for
grabs,
> voters could be remaking Washington this Election Day. But if that
> happens, they will have ambled in the new direction, rather than
striding
> there purposefully.
>
> Andrew Kohut is director of the Pew Research Center for People and
> the Press.
>
> Copyright NY Times Oct 20, 2000
>
>

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 15:19:00 -0400
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@udel.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: At last--a savior! Salvation is at hand!
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

In a way the problems with election polls and the media are just a subset of the more general problem of the press using or misusing statistical information. We routinely react to all sorts of inaccuracies by sending e-mail to the reporters and the editors of our local media. After a while they do get the message and call before they draw some outrageous conclusion from data they have received. Evidence of this is the front page-top line story "Caution: Questionable Polls Ahead" with a sub-head "Savvy voters should learn which methods do (and don't) work". It is possible to have an impact locally even if its difficult to do nationally.

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

From: Colleen K. Porter [mailto:cporter@hp.ufl.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2000 2:39 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: At last--a savior! Salvation is at hand!

Lest we forget, I'd just like to point out that, despite the high volume of election-related stuff on AAPORNET recently, a lot of AAPORITES are **not** political pollsters. A lot of us do program evaluation or demographic work, and may not even feel qualified to give an "expert" opinion on political polls.

Please don't paint us all with a broad brush.

Colleen K. Porter

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 15:26:31 -0400
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Minnesota Poll presidential results
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBAEFDCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010201032100.4468-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Is Nader inadvertently "assisting" Bush, or ? Mark Richards

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of James Beniger
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2000 1:55 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Minnesota Poll presidential results

Minnesota is currently one of CNN.com's 15 "tossup states," with a total of 158 electoral votes (MN has 10). The 15 states are:

AR	MO	PA
FL	NH	TN
IA	NM	WA
MI	NV	WI
MN	OR	WV

Clinton took Minnesota in both '92 and '96. Bush Sr. beat Dukakis there by only 53% to 46% in '88. Bush W. got only 63% in the Republic primary this year, compared to 20% for Keyes and 17% for McCain. Gore topped Bradley in Minnesota by 74% to 14%.

Based on all of the above, I conclude that if Rob Daves's polling is sound (which I doubt anyone could doubt), Gore must be considered as in serious danger of losing this election. I think, based on the best hard data we have at this moment, that we'd have to bet on Bush to defeat Gore--at least by electoral votes (all that counts), and at least given even odds. The election would still be close, however, which I think few now doubt.

But two-and-a-half weeks remain before the election--in politics just a few seconds short of an eternity.....

-- Jim

On Fri, 20 Oct 2000, Rob Daves wrote:

> Friends...
>
> For those of you who keep up with Minnesota politics, you may be
> interested in the results of the latest Minnesota Poll, which shows
> Bush with 44%, Gore with 41%, and Ralph Nader with 8% support in the
> presidential race. Point your web browser to startribune.com/poll
>
> Obviously, if you aren't interested, please excuse the intrusion.
>
> Best wishes...
>
> Rob
>
>
> Robert P. Daves

v: 612.673-7278

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 15:04:06 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The Focus Group Enters Pop Culture as a Stock Joke
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010201453360.4723-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Not only have we not seen the end of this, we have not yet even begun to see the beginning of the end of this, I'm afraid.....

-- Jim

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

www.nytimes.com/2000/10/20/opinion/20SEEL.html

October 20, 2000

THAT CURVE BALL WAS JUST SPIN

By FRANK CAMMUSO AND HART SEELY

And there you have it: Game One of the World Series. I'm Bob Costas, and with me is our analyst Joe Morgan. Joe, who won?"

"It certainly wasn't the fans. I saw a boring game. Neither team looked championesque. But no major gaffes. Obviously, both clubs were heavily coached, but this gave fans a chance to see them without the so-called media filter. Also, coming into this game, the Mets' expectations were a bit lower, so no matter how the game is scored, this is a victory for them."

"Thanks, Joe. We go now to Michigan, a key battleground state, where our group of 12 undecided fans is standing by with Skip Carey. Skip?"

"Yes, Bob, I'm here in the Wayne State University student union in Detroit with our undecided fans. As you may know, no Yankee team has ever taken the World Series without doing well in Michigan, so the opinions of those here tonight are important. O.K., did any of you see a clear winner tonight? Randy! Randy Carter, the

37-year-old carpenter?"

"Yes. Both teams hit hard in the first two innings, but I saw the Yankees as stronger on defense, so I put them ahead on my scorecard."

"I can see Marsha Ellis, registered nurse and single mother of three, shaking her head. She's a lifelong American League fan who's thinking of switching. Marsha?"

"I didn't like the bean balls. I'm tired of all the personal attacks. Also, I don't see why the Yankees must adjust their clothing on national TV. On that note, the Mets won."

"There you have it, a split on the winner. Back to you, Bob."

"Thanks, Skip. We now have the results of our instant poll, and it's too close to call. Of 373 registered fans nationwide, 37 percent said the Mets won and 36 percent said the Yankees, a difference that falls outside the 17 percent margin of error. Nevertheless, a key here is the 15 percent undecided group. Joe Morgan?"

"Well, Bob, a breakout of the numbers shows women more likely to think the Mets were victorious, but fans between 18 and 25 more inclined to pick the Yankees. The Mets scored well among the elderly, military veterans and those who oppose the designated hitter."

"We'll take a short break. Coming up after these messages, our World Series coverage continues when Jim Gray's Truth Squad studies, 'Were the pitches really strikes?' "

Frank Cammuso and Hart Seely are authors of
"2007-Eleven."

www.nytimes.com/2000/10/20/opinion/20SEEL.html

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 17:15:34 +0000
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Minnesota Poll presidential results
References: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBAEFDCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Some of these are states where Nader is doing well. In Minnesota he is at 8% - up from 3% in August (see poll story). Gore is down by 3.

Perot drew evenly from both candidates in 1992 according to exit polls. This year even though the 3rd party candidate will not do as well, because of the tight race in many states and because he is having more of an effect on a single candidate, he could make the difference.

Nick

Mark David Richards wrote:

> Is Nader inadvertently "assisting" Bush, or ? Mark Richards
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of
> James Beniger
> Sent: Friday, October 20, 2000 1:55 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Minnesota Poll presidential results
>
> Minnesota is currently one of CNN.com's 15 "tossup states," with a total
> of 158 electoral votes (MN has 10). The 15 states are:
>
> AR MO PA
> FL NH TN
> IA NM WA
> MI NV WI
> MN OR WV
>
> Clinton took Minnesota in both '92 and '96. Bush Sr. beat Dukakis there
> by only 53% to 46% in '88. Bush W. got only 63% in the Republic primary
> this year, compared to 20% for Keyes and 17% for McCain. Gore topped
> Bradley in Minnesota by 74% to 14%.
>
> Based on all of the above, I conclude that if Rob Daves's polling is
> sound (which I doubt anyone could doubt), Gore must be considered as in
> serious danger of losing this election. I think, based on the best
> hard data we have at this moment, that we'd have to bet on Bush to defeat
> Gore--at least by electoral votes (all that counts), and at least given
> even odds. The election would still be close, however, which I think few
> now doubt.
>
> But two-and-a-half weeks remain before the election--in politics just a
> few seconds short of an eternity.....
>

-- Jim

>
>
> *****
>
> On Fri, 20 Oct 2000, Rob Daves wrote:
>
> > Friends...
> >
> > For those of you who keep up with Minnesota politics, you may be
> > interested in the results of the latest Minnesota Poll, which shows
> > Bush with 44%, Gore with 41%, and Ralph Nader with 8% support in the
> > presidential race. Point your web browser to startribune.com/poll
> >
> > Obviously, if you aren't interested, please excuse the intrusion.
> >
> > Best wishes...
> >
> > Rob
> >
> >
> > Robert P. Daves v: 612.673-7278
> > Director of Strategic & News Research f: 612.673-4359
> > Star Tribune e:
> > daves@startribune.com
> > 425 Portland Av. S.
> > Minneapolis MN USA 55488
> >
> >

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 17:36:03 -0500
From: Frank_Newport@gallup.com
Received: by gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <V18R04HL>; Fri, 20 Oct 2000 17:36:15 -0500
Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90010B0BE1@EXCHNG3>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Likely Voters
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

October 20, 2000

To: Aapornet
From: Frank Newport, The Gallup Poll

There has been interest and discussion this year about the use of likely voter models in the CNN/USA Today/Gallup trial heat election ballots.

David Moore explained Gallup's procedures in a recent e-mail to Aapornet.

I would like to point the attention to Aapornet readers to Lydia Saad's AAPOR paper:

"An Historical Analysis: Presidential Candidate Preferences According to Likelihood to Vote - The Gallup Poll, 1952-1996" presented at AAPOR's annual meeting in Norfolk, Virginia in May, 1997.

We invite those AAPOR members who are interested in learning more about Gallup's likely voter model and its use this year to read through this historical overview. We can arrange to send it to those interested upon request.

As Lydia points out in the paper, the definition of likely voters using Gallup's current method has improved the accuracy of the final survey in several key elections over the years. It has generally never decreased the accuracy of Gallup's last estimate.

But, the difference between all registered voters and likely voters varies from election to election.

In particular, in 1996, 1980 and 1952, there were particularly large differences between the vote preferences of the most likely to vote group and those who were scored less likely to vote. In other elections, such as 1988 and 1984, the differences between the less likely and more likely voter groups were much smaller.

For example, the final Gallup data from 1996 (Nov 3-4) show the following:

Registered voters: Clinton 50%, Dole 34%
Likely voters (using the same cutoff model being used now): Clinton 48%,
Dole 40%

There are only a relative few elections from which to generalize, but the differences between registered voters and likely voters appear to be largest in elections in which the sitting president is from the Democratic Party.

This year we are finding some variability in the Registered Voter to Likely Voter differences. But at times, particularly like the current point, immediately after a debate, the difference between likely voters and registered voters is larger -- with the likely voter electorate showing a substantially larger Bush over Gore margin than registered voters.

This could change as Election Day approaches. But, it is possible that this may be a similar election to 1996 or 1980 in which the "most likely to vote" category skews significantly towards the Republican side of the ledger.

Please also see: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/faq/faq.asp> and
<http://www.gallup.com/poll/fromthead/ed0010.asp>

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 17:42:52 -0500
From: Frank_Newport@gallup.com
Received: by gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <V18R0420>; Fri, 20 Oct 2000 17:42:56 -0500
Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90010B0BE2@EXCHNG3>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Informational Update on Presidential Race Tracking Data
MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

October 20, 2000

To: Aapornet
From: Gallup Poll Editors, Princeton

An analysis of CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll tracking data from September 4th to October 18 indicates that Republican nominee George W. Bush has improved his position vis a vis Democratic nominee Al Gore in the period of time since October 4th (the day after the first debate) compared to the weeks before the first debate.

The data below show the average percent of the vote for both Bush and Gore over the 30 days between September 4 to October 3rd, and the percent of the vote for both candidates over the 15 days from October 4th to October 18. All figures are computed based on likely voters.

September 4-October 3

Gore 47%
Bush 44%

October 4-October 18

Gore 43%
Bush 47%

Gore's average percent of the vote was 47% in the 30 days before the debates (including the night of October 3), and has been 43% in the 15 days since. Bush's percent of the vote went from 44% to 47% over the same period of time.

Gore's current 40% of the vote is roughly where he was in the period of time immediately after the first debate. Bush's current 50% is slightly higher than that same period of time. Gore recovered some before the second debate, and Bush fell back slightly, but Bush gained again after the second debate (and after falling back slightly, Bush has gained again after the third debate.)

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 16:07:10 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Marketplace (Public Radio) Does the Business of Polling
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010201555540.10939-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

This is the complete transcript of the Marketplace program, "The Business of Polling," mentioned here on AAPORNET earlier this week by Jan Werner. I post this for those who prefer text to audio. The transcript features a number of persons well known within AAPOR, and includes the names of people infamous within AAPOR.

-- Jim

Copyright 2000 Minnesota Public Radio--MARKETPLACE

October 18, 2000, Wednesday

MARKETPLACE (6:30 PM ET)

BUSINESS OF POLLING

DAVID BRANCACCIO, ANCHOR

STEPHEN HENN, REPORTER

DAVID BRANCACCIO, anchor:

This is MARKETPLACE. I'm David Brancaccio.

If you caught the presidential debate last night, you were, no doubt, treated to a poll or two and then woke up to new polls this morning. For political pundits, gauging the opinions of the electorate is as much an art as a sport. And this year, surveys say the horse race for the White House is a dead heat. But like any good horse race, there is money at stake, including the millions of dollars spent on tallying what people think about the candidates. We asked MARKETPLACE's Stephen Henn to survey the business of polling.

STEPHEN HENN reporting:

Bill McInturff, a GOP pollster, says his business is a lot more complicated than holding out a windsock to figure out which way the political breeze is blowing.

Mr. BILL McINTURFF (Pollster): What I say to our clients is, 'Look, we do combat message development.'

HENN: By reshaping the way an argument's structured and testing the results with polls, candidates can avoid flailing in the wind. McInturff says if they're lucky, they can even change which way the political breeze is blowing. Andrew Kohut at the Pew Research Center for People and the Press agrees. Polls are powerful stuff but he wonders about the way some media outlets are using them.

Mr. ANDREW KOHUT (Pew Research Center): MSNBC has been using Frank Luntz and Luntz is a Republican pollster, and I would be happier if they used Luntz along with some Democrats than just Frank Luntz.

HENN: Frank Luntz's polls helped shape the Contract for America. And he recently worked for Rudolph Giuliani. But MSNBC doesn't identify him that way.

Mr. KOHUT: You know, I'm not picking on Luntz but the concerns of any (unintelligible) is that a partisan pollster has a--has a--has a client list and is an inherent--potential conflict of interest. What's--what's his--what's his or her task, to report public opinion in a fair and objective way or to advance the interests of his party or his candidates? And how--how can we be s--ever sure which--which agenda is being served?

Unidentified Man: Which candidate do you think is more likeable? Of the 36 people behind me, all undecided, 30 chose Bush and only six chose Al Gore.

HENN: Luntz isn't the only pollster who seeks out the media spotlight. John Zogby, the founder of the non-partisan Zogby Poll, says working with the media during a campaign is a big boost for any pollster's business.

Mr. JOHN ZOGBY (Pollster): Two-thirds of what we do is corporate and private sector, but certainly the political work that we do and especially the work that we do for media, gives us an enormous amount of visibility and--and credibility that allows us then to market ourselves better in the business world.

HENN: But researchers who study polling, like Andrew Kohut, are a bit bothered by the relationship.

Mr. KOHUT: In South Carolina, one day after the New Hampshire victory, when--when McCain won New Hampshire, a one-night Zogby Poll was released showing that--that John McCain had pulled ahead of--of George W. Bush in South Carolina. That survey--that survey, a one-night survey, made 42 newspapers, national newspapers across the country, 14 front pages, three network broadcasts, 16 cable shows. And it created the notion, which the press was writing, that all of a sudden John McCain was a viable ca--was a viable candidate even in the most loyalist Republican states.

HENN: The only problem was the impression was wrong. McCain eventually lost South Carolina by 11 points.

Mr. KOHUT: Polls are being ordered up by the press at the worst possible times, from the point of view of getting a reasoned reaction from the American public.

HENN: There are plenty of business reasons for a pollster like Zogby to do the polls the media wants when they want them, even if it's a bad time. But getting the timing of a poll wrong can be deadly. It's what led Gallup to predict Dewey would beat Truman back in 1948. And more recently, it's one of the reasons America was surprised when Jesse "The Body" suddenly became Jesse the Governor.

Governor JESSE VENTURA (Independent, Minnesota): When--when all--when all the experts were saying 'He can't win, he's the spoiler. He's this. He's that.' I kept thinking back, 'No, that's not true. We can win.' And we have won!

HENN: Governor Ventura was right. The experts got it wrong. And some in

the industry are warning they're likely to get it wrong again if they continue to sacrifice professionalism in search of free publicity. In Washington, I'm Stephen Henn for MARKETPLACE.

Copyright 2000 Minnesota Public Radio--MARKETPLACE

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 16:41:42 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Zogby: Lazio leads Hillary by a Point in New York State
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010201629290.15766-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright 2000 NYP Holdings, Inc. -- New York Post <nypostonline.com>

<http://www.nypostonline.com/news/13928.htm>

Friday, October 20, 2000

POLL-VAULTING RICK LEADS HILL - BUT BARELY

By GREGG BIRNBAUM, ROBERT HARDT Jr. and MAGGIE HABERMAN

Rick Lazio has tied up the Senate race with Hillary Rodham Clinton - gaining crucial ground with voters upstate, where he's focused his attention over the last two weeks, a new Post poll shows.

In fact, the statewide poll shows Lazio leading Clinton 43-42 percent. With a margin of error of plus or minus 4.5 points, the race is deadlocked, pollster John Zogby said.

The poll shows Lazio gaining critical ground with voters upstate - a Republican stronghold where Clinton had made inroads in recent weeks - and now leads his Democratic rival by 18 points, 50-32 percent.

A Sept. 9 Post poll showed Lazio leading upstate by just 7 points, 49-43 percent.

But the most surprising results show the pool of undecided voters swelling with people who had said before that they supported Clinton.

"The remarkable thing about this is that Lazio did not go up - Hillary went down," Zogby said.

The number of undecided Jewish voters has grown to 17 percent, Zogby said, although Clinton still leads that voting block, 60-23 percent.

Zogby attributed Clinton's overall drop to more "effective" campaigning by Lazio - including TV ads raising her "carpetbagger" status - and controversies surrounding her positions on the Middle East.

"She's been taking a bit of a pounding in the Jewish community," Zogby said.

Lazio also may have gotten a bump from GOP presidential hopeful George W. Bush, who has closed the gap in New York against rival Al Gore to just 12 points.

But he noted that Lazio's overall numbers have stayed virtually unchanged since he entered the race in late May - even after a weeks-long "positive" advertising blitz.

"It suggests that he's either not doing enough or not doing it right - that he's essentially pulling the anti-Hillary vote, and that's about it," he said.

The poll, taken Wednesday and yesterday among 504 likely voters, also showed Clinton's New York City numbers slipping to 60 percent, while Lazio has 28 percent.

In the suburbs, Lazio edges Clinton out, 46-40 percent.

Meanwhile, both candidates campaigned around New York City yesterday.

Two days after Clinton delivered a speech on foreign policy, Lazio moved to show he's also up to speed on world affairs - picking up an endorsement from former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

Both Senate candidates, along with Gore and Bush, last night attended the annual Alfred E. Smith dinner, a Catholic-charities fund-raiser - and each presidential candidate also had a little fun at Clinton's expense.

Gore told the crowd there was a woman in the audience "whose husband is about to lose his job, she's struggling to get out of public housing and get a job of her own.

"Hillary Clinton - I want to fight for you," Gore said to laughter.

Bush, for his part, took a dig at Clinton's claim of being a Yankee fan, saying "there's no place like New York, especially for baseball fans like me and Mrs. Clinton."

<http://www.nypostonline.com/news/13928.htm>

Copyright 2000 NYP Holdings, Inc. -- New York Post <nypostonline.com>

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 17:52:18 -0400
From: "Dobson, Richard" <dobson@pd.state.gov>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Gore gains in new poll
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 18:57:49 -0400
From: "Evans Witt" <evans.witt@psra.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Minnesota Poll presidential results
Message-ID: <000701c03b58\$efdbe3a0\$042d2d0a@nbcnews>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
In-Reply-To: <s9f0252d.099@mail.startribune.com>

Rob,

I'm glad to see that the folks in Minnesota have shaken off that old DFL tradition and become "compassionately conservative"!

How's things?

Evans

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Rob Daves
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2000 12:57 PM
To: tsilver@capaccess.org; sschier@carleton.edu;
75227.173@compuserve.com; reide@email.usps.gov; djleary@iname.com;
bhanley@ktca.org
Subject: Minnesota Poll presidential results

Friends...

For those of you who keep up with Minnesota politics, you may be interested in the results of the latest Minnesota Poll, which shows Bush with 44%, Gore with 41%, and Ralph Nader with 8% support in the presidential race. Point your web browser to startribune.com/poll

Obviously, if you aren't interested, please excuse the intrusion.

Best wishes...

Rob

Robert P. Daves
Director of Strategic & News Research v: 612.673-7278
Star Tribune f: 612.673-4359
daves@startribune.com e:
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 09:11:08 -0400
From: "Evans Witt" <evans.witt@psra.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Minnesota Poll presidential results
Message-ID: <001501c03b60\$66aeba00\$042d2d0a@nbcnews>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
In-Reply-To: <000701c03b58\$efdbe3a0\$042d2d0a@nbcnews>

Everyone on AAPORNET,

Sorry for my fumble-fingered reply to Rob that got sent to everyone.

Evans Witt

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 09:47:00 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Face Recognition Software
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010210840530.5385-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I post this to AAPORNET, not to advertise the protest (which apparently took place last Sunday), but because of the likely interest to many AAPORNETters--for reasons ranging from applications to systematic social and marketing research to studies of the implications of the new technology for law and society to its possibly inspiring survey questions about public opinion on face recognition software. I welcome learning more about your own knowledge and opinions of this relatively

new technology.

Already an estimated 1.1 billion different faces are in various digital databases (if you drive legally, your face may well be among them). Is simply having a face now to imply that we forfeit our Fifth Amendment right not to be compelled to be a witness against ourselves in criminal cases, as we do by virtue of having fingerprints, for example? Or that our movements and behavior are to be no more private than what privacy is allowed by the number of video cameras in or on buildings (and who knows where else) and by the number of pcs with FRS software, which has already been pirated into the public domain?

-- Jim

From: Surveillance Camera Players <notbored@panix.com>

Protest Against Face Recognition Software

For immediate release
5 October 2000

At 1 p.m. on Sunday, 15 October 2000, the Surveillance Camera Players (SCP) will protest against the manufacture and distribution of face recognition software by Visionics, a company that has an office in New Jersey. The protest -- which will take the form of a series of performances by the SCP -- will take place across from Visionics' office at 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City. The press and the general public are invited to attend.

Face recognition software (FRS) is the generic name for computer software programs that match images captured by surveillance cameras with images already stored in computerized databases. Though not in use in the United States at this time, FRS manufactured by Visionics is currently being used in England, a country in which the mania for closed-circuit television systems has reached truly sociopathic levels. But England is behind the times: only now is the country considering an American-style Bill of Rights! FRS poses a direct threat to the liberties and rights guaranteed by the First and Fourth Amendments, and we don't want it being used here in the U.S.A.

The problem with FRS is that its effectiveness completely depends on the existence and accessibility of databases of facial images. According to Visionics' own Web site, the world's databases already contain 1.1 billion facial images. But FRS won't be effective until each and every person's face is scanned and uploaded. Otherwise people -- both preferred customers and unwanted guests -- could walk right by software-enhanced surveillance cameras without their identity being known.

Though it might be desirable for certain elements in business and law enforcement, a complete database of the faces of every single human being on the planet is inseparable from a totalitarian nightmare. Certainly it will take totalitarian methods to induce everyone on Earth to let their faces be scanned and uploaded. And so the SCP says, STOP FRS NOW.

For more information, contact the SCP:

Phone (212) 561-0106

E-mail notbored@panix.com

Web site <<http://www.notbored.org/the-scp.html>>

=====
Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 14:03:35 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: tsilver@capaccess.org, sschier@carleton.edu, 75227.173@compuserve.com,
reide@email.usps.gov, jeff.goldblatt@foxnews.com, djleary@iname.com,
Subject: U.S. Senate Race in Minnesota

If you have an interest in Minnesota politics, Democratic challenger Mark Dayton continues to lead Sen. Rod Grams, the most recent Minnesota Poll has found. To see the results, point your browser to <http://www.startribune.com>.

If you are not interested, then please pardon my intrusion.

Best ...

Rob

Robert P. Daves
Director of Strategic & News Research
Star Tribune
daves@startribune.com
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488

v: 612.673-7278
f: 612.673-4359
e:

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 13:18:52 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: Rob Daves <daves@startribune.com>
cc: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: U.S. Senate Race in Minnesota
In-Reply-To: <s9f1a247.029@mail.startribune.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010211253040.17607-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Thanks, Rob!

Even if we were to care only about the national presidential campaign, it would be interesting to note that the Minnesota Poll has DFL Senate candidate Mark Dayton leading Republican Senator Rod Grams by 12 points, 49 to 37 percent, while Bush leads Gore in the same poll--as you told us

yesterday--by 3 points (44 to 41 percent).

In short, Gore is running 8 points *behind* his party's *challenger* for the U.S. Senate (41 vs 49 percent), while Bush is running 7 points *ahead* of his party's *incumbent* for the same position (44 vs 37 percent). [I note that I don't know the relative response rates for the two questions, however]

This gives your findings for the presidential contest even more credibility, it seems to me, because it reduces the possibility that the Bush-Gore findings are due to an oversampling of Republicans and/or independents in a Republican frame of mind at the time of the poll.

Things now seem even worse for Gore than I thought yesterday.

Thanks again for sharing this breaking poll news with AAPORNET.

-- Jim

On Sat, 21 Oct 2000, Rob Daves wrote:

> If you have an interest in Minnesota politics, Democratic challenger
> Mark Dayton continues to lead Sen. Rod Grams, the most recent
> Minnesota Poll has found. To see the results, point your browser to
> <http://www.startribune.com>.

>

> If you are not interested, then please pardon my intrusion.

>

> Best ...

>

> Rob

>

> Robert P. Daves

v: 612.673-7278

> Director of Strategic & News Research

f: 612.673-4359

> Star Tribune

e:

> daves@startribune.com

> 425 Portland Av. S.

> Minneapolis MN USA 55488

>

>

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 19:20:28 EDT

From: RonBerkowitz@aol.com

Received: from RonBerkowitz@aol.com

by imo-d02.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.31.) id 5.47.264b181 (4117)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 21 Oct 2000 19:20:28 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <47.264b181.27237ebc@aol.com>

Subject: Nader Voters

To: aapornet@usc.edu (AAPORNET)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 114

Has anyone seen any detailed data on Ralph Nader's supporters? Have any polls examined whether these voters are likely or willing to swing back to Gore in the final days.

Especially interesting would be polls in Oregon and Washington, too states that Dukakis did extremely well in, but Gore seems to be struggling to win.

Gore still has the advantage in the popular/electoral vote I believe. Too many swing states (i.e. Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Missouri and of course Florida) would all have to eventually fall in Bush's column for the Texas Governor to pull this one out. The fact that Florida is still in play must be keeping Karl Rove and the rest of the Bush team scratching their heads.

Recent issues of the Village Voice and New Republic have very interesting articles on the Nader phenomenon. If Ralph Nader truly plays spoiler next month, perhaps he will be remembered best for his 2000 election performance and less for "Unsafe at any Speed."

Any comments - Ron

```
=====
Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 18:35:56 -0700
From: jon ebeling <ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu>
Subject: Re: Nader Voters
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <39F2447C.71A1602@mail.csuchico.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win98; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <47.264b181.27237ebc@aol.com>
```

Ron:

I fully agree with you. I can't figure out how a person like Nader, who has no real executive experience in either domestic or foreign affairs, can seriously consider that what he is doing is beneficial to the values he pursues. He must be drunk with public popularity and thus unwilling to seriously look at himself. What a waste.

jon ebeling

RonBerkowitz@aol.com wrote:

```
> Has anyone seen any detailed data on Ralph Nader's supporters? Have any
> polls examined whether these voters are likely or willing to swing back to
> Gore in the final days.
>
> Especially interesting would be polls in Oregon and Washington, too states
```

> that Dukakis did extremely well in, but Gore seems to be struggling to win.
>
> Gore still has the advantage in the popular/electoral vote I believe. Too
> many swing states (i.e. Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Missouri and of
> course Florida) would all have to eventually fall in Bush's column for the
> Texas Governor to pull this one out. The fact that Florida is still in
play
> must be keeping Karl Rove and the rest of the Bush team scratching their
> heads.
>
> Recent issues of the Village Voice and New Republic have very interesting
> articles on the Nader phenomenon. If Ralph Nader truly plays spoiler next
> month, perhaps he will be remembered best for his 2000 election performance
> and less for "Unsafe at any Speed."
>
> Any comments - Ron

Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 11:01:12 -0700
From: "MJS" <sullivan@fsc-research.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Are we in for a rude surprise
Message-ID: <39F2C8F8.13086.582C46@localhost>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Recently I have seen references to polling organizations experiencing about 35% compliance in telephone interviewing. This is significantly lower than the compliance rates normally experienced by our laboratory and others in studies related to public health, consumer decision making, customer satisfaction and other substantive areas. We have been getting between 50% and 80% compliance (depending on content of intro and sponsor) in these studies forever. With two-thirds of respondents missing in action (in what seems like an unusual way), I'd say we need to be very circumspect in announcing the confidence intervals associated with our estimates going into the election.

A couple of questions for political scientists and pollsters:

1) are the compliance rates quoted in the press (i.e., 35%) typical of what can now be achieved in political polling; and if they are

2) has this been consistent over time or has something happened to compliance rates in political polling over the last couple of years.

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.

Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 14:15:40 -0400
From: Michael Massagli <mikemassagli@mediaone.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en]C-MOEATL (Win98; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: At last--a savior! Salvation is at hand!
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010200927070.24987-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Here are a few suggestions. Please forgive my ignorance if they have
already been tried and found less effective than publicizing our current
position.

The first is predicated on a couple of questions. Are the practices
decried in press releases, and criticized, and for which we issue
censure, fraudulent or harmful? If so, how? If they are, then let's
advocate for the enforcement of applicable federal and state statutes on
behalf of the damaged parties. If no such statutes exist, then perhaps
we should advocate for passage of some. In addition, why not advocate
to prevent campaign funds from being used for such purposes. The use of
Federal funds is not permitted for research where risks and benefits
have not been disclosed to subjects, so why not require that the same be
done in polls? And while we are at it, we could ask for a review of the
tax status of the national parties and PACs and relieve them of any
exemptions if they are found to be perpetrating fraud or harm.

Next, why not begin accrediting polling organizations and media
outlets. The results of audits revealing bad practice or deception
should be publicized (starting on the web site). Public reports should
recognize the organizations that are accredited, as well as
organizations that do not seek accreditation. Short of that, the
association should be sure that organizations and individuals that run
afoul of our standards of best practice are not allowed to benefit from
membership in the association. Funds for implementation and support of
accreditation activities and audits should be collected as fees from
those seeking accreditation.

Further, while efforts to increase the responsible use of polls by the
media are laudable, this is not the only route, and may not even be the
most effective way, to informing the public. Can we endeavor to
recommend and support elements of a K-12 curriculum that would increase
understanding and awareness of polling and the political process and
related issues? At least at this level, there is somewhat frequent and
open discussion about curriculum content and effectiveness of teaching,
and access to this material could potentially be universal.

And last, perhaps it is not too early to begin thinking about a large,
cooperative project to be carried out by some number of respected

academic and private survey organizations during the next national election cycle, wherein we seek, through application of experimental design to measure definitively the impact of variations in practice that have come to be the subject of criticism.

Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 15:16:25 -0400
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The 100% Count
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

TURKISH STREETS DESERTED
DURING NATIONWIDE CENSUS
October 22, 2000

ANKARA, Turkey (AP) -- Streets and shopping malls were deserted, restaurants and movie theaters closed while millions of Turks obeyed a daylong curfew Sunday and stayed at home to be counted for a nationwide census....
<<http://www.cnn.com/2000/WORLD/meast/10/22/turkey.census.ap/index.html>>

Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 17:56:36 -0400
From: Murray Edelman <murray.edelman@vnsusa.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: AAPOR's Latest Press Release
X-Message-Flag:
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1461.28)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="----_=_NextPart_001_01C03C72.F3422C50"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C03C72.F3422C50
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Our last press release on focus groups was an attempt to speed up the AAPOR's response to news events. We were able to make the news cycle around the debates and in fact, we received good coverage in the Washington Post and The New York Times. However, in our rush to put out this release in time, we improperly criticized NBC and MSNBC's use of a group of undecided voters in

Tampa.=A0 The
release implied an overall criticism of their use of this group while =
in
fact our criticism was based on one on-air statement which we =
interpreted
differently than they intended.=A0=A0 The news coverage in the Times =
magnified
this problem, so we felt it was important to put out another release to =
stop
the misunderstanding from spreading any further.

=A0

=A0

=A0

PRESS RELEASE=20

October 20, 2000

=A0

=A0

AAPOR DID NOT INTEND TO CRITICIZE NBC AND MSNBC FOR THEIR OVERALL USE =
OF A
GROUP OF UNDECIDED VOTERS

=A0

The AAPOR press release that was distributed on October 16th contained =
a
reference to a comment made on the post-debate broadcast that appeared =
on
MSNBC.=A0 AAPOR did not intend to criticize NBC and MSNBC for their =
overall
use of a group of undecided voters in their coverage.

=A0

The group in Tampa, Florida that was interviewed on NBC and MSNBC was =
never
described on air as a focus group. And the people in it were originally =
part
of a random sample.=A0=20

=A0

Our criticism was focused on the use of the word "cross-section" in the
on-the-air comment that in this context appeared to us to imply
representativeness.=A0 However, the term cross-section has other =
meanings, and
we now understand that the networks did not intend to use the term to =
imply
representativeness.

=A0

We did not intend to criticize the method used to assemble the group =
nor the
networks' use of the group on the air.=A0 In fact, their reporting of =
the
group showed appropriate restraint in avoiding the use of tallies and
percentages.

=A0

We regret any confusion this may have caused.

=A0

=A0

=A0

.

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C03C72.F3422C50

Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<html xmlns:o=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" =
xmlns:w=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word" =
xmlns=3D"http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40">

<head>
<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">

<meta name=3DProgId content=3DWord.Document>
<meta name=3DGenerator content=3D"Microsoft Word 9">
<meta name=3DOriginator content=3D"Microsoft Word 9">
<link rel=3DFile-List href=3D"cid:filelist.xml@01C03C4F.C2CA61A0">
<title>In our enthusiasm to put out our press release on focus groups =
in time
for the news cycle, we made an incorrect assumption abo</title>
<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
 <o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
 <o:DoNotRelyOnCSS/>
 </o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
</xml><![endif]--><!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
 <w:WordDocument>
 <w:View>Normal</w:View>
 <w:EnvelopeVis/>
 =
<w:DisplayHorizontalDrawingGridEvery>0</w:DisplayHorizontalDrawingGridEv=
ery>
 =
<w:DisplayVerticalDrawingGridEvery>0</w:DisplayVerticalDrawingGridEvery>=

 <w:UseMarginsForDrawingGridOrigin/>
 <w:Compatibility>
 <w:FootnoteLayoutLikeWW8/>
 <w:ShapeLayoutLikeWW8/>
 <w:AlignTablesRowByRow/>
 <w:ForgetLastTabAlignment/>
 <w:DoNotUseHTMLParagraphAutoSpacing/>
 <w:LayoutRawTableWidth/>
 <w:LayoutTableRowsApart/>
 </w:Compatibility>
 <w:DoNotOptimizeForBrowser/>
 </w:WordDocument>
</xml><![endif]-->
<style>
<!--
 /* Style Definitions */
p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal
 {mso-style-parent:"";
 margin:0in;
 margin-bottom:.0001pt;
 mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
 font-size:12.0pt;
 mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt;

```
font-family:Arial;
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-bidi-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
@page Section1
{size:8.5in 11.0in;
margin:.75in .75in .75in .75in;
mso-header-margin:.5in;
mso-footer-margin:.5in;
mso-paper-source:0;}
div.Section1
{page:Section1;}
-->
</style>
</head>

<body lang=3DEN-US style=3D'tab-interval:.5in'>

<div class=3DSection1>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D3 face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'><span
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt'>Our last press release on focus =
groups was an
attempt to speed up the AAPOR&#8217;s response to news events.<span
style=3D"mso-spacerun: yes">&nbsp; </span>We were able to make the news =
cycle
around the debates and in fact, we received good coverage in the =
Washington
Post and The New York Times.</span></span></font></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D3 face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]>&nbsp;<![endif]></span><o:p></o:p></font></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D3 face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'><span
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt'>However, in our rush to put out =
this release
in time, we improperly criticized NBC and MSNBC&#8217;s use of a group =
of undecided
voters in Tampa.<span style=3D"mso-spacerun: yes">&nbsp; </span>The =
release
implied an overall criticism of their use of this group while in fact =
our
criticism was based on one on-air statement which we interpreted =
differently
than they intended.<span style=3D"mso-spacerun: yes">&nbsp; &nbsp; &nbsp; =
</span>The news
coverage in the Times magnified this problem, so we felt it was =
important to
put out another release to stop the misunderstanding from spreading any
further.</span></span></font></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D3 face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]>&nbsp;<![endif]></span><o:p></o:p></font></p>
```

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal = style=3D'mso-layout-grid-align:none;text-autospace:none'><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal align=3Dcenter = style=3D'text-align:center;mso-layout-grid-align:none;text-autospace:none'>PRESS RELEASE = <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal align=3Dcenter = style=3D'text-align:center;mso-layout-grid-align:none;text-autospace:none'>October 20, = 2000<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal = style=3D'mso-layout-grid-align:none;text-autospace:none'><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal = style=3D'mso-layout-grid-align:none;text-autospace:none'><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal = style=3D'mso-layout-grid-align:none;text-autospace:none'>AAPOR DID NOT INTEND TO CRITICIZE NBC AND MSNBC FOR THEIR OVERALL USE OF A = GROUP OF UNDECIDED VOTERS<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal = style=3D'mso-layout-grid-align:none;text-autospace:none'><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal = style=3D'mso-layout-grid-align:none;text-autospace:none'>The AAPOR press release that was distributed on October 16th = contained a reference to a comment made on the post-debate broadcast that appeared = on MSNBC. AAPOR did not =

intend to criticize NBC and MSNBC for their overall use of a group of undecided voters in their coverage.

group in Tampa, Florida that was interviewed on NBC and MSNBC was never described on air as a focus group. And the people in it were originally part of a random sample.

Our criticism was focused on the use of the word "cross-section" in the on-the-air comment that in this context appeared to us to imply representativeness. However, the term "cross-section" has other meanings, and we now understand that the networks did not intend to use the term to imply representativeness.

We did not intend to criticize the method used to assemble the group nor the networks' use of the group on the air. In fact, their reporting of the group showed appropriate restraint in

avoiding the use of tallies and =
percentages.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal =
style=3D'mso-layout-grid-align:none;text-autospace:none'><font
size=3D2 face=3D"Courier New"><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Courier New"'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal =
style=3D'mso-layout-grid-align:none;text-autospace:none'><font
size=3D2 face=3D"Courier New"><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;font-family:"Courier New"'>We
regret any confusion this may have caused.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><span =
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'><span
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-size:10.0pt'>.</p>

</div>

</body>

</html>

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C03C72.F3422C50--

=====
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 19:18:04 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Barry A. Hollander" <barry@arches.uga.edu>
X-Sender: barry@archa14.cc.uga.edu
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: AAPOR's Latest Press Release
In-Reply-To: <017480CB593ED111B05D0060B0571CFE9485AD@nts_1.vnsusa.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.10.10010221912460.39636-100000@archa14.cc.uga.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Let me get this straight. AAPOR has put out a second
press release clarifying or correcting an earlier
release critical of the press because the first one
got fuddled due to time constraints?

Minneapolis MN USA 55488

Market & Opinion Research International Limited
95 Southwark Street
London SE1 0HX

Tel: +44 (0) 207 928 5955
Fax: +44 (0) 207 955 0070/1/2

Disclaimer

This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of MORI Limited.

If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please either notify the MORI Systems Helpdesk by telephone on 44 (0) 207 928 5955 or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 11:24:10 EDT
From: RonBerkowitz@aol.com
Received: from RonBerkowitz@aol.com
by imo-r11.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.31.) id 5.32.bafd890 (16789);
Mon, 23 Oct 2000 11:24:11 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <32.bafd890.2725b21a@aol.com>
Subject: Gallup/CNN Presidential Poll
To: aapornet@usc.edu, owner-aapornet@usc.edu
CC: rberkowitz@harrisinteractive.com
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 125

Does anyone else find it odd that the Gallup/CNN poll continues to show a 9 point lead for Bush. To be honest, this is hard to believe.

Other polls are continuing to show a 4-5 or less point lead for Bush and some are even closer.

On a broader note, is there any methodologically sound way to combine the popular vote in a poll with the electoral count. That is to somehow give results while taking the electoral counts per state into account. I realize nationwide weighting partially addresses this problem, but it doesn't seem to give more weight to a voter from California than one in Wyoming. I still feel it is somewhat misleading to release a popular vote poll while we truly

still elect a President through the electoral college.

Thanks - Ron

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 11:56:57 -0400
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: A web site of interest
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain

The first two time I sent this it bounced as undeliverable - so I am trying again. Deepest apologies to all if the list receives multiple copies.

I am not sure whether someone else mentioned this or not

But the STATS - Statistical Assessment Service website has a pretty good introduction to the pitfalls of election polling at <http://www.stats.org/newsletters/index.html> in its Special Election Polling Issue - October 2000.

According to their website:

"The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS) is a non-partisan, non-profit research organization in Washington, D.C. STATS is devoted to the accurate use of scientific and social research in public policy debate. STATS serves as a resource for journalists by providing timely and well-researched analysis of current statistical and scientific disputes. Since STATS seeks to weed out bad data and research before it enters the media stream, we field queries from journalists on a regular basis."

Included are; numerous quotes from names you'll recognize, an entry in the worst question ever sweepstakes and pages on exit polls, polls and prediction and much, much more. There a couple of assessments that seem more than a little harsh to me but others may disagree.

There is a mention of (though not a link to) the AAPOR website and the National Council on Public Polls website.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:13:38 -0700
From: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@nevada.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: UNLV Omnibus Poll Reminder
Message-ID: <NEBBLOJLGLBGLGECJGANAEFCCBAA.lamatsch@nevada.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
In-Reply-To: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3098F80@AS_SERVER>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

!!!IF you are interested please contact me ASAP. If you would like us to help you with phrasing your questions please contact us in early December. Deadline for the FINAL questionnaire will be by the end of the fall semester.!!!

UNLV 2001 National Omnibus Poll

The Cannon Center for Survey Research is planning a national public opinion poll for early 2001. We'd like to invite participation from UNLV faculty members and students.

The UNLV Omnibus Poll is meant for researchers who are only interested in asking a few questions and do not have the funding for their own poll. By pooling questions from researchers all over the UNLV campus as well as researchers from other universities we will be able to offer you a chance to ask your questions for a lot less than running your own poll.

Survey Design

1000 completes in the continental United States using a scientific sample
Up to 15 call-backs as well as 2 refusal conversion attempts.

You will receive:

An ASCII or SPSS dataset of your questions plus all standard demographics (gender, income, race and ethnicity, party ID, age, education, marital status)

We will assist you as much or as little as you like with the design of your question(s) as well as with interpreting the results.

COST (for single response items - please call for more complicated designs)

\$870.00

If you ask more than 3 questions we will offer a 25% discount.

All STUDENTS will receive an additional \$100 discount per question.

Time Frame:

We are planning to be in the field in January of 2001. This will give you ample time to secure funding.

If you are interested or have more questions please contact the Center's director Dr. Thomas Lamatsch.

The Cannon Center on the web: http://www.unlv.edu/Research_Centers/ccsr/

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.

Director
The Howard W. Cannon Center for Survey Research
University of Nevada - Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway - Box 455008
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-5008
Phone (702)895-0167
Fax (702)895-0165
Cellular (702)561-8768

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 12:17:24 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: 20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_5319391==_ .ALT"

-----_5319391==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi folks,

With all the thrashing about with respect to polling results and the way these are handled by the media as a basis for generating good stories I thought it appropriate to share this article with you. Doubtless, many of you may have already seen and read it and to those I apologize. But for others, it's worth taking a look. The questions and answers address many of the topics that have occupied AAPORNET these last few months.

Dick Halpern

20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results

Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. and G. Evans Witt

For journalists and for pollsters, questions are the most frequently used tools for gathering information. For the journalist looking at a set of poll numbers, here are the 20 questions to ask the pollster before reporting any results. This publication is designed to help working journalists do a thorough, professional job covering polls. It is not a primer on how to conduct a public opinion survey.

The only polls that should be reported are "scientific" polls. A number of the questions here will help you decide whether or not a poll is "scientific" one worthy of coverage or an unscientific survey without value.

Unscientific pseudo-polls are widespread and sometimes entertaining, if always quite meaningless. Examples include 900-number call-in polls, man-on-the-street surveys, most Internet polls, shopping mall polls, and even the classic toilet tissue poll featuring pictures of the candidates on

=20
each sheet.

The major distinguishing difference between scientific and unscientific=20
polls is who picks the respondents for the survey. In a scientific poll,=20
the pollster identifies and seeks out the people to be interviewed. In an=20
unscientific poll, the respondents usually "volunteer" their opinions,=20
selecting themselves for the poll.

The results of the well-conducted scientific poll can provide a reliable=20
guide to the opinions of many people in addition to those interviewed =96=20
even the opinions of all Americans. The results of an unscientific poll=20
tell you nothing beyond simply what those respondents say.

With these 20 questions in hand, the journalist can seek the facts to=20
decide how to handle every poll that comes across the news desk each day.

The authors wish to thank the officers, trustees and members of the=20
National Council on Public Polls for their editing assistance and their=20
support.

- * Who did the poll?
- * Who paid for the poll and why was it done?
- * How many people were interviewed for the survey?
- * How were those people chosen?
- * What area (nation, state, or region) or what group (teachers, lawyers, =
=20
Democratic voters, etc.) were these people chosen from?
- * Are the results based on the answers of all the people interviewed?
- * Who should have been interviewed and was not?
- * When was the poll done?
- * How were the interviews conducted?
- * What about polls on the Internet or World Wide Web?
- * What is the sampling error for the poll results?
- * Who=92s on first?
- * What other kinds of factors can skew poll results?
- * What questions were asked?
- * In what order were the questions asked?
- * What about "push polls"?
- * What other polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the same=20
thing? If they are different, why are they different?
- * So I've asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The poll is=
=20
correct, right?
- * With all these potential problems, should we ever report poll results?
- * Is this poll worth reporting?

1. Who did the poll?
What polling firm, research house, political campaign, corporation or other=
=20
group conducted the poll? This is always the first question to ask.

If you don't know who did the poll, you can't get the answers to all the=20

other questions listed here. If the person providing poll results can't or
won't tell you who did it, serious questions must be raised about the
reliability and truthfulness of the results being presented.

Reputable polling firms will provide you with the information you need to
evaluate the survey. Because reputation is important to a quality firm, a
professionally conducted poll will avoid many errors.

Top

2. Who paid for the poll and why was it done?

You must know who paid for the survey, because that tells you
audience who thought these topics are important enough to spend money
finding out what people think. This is central to the whole issue of
the poll was done.

Polls are not conducted for the good of the world. They are conducted for a
reason either to gain helpful information or to advance a particular
cause.

It may be the news organization wants to develop a good story. It may be
the politician wants to be re-elected. It may be that the corporation is
trying to push sales of its new product. Or a special-interest group may
be trying to prove that its views are the views of the entire country.

All are legitimate reasons for doing a poll.

The important issue for you as a journalist is whether the motive for doing
the poll creates such serious doubts about the validity of the results that
the numbers should not be publicized.

Examples of suspect polls are private polls conducted for a political
campaign. These polls are conducted solely to help the candidate win
for no other reason. The poll may have very slanted questions or a strange
sampling methodology, all with a tactical campaign purpose. A campaign may
be testing out new slogans, a new statement on a key issue or a new attack
on an opponent. But since the goal of the candidate's poll may not be a
straightforward, unbiased reading of the public's sentiments, the results
should be reported with great care.

Likewise, reporting on a survey by a special-interest group is tricky. For
example, an environmental group trumpets a poll saying the American people
support strong measures to protect the environment. That may be true, but
the poll was conducted for a group with definite views. That may have
swayed the question wording, the timing of the poll, the group interviewed

=20

and the order of the questions. You should examine the poll to be certain=20 that it accurately reflects public opinion and does not simply push a=20 single viewpoint.

Top

3. How many people were interviewed for the survey?

Because polls give approximate answers, the more people interviewed in a=20 scientific poll, the smaller the error due to the size of the sample, all=20 other things being equal. A common trap to avoid is that "more is=20 automatically better." It is absolutely true that the more people=20 interviewed in a scientific survey, the smaller the sampling error =96 all=

=20

other things being equal. But other factors may be more important in=20

judging the quality of a survey.

Top

4. How were those people chosen?

The key reason that some polls reflect public opinion accurately and other=

=20

polls are unscientific junk is how the people were chosen to be interviewed.

In scientific polls, the pollster uses a specific method for picking=20 respondents. In unscientific polls, the person picks himself to participate.

The method pollsters use to pick interviewees relies on the bedrock of=20 mathematical reality: when the chance of selecting each person in the=20 target population is known, then and only then do the results of the sample=

=20

survey reflect the entire population. This is called a random sample or a=20 probability sample. This is the reason that interviews with 1,000 American=

=20

adults can accurately reflect the opinions of more than 200 million=20

American adults.

Most scientific samples use special techniques to be economically feasible.=

=20

For example, some sampling methods for telephone interviewing do not just=20 pick randomly generated telephone numbers. Only telephone exchanges that=20

are known to contain working residential numbers are selected =96 to reduce=

=20

the number of wasted calls. This still produces a random sample. Samples of=

=20

only listed telephone numbers do not produce a random sample of all working=

=20

telephone numbers.

Top

5. What area (nation, state, or region) or what group (teachers, lawyers,=20 Democratic voters, etc.) were these people chosen from?

It is absolutely critical to know from which group the interviewees were=20

chosen.

You must know if a sample was drawn from among all adults in the United States, or just from those in one state or in one city, or from another group. For example, a survey of business people can reflect the opinions of business people but not of all adults. Only if the interviewees were chosen from among all American adults can the poll reflect the opinions of all American adults.

In the case of telephone samples, the population represented is that of people living in households with telephones. For most purposes, telephone households may be similar to the general population. But if you were reporting a poll on what it was like to be poor or homeless, a telephone sample would not be appropriate. Remember, the use of a scientific sampling technique does not mean that the correct population was interviewed.

Political polls are especially sensitive to this issue.

In pre-primary and pre-election polls, which people are chosen as the base for poll results is critical. A poll of all adults, for example, is not very useful on a primary race where only 25 percent of the registered voters actually turn out. So look for polls based on registered voters, "likely voters," previous primary voters, and such. These distinctions are important and should be included in the story, for one of the most difficult challenges in polling is trying to figure out who actually is going to vote.

Top

6. Are the results based on the answers of all the people interviewed? One of the easiest ways to misrepresent the results of a poll is to report the answers of only a subgroup. For example, there is usually a substantial difference between the opinions of Democrats and Republicans on campaign-related matters. Reporting the opinions of only Democrats in a poll purported to be of all adults would substantially misrepresent the results.

Poll results based on Democrats must be identified as such and should be reported as representing only Democratic opinions.

Of course, reporting on just one subgroup can be exactly the right course.

In polling on a primary contest, it is the opinions of those who can vote in the primary that count not those who cannot vote in that contest.

Each state has its own rules about who can participate in its primaries. Primary polls should include only eligible primary voters.

Top

7. Who should have been interviewed and was not?

No survey ever reaches everyone who should have been interviewed. You ought=

=20
to know what steps were undertaken to minimize non-response, such as the=20
number of attempts to reach the appropriate respondent and over how many=
days.

There are many reasons why people who should have been interviewed were=20
not. They may have refused attempts to interview them. Or interviews may=20
not have been attempted if people were not home when the interviewer=20
called. Or there may have been a language problem or a hearing problem.

Top

8. When was the poll done?

Events have a dramatic impact on poll results. Your interpretation of a=20
poll should depend on when it was conducted relative to key events. Even=20
the freshest poll results can be overtaken by events. The President may=20
have given a stirring speech to the nation, the stock market may have=20
crashed or an oil tanker may have sunk, spilling millions of gallons of=20
crude on beautiful beaches.

Poll results that are several weeks or months old may be perfectly valid,=20
but events may have erased any newsworthy relationship to current public=20
opinion.

Top

9. How were the interviews conducted?

There are three main possibilities: in person, by telephone or by mail.=20
Most surveys are now conducted by telephone, with the calls made by=20
interviewers from a central location. However, some surveys are still=20
conducted by sending interviewers into people's homes to conduct the=20
interviews.

Some surveys are conducted by mail. In scientific polls, the pollster picks=20
=20
the people to receive the mail questionnaires. The respondent fills out the=20
=20
questionnaire and returns it.

Mail surveys can be excellent sources of information, but it takes weeks to=20
=20
do a mail survey, meaning that the results cannot be as timely as a=20
telephone survey. And mail surveys can be subject to other kinds of errors,=
=20
particularly low response rates. In many mail surveys, more people fail to=
=20
participate than do. This makes the results suspect.

Surveys done in shopping malls, in stores or on the sidewalk may have their=20
=20
uses for their sponsors, but publishing the results in the media is not=20
among them. These approaches may yield interesting human-interest stories,=
=20
but they should never be treated as if they represent a public opinion poll.

Advances in computer technology have allowed the development of computerized interviewing systems that dial the phone, play taped questions to a respondent and then record answers the person gives by punching numbers on the telephone keypad. Such surveys have a variety of problems, including uncontrolled selection of respondents and poor response rates, and should be avoided.

Top

10. What about polls on the Internet or World Wide Web?

The explosive growth of the Internet and the World Wide Web has given rise to an equally explosive growth in various types of online polls and surveys. Many online polls may be good entertainment, but they tell you nothing about public opinion.

Most Internet polls are simply the latest variation on the pseudo-polls that have existed for many years. Whether the effort is a click-on Web survey, a dial-in poll or a mail-in survey, the results should be ignored and not reported. All these pseudo-polls suffer from the same problem: respondents are self-selected. The individuals choose themselves to take part in the poll and there is no pollster choosing the respondents to be interviewed.

Remember, the purpose of a poll is to draw conclusions about the population, not about the sample. In these pseudo-polls, there is no way to project the results to any larger group. Any similarity between the results of a pseudo-poll and a scientific survey is pure chance.

Clicking on your candidate's button in the "voting booth" on a Web site may drive up the numbers for your candidate in a presidential horse-race poll online. For most such efforts, no effort is made to pick the respondents, to limit users from voting multiple times or to reach out for people who might not normally visit the Web site.

The 900-number dial-in polls may be fine for deciding whether or not Larry the Lobster should be cooked on Saturday Night Live or even for dedicated fans to express their opinions on who is the greatest quarterback in the National Football League. The opinions expressed may be real, but in sum the numbers are just entertainment. There is no way to tell who actually called in, how old they are, or how many times each person called.

Never be fooled by the number of responses. In some cases a few people call in thousands of times. Even if 500,000 calls are tallied, no one has any real knowledge of what the results mean. If big numbers impress you, remember that the Literary Digest's non-scientific sample of 12,000,000 people said Landon would beat Roosevelt in the 1936 Presidential election.

Mail-in coupon polls are just as bad. In this case, the magazine or newspaper includes a coupon to be returned with the answers to the questions. Again, there is no way to know who responded and how many times each person did.

Another variation on the pseudo-poll comes as part of a fund-raising effort. An organization sends out a letter with a survey form attached to a large list of people, asking for opinions and for the respondent to send money to support the organization or pay for tabulating the survey. The questions are often loaded and the results of such an effort are always meaningless.

This technique is used by a wide variety of organizations from political parties and special-interest groups to charitable organizations. Again, if the poll in question is part of a fund-raising pitch, pitch it in the wastebasket.

With regard to the Internet, methods are being developed to sample the opinions of those who have online access, although these efforts are just starting. Even a survey that accurately sampled those who have access to the Internet would still fall short of a poll of all Americans, since only a relatively small fraction of the nation's adults have access to the Internet.

Top

11. What is the sampling error for the poll results?
Interviews with a scientific sample of 1,000 adults can accurately reflect the opinions of nearly 200 million American adults. That means interviews attempted with all 200 million adults if such were possible would give approximately the same results as a well-conducted survey based on 1,000 interviews.

What happens if another carefully done poll of 1,000 adults gives slightly different results from the first survey? Neither of the polls is "wrong." This range of possible results is called the error due to sampling, often called the margin of error.

This is not an "error" in the sense of making a mistake. Rather, it is a measure of the possible range of approximation in the results because a sample was used.

Pollsters express the degree of the certainty of results based on a sample as a "confidence level." This means a sample is likely to be within so many points of the results one would have gotten if an interview were attempted with the entire target population. They usually say this with 95% confidence.

Thus, for example, a "3 percentage point margin of error" in a national poll means that if the attempt were made to interview every adult in the nation with the same questions in the same way at about the same time as the poll was taken, the poll's answers would fall within plus or minus 3 percentage points of the complete count's results 95% of the time.

This does not address the issue of whether people cooperate with the survey, or if the questions are understood, or if any other methodological issue exists. The sampling error is only the portion of the potential error in a survey introduced by using a sample rather than interviewing the entire population. Sampling error tells us nothing about the refusals or those consistently unavailable for interview; it also tells us nothing about the biasing effects of a particular question wording or the bias a particular interviewer may inject into the interview situation.

Remember that the sampling error margin applies to each figure in the results it is at least 3 percentage points plus or minus for each one in our example. Thus, in a poll question matching two candidates for President, both figures are subject to sampling error.

Top

12. Who's on first?

Sampling error raises one of the thorniest problems in the presentation of poll results: For a horse-race poll, when is one candidate really ahead of the other?

Certainly, if the gap between the two candidates is less than the error margin, you should not say that one candidate is ahead of the other. You can say the race is "close", the race is "roughly even", or there is "little difference between the candidates." But it should not be called a "dead heat" unless the candidates are tied with the same percentages.

And just as certainly, when the gap between the two candidates is equal to or more than twice the error margin 6 percentage points in our example and if there are only two candidates and no undecided voters, you can say with confidence that the poll says Candidate A is clearly leading Candidate B.

When the gap between the two candidates is more than the error margin but less than twice the error margin, you should say that Candidate A "is ahead", "has an advantage" or "holds an edge". The story should mention that there is a small possibility that Candidate B is ahead of Candidate A.

When there are more than two choices or undecided voters in the real world the question gets much more complicated. While the solution is statistically complex, you can fairly easily evaluate this situation by estimating the error margin. You can do that by taking the percent for each

of the two candidates in question and multiplying it by the total respondents for the survey (only the likely voters if that is appropriate).

This number is now the effective sample size for your judgement. Look up the sampling error in a table of statistics for that reduced sample size and apply it to the candidate percentages. If they overlap, then you do not know if one is ahead. If they do not, then you can make the judgement that one candidate has a lead.

And bear in mind that when subgroup results are reported for blacks or young people the sampling error margin for those figures is greater than for results based on the sample as a whole.

Top

13. What other kinds of factors can skew poll results?

The margin of sampling error is just one possible source of inaccuracy in a poll. It is not necessarily the source of the greatest source of possible error; we use it because it's the only one that can be quantified. And, other things being equal, it is useful for evaluating whether differences between poll results are meaningful in a statistical sense.

Question phrasing and question order are also likely sources of flaws. Inadequate interviewer training and supervision, data processing errors and other operational problems can also introduce errors. Professional polling operations are less subject to these problems than volunteer-conducted polls, which are usually less trustworthy.

You should always ask if the poll results have been "weighted." This process is usually used to account for unequal probabilities of selection and to adjust slightly the demographics in the sample. You should be aware that a poll could be manipulated unduly by weighting the numbers to produce a desired result. While some weighting may be appropriate, other weighting is not. Weighting a scientific poll is only appropriate to reflect unequal probabilities or to adjust to independent values that are mostly constant.

Top

14. What questions were asked?

You must find out the exact wording of the poll questions. Why? Because the very wording of questions can make major differences in the results.

Perhaps the best test of any poll question is your reaction to it. On the face of it, does the question seem fair and unbiased? Does it present a balanced set of choices? Would most people be able to answer the question?

On sensitive questions =96 such as abortion =96 the complete wording of the =20 question should probably be included in your story. It may well be =20 worthwhile to compare the results of several different polls from different =20 organizations on sensitive questions. You should examine carefully both the =20 results and the exact wording of the questions.

Top

15. In what order were the questions asked?
Sometimes the very order of the questions can have an impact on the =20 results. Often that impact is intentional; sometimes it is not. The impact =20 of order can often be subtle.

During troubled economic times, for example, if people are asked what they =20 think of the economy before they are asked their opinion of the president, =20 the presidential popularity rating will probably be lower than if you had =20 reversed the order of the questions. And in good economic times, the =20 opposite is true.

What is important here is whether the questions that were asked prior to =20 the critical question in the poll could sway the results. If the poll asks =20 questions about abortion just before a question about an abortion ballot =20 measure, the prior questions could sway the results.

Top

16. What about "push polls"?
In recent years, some political campaigns and special-interest groups have =20 used a technique called "push polls" to spread rumors and even outright =20 lies about opponents. These efforts are not polls, but are political =20 manipulation trying to hide behind the smokescreen of a public opinion =20 survey.

In a "push poll," a large number of people are called by telephone and =20 asked to participate in a purported survey. The survey "questions" are =20 really thinly-veiled accusations against an opponent or repetitions of =20 rumors about a candidate =92s personal or professional behavior. The focus =20 here is on making certain the respondent hears and understands the =20 accusation in the question, not in gathering the respondent =92s opinions.

"Push polls" are unethical and have been condemned by professional polling =20 organizations.

"Push polls" must be distinguished from some types of legitimate surveys =20 done by political campaigns. At times, a campaign poll may ask a series of =20 questions about contrasting issue positions of the candidates =96 or various =

=20

things that could be said about a candidate, some of which are negative.=20
These legitimate questions seek to gauge the public=92s reaction to a=20
candidate=92s position or to a possible legitimate attack on a candidate=92s=
=20
record.

A legitimate poll can be distinguished from a "push poll" usually by:

The number of calls made =96 a push poll makes thousands and thousands of=20
calls, instead of hundreds for most surveys; The identity of who is making=
=20
the telephone calls =96 a polling firm for a scientific survey as opposed to=
=20
a telemarketing house or the campaign itself for a "push poll"; The lack of=
=20
any true gathering of results in a "push poll," which has as its only=20
objective the dissemination of false or misleading information.

Top

17. What other polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the same=20
thing? If they are different, why are they different?
Results of other polls =96 by a newspaper or television station, a public=20
survey firm or even a candidate's opponent =96 should be used to check and=
=20
contrast poll results you have in hand.

If the polls differ, first check the timing of the interviewing. If the=20
polls were done at different times, the differing results may demonstrate a=
=20
swing in public opinion.

If the polls were done about the same time, ask each poll sponsor for an=20
explanation of the differences. Conflicting polls often make good stories.

Top

18. So I've asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The poll is=20
correct, right?
Usually, yes. However, remember that the laws of chance alone say that the=
=20
results of one poll out of 20 may be skewed away from the public's real=20
views just because of sampling error.

Also remember that no matter how good the poll, no matter how wide the=20
margin, no matter how big the sample, a pre-election poll does not show=20
that one candidate has the race "locked up." Things change =96 often and=20
dramatically in politics. That=92s why candidates campaign.

Top

19. With all these potential problems, should we ever report poll results?
Yes. Because reputable polling organizations consistently do good work. In=
=20
spite of the difficulties, the public opinion survey, correctly conducted,=
=20

is still the best objective measure of the state of the views of the public.

Top

20. Is this poll worth reporting?

If the poll was conducted correctly, and you have been able to obtain the=20 information outlined here, your news judgment and that of your editors=20 should be applied to polls, as it is to every other element of a story.

Top

This is a copyrighted publication of the National Council on Public Polls=20 in keeping with its mission to help educate journalists on the use of=20 public opinion polls.

The National Council on Public Polls hereby grants the right to duplicate=20 this work in whole, but not in part, for any noncommercial purpose provided=20 that any copy include all of the information on this page.

Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. is Director, Elections, NBC News. G. Evans Witt=20 is president, Princeton Survey Research Associates, Inc. They were=20 cofounders of the Associated Press/ NBC News Poll.

For any additional information on any aspect of polling or a specific poll,=20 please call the NCPP office at 800-239-0909.

The price for a single printed copy price is \$2.95. For educational=20 discounts and multiple copies contact NCPP. This document can be downloaded=20 without charge from the NCPP website: <<http://www.ncpp.org>>www.ncpp.org.

Top

For more information, contact us at <<mailto:info@ncpp.org>>info@ncpp.org.

</x-html>=20

-----_5319391==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<html>

Hi folks,

With all the thrashing about with respect to polling results and the way these are handled by the media as a basis for generating good stories I thought it appropriate to share this article with you. Doubtless, many of you may have already seen and read it and to those I apologize. But for others, it's worth taking a look. The questions and answers address many of the topics that have occupied AAPORNET these last few months.

Dick Halpern

20 Questions A Journalist

Should Ask About Poll Results

Sheldon R. Gawiser,
Ph.D. and G. Evans Witt

For journalists and for pollsters, questions are the most frequently used tools for gathering information. For the journalist looking at a set of poll numbers, here are the 20 questions to ask the pollster before reporting any results. This publication is designed to help working journalists do a thorough, professional job covering polls. It is not a primer on how to conduct a public opinion survey.

The only polls that should be reported are "scientific" polls. A number of the questions here will help you decide whether or not a poll is a "scientific" one worthy of coverage =96 or an unscientific survey without value.

Unscientific pseudo-polls are widespread and sometimes entertaining, if always quite meaningless. Examples include 900-number call-in polls, man-on-the-street surveys, most Internet polls, shopping mall polls, and even the classic toilet tissue poll featuring pictures of the candidates on each sheet.

The major distinguishing difference between scientific and unscientific polls is who picks the respondents for the survey. In a scientific poll, the pollster identifies and seeks out the people to be interviewed. In an unscientific poll, the respondents usually "volunteer" their opinions, selecting themselves for the poll.

The results of the well-conducted scientific poll can provide a reliable guide to the opinions of many people in addition to those interviewed =96 even the opinions of all Americans. The results of an unscientific poll tell you nothing beyond simply what those respondents say.

With these 20 questions in hand, the journalist can seek the facts to decide how to handle every poll that comes across the news desk each day.

The authors wish to thank the officers, trustees and members of the National Council on Public Polls for their editing assistance and their support.

Who did the poll?=20

Who paid for the poll and why was it done?=20

How many people were interviewed for the survey?=20

How were those people chosen?=20

What area (nation, state, or region) or what group (teachers, lawyers, Democratic voters, etc.) were these people chosen from?=20

Are the results based on the answers of all the people interviewed?=20

Who should have been interviewed and was not?=20

When was the poll done?=20

How were the interviews conducted?=20

- What about polls on the Internet or World Wide Web?=20
- What is the sampling error for the poll results?=20
- Who=92s on first?=20
- What other kinds of factors can skew poll results?=20
- What questions were asked?=20
- In what order were the questions asked?=20
- What about "push polls"?=20
- What other polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the same thing? If they are different, why are they different?=20
- So I've asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The poll is correct, right?=20
- With all these potential problems, should we ever report poll results?=20
- Is this poll worth reporting?=20

1. Who di=

d
the poll?

What polling firm=

,
research house, political campaign, corporation or other group conducted
the poll? This is always the first question to ask.

If you don't know who did the poll, you can't get the answers to all the
other questions listed here. If the person providing poll results can't
or won't tell you who did it, serious questions must be raised about the
reliability and truthfulness of the results being presented.

Reputable polling firms will provide you with the information you need to
evaluate the survey. Because reputation is important to a quality firm, a
professionally conducted poll will avoid many errors.

Top

2. Who pa=

id
for the poll and why was it done?

You must know who
paid for the survey, because that tells you =96 and your audience =96 who
thought these topics are important enough to spend money finding out what
people think. This is central to the whole issue of why the poll was
done.

Polls are not conducted for the good of the world. They are conducted for
a reason =96 either to gain helpful information or to advance a particular
cause.

It may be the news organization wants to develop a good story. It may be
the politician wants to be re-elected. It may be that the corporation is
trying to push sales of its new product. Or a special-interest group may
be trying to prove that its views are the views of the entire country.

All are legitimate reasons for doing a poll.

The important issue for you as a journalist is whether the motive for doing the poll creates such serious doubts about the validity of the results that the numbers should not be publicized.

Examples of suspect polls are private polls conducted for a political campaign. These polls are conducted solely to help the candidate win =96and for no other reason. The poll may have very slanted questions or a strange sampling methodology, all with a tactical campaign purpose. A campaign may be testing out new slogans, a new statement on a key issue or a new attack on an opponent. But since the goal of the candidate=92s poll may not be a straightforward, unbiased reading of the public's sentiments, the results should be reported with great care.

Likewise, reporting on a survey by a special-interest group is tricky. For example, an environmental group trumpets a poll saying the American people support strong measures to protect the environment. That may be true, but the poll was conducted for a group with definite views. That may have swayed the question wording, the timing of the poll, the group interviewed and the order of the questions. You should examine the poll to be certain that it accurately reflects public opinion and does not simply push a single viewpoint.

Top

3. How ma=ny

people were interviewed for the survey?

Because polls giv=

e approximate answers, the more people interviewed in a scientific poll, the smaller the error due to the size of the sample, all other things being equal. A common trap to avoid is that "more is automatically better." It is absolutely true that the more people interviewed in a scientific survey, the smaller the sampling error =96 all other things being equal. But other factors may be more important in judging the quality of a survey.

Top

4. How we=

re those people chosen?

The key reason th=

at some polls reflect public opinion accurately and other polls are unscientific junk is how the people were chosen to be interviewed.

In scientific polls, the pollster uses a specific method for picking respondents. In unscientific polls, the person picks himself to participate.

The method pollsters use to pick interviewees relies on the bedrock of mathematical reality: when the chance of selecting each person in the target population is known, then and only then do the results of the

sample survey reflect the entire population. This is called a random sample or a probability sample. This is the reason that interviews with 1,000 American adults can accurately reflect the opinions of more than 200 million American adults.

Most scientific samples use special techniques to be economically feasible. For example, some sampling methods for telephone interviewing do not just pick randomly generated telephone numbers. Only telephone exchanges that are known to contain working residential numbers are selected =96 to reduce the number of wasted calls. This still produces a random sample. Samples of only listed telephone numbers do not produce a random sample of all working telephone numbers.

But even a random sample cannot be purely random in practice since some people don't have phones, refuse to answer, or aren't home.

Top

5. What a= rea

(nation, state, or region) or what group (teachers, lawyers, Democratic voters, etc.) were these people chosen from?

It is absolutely critical to know from which group the interviewees were chosen.

You must know if a sample was draw from among all adults in the United States, or just from those in one state or in one city, or from another group. For example, a survey of business people can reflect the opinions of business people =96 but not of all adults. Only if the interviewees were chosen from among all American adults can the poll reflect the opinions of all American adults.

In the case of telephone samples, the population represented is that of people living in households with telephones. For most purposes, telephone households may be similar to the general population. But if you were reporting a poll on what it was like to be poor or homeless, a telephone sample would not be appropriate. Remember, the use of a scientific sampling technique does not mean that the correct population was interviewed.

Political polls are especially sensitive to this issue.

In pre-primary and pre-election polls, which people are chosen as the base for poll results is critical. A poll of all adults, for example, is not very useful on a primary race where only 25 percent of the registered voters actually turn out. So look for polls based on registered voters, "likely voters," previous primary voters, and such. These distinctions are important and should be included in the story, for one of the most difficult challenges in polling is trying to figure out who actually is going to vote.

Top

6. Are th= e

results based on the answers of all the people interviewed?

One of the easies=

t

ways to misrepresent the results of a poll is to report the answers of only a subgroup. For example, there is usually a substantial difference between the opinions of Democrats and Republicans on campaign-related matters. Reporting the opinions of only Democrats in a poll purported to be of all adults would substantially misrepresent the results.

Poll results based on Democrats must be identified as such and should be reported as representing only Democratic opinions.

Of course, reporting on just one subgroup can be exactly the right course. In polling on a primary contest, it is the opinions of those who can vote in the primary that count =96 not those who cannot vote in that contest. Each state has its own rules about who can participate in its primaries. Primary polls should include only eligible primary voters.

Top

7. Who should have been interviewed and was not?

No survey ever reaches everyone who should have been interviewed. You ought to know what steps were undertaken to minimize non-response, such as the number of attempts to reach the appropriate respondent and over how many days.

There are many reasons why people who should have been interviewed were not. They may have refused attempts to interview them. Or interviews may not have been attempted if people were not home when the interviewer called. Or there may have been a language problem or a hearing problem.

Top

8. When w= as

the poll done?

Events have a dramatic impact on poll results. Your interpretation of a poll should depend on when it was conducted relative to key events. Even the freshest poll results can be overtaken by events. The President may have given a stirring speech to the nation, the stock market may have crashed or an oil tanker may have sunk, spilling millions of gallons of crude on beautiful beaches.

Poll results that are several weeks or months old may be perfectly valid, but events may have erased any newsworthy relationship to current public opinion.

Top

9. How we= re

the interviews conducted?

There are three m= ain

possibilities: in person, by telephone or by mail. Most surveys are now conducted by telephone, with the calls made by interviewers from a central location. However, some surveys are still conducted by sending interviewers into people's homes to conduct the interviews.

Some surveys are conducted by mail. In scientific polls, the pollster picks the people to receive the mail questionnaires. The respondent fills out the questionnaire and returns it.

Mail surveys can be excellent sources of information, but it takes weeks to do a mail survey, meaning that the results cannot be as timely as a telephone survey. And mail surveys can be subject to other kinds of errors, particularly low response rates. In many mail surveys, more people fail to participate than do. This makes the results suspect. =20

Surveys done in shopping malls, in stores or on the sidewalk may have their uses for their sponsors, but publishing the results in the media is not among them. These approaches may yield interesting human-interest stories, but they should never be treated as if they represent a public opinion poll.

Advances in computer technology have allowed the development of computerized interviewing systems that dial the phone, play taped questions to a respondent and then record answers the person gives by punching numbers on the telephone keypad. Such surveys have a variety of severe problems, including uncontrolled selection of respondents and poor response rates, and should be avoided.

[Top](#top)

10. What about polls on the Internet or World Wide Web?

The explosive growth

of the Internet and the World Wide Web has given rise to an equally explosive growth in various types of online polls and surveys. Many online polls may be good entertainment, but they tell you nothing about public opinion.

Most Internet polls are simply the latest variation on the pseudo-polls that have existed for many years. Whether the effort is a click-on Web survey, a dial-in poll or a mail-in survey, the results should be ignored and not reported. All these pseudo-polls suffer from the same problem: the respondents are self-selected. The individuals choose themselves to take part in the poll =96 there is no pollster choosing the respondents to be interviewed.

Remember, the purpose of a poll is to draw conclusions about the population, not about the sample. In these pseudo-polls, there is no way to project the results to any larger group. Any similarity between the results of a pseudo-poll and a scientific survey is pure chance.

Clicking on your candidate's button in the "voting booth" on a Web site may drive up the numbers for your candidate in a presidential horse-race poll online. For most such efforts, no effort is made to pick the respondents, to limit users from voting multiple times or to reach

out for people who might not normally visit the Web site.

The 900-number dial-in polls may be fine for deciding whether or not Larry the Lobster should be cooked on Saturday Night Live or even for dedicated fans to express their opinions on who is the greatest quarterback in the National Football League. The opinions expressed may be real, but in sum the numbers are just entertainment. There is no way to tell who actually called in, how old they are, or how many times each person called.

Never be fooled by the number of responses. In some cases a few people call in thousands of times. Even if 500,000 calls are tallied, no one has any real knowledge of what the results mean. If big numbers impress you, remember that the Literary Digest's non-scientific sample of 12,000,000 people said Landon would beat Roosevelt in the 1936 Presidential election.

Mail-in coupon polls are just as bad. In this case, the magazine or newspaper includes a coupon to be returned with the answers to the questions. Again, there is no way to know who responded and how many times each person did.

Another variation on the pseudo-poll comes as part of a fund-raising effort. An organization sends out a letter with a survey form attached to a large list of people, asking for opinions and for the respondent to send money to support the organization or pay for tabulating the survey. The questions are often loaded and the results of such an effort are always meaningless.

This technique is used by a wide variety of organizations from political parties and special-interest groups to charitable organizations. Again, if the poll in question is part of a fund-raising pitch, pitch it =96 in the wastebasket.

With regard to the Internet, methods are being developed to sample the opinions of those who have online access, although these efforts are just starting. Even a survey that accurately sampled those who have access to the Internet would still fall short of a poll of all Americans, since only a relatively small fraction of the nation=92s adults have access to the Internet.

[Top](#top)

11. What is

the sampling error for the poll results?

Interviews with a scientific sample of 1,000 adults can accurately reflect the opinions of nearly 200 million American adults. That means interviews attempted with all 200 million adults =96 if such were possible =96 would give approximatel=

y the same results as a well-conducted survey based on 1,000 interviews.

What happens if another carefully done poll of 1,000 adults gives slightly different results from the first survey? Neither of the polls is "wrong." This range of possible results is called the error due

to sampling, often called the margin of error.

This is not an "error" in the sense of making a mistake. Rather, it is a measure of the possible range of approximation in the results because a sample was used.

Pollsters express the degree of the certainty of results based on a sample as a "confidence level." This means a sample is likely to be within so many points of the results one would have gotten if an interview were attempted with the entire target population. They usually say this with 95% confidence.

Thus, for example, a "3 percentage point margin of error" in a national poll means that if the attempt were made to interview every adult in the nation with the same questions in the same way at about the same time as the poll was taken, the poll's answers would fall within plus or minus 3 percentage points of the complete count=92s results 95% of the time.

This does not address the issue of whether people cooperate with the survey, or if the questions are understood, or if any other methodological issue exists. The sampling error is only the portion of the potential error in a survey introduced by using a sample rather than interviewing the entire population. Sampling error tells us nothing about the refusals or those consistently unavailable for interview; it also tells us nothing about the biasing effects of a particular question wording or the bias a particular interviewer may inject into the interview situation.

Remember that the sampling error margin applies to each figure in the results =96 it is at least 3 percentage points plus or minus for each one in our example. Thus, in a poll question matching two candidates for President, both figures are subject to sampling error.

[Top](#top)

12. Who=

=92s

on first?

Sampling error raises one of the thorniest problems in the presentation of poll results: For a horse-race poll, when is one candidate really ahead of the other?

Certainly, if the gap between the two candidates is less than the error margin, you should not say that one candidate is ahead of the other. You can say the race is "close", the race is "roughly even", or there is "little difference between the candidates." But it should not be called a "dead heat" unless the candidates are tied with the same percentages.

And just as certainly, when the gap between the two candidates is equal to or more than twice the error margin =96 6 percentage points in our example =96 and if there are only two candidates and no undecided voters, you can say with confidence that the poll says Candidate A is clearly leading Candidate B.

When the gap between the two candidates is more than the error margin but less than twice the error margin, you should say that Candidate A "is ahead", "has an advantage" or "holds an edge". The story should mention that there is a small possibility that Candidate B is ahead of Candidate A.

When there are more than two choices or undecided voters =96 in the real world =96 the question gets much more complicated. While the solution is statistically complex, you can fairly easily evaluate this situation by estimating the error margin. You can do that by taking the percent for each of the two candidates in question and multiplying it by the total respondents for the survey (only the likely voters if that is appropriate). This number is now the effective sample size for your judgement. Look up the sampling error in a table of statistics for that reduced sample size, and apply it to the candidate percentages. If they overlap, then you do not know if one is ahead. If they do not, then you can make the judgement that one candidate has a lead.

And bear in mind that when subgroup results are reported =96 women or blacks, or young people =96 the sampling error margin for those figures is greater than for results based on the sample as a whole.

[Top](#top)

13. What other kinds of factors can skew poll results?
The margin of sampling error is just one possible source of inaccuracy in a poll. It is not necessarily the source of the greatest source of possible error; we use it because it's the only one that can be quantified. And, other things being equal, it is useful for evaluating whether differences between poll results are meaningful in a statistical sense.

Question phrasing and question order are also likely sources of flaws. Inadequate interviewer training and supervision, data processing errors and other operational problems can also introduce errors. Professional polling operations are less subject to these problems than volunteer-conducted polls, which are usually less trustworthy.

You should always ask if the poll results have been "weighted." This process is usually used to account for unequal probabilities of selection and to adjust slightly the demographics in the sample. You should be aware that a poll could be manipulated unduly by weighting the numbers to produce a desired result. While some weighting may be appropriate, other weighting is not. Weighting a scientific poll is only appropriate to reflect unequal probabilities or to adjust to independent values that are mostly constant.

[Top](#top)

14. What questions were asked?
You must find out the exact wording of the poll questions. Why? Because the very wording of questions can make major differences in the results.

Perhaps the best test of any poll question is your reaction to it. On the

face of it, does the question seem fair and unbiased? Does it present a balanced set of choices? Would most people be able to answer the question?

On sensitive questions =96 such as abortion =96 the complete wording of the question should probably be included in your story. It may well be worthwhile to compare the results of several different polls from different organizations on sensitive questions. You should examine carefully both the results and the exact wording of the questions.

Top

15. In what

order were the questions

asked?<font face=3D"arial" size=3D4 color=3D"#0000=

00">

Sometimes the ver=

y

order of the questions can have an impact on the results. Often that impact is intentional; sometimes it is not. The impact of order can often

be subtle.

During troubled economic times, for example, if people are asked what they think of the economy before they are asked their opinion of the president, the presidential popularity rating will probably be lower than if you had reversed the order of the questions. And in good economic times, the opposite is true.

What is important here is whether the questions that were asked prior to the critical question in the poll could sway the results. If the poll asks questions about abortion just before a question about an abortion ballot measure, the prior questions could sway the results.

Top

16. What about "push polls"?

In recent years, some political campaigns and special-interest groups have used a technique called "push polls" to spread rumors and even outright lies about opponents. These efforts are not polls, but are political manipulation trying to hide behind the smokescreen of a public opinion survey.

In a "push poll," a large number of people are called by telephone and asked to participate in a purported survey. The survey "questions" are really thinly-veiled accusations against an opponent or repetitions of rumors about a candidate=92s personal or professional behavior. The focus here is on making certain the respondent hears and understands the accusation in the question, not in gathering the respondent=92s opinions.

"Push polls" are unethical and have been condemned by professional polling organizations.

"Push polls" must be distinguished from some types of legitimate surveys done by political campaigns. At times, a campaign poll may ask a series of questions about contrasting issue positions of the candidates =96 or various things that could be said about a candidate, some of which are negative. These legitimate questions seek to gauge the public=92s reaction to a candidate=92s position or to a possible legitimate attack on a candidate=92s record.

A legitimate poll can be distinguished from a "push poll" usually by:

The number of calls made =96 a push poll makes thousands and thousands of calls, instead of hundreds for most surveys; The identity of who is making the telephone calls =96 a polling firm for a scientific survey as opposed to a telemarketing house or the campaign itself for a "push poll"; The lack of any true gathering of results in a "push poll," which has as its only objective the dissemination of false or misleading information.

Top

17. What other polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the same thing? If they are different, why are they different?

Results of other polls =96 by a newspaper or television station, a public survey firm or even a candidate's opponent =96 should be used to check and contrast poll results you have in hand.

If the polls differ, first check the timing of the interviewing. If the polls were done at different times, the differing results may demonstrate a swing in public opinion.

If the polls were done about the same time, ask each poll sponsor for an explanation of the differences. Conflicting polls often make good stories.

Top

18. So I= 've

asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The poll is correct, right?

Usually, yes. However, remember that the laws of chance alone say that the results of one poll out of 20 may be skewed away from the public's real views just because of sampling error.

Also remember that no matter how good the poll, no matter how wide the margin, no matter how big the sample, a pre-election poll does not show that one candidate has the race "locked up." Things change =96 often and dramatically in politics. That=92s why candidates campaign.=20

Top

19. With

all these potential problems, should we ever report poll results?

Yes. Because
reputable polling organizations consistently do good work. In spite of
the difficulties, the public opinion survey, correctly conducted, is
still the best objective measure of the state of the views of the public.

Top

20. Is t=
his

poll worth reporting?

If the poll was
conducted correctly, and you have been able to obtain the information
outlined here, your news judgment and that of your editors should be
applied to polls, as it is to every other element of a story.

Top

<dl>

<dd>This is a copyrighted publication of the National Council on Public
Polls in keeping with its mission to help educate journalists on the use
of public opinion polls.

<dd>The National Council on Public Polls hereby grants the right to
duplicate this work in whole, but not in part, for any noncommercial
purpose provided that any copy include all of the information on this
page.

<dd>Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. is Director, Elections, NBC News. G. Evans
Witt is president, Princeton Survey Research Associates, Inc. They were
cofounders of the Associated Press/ NBC News Poll.

<dd>For any additional information on any aspect of polling or a specific
poll, please call the NCPP office at 800-239-0909.

<dd>The price for a single printed copy price is \$2.95. For educational
discounts and multiple copies contact NCPP. This document can be
downloaded without charge from the NCPP website:

www.ncpp.org.

<dd>Top

<dd>For more information, contact us at

info@ncpp.org.

</dl></x-html> </html>

-----_5319391==_.ALT--

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 12:46:50 -0400
From: "Curtis Mildner" <cmildner@marketdecisions.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <5.0.0.25.2.20001023121100.049b4a90@mail.mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: 20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0074_01C03CEF.509B9E00"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0074_01C03CEF.509B9E00
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Can this article be reproduced and distributed?

----- Original Message -----=20
From: dick halpern=20
To: aapornet@usc.edu=20
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 12:17 PM
Subject: 20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results

Hi folks,

With all the thrashing about with respect to polling results and the way these are handled by the media as a basis for generating good stories I thought it appropriate to share this article with you. Doubtless, many of you may have already seen and read it and to those I apologize. But for others, it's worth taking a look. The questions and answers address many of the topics that have occupied AAPORNET these last few months.

Dick Halpern

20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results

Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. and G. Evans Witt=20

For journalists and for pollsters, questions are the most frequently used tools for gathering information. For the journalist looking at a set of poll numbers, here are the 20 questions to ask the pollster before reporting any results. This publication is designed to help working journalists do a thorough, professional job covering polls. It is not a primer on how to conduct a public opinion survey.=20

The only polls that should be reported are "scientific" polls. A number of the questions here will help you decide whether or not a poll =

is a "scientific" one worthy of coverage - or an unscientific survey =
without value.=20

Unscientific pseudo-polls are widespread and sometimes entertaining, =
if always quite meaningless. Examples include 900-number call-in polls, =
man-on-the-street surveys, most Internet polls, shopping mall polls, and =
even the classic toilet tissue poll featuring pictures of the candidates =
on each sheet.=20

The major distinguishing difference between scientific and =
unscientific polls is who picks the respondents for the survey. In a =
scientific poll, the pollster identifies and seeks out the people to be =
interviewed. In an unscientific poll, the respondents usually =
"volunteer" their opinions, selecting themselves for the poll.=20

The results of the well-conducted scientific poll can provide a =
reliable guide to the opinions of many people in addition to those =
interviewed - even the opinions of all Americans. The results of an =
unscientific poll tell you nothing beyond simply what those respondents =
say.=20

With these 20 questions in hand, the journalist can seek the facts to =
decide how to handle every poll that comes across the news desk each =
day.=20

The authors wish to thank the officers, trustees and members of the =
National Council on Public Polls for their editing assistance and their =
support.=20

=20

- 1.. Who did the poll?=20
- 2.. Who paid for the poll and why was it done?=20
- 3.. How many people were interviewed for the survey?=20
- 4.. How were those people chosen?=20
- 5.. What area (nation, state, or region) or what =
group (teachers, lawyers, Democratic voters, etc.) were these people =
chosen from?=20
- 6.. Are the results based on the answers of all the people =
interviewed?=20
- 7.. Who should have been interviewed and was not?=20
- 8.. When was the poll done?=20
- 9.. How were the interviews conducted?=20
- 10.. What about polls on the Internet or World Wide Web?=20
- 11.. What is the sampling error for the poll results?=20
- 12.. Who's on first?=20
- 13.. What other kinds of factors can skew poll results?=20
- 14.. What questions were asked?=20
- 15.. In what order were the questions asked?=20
- 16.. What about "push polls"?=20
- 17.. What other polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the =
same thing? If they are different, why are they different?=20
- 18.. So I've asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The =
poll is correct, right?=20
- 19.. With all these potential problems, should we ever report poll =
results?=20
- 20.. Is this poll worth reporting?=20

1. Who did the poll?

What polling firm, research house, political campaign, corporation or other group conducted the poll? This is always the first question to ask.=20

If you don't know who did the poll, you can't get the answers to all the other questions listed here. If the person providing poll results can't or won't tell you who did it, serious questions must be raised about the reliability and truthfulness of the results being presented.=20

Reputable polling firms will provide you with the information you need to evaluate the survey. Because reputation is important to a quality firm, a professionally conducted poll will avoid many errors.=20

Top=20

2. Who paid for the poll and why was it done?

You must know who paid for the survey, because that tells you - and your audience - who thought these topics are important enough to spend money finding out what people think. This is central to the whole issue of why the poll was done.=20

Polls are not conducted for the good of the world. They are conducted for a reason - either to gain helpful information or to advance a particular cause.=20

It may be the news organization wants to develop a good story. It may be the politician wants to be re-elected. It may be that the corporation is trying to push sales of its new product. Or a special-interest group may be trying to prove that its views are the views of the entire country.=20

All are legitimate reasons for doing a poll.=20

The important issue for you as a journalist is whether the motive for doing the poll creates such serious doubts about the validity of the results that the numbers should not be publicized.=20

Examples of suspect polls are private polls conducted for a political campaign. These polls are conducted solely to help the candidate win -and for no other reason. The poll may have very slanted questions or a strange sampling methodology, all with a tactical campaign purpose. A campaign may be testing out new slogans, a new statement on a key issue or a new attack on an opponent. But since the goal of the candidate's poll may not be a straightforward, unbiased reading of the public's sentiments, the results should be reported with great care.=20

Likewise, reporting on a survey by a special-interest group is tricky. For example, an environmental group trumpets a poll saying the American people support strong measures to protect the environment. That may be true, but the poll was conducted for a group with definite views. That may have swayed the question wording, the timing of the poll, the group interviewed and the order of the questions. You should examine the poll =

to be certain that it accurately reflects public opinion and does not simply push a single viewpoint.=20

Top=20

3. How many people were interviewed for the survey?

Because polls give approximate answers, the more people interviewed in a scientific poll, the smaller the error due to the size of the sample, all other things being equal. A common trap to avoid is that "more is automatically better." It is absolutely true that the more people interviewed in a scientific survey, the smaller the sampling error - all other things being equal. But other factors may be more important in judging the quality of a survey.=20

Top=20

4. How were those people chosen?

The key reason that some polls reflect public opinion accurately and other polls are unscientific junk is how the people were chosen to be interviewed.=20

In scientific polls, the pollster uses a specific method for picking respondents. In unscientific polls, the person picks himself to participate.=20

The method pollsters use to pick interviewees relies on the bedrock of mathematical reality: when the chance of selecting each person in the target population is known, then and only then do the results of the sample survey reflect the entire population. This is called a random sample or a probability sample. This is the reason that interviews with 1,000 American adults can accurately reflect the opinions of more than 200 million American adults.=20

Most scientific samples use special techniques to be economically feasible. For example, some sampling methods for telephone interviewing do not just pick randomly generated telephone numbers. Only telephone exchanges that are known to contain working residential numbers are selected - to reduce the number of wasted calls. This still produces a random sample. Samples of only listed telephone numbers do not produce a random sample of all working telephone numbers.=20

But even a random sample cannot be purely random in practice since some people don't have phones, refuse to answer, or aren't home.=20

Top=20

5. What area (nation, state, or region) or what group (teachers, lawyers, Democratic voters, etc.) were these people chosen from?

It is absolutely critical to know from which group the interviewees were chosen.=20

You must know if a sample was drawn from among all adults in the United States, or just from those in one state or in one city, or from another group. For example, a survey of business people can reflect the opinions of business people - but not of all adults. Only if the interviewees were chosen from among all American adults can the poll reflect the opinions of all American adults.=20

In the case of telephone samples, the population represented is that of people living in households with telephones. For most purposes, telephone households may be similar to the general population. But if you were reporting a poll on what it was like to be poor or homeless, a telephone sample would not be appropriate. Remember, the use of a scientific sampling technique does not mean that the correct population was interviewed.=20

Political polls are especially sensitive to this issue.=20

In pre-primary and pre-election polls, which people are chosen as the base for poll results is critical. A poll of all adults, for example, is not very useful on a primary race where only 25 percent of the registered voters actually turn out. So look for polls based on registered voters, "likely voters," previous primary voters, and such. These distinctions are important and should be included in the story, for one of the most difficult challenges in polling is trying to figure out who actually is going to vote.=20

Top=20

6. Are the results based on the answers of all the people interviewed?

One of the easiest ways to misrepresent the results of a poll is to report the answers of only a subgroup. For example, there is usually a substantial difference between the opinions of Democrats and Republicans on campaign-related matters. Reporting the opinions of only Democrats in a poll purported to be of all adults would substantially misrepresent the results.=20

Poll results based on Democrats must be identified as such and should be reported as representing only Democratic opinions.=20

Of course, reporting on just one subgroup can be exactly the right course. In polling on a primary contest, it is the opinions of those who can vote in the primary that count - not those who cannot vote in that contest. Each state has its own rules about who can participate in its primaries. Primary polls should include only eligible primary voters.=20

Top=20

7. Who should have been interviewed and was not?

No survey ever reaches everyone who should have been interviewed. You ought to know what steps were undertaken to minimize non-response, such as the number of attempts to reach the appropriate respondent and over how many days.=20

There are many reasons why people who should have been interviewed were not. They may have refused attempts to interview them. Or interviews may not have been attempted if people were not home when the interviewer called. Or there may have been a language problem or a hearing problem.=20

Top=20

8. When was the poll done?

Events have a dramatic impact on poll results. Your interpretation of =

a poll should depend on when it was conducted relative to key events. =
Even the freshest poll results can be overtaken by events. The President =
may have given a stirring speech to the nation, the stock market may =
have crashed or an oil tanker may have sunk, spilling millions of =
gallons of crude on beautiful beaches.=20

Poll results that are several weeks or months old may be perfectly =
valid, but events may have erased any newsworthy relationship to current =
public opinion.=20

Top=20

9. How were the interviews conducted?

There are three main possibilities: in person, by telephone or by =
mail. Most surveys are now conducted by telephone, with the calls made =
by interviewers from a central location. However, some surveys are still =
conducted by sending interviewers into people's homes to conduct the =
interviews.=20

Some surveys are conducted by mail. In scientific polls, the pollster =
picks the people to receive the mail questionnaires. The respondent =
fills out the questionnaire and returns it.=20

Mail surveys can be excellent sources of information, but it takes =
weeks to do a mail survey, meaning that the results cannot be as timely =
as a telephone survey. And mail surveys can be subject to other kinds of =
errors, particularly low response rates. In many mail surveys, more =
people fail to participate than do. This makes the results suspect.=20

Surveys done in shopping malls, in stores or on the sidewalk may have =
their uses for their sponsors, but publishing the results in the media =
is not among them. These approaches may yield interesting human-interest =
stories, but they should never be treated as if they represent a public =
opinion poll.=20

Advances in computer technology have allowed the development of =
computerized interviewing systems that dial the phone, play taped =
questions to a respondent and then record answers the person gives by =
punching numbers on the telephone keypad. Such surveys have a variety of =
severe problems, including uncontrolled selection of respondents and =
poor response rates, and should be avoided.=20

Top=20

10. What about polls on the Internet or World Wide Web?

The explosive growth of the Internet and the World Wide Web has given =
rise to an equally explosive growth in various types of online polls and =
surveys. Many online polls may be good entertainment, but they tell you =
nothing about public opinion.=20

Most Internet polls are simply the latest variation on the =
pseudo-polls that have existed for many years. Whether the effort is a =
click-on Web survey, a dial-in poll or a mail-in survey, the results =
should be ignored and not reported. All these pseudo-polls suffer from =
the same problem: the respondents are self-selected. The individuals =
choose themselves to take part in the poll - there is no pollster =
choosing the respondents to be interviewed.=20

Remember, the purpose of a poll is to draw conclusions about the = population, not about the sample. In these pseudo-polls, there is no way = to project the results to any larger group. Any similarity between the = results of a pseudo-poll and a scientific survey is pure chance.=20

Clicking on your candidate's button in the "voting booth" on a Web = site may drive up the numbers for your candidate in a presidential = horse-race poll online. For most such efforts, no effort is made to pick = the respondents, to limit users from voting multiple times or to reach = out for people who might not normally visit the Web site.=20

The 900-number dial-in polls may be fine for deciding whether or not = Larry the Lobster should be cooked on Saturday Night Live or even for = dedicated fans to express their opinions on who is the greatest = quarterback in the National Football League. The opinions expressed may = be real, but in sum the numbers are just entertainment. There is no way = to tell who actually called in, how old they are, or how many times each = person called.=20

Never be fooled by the number of responses. In some cases a few people = call in thousands of times. Even if 500,000 calls are tallied, no one = has any real knowledge of what the results mean. If big numbers impress = you, remember that the Literary Digest's non-scientific sample of = 12,000,000 people said Landon would beat Roosevelt in the 1936 = Presidential election.=20

Mail-in coupon polls are just as bad. In this case, the magazine or = newspaper includes a coupon to be returned with the answers to the = questions. Again, there is no way to know who responded and how many = times each person did.=20

Another variation on the pseudo-poll comes as part of a fund-raising = effort. An organization sends out a letter with a survey form attached = to a large list of people, asking for opinions and for the respondent to = send money to support the organization or pay for tabulating the survey. = The questions are often loaded and the results of such an effort are = always meaningless.=20

This technique is used by a wide variety of organizations from = political parties and special-interest groups to charitable = organizations. Again, if the poll in question is part of a fund-raising = pitch, pitch it - in the wastebasket.=20

With regard to the Internet, methods are being developed to sample the = opinions of those who have online access, although these efforts are = just starting. Even a survey that accurately sampled those who have = access to the Internet would still fall short of a poll of all = Americans, since only a relatively small fraction of the nation's adults = have access to the Internet.=20

Top=20

11. What is the sampling error for the poll results?=20

Interviews with a scientific sample of 1,000 adults can accurately = reflect the opinions of nearly 200 million American adults. That means = interviews attempted with all 200 million adults - if such were possible =

- would give approximately the same results as a well-conducted survey based on 1,000 interviews.=20

What happens if another carefully done poll of 1,000 adults gives slightly different results from the first survey? Neither of the polls is "wrong." This range of possible results is called the error due to sampling, often called the margin of error.=20

This is not an "error" in the sense of making a mistake. Rather, it is a measure of the possible range of approximation in the results because a sample was used.=20

Pollsters express the degree of the certainty of results based on a sample as a "confidence level." This means a sample is likely to be within so many points of the results one would have gotten if an interview were attempted with the entire target population. They usually say this with 95% confidence.=20

Thus, for example, a "3 percentage point margin of error" in a national poll means that if the attempt were made to interview every adult in the nation with the same questions in the same way at about the same time as the poll was taken, the poll's answers would fall within plus or minus 3 percentage points of the complete count's results 95% of the time.=20

This does not address the issue of whether people cooperate with the survey, or if the questions are understood, or if any other methodological issue exists. The sampling error is only the portion of the potential error in a survey introduced by using a sample rather than interviewing the entire population. Sampling error tells us nothing about the refusals or those consistently unavailable for interview; it also tells us nothing about the biasing effects of a particular question wording or the bias a particular interviewer may inject into the interview situation.=20

Remember that the sampling error margin applies to each figure in the results - it is at least 3 percentage points plus or minus for each one in our example. Thus, in a poll question matching two candidates for President, both figures are subject to sampling error.=20

Top=20

12. Who's on first?=20

Sampling error raises one of the thorniest problems in the presentation of poll results: For a horse-race poll, when is one candidate really ahead of the other?=20

Certainly, if the gap between the two candidates is less than the error margin, you should not say that one candidate is ahead of the other. You can say the race is "close", the race is "roughly even", or there is "little difference between the candidates." But it should not be called a "dead heat" unless the candidates are tied with the same percentages.=20

And just as certainly, when the gap between the two candidates is equal to or more than twice the error margin - 6 percentage points in our example - and if there are only two candidates and no undecided =

voters, you can say with confidence that the poll says Candidate A is clearly leading Candidate B.=20

When the gap between the two candidates is more than the error margin but less than twice the error margin, you should say that Candidate A "is ahead", "has an advantage" or "holds an edge". The story should mention that there is a small possibility that Candidate B is ahead of Candidate A.=20

When there are more than two choices or undecided voters - in the real world - the question gets much more complicated. While the solution is statistically complex, you can fairly easily evaluate this situation by estimating the error margin. You can do that by taking the percent for each of the two candidates in question and multiplying it by the total respondents for the survey (only the likely voters if that is appropriate). This number is now the effective sample size for your judgement. Look up the sampling error in a table of statistics for that reduced sample size, and apply it to the candidate percentages. If they overlap, then you do not know if one is ahead. If they do not, then you can make the judgement that one candidate has a lead.=20

And bear in mind that when subgroup results are reported - women or blacks, or young people - the sampling error margin for those figures is greater than for results based on the sample as a whole.=20

Top=20

13. What other kinds of factors can skew poll results?=20

The margin of sampling error is just one possible source of inaccuracy in a poll. It is not necessarily the source of the greatest source of possible error; we use it because it's the only one that can be quantified. And, other things being equal, it is useful for evaluating whether differences between poll results are meaningful in a statistical sense.=20

Question phrasing and question order are also likely sources of flaws. Inadequate interviewer training and supervision, data processing errors and other operational problems can also introduce errors. Professional polling operations are less subject to these problems than volunteer-conducted polls, which are usually less trustworthy.=20

You should always ask if the poll results have been "weighted." This process is usually used to account for unequal probabilities of selection and to adjust slightly the demographics in the sample. You should be aware that a poll could be manipulated unduly by weighting the numbers to produce a desired result. While some weighting may be appropriate, other weighting is not. Weighting a scientific poll is only appropriate to reflect unequal probabilities or to adjust to independent values that are mostly constant.=20

Top=20

14. What questions were asked?=20

You must find out the exact wording of the poll questions. Why? Because the very wording of questions can make major differences in the results.=20

Perhaps the best test of any poll question is your reaction to it. On the face of it, does the question seem fair and unbiased? Does it present a balanced set of choices? Would most people be able to answer the question?=
20

On sensitive questions - such as abortion - the complete wording of the question should probably be included in your story. It may well be worthwhile to compare the results of several different polls from different organizations on sensitive questions. You should examine carefully both the results and the exact wording of the questions.=
20

Top=20

15. In what order were the questions asked?=
20

Sometimes the very order of the questions can have an impact on the results. Often that impact is intentional; sometimes it is not. The impact of order can often be subtle.=
20

During troubled economic times, for example, if people are asked what they think of the economy before they are asked their opinion of the president, the presidential popularity rating will probably be lower than if you had reversed the order of the questions. And in good economic times, the opposite is true.=
20

What is important here is whether the questions that were asked prior to the critical question in the poll could sway the results. If the poll asks questions about abortion just before a question about an abortion ballot measure, the prior questions could sway the results.=
20

Top=20

16. What about "push polls"?

In recent years, some political campaigns and special-interest groups have used a technique called "push polls" to spread rumors and even outright lies about opponents. These efforts are not polls, but are political manipulation trying to hide behind the smokescreen of a public opinion survey.=
20

In a "push poll," a large number of people are called by telephone and asked to participate in a purported survey. The survey "questions" are really thinly-veiled accusations against an opponent or repetitions of rumors about a candidate's personal or professional behavior. The focus here is on making certain the respondent hears and understands the accusation in the question, not in gathering the respondent's opinions.=
20

"Push polls" are unethical and have been condemned by professional polling organizations.=
20

"Push polls" must be distinguished from some types of legitimate surveys done by political campaigns. At times, a campaign poll may ask a series of questions about contrasting issue positions of the candidates - or various things that could be said about a candidate, some of which are negative. These legitimate questions seek to gauge the public's reaction to a candidate's position or to a possible legitimate attack on a candidate's record.=
20

A legitimate poll can be distinguished from a "push poll" usually by=
20

The number of calls made - a push poll makes thousands and thousands = of calls, instead of hundreds for most surveys; The identity of who is = making the telephone calls - a polling firm for a scientific survey as = opposed to a telemarketing house or the campaign itself for a "push = poll"; The lack of any true gathering of results in a "push poll," which = has as its only objective the dissemination of false or misleading = information.=20

Top=20

17. What other polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the = same thing? If they are different, why are they different?=20

Results of other polls - by a newspaper or television station, a = public survey firm or even a candidate's opponent - should be used to = check and contrast poll results you have in hand.=20

If the polls differ, first check the timing of the interviewing. If = the polls were done at different times, the differing results may = demonstrate a swing in public opinion.=20

If the polls were done about the same time, ask each poll sponsor for = an explanation of the differences. Conflicting polls often make good = stories.=20

Top=20

18. So I've asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The poll = is correct, right?=20

Usually, yes. However, remember that the laws of chance alone say that = the results of one poll out of 20 may be skewed away from the public's = real views just because of sampling error.=20

Also remember that no matter how good the poll, no matter how wide the = margin, no matter how big the sample, a pre-election poll does not show = that one candidate has the race "locked up." Things change - often and = dramatically in politics. That's why candidates campaign.=20

Top=20

19. With all these potential problems, should we ever report poll = results?=20

Yes. Because reputable polling organizations consistently do good = work. In spite of the difficulties, the public opinion survey, correctly = conducted, is still the best objective measure of the state of the views = of the public.=20

Top=20

20. Is this poll worth reporting?=20

If the poll was conducted correctly, and you have been able to obtain = the information outlined here, your news judgment and that of your = editors should be applied to polls, as it is to every other element of a = story.=20

Top=20

This is a copyrighted publication of the National Council on Public =

Polls in keeping with its mission to help educate journalists on the use =
of public opinion polls.=20

The National Council on Public Polls hereby grants the right to =
duplicate this work in whole, but not in part, for any noncommercial =
purpose provided that any copy include all of the information on this =
page.=20

Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. is Director, Elections, NBC News. G. Evans =
Witt is president, Princeton Survey Research Associates, Inc. They were =
cofounders of the Associated Press/ NBC News Poll.=20

For any additional information on any aspect of polling or a =
specific poll, please call the NCPP office at 800-239-0909.=20

The price for a single printed copy price is \$2.95. For educational =
discounts and multiple copies contact NCPP. This document can be =
downloaded without charge from the NCPP website: www.ncpp.org.=20

Top

For more information, contact us at info@ncpp.org.=20

</x-html>=20

-----_NextPart_000_0074_01C03CEF.509B9E00
Content-Type: text/html;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.50.4134.600" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Can this article be reproduced and=20
distributed?</FONT></DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE=20
style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
  <DIV style=3D"FONT: 10pt arial">----- Original Message ----- </DIV>
  <DIV=20
  style=3D"BACKGROUND: #e4e4e4; FONT: 10pt arial; font-color: =
black"><B>From:</B>=20
  <A title=3Drshalpern@mindspring.com =
```

href=3D"mailto:rshalpern@mindspring.com">dick=20
halpern </DIV>
<DIV style=3D"FONT: 10pt arial">To: <A title=3Daapornet@usc.edu =

href=3D"mailto:aapornet@usc.edu">aapornet@usc.edu </DIV>
<DIV style=3D"FONT: 10pt arial">Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 =
12:17=20
PM</DIV>
<DIV style=3D"FONT: 10pt arial">Subject: 20 Questions A =
Journalist Should=20
Ask About Poll Results</DIV>
<DIV>
</DIV>Hi folks,

With all the thrashing about with =
respect to=20
polling results and the way these are handled by the media as a basis =
for=20
generating good stories I thought it appropriate to share this article =
with=20
you. Doubtless, many of you may have already seen and read it and to =
those I=20
apologize. But for others, it's worth taking a look. The questions and =
answers=20
address many of the topics that have occupied AAPORNET these last few=20
months.

Dick Halpern

<FONT face=3Darial =
color=3D#5d4765=20
size=3D4>20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll=20
Results

<FONT face=3Darial color=3D#000000 =
size=3D2>Sheldon R.=20
Gawiser, Ph.D. and G. Evans Witt

For journalists and for=20
pollsters, questions are the most frequently used tools for gathering=20
information. For the journalist looking at a set of poll numbers, here =
are the=20
20 questions to ask the pollster before reporting any results. This=20
publication is designed to help working journalists do a thorough,=20
professional job covering polls. It is not a primer on how to conduct =
a public=20
opinion survey.

The only polls that should be reported are=20
"scientific" polls. A number of the questions here will help you =
decide=20
whether or not a poll is a "scientific" one worthy of coverage – =
or an=20
unscientific survey without value.

Unscientific pseudo-polls =
are=20
widespread and sometimes entertaining, if always quite meaningless. =
Examples=20
include 900-number call-in polls, man-on-the-street surveys, most =
Internet=20
polls, shopping mall polls, and even the classic toilet tissue poll =
featuring=20
pictures of the candidates on each sheet.

The major =
distinguishing=20
difference between scientific and unscientific polls is who picks the=20
respondents for the survey. In a scientific poll, the pollster =
identifies and=20
seeks out the people to be interviewed. In an unscientific poll, the=20
respondents usually "volunteer" their opinions, selecting themselves =
for the=20
poll.

The results of the well-conducted scientific poll can =

provide a reliable guide to the opinions of many people in addition to those interviewed; even the opinions of all Americans. The results of an unscientific poll tell you nothing beyond simply what those respondents say. With these questions in hand, the journalist can seek the facts to decide how to handle every poll that comes across the news desk each day. The authors wish to thank the officers, trustees and members of the National Council on Public Polls for their editing assistance and their support.

- Who did the poll?
- Who paid for the poll and why was it done?
- How many people were interviewed for the survey?
- How were those people chosen?
- What area (nation, state, or region) or what group (teachers, lawyers, Democratic voters, etc.) were these people chosen from?
- Are the results based on the answers of all the people interviewed?
- Who should have been interviewed and was not?
- When was the poll done?
- How were the interviews conducted?
- What about polls on the Internet or World Wide Web?
- What is the sampling error for the poll results?
- Who's on first?
- What other kinds of factors can skew poll results?
- What questions were asked?
- In what order were the questions asked?
- What about "push polls"?
- What other polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the same thing? If they are different, why are they different?
- So I've asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The poll is correct, right?
- With all these potential problems, should we ever report poll results?
- Is this poll worth reporting?

1. Who did the poll? What polling firm, research house, political campaign, =

corporation or=20

other group conducted the poll? This is always the first question to =
ask.=20

If you don't know who did the poll, you can't get the answers =
to all=20

the other questions listed here. If the person providing poll results =
can't or=20

won't tell you who did it, serious questions must be raised about the=20
reliability and truthfulness of the results being presented. =

Reputable=20

polling firms will provide you with the information you need to =
evaluate the=20

survey. Because reputation is important to a quality firm, a =
professionally=20

conducted poll will avoid many errors.

<A =
href=3D"#top">Top=20

<A =
name=3D2>2. Who paid for=20

the poll and why was it done?
<FONT face=3Darial =
color=3D#000000=20

size=3D2>You must know who paid for the survey, because that tells you =
– and=20

your audience – who thought these topics are important enough to =
spend money=20

finding out what people think. This is central to the whole issue of =
why the=20

poll was done.

Polls are not conducted for the good of the =
world. They=20

are conducted for a reason – either to gain helpful information =
or to advance=20

a particular cause.

It may be the news organization wants to =
develop a=20

good story. It may be the politician wants to be re-elected. It may be =
that=20

the corporation is trying to push sales of its new product. Or a=20
special-interest group may be trying to prove that its views are the =

views of=20
the entire country.

All are legitimate reasons for doing a =

poll.=20

The important issue for you as a journalist is whether the =
motive for=20

doing the poll creates such serious doubts about the validity of the =
results=20

that the numbers should not be publicized.

Examples of suspect =
polls=20

are private polls conducted for a political campaign. These polls are=20
conducted solely to help the candidate win – and for no other =

reason. The poll=20
may have very slanted questions or a strange sampling methodology, all =

with a=20
tactical campaign purpose. A campaign may be testing out new slogans, =

a new=20
statement on a key issue or a new attack on an opponent. But since the =
goal of=20

the candidate’s poll may not be a straightforward, unbiased =
reading of the=20

public's sentiments, the results should be reported with great care.=20

Likewise, reporting on a survey by a special-interest group is =
tricky.=20

For example, an environmental group trumpets a poll saying the =
American people=20

support strong measures to protect the environment. That may be true, =
but the=20

poll was conducted for a group with definite views. That may have =
swayed the=20

question wording, the timing of the poll, the group interviewed and =
the order=20

of the questions. You should examine the poll to be certain that it =
accurately=20

reflects public opinion and does not simply push a single viewpoint.=20

Top

<FONT face=3Darial=20
color=3D#000000>3. How many people were interviewed =
for the=20

survey?
<FONT face=3Darial color=3D#000000 =
size=3D2>Because polls give=20

approximate answers, the more people interviewed in a scientific poll, =
the=20

smaller the error due to the size of the sample, all other things =
being equal.=20

A common trap to avoid is that "more is automatically better." It is=20
absolutely true that the more people interviewed in a scientific =

survey, the=20

smaller the sampling error – all other things being equal. But =
other factors=20

may be more important in judging the quality of a survey.

<A=20
href=3D"#top">Top

<FONT face=3Darial =

color=3D#000000><A=20

name=3D4>4. How were those people chosen?
<FONT =
face=3Darial=20

color=3D#000000 size=3D2>The key reason that some polls reflect public =
opinion=20

accurately and other polls are unscientific junk is how the people =
were chosen=20

to be interviewed.

In scientific polls, the pollster uses a =
specific=20

method for picking respondents. In unscientific polls, the person =
picks=20

himself to participate.

The method pollsters use to pick =
interviewees=20

relies on the bedrock of mathematical reality: when the chance of =
selecting=20

each person in the target population is known, then and only then do =
the=20

results of the sample survey reflect the entire population. This is =
called a=20

random sample or a probability sample. This is the reason that =
interviews with=20

1,000 American adults can accurately reflect the opinions of more than =
200=20

million American adults.

Most scientific samples use special=20
techniques to be economically feasible. For example, some sampling =

methods for=20

telephone interviewing do not just pick randomly generated telephone =
numbers.=20

Only telephone exchanges that are known to contain working residential numbers are selected – to reduce the number of wasted calls. This still produces a random sample. Samples of only listed telephone numbers do not produce a random sample of all working telephone numbers.

But even a sample cannot be purely random in practice since some people don't have phones, refuse to answer, or aren't home.

Top

5. What area (nation, state, or region) or what group (teachers, lawyers, Democratic voters, etc.) were these people chosen from?
It is absolutely critical to know from which group the interviewees were chosen.

You must know if a sample was drawn among all adults in the United States, or just from those in one state or one city, or from another group. For example, a survey of business people can reflect the opinions of business people – but not of all adults. Only if the interviewees were chosen from among all American adults can the poll reflect the opinions of all American adults.

In the case of telephone samples, the population represented is that of people living in households with telephones. For most purposes, telephone households may be similar to the general population. But if you were reporting a poll on what it was like to be poor or homeless, a telephone sample would not be appropriate. Remember, the use of a scientific sampling technique does not mean that the correct population was interviewed.

Political polls are especially sensitive to this issue.

In pre-primary and pre-election polls, which people are chosen as the base for poll results is critical. A poll of all adults, for example, is not very useful on a primary race where only 25 percent of the registered voters actually turn out. So look for polls based on registered voters, "likely voters," previous primary voters, and such. These distinctions are important and should be included in the story, for one of the most difficult challenges in polling is trying to figure out who actually is going

to vote.

Top

<FONT =
face=3Darial=20
color=3D#000000>6. Are the results based on the =
answers of all=20
the people interviewed?
<FONT face=3Darial =
color=3D#000000=20
size=3D2>One of the easiest ways to misrepresent the results of a poll =
is to=20
report the answers of only a subgroup. For example, there is usually a =

substantial difference between the opinions of Democrats and =
Republicans on=20
campaign-related matters. Reporting the opinions of only Democrats in =
a poll=20
purported to be of all adults would substantially misrepresent the =
results.=20

Poll results based on Democrats must be identified as such and =
should=20
be reported as representing only Democratic opinions.

Of =
course,=20
reporting on just one subgroup can be exactly the right course. In =
polling on=20
a primary contest, it is the opinions of those who can vote in the =
primary=20
that count – not those who cannot vote in that contest. Each =
state has its own=20
rules about who can participate in its primaries. Primary polls should =
include=20
only eligible primary voters.

Top=20

<A =
name=3D7>7. Who should=20
have been interviewed and was not?
<FONT face=3Darial=20
color=3D#000000 size=3D2>No survey ever reaches everyone who should =
have been=20
interviewed. You ought to know what steps were undertaken to minimize=20
non-response, such as the number of attempts to reach the appropriate=20
respondent and over how many days.

There are many reasons why =
people=20
who should have been interviewed were not. They may have refused =
attempts to=20
interview them. Or interviews may not have been attempted if people =
were not=20
home when the interviewer called. Or there may have been a language =
problem or=20
a hearing problem.

Top =

<FONT=20
face=3Darial color=3D#000000>8. When was the poll=20
done?
Events =
have a=20
dramatic impact on poll results. Your interpretation of a poll should =
depend=20
on when it was conducted relative to key events. Even the freshest =
poll=20
results can be overtaken by events. The President may have given a =
stirring=20
speech to the nation, the stock market may have crashed or an oil =
tanker may=20

have sunk, spilling millions of gallons of crude on beautiful beaches. =

Poll results that are several weeks or months old may be =
perfectly=20
valid, but events may have erased any newsworthy relationship to =
current=20
public opinion.

Top

<FONT =
face=3Darial=20
color=3D#000000>9. How were the interviews=20
conducted?
<FONT face=3Darial color=3D#000000 =
size=3D2>There are three=20
main possibilities: in person, by telephone or by mail. Most surveys =
are now=20
conducted by telephone, with the calls made by interviewers from a =
central=20
location. However, some surveys are still conducted by sending =
interviewers=20
into people's homes to conduct the interviews.

Some surveys =
are=20
conducted by mail. In scientific polls, the pollster picks the people =
to=20
receive the mail questionnaires. The respondent fills out the =
questionnaire=20
and returns it.

Mail surveys can be excellent sources of =
information,=20
but it takes weeks to do a mail survey, meaning that the results =
cannot be as=20
timely as a telephone survey. And mail surveys can be subject to other =
kinds=20
of errors, particularly low response rates. In many mail surveys, more =
people=20
fail to participate than do. This makes the results suspect. =

Surveys=20
done in shopping malls, in stores or on the sidewalk may have their =
uses for=20
their sponsors, but publishing the results in the media is not among =
them.=20
These approaches may yield interesting human-interest stories, but =
they should=20
never be treated as if they represent a public opinion poll. =

Advances=20
in computer technology have allowed the development of computerized=20
interviewing systems that dial the phone, play taped questions to a =
respondent=20
and then record answers the person gives by punching numbers on the =
telephone=20
keypad. Such surveys have a variety of severe problems, including =
uncontrolled=20
selection of respondents and poor response rates, and should be =
avoided.=20

Top

<FONT face=3Darial=20
color=3D#000000>10. What about polls on the =
Internet or World=20
Wide Web?
<FONT face=3Darial color=3D#000000 =
size=3D2>The explosive=20
growth of the Internet and the World Wide Web has given rise to an =
equally=20

explosive growth in various types of online polls and surveys. Many online polls may be good entertainment, but they tell you nothing about public opinion.

Most Internet polls are simply the latest variation on the pseudo-polls that have existed for many years. Whether the effort is a click-on Web survey, a dial-in poll or a mail-in survey, the results should be ignored and not reported. All these pseudo-polls suffer from the same problem: the respondents are self-selected. The individuals choose themselves to take part in the poll – there is no pollster choosing the respondents to be interviewed.

Remember, the purpose of a poll is to draw conclusions about the population, not about the sample. In these pseudo-polls, there is no way to project the results to any larger group. Any similarity between the results of a pseudo-poll and a scientific survey is pure chance.

Clicking on your candidate's button in the "voting booth" on a Web site may drive up the numbers for your candidate in a presidential horse-race poll online. For most such efforts, no effort is made to pick the respondents to limit users from voting multiple times or to reach out for people who might not normally visit the Web site.

The 900-number dial-in polls may be fine for deciding whether or not Larry the Lobster should be cooked on Saturday Night Live or even for dedicated fans to express their opinions who is the greatest quarterback in the National Football League. The expressed opinions may be real, but in sum the numbers are just entertainment. There is no way to tell who actually called in, how old they are, or how many times each person called.

Never be fooled by the number of responses. In some cases a few people call in thousands of times. Even if 500,000 calls are tallied, no one has any real knowledge of what the results mean. If big numbers impress you, remember that the Literary Digest's non-scientific sample of 12,000,000 people said Landon would beat Roosevelt in the 1936 Presidential election.

Mail-in coupon polls are just as bad. In this case, the magazine or newspaper includes a coupon to be returned with the answers to

questions. Again, there is no way to know who responded and how many =
times=20
each person did.

Another variation on the pseudo-poll comes as =
part of=20
a fund-raising effort. An organization sends out a letter with a =
survey form=20
attached to a large list of people, asking for opinions and for the =
respondent=20
to send money to support the organization or pay for tabulating the =
survey.=20
The questions are often loaded and the results of such an effort are =
always=20
meaningless.

This technique is used by a wide variety of =
organizations=20
from political parties and special-interest groups to charitable=20
organizations. Again, if the poll in question is part of a =
fund-raising pitch,=20
pitch it – in the wastebasket.

With regard to the =
Internet, methods=20
are being developed to sample the opinions of those who have online =
access,=20
although these efforts are just starting. Even a survey that =
accurately=20
sampled those who have access to the Internet would still fall short =
of a poll=20
of all Americans, since only a relatively small fraction of the =
nation’s=20
adults have access to the Internet.

Top=20

<A =
name=3D11>11. What is=20
the sampling error for the poll results?
<FONT =
face=3Darial=20
color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Interviews with a scientific sample of 1,000 =
adults can=20
accurately reflect the opinions of nearly 200 million American adults. =
That=20
means interviews attempted with all 200 million adults – if such =
were possible=20
– would give approximately the same results as a well-conducted =
survey based=20
on 1,000 interviews.

What happens if another carefully done =
poll of=20
1,000 adults gives slightly different results from the first survey? =
Neither=20
of the polls is "wrong." This range of possible results is called the =
error=20
due to sampling, often called the margin of error.

This is not =
an=20
"error" in the sense of making a mistake. Rather, it is a measure of =
the=20
possible range of approximation in the results because a sample was =
used.=20

Pollsters express the degree of the certainty of results based =
on a=20
sample as a "confidence level." This means a sample is likely to be =
within so=20
many points of the results one would have gotten if an interview were=20

attempted with the entire target population. They usually say this =
with 95%=20
confidence.

Thus, for example, a "3 percentage point margin of =
error"=20
in a national poll means that if the attempt were made to interview =
every=20
adult in the nation with the same questions in the same way at about =
the same=20
time as the poll was taken, the poll's answers would fall within plus =
or minus=20
3 percentage points of the complete count’s results 95% of the =
time.=20

This does not address the issue of whether people cooperate =
with the=20
survey, or if the questions are understood, or if any other =
methodological=20
issue exists. The sampling error is only the portion of the potential =
error in=20
a survey introduced by using a sample rather than interviewing the =
entire=20
population. Sampling error tells us nothing about the refusals or =
those=20
consistently unavailable for interview; it also tells us nothing about =
the=20
biasing effects of a particular question wording or the bias a =
particular=20
interviewer may inject into the interview situation.

Remember =
that the=20
sampling error margin applies to each figure in the results – it =
is at least 3=20
percentage points plus or minus for each one in our example. Thus, in =
a poll=20
question matching two candidates for President, both figures are =
subject to=20
sampling error.

Top

<FONT =
face=3Darial=20
color=3D#000000>12. Who’s on first? =

<FONT=20
face=3Darial color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Sampling error raises one of the =
thorniest=20
problems in the presentation of poll results: For a horse-race poll, =
when is=20
one candidate really ahead of the other?

Certainly, if the gap =
between=20
the two candidates is less than the error margin, you should not say =
that one=20
candidate is ahead of the other. You can say the race is "close", the =
race is=20
"roughly even", or there is "little difference" between the =
candidates." But it=20
should not be called a "dead heat" unless the candidates are tied with =
the=20
same percentages.

And just as certainly, when the gap between =
the two=20
candidates is equal to or more than twice the error margin – 6 =
percentage=20
points in our example – and if there are only two candidates and =

no undecided=20
voters, you can say with confidence that the poll says Candidate A is =
clearly=20
leading Candidate B.

When the gap between the two candidates =
is more=20
than the error margin but less than twice the error margin, you should =
say=20
that Candidate A "is ahead", "has an advantage" or "holds an edge". =
The story=20
should mention that there is a small possibility that Candidate B is =
ahead of=20
Candidate A.

When there are more than two choices or undecided =
voters=20
– in the real world – the question gets much more =
complicated. While the=20
solution is statistically complex, you can fairly easily evaluate this =

situation by estimating the error margin. You can do that by taking =
the=20
percent for each of the two candidates in question and multiplying it =
by the=20
total respondents for the survey (only the likely voters if that is=20
appropriate). This number is now the effective sample size for your =
judgement.=20
Look up the sampling error in a table of statistics for that reduced =
sample=20
size, and apply it to the candidate percentages. If they overlap, then =
you do=20
not know if one is ahead. If they do not, then you can make the =
judgement that=20
one candidate has a lead.

And bear in mind that when subgroup =
results=20
are reported – women or blacks, or young people – the =
sampling error margin=20
for those figures is greater than for results based on the sample as a =
whole.=20

Top

<FONT face=3Darial=20
color=3D#000000>13. What other kinds of factors =
can skew poll=20
results?
<FONT face=3Darial color=3D#000000 =
size=3D2>The margin of=20
sampling error is just one possible source of inaccuracy in a poll. It =
is not=20
necessarily the source of the greatest source of possible error; we =
use it=20
because it's the only one that can be quantified. And, other things =
being=20
equal, it is useful for evaluating whether differences between poll =
results=20
are meaningful in a statistical sense.

Question phrasing and =
question=20
order are also likely sources of flaws. Inadequate interviewer =
training and=20
supervision, data processing errors and other operational problems can =
also=20
introduce errors. Professional polling operations are less subject to =
these=20

problems than volunteer-conducted polls, which are usually less trustworthy.

You should always ask if the poll results have been "weighted." This process is usually used to account for unequal probabilities of selection and to adjust slightly the demographics in the sample. You should be aware that a poll could be manipulated unduly by weighting the numbers to produce a desired result. While some weighting may be appropriate, other weighting is not.

Weighting a scientific poll is only appropriate to reflect unequal probabilities or to adjust to independent values that are mostly constant.

Top

14. What questions were asked?
You must find out the exact wording of the poll questions. Why? Because the very wording of questions can make major differences in the results.

Perhaps the best test of any poll question is your reaction to it. On the face of it, does the question seem fair and unbiased? Does it present a balanced set of choices? Would most people be able to answer the question?

On sensitive questions – such as abortion – the complete wording of the question should probably be included in your story. It may well be worthwhile to compare the results of several different polls from different organizations on sensitive questions. You should examine carefully both the results and the exact wording of the questions.

Top

15. In what order were the questions asked?
Sometimes the very order of the questions can have an impact on the results. Often that impact is intentional; sometimes it is not. The impact of order can often be subtle.

During troubled economic times, for example, if people are asked what they think of the economy before they are asked their opinion of the president, the presidential popularity rating will probably be lower than if you had reversed the order of the questions. And in good economic times, the opposite is true.

What is important here is whether the questions that

were asked prior to the critical question in the poll could sway the =
results.=20

If the poll asks questions about abortion just before a question about =
an=20

abortion ballot measure, the prior questions could sway the results.=20

Top

<FONT face=3Darial=20
color=3D#000000>16. What about "push=20
polls"?
In =
recent years,=20

some political campaigns and special-interest groups have used a =
technique=20

called "push polls" to spread rumors and even outright lies about =
opponents.=20

These efforts are not polls, but are political manipulation trying to =
hide=20

behind the smokescreen of a public opinion survey.

In a "push =
poll," a=20

large number of people are called by telephone and asked to =
participate in a=20

purported survey. The survey "questions" are really thinly-veiled =
accusations=20

against an opponent or repetitions of rumors about a candidate’s =
personal or=20

professional behavior. The focus here is on making certain the =
respondent=20

hears and understands the accusation in the question, not in gathering =
the=20

respondent’s opinions.

"Push polls" are unethical and =
have been=20

condemned by professional polling organizations.

"Push polls" =
must be=20

distinguished from some types of legitimate surveys done by political=20
campaigns. At times, a campaign poll may ask a series of questions =
about=20

contrasting issue positions of the candidates – or various =
things that could=20

be said about a candidate, some of which are negative. These =
legitimate=20

questions seek to gauge the public’s reaction to a =
candidate’s position or to=20

a possible legitimate attack on a candidate’s record.

A =
legitimate=20

poll can be distinguished from a "push poll" usually by:

The =
number of=20

calls made – a push poll makes thousands and thousands of calls, =
instead of=20

hundreds for most surveys; The identity of who is making the telephone =
calls –=20

a polling firm for a scientific survey as opposed to a telemarketing =
house or=20

the campaign itself for a "push poll"; The lack of any true gathering =
of=20

results in a "push poll," which has as its only objective the =
dissemination of=20

false or misleading information.

Top=20

<A =
name=3D17>17. What other=20

polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the same thing? If they are different, why are they different? **Results of other polls**; by a newspaper or television station, a public survey firm or even a candidate's opponent should be used to check and contrast poll results you have in hand. **If the polls differ**, first check the timing of the interviewing. If the polls were done at different times, the differing results may demonstrate a swing in public opinion. **If the polls were done about the same time**, ask each sponsor for an explanation of the differences. Conflicting polls often make good stories. **Top** **18**. So I've asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The poll is correct, right? **Usually, yes**. However, remember that the laws of chance alone say that the results of one poll out of 20 may be skewed away from the public's real views just because of sampling error. **Also** remember that no matter how good the poll, no matter how wide the margin, no matter how big the sample, a pre-election poll does not show that one candidate has the race "locked up." Things change; often and dramatically in politics. That's why candidates campaign. **Top** **19**. With all these potential problems, should we ever report poll results? **Yes**. Because reputable polling organizations consistently do good work. In spite of the difficulties, the public opinion survey, correctly conducted, is still the best objective measure of the state of the views of the public. **Top** **20** **20**. Is this poll worth reporting? **If the poll was conducted correctly**, and you have been able to obtain the information outlined here, your news judgment and that of your editors should be applied to polls, as it is to every other element of a story. **Top**

<DD>This is a copyrighted publication of the National Council on =
Public=20
Polls in keeping with its mission to help educate journalists on the =
use of=20
public opinion polls.

<DD>The National Council on Public Polls hereby grants the right to=20
duplicate this work in whole, but not in part, for any noncommercial =
purpose=20
provided that any copy include all of the information on this page. =

<DD>Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. is Director, Elections, NBC News. G. =
Evans=20
Witt is president, Princeton Survey Research Associates, Inc. They =
were=20
cofounders of the Associated Press/ NBC News Poll.

<DD>For any additional information on any aspect of polling or a =
specific=20
poll, please call the NCPP office at 800-239-0909.

<DD>The price for a single printed copy price is \$2.95. For =
educational=20
discounts and multiple copies contact NCPP. This document can be =
downloaded=20
without charge from the NCPP website: <A=20
href=3D"http://www.ncpp.org">www.ncpp.org.

<DD>Top

<DD>For more information, contact us at <A=20
href=3D"mailto:info@ncpp.org">info@ncpp.org. =

</DD></DL><FONT=20
color=3D#000000></x-html> </BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0074_01C03CEF.509B9E00--

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 12:59:17 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: 20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results
In-Reply-To: <007701c03d10\$d87521e0\$17a8a8c0@maine.rr.com>
References: <5.0.0.25.2.20001023121100.049b4a90@mail.mindspring.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="===== _5230587== _ .ALT"

----- _5230587== _ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

That article can be accessed at <http://www.ncpp.org>

At 12:46 PM 10/23/00 -0400, you wrote:
>Can this article be reproduced and distributed?
>----- Original Message -----
>From: <mailto:rshalpern@mindspring.com>dick halpern
>To: <mailto:aapornet@usc.edu>aapornet@usc.edu
>Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 12:17 PM
>Subject: 20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results

>
>Hi folks,
>
>With all the thrashing about with respect to polling results and the way
>these are handled by the media as a basis for generating good stories I
>thought it appropriate to share this article with you. Doubtless, many of
>you may have already seen and read it and to those I apologize. But for
>others, it's worth taking a look. The questions and answers address many
>of the topics that have occupied AAPORNET these last few months.
>
>Dick Halpern
>
>
>
>20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results
>
>Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. and G. Evans Witt
>
>For journalists and for pollsters, questions are the most frequently used
>tools for gathering information. For the journalist looking at a set of
>poll numbers, here are the 20 questions to ask the pollster before
>reporting any results. This publication is designed to help working
>journalists do a thorough, professional job covering polls. It is not a
>primer on how to conduct a public opinion survey.
>
>The only polls that should be reported are "scientific" polls. A number of
>the questions here will help you decide whether or not a poll is a
>"scientific" one worthy of coverage or an unscientific survey without value.
>
>Unscientific pseudo-polls are widespread and sometimes entertaining, if
>always quite meaningless. Examples include 900-number call-in polls,
>man-on-the-street surveys, most Internet polls, shopping mall polls, and
>even the classic toilet tissue poll featuring pictures of the candidates
>on each sheet.
>
>The major distinguishing difference between scientific and unscientific
>polls is who picks the respondents for the survey. In a scientific poll,
>the pollster identifies and seeks out the people to be interviewed. In an
>unscientific poll, the respondents usually "volunteer" their opinions,
>selecting themselves for the poll.
>
>The results of the well-conducted scientific poll can provide a reliable
>guide to the opinions of many people in addition to those interviewed even
>the opinions of all Americans. The results of an unscientific poll tell
>you nothing beyond simply what those respondents say.
>
>With these 20 questions in hand, the journalist can seek the facts to
>decide how to handle every poll that comes across the news desk each day.
>
>The authors wish to thank the officers, trustees and members of the
>National Council on Public Polls for their editing assistance and their
>support.
>
>
>
> * Who did the poll?
> * Who paid for the poll and why was it done?
> * How many people were interviewed for the survey?

> * How were those people chosen?
> * What area (nation, state, or region) or what group (teachers, lawyers,
> Democratic voters, etc.) were these people chosen from?
> * Are the results based on the answers of all the people interviewed?
> * Who should have been interviewed and was not?
> * When was the poll done?
> * How were the interviews conducted?
> * What about polls on the Internet or World Wide Web?
> * What is the sampling error for the poll results?
> * Who s on first?
> * What other kinds of factors can skew poll results?
> * What questions were asked?
> * In what order were the questions asked?
> * What about "push polls"?
> * What other polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the same
> thing? If they are different, why are they different?
> * So I've asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The poll is
> correct, right?
> * With all these potential problems, should we ever report poll results?
> * Is this poll worth reporting?

>
>
>
>
>
>
>1. Who did the poll?

>What polling firm, research house, political campaign, corporation or
>other group conducted the poll? This is always the first question to ask.

>
>If you don't know who did the poll, you can't get the answers to all the
>other questions listed here. If the person providing poll results can't or
>won't tell you who did it, serious questions must be raised about the
>reliability and truthfulness of the results being presented.

>
>Reputable polling firms will provide you with the information you need to
>evaluate the survey. Because reputation is important to a quality firm, a
>professionally conducted poll will avoid many errors.

>
>Top

>
>2. Who paid for the poll and why was it done?

>You must know who paid for the survey, because that tells you and your
>audience who thought these topics are important enough to spend money
>finding out what people think. This is central to the whole issue of why
>the poll was done.

>
>Polls are not conducted for the good of the world. They are conducted for
>a reason either to gain helpful information or to advance a particular
>cause.

>
>It may be the news organization wants to develop a good story. It may be
>the politician wants to be re-elected. It may be that the corporation is
>trying to push sales of its new product. Or a special-interest group may
>be trying to prove that its views are the views of the entire country.

>
>All are legitimate reasons for doing a poll.

>
>The important issue for you as a journalist is whether the motive for

>doing the poll creates such serious doubts about the validity of the
>results that the numbers should not be publicized.

>

>Examples of suspect polls are private polls conducted for a political
>campaign. These polls are conducted solely to help the candidate win and
>for no other reason. The poll may have very slanted questions or a strange
>sampling methodology, all with a tactical campaign purpose. A campaign may
>be testing out new slogans, a new statement on a key issue or a new attack
>on an opponent. But since the goal of the candidate's poll may not be a
>straightforward, unbiased reading of the public's sentiments, the results
>should be reported with great care.

>

>Likewise, reporting on a survey by a special-interest group is tricky. For
>example, an environmental group trumpets a poll saying the American people
>support strong measures to protect the environment. That may be true, but
>the poll was conducted for a group with definite views. That may have
>swayed the question wording, the timing of the poll, the group interviewed
>and the order of the questions. You should examine the poll to be certain
>that it accurately reflects public opinion and does not simply push a
>single viewpoint.

>

>Top

>

>3. How many people were interviewed for the survey?

>Because polls give approximate answers, the more people interviewed in a
>scientific poll, the smaller the error due to the size of the sample, all
>other things being equal. A common trap to avoid is that "more is
>automatically better." It is absolutely true that the more people
>interviewed in a scientific survey, the smaller the sampling error all
>other things being equal. But other factors may be more important in
>judging the quality of a survey.

>

>Top

>

>4. How were those people chosen?

>The key reason that some polls reflect public opinion accurately and other
>polls are unscientific junk is how the people were chosen to be interviewed.

>

>In scientific polls, the pollster uses a specific method for picking
>respondents. In unscientific polls, the person picks himself to participate.

>

>The method pollsters use to pick interviewees relies on the bedrock of
>mathematical reality: when the chance of selecting each person in the
>target population is known, then and only then do the results of the
>sample survey reflect the entire population. This is called a random
>sample or a probability sample. This is the reason that interviews with
>1,000 American adults can accurately reflect the opinions of more than 200
>million American adults.

>

>Most scientific samples use special techniques to be economically
>feasible. For example, some sampling methods for telephone interviewing do
>not just pick randomly generated telephone numbers. Only telephone
>exchanges that are known to contain working residential numbers are
>selected to reduce the number of wasted calls. This still produces a
>random sample. Samples of only listed telephone numbers do not produce a
>random sample of all working telephone numbers.

>

>But even a random sample cannot be purely random in practice since some
>people don't have phones, refuse to answer, or aren't home.

>

>Top

>

>5. What area (nation, state, or region) or what group (teachers, lawyers,
>Democratic voters, etc.) were these people chosen from?

>It is absolutely critical to know from which group the interviewees were
>chosen.

>

>You must know if a sample was drawn from among all adults in the United
>States, or just from those in one state or in one city, or from another
>group. For example, a survey of business people can reflect the opinions
>of business people but not of all adults. Only if the interviewees were
>chosen from among all American adults can the poll reflect the opinions of
>all American adults.

>

>In the case of telephone samples, the population represented is that of
>people living in households with telephones. For most purposes, telephone
>households may be similar to the general population. But if you were
>reporting a poll on what it was like to be poor or homeless, a telephone
>sample would not be appropriate. Remember, the use of a scientific
>sampling technique does not mean that the correct population was
interviewed.

>

>Political polls are especially sensitive to this issue.

>

>In pre-primary and pre-election polls, which people are chosen as the base
>for poll results is critical. A poll of all adults, for example, is not
>very useful on a primary race where only 25 percent of the registered
>voters actually turn out. So look for polls based on registered voters,
>"likely voters," previous primary voters, and such. These distinctions are
>important and should be included in the story, for one of the most
>difficult challenges in polling is trying to figure out who actually is
>going to vote.

>

>Top

>

>6. Are the results based on the answers of all the people interviewed?

>One of the easiest ways to misrepresent the results of a poll is to report
>the answers of only a subgroup. For example, there is usually a
>substantial difference between the opinions of Democrats and Republicans
>on campaign-related matters. Reporting the opinions of only Democrats in a
>poll purported to be of all adults would substantially misrepresent the
>results.

>

>Poll results based on Democrats must be identified as such and should be
>reported as representing only Democratic opinions.

>

>Of course, reporting on just one subgroup can be exactly the right course.
>In polling on a primary contest, it is the opinions of those who can vote
>in the primary that count not those who cannot vote in that contest. Each
>state has its own rules about who can participate in its primaries.
>Primary polls should include only eligible primary voters.

>

>Top

>

>7. Who should have been interviewed and was not?
>No survey ever reaches everyone who should have been interviewed. You
>ought to know what steps were undertaken to minimize non-response, such as
>the number of attempts to reach the appropriate respondent and over how
>many days.

>
>There are many reasons why people who should have been interviewed were
>not. They may have refused attempts to interview them. Or interviews may
>not have been attempted if people were not home when the interviewer
>called. Or there may have been a language problem or a hearing problem.

>
>Top

>8. When was the poll done?
>Events have a dramatic impact on poll results. Your interpretation of a
>poll should depend on when it was conducted relative to key events. Even
>the freshest poll results can be overtaken by events. The President may
>have given a stirring speech to the nation, the stock market may have
>crashed or an oil tanker may have sunk, spilling millions of gallons of
>crude on beautiful beaches.

>
>Poll results that are several weeks or months old may be perfectly valid,
>but events may have erased any newsworthy relationship to current public
>opinion.

>
>Top

>9. How were the interviews conducted?
>There are three main possibilities: in person, by telephone or by mail.
>Most surveys are now conducted by telephone, with the calls made by
>interviewers from a central location. However, some surveys are still
>conducted by sending interviewers into people's homes to conduct the
>interviews.

>
>Some surveys are conducted by mail. In scientific polls, the pollster
>picks the people to receive the mail questionnaires. The respondent fills
>out the questionnaire and returns it.

>
>Mail surveys can be excellent sources of information, but it takes weeks
>to do a mail survey, meaning that the results cannot be as timely as a
>telephone survey. And mail surveys can be subject to other kinds of
>errors, particularly low response rates. In many mail surveys, more people
>fail to participate than do. This makes the results suspect.

>
>Surveys done in shopping malls, in stores or on the sidewalk may have
>their uses for their sponsors, but publishing the results in the media is
>not among them. These approaches may yield interesting human-interest
>stories, but they should never be treated as if they represent a public
>opinion poll.

>
>Advances in computer technology have allowed the development of
>computerized interviewing systems that dial the phone, play taped
>questions to a respondent and then record answers the person gives by
>punching numbers on the telephone keypad. Such surveys have a variety of
>severe problems, including uncontrolled selection of respondents and poor
>response rates, and should be avoided.

>

>Top

>

>10. What about polls on the Internet or World Wide Web?

>The explosive growth of the Internet and the World Wide Web has given rise
>to an equally explosive growth in various types of online polls and
>surveys. Many online polls may be good entertainment, but they tell you
>nothing about public opinion.

>

>Most Internet polls are simply the latest variation on the pseudo-polls
>that have existed for many years. Whether the effort is a click-on Web
>survey, a dial-in poll or a mail-in survey, the results should be ignored
>and not reported. All these pseudo-polls suffer from the same problem: the
>respondents are self-selected. The individuals choose themselves to take
>part in the poll there is no pollster choosing the respondents to be
>interviewed.

>

>Remember, the purpose of a poll is to draw conclusions about the
>population, not about the sample. In these pseudo-polls, there is no way
>to project the results to any larger group. Any similarity between the
>results of a pseudo-poll and a scientific survey is pure chance.

>

>Clicking on your candidate's button in the "voting booth" on a Web site
>may drive up the numbers for your candidate in a presidential horse-race
>poll online. For most such efforts, no effort is made to pick the
>respondents, to limit users from voting multiple times or to reach out for
>people who might not normally visit the Web site.

>

>The 900-number dial-in polls may be fine for deciding whether or not Larry
>the Lobster should be cooked on Saturday Night Live or even for dedicated
>fans to express their opinions on who is the greatest quarterback in the
>National Football League. The opinions expressed may be real, but in sum
>the numbers are just entertainment. There is no way to tell who actually
>called in, how old they are, or how many times each person called.

>

>Never be fooled by the number of responses. In some cases a few people
>call in thousands of times. Even if 500,000 calls are tallied, no one has
>any real knowledge of what the results mean. If big numbers impress you,
>remember that the Literary Digest's non-scientific sample of 12,000,000
>people said Landon would beat Roosevelt in the 1936 Presidential election.

>

>Mail-in coupon polls are just as bad. In this case, the magazine or
>newspaper includes a coupon to be returned with the answers to the
>questions. Again, there is no way to know who responded and how many times
>each person did.

>

>Another variation on the pseudo-poll comes as part of a fund-raising
>effort. An organization sends out a letter with a survey form attached to
>a large list of people, asking for opinions and for the respondent to send
>money to support the organization or pay for tabulating the survey. The
>questions are often loaded and the results of such an effort are always
>meaningless.

>

>This technique is used by a wide variety of organizations from political
>parties and special-interest groups to charitable organizations. Again, if
>the poll in question is part of a fund-raising pitch, pitch it in the
>wastebasket.

>

>With regard to the Internet, methods are being developed to sample the
>opinions of those who have online access, although these efforts are just
>starting. Even a survey that accurately sampled those who have access to
>the Internet would still fall short of a poll of all Americans, since only
>a relatively small fraction of the nation's adults have access to the
>Internet.

>

>Top

>

>11. What is the sampling error for the poll results?

>Interviews with a scientific sample of 1,000 adults can accurately reflect
>the opinions of nearly 200 million American adults. That means interviews
>attempted with all 200 million adults if such were possible would give
>approximately the same results as a well-conducted survey based on 1,000
>interviews.

>

>What happens if another carefully done poll of 1,000 adults gives slightly
>different results from the first survey? Neither of the polls is "wrong."
>This range of possible results is called the error due to sampling, often
>called the margin of error.

>

>This is not an "error" in the sense of making a mistake. Rather, it is a
>measure of the possible range of approximation in the results because a
>sample was used.

>

>Pollsters express the degree of the certainty of results based on a sample
>as a "confidence level." This means a sample is likely to be within so
>many points of the results one would have gotten if an interview were
>attempted with the entire target population. They usually say this with
>95% confidence.

>

>Thus, for example, a "3 percentage point margin of error" in a national
>poll means that if the attempt were made to interview every adult in the
>nation with the same questions in the same way at about the same time as
>the poll was taken, the poll's answers would fall within plus or minus 3
>percentage points of the complete count's results 95% of the time.

>

>This does not address the issue of whether people cooperate with the
>survey, or if the questions are understood, or if any other methodological
>issue exists. The sampling error is only the portion of the potential
>error in a survey introduced by using a sample rather than interviewing
>the entire population. Sampling error tells us nothing about the refusals
>or those consistently unavailable for interview; it also tells us nothing
>about the biasing effects of a particular question wording or the bias a
>particular interviewer may inject into the interview situation.

>

>Remember that the sampling error margin applies to each figure in the
>results it is at least 3 percentage points plus or minus for each one in
>our example. Thus, in a poll question matching two candidates for
>President, both figures are subject to sampling error.

>

>Top

>

>12. Who's on first?

>Sampling error raises one of the thorniest problems in the presentation of
>poll results: For a horse-race poll, when is one candidate really ahead of
>the other?

>
>Certainly, if the gap between the two candidates is less than the error
>margin, you should not say that one candidate is ahead of the other. You
>can say the race is "close", the race is "roughly even", or there is
>"little difference between the candidates." But it should not be called a
>"dead heat" unless the candidates are tied with the same percentages.
>
>And just as certainly, when the gap between the two candidates is equal to
>or more than twice the error margin 6 percentage points in our example and
>if there are only two candidates and no undecided voters, you can say with
>confidence that the poll says Candidate A is clearly leading Candidate B.
>
>When the gap between the two candidates is more than the error margin but
>less than twice the error margin, you should say that Candidate A "is
>ahead", "has an advantage" or "holds an edge". The story should mention
>that there is a small possibility that Candidate B is ahead of Candidate A.
>
>When there are more than two choices or undecided voters in the real world
>the question gets much more complicated. While the solution is
>statistically complex, you can fairly easily evaluate this situation by
>estimating the error margin. You can do that by taking the percent for
>each of the two candidates in question and multiplying it by the total
>respondents for the survey (only the likely voters if that is
>appropriate). This number is now the effective sample size for your
>judgement. Look up the sampling error in a table of statistics for that
>reduced sample size, and apply it to the candidate percentages. If they
>overlap, then you do not know if one is ahead. If they do not, then you
>can make the judgement that one candidate has a lead.
>
>And bear in mind that when subgroup results are reported women or blacks,
>or young people the sampling error margin for those figures is greater
>than for results based on the sample as a whole.
>
>Top
>
>13. What other kinds of factors can skew poll results?
>The margin of sampling error is just one possible source of inaccuracy in
>a poll. It is not necessarily the source of the greatest source of
>possible error; we use it because it's the only one that can be
>quantified. And, other things being equal, it is useful for evaluating
>whether differences between poll results are meaningful in a statistical
>sense.
>
>Question phrasing and question order are also likely sources of flaws.
>Inadequate interviewer training and supervision, data processing errors
>and other operational problems can also introduce errors. Professional
>polling operations are less subject to these problems than
>volunteer-conducted polls, which are usually less trustworthy.
>
>You should always ask if the poll results have been "weighted." This
>process is usually used to account for unequal probabilities of selection
>and to adjust slightly the demographics in the sample. You should be aware
>that a poll could be manipulated unduly by weighting the numbers to
>produce a desired result. While some weighting may be appropriate, other
>weighting is not. Weighting a scientific poll is only appropriate to
>reflect unequal probabilities or to adjust to independent values that are
>mostly constant.

>

>Top

>

>14. What questions were asked?

>You must find out the exact wording of the poll questions. Why? Because
>the very wording of questions can make major differences in the results.

>

>Perhaps the best test of any poll question is your reaction to it. On the
>face of it, does the question seem fair and unbiased? Does it present a
>balanced set of choices? Would most people be able to answer the question?

>

>On sensitive questions such as abortion the complete wording of the
>question should probably be included in your story. It may well be
>worthwhile to compare the results of several different polls from
>different organizations on sensitive questions. You should examine
>carefully both the results and the exact wording of the questions.

>

>Top

>

>15. In what order were the questions asked?

>Sometimes the very order of the questions can have an impact on the
>results. Often that impact is intentional; sometimes it is not. The impact
>of order can often be subtle.

>

>During troubled economic times, for example, if people are asked what they
>think of the economy before they are asked their opinion of the president,
>the presidential popularity rating will probably be lower than if you had
>reversed the order of the questions. And in good economic times, the
>opposite is true.

>

>What is important here is whether the questions that were asked prior to
>the critical question in the poll could sway the results. If the poll asks
>questions about abortion just before a question about an abortion ballot
>measure, the prior questions could sway the results.

>

>Top

>

>16. What about "push polls"?

>In recent years, some political campaigns and special-interest groups have
>used a technique called "push polls" to spread rumors and even outright
>lies about opponents. These efforts are not polls, but are political
>manipulation trying to hide behind the smokescreen of a public opinion
>survey.

>

>In a "push poll," a large number of people are called by telephone and
>asked to participate in a purported survey. The survey "questions" are
>really thinly-veiled accusations against an opponent or repetitions of
>rumors about a candidate's personal or professional behavior. The focus
>here is on making certain the respondent hears and understands the
>accusation in the question, not in gathering the respondent's opinions.

>

>"Push polls" are unethical and have been condemned by professional polling
>organizations.

>

>"Push polls" must be distinguished from some types of legitimate surveys
>done by political campaigns. At times, a campaign poll may ask a series of
>questions about contrasting issue positions of the candidates or various

>things that could be said about a candidate, some of which are negative.
>These legitimate questions seek to gauge the public's reaction to a
>candidate's position or to a possible legitimate attack on a candidate's
>record.

>
>A legitimate poll can be distinguished from a "push poll" usually by:

>
>The number of calls made a push poll makes thousands and thousands of
>calls, instead of hundreds for most surveys; The identity of who is making
>the telephone calls a polling firm for a scientific survey as opposed to a
>telemarketing house or the campaign itself for a "push poll"; The lack of
>any true gathering of results in a "push poll," which has as its only
>objective the dissemination of false or misleading information.

>
>Top

>
>17. What other polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the same
>thing? If they are different, why are they different?

>Results of other polls by a newspaper or television station, a public
>survey firm or even a candidate's opponent should be used to check and
>contrast poll results you have in hand.

>
>If the polls differ, first check the timing of the interviewing. If the
>polls were done at different times, the differing results may demonstrate
>a swing in public opinion.

>
>If the polls were done about the same time, ask each poll sponsor for an
>explanation of the differences. Conflicting polls often make good stories.

>
>Top

>
>18. So I've asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The poll is
>correct, right?

>Usually, yes. However, remember that the laws of chance alone say that the
>results of one poll out of 20 may be skewed away from the public's real
>views just because of sampling error.

>
>Also remember that no matter how good the poll, no matter how wide the
>margin, no matter how big the sample, a pre-election poll does not show
>that one candidate has the race "locked up." Things change often and
>dramatically in politics. That's why candidates campaign.

>
>Top

>
>19. With all these potential problems, should we ever report poll results?
>Yes. Because reputable polling organizations consistently do good work. In
>spite of the difficulties, the public opinion survey, correctly conducted,
>is still the best objective measure of the state of the views of the public.

>
>Top

>
>20. Is this poll worth reporting?

>If the poll was conducted correctly, and you have been able to obtain the
>information outlined here, your news judgment and that of your editors
>should be applied to polls, as it is to every other element of a story.

>
>Top

>This is a copyrighted publication of the National Council on Public Polls
>in keeping with its mission to help educate journalists on the use of
>public opinion polls.
>
>The National Council on Public Polls hereby grants the right to duplicate
>this work in whole, but not in part, for any noncommercial purpose
>provided that any copy include all of the information on this page.
>
>Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. is Director, Elections, NBC News. G. Evans Witt
>is president, Princeton Survey Research Associates, Inc. They were
>cofounders of the Associated Press/ NBC News Poll.
>
>For any additional information on any aspect of polling or a specific
>poll, please call the NCPP office at 800-239-0909.
>
>The price for a single printed copy price is \$2.95. For educational
>discounts and multiple copies contact NCPP. This document can be
>downloaded without charge from the NCPP website:
><<http://www.ncpp.org>>www.ncpp.org.
>
>Top
>
>For more information, contact us at <<mailto:info@ncpp.org>>info@ncpp.org.
>
>
>
></x-html>

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

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com
<http://www.MitofskyInternational.com>

-----_5230587==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>
That article can be accessed at
<http://www.ncpp.org>

At 12:46 PM 10/23/00 -0400, you wrote:

<blockquote type=cite class=cite cite>Can this
article be reproduced and distributed?
<dl>
<dd>----- Original Message -----
<dd>From: dick halpern
<dd>To: aapornet@usc.edu
<dd>Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 12:17 PM
<dd>Subject: 20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll
Results

<dd>Hi folks,

<dd>With all the thrashing about with respect to polling results and the way these are handled by the media as a basis for generating good stories I thought it appropriate to share this article with you. Doubtless, many of you may have already seen and read it and to those I apologize. But for others, it's worth taking a look. The questions and answers address many of the topics that have occupied AAPORNET these last few months.

<dd>Dick Halpern

<dd>20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results

<dd>Sheldon R. Gawiser, Ph.D. and G. Evans Witt

<dd>For journalists and for pollsters, questions are the most frequently used tools for gathering information. For the journalist looking at a set of poll numbers, here are the 20 questions to ask the pollster before reporting any results. This publication is designed to help working journalists do a thorough, professional job covering polls. It is not a primer on how to conduct a public opinion survey.

<dd>The only polls that should be reported are "scientific" polls. A number of the questions here will help you decide whether or not a poll is a "scientific" one worthy of coverage or an unscientific survey without value.

<dd>Unscientific pseudo-polls are widespread and sometimes entertaining, if always quite meaningless. Examples include 900-number call-in polls, man-on-the-street surveys, most Internet polls, shopping mall polls, and even the classic toilet tissue poll featuring pictures of the candidates on each sheet.

<dd>The major distinguishing difference between scientific and unscientific polls is who picks the respondents for the survey. In a scientific poll, the pollster identifies and seeks out the people to be interviewed. In an unscientific poll, the respondents usually "volunteer" their opinions, selecting themselves for the poll.

<dd>The results of the well-conducted scientific poll can provide a reliable guide to the opinions of many people in addition to those interviewed even the opinions of all Americans. The results of an unscientific poll tell you nothing beyond simply what those respondents

evaluate the survey. Because reputation is important to a quality firm, a professionally conducted poll will avoid many errors.

Top

2. Who paid for the poll and why was it done?

You must know who paid for the survey, because that tells you and your audience who thought these topics are important enough to spend money finding out what people think. This is central to the whole issue of why the poll was done.

Polls are not conducted for the good of the world. They are conducted for a reason either to gain helpful information or to advance a particular cause.

It may be the news organization wants to develop a good story. It may be the politician wants to be re-elected. It may be that the corporation is trying to push sales of its new product. Or a special-interest group may be trying to prove that its views are the views of the entire country.

All are legitimate reasons for doing a poll.

The important issue for you as a journalist is whether the motive for doing the poll creates such serious doubts about the validity of the results that the numbers should not be publicized.

Examples of suspect polls are private polls conducted for a political campaign. These polls are conducted solely to help the candidate win and for no other reason. The poll may have very slanted questions or a strange sampling methodology, all with a tactical campaign purpose. A campaign may be testing out new slogans, a new statement on a key issue or a new attack on an opponent. But since the goal of the candidate's poll may not be a straightforward, unbiased reading of the public's sentiments, the results should be reported with great care.

Likewise, reporting on a survey by a special-interest group is tricky. For example, an environmental group trumpets a poll saying the American people support strong measures to protect the environment. That may be true, but the poll was conducted for a group with definite views. That may have swayed the question wording, the timing of the poll, the group interviewed and the order of the questions. You should examine the poll to be certain that it accurately reflects public opinion and does not simply push a single viewpoint.

Top

3. How many people were interviewed for the survey?

Because polls give approximate answers, the more people interviewed in a scientific poll, the smaller the error due to the size of the sample, all other things being equal. A common trap to avoid is that "more is automatically better." It is absolutely true that the more people interviewed in a scientific survey, the smaller the sampling error all other things being equal. But other factors may be more important in judging the quality of a survey.

Top

4. How were those people chosen?

The key reason that some polls reflect public opinion accurately and other polls are unscientific junk is how the people were chosen to be interviewed.

In scientific polls, the pollster uses a specific method for picking respondents. In unscientific polls, the person picks himself to participate.

The method pollsters use to pick interviewees relies on the bedrock of mathematical reality: when the chance of selecting each person in the target population is known, then and only then do the results of the sample survey reflect the entire population. This is called a random sample or a probability sample. This is the reason that interviews with 1,000 American adults can accurately reflect the opinions of more than 200 million American adults.

Most scientific samples use special techniques to be economically feasible. For example, some sampling methods for telephone interviewing do not just pick randomly generated telephone numbers. Only telephone exchanges that are known to contain working residential numbers are selected to reduce the number of wasted calls. This still produces a random sample. Samples of only listed telephone numbers do not produce a random sample of all working telephone numbers.

But even a random sample cannot be purely random in practice since some people don't have phones, refuse to answer, or aren't home.

Top

5. What area (nation, state, or region) or what group (teachers, lawyers, Democratic voters, etc.) were these people chosen from?

It is absolutely critical to know from which group the interviewees were chosen.

You must know if a sample was drawn from among all adults in the United States, or just from those in one state or in one city, or from another group. For example, a survey of business people can reflect the opinions of business people but not of all adults. Only if the interviewees were chosen from among all American adults can the poll reflect the opinions of all American adults.

In the case of telephone samples, the population represented is that of people living in households with telephones. For most purposes, telephone households may be similar to the general population. But if you were reporting a poll on what it was like to be poor or homeless, a telephone sample would not be appropriate. Remember, the use of a scientific sampling technique does not mean that the correct population was interviewed.

Political polls are especially sensitive to this issue.

In pre-primary and pre-election polls, which people are chosen as the base for poll results is critical. A poll of all adults, for example, is not very useful on a primary race where only 25 percent of the registered voters actually turn out. So look for polls based on registered voters, "likely voters," previous primary voters, and such. These distinctions are important and should be included in the story, for one of the most difficult challenges in polling is trying to figure out who actually is going to vote.

Top

6. Are the results based on the answers of all the people interviewed?

One of the easiest ways to misrepresent the results of a poll is to report the answers of only a subgroup. For example, there is usually a substantial difference between the opinions of Democrats and Republicans on campaign-related matters. Reporting the opinions of only Democrats in a poll purported to be of all adults would substantially misrepresent the results.

Poll results based on Democrats must be identified as such and should be reported as representing only Democratic opinions.

Of course, reporting on just one subgroup can be exactly the right course. In polling on a primary contest, it is the opinions of those who can vote in the primary that count not those who cannot vote in that contest. Each state has its own rules about who can participate in its primaries. Primary polls should include only eligible primary voters.

Top

7. Who should have been interviewed and was not?

No survey ever reaches everyone who should have been interviewed. You ought to know what steps were undertaken to minimize non-response, such as the number of attempts to reach the appropriate respondent and over how many days.

There are many reasons why people who should have been interviewed were not. They may have refused attempts to interview them. Or interviews may not have been attempted if people were not home when the interviewer called. Or there may have been a language problem or a hearing problem.

Top

8. When was the poll done?

Events have a dramatic impact on poll results. Your interpretation of a poll should depend on when it was conducted relative to key events. Even the freshest poll results can be overtaken by events. The President may have given a stirring speech to the nation, the stock market may have crashed or an oil tanker may have sunk, spilling millions of gallons of crude on beautiful beaches.

Poll results that are several weeks or months old may be perfectly valid, but events may have erased any newsworthy relationship to current public opinion.

Top

9. How were the interviews conducted?

There are three main possibilities: in person, by telephone or by mail. Most surveys are now conducted by telephone, with the calls made by interviewers from a central location. However, some surveys are still conducted by sending interviewers into people's homes to conduct the interviews.

Some surveys are conducted by mail. In scientific polls, the pollster picks the people to receive the mail questionnaires. The respondent fills out the questionnaire and returns it.

Mail surveys can be excellent sources of information, but it takes weeks to do a mail survey, meaning that the results cannot be as timely as a telephone survey. And mail surveys can be subject to other kinds of errors, particularly low response rates. In many mail surveys, more people fail to participate than do. This makes the results suspect.

Surveys done in shopping malls, in stores or on the sidewalk may have their uses for their sponsors, but publishing the results in the media is not among them. These approaches may yield interesting human-interest stories, but they should never be treated as if they represent a public opinion poll.

Advances in computer technology have allowed the development of computerized interviewing systems that dial the phone, play taped questions to a respondent and then record answers the person gives by punching numbers on the telephone keypad. Such surveys have a variety of severe problems, including uncontrolled selection of respondents and poor response rates, and should be avoided.

Top

10. What about polls on the Internet or World Wide Web?

The explosive growth of the Internet and the World Wide Web has given rise to an equally explosive growth in various types of online polls and surveys. Many online polls may be good entertainment, but they tell you nothing about public opinion.

Most Internet polls are simply the latest variation on the pseudo-polls that have existed for many years. Whether the effort is a click-on Web survey, a dial-in poll or a mail-in survey, the results should be ignored and not reported. All these pseudo-polls suffer from the same problem: the respondents are self-selected. The individuals choose themselves to take part in the poll there is no pollster choosing the respondents to be interviewed.

Remember, the purpose of a poll is to draw conclusions about the population, not about the sample. In these pseudo-polls, there is no way

to project the results to any larger group. Any similarity between the results of a pseudo-poll and a scientific survey is pure chance.

Clicking on your candidate's button in the "voting booth" on a Web site may drive up the numbers for your candidate in a presidential horse-race poll online. For most such efforts, no effort is made to pick the respondents, to limit users from voting multiple times or to reach out for people who might not normally visit the Web site.

The 900-number dial-in polls may be fine for deciding whether or not Larry the Lobster should be cooked on Saturday Night Live or even for dedicated fans to express their opinions on who is the greatest quarterback in the National Football League. The opinions expressed may be real, but in sum the numbers are just entertainment. There is no way to tell who actually called in, how old they are, or how many times each person called.

Never be fooled by the number of responses. In some cases a few people call in thousands of times. Even if 500,000 calls are tallied, no one has any real knowledge of what the results mean. If big numbers impress you, remember that the Literary Digest's non-scientific sample of 12,000,000 people said Landon would beat Roosevelt in the 1936 Presidential election.

Mail-in coupon polls are just as bad. In this case, the magazine or newspaper includes a coupon to be returned with the answers to the questions. Again, there is no way to know who responded and how many times each person did.

Another variation on the pseudo-poll comes as part of a fund-raising effort. An organization sends out a letter with a survey form attached to a large list of people, asking for opinions and for the respondent to send money to support the organization or pay for tabulating the survey. The questions are often loaded and the results of such an effort are always meaningless.

This technique is used by a wide variety of organizations from political parties and special-interest groups to charitable organizations. Again, if the poll in question is part of a fund-raising pitch, pitch it in the wastebasket.

With regard to the Internet, methods are being developed to sample the opinions of those who have online access, although these efforts are just starting. Even a survey that accurately sampled those who have access to the Internet would still fall short of a poll of all Americans, since only a relatively small fraction of the nation's adults have access to the Internet.

[Top](#top)

**11. What is the sampling error for the poll results?
**

**Interviews with a scientific sample of 1,000 adults can accurately reflect the opinions of nearly 200 million American adults. That means interviews attempted with all 200 million adults if such were possible would give approximately the same results as a well-conducted survey based on 1,000 interviews.
**

What happens if another carefully done poll of 1,000 adults gives slightly different results from the first survey? Neither of the polls is "wrong." This range of possible results is called the error due to sampling, often called the margin of error.

This is not an "error" in the sense of making a mistake. Rather, it is a measure of the possible range of approximation in the results because a sample was used.

Pollsters express the degree of the certainty of results based on a sample as a "confidence level." This means a sample is likely to be within so many points of the results one would have gotten if an interview were attempted with the entire target population. They usually say this with 95% confidence.

Thus, for example, a "3 percentage point margin of error" in a national poll means that if the attempt were made to interview every adult in the nation with the same questions in the same way at about the same time as the poll was taken, the poll's answers would fall within plus or minus 3 percentage points of the complete count s results 95% of the time.

This does not address the issue of whether people cooperate with the survey, or if the questions are understood, or if any other methodological issue exists. The sampling error is only the portion of the potential error in a survey introduced by using a sample rather than interviewing the entire population. Sampling error tells us nothing about the refusals or those consistently unavailable for interview; it also tells us nothing about the biasing effects of a particular question wording or the bias a particular interviewer may inject into the interview situation.

Remember that the sampling error margin applies to each figure in the results it is at least 3 percentage points plus or minus for each one in our example. Thus, in a poll question matching two candidates for President, both figures are subject to sampling error.

[Top](#top)

12. Who s on first?

Sampling error raises one of the thorniest problems in the presentation of poll results: For a horse-race poll, when is one candidate really ahead of the other?

Certainly, if the gap between the two candidates is less than the error margin, you should not say that one candidate is ahead of the other. You can say the race is "close"; the race is "roughly even"; or there is "little difference between the candidates." But it should not be called a "dead heat" unless the candidates are tied with the same percentages.

And just as certainly, when the gap between the two candidates is equal to or more than twice the error margin 6 percentage points in our example and if there are only two candidates and no undecided voters, you can say with confidence that the poll says Candidate A is clearly leading Candidate B.

When the gap between the two candidates is more than the error margin but less than twice the error margin, you should say that Candidate A "is ahead", "has an advantage" or "holds an edge". The story should mention that there is a small possibility that Candidate B is ahead of Candidate A.

When there are more than two choices or undecided voters in the real world the question gets much more complicated. While the solution is statistically complex, you can fairly easily evaluate this situation by estimating the error margin. You can do that by taking the percent for each of the two candidates in question and multiplying it by the total respondents for the survey (only the likely voters if that is appropriate). This number is now the effective sample size for your judgement. Look up the sampling error in a table of statistics for that reduced sample size, and apply it to the candidate percentages. If they overlap, then you do not know if one is ahead. If they do not, then you can make the judgement that one candidate has a lead.

And bear in mind that when subgroup results are reported women or blacks, or young people the sampling error margin for those figures is greater than for results based on the sample as a whole.

Top

13. What other kinds of factors can skew poll results?

The margin of sampling error is just one possible source of inaccuracy in a poll. It is not necessarily the source of the greatest source of possible error; we use it because it's the only one that can be quantified. And, other things being equal, it is useful for evaluating whether differences between poll results are meaningful in a statistical sense.

Question phrasing and question order are also likely sources of flaws. Inadequate interviewer training and supervision, data processing errors and other operational problems can also introduce errors. Professional polling operations are less subject to these problems than volunteer-conducted polls, which are usually less trustworthy.

You should always ask if the poll results have been "weighted." This process is usually used to account for unequal probabilities of selection and to adjust slightly the demographics in the sample. You should be aware that a poll could be manipulated unduly by weighting the numbers to produce a desired result. While some weighting may be appropriate, other weighting is not. Weighting a scientific poll is only appropriate to reflect unequal probabilities or to adjust to independent values that are mostly constant.

Top

14. What questions were asked?

You must find out the exact wording of the poll questions. Why? Because the very wording of questions can make major differences in the results.

Perhaps the best test of any poll question is your reaction to it. On the face of it, does the question seem fair and unbiased? Does it present a balanced set of choices? Would most people be able to answer the question?

On sensitive questions such as abortion the complete wording of the question should probably be included in your story. It may well be worthwhile to compare the results of several different polls from different organizations on sensitive questions. You should examine carefully both the results and the exact wording of the questions.

Top

15. In what order were the

questions asked?

Sometimes the very order of the questions can have an impact on the results. Often that impact is intentional; sometimes it is not. The impact of order can often be subtle.

During troubled economic times, for example, if people are asked what they think of the economy before they are asked their opinion of the president, the presidential popularity rating will probably be lower than if you had reversed the order of the questions. And in good economic times, the opposite is true.

What is important here is whether the questions that were asked prior to the critical question in the poll could sway the results. If the poll asks questions about abortion just before a question about an abortion ballot measure, the prior questions could sway the results.

Top

16. What about "push polls"?

In recent years, some political campaigns and special-interest groups have used a technique called "push polls" to spread rumors and even outright lies about opponents. These efforts are not polls, but are political manipulation trying to hide behind the smokescreen of a public opinion survey.

In a "push poll," a large number of people are called by telephone and asked to participate in a purported survey. The survey "questions" are really thinly-veiled accusations against an opponent or repetitions of rumors about a candidate s personal or professional behavior. The focus here is on making certain the respondent hears and understands the accusation in the question, not in gathering the respondent s opinions.

"Push polls" are unethical and have been condemned by professional polling organizations.

"Push polls" must be distinguished from some types of legitimate surveys done by political campaigns. At times, a campaign poll may ask a series of questions about contrasting issue positions of the candidates or various things that could be said about a candidate, some of which are negative. These legitimate questions seek to gauge the public s reaction to a candidate s position or to a possible legitimate

attack on a candidate's record.

A legitimate poll can be distinguished from a "push poll"; usually by:

The number of calls made a push poll makes thousands and thousands of calls, instead of hundreds for most surveys; The identity of who is making the telephone calls a polling firm for a scientific survey as opposed to a telemarketing house or the campaign itself for a "push poll"; The lack of any true gathering of results in a "push poll," which has as its only objective the dissemination of false or misleading information.

Top

17. What other polls have been done on this topic? Do they say the same thing? If they are different, why are they different?

Results of other polls by a newspaper or television station, a public survey firm or even a candidate's opponent should be used to check and contrast poll results you have in hand.

If the polls differ, first check the timing of the interviewing. If the polls were done at different times, the differing results may demonstrate a swing in public opinion.

If the polls were done about the same time, ask each poll sponsor for an explanation of the differences. Conflicting polls often make good stories.

Top

18. So I've asked all the questions. The answers sound good. The poll is correct, right?

Usually, yes. However, remember that the laws of chance alone say that the results of one poll out of 20 may be skewed away from the public's real views just because of sampling error.

Also remember that no matter how good the poll, no matter how wide the margin, no matter how big the sample, a pre-election poll does not show that one candidate has the race "locked up." Things change often and dramatically in politics. That's why candidates campaign.

Top

19. With all these potential problems, should we ever report poll results?

Yes. Because reputable polling organizations consistently do good work. In spite of the difficulties, the public opinion survey, correctly conducted, is still the best objective measure of the state of the views of the public.

Top

href="http://www.mitofskyinternational.com/" eudora="autourl">.com

</div>
</html>

-----_5230587==_ .ALT--

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 13:13:05 -0400
From: "Evans Witt" <evans.witt@psra.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: 20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results
Message-ID: <000801c03d14\$82eec420\$042d2d0a@nbcnews>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0009_01C03CF2.FBEDED00"
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
In-Reply-To: <007701c03d10\$d87521e0\$17a8a8c0@maine.rr.com>

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0009_01C03CF2.FBEDED00
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

NCPP has made distribution of "20 Questions" easy. To quote from the end of the booklet,

This is a copyrighted publication of the National Council on Public Polls in keeping with its mission to help educate journalists on the use of public opinion polls. The National Council on Public Polls hereby grants the right to duplicate this work in whole, but not in part, for any noncommercial purpose provided that any copy include all of the information on this page.

Evans

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Curtis Mildner
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 12:47 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: 20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results

Can this article be reproduced and distributed?

-----_NextPart_000_0009_01C03CF2.FBEDED00
Content-Type: text/html;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

```
<HTML><HEAD>
<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">

<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.50.4134.600" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV>
<DD><SPAN class=3D00371017-23102000><FONT face=3DArial color=3D#0000ff =
size=3D2>NCP has=20
made distribution of "20 Questions" easy. To quote from the end of the=20
booklet,</FONT></SPAN>
<DD><SPAN class=3D00371017-23102000><FONT face=3DArial color=3D#0000ff=20
size=3D2></FONT></SPAN>&nbsp;
<DD>This is a copyrighted publication of the National Council on Public =
Polls in=20
keeping with its mission to help educate journalists on the use of =
public=20
opinion polls.&nbsp;<SPAN class=3D00371017-23102000>T</SPAN>he National =
Council on=20
Public Polls hereby grants the right to duplicate this work in whole, =
but not in=20
part, for any noncommercial purpose provided that any copy include all =
of the=20
information on this page. </DD></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial color=3D#0000ff size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><SPAN class=3D00371017-23102000><FONT face=3DArial color=3D#0000ff=20
size=3D2>Evans</FONT></SPAN></DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE dir=3Dltr=20
style=3D"PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; BORDER-LEFT: #0000ff 2px =
solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
  <DIV class=3DOutlookMessageHeader><FONT size=3D2>-----Original=20
  Message-----<BR><B>From:</B> owner-aapornet@usc.edu=20
  [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]<B>On Behalf Of</B> Curtis=20
  Mildner<BR><B>Sent:</B> Monday, October 23, 2000 12:47 =
  PM<BR><B>To:</B>=20
  aapornet@usc.edu<BR><B>Subject:</B> Re: 20 Questions A Journalist =
  Should Ask=20
  About Poll Results<BR><BR></FONT></DIV>
  <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Can this article be reproduced and=20
  distributed?</FONT></DIV></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>
```

-----=_NextPart_000_0009_01C03CF2.FBEDED00--

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 12:23:06 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>
Subject: Re: Gallup/CNN Presidential Poll
In-Reply-To: <32.bafd890.2725b21a@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

At 11:24 AM 10/23/2000 -0400, Ron Berkowitz wrote:

>snip

>On a broader note, is there any methodologically sound way to combine the
>popular vote in a poll with the electoral count. That is to somehow give
>results while taking the electoral counts per state into account. I realize
>nationwide weighting partially addresses this problem, but it doesn't seem
to
>give more weight to a voter from California than one in Wyoming. I still
>feel it is somewhat misleading to release a popular vote poll while we truly
>still elect a President through the electoral college.

The problem is multifold. First, sampling and weighting at the national level may mean that different types of potential respondent from the same state have a differential likelihood of entering the sample which cannot be "corrected for". That would mean that the respondents from a given state cannot be treated as a random sample from that state.

Even if this criterion is met, however, there are other problems. The election is not really a national contest of course, but an amalgamation of fifty-one (remember DC) local contests. In almost all cases, whoever gets a plurality of a given state's votes gets ALL its electoral votes, regardless of the size of the plurality. That means that it is theoretically possible to win the election by getting one vote more than one's nearest opponent in enough states to equal 270 electoral votes (one more than half the sum of 435 House seats, 100 Senators, and DC's 3 electorals) without getting any votes elsewhere. While that is quite unlikely, depending on the distribution of votes, the electoral result can substantially differ from the popular, and just weighting for size of state (or even probability of votes affecting electoral totals) misses the point.

The "margin of error" for any single state, extracted from a national sample, can be huge. For instance, if the overall margin is plus or minus three percent, then the comparable figure for the respondents from a state with seven electorals would be about plus or minus twenty-eight; for one with seventeen electoral votes, it would be about plus or minus sixteen. Even for one with 47 electorals, it would come to plus or minus ten, requiring large pluralities to be confident a given candidate was actually ahead in a particular state.

Of course, since there is more than one way of skinning the cat and getting to 270 votes, it is yet more complex. Suppose we were sure -- somehow-- that candidate "A" was within ten electoral votes but there were two states, where the probabilities that "A" was ahead were .67 and .75 (each within the "margin of error" for the single state, since the probability must hit .95 to meet the "normal" threshold.). If we can take the two state samples as independent of one another, the likelihood that "A" would win both is one in two (two thirds of three quarters). The likelihood "A" would win one but not the other is seven twelfths, the likelihood that "A" would lose both is one in twelve (one third times one fourth). However, only the final condition loses the election, since the electoral votes of only one are sufficient to put "A" over the top. This is just an example, of course, since one would never literally be sure of all but two states, and the real probability that "A" is ahead in the electoral college takes the fifty-one state probabilities and converts them to the probability that "A" is ahead in SOME combination sufficient to tally 270 votes. This is calculable, but try conveying it to an audience! And, obviously, one is ignoring any other "source of error", and the blatant difficulty that most

national samples in fact are samples of the contiguous forty-eight states plus the District, so Alaska and Hawaii don't enter into the picture at all, and hence provide no estimates.

As to Ron's final point. To be sure, the election is not legally a popular referendum. However, in fact, the electoral vote tends to exaggerate the popular winner's margin, although -- as noted -- this is by no means certain. And a discrepant result (e.g. Bush gets more popular votes but Gore gets more electorals) would pose major system legitimacy issues. So, even though it is appropriate to remind people that the popular contest is not the only show in town, it strikes me as a useful gauge of popular sentiment.

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705
608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 13:42:28 EDT
From: HOneill536@aol.com
Received: from HOneill536@aol.com
by imo-r18.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.31.) id 5.9e.b2ec5e1 (4256)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Oct 2000 13:42:28 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <9e.b2ec5e1.2725d284@aol.com>
Subject: Re: 20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll R
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 109

20 questions can be found on the NCPP website: www.ncpp.org

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 14:23:29 -0400
From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.51 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Wash.-Balt. Chapter
References: <4CD371A22A53D411B60F00508B6F39B012F32D@UINT4>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Rob,
Who are the current DC chapter officers?

Pres.

Pres Elect.
Past Pres.
Treas.
Sec.

Thanks.

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 14:28:21 -0400 (EDT)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login6.isis.unc.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Gallup/CNN Presidential Poll
In-Reply-To: <32.bafd890.2725b21a@aol.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0010231352030.45544-100000@login6.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Regarding: xxxx I still feel it is somewhat misleading to release a popular vote poll while we truly still elect a President through the electoral college. xxxx

The reason it works is that the electoral vote tends to exaggerate the winner's margin. For example, a candidate who won by a single vote in each state would get 100% of the electoral vote. Political scientists like this feature because it adds legitimacy to the outcome -- a stronger consensus among states than among individuals.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 <http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer>

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 14:59:34 -0400
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Political Groups Scramble to Find E-Mail Addresses
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain

In the Washington Post this weekend

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A54351-2000Oct21?language=printer>

Selected quotes

"You Could Win a Free Palm Pilot!" the Republican National Committee wrote in a message to GOP activists. "Simply enter just two e-mail addresses of GOP friends!" E-mail addresses are emerging as this electoral season's

hottest commodity: a new, efficient and inexpensive way to reach voters and prod them to get to the polls. But with no Yellow Pages for the Internet, political groups are going to extraordinary lengths to gather--"harvest" is the word online marketing experts use--the e-mail addresses of millions of likely supporters, even if they have to do it two at a time."

And this lovely use of a "poll" -

"Besides using the gimmick of the Palm Pilot sweepstakes, the RNC paid Juno.com for the e-mail addresses of 50,000 Juno subscribers. The firm first held an online survey of subscribers on their views of Texas Gov. George W. Bush, then asked respondents to consent to having their e-mails given to the RNC."

"If a political e-mail is good, and in our culture that often means if it's funny, then I might send it to my in-laws, and they might send it to people at their country club," said Michael Cornfield, a George Washington University expert on political uses of the Internet. "E-mail will prove to be much more important to campaigns than the Web," he said. "Those e-mail addresses are the gold in the mine."

Over in the Usenet anti-spam groups there are already some early signs that the collection of email addresses by political parties have gone even further. Several people have complained that they have received unsolicited emails from clickaction.net promoting <http://www.echampions2000.com/> (a RNC website that collects email addresses). According to those who posted when they complained to clickaction the company said that they were sent this by mistake. Another person complained to clickaction and was told since his email address was available on the WWW he was soliciting the email.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 15:21:37 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: George Bishop 513-556-5078 <george.bishop@uc.edu>
Subject: Internet Lab
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="====_5531638==_ .ALT"

-----_5531638==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

The Center for the Study of Democratic Citizenship in the University of Cincinnati's Political Science Department would like to announce the formation of the Internet Public Opinion Laboratory (IPOL).The IPOL is designed primarily to conduct laboratory experiments in public opinion polling and does not attempt to conduct any surveys for the purpose of making population projections (with self-selected samples of Web users).

The inaugural experiment of the laboratory with an online presidential election

poll, which has been running continuously since October 8th and which will conclude on November 7th, can be viewed at the following web address:
<http://www.artsci.uc.edu/poll>.

George Bishop
Director
Internet Public Opinion Laboratory

-----_5531638==_.ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>

The Center for the Study of Democratic Citizenship in the University of Cincinnati's Political Science Department would like to announce the formation of the<i> Internet Public Opinion Laboratory </i>(<i>IPOL</i>).The <i>IPOL</i> is designed primarily to conduct laboratory experiments in public opinion polling and does not attempt to conduct any surveys for the purpose of making population projections (with self-selected samples of Web users).

The inaugural experiment of the laboratory with an online presidential election poll, which has been running continuously since October 8th and which will conclude on November 7th, can be viewed at the following web address:
<http://www.artsci.uc.edu/poll>.

George Bishop

Director

Internet Public Opinion Laboratory

</html>

-----_5531638==_.ALT--

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 14:19:52 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Wash.-Balt. Chapter
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 MAA11738

Marlene,

I think that you want the other Rob. I'm a Midwest chapter member, former president, but don't really have much contact with the DC chapter (thought I'd love to be able to attend their programs).

Best...

Rob

>>> Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu> 10/23 12:23 PM >>>

Hi Rob,

Who are the current DC chapter officers?

Pres.

Pres Elect.

Past Pres.

Treas.

Sec.

Thanks.

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 16:19:14 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Internet Lab
References: <4.1.20001023144630.00bc5660@email.uc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Going to that web address does not allow you to "view" anything and gives you little or no information about the poll or its sponsor.

What it does is land you on a page with a single button which launches a javascript driven poll if you click on it. Perhaps if you choose to go all the way through the survey, you might get somewhere, but I didn't, if only because it follows the obnoxious practice of not providing a DK/NA response and not allowing you to proceed until you have answered a question.

The parent page has a redirect without pause to the college main page, which in turn prevents you from clicking directly back to where you came from, let alone try and get any information. Another way to turn off potential visitors.

This is absolutely the wrong way to try and get people to respond to an Internet poll. It makes you wonder who would bother, and why.

Jan Werner

George Bishop 513-556-5078 wrote:

>

> The Center for the Study of Democratic Citizenship in the University
> of Cincinnati's Political Science Department would like to announce
> the formation of the Internet Public Opinion Laboratory (IPOL).The
> IPOL is designed primarily to conduct laboratory experiments in public
> opinion polling and does not attempt to conduct any surveys for the
> purpose of making population projections (with self-selected samples
> of Web users).
>
> The inaugural experiment of the laboratory with an online presidential
> election poll, which has been running continuously since October 8th
> and which will conclude on November 7th, can be viewed at the
> following web address: <http://www.artsci.uc.edu/poll>.
>
> George Bishop
> Director
> Internet Public Opinion Laboratory

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 16:52:15 -0400
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>
To: "'jwerner@jwdp.com'" <jwerner@jwdp.com>,
 "'aapornet@usc.edu'"
Subject: RE: Internet Lab
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2651.58)
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

Jan,

It might just be that you were randomly assigned to the condition that you judge to be unpleasant and poorly configured, and that you have already been a "successful" subject in their experiment.

Just a thought...

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 4:19 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Internet Lab

Going to that web address does not allow you to "view" anything and gives you little or no information about the poll or its sponsor.

What it does is land you on a page with a single button which launches a javascript driven poll if you click on it. Perhaps if you choose to go all the way through the survey, you might get somewhere, but I didn't, if only because it follows the obnoxious practice of not providing a DK/NA response and not allowing you to proceed until you have answered a question.

The parent page has a redirect without pause to the college main page, which in turn prevents you from clicking directly back to where you came from, let alone try and get any information. Another way to turn off potential visitors.

This is absolutely the wrong way to try and get people to respond to an Internet poll. It makes you wonder who would bother, and why.

Jan Werner

George Bishop 513-556-5078 wrote:

>
> The Center for the Study of Democratic Citizenship in the University
> of Cincinnati's Political Science Department would like to announce
> the formation of the Internet Public Opinion Laboratory (IPOL).The
> IPOL is designed primarily to conduct laboratory experiments in public
> opinion polling and does not attempt to conduct any surveys for the
> purpose of making population projections (with self-selected samples
> of Web users).
>
> The inaugural experiment of the laboratory with an online presidential
> election poll, which has been running continuously since October 8th
> and which will conclude on November 7th, can be viewed at the
> following web address: <http://www.artsci.uc.edu/poll>.
>
> George Bishop
> Director
> Internet Public Opinion Laboratory

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 17:13:21 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: George Bishop 513-556-5078 <george.bishop@uc.edu>
Subject: RE: Internet Lab
In-Reply-To: <F9BC190B7DE9D111965000805FA7C60B0389C31A@nmrusnysx1.dun.nielsen.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Thanks Paul,

Yes, indeed--he landed (randomly) on Form A, which is by design, a totally constrained format.

We thought the sponsor of the survey was quite evident at the top of the page: The Internet Public Opinion Laboratory in the Department of Political Science with the University's LOGO sharply displayed on the left hand side of the first page. Perhaps we could make a bit more explicit who the sponsor is in future experiments(we have no commercial or non-commercial sponsors). This is just a beginning for a doctoral student's dissertation project. So far, over 850 respondents have participated in the experiment via various links and solicitations.

George

At 04:52 PM 10/23/2000 -0400, you wrote:
>Jan,

>
>It might just be that you were randomly assigned to the condition that you
>judge to be unpleasant and poorly configured, and that you have already been
>a "successful" subject in their experiment.

>
>Just a thought...

>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
>Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 4:19 PM
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Re: Internet Lab

>
>
>Going to that web address does not allow you to "view" anything and
>gives you little or no information about the poll or its sponsor.

>
>What it does is land you on a page with a single button which launches a
>javascript driven poll if you click on it. Perhaps if you choose to go
>all the way through the survey, you might get somewhere, but I didn't,
>if only because it follows the obnoxious practice of not providing a
>DK/NA response and not allowing you to proceed until you have answered a
>question.

>
>The parent page has a redirect without pause to the college main page,
>which in turn prevents you from clicking directly back to where you came
>from, let alone try and get any information. Another way to turn off
>potential visitors.

>
>This is absolutely the wrong way to try and get people to respond to an
>Internet poll. It makes you wonder who would bother, and why.

>
>Jan Werner

> _____

>
>George Bishop 513-556-5078 wrote:

>>
>> The Center for the Study of Democratic Citizenship in the University
>> of Cincinnati's Political Science Department would like to announce
>> the formation of the Internet Public Opinion Laboratory (IPOL).The
>> IPOL is designed primarily to conduct laboratory experiments in public
>> opinion polling and does not attempt to conduct any surveys for the
>> purpose of making population projections (with self-selected samples
>> of Web users).

>>
>> The inaugural experiment of the laboratory with an online presidential
>> election poll, which has been running continuously since October 8th
>> and which will conclude on November 7th, can be viewed at the
>> following web address: <http://www.artsci.uc.edu/poll>.

>>
>> George Bishop
>> Director
>> Internet Public Opinion Laboratory

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 16:21:19 -0500

From: "Barry Feinberg" <bfeinberg@customresearch.com>
To: <george.bishop@uc.edu>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Internet Lab
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline

I tried it and got a full range of "don't knows", "no opinions" and "no answers" in the questions. Guess that takes care of AAPORNET "subjects" not knowing that experimental variable.

Barry Feinberg
CRI/NY

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 18:44:23 -0400
From: Rich Clark <rich@csra.uconn.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Internet Lab
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain

I to was assigned to Form A and was immediately disgruntled and critical as I sat there taking the survey. Now I think this is a wonderful experiment. Please post a note when you are ready to publish the results.

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.
Department of Political Science
U-1024, University of Connecticut
341 Mansfield Road
Storrs, CT 06269-1032
860-486-3373 (voice)
860-486-6655 (fax)
richard.l.clark@uconn.edu

> -----Original Message-----
> From: George Bishop 513-556-5078 [SMTP:george.bishop@uc.edu]
> Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 5:13 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: Internet Lab
>
>
>
> Thanks Paul,
>
> Yes, indeed--he landed (randomly) on Form A, which is by design, a totally
> constrained format.
>
> We thought the sponsor of the survey was quite evident at the top of the
> page: The Internet Public Opinion Laboratory in the Department of
> Political
> Science with the University's LOGO sharply displayed on the left hand side

> of the first page. Perhaps we could make a bit more explicit who the
> sponsor is in future experiments(we have no commercial or non-commercial
> sponsors). This is just a beginning for a doctoral student's dissertation
> project. So far, over 850 respondents have participated in the experiment
> via various links and solicitations.

>

> George

>

>

> At 04:52 PM 10/23/2000 -0400, you wrote:

> >Jan,

> >

> >It might just be that you were randomly assigned to the condition that
> you

> >judge to be unpleasant and poorly configured, and that you have already
> been

> >a "successful" subject in their experiment.

> >

> >Just a thought...

> >

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

> >From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]

> >Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 4:19 PM

> >To: aapornet@usc.edu

> >Subject: Re: Internet Lab

> >

> >

> >Going to that web address does not allow you to "view" anything and

> >gives you little or no information about the poll or its sponsor.

> >

> >What it does is land you on a page with a single button which launches a

> >javascript driven poll if you click on it. Perhaps if you choose to go

> >all the way through the survey, you might get somewhere, but I didn't,

> >if only because it follows the obnoxious practice of not providing a

> >DK/NA response and not allowing you to proceed until you have answered a
> >question.

> >

> >The parent page has a redirect without pause to the college main page,

> >which in turn prevents you from clicking directly back to where you came

> >from, let alone try and get any information. Another way to turn off

> >potential visitors.

> >

> >This is absolutely the wrong way to try and get people to respond to an

> >Internet poll. It makes you wonder who would bother, and why.

> >

> >Jan Werner

> >

> >

> >George Bishop 513-556-5078 wrote:

> >>

> >> The Center for the Study of Democratic Citizenship in the University

> >> of Cincinnati's Political Science Department would like to announce

> >> the formation of the Internet Public Opinion Laboratory (IPOL).The

> >> IPOL is designed primarily to conduct laboratory experiments in public

> >> opinion polling and does not attempt to conduct any surveys for the

> >> purpose of making population projections (with self-selected samples

> >> of Web users).

> >>
> >> The inaugural experiment of the laboratory with an online presidential
> >> election poll, which has been running continuously since October 8th
> >> and which will conclude on November 7th, can be viewed at the
> >> following web address: <http://www.artsci.uc.edu/poll>.
> >>
> >> George Bishop
> >> Director
> >> Internet Public Opinion Laboratory

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 16:06:36 -0700
From: "Ross, Robert" <rross@csuchico.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Gallup/CNN Presidential Poll
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain

It's true that Alexander Hamilton stated that if the Electoral College "be not perfect, it is at least excellent." (Federalist #68) But most political scientists that I know find it one of the least desirable of our constitutional features because of the mischief that it can cause. One especially quirky feature is that the House elects the president if no candidate gets an absolute majority. With each state having only one vote, it can lead to such constitutional crises as when it took 36 ballots to elect Thomas Jefferson over Aaron Burr who was his vice presidential running mate, which required a Constitutional Amendment to prevent in the future, or when John Quincy Adams was chosen over Andrew Jackson. It can also lead to the situation we have been discussing the past few days: the possibility of Gore winning the election but losing the popular vote. It has happened before: Jackson was the popular choice, as was Grover Cleveland when he lost to Benjamin Harrison. In all likelihood, Samuel Tilden was the popular vote winner in 1876.

It has almost happened in several recent elections. For example, with the shift of only a few thousand votes in Oregon and Ohio in 1976, Ford would have won the electoral vote, but Carter would have still had almost a million more popular votes. And in 1960, one could argue that about 250,000 South Carolina votes that were assigned to Kennedy should be subtracted from his total because those votes were cast for electors who did not vote for Kennedy, which would have made Nixon the popular vote winner.

A number of political scientists have made a career out of studying the distortions in the Electoral College system and providing measurements of who is advantaged and who disadvantaged by the system. It is true that in most elections where there is a clear winner in both the popular and the electoral vote the electoral vote exaggerates the difference. But in close elections, especially where there are regional differences, the Electoral College can as easily produce a perverse effect. That's why most of my colleagues prefer a direct popular vote.

> -----
> From: Philip Meyer
> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 11:28 AM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Gallup/CNN Presidential Poll
>
>
> Regarding: xxxx I still feel it is somewhat misleading to release a
> popular vote poll while we truly still elect a President through the
> electoral college. xxxx
>
> The reason it works is that the electoral vote tends to exaggerate the
> winner's margin. For example, a candidate who won by a single vote in each
> state would get 100% of the electoral vote. Political scientists like this
> feature because it adds legitimacy to the outcome -- a stronger consensus
> among states than among individuals.
>
> =====
> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
> CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
> University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
> Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
> =====
>
>
>
>

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 23:26:07 EDT
From: RSimm32573@aol.com
Received: from RSimm32573@aol.com
by imo-d04.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.32.) id 5.23.28433bc (3317)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Oct 2000 23:26:08 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <23.28433bc.27265b4f@aol.com>
Subject: Re: Wash.-Balt. Chapter
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 114

Hi Marlene,

We are about to have elections, but at the moment the President is still Rob Santos, the Secretary is still Audrey Kindlon, and the Treasurer is still Carolyn Shettle. I am serving as Past President because my successor, Karol Krotki, served as President only briefly before leaving town.

We have no VP-and-President-Elect, but we will sometime next month. In the early spring this person will move up to President, others elected next month will replace the current Sec. and Treas., and Santos will replace me as Past Pres.

Rob Simmons

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 23:59:21 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: Answers to Questions we often hear from the public
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="=====_24732805==_ .ALT"

=====_24732805==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Hi folks,

After sending the last piece, 20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results, to AAPORNET, it occurred to me that in many ways I was preaching to the converted and that there were many others who were not research professionals but who might find the piece interesting and helpful. So, as an experiment I sent it off to many of my friends who work in a wide variety of fields (medicine, law, journalism, arts, etc.) Happily, I was rewarded with many notes of thanks, even from journalists, along with comments about how it helped their understanding, as lay people, of what polling was all about.

With that in mind I down loaded a second article, Answers to Questions we often hear from the public, also from NCPP's web site and sent it off to the same group. Many of us complain as both individuals and as a professional group about the ignorance and general lack of understanding on the part of the public as to what polling is all about and the kind of painful criticisms that hit from all sides as a result. To begin to repair this gap in knowledge I wondered what would happen if each member of AAPOR were to send copies of these articles off to their friends? You know, the ones who send you scads and scads of bad jokes. Obviously, the result would be only a small drop in a big bucket...but it might be a beginning. If we are able to enlarge, ever so slightly, the knowledge and appreciation base of various opinion leaders in medicine, law and even journalism it just might help.....even college students might profit.

I'm probably being silly, naive and idealistic, but then, who knows?

Dick Halpern

+++++
<http://www.ncpp.org/faq.htm><x-html>
<home.htm>

Answers to Questions

WE OFTEN HEAR FROM THE PUBLIC

* Why am I or my friends never included in political polls conducted for the media?

* Is a larger sample always better than a smaller sample?

* How can a sample of only 800 or 1200 truly reflect the opinions of 200 million Americans within a few percentage points?

* Why do polls often disagree with how I and my friends feel about things?

* Why is job approval for elected officials asked so often in polls?

* How accurate are polls?

* Can wording of questions bias poll results?

* Why should I respond to a poll?

1. Why am I or my friends never included in political polls conducted for the media?

The reason is fairly simple. There are about 200 million adult or voting age Americans. But the average poll has a sample size of 1,000 adults. This

means that only one person in 200,000 will be included in any one national or state poll. To put it another way, it would take 200,000 polls with samples of 1,000 for pollsters to get around to all Americans - and this assumes no one is called twice.

Of course, national and local media organizations conduct several polls in one year. The number of national or local media political polls you see in a single year is about 250 - but can vary depending on where you live. But even two hundred fifty polls in a single year means your chance of being interviewed at least once is still small.

Top

2. Is a larger sample always better than a smaller sample?

Larger sample are generally more precise, but sometimes not. The important rule in sampling is not how many poll respondents are selected but, instead, how they are selected. A reliable sample selects poll respondents randomly or in a manner which insures that everyone in the area being surveyed has a known chance of being selected.

Top

3. How can a sample of only 800 or 1200 truly reflect the opinions of 200 million Americans within a few percentage points?

Sampling methods and measures of sample reliability or precision are derived from a mathematical science called statistics. Statistics is a subject taught in colleges and some high schools. Text books on the subject are available in most libraries.

At the root of statistical reliability is probability; i.e., the odds of obtaining a particular outcome by chance alone. As an example, the chances of having a coin come up heads in a single toss is 50%. Heads is one of only two possible outcomes. The chance of getting two heads in two coin tosses is less because two heads are now only one of four possible outcomes; i.e., a head/head, head/tail, tail/head and tail/tail. As the number of coin tosses increases, it becomes increasingly more likely to get outcomes which are either very close to half heads or exactly half because, as with two coins, there are more ways to get such outcomes.

Sample survey reliability works the same way - but on a much larger scale. As in coin tosses, the most likely sample outcome is the true percentage of whatever it is we are measuring across the total population. Next most likely are outcomes very close to this true percentage. A statement of potential margin of error or sample precision reflects this and often appears in poll stories. Using a sample of 1000 as an example, the statement could read: the chances are 95% of coming within +/- 3% of a hypothetical survey conducted among all members of the population. This means that 95% of all samples which could possibly be drawn will yield an outcome within 3% of the true percentage among the population.

Keep in mind that estimates of potential sample error always assume random samples. But even in true random samples, precision can be compromised by other factors such as the wording of questions or the order in which questions were asked.

There is no single ideal sample size. Samples of any size have some degree of precision. The question is always whether there is sufficient precision

to draw conclusions as determined by statistical formulae.

Top

4. Why do polls often disagree with how I and my friends feel about things? It is unlikely that you have a circle of friends as diverse as a randomly selected sample described before, a sample of the entire nation or of the state where you live. This would mean you have friends from all neighborhoods, of all ages, very wealthy friends and friends with no wealth, who are from all walks of life and with educational levels ranging from grade school to post-graduate.

No poll has ever shown all people feeling exactly the same way on one issue. So the next time you see a poll showing only 30% in agreement with your point of view, remember, although you may not be in the majority, it still means that 60,000,000 Americans feel the way you do.

Top

5. Why is job approval for elected officials asked so often in polls? Job approval is a question asked in polls for over 50 years, asked about presidents from Harry Truman to Bill Clinton. It is a measure of potential electoral success for an incumbent president (or state and local elected officials) and is useful for trend purposes. Incumbents who fail to win approval from a majority of the public for the job they are doing are very often in trouble on election day.

Experience shows presidential job approval has a lot to do with how well people think things are going in the country today. High job approval does not mean the office-holder is necessarily held in high, personal esteem. Job approval is just one question which when analyzed in combination with response to other questions gives a good overall picture of how an incumbent is perceived.

Top

6. How accurate are polls?

The NCPP analyzed final presidential election polls conducted by the national media dating back over 50 years. When compared with actual election outcomes, average poll error for presidential elections between 1956 and 1996 has been declining. Average poll error on each candidate during this period was 1.9 percentage points.

Important to this analysis of accuracy is that most of these polls were conducted within days or even hours before election day. Polls conducted 1-2 weeks before election day or even longer by local newspapers and TV stations cannot usually be expected to closely match election outcomes. Earlier polls are intended to monitor the success of campaigns and to identify the issues or events which will influence voter preferences on election day.

Top

7. Can wording of questions bias poll results?

How questions in a poll are worded is as important as sampling procedure in obtaining valid results.

Most professional polling organizations and their media clients review the wording of questions as carefully as editors would examine a manuscript before publication. This process usually calls for a review of several drafts prior to fielding a poll. Questions are checked for balance, that is, are they worded in a neutral fashion without taking sides on an issue? Does the question represent both sides of an issue fairly? Answer choices read to poll respondents must also be balanced; e.g., approve or disapprove, favor or oppose.

The order of questions must be in logical order. That is, general questions are asked before specific questions. For example, overall job approval of an incumbent must be asked before specific questions are asked which may remind respondents about the incumbent's successes or failures. The same goes for questions asking respondents which side they take on an issue which may influence a later question about opinion of a candidate who takes the opposite side.

Questions are written using clear, unambiguous, concise language to insure all respondents regardless of educational level understand them. And since most polls are conducted by phone, a writing style suitable for the ear is often adopted as opposed to a style more suitable for reading.

Top

8. Why should I respond to a poll?

Each year, tens of thousands of Americans respond to poll interviews on subjects of national interest. They do so because they want their opinions heard. A poll or survey is an unbiased way for people to make their views known to each other, to their government, to businesses, to educators and many other institutions. This is one way for average Americans to add their voices to the debate over important issues of our day. It is our sense that people want to be included in polls.

Polling is only a part of a \$3 billion U.S. survey research industry that affects your life in many ways. Medicines in your cabinet became available only after they had been tested for effectiveness and safety, tested among samples of patients. Manufacturers use sampling methods to guard against producing defective products. Businesses conduct market research by sampling consumer opinions to help develop products people want and avoid costly mistakes. Even the Bureau of the Census only interviews everyone in the nation once every ten years. The Census Bureau along with other government agencies also conduct sample surveys to obtain social and economic data we see in the news.

One thing legitimate survey researchers will never do is try to sell you something. That is called telemarketing. According to direct marketing industry estimates, there are now 2 million telemarketers who call the general public to sell products and services. The number of survey research interviewers who conduct telephone interviews is probably only a small fraction of 2 million.

Top

For more information, contact us at <mailto:info@ncpp.org><mailto:info@ncpp.org>info@ncpp.org.

-----_24732805==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>

Hi folks,

After sending the last piece,

<i><u>20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About Poll Results</i></u> to AAPORNET, it occurred to me that in many ways I was preaching to the converted and that there were many others who were not research professionals but who might find the piece interesting and helpful. So, as an experiment I sent it off to many of my friends who work in a wide variety of fields (medicine, law, journalism, arts, etc.) Happily, I was rewarded with many notes of thanks, even from journalists, along with comments about how it helped their understanding, as lay people, of what polling was all about.

With that in mind I down loaded a second article, <u>Answers to Questions we often hear from the public,</u> also from NCPP's web site and sent it off to the same group. Many of us complain as both individuals and as a professional group about the ignorance and general lack of understanding on the part of the public as to what polling is all about and the kind of painful criticisms that hit from all sides as a result. To begin to repair this gap in knowledge I wondered what would happen if each member of AAPOR were to send copies of these articles off to their friends? You know, the ones who send you scads and scads of bad jokes. Obviously, the result would be only a small drop in a big bucket...but it might be a beginning. If we are able to enlarge, ever so slightly, the knowledge and appreciation base of various opinion leaders in medicine, law and even journalism it just might help.....even college students might profit.

I'm probably being silly, naive and idealistic, but then, who knows?

Dick Halpern

+++++

b

r>

<a href="http://www.ncpp.org/faq.htm"

eudora="autourl">http://www.ncpp.org/faq.htm<x-html>

Answers to Questions

WE OFTEN HEAR FROM THE

PUBLIC

Why am I or my friends never included in political polls conducted for the media?

Is a larger sample always better than a smaller sample?

How can a sample of only 800 or 1200 truly reflect the opinions of 200 million Americans within a few percentage points?

Why do polls often disagree with how I and my friends

feel about things?

Why is job approval for elected officials asked so often in polls?

How accurate are polls?

Can wording of questions bias poll results?

Why should I respond to a poll?

1. Why am I or my friends never included in political polls conducted for the media?

The reason is fairly simple. There are about 200 million adult or voting age Americans. But the average poll has a sample size of 1,000 adults. This means that only one person in 200,000 will be included in any one national or state poll. To put it another way, it would take 200,000 polls with samples of 1,000 for pollsters to get around to all Americans - and this assumes no one is called twice.

Of course, national and local media organizations conduct several polls in one year. The number of national or local media political polls you see in a single year is about 250 - but can vary depending on where you live. But even two hundred fifty polls in a single year means your chance of being interviewed at least once is still small.

Top

2. Is a larger sample always better than a smaller sample?

Larger sample are generally more precise, but sometimes not. The important rule in sampling is not how many poll respondents are selected but, instead, how they are selected. A reliable sample selects poll respondents randomly or in a manner which insures that everyone in the area being surveyed has a known chance of being selected.

Top

3. How can a sample of only 800 or 1200 truly reflect the opinions of 200 million Americans within a few percentage points?

Sampling methods and measures of sample reliability or precision are derived from a mathematical science called statistics. Statistics is a subject taught in colleges and some high schools. Text books on the subject are available in most libraries.

At the root of statistical reliability is probability; i.e., the odds of obtaining a particular outcome by chance alone. As an example, the chances of having a coin come up heads in a single toss is 50%. Heads is one of only two possible outcomes. The chance of getting two heads in two coin tosses is less because two heads are now only one of four possible outcomes; i.e., a head/head, head/tail, tail/head and tail/tail. As the number of coin tosses increases, it becomes increasingly more likely to get outcomes which are either very close to half heads or exactly half because, as with two coins, there are more ways to get such outcomes.

Sample survey reliability works the same way - but on a much larger scale. As in coin tosses, the most likely sample outcome is the true percentage of whatever it is we are measuring across the total population. Next most likely are outcomes very close to this true percentage. A statement of potential margin of error or sample precision

reflects this and often appears in poll stories. Using a sample of 1000 as an example, the statement could read: the chances are 95% of coming within +/- 3% of a hypothetical survey conducted among all members of the population. This means that 95% of all samples which could possibly be drawn will yield an outcome within 3% of the true percentage among the population.

Keep in mind that estimates of potential sample error always assume random samples. But even in true random samples, precision can be compromised by other factors such as the wording of questions or the order in which questions were asked.

There is no single ideal sample size. Samples of any size have some degree of precision. The question is always whether there is sufficient precision to draw conclusions as determined by statistical formulae.

Top

4. Why do polls often disagree with how I and my friends feel about things?

It is unlikely that you have a circle of friends as diverse as a randomly selected sample described before, a sample of the entire nation or of the state where you live. This would mean you have friends from all neighborhoods, of all ages, very wealthy friends and friends with no wealth, who are from all walks of life and with educational levels ranging from grade school to post-graduate.

No poll has ever shown all people feeling exactly the same way on one issue. So the next time you see a poll showing only 30% in agreement with your point of view, remember, although you may not be in the majority, it still means that 60,000,000 Americans feel the way you do.

Top

5. Why is job approval for elected officials asked so often in polls?

Job approval is a question asked in polls for over 50 years, asked about presidents from Harry Truman to Bill Clinton. It is a measure of potential electoral success for an incumbent president (or state and local elected officials) and is useful for trend purposes. Incumbents who fail to win approval from a majority of the public for the job they are doing are very often in trouble on election day.

Experience shows presidential job approval has a lot to do with how well people think things are going in the country today. High job approval does not mean the office-holder is necessarily held in high, personal esteem. Job approval is just one question which when analyzed in combination with response to other questions gives a good overall picture of how an incumbent is perceived.

Top

6. How accurate are polls?

The NCPP analyzed final presidential election polls conducted by the national media dating back over 50 years. When compared with actual election outcomes, average poll error for presidential elections between

1956 and 1996 has been declining. Average poll error on each candidate during this period was 1.9 percentage points.

Important to this analysis of accuracy is that most of these polls were conducted within days or even hours before election day. Polls conducted 1-2 weeks before election day or even longer by local newspapers and TV stations cannot usually be expected to closely match election outcomes. Earlier polls are intended to monitor the success of campaigns and to identify the issues or events which will influence voter preferences on election day.

Top

7. Can wording of questions bias poll results?

How questions in a poll are worded is as important as sampling procedure in obtaining valid results.

Most professional polling organizations and their media clients review the wording of questions as carefully as editors would examine a manuscript before publication. This process usually calls for a review of several drafts prior to fielding a poll. Questions are checked for balance, that is, are they worded in a neutral fashion without taking sides on an issue? Does the question represent both sides of an issue fairly? Answer choices read to poll respondents must also be balanced; e.g., approve or disapprove, favor or oppose.

The order of questions must be in logical order. That is, general questions are asked before specific questions. For example, overall job approval of an incumbent must be asked before specific questions are asked which may remind respondents about the incumbent's successes or failures. The same goes for questions asking respondents which side they take on an issue which may influence a later question about opinion of a candidate who takes the opposite side.

Questions are written using clear, unambiguous, concise language to insure all respondents regardless of educational level understand them. And since most polls are conducted by phone, a writing style suitable for the ear is often adopted as opposed to a style more suitable for reading.

Top

8. Why should I respond to a poll?

Each year, tens of thousands of Americans respond to poll interviews on subjects of national interest. They do so because they want their opinions heard. A poll or survey is an unbiased way for people to make their views known to each other, to their government, to businesses, to educators and many other institutions. This is one way for average Americans to add their voices to the debate over important issues of our day. It is our sense that people want to be included in polls.

Polling is only a part of a \$3 billion U.S. survey research industry that affects your life in many ways. Medicines in your cabinet

became available only after they had been tested for effectiveness and safety, tested among samples of patients. Manufacturers use sampling methods to guard against producing defective products. Businesses conduct market research by sampling consumer opinions to help develop products people want and avoid costly mistakes. Even the Bureau of the Census only interviews everyone in the nation once every ten years. The Census Bureau along with other government agencies also conduct sample surveys to obtain social and economic data we see in the news.

One thing legitimate survey researchers will never do is try to sell you something. That is called telemarketing. According to direct marketing industry estimates, there are now 2 million telemarketers who call the general public to sell products and services. The number of survey research interviewers who conduct telephone interviews is probably only a small fraction of 2 million.

Top

For more information, contact us at info@ncpp.org.

</html>

-----_24732805==_.ALT--

=====
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 06:02:56 -0700 (PDT)
From: Kat Lind <kat_lind99@yahoo.com>
Subject: Wanted: Montreal Info
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

I am beginning to collect "social activity" information for the 2001 AAPOR conference in Montreal.

If anyone has "inside" information on favorite places to go, eat, shop, or other tips about Montreal and the surrounding area, please send me an e-mail (Remember - Don't do automatic reply - send a new email directly to me).

Kat_Lind99@yahoo.com

Thank you,

Katherine "Kat" Lind
AAPOR Social Activity Coordinator

=====

Katherine "Kat" Lind
Kat_Lind99@yahoo.com

Do You Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Messenger - Talk while you surf! It's FREE.
<http://im.yahoo.com/>

Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 09:41:09 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: Gallup/CNN Presidential Poll
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <39F59174.BF839CA3@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <A154FC0C2AC8D111BE4F00805F6FDFF6018F8FB1@MESQUITE>

The problem with a direct popular vote, though, is that we would have to change the Constitution to elect candidates by plurality. Otherwise, more elections would end up in the House of Representatives because no person received a majority due to third-party votes. (This would have occurred in 1992 and 1996, just as two examples).

Frank Rusciano

"Ross, Robert" wrote:

> It's true that Alexander Hamilton stated that if the Electoral College "be
> not perfect, it is at least excellent." (Federalist #68) But most
political
> scientists that I know find it one of the least desirable of our
> constitutional features because of the mischief that it can cause. One
> especially quirky feature is that the House elects the president if no
> candidate gets an absolute majority. With each state having only one vote,
> it can lead to such constitutional crises as when it took 36 ballots to
> elect Thomas Jefferson over Aaron Burr who was his vice presidential
running
> mate, which required a Constitutional Amendment to prevent in the future,
or
> when John Quincy Adams was chosen over Andrew Jackson. It can also lead to
> the situation we have been discussing the past few days: the possibility of
> Gore winning the election but losing the popular vote. It has happened
> before: Jackson was the popular choice, as was Grover Cleveland when he
lost
> to Benjamin Harrison. In all likelihood, Samuel Tilden was the popular
vote
> winner in 1876.
>
> It has almost happened in several recent elections. For example, with the
> shift of only a few thousand votes in Oregon and Ohio in 1976, Ford would
> have won the electoral vote, but Carter would have still had almost a

> million more popular votes. And in 1960, one could argue that about
> 250,000
> South Carolina votes that were assigned to Kennedy should be subtracted
> from
> his total because those votes were cast for electors who did not vote for
> Kennedy, which would have made Nixon the popular vote winner.
>
> A number of political scientists have made a career out of studying the
> distortions in the Electoral College system and providing measurements of
> who is advantaged and who disadvantaged by the system. It is true that in
> most elections where there is a clear winner in both the popular and the
> electoral vote the electoral vote exaggerates the difference. But in close
> elections, especially where there are regional differences, the Electoral
> College can as easily produce a perverse effect. That's why most of my
> colleagues prefer a direct popular vote.

> > -----

> > From: Philip Meyer
> > Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Sent: Monday, October 23, 2000 11:28 AM
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Re: Gallup/CNN Presidential Poll

> > Regarding: xxxx I still feel it is somewhat misleading to release a
> > popular vote poll while we truly still elect a President through the
> > electoral college. xxxx

> > The reason it works is that the electoral vote tends to exaggerate the
> > winner's margin. For example, a candidate who won by a single vote in
> each
> > state would get 100% of the electoral vote. Political scientists like
> this
> > feature because it adds legitimacy to the outcome -- a stronger consensus
> > among states than among individuals.

> > =====

> > Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
> > CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
> > University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
> > Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
> > =====

=====
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 13:09:47 EDT
From: RFunk787@aol.com
Received: from RFunk787@aol.com
by imo-r10.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.32.) id 5.b6.c45e718 (9762)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Oct 2000 13:09:49 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <b6.c45e718.27271c5b@aol.com>
Subject: Question concerning POQ article on nonresponse
To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 106

The recent POQ (Summer 2000) contains an ararticle, "Consequences of Reducing Nonresponse in a National Telephone Survey," by Keeter, Miller, Kohut, Groves and Presser. A laudible effort to shed some light on the problem of low response rates to surveys that the profession has been facing lately, it compares the results of two telephone surveys, with response rates of 36% and 60.6%.. One thing in the article did puzzle me. In the section, "Differences in Political and Social Attitudes and Electoral Behavior", the authors state: "We found only the barest support for the charge that Standard procedures -- relative to the Rigorous protocol -- underrepresent conservatives and Republicans." However, the article inexplicably neglects to note that, as shown in Table 2, these two samples reported, respectively, that 55% and 58% voted for Clinton in 1996. Unlike many of the items, this can be validated against hard, outside data. In fact, Clinton received 49% of the popular vote in 1966. It would appear that both these samples underrepresent somebody -- conservatives, Republicans, whatever -- by 6% and 9%, respectively. I wonder if any of the authors could clarify this for us?

Thanks, Ray Funkhouser

=====
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 10:32:28 -0700
From: "MJS" <sullivan@fsc-research.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Question concerning POQ article on nonresponse
Message-ID: <39F5653C.17096.A8AF97B@localhost>
In-reply-to: <b6.c45e718.27271c5b@aol.com>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Good question!!!

Date sent: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 13:09:47 EDT
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: RFunk787@aol.com
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Question concerning POQ article on nonresponse

The recent POQ (Summer 2000) contains an ararticle, "Consequences of Reducing Nonresponse in a National Telephone Survey," by Keeter, Miller, Kohut, Groves and Presser. A laudible effort to shed some light on the problem of low response rates to surveys that the profession has been facing lately, it compares the results of two telephone surveys, with response rates of 36% and 60.6%.. One thing in the article did puzzle me. In the section, "Differences in Political and Social Attitudes and Electoral Behavior", the authors state: "We found only the barest support for the charge that Standard procedures -- relative to the Rigorous protocol -- underrepresent conservatives and Republicans." However, the article inexplicably neglects to note that, as shown in Table 2, these two samples reported, respectively, that 55% and 58% voted for Clinton in 1996. Unlike many of the items, this

can be validated against hard, outside data. In fact, Clinton received 49% of the popular vote in 1966. It would appear that both these samples underrepresent somebody -- conservatives, Republicans, whatever -- by 6% and 9%, respectively. I wonder if any of the authors could clarify this for us?

Thanks, Ray Funkhouser

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.

Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 12:28:44 -0500
From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOroure@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Position available

POSITION NOTICE

SURVEY RESEARCH LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO

SRL has an immediate opening at its Chicago office for a Visiting Data Reduction (DR) Coordinator. This position requires experience in survey research or a related area. The primary function is to direct the DR services and set operational policies and procedures. DR is responsible for survey mailings, coding, data entry for paper questionnaires, and back-end cleanup of computerized interviews. Duties include budget proposals; hire, train, and supervise coders and coding supervisors. Requirements: Bachelor's degree in a social science or related field and survey research experience. Prefer knowledge of Word, Excel, Access, CASES survey software, and managerial experience. Salary in the \$30s commensurate with experience.

For full consideration, send resume by November 8, 2000 to:

Diane O'Rourke
Assistant Director for Survey Operations
Survey Research Laboratory
909 W. Oregon, Suite 300
Urbana, IL 61801
or fax to 217-244-4408

The University of Illinois is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer.

Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 14:11:38 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Claire Durand <durandc@SOCIO.UMontreal.CA>
Subject: Re: Wanted: Montreal Info
In-Reply-To: <20001024130256.2445.qmail@web704.mail.yahoo.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id LAA25548

Katherine,

As a Montreal resident and Montreal "fan", I have lots of inside information, but I have quite a lot of work these days too... I am wondering if you have contacted the Turism bureau yet. You will get a lot of information from them. Some perhaps interesting activities are the Cruises with or without a meal, on the St-Laurence river. White water rafting on the St-Laurence river. A number of other activities on the St-Laurence river may be interesting like a ride on the "amphibia bus". All these activities are right down town, not far from the hotel.

Some people may be interested in a trip to Quebec City, the oldest city in North America...

As for restaurants, there are a number of very good restaurants in Montreal but one of them is extremely special, extremely good and rather expensive (100\$ Canadian for one person minimum). It could be an idea to make reservations (easily a month in advance) for the organizing committee or some "selected" group.

Those are my ideas for now...Do not hesitate to contact me again...

Regards,

Claire Durand

At 06:02 00-10-24 -0700, you wrote:
>I am beginning to collect "social activity"
>information for the 2001 AAPOR conference in Montreal.
>
>If anyone has "inside" information on favorite places
>to go, eat, shop, or other tips about Montreal and the
>surrounding area, please send me an e-mail (Remember -
>Don't do automatic reply - send a new email directly
>to me).
>
>Kat_Lind99@yahoo.com
>
>Thank you,
>
>Katherine "Kat" Lind
>AAPOR Social Activity Coordinator
>
>=====
>
>Katherine "Kat" Lind
>Kat_Lind99@yahoo.com
>

>
>Do You Yahoo!?
>Yahoo! Messenger - Talk while you surf! It's FREE.
>http://im.yahoo.com/

Claire Durand
Universit  de Montr al, dept. de sociologie,
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montr al, Qu bec, Canada, H3C 3J7

durandc@socio.umontreal.ca
http://alize.ere.umontreal.ca/~durandc

"Si vous connaissez une seule soci t , vous n'en connaissez aucune."
"If you know only one society, you don't know any".

Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 14:09:25 -0400
From: "Curtis Mildner" <cmildner@marketdecisions.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Remove from List
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_004C_01C03DC4.046CD6E0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_004C_01C03DC4.046CD6E0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_001_004D_01C03DC4.046CD6E0"

-----_NextPart_001_004D_01C03DC4.046CD6E0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

How do I get off this list so that I do not receive these e-mails =
automatically?

-----_NextPart_001_004D_01C03DC4.046CD6E0
Content-Type: text/html;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">  
<HTML><HEAD>  
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =  
charset=3Diso-8859-1">  
<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.50.4134.600" name=3DGENERATOR>  
<STYLE></STYLE>  
</HEAD>
```

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV>How do I get off this list so that I do =
not receive=20
these e-mails automatically?</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_001_004D_01C03DC4.046CD6E0--

-----=_NextPart_000_004C_01C03DC4.046CD6E0
Content-Type: text/x-vcard;
 name="Curtis Mildner.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: attachment;
 filename="Curtis Mildner.vcf"

BEGIN:VCARD
VERSION:2.1
N:Mildner;Curtis
FN:Curtis Mildner
ORG:Market Decisions
TITLE:President, Senior Consultant
TEL;WORK;VOICE:207-767-6440 x105
TEL;WORK;FAX:207-767-8158
ADR;WORK;ENCODING=3DQUOTED-PRINTABLE:;;One Park Square=3D0D=3D0A85 E =
Street;South Portland;ME;04106;USA
LABEL;WORK;ENCODING=3DQUOTED-PRINTABLE:One Park Square=3D0D=3D0A85 E =
Street=3D0D=3D0ASouth Portland, ME 04106=3D0D=3D0AUSA
URL:
URL:http://www.marketdecisions.com
EMAIL;PREF;INTERNET:cmildner@marketdecisions.com
REV:20001024T180925Z
END:VCARD

-----=_NextPart_000_004C_01C03DC4.046CD6E0--

=====
Date: 24 Oct 2000 14:21:06 -0400
Message-ID: <-1239725232rmatovic@ssk.com>
Sender: Rebecca Matovic <rmatovic@ssk.com>
From: Rebecca Matovic <rmatovic@ssk.com>
Subject: Re:Question concerning POQ article on nonresponse
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
X-Mailer: QuickMail Pro 2.0 (Mac)
X-Priority: 3
MIME-Version: 1.0
Reply-To: Rebecca Matovic <rmatovic@ssk.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-Ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id LAA04751

> these two samples reported, respectively, >that 55% and 58% voted for
Clinton in 1996. Unlike many of the items, this >can be
validated against hard, outside data. In fact, Clinton received 49% >of the
popular vote in 1966. It would appear that both these

samples >underrepresent somebody -- conservatives, Republicans, whatever --
by
6% and >9%, respectively. I wonder if any of the
authors could
>clarify this for us?
>
>Thanks, Ray Funkhouser >

As a rule of thumb, I've always found that ALL post election surveys over-
represent the winner of an election (unless he's become
exceedingly unpopular). People's reporting of what they did in the past is
very fickkle.

Rebecca Matovic

Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 14:31:20 -0400 (EDT)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login0.isis.unc.edu
To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Direct election of the President
In-Reply-To: <39F59174.BF839CA3@rider.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0010241414400.103350-100000@login7.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

It's been a while since I've looked at this issue, and maybe I should
have said "political scientists over 60" like the electoral college. A
popular vote amendment could provide for a runoff. But if it were no
longer necessary to win an entire state, single-issue parties would be
encouraged and there would be constant coalition-forming to build a
majority for the runoff -- fun for journalists, but destabilizing for the
nation.

And the main battlegrounds would be the heavily-populated states that
are dominated by one party. A candidate could gain more by boosting
turnout there than by contesting what are now the swing states. So there
would be less incentive to woo the undecided center.

Finally, and I think I'm quoting Nelson Polby here, a close popular
vote like 1960 could lead to weeks or months of uncertainty while recounts
took place all over the nation. Charges of -- and temptations for -- fraud
would multiply.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 <http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer>

Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 14:35:43 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re:Question concerning POQ article on nonresponse
In-Reply-To: <-1239725232rmatovic@ssk.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 02:21 PM 10/24/00 -0400, you wrote:
>Naw, it is "selective attrition"--REPUBLICANS die young.

In all seriousness on this topic, however, I think the funniest example is to track through the results from the 1972 Presidential election in either the GSS or the NES. You would never know that Nixon won by a landslide.

I trot out the "Republicans die young" hypothesis to explain the results to my Methods classes just to see what they make of it.

Susan

> > these two samples reported, respectively, >that 55% and 58% voted for
> Clinton in 1996. Unlike many of the items, this >can be validated
> against hard, outside data. In fact, Clinton received 49% >of the
> popular vote in 1966. It would appear that both these
> samples >underrepresent somebody -- conservatives, Republicans, whatever
> -- by 6% and >9%, respectively. I wonder if any of the authors could
> >clarify this for us?

> >
> >Thanks, Ray Funkhouser >
>
>

>As a rule of thumb, I've always found that ALL post election surveys
>over-represent the winner of an election (unless he's become exceedingly
>unpopular). People's reporting of what they did in the past is very
>fickkle.

>
>Rebecca Matovic

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4453
(850) 644-8778 (VOICE)
(850) 644-8776 (FAX)
(850) 644-4592 (DEPARTMENT)

Visit the site!
<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>

Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 14:04:42 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "G Donald Ferree, Jr." <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>

Subject: Re: Direct election of the President
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0010241414400.103350-100000@login7.isis.unc.edu>
References: <39F59174.BF839CA3@rider.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Phil Meyer wrote (in part):

>
> Finally, and I think I'm quoting Nelson Polby here, a close popular
>vote like 1960 could lead to weeks or months of uncertainty while recounts
>took place all over the nation. Charges of -- and temptations for -- fraud
>would multiply.

>
And not just recounts. Considering how society has shifted in the past decades, lawsuits would abound.

I was recently reminded that Richard Nixon (not exactly a paragon of disinterested devotion to system legitimacy) considered, and rejected, a formal challenge to the 1960 results (to which he would certainly have -- by modern standards a potential case) on the grounds that the country could not stand the uncertainty or a President who had gained office in such a contested manner. How many candidates since, confronted with the same facts, could have been counted on to let Kennedy's election go unchallenged?

In any event, the impact of the electoral college, and whether it acts in fact to benefit certain groups, positions, or interestst, is a most complicated and contested one.

Don

Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 19:04:21 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Direct election of the President
References: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0010241414400.103350-100000@login7.isis.unc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I would strongly disagree with this analysis.

As a resident of a state (Massachusetts) which is totally ignored by the presidential candidates because it is certain to go for the Democrat, I would relish the opportunity to have my vote actually count in the national election, and I think that many others would also, not just in Massachusetts, but in states that are taken for granted on the other side, say, Idaho.

I simply do not accept the argument that it is too difficult to conduct

a national election. Even third world countries can do it, if they have a democratic government to begin with, and we certainly have the means to do so.

The idea that coalition building would be destabilizing to the nation is simply ridiculous: that is what politics should be all about in the first place, and we could use more of it, not less.

A constant complaint is that people are turned off to politics and to the major issues that confront the country. But the electoral college, which was a brilliant solution to communications deficiencies in the late 18th century, no longer makes any sense. Everyone has access to news today, and everyone should have an opportunity to vote in the presidential election. The main result of the electoral college today is to create a lumpen electorate.

If a vote in Massachusetts or Idaho counted as much as a vote in Ohio, then there would be an incentive for parties to get EVERYONE out to vote, EVERYWHERE, because EVERY vote would count. And we SHOULD be trying to get everyone involved, not just a handful of middle-aged white males in a few swing states, which is what the current system has led to.

Jan Werner

Philip Meyer wrote:

>
> It's been a while since I've looked at this issue, and maybe I should
> have said "political scientists over 60" like the electoral college. A
> popular vote amendment could provide for a runoff. But if it were no
> longer necessary to win an entire state, single-issue parties would be
> encouraged and there would be constant coalition-forming to build a
> majority for the runoff -- fun for journalists, but destabilizing for the
> nation.

>
> And the main battlegrounds would be the heavily-populated states that
> are dominated by one party. A candidate could gain more by boosting
> turnout there than by contesting what are now the swing states. So there
> would be less incentive to woo the undecided center.

>
> Finally, and I think I'm quoting Nelson Polby here, a close popular
> vote like 1960 could lead to weeks or months of uncertainty while recounts
> took place all over the nation. Charges of -- and temptations for -- fraud
> would multiply.

> =====
> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
> CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
> University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
> Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
> =====

Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 20:14:47 -0500
From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0010241414400.103350-100000@login7.isis.unc.edu>

<39F61575.CEFF40B6@jwdp.com>
Subject: Re: Direct election of the President
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

This is an important point. But the alternatives aren't a panacea either. Look at the experience of proportional representation (PR) systems or run-off systems like France's. Both these systems are designed to make the voter's vote count. But they also contribute to the proliferation of parties and then require coalition-building after elections (PR) or after the first round (run-off systems).

Direct presidential elections with run-offs in the U.S. would probably encourage the growth of third parties. (And if House & Senate elections also adopted run-offs, the third parties might then extend to those levels.) Everyone could vote for exactly whom they wanted on the first round. But then on the next round, some voters might feel just as left out as they do now. They would also have little control over whom their (losing) candidate endorsed. They don't have to follow their candidate's recommendation, but it might still sway enough voters to determine the election.

PR takes it even further. In PR, everyone knows that their vote counts fully, but they also know that they have very little control over coalition-formation after the election. Their party might join with a party the voter doesn't like, and sometimes the (plurality) winning party can even be excluded from government if they can't forge a deal with coalition partners. (This happened in Austria in the last round ... and brought in Haider's party.)

Thus, PR and run-off systems can also create disaffection/alienation. It's an empirical question which system produces most. The issue is coalition-building. In our system, we build the coalitions within the parties before the elections. In PR and run-off systems, they build coalitions after/between the elections. In all diverse societies, some voters can feel left out.

A note on Phil Meyer's argument about governability. Phil's political scientists over 60 (!) argue that our system magnifies plurality votes into clear majority outcomes and, thus, leads to better governability. And there's evidence that good "governability" reduces voters' dissatisfaction. However, this argument works better in parliamentary systems like Britain's than ours, because our checks & balances can produce clear, but *opposing* majorities - i.e., gridlock. Recall that many of those political scientists over 60 also used to argue for a parliamentary system in the U.S. in the 1950s & 60s. (Actually, Juan Linz still does argue against presidential systems.) Talk about constitutional changes!

Rick Weil

Frederick Weil, Associate Professor
Department of Sociology

Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
tel. 225-388-1140
fax 225-388-5102
fweil@lapop.lsu.edu

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

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 6:04 PM
Subject: Re: Direct election of the President

> I would strongly disagree with this analysis.

>

> As a resident of a state (Massachusetts) which is totally ignored by the
> presidential candidates because it is certain to go for the Democrat, I
> would relish the opportunity to have my vote actually count in the
> national election, and I think that many others would also, not just in
> Massachusetts, but in states that are taken for granted on the other
> side, say, Idaho.

>

> I simply do not accept the argument that it is too difficult to conduct
> a national election. Even third world countries can do it, if they have
> a democratic government to begin with, and we certainly have the means
> to do so.

> The idea that coalition building would be destabilizing to the nation is
> simply ridiculous: that is what politics should be all about in the
> first place, and we could use more of it, not less.

>

> A constant complaint is that people are turned off to politics and to
> the major issues that confront the country. But the electoral college,
> which was a brilliant solution to communications deficiencies in the
> late 18th century, no longer makes any sense. Everyone has access to
> news today, and everyone should have an opportunity to vote in the
> presidential election. The main result of the electoral college today is
> to create a lumpen electorate.

>

> If a vote in Massachusetts or Idaho counted as much as a vote in Ohio,
> then there would be an incentive for parties to get EVERYONE out to
> vote, EVERYWHERE, because EVERY vote would count. And we SHOULD be
> trying to get everyone involved, not just a handful of middle-aged white
> males in a few swing states, which is what the current system has led
> to.

>

> Jan Werner

> _____

>

> Philip Meyer wrote:

> >

> > It's been a while since I've looked at this issue, and maybe I should
> > have said "political scientists over 60" like the electoral college. A
> > popular vote amendment could provide for a runoff. But if it were no
> > longer necessary to win an entire state, single-issue parties would be
> > encouraged and there would be constant coalition-forming to build a
> > majority for the runoff -- fun for journalists, but destabilizing for
the

> > nation.
> >
> > And the main battlegrounds would be the heavily-populated states that
> > are dominated by one party. A candidate could gain more by boosting
> > turnout there than by contesting what are now the swing states. So there
> > would be less incentive to woo the undecided center.
> >
> > Finally, and I think I'm quoting Nelson Polby here, a close popular
> > vote like 1960 could lead to weeks or months of uncertainty while
recounts
> > took place all over the nation. Charges of -- and temptations for --
fraud
> > would multiply.
> >
> > =====
> > Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
> > CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
> > University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
> > Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
> > =====

=====
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2000 21:59:05 -0400
From: "Colleen K. Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
Reply-To: cporter@hp.ufl.edu
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Comments on media
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

First, did anyone else see the Frank and Ernest for Tuesday, October 24? Worth a look for anyone interested in survey research:)

Second, I have to shake my head at some of the comments about journalists reporting poll data. I know I'm being cynical here, but my first reaction is, "So we ask the 20 questions, and then what?"

The thing is, not all journalists are created equal. A few stars are highly paid and respected, and can devote time and resources to really doing the job well. But mere reporters often earn less than a starting school teacher, and the pressure of deadlines is horrific; there is never enough time to fill in all the blanks you wanted to.

I do a bit better because of having been a popular columnist before becoming an editorial writer--but still. I'm paid by the piece, so it isn't worth my while to obsess over little details like whether the people giving their opinion on the importance of prescription drugs had ever had to use their insurance's prescription drug benefit. I do take that time, because of my perfectionist tendencies, but if the column has to be turned in and you haven't returned my phone call, I write around it.

Also, most of the "research" I do for the newspaper is on the web or in the library. So please put all that crucial information in the press release or in your report. I think the 20 Questions can be a great guideline to researchers in anticipating what a journalist would ask.

I also think that we survey researchers need to get our act together better on uniformity of things like response rate, and that will help make poll reporting easier. The work of the standards committee is phenomenally important in helping comparisons between studies.

(Oh dear, I'm really sounding schizoid now, speaking first as a writer and then as a researcher....well, I really do have two jobs for two different employers.)

Colleen K. Porter
project coordinator/editorial writer

```
=====
Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 02:53:53 GMT
From: sidg@his.com
Received: from 1cust165.tnt21.bos2.da.uu.net (www@herndon4.his.com
[209.67.207.7])
    by mail.his.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id WAA18376
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Oct 2000 22:53:53 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <200010250253.WAA18376@mail.his.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: direct election of the president
X-Mailer: Endymion MailMan Standard Edition v3.0.19
```

Jan Werner has stated it well: The sense of disenfranchisement so many of us feel this year overwhelms any arguments in favor of keeping the Electoral College. I vote in Maryland, though I'm temporarily living in Massachusetts. In neither state will/would my vote count in the pres. contest. This same was true for most national elections of the past few decades. To make matters worse this year, there are no Senators up for re-election and no competitive House contest in my MD district -- all of which makes it hard to explain to my 10 year-old why people should bother to vote. (My wife reminds me, there are a few school board aspirants I should be sure NOT to vote for.)

Conventional wisdom holds that never would enough small states support a Constitutional amendment to overturn the College. Maybe not, but think of how many small states are habitually non-competitive, and thus ignored in presidential campaigns! Many of the Southern, Midwestern, and Mountain states fit this description. Unless the partisan complexion of these states changes dramatically (unlikely in the foreseeable future), it might very well be in their self-interest to support direct popular election. My guess is that the larger and more politically competitive states would lead the opposition to change, even though in terms of sheer population they are mathematically disadvantaged. The "mandate" argument in favor of keeping the E.C. is, at base, artificial. As for encouraging third parties and splinter groups, run-off elections could be instituted and/or minimum thresholds set. And, perhaps allowing some new entrants a serious chance at a piece of the pie might not be such a bad thing given current levels of cynicism and non-voting.

The Electoral College would never get my vote in U.S.News' annual "America's Best Colleges" balloting.

Sid Groeneman
Manager, Social Capital Benchmark Survey
Kennedy School of Government - Harvard University
sidg@his.com

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

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 7:04 PM
Subject: Re: Direct election of the President

> I would strongly disagree with this analysis.
>
> As a resident of a state (Massachusetts) which is totally ignored by the
> presidential candidates because it is certain to go for the Democrat, I
> would relish the opportunity to have my vote actually count in the
> national election, and I think that many others would also, not just in
> Massachusetts, but in states that are taken for granted on the other
> side, say, Idaho.
>
> I simply do not accept the argument that it is too difficult to conduct
> a national election. Even third world countries can do it, if they have
> a democratic government to begin with, and we certainly have the means
> to do so.
> The idea that coalition building would be destabilizing to the nation is
> simply ridiculous: that is what politics should be all about in the
> first place, and we could use more of it, not less.
>
> A constant complaint is that people are turned off to politics and to
> the major issues that confront the country. But the electoral college,
> which was a brilliant solution to communications deficiencies in the
> late 18th century, no longer makes any sense. Everyone has access to
> news today, and everyone should have an opportunity to vote in the
> presidential election. The main result of the electoral college today is
> to create a lumpen electorate.
>
> If a vote in Massachusetts or Idaho counted as much as a vote in Ohio,
> then there would be an incentive for parties to get EVERYONE out to
> vote, EVERYWHERE, because EVERY vote would count. And we SHOULD be
> trying to get everyone involved, not just a handful of middle-aged white
> males in a few swing states, which is what the current system has led
> to.
>
>
> Jan Werner
>

This message was sent via <http://webmail.his.com>.
<http://www.his.com/>

=====
Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 09:29:46 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Eric Plutzer <expl2@psu.edu>
Subject: Direct election of president: votes count
In-Reply-To: <200010250704.AAA11683@usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

OK. Let me get this straight:

In places like Massachusetts, most voters are Democrats. Their elected representatives are Democrats; their senators are Democrats; MA consistently provides the electoral college foundation all successful Democratic presidential candidates; and as a consequence of all this form the bedrock for all progressive legislation in the nation.

And all this means that their votes don't count?

I think we're all a bit confused here.

Sure, we'd all like to be down by three runs, and be batting with two outs and the bases loaded in the bottom of the ninth inning. Then what you do counts in a memorable way. And it's a way to feel "needed." But this is not the only way in which to imagine that a vote "counts." Indeed, fantasizing that you might somehow cast the decisive vote may be the most egotistical way of thinking about it.

Of course, there are the lonely Republicans in Massachusetts and lonely Democrats in Wyoming who can be discouraged by the fact that they never vote for a winner. I'm sympathetic. But there will always be people who vote for the loser. Making elections "closer" means that more will vote for losers in any given election but fewer will do so consistently year after year. But in terms of running the country and in terms of policies and judicial appointments that influence the well-being of people, examples like Massachusetts suggest that votes may in fact count more in safe states than swing states.

At 03:04 AM 10/25/00, you wrote:

>Jan Werner has stated it well: The sense of disenfranchisement so many of us
>feel this year overwhelms any arguments in favor of keeping the Electoral
>College. I vote in Maryland, though I'm temporarily living in
>Massachusetts. In neither state will/would my vote count in the pres.
>contest. This same was true for most national elections of the past few
>decades. To make matters worse this year, there are no Senators up for
>re-election and no competitive House contest in my MD district -- all of
>which makes it hard to explain to my 10 year-old why people should bother to
>vote. (My wife reminds me, there are a few school board aspirants I should
>be sure NOT to vote for.)

Eric Plutzer
Associate Professor of Political Science & Sociology
Penn State University
<http://polisci.la.psu.edu/faculty/plutzer/>

=====
Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 09:35:36 -0400 (EDT)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login4.isis.unc.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Direct election of president: votes count
In-Reply-To: <4.3.1.2.20001025090913.00b34250@mail.psu.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0010250931320.92320-100000@login4.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Rick's point about coalition building shows why this thread is relevant to polling. It's true that the coalitions have to be formed before the election. So why don't the media polls try to illuminate the process instead of focusing on the horse race? Aside from some references to the "gender gap," we're not told much about the content of coalitions.

But if I'm being invited into a coalition, I want to know who else is in it and what they are after. The most important function of polling should be to let segments of voters find out about one another and help them identify potential areas of common effort.

=====
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 <http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer>
=====

On Wed, 25 Oct 2000, Eric Plutzer wrote:

> Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 09:29:46 -0400
> From: Eric Plutzer <expl2@psu.edu>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Direct election of president: votes count
>
> OK. Let me get this straight:
>
> In places like Massachusetts, most voters are Democrats. Their elected
> representatives are Democrats; their senators are Democrats; MA
> consistently provides the electoral college foundation all successful
> Democratic presidential candidates; and as a consequence of all this form
> the bedrock for all progressive legislation in the nation.
>
> And all this means that their votes don't count?
>
> I think we're all a bit confused here.
>
> Sure, we'd all like to be down by three runs, and be batting with two outs
> and the bases loaded in the bottom of the ninth inning. Then what you do
> counts in a memorable way. And it's a way to feel "needed." But this is
> not the only way in which to imagine that a vote "counts." Indeed,

> fantasizing that you might somehow cast the decisive vote may be the most
> egotistical way of thinking about it.
>
> Of course, there are the lonely Republicans in Massachusetts and
> lonely Democrats in Wyoming who can be discouraged by the fact that they
> never vote for a winner. I'm sympathetic. But there will always be people
> who vote for the loser. Making elections "closer" means that more will
> vote for losers in any given election but fewer will do so consistently
> year after year. But in terms of running the country and in terms of
> policies and judicial appointments that influence the well-being of people,
> examples like Massachusetts suggest that votes may in fact count more in
> safe states than swing states.
>
>
> At 03:04 AM 10/25/00, you wrote:
> >Jan Werner has stated it well: The sense of disenfranchisement so many of
us
> >feel this year overwhelms any arguments in favor of keeping the Electoral
> >College. I vote in Maryland, though I'm temporarily living in
> >Massachusetts. In neither state will/would my vote count in the pres.
> >contest. This same was true for most national elections of the past few
> >decades. To make matters worse this year, there are no Senators up for
> >re-election and no competitive House contest in my MD district -- all of
> >which makes it hard to explain to my 10 year-old why people should bother
to
> >vote. (My wife reminds me, there are a few school board aspirants I
should
> >be sure NOT to vote for.)
>
>
> Eric Plutzer
> Associate Professor of Political Science & Sociology
> Penn State University
> <http://polisci.la.psu.edu/faculty/plutzer/>
>
>
>

Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 11:26:07 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)
From: bwiggin@irss.unc.edu (Bev Wiggins)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: methodologist job opening
X-Mailer: Siren Mail (Windows Version 4.0.2 (Windows 95/NT))
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET="US-ASCII"

Job Opening:
Assistant or Associate Professor for a tenure-track joint appointment
in a
Social Science discipline and the Odum Institute for Research in
Social Science
at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Duties include
the teaching
of two courses in the department of appointment as well as
responsibilities as a

statistical analyst in the Odum Institute during the academic year and summer.

Odum Institute requires expertise in survey methodology (sampling, missing data, weighting), and statistical software to assist faculty and graduate students.

PhD required.

Application deadline: January 15, 2001. Send letter of interest, names of four

references and current full CV to: Joint Tenure Track Appointment, Search

Committee Chair, Odum Institute, UNC-CH, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3355. The

University of North Carolina is an EEO/ADA Employer.

Beverly B. Wiggins

Associate Director for Research Development

Odum Institute for Research in Social Science

Manning Hall, CB#3355

University of North Carolina

Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3355

phone: 919-966-2350

fax: 919-962-4777

email: bwiggins@irss.unc.edu

Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 10:04:46 -0700 (PDT)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Nickelodeon Kids Vote--New Kid on the Block?

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010250948470.8828-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Here's one good reason to hope Gore wins--so that we don't have to spend the next four years listening to people say: "Scientific polls!? Why, even Nickelodeon's kids poll has a much better record than Gallup-- 4 for 4, 100 percent perfect!"

-- Jim

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited.

http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/nm/20001025/re/television_campaign_dc_1.html

Entertainment News - updated 12:11 PM ET Oct 25

Wednesday October 25 4:12 AM ET

Nick Kids Pick Bush for President

NEW YORK (Variety) - If kids could vote for president next month, George W. Bush (news - web sites) would beat Al Gore (news - web sites) by a substantial margin of 55% to 45%.

At least that's true for kids who watch Nickelodeon and who participated in Nick's ``Kids Vote'' national poll, which delivered the good news to Gov. Bush in a special edition of ''Nick News'' at 8:30 p.m. Sunday.

Nickelodeon's survey of kids is batting 1.000: It has predicted the winner in each of the past three presidential campaigns. The network said 330,778 kids (almost all between ages 6-11) participated this year by calling a heavily promoted 800 number between 4 and 6:30 p.m. on Friday. In addition, kids could log on to Nick.com and cast their votes online at any time during the week of Oct. 16.

The kids' voting is part of a yearlong ``Kids Pick the President'' campaign that Nickelodeon has conjured up every four years since 1988 to ``educate and empower'' the Nick audience.

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited.

Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 13:34:52 EDT
From: RonBerkowitz@aol.com
Received: from RonBerkowitz@aol.com
by imo-r02.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.32.) id 5.7e.c02b454 (4331);
Wed, 25 Oct 2000 13:34:52 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <7e.c02b454.272873bc@aol.com>
Subject: Article on James Zogby
To: aapornet@usc.edu, owner-aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"
Content-Language: en
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 125
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id KAA28093

Dear Colleagues:

I realize I am on potentially dangerous ground reprinting this article here, as this article directly attacks the credibility and methodological soundness of one of our more prominent colleagues. I was just wondering if anyone had any comments/insights about this.

While the writer (Wayne Barrett) is by no means an objective reporter, he has broken many stories that other papers have ignored in the 12 years I have been reading the village voice. Any comments?

Published October 25 - 31, 2000

Surges and Soft Money
The Post's Predictable Pollster
by Wayne Barrett

ohn Zogby, one of the nation's top pollsters, is always the first to see a New York surge for the GOP. He may be giving his number-one client in the state;½?"the New York Post;½?"exactly what they want to hear. But his Post numbers last Friday, showing a one-point Rick Lazio lead, echoed his performance in the 1998 Senate race. He was the only pollster who predicted an Al D'Amato win over Chuck Schumer, coming up with numbers the Sunday before the election that dovetailed with the Post's cheerleading headlines for the supposedly hard-charging senator.

-
--

In Murdochland, apparently, it doesn't matter if you take money from one of the partisans even while you poll their race for the Post.

-
--

Based in Utica, New York, Zogby was on Face the Nation this weekend, explaining that defecting Jewish voters accounted for much of Hillary Clinton's slide. That was what he wrote in 1998 as well, even though exit polls later indicated that 76 percent of Jews backed Schumer, who beat D'Amato by a whopping nine points.

In Murdochland, apparently, it doesn't matter if you take money from one of the partisans even while you poll their race for the Post. The latest filing of the New York State Republican Committee lists a \$5000 disbursement to Zogby on August 22. Asked about it by the Voice, Zogby flew into a rage, calling this reporter an "asshole" five times and adding that other reporters, including the Voice's Jim Ridgeway, "think you're an asshole." Zogby claimed the disbursement was payment for a poll "in a local assembly race," but when asked why the local candidate didn't pay for the poll (as in other cases he cited), he replied: "Well, actually, I'm not sure what race it is."

In 1997, the Voice reported that the Giuliani campaign paid Zogby \$54,000 after he predicted a 29-point Rudy win in his final Post poll. Zogby nearly doubled Giuliani's eventual 15-point margin and, like in the D'Amato race, was the only major pollster to miss the outcome so badly. But in that race, none of the payments to Zogby appeared on a filing until after the election. This time, he may have gotten a little ahead of himself. It's certainly unclear what the final GOP tally to him may be.

The other interesting tidbit from the most recent state Republican filings is the timing of a September series of transactions that suggest that Lazio was engaged in soft-money maneuvers even while he was pushing Hillary toward a ban. The state GOP paid for \$183,000 in radio commercials denouncing Hillary on September 22, eight days after Lazio staged his soft-money confrontation with Clinton in the first debate. Republican sources say that a businessman who bought the time for business ads "some of it on the Howard Stern show" decided he didn't want to do the ads and donated the time to the state party. That means the donation was 183 times the \$1000 federal limit.

The party filled the space with ads done through Strategic Media Services in Washington, and they aired right around the time Lazio was demanding a ban on a daily basis.

Similarly, the National Republican Campaign Committee and one of its subsidiaries, the State Elections Committee, transferred \$821,000 to the New York party in September, ostensibly in part for use in the Senate campaign. Incredibly, \$142,000 of it was transferred on September 21 and 22, just as Lazio was taunting Clinton with letters signed by 14 "independent" committees who had agreed not to raise or spend soft money on his behalf. By September 23, she'd agreed to the ban.

GOP sources say the national motherlode is helping two Republicans in tight House races in Suffolk, though some of it is undoubtedly also a boon to Lazio. The soft-money agreement only wound up covering television and radio commercials, but Lazio was pushing for a ban on all soft-money expenditures.

-
--

Research: Robbie Chaplick, Jennifer Fagan, and Rob Morlino

-
--

=====
Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 14:38:59 -0400
Subject: Re: Gallup/CNN Presidential Poll
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Richard Morin" <morinr@washpost.com>
Message-ID: <OF14DC1BA7.7EC2192C-ON85256983.0065FB59@washpost.com>
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on inetmail1/TWP(Release 5.0.3 |March 21, 2000) at 10/25/2000
02:39:16 PM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

The latest Poll Watchers column has just been posted on the Washingtonpost.com website.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A11198-2000Oct25.html>

In this week's column:

The Gaps Beyond the Gender Gap
Rasmussen's Robot Polls
Kathy Frankovic of CBS on Her Biggest Goof
20 Questions You Should Ask About Any Poll

Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 14:56:06 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: The Nickelodeon Poll
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <39F72CC6.E27C5C56@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <OF14DC1BA7.7EC2192C-ON85256983.0065FB59@washpost.com>

Lest we forget, there was the Weekly Reader Poll, which polled child readers and had not been wrong in about 40 years-- until 1992, when it picked Bush over Clinton.

Frank Rusciano

Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 16:04:51 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Article on James Zogby
References: <7e.c02b454.272873bc@aol.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

This poll was discussed last Friday (10/20/2000) on "The Media Show," a syndicated program from public radio station WAMC in Albany, NY.

Dr. Alan Chartock, executive director of WAMC and professor of communications and political science at SUNY-Albany, and also a columnist and TV commentator, effectively indicated that he believed there were indications that Zogby had taken a dive in that same NY Post tracking poll in the Schumer/D'Amato race two years ago.

Chartock noted that the Zogby/Post daily tracking poll in that race matched other polls showing Schumer catching up with D'Amato until the day when he actually passed the incumbent, at which point it showed a sudden drop for Schumer that kept him behind D'Amato until the election. This was not reflected in any other polls and was proven wrong by the election results.

Chartock also mused, while being very careful to cover himself by stating that he didn't believe that Zogby would actually ever do such a thing, that it would look bad on Zogby's record if the Post poll were wrong again this year, and that showing Lazio leading at this early date would allow enough time to get things right before the election, which is all that anyone would remember.

I don't have much regard for Alan Chartock as an analyst, but he tends to be up on the inside gossip in NY State politics, so I would guess that there is enough speculation about Zogby in Albany to raise these kinds of questions.

The Media Show is available in RealAudio at
<http://www.wamc.org/archive.html>

Jan Werner

RonBerkowitz@aol.com wrote:

>
> Dear Colleagues:
>
> I realize I am on potentially dangerous ground reprinting this article here,
> as this article directly attacks the credibility and methodological soundness
> of one of our more prominent colleagues. I was just wondering if anyone had
> any comments/insights about this.
>
> While the writer (Wayne Barrett) is by no means an objective reporter, he has
> broken many stories that other papers have ignored in the 12 years I have
> been reading the village voice. Any comments?
>
> Published October 25 - 31, 2000
>
> Surges and Soft Money
> The Post's Predictable Pollster
> by Wayne Barrett
>
> ohn Zogby, one of the nation's top pollsters, is always the first to see a
> New York surge for the GOP. He may be giving his number-one client in the
> state;½?"the New York Post;½?"exactly what they want to hear. But his
Post
numbers
> last Friday, showing a one-point Rick Lazio lead, echoed his performance in

> the 1998 Senate race. He was the only pollster who predicted an Al D'Amato
> win over Chuck Schumer, coming up with numbers the Sunday before the
election
> that dovetailed with the Post's cheerleading headlines for the supposedly
> hard-charging senator.
>
> -----
-
--
>
> --
>
> In Murdochland, apparently, it doesn't matter if you take money from one of
> the partisans even while you poll their race for the Post.
>
> -----
-
--
>
> --
>
> Based in Utica, New York, Zogby was on Face the Nation this weekend,
> explaining that defecting Jewish voters accounted for much of Hillary
> Clinton's slide. That was what he wrote in 1998 as well, even though exit
> polls later indicated that 76 percent of Jews backed Schumer, who beat
> D'Amato by a whopping nine points.
>
> In Murdochland, apparently, it doesn't matter if you take money from one of
> the partisans even while you poll their race for the Post. The latest
filing
> of the New York State Republican Committee lists a \$5000 disbursement to
> Zogby on August 22. Asked about it by the Voice, Zogby flew into a rage,
> calling this reporter an "asshole" five times and adding that other
> reporters, including the Voice's Jim Ridgeway, "think you're an asshole."
> Zogby claimed the disbursement was payment for a poll "in a local assembly
> race," but when asked why the local candidate didn't pay for the poll (as
in
> other cases he cited), he replied: "Well, actually, I'm not sure what race
it
> is."
>
> In 1997, the Voice reported that the Giuliani campaign paid Zogby \$54,000
> after he predicted a 29-point Rudy win in his final Post poll. Zogby nearly
> doubled Giuliani's eventual 15-point margin and, like in the D'Amato race,
> was the only major pollster to miss the outcome so badly. But in that race,
> none of the payments to Zogby appeared on a filing until after the
election.
> This time, he may have gotten a little ahead of himself. It's certainly
> unclear what the final GOP tally to him may be.
>
> The other interesting tidbit from the most recent state Republican filings
is
> the timing of a September series of transactions that suggest that Lazio
was
> engaged in soft-money maneuvers even while he was pushing Hillary toward a
> ban. The state GOP paid for \$183,000 in radio commercials denouncing
Hillary

> on September 22, eight days after Lazio staged his soft-money confrontation
> with Clinton in the first debate. Republican sources say that a businessman
> who bought the time for business ads;½?"some of it on the Howard Stern
> show;½?"decided he didn't want to do the ads and donated the time to the
> state
> party. That means the donation was 183 times the \$1000 federal limit.
>
> The party filled the space with ads done through Strategic Media Services
> in
> Washington, and they aired right around the time Lazio was demanding a ban
> on
> a daily basis.
>
> Similarly, the National Republican Campaign Committee and one of its
> subsidiaries, the State Elections Committee, transferred \$821,000 to the
> New
> York party in September, ostensibly in part for use in the Senate campaign.
> Incredibly, \$142,000 of it was transferred on September 21 and 22, just as
> Lazio was taunting Clinton with letters signed by 14 "independent"
> committees
> who had agreed not to raise or spend soft money on his behalf. By September
> 23, she'd agreed to the ban.
>
> GOP sources say the national motherlode is helping two Republicans in tight
> House races in Suffolk, though some of it is undoubtedly also a boon to
> Lazio. The soft-money agreement only wound up covering television and radio
> commercials, but Lazio was pushing for a ban on all soft-money
> expenditures.
>
> -----
> -
> --
>
> --
>
> Research: Robbie Chaplick, Jennifer Fagan, and Rob Morlino
>
> -----
> -
> --
>
> --

=====
Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 13:16:55 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: The Nickelodeon Poll
In-Reply-To: <39F72CC6.E27C5C56@rider.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010251247100.423-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hmmm, I detect a pattern here--ambitious, hard-working, civic-minded kids

are more likely to have parents who influence their beliefs, who are opinion leaders in their communities, and who are especially likely to vote? Conclusion: scrap the adult samples, and worries about registered and likely voters, and concentrate on sampling kids. Pollsters, are you paying attention here?

Thanks, Frank.

-- Jim

P.S. Alternative hypothesis: Parents with kids use voting as an excuse to get out of the house. Implications for political candidates: Skip the banquets; hit the PTA meetings--Chuck E. Cheese's on the weekends; advertise on Sesame Street, Nickelodeon and the Disney Channel; seek endorsements from the Teletubbies, various key Pokemon, the Power Rangers, the Power Puff Girls, and Sailor Moon; reduce speeches to short and simple narratives--in basic English--with some suspense, strong moral lessons, and happy endings; purchase big blocks of television time on weekdays, a half-hour before beddy-bye, local time.

[Remember that they laughed at the Wright Brothers when they first said they intended to fly like birds.]

On Wed, 25 Oct 2000, Frank Rusciano wrote:

> Lest we forget, there was the Weekly Reader Poll, which polled child
> readers and had not been wrong in about 40 years-- until 1992, when it
> picked Bush over Clinton.
>
> Frank Rusciano
>
>

Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 16:15:53 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Nickelodeon Kids Vote--New Kid on the Block?
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010250948470.8828-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

As a partisan response I just hope the kids are wrong. Has anybody any figures on a demographic profile of kids responding to the poll???

At 01:04 PM 10/25/00, you wrote:

> Here's one good reason to hope Gore wins--so that we don't have to spend
> the next four years listening to people say: "Scientific polls!? Why,
> even Nickelodeon's kids poll has a much better record than Gallup--
> 4 for 4, 100 percent perfect!"
>

-- Jim

>
>-----
> Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited.
>-----
> http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/nm/20001025/re/television_campaign_dc_1.html
>
> Entertainment News - updated 12:11 PM ET Oct 25
> Wednesday October 25 4:12 AM ET
>
>
> Nick Kids Pick Bush for President
>
>
> NEW YORK (Variety) - If kids could vote for president next month, George
> W. Bush (news - web sites) would beat Al Gore (news - web sites) by a
> substantial margin of 55% to 45%.
>
> At least that's true for kids who watch Nickelodeon and who participated
> in Nick's ``Kids Vote'' national poll, which delivered the good news to
> Gov. Bush in a special edition of ''Nick News'' at 8:30 p.m. Sunday.
>
> Nickelodeon's survey of kids is batting 1.000: It has predicted the
> winner in each of the past three presidential campaigns. The network
> said 330,778 kids (almost all between ages 6-11) participated this year
> by calling a heavily promoted 800 number between 4 and 6:30 p.m. on
> Friday. In addition, kids could log on to Nick.com and cast their votes
> online at any time during the week of Oct. 16.
>
> The kids' voting is part of a yearlong ``Kids Pick the President''
> campaign that Nickelodeon has conjured up every four years since 1988 to
> ``educate and empower'' the Nick audience.
>
>-----
> Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc., and Reuters Limited.
>-----
>
>
>*****

=====
Date: Wed, 25 Oct 2000 13:53:41 -0700
From: "H. Stuart Elway" <hstuart@elwayresearch.com>
To: "'AAPORNET'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Washington state
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0077_01C03E8A.FB72FD40"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0077_01C03E8A.FB72FD40
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

--simple boundary

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

First, there has been very little change in happiness from 1972 to 1998. Happiness is one of the most stable of items measured on the General Social Survey.

Second, if we poll together 1972-1974 and 1996 and 1998 (to get a stable base for point three below), the % very happy was 35.2% in the 70s and 32.7% in the 90s.

Third, if we standardize on the 1972-1974 marital distribution, the 1996-98 figure become 35.2%. Or all of the modest drop in happiness can be explained by the increased % not married in the 90s.

Reply Separator

Subject: Does Money Buy Happiness?

Author: <aapornet@usc.edu> at INTERNET

Date: 10/11/00 3:14 PM

This is an interesting analysis which suggests that for many folks the increase in economic well being has not resulted in a commensurate increase in happiness. Women, according to the analysis have grown less content over time despite females' big strides in employment and educational attainment. Could these attitudes possibly contribute to the gender differences reported between Bush and Gore?

Business Week: October 16, 2000

Department: Economic Trends

Does Money Buy Happiness?

-- By Gene Koretz

In recent decades, living standards in the U.S. have risen markedly, with per capita income up by 75% in real terms since 1970. So you might think that Americans would be a lot more content and satisfied with their lives, particularly since material success looms so large in the nation's psyche.

As it happens, numerous surveys suggest that Americans have actually been growing less happy. And the cause, report David G. Blanchflower and Andrew J. Oswald in a new National Bureau of Economic Research study, appears to be a cluster of social trends that far overshadow income gains.

The study's focus is the highly detailed annual General Social Survey of the U.S. Between 1972 and 1998, the GSS shows a steady decline from 34% to 30% in the share of Americans describing themselves as "very happy." Using statistical analysis, the two economists try to figure out why.

Other things being equal, they do find that higher incomes bring more happiness, but the impact is surprisingly weak. Other factors such as

gender and marital status weigh more heavily.

For one thing, it is women rather than men who have grown significantly less content over time, despite females' big strides in employment and educational attainment. Women still appear somewhat happier than men after adjustments are made for multiple factors affecting happiness, but the gap, says Blanchflower, "is narrowing, as women's economic roles become more like men's."

Second, marital status seems to be a major determinant of satisfaction. Not only are married folks happier than others, but those who are separated are the least happy, followed closely by those who are widowed or divorced. Further, the impact of marital breakups appears to endure over the years--and generations. People in second marriages report lower levels of well-being than those in first marriages, and those whose parents were divorced when they were kids are also less content.

Such findings confirm more intensive research by psychologists on the negative effects of divorce on children much later in life. They also suggest that the rise in divorce rates and the decline in marriage are both taking a large toll on Americans' happiness.

On the economic front, the study indicates that being unemployed dampens happiness almost as much as being divorced. Moreover, the researchers find that relative income--that is, how far one's income is above or below the average in his or her state--has a substantial impact on reported well-being.

Other intriguing findings include the fact that happiness peaks at age 18, declines until age 40, and then moves higher--though never approaching the joy of youth. But the study clearly raises more questions than it answers.

At the very least, it suggests that those who think income gains alone guarantee greater happiness are deluding themselves. And it implies that some apparent aspects of the New Economy--such as more bouts of unemployment and greater income inequality--carry significant psychological costs.

copyright @Business Week

--simple boundary

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

<html>

This is an interesting analysis which suggests that for many folks the increase in economic well being has not resulted in a commensurate increase in happiness. Women, according to the analysis have grown less content over time
despite females' big strides in employment and educational attainment. Could these attitudes possibly contribute to the gender differences reported between Bush and Gore?

Business Week: October 16,

2000

Department: Economic Trends

Does Money Buy Happiness?

-- By Gene Koretz

In recent decades, living standards in the U.S. have risen markedly, with per capita income up by 75% in real terms since 1970. So you might think that Americans would be a lot more content and satisfied with their lives, particularly since material success looms so large in the nation's psyche.

As it happens, numerous surveys suggest that Americans have actually been growing less happy. And the cause, report David G. Blanchflower and Andrew J. Oswald in a new National Bureau of Economic Research study, appears to be a cluster of social trends that far overshadow income gains.

The study's focus is the highly detailed annual General Social Survey of the U.S. Between 1972 and 1998, the GSS shows a steady decline from 34% to 30% in the share of Americans describing themselves as "very happy." Using statistical analysis, the two economists try to figure out why.

Other things being equal, they do find that higher incomes bring more happiness, but the impact is surprisingly weak. Other factors such as gender and marital status weigh more heavily.

For one thing, it is women rather than men who have grown significantly less content over time, despite females' big strides in employment and educational attainment. Women still appear somewhat happier than men after adjustments are made for multiple factors affecting happiness, but the gap, says Blanchflower, "is narrowing, as women's economic roles become more like men's."

Second, marital status seems to be a major determinant of satisfaction. Not only are married folks happier than others, but those who are separated are the least happy, followed closely by those who are widowed or divorced. Further, the impact of marital breakups appears to endure over the years--and generations. People in second marriages report lower levels of well-being than those in first marriages, and those whose parents were divorced when they were kids are also less content.

Such findings confirm more intensive research by psychologists on the negative effects of divorce on children much later in life. They also suggest that the rise in divorce rates and the decline in marriage are both taking a large toll on Americans' happiness.

On the economic front, the study indicates that being unemployed dampens happiness almost as much as being divorced. Moreover, the researchers find that relative income--that is, how far one's income is above or below the average in his or her state--has a substantial impact on reported well-being.

Other intriguing findings include the fact that happiness peaks at age 18, declines until age 40, and then moves higher--though never

approaching the joy of youth. But the study clearly raises more questions than it answers.

At the very least, it suggests that those who think income gains alone guarantee greater happiness are deluding themselves. And it implies that some apparent aspects of the New Economy--such as more bouts of unemployment and greater income inequality--carry significant psychological costs.

copyright @Business Week

</html>

--simple boundary--

=====
Date: Thu, 26 Oct 2000 13:39:39 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: Does Money Buy Happiness?
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <39F86C5A.6B12E2AE@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <0010269725.AA972566823@norcmail.uchicago.edu>

Regarding the relationship between money and happiness, there was actually a very interesting discussion that went on in the 1970s on this issue. It dealt more with a comparative perspective, and argued that higher degrees of happiness did not appear to correlate with higher GNPs or per capita incomes among nations. A very interesting discussion of this issue can be found in Fred Hirsch's "The Social Limits to Growth." Basically, he argues that once individuals move above the sustenance level, they wish to acquire goods because of the status attached to them; however, the status attached to them is derived from the fact that only a few individuals (usually of high status) possess these goods. Once they become readily available to the masses, they lose their status value. Hence, the pursuit of such goods is actually a veiled, and ultimately frustrated, search for status; ironically, the mass attainment of such goods robs them of the feature that made them attractive to the mass public in the first place. (By the way, this tendency applies to both men and women, so it wouldn't necessarily apply to the argument about gender in this election).

There are other arguments in his book, but I hope I did his work some degree

of
justice. Anyway, it would be interesting to look at the data in a
comparative
perspective also.

Frank Rusciano

smitt@norcmail.uchicago.edu wrote:

> First, there has been very little change in happiness from 1972 to
> 1998. Happiness is one of the most stable of items measured on the
> General Social Survey.
> Second, if we poll together 1972-1974 and 1996 and 1998 (to get a
> stable base for point three below), the % very happy was 35.2% in the
> 70s and 32.7% in the 90s.
> Third, if we standardize on the 1972-1974 marital distribution, the
> 1996-98 figure become 35.2%. Or all of the modest drop in happiness
> can be explained by the increased % not married in the 90s.

>
> _____ Reply Separator

> Subject: Does Money Buy Happiness?
> Author: <aapornet@usc.edu> at INTERNET
> Date: 10/11/00 3:14 PM

>
> This is an interesting analysis which suggests that for many folks the
> increase in economic well being has not resulted in a commensurate increase
> in happiness. Women, according to the analysis have grown less content over
> time despite females' big strides in employment and educational attainment.
> Could these attitudes possibly contribute to the gender differences
> reported between Bush and Gore?

>
> Business Week: October 16, 2000
> Department: Economic Trends

>
> Does Money Buy Happiness?

>
> -- By Gene Koretz

>
> In recent decades, living standards in the U.S. have risen markedly, with
> per capita income up by 75% in real terms since 1970. So you might think
> that Americans would be a lot more content and satisfied with their lives,
> particularly since material success looms so large in the nation's psyche.

>
> As it happens, numerous surveys suggest that Americans have actually been
> growing less happy. And the cause, report David G. Blanchflower and Andrew
> J. Oswald in a new National Bureau of Economic Research study, appears to
> be a cluster of social trends that far overshadow income gains.

>
> The study's focus is the highly detailed annual General Social Survey of
> the U.S. Between 1972 and 1998, the GSS shows a steady decline from 34% to
> 30% in the share of Americans describing themselves as "very happy." Using
> statistical analysis, the two economists try to figure out why.

>
> Other things being equal, they do find that higher incomes bring more
> happiness, but the impact is surprisingly weak. Other factors such as
> gender and marital status weigh more heavily.

>
> For one thing, it is women rather than men who have grown significantly
> less content over time, despite females' big strides in employment and
> educational attainment. Women still appear somewhat happier than men after
> adjustments are made for multiple factors affecting happiness, but the gap,
> says Blanchflower, "is narrowing, as women's economic roles become more
> like men's."
>
> Second, marital status seems to be a major determinant of satisfaction. Not
> only are married folks happier than others, but those who are separated are
> the least happy, followed closely by those who are widowed or divorced.
> Further, the impact of marital breakups appears to endure over the
> years--and generations. People in second marriages report lower levels of
> well-being than those in first marriages, and those whose parents were
> divorced when they were kids are also less content.
>
> Such findings confirm more intensive research by psychologists on the
> negative effects of divorce on children much later in life. They also
> suggest that the rise in divorce rates and the decline in marriage are both
> taking a large toll on Americans' happiness.
>
> On the economic front, the study indicates that being unemployed dampens
> happiness almost as much as being divorced. Moreover, the researchers find
> that relative income--that is, how far one's income is above or below the
> average in his or her state--has a substantial impact on reported well-
being.
>
> Other intriguing findings include the fact that happiness peaks at age 18,
> declines until age 40, and then moves higher--though never approaching the
> joy of youth. But the study clearly raises more questions than it answers.
>
> At the very least, it suggests that those who think income gains alone
> guarantee greater happiness are deluding themselves. And it implies that
> some apparent aspects of the New Economy--such as more bouts of
> unemployment and greater income inequality--carry significant psychological
> costs.
>
> copyright @Business Week
>

> -----
> Type: Plain Text (text/plain)
> Part 1.2 Encoding: 7bit
> Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

Date: Thu, 26 Oct 2000 14:59:27 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Request for information on Star Wars
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <39F87F0F.1D68190@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010251247100.423-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Fellow AAORneters,

Does anyone know of any data sources available regarding the Strategic Defense Initiative (e.g. SDI, or "Star Wars")? I am particularly interested in three things, especially including trends over time:

- (1) degree of support for research on it;
- (2) opinions about whether citizens think it exists; and
- (3) opinions about whether they think it should be deployed.

Any help in this regard would be appreciated. I am looking for data from anytime since the program was proposed to the present.

Thanks.

Frank Rusciano

P.S. I suspect others might not be interested, so please reply directly to me.

Date: Thu, 26 Oct 2000 12:44:00 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Wall Street Journal on "Gallup's Credibility Gap"
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010261207330.5078-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Certainly John Fund's piece (see below) on recent Gallup polls requires no rejoinder here--not on AAPORNET.

The Wall Street Journal's opinionjournal.com site posts many letters from its readers. If you care to share your views of John Fund's "campaign briefing," you might visit the site (see URL, immediately below the copyright notice at the top), where the letters section will be easy to spot.

-- Jim

Copyright 2000 -- The Wall Street Journal -- WSJ.com

<http://opinionjournal.com/diary/?id=65000474>

Thursday, October 26, 2000 12:01 a.m. EDT

John Fund Campaign Briefings 2000

JOHN FUND'S POLITICAL DIARY

Gallup's Credibility Gap

What's with those wild swings in the polls?

"The Gallup Poll just has no credibility with me anymore," the network producer sighs. "Even if the survey methods are valid, how can you tell viewers that a swing of 15 points in four days is realistic?"

They might be even more skeptical of Gallup's tracking poll if they knew that the swings are due in large part to the company's nightly sample having large fluctuations in how many Democrats vs. Republicans are interviewed. One three-night sample, on Oct. 4, had 37% Democrats and 30% Republicans. Perhaps not surprisingly, Al Gore had an 11-point lead. Three nights later, on Oct. 7, a completely new sample consisted of 39% Republicans and only 31% Democrats. Lo and behold, George W. Bush suddenly had an eight-point lead. Typical exit polls of actual voters, taken as they leave the polls, show the parties evenly matched or with just a point or two advantage for Democrats.

Gallup and CNN, a major sponsor of its poll, insist they have a plausible explanation for this. Gallup told the Washington Post that in 1996 fully 25% of the people they contacted changed their party identification at least twice. That seems highly implausible, and James Campbell, a polling expert at the State University of New York at Buffalo, says it's "crazy" and misleading to base nightly poll results on a hypothetical electorate that switches party identification so readily.

Gallup has certainly been a roller coaster this year, while other tracking polls have been remarkably placid. But because of Gallup's reputation, and because its tracking poll is sponsored by CNN and USA Today, the company's stomach-churning numbers get a lot of attention and overshadow the four other tracking polls.

Consider what an average consumer of news saw in Gallup's numbers just the past few days. On Saturday, using the previous three nights of tracking polls and averaging them, George W. Bush leapt to an 11 point lead with Gallup's likely-voter pool. Even though Mr. Bush had fought Mr. Gore to a draw in the third debate after winning the second, few observers thought that lead realistic. Even CNN commentators, whose network was one of the survey's sponsors, ridiculed it. On Sunday the Bush lead dropped to nine points. The next day it was suddenly down to two. Then on Tuesday, Mr. Gore jumped to a one-point lead. Political tremors were felt in network newsrooms. But yesterday the needles were going haywire in the other direction. Mr. Bush was back to a five-point lead.

To Frank Newport, Gallup's president, this is all as it should be. He wrote us recently that there was more volatility in the tracking polls his organization conducted in 1996, but no one complained much then. Well, perhaps that's because most people viewed the 1996 outcome as a foregone conclusion, while few observers are so sure of this year's

result.

Mr. Newport says that "volatility in the horse race is natural and expected, particularly in and around high-profile campaign events." Sure, but the four other nightly tracking polls--Reuters/Zogby, Washington Post/ABC, Battleground and Rasmussen Research--don't show anything like Gallup's volatility.

Other polls don't tend to follow Gallup's variations in the percentage of Republicans, Democrats and independents in its likely-voter pool. Gallup told the Washington Post's Richard Morin that short-term feelings about the campaign can dramatically change the composition of that pool, as some voters become bored and others become excited. Mr. Morin, who is also the Post's polling director says that by tracking short-term bursts in voter enthusiasm, Gallup may be "unfairly excluding some from the likely voter pool while it forces others in."

It seems likely that the Gallup pendulum swings are in part the consequence of tracking polls that sample only 400 voters a night and then pare that number down to 240 or so likely voters when results are published. Not weighting a sample properly for party identification doesn't seem to make sense. Pushing undecided voters too hard can make people give unconsidered answers. And Gallup seems strangely convinced that its voter samples can have big mood swings from one night to the next. Finally, there's the problem that, as we're always told, the chances of getting a truly odd sample are at least 5% on any given night. That means in 60 days of nightly tracking, Gallup can expect a rogue voter pool about three nights. That could skew any three-day average of nightly tracking polls significantly.

Having said all this, Gallup does have a good record in its large-sample surveys. In 1996, the company's final poll forecast an 11-point Clinton win. The president wound up winning by eight points, just within the margin of error. Yet Gallup's methodology seems less reliable when applied to earlier tracking polls with smaller samples.

But voters can't be expected to make sense of polls that bounce around with swings of 15 points in four nights. If you like to be kept on the edge of your seat in this election, watching the Gallup poll may be just your ticket. As for me, I'm paying more attention to the other tracking polls, which leave me with fewer butterflies in my stomach.

Copyright 2000 -- The Wall Street Journal -- WSJ.com

Date: Thu, 26 Oct 2000 15:21:02 -0500
From: Frank_Newport@gallup.com
Received: by exchn5.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <VSKDLKFV>; Thu, 26 Oct 2000 15:21:06 -0500
Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90010B0C3A@EXCHNG3>
To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: Wall Street Journal Online Piece
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

By way of background for AAPORNET members, this is a copy of the correspondence sent to Mr. Fund after his first article on this same issue several weeks ago.

Thanks,

Frank Newport
The Gallup Poll
Princeton

To: John Fund

We always appreciate open discussion of polls, a tradition that began with George Gallup more than 50 years ago. We publish as much about our polls, including daily demographic breaks, as possible, and welcome comments and observations.

I would direct your attention to these two pieces currently on our web site which explain in detail our basic tracking poll methodology, and which discuss the last week's results in detail.
<http://www.gallup.com/Poll/releases/pr001009b.asp> and
<http://www.gallup.com/poll/fromthead/ed0010.asp>

Volatility in the horse race is natural and expected, particularly in and around high profile candidate events. Our experience in 1992 and 1996 demonstrated the normalcy in movement among uncommitted voters as the highly informational intensive last months of the campaign unfold.

Our methodology (see above link) involves interviews with 400 national adults every day. The numbers you report are the final estimates from likely voters within that group, arrived by applying likely voter models Gallup has developed over the decades.

Our poll is designed to be sensitive to change. If it were not, we wouldn't bother to track at all, but rather -- like the NBC/WSJ poll -- just interview at discrete time intervals through the fall. Our objective is to pick up movements up and down in reaction to the day to day events of the campaign. To think that debates, intensive media coverage, expenditure of millions of dollars by the candidates on advertising, and candidate appearances would not move the needle on an election one way or the other is unrealistic. A sizeable portion of the voting population, upwards of 20%, is uncommitted, and on any given day as likely to come down in favor of one candidate as the other.

We take our obligation to measure the status of the race on a day to day basis seriously, and have an extensive team of highly experienced researchers, statisticians and methodologists who design and monitor our survey work.

I think that more time should be spent using the tracking data to understand the electorate and the process of the campaign, rather than sticking stubbornly to the outdated perception that voters don't change their minds, or change them slightly and/or slowly during the fall. The campaign is dynamic, and the type of movement we see is real.

Thanks,

Frank Newport
Editor in Chief
The Gallup Poll
Princeton, NJ
frank_newport@gallup.com

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

From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2000 2:44 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Wall Street Journal on "Gallup's Credibility Gap"

Certainly John Fund's piece (see below) on recent Gallup polls requires no rejoinder here--not on AAPORNET.

The Wall Street Journal's opinionjournal.com site posts many letters from its readers. If you care to share your views of John Fund's "campaign briefing," you might visit the site (see URL, immediately below the copyright notice at the top), where the letters section will be easy to spot.

-- Jim

=====
Date: Thu, 26 Oct 2000 18:00:17 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu>
Subject: RE: Wall Street Journal Online Piece
In-Reply-To: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90010B0C3A@EXCHNG3>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I read over the tracking poll methodology but did not find any information on response rates. Does the Gallup Poll publish its response rates (especially the CASRO rate)? How do you handle potential bias due to unit nonresponse? How much have response rates changed over time and has this introduced any bias in interpreting certain kinds of trend data?

At 03:21 PM 10/26/00 -0500, you wrote:

>By way of background for AAPORNET members, this is a copy of the
>correspondence sent to Mr. Fund after his first article on this same issue
>several weeks ago.

>

>Thanks,
>
>Frank Newport
>The Gallup Poll
>Princeton
>
>
>
>To: John Fund
>
>We always appreciate open discussion of polls, a tradition that began with
>George Gallup more than 50 years ago. We publish as much about our polls,
>including daily demographic breaks, as possible, and welcome comments and
>observations.
>
>I would direct your attention to these two pieces currently on our web site
>which explain in detail our basic tracking poll methodology, and which
>discuss the last week's results in detail.
><http://www.gallup.com/Poll/releases/pr001009b.asp> and
><http://www.gallup.com/poll/fromthead/ed0010.asp>
>
>Volatility in the horse race is natural and expected, particularly in and
>around high profile candidate events. Our experience in 1992 and 1996
>demonstrated the normalcy in movement among uncommitted voters as the highly
>informational intensive last months of the campaign unfold.
>
>Our methodology (see above link) involves interviews with 400 national
>adults every day. The numbers you report are the final estimates from
>likely voters within that group, arrived by applying likely voter models
>Gallup has developed over the decades.
>
>Our poll is designed to be sensitive to change. If it were not, we wouldn't
>bother to track at all, but rather -- like the NBC/WSJ poll -- just
>interview at discrete time intervals through the fall. Our objective is to
>pick up movements up and down in reaction to the day to day events of the
>campaign. To think that debates, intensive media coverage, expenditure of
>millions of dollars by the candidates on advertising, and candidate
>appearances would not move the needle on an election one way or the other is
>unrealistic. A sizeable portion of the voting population, upwards of 20%,
>is uncommitted, and on any given day as likely to come down in favor of one
>candidate as the other.
>
>We take our obligation to measure the status of the race on a day to day
>basis seriously, and have an extensive team of highly experienced
>researchers, statisticians and methodologists who design and monitor our
>survey work.
>
>I think that more time should be spent using the tracking data to understand
>the electorate and the process of the campaign, rather than sticking
>stubbornly to the outdated perception that voters don't change their minds,
>or change them slightly and/or slowly during the fall. The campaign is
>dynamic, and the type of movement we see is real.
>
>Thanks,
>
>Frank Newport
>Editor in Chief

>The Gallup Poll
>Princeton, NJ
>frank_newport@gallup.com
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
>Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2000 2:44 PM
>To: AAPORNET
>Subject: Wall Street Journal on "Gallup's Credibility Gap"

>
>
>
>
>
> Certainly John Fund's piece (see below) on recent
> Gallup polls requires no rejoinder here--not on
> AAPORNET.
>
> The Wall Street Journal's opinionjournal.com site
> posts many letters from its readers. If you care
> to share your views of John Fund's "campaign
> briefing," you might visit the site (see URL,
> immediately below the copyright notice at the top),
> where the letters section will be easy to spot.
>
> -- Jim

=====
Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.
Director
Center for Family and Community Health
School of Public Health
University of California, Berkeley
140 Warren Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-7360

Phone: 510-643-7314
Fax: 510-643-7316
E-mail: jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu
WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>
=====

=====
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 06:40:27 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Polling scam comes to email.
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The following showed up in this morning's email.

Like many spams, it originates from Hotmail, Microsoft's anonymous email service, making it hard to track down the perpetrator.

This is a relatively sophisticated spam: The send date is September 1999, which will make it display at the top of the inbox for many people. Also note that a box at the bottom claiming compliance with anti-spam measures is separated from the main text by a wide blank area, effectively hiding it until a recipient has read the first part of the message, making it much less likely that someone will immediately recognize this as spam and delete it without reading it.

Jan Werner

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

Subject: Is Gov. Bush Ready to be President or should his past disqualify him ?

Date: Wed, 01 Sep 99 19:25:07 EST

From: officialprespolltaker6@hotmail.com

Reply-To: officialprespolltaker6@hotmail.com

To: officialprespolltaker@hotmail.com

Hi,

We are an Independent polling company looking to make a difference in This Critical Election by polling internet voters and citizens, then make those results available to the news media and post them on the internet. Your opinions may sway the undecided voters and put the right guy in the White House.

The Internet Poll question is,
"Is George W. Bush really prepared to be President,
or should his past disqualify him?"

The results will be posted on the Internet and sent to a number of news agencies 24 to 48 hours before the election and could make the difference in this very tight race. Although we have no way of knowing, we ask that you leave your opinion only once, otherwise this may be seen as votes when posted and may give one candidate an unfair advantage over the other.

To give your opinion please call 1-900-226-0388.

If response is strong, a question will be asked about V.P. Al Gore and his fitness to be president during the last week of the election. You may suggest a question to be asked when

You give Your opinion About Gov. Bush. One will be chosen from Your responses.

There is a charge of \$1.99 per minute to leave your opinion, a very small price to be heard and to have an opportunity to influence this critical election.

This message is sent in compliance of the proposed bill: SECTION 301. Per Section 301, Paragraph (a) (2) (C) of S. 1618, further transmissions to you by the sender of this email may be stopped at no cost to you by sending a reply to this email address with the word remove in the subject line. This message is not intended for residents in the State of Washington, screening of addresses has been done to the best of our technical ability. If you are a Washington, Virginia, or California resident or otherwise wish to be removed from this list, further transmissions to you by the sender of this email may be stopped at no cost to you by sending a reply to mstrsrvcs@mailme.org with the word remove in the subject line.

2

winner

=====
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 07:57:06 -0400
From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: DC-AAPOR 11-2: Surveys & Computer/Cognitive Sciences
MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

FINAL CALL: NOTE SPECIAL TIME (3:00pm to 4:30 pm)

Sponsors: WSS Data Collection Methods Section/DC-AAPOR

Topic: Interdisciplinary Survey Research Involving the
Computer and Cognitive Sciences: "Unraveling the Seam
Effect," and "The Gold Standard of Question Quality on
Surveys: Experts, Computer Tools, Versus Statistical
Indices"

When: Thursday, November 2, 2000, 3:00-4:30 p.m.

Speakers: Lance J. Rips, Northwestern University and
Arthur Graesser, The University of Memphis

Location: BLS Conference and Training Center, Room #1
(Basement/lower level)
Postal Square Building, 2 Massachusetts Ave., NE
Washington, DC (Enter on First St., NE, and bring a photo ID)

Metro: Union Station, Red Line

RSVP: To be placed on the visitor's list, send e-mail to
audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com or call
Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 by Monday, October 30.

Abstracts:

(Rips) Panel surveys sometimes ask respondents for data from several different intervals within a longer reference period. Findings from such surveys often show larger changes from one month to the next when the data come from two different interviews than from the same interview. We have studied this seam effect experimentally in a setting that allows us to control the information that respondents should report. The results of the experiments are consistent with a theory in which the seam difference is due to two factors: (a) respondents' forgetting information within the response interval, and (b) their bias in reporting when they can no longer remember correct answers.

(Graesser) We have developed a computer tool (called QUAID) that assists survey methodologists in improving the wording, syntax, and semantics of survey questions. We have performed analyses that assess these problems on a corpus of surveys. There has been a persistent challenge in our assessments of the validity of QUAID's critiques: What is the gold standard for determining whether a question has a particular problem. A computer tool can perform complex computations, but the question remains whether the output is valid. This presentation addresses the challenges of performance evaluation when there is no defensible gold standard for question quality.

=====
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 11:38:15 -0400
From: Monica Wolford <mwolford@hers.com>

Reply-To: mwolford@hers.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en]C-CCK-MCD NSCPCD47 (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Public Opinion Shows on PBS
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

PBS SERIES ON PUBLIC OPINION ON PUBLIC POLICY

Throughout this fall, PBS will be carrying a series of four half-hour shows on public opinion on public policy called Vox Populi. Hosted by veteran newsman and Executive Director of the Washington Office of the Shorenstein Center, Marvin Kalb, the shows focus on: the relationship between the public and the government, healthcare, America's role in the world, and federal budget priorities. Produced by the Emmy-award winning Quorum Television in conjunction with the Center on Policy Attitudes (COPA), each show presents a basic overview of the policy issue followed by footage from focus groups conducted around the country as well nationwide polls. Steven Kull, director of COPA, is the moderator of the focus groups and summarizes public attitudes expressed in polls. In addition there is commentary from other public opinion specialists including Andrew Kohut, Benjamin Page, Robert Shapiro, Lawrence Jacobs and Ole Holsti. Elaborating the policy dimensions of each issue are numerous policy specialists including Henry Aaron, Princeton Lyman, Ivo Daalder, Lawrence Korb, General Gordion Sullivan (ret) and others. Each show ends with a roundtable discussion moderated by Marvin Kalb among a group of journalists and specialists including E.J. Dionne, Jody Allen. Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro, Bonnie Erbe, and Robert Greenstein.

For more information about the series, including show times in your area, see the the Vox Populi website at www.vox-populi.org. The website also includes a comprehensive review of polling data on the issues explored in the shows.

--

~~~~~  
Monica Wolford [mwolford@hers.com](mailto:mwolford@hers.com)  
Program on International Policy Attitudes [www.pipa.org](http://www.pipa.org)  
A joint program of Center on Policy Attitudes [www.policyattitudes.org](http://www.policyattitudes.org)  
and the Center for Int'l & Security Studies at U Maryland  
1779 Massachusetts Ave NW #510  
Washington, DC 20036

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 11:50:06 EDT  
From: rhickson@monmouth.com  
Received: from 199.20.64.72 ([www.monmouth.com](http://www.monmouth.com) [209.191.58.2])  
by mail.monmouth.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA26898

















working around Gallup's 1996 wording: "How do you personally feel about Christian fundamentalist religions -- very favorable, mostly favorable, mostly unfavorable, or very unfavorable?" Does anyone know of data based on similar measures from this time period, or of other data related to views of fundamentalist Christians?

Many thanks,

Patricia Moy

---

Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 11:17:43 -0500  
From: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu  
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])  
by genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA16998;  
Fri, 27 Oct 2000 11:20:26 -0500  
Received: from ccMail by norcmail.uchicago.edu (ccMail Link to SMTP  
R8.30.00.7)  
id AA972663465; Fri, 27 Oct 2000 11:17:46 -0500  
Message-Id: <0010279726.AA972663465@norcmail.uchicago.edu>  
X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.30.00.7  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: <pakerr@u.washington.edu>  
Subject: Re: views of fundamentalist Christians  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

Check the feeling thermometer. of the National Election study and contact the National Conference for Community and Justice for their new TAP survey.

---

Reply Separator

---

Subject: views of fundamentalist Christians  
Author: <aapornet@usc.edu> at INTERNET  
Date: 10/27/00 9:04 AM

Dear AAPORNET,

One of my students is searching for national opinion data from 1980 to 2000 dealing with Americans' views of fundamentalist Christians. He's working around Gallup's 1996 wording: "How do you personally feel about Christian fundamentalist religions -- very favorable, mostly favorable, mostly unfavorable, or very unfavorable?" Does anyone know of data based on similar measures from this time period, or of other data related to views of fundamentalist Christians?

Many thanks,

Patricia Moy



Message-Id: <200010271703.e9RH3eJ28299@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>  
Subject: Congressional Budget Office wants disclosure of personal census info?  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-MD5: 5C6S48KoesCQDC3ItnKiww==

This press release is the census.gov website, but I don't see anything explaining why the CBO is asking for this change in the confidentiality provisions. Is this just political maneuvering?

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2000

Contact: Patricia Woodward  
202-482-4883  
Karen Cowles  
202-482-1523

CB00-CN.62

Commerce Secretary Sends Veto Message on Legislation to Change  
Census Confidentiality Law

Last night, Commerce Secretary Norman Y. Mineta sent a letter to Members of Congress expressing "strong opposition to any attempt to force the disclosure of personal census information currently protected by the confidentiality provisions of Title 13." Secretary Mineta further writes: "The adoption of these changes with no public debate runs the very serious risk of undermining the public's confidence in the privacy of census information."

The language may be attached to any one of a number of last-minute, must-pass bills which the Congress will consider as early as today. The amendment would allow an arm of Congress, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to acquire confidential census data collected in monthly surveys, including the Current Population Survey and the Survey of Income and Program Participation.

"I will recommend a Presidential veto of the legislation." Mineta wrote in his letter to Congress.

U.S. Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt has publicly expressed his opposition to the CBO legislation, saying that no amendment to Title 13 should be considered by the Congress without public discussion, congressional testimony and a deliberative process which fully debates the consequences of such a change.

Carolyn S. White, PhD  
Program Coordinator  
Assistant Professor, Sociology  
Room 1445 Digital Computing Lab  
1304 W. Springfield Ave.  
Urbana, Il 61801  
Voice: 217-333-6751  
Fax: 217-244-7089  
Email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 13:08:25 -0400

From: "Safir, Adam" <ASafir@ui.urban.org>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "'cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu'" <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Congressional Budget Office wants disclosure of personal census info?  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Carolyn,

More background on this issue can be found in the Op-Ed from the NY Times (10/23/2000) copied below.

Excerpt:

"The Congressional Budget Office, with the surprising help of some Congressional Republicans, is angling to get its hands on Census Bureau files. The budget office wants to create a "linked data set" on individuals - using information from the Internal Revenue Service, Social Security Administration and Census Bureau surveys - to help it evaluate proposed reforms in Medicare and Social Security."

Adam Safir  
Urban Institute

\*\*\*\*\*

"My Data, Mine to Keep Private" by Linda R. Monk  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2000/10/23/opinion/23MONK.html>

WASHINGTON -- I was one of those paranoid Americans who chose not to answer all questions on the long form of the 2000 census. My husband and I decided that the government did not need to know, or had other ways of finding out, what time we left for work, how much our mortgage payment was or the amount of our income that came from wages. We were willing to risk the \$100 fine to take a stand for individual privacy in an increasingly nosy and automated age.

Editorial writers across the nation chided people like us for being so silly, insisting that only right-wing nuts with delusions of jackbooted federal invaders could possibly object to the census. Think of all the poor women who need day care and disabled people who depend on public transportation, we were told. And don't listen to the warnings of Trent Lott, the Senate majority leader - they're just another Republican ploy to get a low count on the census.

Now, however, my concerns don't appear quite so ridiculous. The Congressional Budget Office, with the surprising help of some Congressional Republicans, is angling to get its hands on Census Bureau files. The budget office wants to create a "linked data set" on individuals - using information from the Internal Revenue Service, Social Security Administration and Census Bureau surveys - to help it evaluate proposed reforms in Medicare and Social Security.

Under current law, census data on individuals can be used only to benefit

the Census Bureau, which has balked at turning over files to the budget office without greater assurances of individual privacy. However, the Congressional number crunchers are not taking no for an answer. Republicans may tack an amendment allowing Congress access to census data onto an appropriations bill before Congress adjourns for the elections.

The records the budget office wants are not themselves from the 2000 Census; they are voluntary responses to monthly surveys, with confidentiality promised. Forcing the bureau to give them up would set a disturbing precedent. Commerce Secretary Norman Mineta, who supervises the Census Bureau, warned Congress this month that amending the census law would "seriously compromise" the department's ability to safeguard taxpayers' privacy and "to assure continued high response rates of the American public to census surveys."

Chip Walker, a spokesman for Representative Dan Miller, a Florida Republican who chairs the House subcommittee on the census, sees no problem with congressional access to census data. "The Census Bureau is the government, and Congress is the government," he said.

Well, that's exactly what I'm afraid of. It's not surprising that a federal agency that stockpiles information would be raided by other federal agencies. If Congress changes the census law, the government will be well on its way to becoming another Amazon.com, which abruptly and retroactively weakened its privacy policy this year. I expected as much, because I don't believe either the government or businesses when they promise me privacy. That's why I routinely lie about personal information when applying for shoppers' discount cards and the like. And it's why I don't answer invasive questions on census forms. Keep your hands off my data set.

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 13:39:22 -0400  
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Congressional Budget Office wants disclosure of personal census info?  
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBIEKHCAA.mark@bisconti.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400  
In-Reply-To: <200010271703.e9RH3eJ28299@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>

I have good news for census and pollsters and bad news for DC residents. The Commerce bill with a number of controversial provisions (including the CBO/census one, immigration, assisted suicide, etc.) that are widely considered "veto bait" for Clinton was tagged onto the D.C.'s Appropriation bill that is very late in getting passed (80% of the \$5 billion is local tax money; the budget must be approved by Congress, adding six months and \$3 million cost to DC p/yr. ... It is a difficult bill to get agreement on). DC officials are now "annoyed" because by tagging on "veto bait" to DC's bill means it will be delayed again... resulting in bond market questions and issues related to paying the bills. Yesterday, the DC bill with

Commerce tagged on passed the House 208 to 196, mostly along partisan lines with crossovers both directions (20 or so). Now it moves to the Senate, where it is expected to gain approval, and then to the President who will veto it. And round and round we go. THE GOOD NEWS FOR CENSUS IS THIS: According to Delegate Norton's office, in the House markup, the CBO/census provision was pulled because there was concern among BOTH Democrats and Republicans that this would have undermined census efforts-afterall, they had promised confidentiality, and already many Americans don't believe them. So-that provision is gone for now. Every bill is political maneuvering, a sort of "hide the ball" game. Sorry if I told you more than you wanted to know. cheers, Mark Richards

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Carolyn White  
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2000 1:04 PM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Congressional Budget Office wants disclosure of personal census info?

This press release is the census.gov website, but I don't see anything explaining why the CBO is asking for this change in the confidentiality provisions. Is this just political maneuvering?

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2000

Contact: Patricia Woodward  
202-482-4883  
Karen Cowles  
202-482-1523

CB00-CN.62

#### Commerce Secretary Sends Veto Message on Legislation to Change Census Confidentiality Law

Last night, Commerce Secretary Norman Y. Mineta sent a letter to Members of Congress expressing "strong opposition to any attempt to force the disclosure of personal census information currently protected by the confidentiality provisions of Title 13." Secretary Mineta further writes: "The adoption of these changes with no public debate runs the very serious risk of undermining the public's confidence in the privacy of census information."

The language may be attached to any one of a number of last-minute, must-pass bills which the Congress will consider as early as today. The amendment would allow an arm of Congress, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to acquire confidential census data collected in monthly surveys, including the Current Population Survey and the Survey of Income and Program Participation.

"I will recommend a Presidential veto of the legislation." Mineta wrote in his letter to Congress.

U.S. Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt has publicly expressed his opposition to the CBO legislation, saying that no amendment to Title 13 should be considered by the Congress without public discussion, congressional testimony and a deliberative process which fully debates the consequences of such a change.

Carolyn S. White, PhD  
Program Coordinator  
Assistant Professor, Sociology  
Room 1445 Digital Computing Lab Voice: 217-333-6751  
1304 W. Springfield Ave. Fax: 217-244-7089  
Urbana, Il 61801 Email: cswhite@uiuc.edu

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 13:39:01 -0400  
Message-Id: <200010271739.NAA74040@garnet2.acns.fsu.edu>  
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu, pmoy@u.washington.edu  
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>  
Subject: Re: views of fundamentalist Christians

Check out the two articles in POQ last year on Attitudes Toward  
Fundamentalist Christians. The authors used a national dataset but I can't  
remember which one.

P.S. Please put me on your mailing list for references and whatever you  
find. Thanks!

Susan  
Susan Carol Losh, PhD.  
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at:  
<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>

850-644-8778  
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592  
FAX 850-644-8776

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I HAVE JUST JOINED THE FACULTY AT:

The Department of Educational Research  
307L Stone Building  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 15:15:54 EDT  
From: Rlbconley@aol.com  
Received: from Rlbconley@aol.com  
by imo-d03.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v28.32.) id 5.9.c594e4c (15899)  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 27 Oct 2000 15:16:32 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from web40.aolmail.aol.com (web40.aolmail.aol.com [205.188.161.1])  
by air-id09.mx.aol.com (v76\_r1.20) with ESMTP; Fri, 27  
Oct 2000 15:15:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: views of fundamentalist Christians  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Mailer: Unknown  
Message-ID: <9.c594e4c.272b2e6a@aol.com>

The Citizen Participation Study 1989-1990 may have asked about them in a  
"closeness question".

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 22:44:21 +0300  
From: "Vladimir I. Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>  
X-Mailer: The Bat! (v1.46c)  
Reply-To: "Vladimir I. Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
Message-ID: <4034926723.20001027224421@kmis.kiev.ua>  
To: AAPOR Network <aapornet@usc.edu>  
CC: WAPOR NET <wapornet@lambada.oit.unc.edu>  
Subject: KIIS (Ukraine) November omnibus survey  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues,

May be period of the presidential race is not good for adv., but still  
my firm (The Kiev International Institute of Sociology) in the period  
of 22 November-- 4 December, 2000 will conduct an omnibus survey of  
the adult population of Ukraine (details are below).

Pay your attention, that prices in Ukraine are much below, than in  
USA, so it's possible to review conducting some methodological  
experiments firstly in Ukraine.

Please pass this message on to any contacts and colleagues who may be  
interested.

Sorry for cross-posting - those of you who are the members both WAPOR  
and AAPOR may receive this message twice. If someone knows how to avoid  
cross-posting - let me know, please.

My best regards

Vladimir Paniotto

KIIS UKRAINE OMNIBUS SURVEY

The Kiev International Institute of Sociology informs that in the period of 22 November-- 4 December, 2000 it will conduct an omnibus survey of the adult population of Ukraine.

SAMPLE:

2,000 respondents aged 16 years and older, living in Ukraine. Sample is based on random selection of 200 sampling points (post-office districts) all over Ukraine (in all 24 oblasts of Ukraine and Crimea). The sampling process consists of random selection of streets, buildings and apartments inside each post-office district. The last stage is the random selection of respondents from households.

Our sample has more respondents and more sampling points than any other sample for omnibuses in Ukraine, it is representative not only for Ukraine as a whole but for separate regions and groups of regions. It includes about 1,350 urban interviews.

You can choose to buy half a sample (1,000 respondents) for lower price and it will be done also in all 200 sampling points. The number of sampling points influences greatly on the sample error (if for example for cluster sample of 1,000 respondents and 100 sampling points sample error is 5%, the sample error for the same 1,000 respondents, but 200 sampling points is 3.5%)

DEADLINES:

The deadline to provide questions is 15th November, 2000

FIELDWORK: 22 November-- 4 December, 2000

RESULTS AVAILABLE: 18th December, 2000

COST PER ONE QUESTION:

| Type of the question                                                                                                               | Full sample         | (Half sample)         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Closed (pre-coded) question (one variable in SPSS) or closed (pre-coded) question with multiple choice (up to 5 variables in SPSS) | \$ 260              | ( \$ 130)             |
| Closed (pre-coded) question with multiple choice (k variables in SPSS, k>5)                                                        | \$ 260 + \$50*(k-5) | (\$ 130 + \$25*(k-5)) |
| Open-ended question                                                                                                                | \$ 460              | ( \$ 240)             |
| Closed question in the battery of 3 and more questions                                                                             | \$ 190              | ( \$ 110)             |

DISCOUNTS:

- For clients who will purchase more than 10 questions - 10% discount;
- For clients who participated in one of previous

omnibus surveys - 20% discount.

DEMOGRAPHICS INCLUDED:

- Sex
- Age
- Education
- Ethnicity
- Place of residence (oblast, urban or rural)

OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS AVAILABLE:

- Socio-economic status
- Income
- Language
- Religiousness
- Size of settlement

The cost of every additional demographics question is \$55 for 2,000 respondents sample and \$30 for 1,000 sample

COMMENTS FOR OUR REGULAR CLIENTS:

- 1) We would like to pay your attention, that our regular prices became lower - the same price for 2,000 interview instead of 1,600;
- 2) We refused from \$370 entry fee as it was before, and have instead payment for additional demography questions, it's much more comfortable for the clients, who included just a few questions

\*\*\*\*\*

Our address and phone numbers:

8/5 Voloska str  
04070, Kiev, Ukraine  
Tel/Fax: (+380 44) 463-5868  
238-2567/2568  
e-mail: omnibus@kiis.com.ua

\*\*\*\*\*

Report problems to: <<mailto:omnibus@kiis.com.ua>>  
Check the Omnibus web page: <<http://kiis.com.ua/new/?omnibus>>

To unsubscribe, click here:

<[mailto:omnlist@kiis.com.ua?subject=Unsubscribe\\_Omnlist](mailto:omnlist@kiis.com.ua?subject=Unsubscribe_Omnlist)>

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

Volodimir Paniotto, Director of KIIS  
(Kiev International Institute of Sociology)  
Milchakova 1/18, kv.11, Kiev-02002, UKRAINE  
Phone (380-44)-463-5868,238-2567,238-2568 (office)  
Phone (380-44)-517-3949 (home)  
Fax (380-44)-263-3458, phone-fax 463-5868  
E-mail: paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua

http://www.kiis.com.ua

\*\*\*\*\*

=====

Date: Sat, 28 Oct 2000 00:14:14 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>  
Subject: From Slate -- Why the Polls contradict each other  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="===== \_54141358==\_.ALT"

----- \_54141358==\_.ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Most interesting article from SLATE (on line) -- about why the polls contradict each other. The author raises many questions to which we know the answers to some.....

Dick Halpern

+++++++  
Pollish Sausage  
By William Saletan

Thursday, Oct. 26, 2000, at 4:00 p.m. PT

No matter who you think is going to win the presidential election, you can find a poll to back up your opinion. If you're betting on George W. Bush, you can point to the Voter.com Battleground 2000 survey, which consistently shows Bush ahead. If you're betting on Al Gore, you can point to the New York Times/CBS poll, which usually indicates a small lead for Gore. If you think the debates helped Bush a lot, you can point to the CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll, which found a big Bush surge after each encounter. If you think the debates didn't help Bush much, you can point to the Reuters/MSNBC/Zogby survey, which has rarely shifted more than two points a day.

Why do the polls confirm so many theories? Because theories are built into the polls. Each polling outfit has its own objectives and biases. In the case of media surveys, these objectives and biases aren't about ideology; they're about news-making and social science. Some tracking pollsters want to find big day-to-day changes, others want stability. Some want to narrow the population they study, others want to broaden it. Some fear passive bias, others fear active bias. Each pollster designs his survey to suit his preferences, and each gets the results he's looking for. Like the rest of us, pollsters have theories about who will vote and how. Polls don't

confirm these theories. They incorporate them.

This year's big controversy is the CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll. Other pollsters are dismayed at Gallup's radical swings. In the two days after the first debate, Gallup's three-day sample went from an 11-percentage-point Gore lead to a seven-point Bush lead. Last weekend, Bush had a nine-point lead in the Gallup sample; two days later, Gore had grabbed the lead. Contrast this with the Zogby survey, which moved only four points and two points during those periods, respectively. Why the difference? Because Gallup and Zogby are looking for different things. Gallup is trying to capture daily fluctuations, while Zogby is trying to filter them out.

On its Web site, Gallup makes clear that its poll seeks to maximize daily change: "Our objective is to pick up movements up and down in reaction to the day-to-day events of the campaign." Gallup postulates that one in five voters is highly malleable: "A sizeable portion of the voting population, upwards of 20%, is uncommitted and on any given day as likely to come down in favor of one candidate as the other." Gallup doesn't mind that big shifts in the partisan makeup of each day's sample one day lots of Republicans, the next day lots of Democrats push its numbers back and forth. Gallup's editor in chief, Frank Newport, says these partisan shifts reflect "differential intensity" between the parties. One day, Republicans feel likely to vote; the next, Democrats feel likely to vote. Accordingly, the pool of "likely voters" shifts from Bush to Gore.

Other pollsters regard that kind of change as a distraction. They want to hold some factors constant including party affiliation so they can focus on variations in other factors. "We're trying to measure movement within groups," says Ed Goeas, the Republican pollster who oversees the Voter.com survey. "If I see that white women have moved 10 points, I want to see whether that was real movement" as opposed to an excess of Republican women in the first sample and an excess of Democratic women in the second. Similarly, Washington Post survey director Rich Morin writes that Gallup "may not be tracking real changes in the electorate, but merely changes in relative interest or enthusiasm of Republicans and Democrats."

Notice the clash of premises. Morin and Goeas use a hard model of voting behavior. They assume that any changes in the horse-race numbers (i.e., the percentage of respondents who plan to vote for Bush or Gore) caused by changes in the partisan makeup of the likely voter pool aren't "real." These

pollsters treat the distribution of Democratic and Republican voters in presidential election turnout as a constant. When they see poll results in which that distribution shifts back and forth like a variable, they dismiss the data and fault the poll's methods. You could argue that their hard model, with its fixed dichotomy of constants and variables, is too rigid. But you could argue just as easily that Gallup's soft model, which treats everything as a variable to the point of positing that uncommitted voters are "on any given day as likely to come down in favor of one candidate as the other" is too mushy and chaotic. Which model is better? The answer to that question isn't scientific. It's philosophical.

It's also practical. CNN and USA Today are in the news business. They're paying Gallup for new numbers every day. If Gallup's numbers don't change, where's the news? So Gallup has an incentive to keep its filter loose, allowing the winds of shifting partisan intensity to blow its numbers back and forth. Goeas, on the other hand, is a professional campaign pollster as is his Democratic partner in the Voter.com survey, Celinda Lake. They've designed their poll to get the kind of information a candidate, as opposed to a news organization, would want. Campaigns divide the electorate into demographic groups: union households, white women, Midwestern Catholics and target their ads and messages to those groups. A campaign manager needs to hold the distribution of these groups constant from day to day so she can track movement within each group. Which poll is correct? That depends on what you need the numbers for.

Here's another philosophical question: How many days do you need to poll in order to understand public opinion? Gallup is sampling 400 people every night. Since CNN and USA Today want the numbers to keep changing, they report a rolling average based on only the last three samples. If Gore was doing well three nights ago, but Bush is doing well tonight, the pro-Gore sample drops out of the three-night mix, the pro-Bush sample goes in, and Bush gets a big bump. On its Web site, however, Gallup reports a rolling average based on the last six samples. The pro-Gore sample stays in the mix, diluting Bush's bump and conversely, tonight's pro-Bush sample stays in the mix five days from now, diluting Gore's next bump. The result is a less exciting series of smaller shifts. The three-day average tells you how 1,200 people feel right now. The six-day average tells you how 2,400 people feel over the course of a week. Which number should you pay attention to? That depends on whether you want the latest news or the big picture.

The argument for the big picture is that it's a better predictor. Presidential preference "is not a firmly held attitude," says Gallup's Web site. "[T]here is no need for Americans to develop a firmly held view on their vote until Nov. 7." Yet Gallup says its poll is designed to clarify who would win the election if it were held today. Its surge toward Bush after the first debate, for example, suggests that "if the election were indeed held during the days after the debate, Bush would have won, in large part because his voters would be more likely to turn out to vote." But if presidential preferences don't become "firmly held" until Election Day, then it makes no sense to infer from today's numbers that Bush would win "if the election were held today." The election isn't being held today and if it were, voters would have to resolve their fluctuating feelings into firmly held views that might not lead to the same conclusion.

Every pollster dreads statistical bias. But there are two kinds of statistical bias: passive and active. Passive bias is what happens when you don't balance your sample. If you live in a white neighborhood and poll your neighbors, you don't get enough black respondents. You have to take steps to make sure you either 1) sample the proper percentage of blacks up front; or 2) "weight" the number of blacks in your sample to reach the proper percentage. For example, if you polled half as many blacks as you should have, you double the weight of each black respondent's answers, as though you had polled the correct number.

How do you determine the proper percentage? The least intrusive way is to adjust each demographic groupwomen, Hispanics, senior citizens to census data. But what if you're polling likely voters? Shouldn't you adjust the percentage of black respondents in your sample to the percentage of blacks among voters who actually turn out on Election Day? And how do you figure that percentage? Do you look just at exit polls from the last election or at precinct-by-precinct turnout figures? How many past elections should you look at? How should you update those old figures to take account of possible changes in this year's black turnout? And what if you overestimate black turnout and assign too much weight to black respondents in your poll? In that case, you've replaced passive bias with active bias.

Gallup and the New York Times/CBS poll use minimal weighting, based on the census. Goetz and Zogby, however, adjust their filters and weights to match the turnouts they expect among various

demographic groups, based on past turnout, current voter registration, and other factors. Polls whose weights and filters are calibrated to reflect turnout, as opposed to just the census, tend to favor senior citizens, well-educated people, whites, men, and nonunion households. The weights alone can radically change the final numbers. According to the Post, on one recent night Zogby's weighting process shifted the results from a four-point Bush lead to a four-point Gore lead.

To see how filters can affect survey results, look at the disclaimer on the Post's own poll: "The Post and ABC News collect data jointly but use somewhat different models to identify likely voters. This can produce slightly different estimates of candidate support." Sure enough, over the past week, ABC and the Post have reported different results from the same tracking poll. Here is a perfect controlled study: The raw data are the same, but the pollsters differ, and therefore, so do the reported results.

The problem isn't ideological bias. Weighting can just as easily shift the numbers the other way. The problem is that weights and filters aren't part of the interviewing process. They precede and succeed it. Whether you're filtered into or out of the poll and how heavily your answers are weighted depend largely on the pollster's theory of this year's turnout and that theory isn't reported alongside the numbers in tomorrow's newspaper. "Every time you add a weight, you run the risk of skewing your internal data. You're adding one more unknown," observes Goeas. So which poll should you trust: the one that minimizes weights and filters or the one that maximizes them? That depends on which kind of bias worries you more.

The big debate about weighting this year concerns party affiliation. Republicans are indicating they're more likely to vote this year than in past years. Should pollsters believe them or stick with the old turnout projections, which favor Democrats? Usually, weighting protects the GOP. On his Web site, for example, Zogby argues that his polls are more accurate because "we apply weighting for party identification to ensure that there is no built-in Democratic bias in our sampling." But New York Times survey editor Mike Kagay agrees with Gallup poll editor Frank Newport that party affiliation, unlike race or gender, is too vague and changeable to measure or track reliably. So in addition to the difference among pollsters over which kind of bias to err against, there's a philosophical disagreement over whether party affiliation is more like a trait or like an opinion. Good

luck resolving that one.

There are plenty of other backstage quarrels among the pollsters. Zogby dismays some colleagues by polling during the day. Goegas dismays others by not polling on Fridays or Saturdays, which are the hardest days to reach married voters with children. Whose methods get the most accurate result? Even the election won't settle that question. Every pollster has fudge factors he can apply to massage his numbers at the last moment. He can raise or lower his projected turnout. He can adjust his weighting coefficients, as several pollsters have already done during this campaign. Twelve years ago, when I worked at the Hotline, our final three-day rolling average missed the election result so we left an extra night's sample in the mix and bragged about nailing the result with our four-day rolling average. Being a clever pollster means never having to say you're sorry.

=  
-----\_54141358==\_.ALT  
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>  
Most interesting article from SLATE (on line) &nbsp; -- about why the polls contradict each other. The author raises many questions to which we know the answers to some..... <br>  
<br>  
Dick Halpern<br>  
<br>  
+++++++<br>  
<font size=4>Pollish Sausage</font> <br>  
By William Saletan<br>  
<br>  
Thursday, Oct. 26, 2000, at 4:00 p.m. PT<br>  
<br>  
<font face="Times New Roman, Times">No matter who you think is going to win the presidential election, you can find a poll to back up your<br>opinion. If you're betting on George W. Bush, you can point to the Voter.com Battleground 2000<br>survey, which consistently shows Bush ahead. If you're betting on Al Gore, you can point to the<br>New York Times/CBS poll, which usually indicates a small lead for Gore. If you think the debates<br>helped Bush a lot, you can point to the CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll, which found a big Bush surge<br>after each encounter. If you think the debates didn't help Bush much, you can point to the<br>Reuters/MSNBC/Zogby survey, which has rarely shifted more than two points a day.<br>  
<br>  
Why do the polls confirm so many theories? Because theories are built into the polls. Each polling<br>outfit has its own objectives and biases. In the case of media surveys, these objectives and biases<br>

aren't about ideology; they're about news-making and social science. Some tracking pollsters want  
to find big day-to-day changes, others want stability. Some want to narrow the population they  
study, others want to broaden it. Some fear passive bias, others fear active bias. Each pollster  
designs his survey to suit his preferences, and each gets the results he's looking for. Like the rest of  
us, pollsters have theories about who will vote and how. Polls don't confirm these theories. They  
incorporate them.

This year's big controversy is the CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll. Other pollsters are  
dismayed at Gallup's radical swings. In the two days after the first debate, Gallup's three-day sample  
went from an 11-percentage-point Gore lead to a seven-point Bush lead. Last weekend, Bush had a  
nine-point lead in the Gallup sample; two days later, Gore had grabbed the lead. Contrast this with  
the Zogby survey, which moved only four points and two points during those periods, respectively.  
Why the difference? Because Gallup and Zogby are looking for different things. Gallup is trying to  
capture daily fluctuations, while Zogby is trying to filter them out.

On its Web site, Gallup makes clear that its poll seeks to maximize daily change: "Our objective is to  
pick up movements up and down in reaction to the day-to-day events of the campaign." Gallup  
postulates that one in five voters is highly malleable: "A sizeable portion of the voting population,  
upwards of 20%, is uncommitted and on any given day as likely to come down in favor of one  
candidate as the other." Gallup doesn't mind that big shifts in the partisan makeup of each day's  
sample one day lots of Republicans, the next day lots of Democrats push its numbers back and  
forth. Gallup's editor in chief, Frank Newport, says these partisan shifts reflect "differential intensity"  
between the parties. One day, Republicans feel likely to vote; the next, Democrats feel likely to vote.  
Accordingly, the pool of "likely voters" shifts from Bush to Gore.

Other pollsters regard that kind of change as a distraction. They want to hold some factors  
constant including party affiliation so they can focus on variations in other factors. "We're trying  
to measure movement within groups," says Ed Goetas, the Republican pollster who oversees the  
Voter.com survey. "If I see that white women have moved 10 points, I want to see whether that was  
real movement" as opposed to an excess of Republican women in the first sample and an excess  
of Democratic women in the second. Similarly, Washington Post survey

director Rich Morin writes  
that Gallup "may not be tracking real changes in the electorate, but merely changes in relative interest  
or enthusiasm of Republicans and Democrats."

Notice the clash of premises. Morin and Goeas use a hard model of voting behavior. They assume  
that any changes in the horse-race numbers (i.e., the percentage of respondents who plan to vote for  
Bush or Gore) caused by changes in the partisan makeup of the likely voter pool aren't "real"; These  
pollsters treat the distribution of Democratic and Republican voters in presidential election turnout as  
a constant. When they see poll results in which that distribution shifts back and forth like a variable,  
they dismiss the data and fault the poll's methods. You could argue that their hard model, with its  
fixed dichotomy of constants and variables, is too rigid. But you could argue just as easily that  
Gallup's soft model, which treats everything as a variable to the point of positing that uncommitted  
voters are "on any given day as likely to come down in favor of one candidate as the other" is too  
mushy and chaotic. Which model is better? The answer to that question isn't scientific. It's  
philosophical.

It's also practical. CNN and USA Today are in the news business. They're paying Gallup for new  
numbers every day. If Gallup's numbers don't change, where's the news? So Gallup has an incentive  
to keep its filter loose, allowing the winds of shifting partisan intensity to blow its numbers back and  
forth. Goeas, on the other hand, is a professional campaign pollster as is his Democratic partner in  
the Voter.com survey, Celinda Lake. They've designed their poll to get the kind of information a  
candidate, as opposed to a news organization, would want. Campaigns divide the electorate into  
demographic groups: union households, white women, Midwestern Catholics and target their ads  
and messages to those groups. A campaign manager needs to hold the distribution of these groups  
constant from day to day so she can track movement within each group. Which poll is correct? That  
depends on what you need the numbers for.

Here's another philosophical question: How many days do you need to poll in order to understand  
public opinion? Gallup is sampling 400 people every night. Since CNN and USA Today want the  
numbers to keep changing, they report a rolling average based on only the last three samples. If  
Gore was doing well three nights ago, but Bush is doing well tonight, the pro-Gore sample drops out  
of the three-night mix, the pro-Bush sample goes in, and Bush gets a big bump. On its Web site,

however, Gallup reports a rolling average based on the last six samples. The pro-Gore sample stays in the mix, diluting Bush's bump and conversely, tonight's pro-Bush sample stays in the mix five days from now, diluting Gore's next bump. The result is a less exciting series of smaller shifts. The three-day average tells you how 1,200 people feel right now. The six-day average tells you how 2,400 people feel over the course of a week. Which number should you pay attention to? That depends on whether you want the latest news or the big picture.

The argument for the big picture is that it's a better predictor. Presidential preference is not a firmly held attitude, says Gallup's Web site. There is no need for Americans to develop a firmly held view on their vote until Nov. 7. Yet Gallup says its poll is designed to clarify who would win the election if it were held today. Its surge toward Bush after the first debate, for example, suggests that if the election were indeed held during the days after the debate, Bush would have won, in large part because his voters would be more likely to turn out to vote. But if presidential preferences don't become firmly held until Election Day, then it makes no sense to infer from today's numbers that Bush would win if the election were held today. The election isn't being held today and if it were, voters would have to resolve their fluctuating feelings into firmly held views that might not lead to the same conclusion.

Every pollster dreads statistical bias. But there are two kinds of statistical bias: passive and active. Passive bias is what happens when you don't balance your sample. If you live in a white neighborhood and poll your neighbors, you don't get enough black respondents. You have to take steps to make sure you either 1) sample the proper percentage of blacks up front; or 2) weight the number of blacks in your sample to reach the proper percentage. For example, if you polled half as many blacks as you should have, you double the weight of each black respondent's answers, as though you had polled the correct number.

How do you determine the proper percentage? The least intrusive way is to adjust each demographic groupwomen, Hispanics, senior citizens to census data. But what if you're polling likely voters? Shouldn't you adjust the percentage of black respondents in your sample to the percentage of blacks among voters who actually turn out on Election Day? And how do you figure that percentage? Do you look just at exit polls from the last election or at precinct-by-precinct turnout figures? How many past elections should you look at? How should

you update those old  
figures to take account of possible changes in this year's black turnout?  
And what if you  
overestimate black turnout and assign too much weight to black  
respondents in your poll? In that  
case, you've replaced passive bias with active bias.

Gallup and the New York Times/CBS poll use minimal weighting, based on  
the census. Goeas and  
Zogby, however, adjust their filters and weights to match the turnouts  
they expect among various  
demographic groups, based on past turnout, current voter registration,  
and other factors. Polls  
whose weights and filters are calibrated to reflect turnout, as opposed  
to just the census, tend to  
favor senior citizens, well-educated people, whites, men, and nonunion  
households. The weights  
alone can radically change the final numbers. According to the Post, on  
one recent night Zogby's  
weighting process shifted the results from a four-point Bush lead to a  
four-point Gore lead.

To see how filters can affect survey results, look at the disclaimer on  
the Post's own poll: "The Post  
and ABC News collect data jointly but use somewhat different models to  
identify likely voters. This  
can produce slightly different estimates of candidate support." Sure  
enough, over the past week,  
ABC and the Post have reported different results from the same tracking  
poll. Here is a perfect  
controlled study: The raw data are the same, but the pollsters differ,  
and therefore, so do the  
reported results.

The problem isn't ideological bias. Weighting can just as easily shift  
the numbers the other way. The  
problem is that weights and filters aren't part of the interviewing  
process. They precede and succeed  
it. Whether you're filtered into or out of the poll and how heavily your  
answers are weighted depend  
largely on the pollster's theory of this year's turnout and that theory  
isn't reported alongside the  
numbers in tomorrow's newspaper. "Every time you add a weight, you  
run the risk of skewing your  
internal data. You're adding one more unknown," observes Goeas. So  
which poll should you  
trust the one that minimizes weights and filters or the one that maximizes  
them? That depends on  
which kind of bias worries you more.

The big debate about weighting this year concerns party affiliation.  
Republicans are indicating they're  
more likely to vote this year than in past years. Should pollsters  
believe them or stick with the old  
turnout projections, which favor Democrats? Usually, weighting protects  
the GOP. On his Web site,  
for example, Zogby argues that his polls are more accurate because

&quot;we apply weighting for party  
identification to ensure that there is no built-in Democratic bias in our  
sampling.&quot; But New York  
Times survey editor Mike Kagay agrees with Gallup poll editor Frank  
Newport that party affiliation,  
unlike race or gender, is too vague and changeable to measure or track  
reliably. So in addition to the  
difference among pollsters over which kind of bias to err against  
or passivethere's a  
philosophical disagreement over whether party affiliation is more like a  
trait or like an opinion. Good  
luck resolving that one.

<br>  
There are plenty of other backstage quarrels among the pollsters. Zogby  
dismays some colleagues  
by polling during the day. Goeas dismays others by not polling on Fridays  
or Saturdays, which are  
the hardest days to reach married voters with children. Whose methods get  
the most accurate result?  
Even the election won't settle that question. Every pollster has fudge  
factors he can apply to massage  
his numbers at the last moment. He can raise or lower his projected  
turnout. He can adjust his  
weighting coefficients, as several pollsters have already done during  
this campaign. Twelve years  
ago, when I worked at the Hotline, our final three-day rolling average  
missed the election resultso  
we left an extra night's sample in the mix and bragged about nailing the  
result with our four-day  
rolling average. Being a clever pollster means never having to say you're  
sorry. <br>  
<br>  
</font>=</html>

-----\_54141358==\_ .ALT--

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2000 22:41:16 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Green Party Net Challenge: Poll This!  
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010272209001.7966-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

From this report I conclude that, as long as Net culture  
prevails, for national elections, national polls are going  
to be considerably more accurate than are state polls.

-- Jim

-----  
Copyright (c) 2000 The Standard Media International

---

<http://www.thestandard.com/article/display/0,1151,19785,00.html>

October 27, 2000, 6:55 PM PDT

### Vote Swapping for Gore

Green Party supporters are trading their votes over the Net with Democrats to help the vice president win the election.

By Scott Harris

"Nervous Naderites" who live in hotly contested swing states such as Washington and Michigan are making pledges via the Internet to swap votes with Democrats in Republican havens such as Texas, as traffic zooms on three Web sites promoting the political tactic.

The strategy, designed to simultaneously promote the Green Party's political goal of achieving 5 percent of the popular vote while enhancing Democratic presidential nominee Al Gore's chances against Republican George W. Bush, has resulted in more than 1,000 swaps so far, according to the creators of Voteexchange.org, NaderTrader.org and Voteswap2000.com.

None of the sites are sanctioned by the official Green or Democratic parties, but the deals come amid growing concern among both Gore and Nader supporters that their divide could result in a Republican triumph Nov. 7.

The idea has spurred Internet traffic since Monday, when online magazine Slate published a commentary by American University law professor Jamie Raskin that promoted the idea of a bipartisan alliance between what he called "nervous Naderites" and "despondent Democrats." Unbeknown to Raskin, two exchange sites had already been independently created.

Steve Yoder, a Washington, D.C., technical writer, launched Voteexchange.org on Oct. 1, and Jeff Cardille, an environmental studies grad student at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, had coincidentally launched NaderTrader the same day Raskin's article appeared.

By Wednesday, Slate had linked to those sites. Then, inspired by Raskin's article, Jim Cody and Ted Johnson of Los Angeles created Voteswap2000, a site that automatically links voters who buy into the vote-swap idea. Yoder has linked his site to Voteswap2000 because of its automated features. "It's the perfect marriage of the Internet and a close political race," Yoder says.

By 4 p.m. Friday -- less than 24 hours after its launch -- Voteswap2000 had recorded 897 swaps. Yoder says his site, which had generated only four trades before Monday, since has counted an additional 220. Cardille, meanwhile, offers no such numbers from NaderTrader, saying his objective is to promote the idea via e-mail among only his trusted friends and family.

Traffic to all three sites has soared as the swap concept has spread via the Web. Yoder says his site, which averaged about 400 visits per day before Monday, received 1,200 on Monday, 1,600 on Tuesday, 29,500 on Wednesday and 62,000 Thursday. Cardille says traffic on NaderTrader's went from zero on Monday to 432 on Tuesday, 3,411 on Wednesday and 10,448 Thursday.

Cardille says his goal is to help the Green Party achieve a 5 percent share of the popular vote, thus ensuring that the fledgling party will receive federal matching funds in 2004 -- and hopefully also capturing a Gore victory in the process.

Raskin says it's not so much the vote-swap strategy that he sees as revolutionary but more the enlightened deliberation between voters that the strategy has encouraged. "The Internet becomes something like the Senate or House floor where citizens can engage in a meaningful negotiation about our destiny," he says. "I don't think it's really vote trading, because it's all about people declaring their intentions anyway."

---

Copyright (c) 2000 The Standard Media International

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Sat, 28 Oct 2000 07:42:26 -0400  
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Call for Papers -- Eastern Evaluation Research Society  
References: <200010271550.LAA26898@mail.monmouth.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Susan

Glad you are interested in EERS -- it's a great conference

I too have multiple lives and addresses. When I am in my Trenton office next week I can forward the file with the call for papers, etc.

Check out [www.eers.org](http://www.eers.org) for more information on the Society.

Regards

Rachel Hickson

---

Date: Sat, 28 Oct 2000 10:47:22 -0500  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@facstaff.wisc.edu>

Subject: Keeping Track of Tracking Polls  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

From Wired News, available online at:  
<http://www.wired.com/news/print/0,1294,39727,00.html>

Keeping Track of Tracking Polls  
by Declan McCullagh

2:00 a.m. Oct. 26, 2000 PDT

WASHINGTON -- Good news for conservatives: Portraitofamerica.com's latest telephone poll reveals that George W. Bush is winning the presidential race by a hefty 6 percentage points.

Oops! No, it's actually Vice President Al Gore who will be moving into the White House, thanks to a 3-point lead over his rival, according to Zogby's latest poll featured on msnbc.com.

Or might the race between the two major-party candidates be exactly tied, as the Washington Post-ABC News poll insists?

Welcome to the head-scratchingly bizarre world of presidential polling, where the various methods of taking America's political pulse can mean wildly different diagnoses of the patient's condition.

Just to be clear, we're not talking about those notoriously inaccurate, click-here-to-vote online polls. These are statistically valid polls conducted by paid professionals, usually by phoning hundreds of random Americans every evening.

But they can't all be right.

That hasn't stopped political junkies from making the rounds of such websites, for one very good reason. This is the first presidential election in which you don't have to be a campaign insider or subscribe to high-priced newsletters to keep up with the latest polls.

Instead of waiting for media outlets to dole out polling data -- such as vital and underreported electoral college counts -- data-starved wonks can simply visit the recently established websites of the polling companies themselves. (Gallup, a leading polling firm, didn't even have a public website in 1996.)

Five groups provide daily tracking polls that are available for free:

CNN-USA Today-Gallup poll (Wednesday's results: Bush 45 percent, Gore 46 percent)

Reuters-MSNBC-Zogby poll (Bush 42 percent, Gore 45 percent)

Rasmussen's Portrait of America poll (Bush 47 percent, Gore 41 percent)

Washington Post-ABC News (Bush 46 percent, Gore 46 percent)

Voter.com-Battleground poll (Bush 45 percent, Gore 39 percent)

Now, that's a lot of reading to do over coffee every morning -- a problem that Peter Orvetti neatly solves with his own website, [orvetti.com](http://orvetti.com).

Orvetti, a recent Harvard dropout who's worked for [NationalJournal.com](http://NationalJournal.com), summarizes the day's polls in statistics-heavy morning and afternoon updates.

"In the first week of October, pageviews tripled, then tripled again in the second, and have doubled each week since then," Orvetti says. "On election night I will be providing rolling coverage, updated every five minutes or so rather than the 30 or 60 minutes it takes the big sites to get new returns and projections up on election nights."

Voter.com offers a similar service: A "poll center" with writeups of the latest results.

But for true statistics buffs, nothing beats crunching the numbers yourself.

That usually means a trip to [portraitofamerica.com](http://portraitofamerica.com), a data-rich website set up by Rasmussen Research.

Rasmussen, a 5-year-old firm, uses an automated dialing system to conduct interviews with whomever answers at randomly chosen phone numbers. The results -- which include surveys such as should-the-feds-break-up-Microsoft in addition to the standard political fare -- usually appear on their website the following day.

"It's been picking up dramatically," says company President Scott Rasmussen about the traffic to his website, which he says went online in its current form in early 1999.

"We expect in this month we'll hit about 3 million page views. In September we were about a million and a half (and) about 300,000 in June," Rasmussen says.

"We have been dramatically upgrading our website as best we can," he says. "We had some trouble earlier since we were caught off guard by the (increase in) traffic."

(On Wednesday, Zogby's website was so overloaded with visitors that it repeatedly coughed up: "HTTP Error 403 / Access Forbidden: Too many users are connected" errors. Other sites reported similar problems in November 1996.)

One of the reasons for differences between the polls is that Rasmussen's -- unlike others -- is automated. Another explanation is that his computers don't try to nudge undecided voters toward one candidate or another, which Gallup's human callers intentionally do.

And who's likely to win? "We're in a situation now where the race is Bush's to lose," Rasmussen says.

Detailed state-by-state polls, updated regularly, is what makes his figures particularly attractive to political buffs.

The U.S. president, of course, isn't elected by a direct popular vote, but by winning a majority of the 538 electoral state-by-state votes. It's possible to win the popular vote -- by landslides in states like California and New York -- but lose the presidency, an unusual turn of events that last occurred in 1888.

Rasmussen's presidential tracking poll released Wednesday says that Bush has a commanding share -- 220 votes -- of the 270 electoral votes that are required to win. Gore, by contrast, only has 168, and the rest of the states are too close to call.

Tracking Rasmussen's numbers every day has become a favorite hobby for Michael Frese, a computational physicist and consultant who sends his analysis of Rasmussen's figures to a mailing list of friends and family every day.

"I'm just a political junkie. I find it very hard for other people to give me interpretations of the data," says Frese, who holds a doctorate in applied math. "CNN was just on a moment ago telling me about a poll but they only gave me (the totals and) a margin of error. They didn't give me any more information."

Frese says he envisions providing people "with a scorecard for election night, so you won't have to rely on NBC or CBS or Fox or whatever you're watching."

He also predicts a Bush victory: "If the election were held today, the odds would be 9 out of 10. If the election is held two weeks from now, it's possible for it to drift a good bit because there is some movement in the traditional Democratic strongholds back toward Gore."

=====  
Date: Sat, 28 Oct 2000 12:03:34 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Re: Keeping Track of Tracking Polls  
In-Reply-To: <p04320401b620a557283b@[24.10.212.149]>  
References: <p04320402b576a4a7ee30@[24.10.212.149]>  
<D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90EEEFCEB@EXCHNG3>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Given the incredible closeness of the election do you think the parties involved would settle for twin beds in the White House?

At 11:47 AM 10/28/00, you wrote:

> From Wired News, available online at:  
><http://www.wired.com/news/print/0,1294,39727,00.html>  
>  
>Keeping Track of Tracking Polls  
>by Declan McCullagh  
>  
>2:00 a.m. Oct. 26, 2000 PDT  
>  
>WASHINGTON -- Good news for conservatives: Portraitofamerica.com's  
>latest telephone poll reveals that George W. Bush is winning the

>presidential race by a hefty 6 percentage points.  
>  
>Oops! No, it's actually Vice President Al Gore who will be moving into  
>the White House, thanks to a 3-point lead over his rival, according to  
>Zogby's latest poll featured on msnbc.com.  
>  
>Or might the race between the two major-party candidates be exactly  
>tied, as the Washington Post-ABC News poll insists?  
>  
>Welcome to the head-scratchingly bizarre world of presidential  
>polling, where the various methods of taking America's political pulse  
>can mean wildly different diagnoses of the patient's condition.  
>  
>Just to be clear, we're not talking about those notoriously  
>inaccurate, click-here-to-vote online polls. These are statistically  
>valid polls conducted by paid professionals, usually by phoning  
>hundreds of random Americans every evening.  
>  
>But they can't all be right.  
>  
>That hasn't stopped political junkies from making the rounds of such  
>websites, for one very good reason. This is the first presidential  
>election in which you don't have to be a campaign insider or subscribe  
>to high-priced newsletters to keep up with the latest polls.  
>  
>Instead of waiting for media outlets to dole out polling data -- such  
>as vital and underreported electoral college counts -- data-starved  
>>wonks can simply visit the recently established websites of the  
>polling companies themselves. (Gallup, a leading polling firm, didn't  
>even have a public website in 1996.)  
>  
>Five groups provide daily tracking polls that are available for free:  
>  
>  
>CNN-USA Today-Gallup poll (Wednesday's results: Bush 45 percent, Gore  
>46 percent)  
>  
>Reuters-MSNBC-Zogby poll (Bush 42 percent, Gore 45 percent)  
>  
>Rasmussen's Portrait of America poll (Bush 47 percent, Gore 41  
>percent)  
>  
>Washington Post-ABC News (Bush 46 percent, Gore 46 percent)  
>  
>Voter.com-Battleground poll (Bush 45 percent, Gore 39 percent)  
>  
>Now, that's a lot of reading to do over coffee every morning -- a  
>problem that Peter Orvetti neatly solves with his own website,  
>orvetti.com.  
>  
>Orvetti, a recent Harvard dropout who's worked for  
>NationalJournal.com, summarizes the day's polls in statistics-heavy  
>morning and afternoon updates.  
>"In the first week of October, pageviews tripled, then tripled again  
>in the second, and have doubled each week since then," Orvetti says.  
>"On election night I will be providing rolling coverage, updated every  
>five minutes or so rather than the 30 or 60 minutes it takes the big

>sites to get new returns and projections up on election nights."  
>  
>Voter.com offers a similar service: A "poll center" with writeups of  
>the latest results.  
>  
>But for true statistics buffs, nothing beats crunching the numbers  
>yourself.  
>  
>That usually means a trip to portraitofamerica.com, a data-rich  
>website set up by Rasmussen Research.  
>  
>Rasmussen, a 5-year-old firm, uses an automated dialing system to  
>conduct interviews with whomever answers at randomly chosen phone  
>numbers. The results -- which include surveys such as  
>should-the-feds-break-up-Microsoft in addition to the standard  
>political fare -- usually appear on their website the following day.  
>  
>"It's been picking up dramatically," says company President Scott  
>Rasmussen about the traffic to his website, which he says went online  
>in its current form in early 1999.  
>  
>"We expect in this month we'll hit about 3 million page views. In  
>September we were about a million and a half (and) about 300,000 in  
>June," Rasmussen says.  
>  
>"We have been dramatically upgrading our website as best we can," he  
>says. "We had some trouble earlier since we were caught off guard by  
>the (increase in) traffic."  
>  
>(On Wednesday, Zogby's website was so overloaded with visitors that it  
>repeatedly coughed up: "HTTP Error 403 / Access Forbidden: Too many  
>users are connected" errors. Other sites reported similar problems in  
>November 1996.)  
>  
>One of the reasons for differences between the polls is that  
>Rasmussen's -- unlike others -- is automated. Another explanation is  
>that his computers don't try to nudge undecided voters toward one  
>candidate or another, which Gallup's human callers intentionally do.  
>  
>And who's likely to win? "We're in a situation now where the race is  
>Bush's to lose," Rasmussen says.  
>  
>Detailed state-by-state polls, updated regularly, is what makes his  
>figures particularly attractive to political buffs.  
>  
>The U.S. president, of course, isn't elected by a direct popular vote,  
>but by winning a majority of the 538 electoral state-by-state votes.  
>It's possible to win the popular vote -- by landslides in states like  
>California and New York -- but lose the presidency, an unusual turn of  
>events that last occurred in 1888.  
>  
>Rasmussen's presidential tracking poll released Wednesday says that  
>Bush has a commanding share -- 220 votes -- of the 270 electoral votes  
>that are required to win. Gore, by contrast, only has 168, and the  
>rest of the states are too close to call.  
>  
>Tracking Rasmussen's numbers every day has become a favorite hobby for

>Michael Frese, a computational physicist and consultant who sends his  
>analysis of Rasmussen's figures to a mailing list of friends and  
>family every day.  
>  
>"I'm just a political junkie. I find it very hard for other people to  
>give me interpretations of the data," says Frese, who holds a  
>doctorate in applied math. "CNN was just on a moment ago telling me  
>about a poll but they only gave me (the totals and) a margin of error.  
>They didn't give me any more information."  
>  
>Frese says he envisions providing people "with a scorecard for  
>election night, so you won't have to rely on NBC or CBS or Fox or  
>whatever you're watching."  
>  
>He also predicts a Bush victory: "If the election were held today, the  
>odds would be 9 out of 10. If the election is held two weeks from now,  
>it's possible for it to drift a good bit because there is some  
>movement in the traditional Democratic strongholds back toward Gore."

---

Date: Sat, 28 Oct 2000 14:38:12 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: AP: Bush Claims Small Electoral Lead  
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010281420290.24346-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---

Copyright 2000 Los Angeles Times

---

<http://www.latimes.com/wires/20001028/tCB00V0862.html>

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Bush Claims Small Electoral Lead

By RON FOURNIER, AP Political Writer

WASHINGTON--George W. Bush has claimed a small lead over Al Gore in the race for electoral votes, with an unusually high number of states up for grabs. The political picture is clouded by two wild cards: Bill Clinton and Ralph Nader.

Ten days before what could be the closest election in generations, Republican and Democrats alike say they can't predict the outcome.

"I have given up trying to look into cloudy crystal balls," said Dawn Clark Netsch, a former Democratic nominee for Illinois governor. She was one of more than 70 political activists and analysts in 24 battleground states interviewed by The Associated Press for an analysis

of the Electoral College race.

As national polls show Bush opening up a small lead in popular opinion, 25 states with 214 electoral votes are solidly in the Texas governor's control or leaning his way -56 votes short of the 270 needed to win the presidency. Eleven states plus the District of Columbia favor the vice president for 179 electoral votes.

That leaves 14 states with 145 electoral votes as tossups, but even that understates the campaign's volatility.

More evidence:

- A half dozen or so states assigned to Bush or Gore would slip into the tossup category with the slightest shift in momentum.

- The totals are a mirror image of where Bush and Gore stood before the first debate Oct. 3, when the vice president was on target for 226 electoral votes to Bush's 175. National polls showed the race even at the time, only a modest difference from where they stand now.

- Nearly one in four voters tell pollsters they still may change their minds about who to back. David Wenzel, a Republican and former mayor of Scranton, Pa., said: "There's a lot of people out there who are not happy with either choice."

Both candidates have their shortcomings, known all too well by their nervous backers.

Speaking of Gore, Democratic analyst Bill Dixon of Wisconsin said: "If there's anything people like less than a politician who knows it all, it's one who lets you know it."

Republican analyst Bill Kraus, who also lives in Wisconsin, said of Bush: "There's the intelligence question. He's not stupid, but he might be ignorant."

Their weaknesses may be why Clinton, a non-candidate, and Nader, a minor candidate, are suddenly playing major roles in the campaign.

Convinced that Gore's campaign is sagging, anxious Democrats are urging Clinton to make the case for staying on course for another four years. "I think it's a no-brainer to have Clinton come in," said Kentucky Democrat Terry McBrayer.

The vice president is cool to the idea because he wants to show voters that he is his own man. He also fears that swing voters don't want to be reminded about Clinton's impeachment, an issue that makes Gore himself vulnerable to character attacks.

Clinton believes he can help Gore and Democratic congressional candidates. He will try to mobilize minorities -a task Gore gladly assigned to him -and plans to visit several states in an eleventh-hour blitz next week.

It's the travel that bothers the vice president. He fears the media will pounce on Clinton's trips, drawing attention from Gore's message and

reminding swing voters about why they might want a change in Washington in a time of prosperity.

Aides say Clinton and Gore hardly speak to each other. Their staffs are gingerly negotiating the president's role, with Gore trying to keep his boss bottled up.

Nader is another problem.

The consumer activist and Green Party candidate doesn't stand a chance of winning the presidency, but polls suggest he cuts into Gore's liberal base in several key states, including Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Oregon, Washington and Wisconsin. Those six states alone add up to 68 electoral votes.

"The election could turn on Ralph Nader," said Gov. Angus King of Maine, an independent who has not endorsed any candidate.

Knowing a good thing when they see it, a moderate GOP group with ties to Bush began airing ads featuring Nader attacking the vice president.

Gore is visiting Nader strongholds such as Madison, Wis., as strategists bank on polls showing that half of Nader's backers don't want to elect Bush.

"I ask you to think how you would feel when you wake up Nov. 8 and Bush has carried Oregon," vice presidential candidate Joe Lieberman told voters Friday.

Both Gore and Bush are campaigning on a larger-than-usual battlefield, much of which is traditionally Democratic turf.

Bush is fighting for his political life in Florida and Gore's grip on must-win California is slipping. If those two states follow their historical tendencies -Florida to Bush and California to Gore -the race will be determined in six closely fought Great Lake states: Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan and Pennsylvania.

Meantime, voters will be fed a steady dose of negative ads, the parties will engineer frenzied get-out-the-vote drives and both campaigns will tweak their end-game strategies.

Gore aides said they may be forced to air their first ads in California if Bush continues to make inroads. The vice president will increase his ad campaign in Tennessee, hoping to stave off an embarrassing loss in his home state. In Ohio, a state now favoring Bush, Gore is considering a last-minute visit and substantial increase in his ad buy.

With money to burn, Bush is increasing his ad campaigns in Maine and Minnesota -two states that had been leaning Gore but are now tossups.

The up-in-the-air quality of this year's race has both campaigns thinking about extraordinary outcomes, such as the prospect of Gore winning the White House by capturing 270 electoral votes but losing to Bush in the popular vote. The last time that happened was in 1888, when

Benjamin Harrison defeated Grover Cleveland.

A more remote possibility is a 269/269 electoral vote tie, which would throw the election into the hands of Congress. That hasn't happened before, though Rutherford B. Hayes beat Samuel Tilden by one electoral vote in 1876.

Nobody is predicting a history-making result. Then again, this seesawing election is not an easy one to predict. That view was echoed by Ted Jelen, a political scientist in Nevada, who said:

"I wouldn't bet a nickel either way."

-----  
EDITOR'S NOTE: Ron Fournier is chief political writer for The Associated Press.

<http://www.latimes.com/wires/20001028/tCB00V0862.html>

-----  
Copyright 2000 Los Angeles Times  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Sat, 28 Oct 2000 18:34:14 -0400  
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>  
Subject: Re: Green Party Net Challenge: Poll This!  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <39FB5466.F2F2F27F@rider.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.51 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win98; U)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
X-Accept-Language: en  
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0010272209001.7966-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

To all those voters who are "swapping votes", a caution: when I was in graduate school, my roommate (who was for Ford) said that he told someone who was voting for Carter, "since our votes will cancel each other out, why don't we both just not vote?" The other person agreed.

The punchline?-- he had made the same agreement with nine other Carter supporters that day!

Frank Rusciano

James Beniger wrote:

> From this report I conclude that, as long as Net culture  
> prevails, for national elections, national polls are going

> to be considerably more accurate than are state polls.

> -- Jim

-----  
> Copyright (c) 2000 The Standard Media International  
-----

> <http://www.thestandard.com/article/display/0,1151,19785,00.html>

> October 27, 2000, 6:55 PM PDT

> Vote Swapping for Gore

> Green Party supporters are trading their votes over the Net with  
> Democrats to help the vice president win the election.

> By Scott Harris

> "Nervous Naderites" who live in hotly contested swing states such as  
> Washington and Michigan are making pledges via the Internet to swap votes  
> with Democrats in Republican havens such as Texas, as traffic zooms on  
> three Web sites promoting the political tactic.

> The strategy, designed to simultaneously promote the Green Party's  
> political goal of achieving 5 percent of the popular vote while enhancing  
> Democratic presidential nominee Al Gore's chances against Republican  
> George W. Bush, has resulted in more than 1,000 swaps so far, according  
> to the creators of Voteexchange.org, NaderTrader.org and  
> Voteswap2000.com.

> None of the sites are sanctioned by the official Green or Democratic  
> parties, but the deals come amid growing concern among both Gore and  
> Nader supporters that their divide could result in a Republican triumph  
> Nov. 7.

> The idea has spurred Internet traffic since Monday, when online magazine  
> Slate published a commentary by American University law professor Jamie  
> Raskin that promoted the idea of a bipartisan alliance between what he  
> called "nervous Naderites" and "despondent Democrats." Unbeknown to  
> Raskin, two exchange sites had already been independently created.

> Steve Yoder, a Washington, D.C., technical writer, launched  
> Voteexchange.org on Oct. 1, and Jeff Cardille, an environmental studies  
> grad student at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, had  
> coincidentally launched NaderTrader the same day Raskin's article  
> appeared.

> By Wednesday, Slate had linked to those sites. Then, inspired by Raskin's  
> article, Jim Cody and Ted Johnson of Los Angeles created Voteswap2000, a  
> site that automatically links voters who buy into the vote-swap idea.  
> Yoder has linked his site to Voteswap2000 because of its automated  
> features. "It's the perfect marriage of the Internet and a close  
> political race," Yoder says.

> By 4 p.m. Friday -- less than 24 hours after its launch -- Voteswap2000  
> had recorded 897 swaps. Yoder says his site, which had generated only  
> four trades before Monday, since has counted an additional 220. Cardille,

> meanwhile, offers no such numbers from NaderTrader, saying his objective  
> is to promote the idea via e-mail among only his trusted friends and  
> family.  
>  
> Traffic to all three sites has soared as the swap concept has spread via  
> the Web. Yoder says his site, which averaged about 400 visits per day  
> before Monday, received 1,200 on Monday, 1,600 on Tuesday, 29,500 on  
> Wednesday and 62,000 Thursday. Cardille says traffic on NaderTrader's  
> went from zero on Monday to 432 on Tuesday, 3,411 on Wednesday and 10,448  
> Thursday.  
>  
> Cardille says his goal is to help the Green Party achieve a 5 percent  
> share of the popular vote, thus ensuring that the fledgling party will  
> receive federal matching funds in 2004 -- and hopefully also capturing a  
> Gore victory in the process.  
>  
> Raskin says it's not so much the vote-swap strategy that he sees as  
> revolutionary but more the enlightened deliberation between voters that  
> the strategy has encouraged. "The Internet becomes something like the  
> Senate or House floor where citizens can engage in a meaningful  
> negotiation about our destiny," he says. "I don't think it's really vote  
> trading, because it's all about people declaring their intentions  
> anyway."  
>

-----  
> Copyright (c) 2000 The Standard Media International  
> -----  
>  
>  
>  
> \*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Sun, 29 Oct 2000 08:28:10 +0000  
From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>  
Reply-To: mkshares@mcs.net  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: [Fwd: VP Gore Thinks Gov. Bush's Ed record stinks-Is He Prepared For  
 Presidency?]  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

Subject: VP Gore Thinks Gov. Bush's Ed record stinks-Is He Prepared For  
 Presidency?  
Date: Mon, 27 Sep 99 17:33:42 EST  
From: theofficialprespolltaker2@hotmail.com  
Reply-To: theofficialprespolltaker2@hotmail.com  
To: officialprespolltaker3@hotmail.com

Hi,

We are an Independent polling company looking to make a

difference in This Critical Election by polling internet voters and citizens, then make those results available to the news media and post them on the internet. Your opinions may sway the undecided voters and put the right guy in the White House.

The Internet Poll question is,  
"Is George W. Bush really prepared to be President,  
or should his past disqualify him?"

The results will be posted on the Internet and sent to a number of news agencies 24 to 48 hours before the election and could make the difference in this very tight race. Although we have no way of knowing, we ask that you leave your opinion only once, otherwise this may be seen as votes when posted and may give one candidate an unfair advantage over the other.

To give your opinion please call 1-900-226-0388.

If response is strong, a question will be asked about V.P. Al Gore and his fitness to be president during the last week of the election. You may suggest a question to be asked when You give Your opinion About Gov. Bush. One will be chosen from Your responses.

There is a charge of \$1.99 per minute to leave your opinion, a very small price to be heard and to have an opportunity to influence this critical election.

\*\*\*\*\*

This message is sent  
in compliance of the proposed bill: SECTION- 301.  
Per Section-- 301, Paragraph (a) (2) (C) of S. 1618,  
further transmissions to you by the sender of this  
email may be stopped at no cost to you by sending a

reply to this email address with the word remove in the subject line. This message is not intended for residents in the State of Washington, screening of addresses has been done to the best of our technical ability. If you are a Washington, Virginia, or California resident or otherwise wish to be removed by sending a reply to mstrsrvcs@mailme.org with the word remove in the subject line.

\*\*\*\*\*

--3--Winner

=====  
Date: Sun, 29 Oct 2000 18:38:54 -0500  
To: "SRMSNet" <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>, "allstat" <allstat@mailbase.ac.uk>, "AAPORNET" <AAPORNET@usc.edu>  
From: "David A. Binder" <binddav@statcan.ca>  
Subject: Statistics Canada Symposium 2001  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id PAA24260

CALL FOR PAPERS

Achieving Data Quality in a Statistical Agency : a Methodological Perspective  
October 17-19, 2001  
XVIIIth International Symposium on Methodological Issues  
Statistics Canada

With its eighteenth annual symposium, Statistics Canada continues its successful series of conferences on methodological issues, attracting renowned statisticians, researchers, academics, and data analysts and others interested in meeting the challenges of a statistical agency. Symposium 2001 will feature both invited and contributed sessions, and will provide an ideal forum for exchanging your experiences and knowledge of methods to achieve data quality. Papers of this conference will be published in the proceedings of the Symposium.

We invite abstracts of 200 to 300 words for contributed papers. We are especially interested in papers that present innovative methods to meet the challenges of data quality, especially from the perspective of data accuracy. Your abstract (English or French) should include the presenter's name, affiliation, address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address. The deadline is December 1, 2000. Send yours to:

Simon Cheung, Symposium 2001 Co-ordinator  
16th Floor, R.H. Coats Building, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Canada, K1A 0T6  
E-mail: symposium2001@statcan.ca Telephone: (613) 951-1482 Fax: (613) 951-3100

The symposium will be held at the Palais des congrès in Hull, Quebec, just

minutes away from downtown Ottawa. Examples of possible topics for the Symposium are listed below.

Registers and Frames: construction and maintenance, coverage and quality evaluation, dealing with imperfect frames

Sample Design: complex survey redesign, multi-phase sampling, area sampling, sample rotation, robustness over time, respondent burden, longitudinal surveys, co-ordinating samples between surveys, sampling rare or elusive population, RDD sampling, sampling for non-response

Data Collection and Capture: new technologies for quality control of collection and capture, mixed-mode collection, interviewer effects, re-interview and response evaluation, measurement errors, cognitive aspects, questionnaire design, reducing non-response, controlling response error, selective follow-up, remote sensing, data scanning and recognition, internet survey

Data Processing: selective editing, graphical editing, macro editing, new coding and editing technologies, new imputation methods

Estimation: estimation of level, change, trend or complex indices, use of auxiliary information, weighting, small area methods, model-assisted methods, combining data across time and space, calibration methods, mass imputation, variance estimation and in the presence of imputed data, outliers, use of measurement scales, coherence and integration with external information, data calendarization and benchmarking, projection and advance statistics

Data Analysis and Dissemination: analysis of data from complex surveys, modelling with survey data, quality evaluation, accuracy measurement, effects of survey errors, impact of disclosure control, communicating data quality

Sector-specific: censuses, surveys of households, individuals, institutions, businesses, agriculture, and the environment, price indexes, system of national accounts

Cross-cutting Issues: survey integration and harmonisation, international comparisons, derived products, meta-analysis, use of administrative data, record linkage, statistical matching, time series methods, tools for survey design and data processing

Visit our Web site:

<http://www.statcan.ca/english/conferences/symposium2001/index.htm>

---

|                                 |                              |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| David A. Binder                 | binddav@statcan.ca           |
| Methodology Branch              | davidbinder@home.com         |
| 120 Parkdale Avenue             | az004@ncf.ca                 |
| R.H. Coats Building 3-0         | TEL: 1-613-951-0980 (Office) |
| Statistics Canada               | 1-613-226-7292 (Home)        |
| Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA K1A 0T6 | FAX: 1-613-951-5711          |

=====  
Date: Sun, 29 Oct 2000 19:59:47 -0500  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Volatile polls Op-Ed in NY Times  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The following appeared in the New York Times today.

/-----\

The Myth of the Volatile Voter  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2000/10/29/opinion/29PLIS.html>

October 29, 2000

By MARTIN PLISSNER

WASHINGTON A week of volatility in the public," Bernard Shaw of CNN concluded Thursday afternoon as George W. Bush's lead over Al Gore in the CNN-USA Today Gallup "tracking" poll soared to 7 percentage points.

The week had begun with the poll showing Governor Bush trouncing Vice President Gore by 9 points, about the same margin Bill Clinton dispatched Bob Dole by four years ago. By 5 o'clock Monday afternoon, however, the Bush lead had slipped to a mere two points. On Tuesday and Wednesday, it was dead even, and then came that 7 points on Thursday. To cap off the week, on Friday Gallup had Mr. Bush soaring toward a 52 percent to 39 percent landslide.

This roller coaster ride is not confined to Gallup, still the polling brand name most familiar to the public. During a relatively uneventful eight days, ending Sept. 22, a 14-point Bush landslide in the first of a series of Newsweek polls melted away to 2 points at the end. And the variations on many days among the multitude of different polls in point spread and even in who is leading have become a subject of as much derision as the deceptive claims of the candidates in this year's election season.

Like the candidates, the pollsters naturally hold themselves blameless. Seldom in their accounting for day-to-day and poll-to-poll disparities do you hear a word about the inherent fuzziness (to borrow a word from Governor Bush) of their own numbers. The fuzziness, they imply, is all in the heads of an insufficiently attentive and caring public, especially this year's reigning suspect as the source of all volatility: independent women. "They bounce around," says Frank Newport, Gallup's executive editor, "depending on the last thing they heard on the news."

Neither Gallup, of course, nor most of the other survey

researchers struggling to cope with this supposed pogo-stick behavior are fly-by-night operators. The polling organizations are run for the most part by veteran professionals who identify their surveys as "scientific" to distinguish themselves from competitors who use less refined methodologies, and this year, as in the past, they will assure you they are doing everything perfectly right.

How can this be true and still yield the wildly swinging results we are seeing? Well, there are, of course, those flighty independent women. But, much more to the point, there is sampling error. Plus or minus 3 or 4 percentage points are the figures commonly posted for this error in an overall sample of "likely voters." What the public is seldom being told in this election season is that the potential range of error applies separately to the numbers for both Mr. Bush and Mr. Gore.

What this means is that the spread between the candidates, which is all that anybody talks about, can be off by as much as 8 percentage points and that discrepancy can still be "within sampling error." And that's before you factor in the error, impossible to calculate, arising from the fact that as few as a third of the targeted respondents in the scientific model may have been reached and induced to answer questions.

It is in the tonier, "in-depth" analytical reporting in the press, even more than in the down-to-earth horse-race stories about the campaign, that you get the greatest exposure to sampling error. Take the incessant breakouts on the voting intentions of men and women. Here the size of each group is half of the full sample, and the sampling error on the Bush-Gore spread grows from, say, 8 percent to 11 or 12 percent.

Out of that, and perhaps some other things as well, you get such howlers as the discrepancy at the close of the Democratic convention between Gallup's figures and those of Newsweek's Princeton Survey Research. In polls a day apart, Newsweek had Mr. Gore ahead of Mr. Bush among likely male voters, while Gallup had Mr. Bush ahead by 19 points. Or consider a recent USA Today story that attributed a sudden overall shift in its Gallup tracking poll to "independent voters, mainly women." The sampling error on the Bush-Gore margin in that poll's sub-sample of independent women would be in the neighborhood of 16 points.

On Nov. 7, of course, the deplorably unstable subjects of all this scientific research will register the final bounce, and this gives the entire polling industry reason to be deeply worried. The business world spends zillions of dollars a year for surveys of the choices Americans are likely to make on all sorts of things, with little hard evidence of the relation to reality of the research they are paying for. The nearest thing there is to an objective check on the validity of opinion surveys comes once every four years with the final polls before a presidential election.

Four years ago there were sizable differences between what the final polls predicted and the actual election results with most of the polls, as it happened, overstating the Clinton margin. Though this evoked some grumbling from Republicans, it got

relatively little attention from the general public, since Mr. Clinton did in fact win quite comfortably. The National Council of Public Polls, the vigilant watchdog of polling's image, soon put out a report thick with tables purporting to show that 1996 had been one of the industry's "best years ever" in forecasting an election outcome.

In the much closer election that may be coming, discrepancies on the order of those in 1996, if they went, on balance, the wrong way, could be very bad for business. In over half a century, only one final poll has ever come down on the wrong side of a presidential election, but the closer the election, the greater the risk. This year it's not just the politicians who have reason to be nervous.

Martin J. Plissner is the former executive political director of CBS News. He is the author of "The Control Room: How Television Calls the Shots in Presidential Elections."

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

```
=====
Date: Sun, 29 Oct 2000 21:48:43 EST
From: Dcolasanto@aol.com
Received: from Dcolasanto@aol.com
        by imo-r05.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.32.) id 5.61.87431e6 (7042)
        for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 29 Oct 2000 21:48:44 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <61.87431e6.272e3b8b@aol.com>
Subject: Call for Nominations-- POQ Editor
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Windows AOL sub 124
```

October 30, 2000

The Advisory Board of Public Opinion Quarterly is beginning its search for the next Editor of POQ. A subcommittee co-chaired by Scott Keeter and Diane Colasanto is seeking nominations for candidates. Stanley Presser and Vincent Price, POQ's current editor, are also members of the committee.

Qualified candidates will have a strong record of research and publication about public opinion theory or methods and will also have good management skills. The committee would welcome statements in support of nominees, but these are not required. In fact, the committee is more than happy to receive name-only nominations. Individuals should feel free to nominate themselves if they are interested in the position.

Editors are usually appointed for a term of 4 years, and their host institutions receive money from AAPOR to pay for an office manager, supplies and other expenses associated with editing the journal. The new Editor's term will begin during the summer of 2001.

The committee will begin considering nominations at its next meeting on November 14. Nominations should be sent to Diane Colasanto at dcolasanto@aol.com or:

Princeton Survey Research Associates  
911 Commons Way  
Princeton, NJ 08540

=====  
Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 07:20:43 -0500  
From: Lori\_Cook@bcbsme.com  
Received: by notesext.ahsme.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.7 (934.1 12-30-1999))  
id  
85256988.0043D6C0 ; Mon, 30 Oct 2000 07:20:58 -0500  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: BCBSME  
To: aapornet@vm.usc.edu  
Message-ID: <85256988.0043D581.00@notesext.ahsme.com>  
Subject: New England Chapter: Post-Election Panel  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Disposition: inline

In honour of the fall election season, The New England Chapter of AAPOR is sponsoring a post-election panel to sift through the results of what promises to be the closest election outcome in decades. Please join us.

POST ELECTION PANEL - November 9th, 2000

Date: Thursday, November 9, 2000

Time: 12:30 - 2 pm (light lunch will be served)

Location: Abt Associates  
(tentative) 55 Wheeler Street  
Cambridge, MA

Cost: Free to Chapter members; \$8 for non-members; \$4 for students

Panelists:

John Gorman, President, Opinion Dynamics (Pollster for the Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll)

R.D. Sahl, News Anchor of New England Cable News (NECN)

Wayne Woodlief, Op-ed political columnist, Boston Herald

Space will be limited and so you are urged to RSVP by Friday November 3rd to ensure a seat.

RSVP to Lori Cook at [Lori\\_Cook@bcbsme.com](mailto:Lori_Cook@bcbsme.com)

=====  
Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 09:16:47 -0500  
From: "Christine Kreider" <ckmarg@mint.net>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: New England Chapter: Post-Election Panel  
Message-ID: <LPBBJMECHCAHECCMFKEPKEEACDAA.ckmarg@mint.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
In-Reply-To: <85256988.0043D581.00@notesext.ahsme.com>  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

HI Lori --

Can't make it to the panel -- but can you have membership stuff sent to me?  
I keep falling out of NE membership.

How are you doing amidst the changes?

Christine E. Kreider, MPA  
Kreider Research & Consulting  
P.O. Box 272 85 Main Street  
Orono, ME 04473  
(207) 866-5912  
fax (877) 311 - 7839  
ckreider@mint.net

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of  
Lori\_Cook@bcbsme.com  
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2000 7:21 AM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: New England Chapter: Post-Election Panel

In honour of the fall election season, The New England Chapter of AAPOR is  
sponsoring a post-election panel to sift through the results of what  
promises to  
be the closest election outcome in decades. Please  
join us.

POST ELECTION PANEL - November 9th, 2000

Date: Thursday, November 9, 2000

Time: 12:30 - 2 pm (light lunch will be served)

Location: Abt Associates  
(tentative) 55 Wheeler Street  
Cambridge, MA

Cost: Free to Chapter members; \$8 for non-members; \$4 for students

Panelists:

John Gorman, President, Opinion Dynamics (Pollster for the Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll)

R.D. Sahl, News Anchor of New England Cable News (NECN)

Wayne Woodlief, Op-ed political columnist, Boston Herald

Space will be limited and so you are urged to RSVP by Friday November 3rd to ensure a seat.

RSVP to Lori Cook at [Lori\\_Cook@bcbsme.com](mailto:Lori_Cook@bcbsme.com)

=====  
Date: 30 Oct 2000 10:49:33 -0500  
Message-ID: <-1239219525j\_stanford@osba-ohio.org>  
Sender: John Stanford <j\_stanford@osba-ohio.org>  
From: John Stanford <j\_stanford@osba-ohio.org>  
Subject: Recent Ohio Poll  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
X-Mailer: QuickMail Pro 2.0.4 (Mac)  
X-Priority: 3  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Reply-To: John Stanford <j\_stanford@osba-ohio.org>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id HAA03038

Campaign 2000  
OSU POLL HAS PLUSES FOR BOTH GORE, BUSH

Thursday, October 26, 2000  
NEWS 09C

By Jonathan Riskind  
Dispatch Washington Bureau Chief

A poll released yesterday by Ohio State University's Center for Survey Research shows Democratic presidential contender Al Gore with a 2 percentage-point lead in Ohio over Republican George W. Bush.

The telephone poll of 1,037 registered voters from Oct. 2 through Monday has Gore ahead of Bush 45 percent to 43 percent, with 7 percent undecided.

However, support for Bush was growing during the final two weeks of the survey

period.

And Bush had a somewhat higher percentage of supporters who say they are very interested in the election, indicating that the Texas governor may have an easier time getting his backers to vote on Election Day, Nov. 7.

The survey indicates undecided voters may not play as large a role in the election as predicted, said Lewis Horner, research associate at the center.

Undecided voters displayed less interest in the campaign and were less likely to say they will vote, the poll discovered.

"Given these results, it is very possible that many undecided voters will not go to the polls at all," he said.

That would magnify the drive by the Bush and Gore campaigns to turn out their base supporters.

The poll also shows incumbent Republican U.S. Sen. Mike DeWine ahead of his Democratic challenger, Ted Celeste, by 50 percent to 36 percent.

The poll's margin of sampling error is 3 percentage points.

-- Darrel Rowland

Tiberi, O'Shaughnessy

raking in campaign cash

Money continues to roll into the campaign coffers of the major-party candidates in the 12th Congressional District contest.

Republican Pat Tiberi raised \$208,590 between Oct. 1 and Oct. 18, according to a report submitted to the Federal Election Commission.

Democrat Maryellen O'Shaughnessy took in \$111,113 during that period, her campaign report says.

That brings the total raised by Tiberi, a state representative from Columbus, to more than \$2.1 million for his bid to replace outgoing Rep. John R. Kasich, R-Westerville. That includes about \$800,000 Tiberi spent to win a GOP primary earlier this year.

Meanwhile, O'Shaughnessy, a Columbus City Council member, has now reaped about \$1.2 million for her campaign. O'Shaughnessy did not have a serious Democratic primary opponent.

Once Tiberi's primary spending is taken into account, each candidate has raised about the same amount for the general election. However, Tiberi had \$535,343 on hand as of Oct. 18, compared with \$102,902 for O'Shaughnessy.

The money spent by the two candidates doesn't include hundreds of thousands of dollars spent by outside interest groups for advertising and literature.

-- Jonathan Riskind

---

Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 11:52:36 -0500  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: New England Chapter: Post-Election Panel  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2651.58)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"

Lori,

I'd like to attend but my schedule won't allow me to come that day. However, now that I am based in NYC I hope to have more chances to attend NEAAPOR meetings. Thanks.

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

From: Lori\_Cook@bcbsme.com [mailto:Lori\_Cook@bcbsme.com]  
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2000 7:21 AM  
To: aapornet@vm.usc.edu  
Subject: New England Chapter: Post-Election Panel

In honour of the fall election season, The New England Chapter of AAPOR is sponsoring a post-election panel to sift through the results of what promises to be the closest election outcome in decades. Please join us.

POST ELECTION PANEL - November 9th, 2000

Date: Thursday, November 9, 2000

Time: 12:30 - 2 pm (light lunch will be served)

Location: Abt Associates  
(tentative) 55 Wheeler Street  
Cambridge, MA

Cost: Free to Chapter members; \$8 for non-members; \$4 for students

Panelists:

John Gorman, President, Opinion Dynamics (Pollster for the Fox News/Opinion

Dynamics Poll)

R.D. Sahl, News Anchor of New England Cable News (NECN)

Wayne Woodlief, Op-ed political columnist, Boston Herald

Space will be limited and so you are urged to RSVP by Friday November 3rd to ensure a seat.

RSVP to Lori Cook at [Lori\\_Cook@bcbsme.com](mailto:Lori_Cook@bcbsme.com)

---

Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 12:25:17 +0000  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mkshares@mcs.net](mailto:mkshares@mcs.net)>  
Reply-To: [mkshares@mcs.net](mailto:mkshares@mcs.net)  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)  
Subject: Clinton  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

OK. So Clinton can't be out there with a high profile campaign on behalf of Gore. He would diminish Gore's stature .

So why isn't he out campaigning for Senate candidates in swing states, races such as Dayton in MN and Stabenow in MI? There may be more like these states.

Getting Democratic votes for Senate candidatis in these states should be equivalent to helping Gore.

---

Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 14:54:05 -0500  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <[hferienberg@stats.org](mailto:hferienberg@stats.org)>  
To: <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Subject: USA Today: The problem with poll stories? They are often wrong  
Message-ID: <000201c042ab\$9fc67c40\$3a24accf@howard>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

The problem with poll stories? They are often wrong  
By Stephen Hess  
<http://www.brookings.edu/GS/Projects/HessReport/week8.htm>

you would  
Republican  
close to  
Bradley in the

Had you been watching the CBS Evening News on Jan. 31, have heard Dan Rather say the race in New Hampshire's primary between George W. Bush and John McCain was "'too call,'" and Al Gore had "'a comfortable lead'" over Bill Democratic primary.

slipped past  
wouldn't have been

The next day, McCain trounced Bush, and Gore barely Bradley. If you hadn't listened to the news media, you misinformed.

reported on how  
victory; Bob  
trounced McCain.

The Republicans went on to South Carolina. Phil Jones "'crossover voters'" are expected to produce a McCain Schieffer told us it was "'dead even.'" The next day Bush

only a snapshot of the  
minute. Or lie.

On to Michigan. Again, the polls were wrong.

After each fiasco, journalists explain that polls are moment. People change their minds. Or decide at the last

concerned

But I'm not so concerned about the accuracy of polls. I'm about journalists using polls to frame their stories.

---

Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 15:38:17 -0500  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "Nelson, Sean" <Sean\_Nelson@TVRatings.com>, "Feeney, Kelly"  
Subject: Methodological Research opening at Nielsen Media Research  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2651.58)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Nielsen Media Research (NMR) is seeking applicants for an open salaried position either at the level of Senior Research Analyst I or Senior Research Analyst II.

The position is full-time within NMR's Methodological Research Department and is located in our Tampa (Dunedin) Florida office.

DESCRIPTION

This position is responsible for preparing and conducting moderately to highly complex research projects. The main objectives of this position are to:

- \* Contribute to the initiation of research ideas.
- \* Assist in the design and planning of research projects.
- \* Execute data collection and data analysis activities for research projects.
- \* Provide cost detail on research projects.
- \* Train associates in procedures used to conduct research projects.

\*  
\*

\* REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS:

\*

\* B.S./B.A. in Marketing Research, Social Sciences, Statistics or equivalent. 4 years experience directly related to research.

\* Extensive knowledge of:

\* Mechanics of research design for telephone, mail and in-person including response rates and use of incentives.

\* Questionnaire construction and flowcharting.

\* Sampling methods for various data collection approaches

\* Data analysis including coding and editing of raw data, weighting and tabulation (cross-tabulation, cumulative tabulation), summary measures for research data (mean, median, standard deviation, etc.)

\*  
\*

\* DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS:

\*

\* General media industry knowledge.

\* Knowledge of project costing procedures.

Interested parties should contact Kelly Feeney, Nielsen Media Research, 375 Patricia Avenue, Dunedin, FL 34698-8190; Office: 727-738-3476; Fax: 727-738-3012; Email: FeeneyK@TVRatings.com <mailto:FeeneyK@TVRatings.com>

Please indicate JOB POSTING #KF81500SRA on all correspondence.

NMR strongly encourages the application of women and minorities to all open positions.

\*\*\*\*\*

Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.  
Vice President & Senior Research Methodologist  
NIELSEN MEDIA RESEARCH  
299 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10171  
OFFICE/VOICE: 212-708-7002  
FAX: 212-708-7013  
HOME: 740-587-0223

\*\*\*\*\*

=====

Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 15:56:58 -0500  
From: MSaxon@jup.com  
Received: from nyc-ex01.jup.com (nyc-ex01xt.jup.com [209.246.40.30])  
by mail.jupmail.com (Build 91 (devel) 8.9.3/NT-8.9.3) with ESMTTP id  
QAA20555  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 30 Oct 2000 16:10:44 -0500  
Received: by nyc-ex01.jup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)  
id <VHSJBA8W>; Mon, 30 Oct 2000 15:56:59 -0500  
Message-ID: <97F990776A73D31180960090279C181602A42D35@nyc-ex01.jup.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Survey research opening at Jupiter Research  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Jupiter Research, a company of Jupiter Media Metrix, is seeking a full-time experienced survey analyst to join our Data Research Group. The position is located at our corporate headquarters in NYC. If you're interested, please forward your resume to our HR department contact listed below.

Data Analyst

Responsibilities:

- 1) Direct primary research efforts in the US for Jupiter. Duties include survey design, management of research vendors, data analysis, survey interpretation and writing-up results. Manage dozens of surveys each year relating to consumers, the Internet, and technology.
- 2) Help write several annual studies relating to consumer usage of the internet
- 3) Work with Jupiter analysts to describe and interpret data in Jupiter's published research Reports, to industry press, and at Jupiter Conferences.
- 4) Help coordinate Jupiter's US and International research initiatives.

Requirements:

- 1) Experience with managing research vendor relationships, multivariate statistics, and report writing essential. Experience managing projects and staff also critical.
- 2) Background in exploring the attitudes, behaviors, and characteristics of consumers and technology preferred.
- 3) A highly motivated and creative individual able to excel in a dynamic, entrepreneurial environment
- 4) 4 years+ experience as a professional market researcher

Contact: Corinne Pallotta

Job Code: DA

Email: careers@jup.com

Address: 627 Broadway

New York, NY 10012

212-780-6060

Fax: 212-780-5219

No calls or unscheduled visits please.

Michael Saxon | Research Director, Primary Research |  
Jupiter Research | 21 Astor Place | New York, NY 10003 |  
Voice: 917-534-6315 | Fax: 917-534-6812 | <http://www.jup.com>

=====  
Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2000 16:38:12 -0800  
From: "Stuart Sobel" <stUARTsobel@visto.com>  
Subject: EmploymentOpportunity  
X-Mailer: Visto  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Visto Server  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id QAA27206

FIELD INTERVIEW MANAGER

The March of Dimes' California Birth Defects Monitoring Program in Oakland, CA (near San Francisco) is a nationally recognized program devoted to finding the causes of birth defects. To this end the Program:

- . Maintains a birth defects registry of babies born with a medically-significant, structural birth defect
- . Conducts large interview studies to gather information about factors which may be associated with birth defects
- . Monitors rates and trends
- . Responds to community concerns about birth defects and the environment

We are looking for an experienced Field Interviewer Manager to direct our surveys of mothers of children born with birth defects. You will implement data collection procedures and protocols to ensure study goals are effectively met, including:

- &#61692; Work with research scientists to help develop and test survey questionnaires
- &#61692; Monitor and analyze survey progress and propose strategies to improve progress and increase response rates
- &#61692; Supervise day-to-day activities of home-based interviewers, including assignment of cases, monitoring telephone or in-person interviews in progress
- &#61692; Perform quality control of interviews and the overall survey process
- &#61692; Hire and train new interviewers
- &#61692; Direct tracking and tracing activities
- &#61692; Meet with interviewers on individual and group basis to discuss ways to improve quality and efficiency
- &#61692; Meet with research scientists to discuss ways to improve survey methods
- &#61692; Identify and possibly implement alternative methods of data gathering

The position requires a minimum of 3 years experience managing research survey staff as described above. Previous experience with interviewing or interviewer supervision is desirable. Experience with computer assisted interviewing (CATI/CAPI) is preferred (or at least computer literacy and willingness to learn this technology). Knowledge of alternative methods of data gathering such as focus groups, etc. Experience in a scientific environment is a plus. Periodic travel throughout California is also required.

We offer a collegial, team oriented work environment with sane schedules and flexible hours. Highly competitive salary, 18% additional for selection of benefits or cash, generous paid time off.

Email resume to [careers@cbdmp.org](mailto:careers@cbdmp.org) Fax to [Careers@CBDMP](mailto:Careers@CBDMP) (510) 434-5393, or mail to California Birth Defects Monitoring Program, Attn: Careers, 1830 Embarcadero, Suite 100, Oakland, CA 94606. EOE/AA

---

Visit <http://www.visto.com/info>, your free web-based communications center. Visto.com. Life on the Dot.

---

Date: Tue, 31 Oct 2000 10:47:57 -0600  
From: "Rademacher, Eric (RADEMAEW)" <[RADEMAEW@UCMAIL.UC.EDU](mailto:RADEMAEW@UCMAIL.UC.EDU)>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Subject: Jo Opportunities at the University of Cincinnati  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Listed below are two job opportunities at the University of Cincinnati's Institute for Policy Research.

Please respond to the addresses listed below and apologies for any cross-posting.

Eric

Eric Rademacher  
Director, Ohio Poll Public Polling  
University of Cincinnati  
Institute for Policy Research

PHONE: (513) 556-3304  
FAX: (513) 556-9023

JOB OPPORTUNITIES:  
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE (PROJECT MANAGER)  
INSTITUTE FOR POLICY RESEARCH (IPR), UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI  
CONTROL #: 20UC6141

(RESUMES ACCEPTED UNTIL FILLED)

Serve as project manager for survey research projects and other social/health sciences research projects of the IPR. Responsible for the daily operation of multiple research projects; assist with the planning, design and administration of ongoing survey projects and programs of the IPR; and recommend appropriate research and data analysis methodologies suitable to client needs. Min. Quals.: Bachelor's degree and 2-3 yrs. survey research experience or an equivalent combination of edu./exp. is necessary. The ideal candidate will have strong organizational/project management skills; familiarity with research design/quantitative research methods; demonstrated training; strong written/oral communication skills; and familiarity with data management software (e.g. Access, SAS, SPSS). Salary will be commensurate with experience and qualifications. Send resumes (noting control #) to:

Alfred J. Tuchfarber, PhD, Director  
Institute for Policy Research  
University of Cincinnati  
PO Box 210132  
Cincinnati OH 45221-0132

phone: 513-556-5080  
fax: 513-556-9023  
email: Alfred.Tuchfarber@uc.edu

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE  
INSTITUTE FOR POLICY RESEARCH (IPR), UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI  
CONTROL #: 20UC6142

Seeking an experienced survey research professional to assist with the ongoing survey projects and programs of the IPR including coding/data management; and provide programming support for data analysis and file maintenance. Min. Quals.: Bachelor's degree and 2-3 yrs. survey research experience or an equivalent combination of edu./exp. is necessary. The ideal candidate will have demonstrated exp. with data base management; ability to design/write/modify complex statistical programs; familiar with data management software (e.g., Access, SAS, SPSS); demonstrated training/exp. in survey research; steadily increasing exp./responsibility in survey-based research; and strong oral/written communication and interpersonal skills. Salary will be commensurate with experience and qualifications. Send letter (noting control #), resume and 3 or more names of references to:

Alfred J. Tuchfarber, PhD, Director  
Institute for Policy Research  
University of Cincinnati  
PO Box 210132  
Cincinnati OH 45221-0132

phone: 513-556-5080  
fax: 513-556-9023  
email: Alfred.Tuchfarber@uc.edu

=====  
Date: Tue, 31 Oct 2000 12:24:02 -0500  
From: "Clare Sherlock" <csherlock@technometrica.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Announcing the TIPP daily presidential tracking poll  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0129\_01C04335.7423BA00"  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0129\_01C04335.7423BA00  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence, is the polling =  
partner of  
two national publications: Investors Business Daily and the Christian  
Science Monitor. TIPP began tracking the presidential race on a weekly  
basis starting the first week of October, and yesterday began daily =  
tracking.  
The daily tracking poll shows the most recent 3 days of collection, with  
a sample size of approximately 800-1000 likely voters.

We will be publishing the results of our daily tracking poll up until =  
the  
election. The results will be released every day at 11:30 am on our =  
website  
<http://www.tipponline.com> The results will also be released to AP and =  
the  
[pollingreport.com](http://pollingreport.com). If anyone is interested in receiving the results, =  
please  
email me and we'll be glad to put you on our emailing list.

In case you're not familiar with TIPP, we've made several significant  
contributions in this year's presidential race:

1) we developed the IBD/TIPP MetaPoll, the only poll of its kind, which  
consolidates all leading national polls, weighting for accuracy, polling  
population and recentness. The MetaPoll has been published weekly in =  
IBD  
(Investors Business Daily) since May 2000.

2) we were the first to bring to light (Sept 25, 2000) media bias in the coverage of the race with our partner publication Editor & Publisher magazine. The article that appeared in E&P set off a chain of stories = in leading publications such as USA Today, the Boston Globe, the Washington Post, etc.

3) we were also the first to publish a thorough analysis of the Investor Class, in what is viewed by many as groundbreaking work that set off a flurry of interest in this important voting bloc.

Our first-day, baseline results for Monday, 10/30/00 are as follows. = Two articles, one in IBD and one in the Monitor, appear tomorrow.

Bush 47%  
Gore 41%  
Nader 3%  
Buchanan 1%  
Other 1%  
Undecided 8%

Sample size 739 Likely Voters. The poll was conducted between Thursday 10/26 and Sunday 10/29 and has a margin of error of +/- 4 percentage = points.

Results for Tuesday 10/31 are:

Bush 49%  
Gore 40%  
Nader 3%  
Buchanan 1%  
Other 1%  
Undecided 7%

Sample size 795 Likely Voters. The poll was conducted between 10/28 and = 10/30 and has a margin of error of +/- 3.5 percentage points.

More information on this and earlier polls can be found on our website = at [www.tipponline.com](http://www.tipponline.com)

Clare Sherlock  
Vice President  
TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence/TIPP  
201-986-1288  
[csherlock@technometrica.com](mailto:csherlock@technometrica.com)

---

Clare Sherlock  
Vice President  
TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence  
690 Kinderkamack Rd., Suite 102

Oradell, NJ 07649  
201-986-1288  
www.technometrica.com

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0129\_01C04335.7423BA00  
Content-Type: text/html;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META content=3D"text/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1" =
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.00.2919.6307" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market =
Intelligence,=20
is the polling partner of<BR>two national publications:&nbsp; Investors =
Business=20
Daily and the Christian<BR>Science Monitor.&nbsp; TIPP began tracking =
the=20
presidential race on a weekly<BR>basis starting the first week of =
October, and=20
yesterday began daily tracking.<BR>The daily tracking poll shows the =
most recent=20
3 days of collection, with<BR>a sample size of approximately 800-1000 =
likely=20
voters.<BR><BR>We will be publishing the results of our daily tracking =
poll up=20
until the<BR>election.&nbsp; The results will be released every day at =
11:30 am=20
on our website<BR><A=20
href=3D"http://www.tipponline.com">http://www.tipponline.com</A>&nbsp; =
The results=20
will also be released to AP and the<BR>pollingreport.com.&nbsp; If =
anyone is=20
interested in receiving the results, please<BR>email me and we'll be =
glad to put=20
you on our emailing list.<BR><BR>In case you're not familiar with TIPP, =
we've=20
made several significant<BR>contributions in this year's presidential=20
race:<BR><BR>1) we developed the IBD/TIPP MetaPoll, the only poll of its =
kind,=20
which<BR>consolidates all leading national polls, weighting for =
accuracy,=20
polling<BR>population and recentness.&nbsp; The MetaPoll has been =
published=20
weekly in IBD<BR>(Investors Business Daily) since May 2000.<BR><BR>2) we =
were=20
the first to bring to light (Sept 25, 2000) media bias in =
the<BR>coverage of the=20
race with our partner publication Editor & =
Publisher<BR>magazine.&nbsp; The=20
article that appeared in E&P set off a chain of stories =
in<BR>leading=20
```

publications such as USA Today, the Boston Globe, the Washington Post, etc. we were also the first to publish a thorough analysis of the Investor Class, in what is viewed by many as groundbreaking work that set off a flurry of interest in this important voting bloc. Our first-day baseline results for Monday, 10/30/00 are as follows. Two articles, one in IBD and one in the Monitor, appear tomorrow. Bush 47% Gore 41% Nader 3% Buchanan 1% Other 1% Undecided 8%

Sample size 739 Likely Voters. The poll was conducted between Thursday 10/26 and Sunday 10/29 and has a margin of error of +/- 4 percentage points.

Results for Tuesday 10/31 are:

Bush 49% Gore 40% Nader 3% Buchanan 1% Other 1% Undecided 7%

Sample size 795 Likely Voters. The poll was conducted between 10/28 and 10/30 and has a margin of error of +/- 3.5 percentage points. More information on this and earlier polls can be found on our website at [www.tipponline.com](http://www.tipponline.com)

[www.tipponline.com](mailto:csherlock@technometrica.com) Clare Sherlock Vice President TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence/TIPP 201-986-1288 [csherlock@technometrica.com](mailto:csherlock@technometrica.com)

Clare Sherlock Vice President TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence 690 Kinderkamack Rd., Suite 102 Oradell, NJ 07649 201-986-1288 [www.technometrica.com](http://www.technometrica.com)

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0129\_01C04335.7423BA00--

---

Date: Tue, 31 Oct 2000 13:54:20 -0500  
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Grassroots vs. establishment?  
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBMEMGCMAA.mark@bisconti.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

For those interested, below are 4 items I've received showing some different lines of thought about Nader and the Greens.

Some thoughts: I get the impression (from conversations with Greens and other activists) that committed Nader people feel they would rather be "sold out" by a clearly defined enemy (Bush) than by a "so-called friend" (Gore)-in both cases they'll have to fight just as hard, and revenues may roll in faster to their causes with a perceived threat. In addition, some believe Carol Browner at EPA has been "as bad, or worse," than when EPA was managed by Republicans-but has escaped the scrutiny that Republicans would have gotten from Democrats. This looks like a struggle between grassroots and establishment/insider people.

The same dynamic seems to have appeared on many issues, not just the environment. ACT UP, for example, is very critical of Human Rights Campaign for their insider and elitist top-down decision-making style. HRC is accused of not being diverse enough in positions of power within their organization. This accusation has been made by environmental justice groups against "mainstream" environmental groups also. One ACT UP member told me he would vote Bush over Gore if Nader didn't run.

Juxtapose these perspectives: The Center for Policy Attitudes found 75% of U.S. adults felt the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves. And a Pew Research study found 59% of young people think things will be the same regardless of who wins the 2000 Presidential election (compared to 40% older people).

I suppose many Nader people feel they must take "radical" action to shake up an establishment that has become too comfortable with ruling and treating the grassroots with what they perceive as disrespect. I imagine my friends who are Bush supporters are enjoying watching Democrats scramble, just as my friends who are Nader supporters are.

Although Democrats are making an effort to clarify how Gore is different from Bush, I suspect that is not the key issue and thus will not sway many loyal Nader supporters. But who knows?

Mark Richards

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

Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2000 11:34 AM

To: undisclosed-recipients:

Subject: Distinctions: Gore vs. Bush: For Nader Supporters

Distinctions: Gore vs. Bush: For Nader Supporters

Dear Fellow Activists:

As long-time environmental and social justice activists - and, we might add, big fans of Ralph Nader - we write to urge you to consider the real differences between Al Gore and George Bush.

We, like many, wish they were greater. But we think the differences are much larger than is readily apparent from the candidates' debates and mainstream materials. And much larger than Ralph Nader will admit.

Few of us have the time to make a systematic survey of the likely differences between possible Gore and Bush administrations. To assist you, we have collected a number of web links by responsible liberal and progressive activists and organizations that articulate these differences.

We are very concerned about the effect the Nader candidacy will have on the ultimate success of the progressive (environmentalist/feminist/social justice movement, which, of course, depends upon a grand alliance of its component causes. We need to visualize strategies that further this alliance and that bring us together.

No strategy that divides these groups will hasten that day. Unfortunately, though Nader's candidacy is exciting and educational, it's one step forward, two steps backward. The reason is because, as you will see from the links below, it pits progressives against one another and therefore nullifies their potentially very positive and influential impact on politics, economics, the environment and the society, especially at this critical moment.

We hope you will find these links useful as you contemplate your vote on November 7.

Please "bounce" this e-mail out to your friends and associates.

Sincerely,

Joe Libertelli JoeL@Essential.org; JLibertelli@law.udc.edu  
Jack Gleason: tcjgleason@aol.com

This e-mail is a volunteer effort and has had no assistance from the Gore Campaign.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GORE AND BUSH ON ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE TO PROGRESSIVES:

#### 1. General:

The Nation, perhaps the nation's most influential progressive publication, has produced some excellent articles on differences we might expect to find in the two possible administrations. You can search their archives (see especially the Election 2000 section) <http://www.thenation.com> Their endorsement of Gore is contained in the thoughtful editorial The Election and Beyond: <http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20001106&s=editors>

#### 2. Supreme Court Composition:

This site appears to be a joint effort by People for the American Way and "Voters for Choice." They say, "The Next President's Supreme Court Appointments Could Turn Back the Clock on 50 Years of Social Justice Progress. Who Will You Trust with Your Freedoms? To find out what is at risk and how you can take action, please visit our website dedicated to preventing a right-wing takeover of our Supreme Court: [www.SupremeCourtVote.org](http://www.SupremeCourtVote.org) For an extremely detailed analysis (40+ pages) of the implications of the Gore/Bush choice, go to the bottom of the Supreme Court Vote homepage and click on "Courting Disaster."

#### 3. Racial Disparity:

While the NAACP is a "non-partisan" group, it is spending an unprecedented

amount of money and effort this election cycle to register voters and to get out the vote. Their list of Ten Reasons to Vote doesn't name names - but the issues they outline all distinguish Gore and Bush:  
[http://www.naacp.org/Ten\\_reasons.htm](http://www.naacp.org/Ten_reasons.htm)

#### 4. Environment:

Gore is clearly better than Bush on the environment. Sure he could be MUCH better (perhaps he should even reread his own book?) but don't believe us, listen to Friends of the Earth's PAC: <http://www.foepac.org/gorerational.htm>

Here is the Sierra Club's voter guide that contrasts Bush and Gore's environmental positions:

[http://www.sierraclub.org/voter\\_education/president/voterguide.asp](http://www.sierraclub.org/voter_education/president/voterguide.asp)

and a press announcement of the Sierra Club endorsement:

<http://www.sierraclub.org/planet/sept2000/gore.asp>

And here's the League of Conservation Voters comparison:

[http://www.lcv.org/campaigns/endorsements/gore\\_comparison.htm](http://www.lcv.org/campaigns/endorsements/gore_comparison.htm)

#### 5. Womens' Right to Choose Abortion and Access to Family Planning

Virtually all major women's rights organizations are supporting Gore. Many came out for him very early, sensing much was at stake. Don't take our word for it, see the National Abortion Rights Action League's essay:

<http://www.naral.org/choice2000/index.html>

Also see the National Organization for Women's PAC site essay entitled: Is Ralph Nader a Viable Alternative for Feminist Voters?

<http://www.now.org/issues/election/elections2000/nader.html>

and the "Bush-wacker" essay by Linda Berg, NOW Political Director at

<http://www.now.org/nnt/fall-2000/elections.html>

Here's a statement by NOW President, Patricia Ireland:

<http://www.now.org/press/08-00/08-25-00.html>

This is a "Women for Gore" letter from the Gore website (- take it for what it's worth):

[http://www.algore.com/briefingroom/open\\_letter\\_to\\_pro\\_choice\\_voters.html](http://www.algore.com/briefingroom/open_letter_to_pro_choice_voters.html)

#### 6. Gay and Lesbian Issues:

The Human Rights Campaign PAC has endorsed Al Gore. The HRC Website summarizes the positions of the various presidential candidates at:

<http://www.hrc.org>.

Scroll down on right to " Campaign 2000, What's at

Stake?" Click on it and then scroll down again to "Rating the Candidates."

#### 7. Tort "Reform":

Many progressives don't understand this important issue. Tort "reform," in Bush's Texas involves smothering the rights of individuals to sue corporations for defective products, pollution, and other damages. Please see The Nation article by Robert Sherrill

<http://past.thenation.com/e2k/recent/0124sherrill.shtml>

-----

To: Sierra Club Leaders  
Environmental colleagues

Fr: Carl Pope  
Re: Ralph Nader attack on environmentalists who are supporting  
Vice-President  
Gore

Yesterday I received from Ralph Nader a letter addressed to concerned environmental voters, but distributed also through the Nader press list. The letter attacked Vice-President Gore, but went beyond that attack to criticize those environmentalists who are endorsing Gore for adopting a "servile mentality." While the letter raised, legitimately, a number of valid issues on which Nader and Gore differ, it also contained a number of inaccurate and utterly unfair attacks.

Additionally, Green Party spokespeople have begun attacking the Sierra Club, and other environmentalists who are supporting the Gore-Lieberman ticket, in increasing harsh terms, terms that go far beyond anything that we have said or would in any conceivable world want to say about our differences with the Nader candidacy.

I have responded to this attack, and my response is attached. I would appreciate it if folks could distribute this as widely as possible to environmentalists outside the Club. We will get it out to the entire Club leadership list on email.

Ralph Nader  
Nader 2000  
PO Box 18002  
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Ralph:

Yesterday you sent me (and many other environmentalists) a long letter defending your candidacy and attacking "the servile mentality" of those of us in the environmental community who are supporting Vice-President Gore.

I've worked alongside you as a colleague for thirty years.

Neither the letter nor the tactics you are increasingly adopting in your candidacy are worthy of the Ralph Nader I knew.

The heart of your letter is the argument that "the threat to our planet articulated by Bush and his ilk" can now be dismissed. But you offer no evidence for this crucial assertion. Based on the polls today Bush is an even bet to become the next President, with both a Republican Senate and a Republican House to accompany him.

You have referred to the likely results of a Bush election as being a "cold shower" for the Democratic party. You have made clear that you will consider it a victory if the net result of your campaign is a Bush presidency.

But what will your "cold shower" mean for real people and real places?

What will it mean for tens of millions of asthmatic children when Bush applies to the nation the "voluntary" approach he's using in Texas to clean up the air. And what about his stated opposition to enforcing environmental standards against corporations?

What will it mean for Americans vulnerable to water pollution when Bush allows water quality standards to be degraded to meet the needs of paper mills and refineries as he has consistently done in Texas, most recently at Lake Sam Rayburn? And what if he eliminates federal financial support for both drinking water and water pollution, as his budget calls for and his record in Texas (46th in spending on drinking water) suggests?

What will it mean for communities of color and poverty located near toxic waste sites, when Bush applies his Texas approach of lower standards and lower polluter liability to toxic waste clean-up?

What will a Bush election mean to the Gwich'in people of the Arctic, when the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is turned over to the oil companies and the calving grounds of the Porcupine Caribou herd on which they depend are destroyed and despoiled?

What will it mean for the fishing families of the Pacific Northwest when Bush amends the Endangered Species Act to make extinction for the endangered salmon a legally acceptable option? If he refuses to remove the dams on the Snake River or reduce timber cutting levels to preserve salmon?

What will it mean for millions of rural Americans whose livelihood, health and communities are being destroyed by unregulated factory feeding operations,

if Bush weakens the Clean Water Act? When he appoints Supreme Court justices who complete the task of shutting down access to federal courts for citizens trying to enforce environmental laws?

What will it mean for the wildlife that depend upon our National Forests when Bush undoes the Clinton-Gore Administration reforms, reverses their roadless area protection policy, and restores the timber industry to the mastery of the forests and the Forest Service that it enjoyed under his father? If he doubles, or triples, the cut on those Forests?

What will it mean for millions of people in Bangladesh and other low-lying countries when an American refusal to confront the problem of global warming unleashes the floods and typhoons of a rising ocean upon them?

Your letter addresses none of these real consequences of a Bush victory. Nor has your campaign. Instead, you indulge yourself in the language of academic discourse when you claim:

"Bush's "old school" allegiance to plunder and extermination as humanity's appropriate relationship to our world speaks a language effectively discounted by the great tradition of naturalists from John Muir to David Brower. Bush's blatant anti-environmentalism will lose corporate favor as it loses popular support. It is a language of politics fading rapidly, and without a future."

Candidate Bush may well be speaking a fading language. So was candidate Reagan in 1980 when he ranted that trees caused air pollution. It is power, however, not language, that determines policy. President Bush would be vested with the powers of the government of the United States, and he is an even more devoted servant of environmental counter-revolution than Reagan ever was.

Because your letter is couched in this language, so divorced from the real world consequences of your candidacy, and the real world choices that face Americans, it is difficult to respond to all of its selective misrepresentations and inaccuracies. A few samples, however, may show you why I am so disappointed in the turn your candidacy has taken:

You claim that "Earth in the Balance" was "an advertisement for his calculated strategy and availability as an environmental poseur." Can you offer

a single piece of evidence to support this quite astonishing statement?

You claim that the Clinton Administration stood up to the oil industry on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge only because "focus groups have shown him he cannot give" it up. In fact, most polls show that the public is somewhat split on this issue, and there are certainly no focus groups I know of showing that it is a third-rail which no President can cross at his peril. Can you cite your evidence?

You lament that the Administration has "set aside lands not in National Parks, but rather in National Monuments...." You are surely aware that a President cannot legally create national parks, which require an act of Congress; nor can you be under the misapprehension that this Congress with Don Young as the head of the House Resources Committee and Frank Murkowski as his counterpart in the Senate would have designated these areas as parks however long a battle Clinton and Gore might have fought. No, you simply took a cheap shot, and ignored the facts.

You have also broken your word to your followers who signed the petitions that got you on the ballot in many states. You pledged you would not campaign as a spoiler and would avoid the swing states. Your recent campaign rhetoric and campaign schedule make it clear that you have broken this pledge. Your response: you are a political candidate, and a political candidate wants to take every vote he can. Very well -- you admit you are a candidate -- admit that you are, like your opponents, a flawed one.

Irresponsible as I find your strategy, I accept that you genuinely believe in it. Please accept that I, and the overwhelming majority of the environmental movement in this country, genuinely believe that your strategy is flawed, dangerous and reckless. Until you can answer how you will protect the people and places who will be put in harm's way, or destroyed, by a Bush presidency, you have no right to slander those who disagree with you as "servile."

You have called upon us to vote our hopes, not our fears. I find it easy to do so. My hope is that by electing the best environmental President in American

history, Al Gore, we can move forward. My fear is that you, blinded by your anger at flaws of the Clinton-Gore Administration, may be instrumental in electing the worst.

Sincerely yours,

Carl Pope  
Executive Director  
The Sierra Club

-----  
A Green Response:

It's important that we all know what the Sierra Club's top brass is up to. In case anyone missed the opportunity last Wednesday to meet with residents of East Liverpool while they were chained to a bus outside EPA headquarters, I would urge anyone who plans to vote for Gore to go to East Liverpool (as I did earlier this year), visit with people whose children have eye cancer because of Al Gore's failure to stand up to big corporate polluters that give money to the Democratic Party, and tell those parents that Al Gore is an environmentalist and should be the President. Anyone who can pull that off can also believe that the lesser of two evils is somehow not evil.

But it is. A vote for Nader is a vote against the preposterous and brazenly anti-democratic notion that we, who live in a jurisdiction that recognizes four major parties and 34 minor ones, must choose one of the inadequate options offered by two parties that are more interested in their own fortunes than in the nation's -- or in yours or mine.

If Gore wanted to regain the votes he has lost to Nader, instead of whining about how he might be unable to defeat George W. Bush (and a sitting Vice president of the United States who is unable to defeat George W. Bush by a margin that would survive a 10% spoiler is hardly a compelling candidate), he could sever his personal ties to big oil; halt the ongoing atrocity in East Liverpool; pledge to rehire Peter Kostmayer and other real environmentalists purged from the Clinton EPA; give back all the money he has received from timber, oil, war, automotive and (especially) incinerator interests; and, most important to victims of environmental injustice, support single-payer universal health care now. If he did all that, he'd earn progressives' votes. He hasn't.

Mike Livingston  
New Columbia

-----  
Subject: NEWS ADVISORY: Gore would roll back abortion rights  
GREEN CAMPAIGN 2000  
The Association of State Green Parties  
[Forwarded by the DC Statehood Green Party]

MEDIA ADVISORY  
For immediate release

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Contacts:

Nancy Allen, Media Coordinator  
207-326-4576, nallen@acadia.net  
Scott McLarty, Media Coordinator  
202-518-5624, scottmclarty@yahoo.com

Al Gore would roll back some abortion rights

\*\*\* Gore and Bush both oppose late term abortions

\*\*\* Nader and Greens continue to support unrestricted abortion rights and access

WASHINGTON, D.C. -- Gore supporters who have urged Ralph Nader to drop out of the race out of fear of a Republican victory can no longer use the threat of rollback of abortion rights under George W. Bush.

In a response to a presidential candidate's questionnaire from the U.S. Catholic Conference, dated October 19, 2000

(<http://www.nccbuscc.org/ogl/questionnaire.htm>), Al Gore affirms his general support for abortion rights, but he would allow legal restrictions on late-term abortions. He even uses the term "partial-birth abortion," a phrase favored by Republicans and anti-choice advocates: "Al Gore opposes late-term abortions and the procedure of partial-birth abortions.... Al Gore believes that any law prohibiting the partial-birth abortion procedure must be narrowly tailored, and should include protections for the life and health of the mother."

Mr. Gore's answer suggests that late-term abortion will come under threat regardless of whether he or Gov. George W. Bush wins the White House. The position of the Green Party and Ralph Nader is that the decision to have an abortion should always remain between a woman and her physician, without legal interference.

In Republican candidate Gov. Bush's answer to the same question, he says "I will provide leadership to take positive, practical steps to reduce the number of abortions in America: ending partial-birth abortion, streamlining adoption, helping women in crisis through maternity group homes, promoting abstinence, and passing laws requiring parental notification and waiting periods. I believe the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision upholding the brutal practice of partial-birth abortion was wrong, and as President I will fight for and sign a ban on partial-birth abortions that passes constitutional muster."

There's little substantive difference between what Mr. Gore and Gov. Bush promise, in terms of White House policy, although Bush is more specific in the measures he'd undertake to discourage abortion. Mr. Gore, following Clinton Administration policy, agrees with Bush about promotion of abstinence. Republicans know that outlawing all abortion would be political suicide, so they've targeted late term abortion. In office, Gov. Bush would probably also support exceptions for "protections for the life and health of the mother."

Mr. Gore supporters, accusing Nader and the Green Party of attempting to "spoil" the election, have argued that abortion and other human rights show the need to vote Democrat on November 7. In retreating on abortion rights, Mr. Gore evokes his early career in Congress, when he supported the Hyde Amendment's restrictions on access to abortion for poor women. Mr. Gore, as Senator from Tennessee, voted to confirm the confirmation of rightwing Justice Antonin Scalia to the Supreme Court. President Clinton and Vice President Gore did nothing in eight years to promote abortion drug RU-486 and push its passage through the FDA until two months before the 2000 election.

Comparable retreats by Al Gore on other issues

Mr. Gore's gradual slide on abortion rights is comparable to his "step by step" position on universal health care. From 1948 until the Clinton-Gore Administration, the Democratic Party promised national health insurance, a pledge the Clinton \-Gore ticket canceled in 1996. Mr. Gore's 2000 program offers what he calls "steps" towards universal health care, such as a prescription medicine plan for older Americans (which leaves them with coverage inferior to what Americans under 65 enjoy if they have private insurance).

But Mr. Gore confirmed during the debates that he opposes government administration of health coverage, i.e., the kind of national health insurance plan Mr. Nader and the Greens support. In his 2000 campaign, Mr. Gore has refused to address the crisis of 44 million Americans frozen out of our failed private-profit-driven HMO and insurance system. As in the public debate on abortion, he aims for an ill-defined "center," regardless of the needs of women, patients, and seniors.

Ralph Nader and the Green Party have insisted that the positions of George W. Bush and Al Gore are the same or nearly the same on most important issues. These include support for free trade pacts with the

authority to overrule human, labor, and environmental protections; inaction on fuel emission standards; rescission of the Delaney Clause prohibiting pesticides and other carcinogens in food; toxic waste siting and dioxin production; increased military spending; development of President Reagan's fraudulent space-based missile defense scheme; continuation of sanctions which have killed over a million Iraqi civilians; maintenance of profit-based corporate HMO and insurance coverage and opposition to national health insurance; the death penalty; privatization of the prison system; rollback of New Deal and Great Society social safety net guarantees; the military-based war on drugs; opposition to medical marijuana; preserving Taft-Hartley restrictions on union organizing; opposition to the living wage; support for the Defense of Marriage Act; maintaining subsidies, tax-breaks, bail-outs, and other taxpayer free lunch for corporations; and acceptance of corporate soft-money contributions throughout the 2000 campaign.

More information:

\*\*\* Association of State Green Parties:  
<http://www.greenparties.org>

\*\*\* Green Party Platform: <http://www.gp.org>

\*\*\* Nader 2000 Campaign: <http://www.votenader.org>

The Association of State Green Parties  
PO Box 18452, Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 232-0335

END

---

Date: Tue, 31 Oct 2000 14:00:52 -0500  
From: "Jack Marcum" <JackM@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: <AAPORNET@usc.edu>  
Subject: State by State Polls?

Could someone (re)post the Web page with links to state-by-state presidential poll results?

John P. (Jack) Marcum, Ph.D.  
Associate for Survey Research, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)  
Administrator, The Presbyterian Panel  
Secretary-Treasurer, Association of Statisticians of  
American Religious Bodies  
Research Services, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)  
100 Witherspoon Street  
Louisville KY 40202-1396

502-569-5161  
502-569-5501 (fax)

**a**