This is the USC listproc archive of aapornet messages for this entire month. It is one big message, just the way the USC archive stored it. You can search within this month with your browser's search function.

Turning this into individual messages that Listserv can index and sort means a lot of reformatting. We will do this as time permits. Meanwhile, the search function works, so we have as much functionality as before. New messages are of course automatically formatted correctly--See August & September 2002.

Some of the early months have been completed. Take a look at them for an idea of how AAPORNET got started. (Thanks, Jim!)

Shap Wolf
shap.wolf@asu.edu

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log0110.
Part 1/1, total size 2180881 bytes:

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

>From rusciano@rider.edu Mon Oct  1 07:13:53 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f91EDre04382 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 1 Oct 2001
07:13:53 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from enigma.rider.edu (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA02590 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 1 Oct 2001 07:13:52 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
id
<01K8ZELTE85W000HGZ@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 1 Oct 2001
10:15:28 EDT
Received: from rider.edu (fafac53.rider.edu [10.59.1.53])
    by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
    with ESMTP id <01K8ZELSYY4C000HT7@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Mon, 01 Oct 2001 10:15:27 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Mon, 01 Oct 2001 10:12:06 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Data set for teaching methods of political analysis
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3BBB879B6.F42E4692@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD (RIDER) (Win95; I)
Dear friends,

I teach the Methods of Political Analysis course at my university, and I recently switched my students from using the mainframe computer to using the SPSS student version for Windows. In the past I used the "SETUPS" version of the Michigan election survey for my classes; however, the SPSS student version limitation of only 50 variables makes this impossible. There are a few versions of the GSS and other surveys on the package, but they are not really suitable for use. Does anyone know of a data set that would fit the requirements of the package (1500 cases and 50 variables maximum), and would provide plenty of relationships for students to investigate?

Failing that, is there a way to create a file with only 50 variables from another file like the SETUPS? Finally, is there a way on this program to create non-redundant correlation and one-way ANOVA tables; the format where they give you "everything by everything" in redundant format wastes a tremendous amount of paper.

Please reply to me personally, as I don't think most members of AAPOR would have an interest in the answers.

Thanks.

Frank Rusciano
rusciano@rider.edu
Mon, 1 Oct 2001 10:32:01 -0400
Date: Mon, 1 Oct 2001 10:32:01 -0400 (EDT)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login9.isis.unc.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Data set for teaching methods of political analysis
In-Reply-To: <3BB879B6.F42E4692@rider.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0110011027070.29554-100000@login9.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

SPSS has a new product that solves this problem. It is a $37 edition that is just like the full version except that it locks itself up when the semester is over. I think it is called SPSS for Students.

On Mon, 1 Oct 2001, Frank Rusciano wrote:

> Date: Mon, 01 Oct 2001 10:12:06 -0400
> From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Data set for teaching methods of political analysis
>
> Dear friends,
>
> I teach the Methods of Political Analysis course at my university, and I recently switched my students from using the mainframe computer to using the SPSS student version for Windows. In the past I used the "SETUPS" version of the Michigan election survey for my classes; however, the SPSS student version limitation of only 50 variables makes this impossible. There are a few versions of the GSS and other surveys on the package, but they are not really suitable for use. Does anyone know of a data set that would fit the requirements of the package (1500 cases and 50 variables maximum), and would provide plenty of relationships for students to investigate?
>
> Failing that, is there a way to create a file with only 50 variables from another file like the SETUPS? Finally, is there a way on this program to create non-redundant correlation and one-way ANOVA tables; the format where they give you "everything by everything" in redundant format wastes a tremendous amount of paper.
>
> Please reply to me personally, as I don't think most members of AAPOR would have an interest in the answers.
>
> Thanks.
FRANK RUSCIANO
rusciano@rider.edu

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Oct  1 21:13:44 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f924Die08746 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 1 Oct 2001
21:13:44 -0700
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id VAA00571 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 1 Oct 2001 21:13:45 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f924Cic11349 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 1 Oct 2001 21:12:44 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Mon, 1 Oct 2001 21:12:44 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Britons most depressed in Europe (Reuters)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110012100160.3280-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---
Copyright (C) 2001 Reuters Limited
---
http://uk.news.yahoo.com/011001/80/c5wwg.html

BRITONS MOST DEPRESSED IN EUROPE

LONDON (Reuters) - Britons are the most depressed people in Europe, according to a
new study.

Depression affects more women than men and is more common in urban areas, according
to findings published on Monday in the British Journal of Psychiatry.

Scientists compared patients in Britain, Spain, Finland, Norway and Ireland,
looking at groups in busy cities and rural villages.

"Depressive disorder is a highly prevalent condition among working age adults in
Europe," the report's authors, including Professor Greg Wilkinson, of the University
of Liverpool, said in the report. "Rural communities show a lower prevalence
of depressive episodes."

More than 14,000 people aged from 18 to 65 were randomly selected to take part in the study, the first of its kind to cover Europe.

Researchers chose Liverpool and Dublin as their UK and Ireland urban research centres. The Vale of Clywd in Wales and the Irish county of Laois were the rural test centres.

Researchers found that across Europe, 7.9 percent of women and 5.2 percent of men suffered from depression.

The figures were much higher across the UK and Ireland, particularly in towns and cities.

Some 21 percent of urban UK women were prone to depression, compared to only 4.7 percent in rural areas.

One in 10 men in UK cities suffered depression -- the figure was halved among men in the country.

The study found Spain had the lowest levels of depression with barely figures of barely two percent.

In Finland and Norway there was not much difference between rates of depression in town and country, with the figure hovering between four percent and ten percent.

The report concluded that fair treatment should be brought in across Europe to tackle depression.

http://uk.news.yahoo.com/011001/80/c5wwg.html

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright (C) 2001 Reuters Limited
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

*****

>From SKIPCAMP@aol.com Tue Oct 2 04:57:33 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f92BvWe04984 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001
04:57:32 -0700
Hi Ed,

Try Price Club, they can place the order. I find the Sprint card has the best per minute price for orders like these. You may try calling Sprint directly at 1-888-203-2821 but I have never order directly from the vendor. Good luck, Skip

Every few weeks I am dropped from the listserve, and I need to resubscribe.
Does this happen to anyone else?

--Rich Clark
--

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.
Manager of Research Support Unit
Carl Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia
201 N. Milledge Avenue
Athens, GA 30677

(706)542-2736 (main desk)
(706)542-9301 (fax)

Your favorite stores, helpful shopping tools and great gift ideas. Experience the convenience of buying online with Shop@Netscape! http://shopnow.netscape.com/

Get your own FREE, personal Netscape Mail account today at http://webmail.netscape.com/

Yes, it has now happened to me for the second time in the past month and did several times about a year ago.
At 09:25 AM 10/2/01 -0400, you wrote:
>Every few weeks I am dropped from the listserve, and I need to
>resubscribe. Does this happen to anyone else?
>
>---Rich Clark
>---
>
>Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.
>Manager of Research Support Unit
>Carl Vinson Institute of Government
>University of Georgia
>201 N. Milledge Avenue
>Athens, GA 30677
>
>(706)542-2736 (main desk)
>(706)542-9301 (fax)
>
>__________________________________________________________________
>Your favorite stores, helpful shopping tools and great gift ideas.
>Experience the convenience of buying online with Shop@Netscape!
>http://shopnow.netscape.com/
>
>Get your own FREE, personal Netscape Mail account today at
>http://webmail.netscape.com/

Dale A. Neuman
Professor Emeritus
University of Missouri-Kansas City
VP Member Services
CSD-SPEBSQSA
816-942-9091

>From simonetta@artsci.com Tue Oct  2 08:19:33 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f92FJWelu4001 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001
08:19:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA21815 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 08:19:33 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
    id <T2T2TFTH>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 11:17:54 -0400
Message-ID: <91E25E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F33225B3@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Dropped from the list
Date: Tue, 2 Oct 2001 11:17:53 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Did you have a temporary Internet or email outage?

Our DNS got messed up bouncing all our mail (as a permanent fatal error) in late August and early September and I got dropped from the list so that my bounce messages didn't drive the group, posters or our peerless leaders crazier.

I thought AAPORnet was being awfully quiet until I decided to try a post myself.

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

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Dale Neuman [mailto:Neumand@umkc.edu]
> Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2001 10:51 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Dropped from the list
>
> Yes, it has now happened to me for the second time in the past month and
did several times about a year ago.
>
> At 09:25 AM 10/2/01 -0400, you wrote:
> >Every few weeks I am dropped from the listserve, and I need to
> >resubscribe. Does this happen to anyone else?
> >
> >--Rich Clark
> >--
> >
> >Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.
> >Manager of Research Support Unit
> >Carl Vinson Institute of Government
> >University of Georgia
> >201 N. Milledge Avenue
> >Athens, GA 30677
> >
> >(706)542-2736 (main desk)
> >(706)542-9301 (fax)

> >Your favorite stores, helpful shopping tools and great gift ideas.
> >Experience the convenience of buying online with Shop@Netscape!
> >http://shopnow.netscape.com/
> >
> >Get your own FREE, personal Netscape Mail account today at
> >http://webmail.netscape.com/
>
> Dale A. Neuman
> Professor Emeritus
I reply to Rich Clark on our list, for whatever value this might have for each of you:

If you are dropped from AAPORNET without requesting to be, you should first check with the computer people who run the local system (university, government agency, commercial firm, etc.) you are using, or else those at your own commercial service. The most common reason to be bounced from AAPORNET is that one's own computing account has exceeded its storage limit for accumulated messages, your system thereafter bounces new messages back to their senders, and the listproc software that runs AAPORNET eventually concludes that your subscription is no longer operational (as indeed it is not) and drops it. In short, you have been snubbed by the software (I have myself been thusly snubbed, more than once, so I know the feeling). Your local computer people are really the only source of information for problems such as this—all you yourself look like to the software is a string of bounced messages.

Only two people can drop you from AAPORNET without your permission: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>, in the AAPOR central office in Ann Arbor, and me, Jim Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>, on the USC computing system, which provides all of its support and services for AAPORNET without any charge (as almost any American university would certainly do, for an association like AAPOR, but of course). Although I can't say for certain, I'm pretty sure that Marlene's assistants in the AAPOR office do occasionally take over the
responsibilities of her own computing account, including adding and removing AAPOR members to and from our list, when she is not online—certainly an excellent policy for serving us all. And all of these various strategies, combined, make the modest work of running our list even much less work than most of you will probably imagine (translation: Marlene does most of the work).

I don't believe that either Marlene or I would ever drop anyone from our list, intentionally, without first informing you personally of our intention, and explaining our reason for our action. I know that I have never dropped anyone at all, except at the personal request of the member. Such requests are especially common from people about to leave their accounts for extended vacations. Requesting suspensions from AAPORNET for a long vacation might well save you from the overflowing mail problem mentioned above. If so, please simply contact Marlene or me, at the email addresses above, shortly before you leave (and, don't forget, a second time, upon your return).

-- Jim

******

On Tue, 2 Oct 2001, Rich Clark wrote:

> Every few weeks I am dropped from the listserve, and I need to
> resubscribe. Does this happen to anyone else?
>
> --Rich Clark
>
> --

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.
Manager of Research Support Unit
Carl Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia
201 N. Milledge Avenue
Athens, GA 30677

(706)542-2736 (main desk)
(706)542-9301 (fax)

Your favorite stores, helpful shopping tools and great gift ideas.
Experience the convenience of buying online with Shop@Netscape!
http://shopnow.netscape.com/

Get your own FREE, personal Netscape Mail account today at
http://webmail.netscape.com/

>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Tue Oct  2 08:31:05 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f92FV5e15283 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001
08:31:05 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from exchng7.gallup.com (exchng7.gallup.com [198.175.140.71])
To follow up on my note to aapornet last week about the AP headline, 'Consumer Confidence Plunges Following Terrorist Attacks,' here's another AP story misreporting the Conference Board data. In particular, see paragraph 4.

Remember, most of the Conference Board surveys (some 88%) were returned before September 11. The decline in confidence they show only mirrors what several consumer surveys found in early September, prior to the attack. From all these surveys (Conference Board, ABC/Money, Gallup, etc.) it seems clear that consumer confidence took a hit in late August/early September, possibly due to the worsening unemployment figures. But the Conference Board September data offers no insights about the consumer post-September 11 (they don't claim to in their own release). Nevertheless these AP (and other) misleading stories continue. Misleading because they suggest cause and effect between the attack and the drop in confidence in September. Lumnaries as distinguished as Robert Rubin seem to have accepted this association as a fact.

There is also a reference to Michigan's consumer sentiment index for September in this article. While the article doesn't explain it, the Michigan index is based on data collected both before and after the 11th. If you've been following the news coverage of the Michigan data however, you've seen that their release of "late September" findings within their overall sample of 500 -- showing confidence rising the first week after the attack and dropping sharply the second week after the attack
-- is getting lots of attention. There are some questions worth raising about
the
methodology involved in their reporting out "late September" findings based on
a
partial sample, but that's another issue...

At Gallup we attempted to summarize the available consumer data pre and post
9/11.
The available and reliable survey evidence universally points to either no
change in
consumer attitudes toward the economy since September 11, or a slight "rally"
in
these attitudes. http://gallup.com/poll/index.asp

--Lydia Saad

Fed Expected to Cut Interest Rates
By Martin Crutsinger
AP Economics Writer
Monday, Oct. 1, 2001; 5:34 p.m. EDT
WASHINGTON -- The Federal Reserve, faced with an America gripped by fears of more
terrorist attacks, is expected on Tuesday to push a key interest rate to its lowest
level in four decades in an effort to get consumers spending again.
In the wake of the worst terrorist attacks in U.S. history, consumer confidence has
plunged by the largest amount since the Persian Gulf War, an ominous
development
given that consumer spending accounts for two-thirds of total economic activity.
Wall Street, after two weeks of volatile trading, took a breather on Monday, awaiting
the Fed's next move. The Dow Jones industrial average closed down 10.73 points
at
8,836.83.
Both of the major readings of consumer sentiment - done by the Conference Board in
New York and the University of Michigan - show that confidence has been badly jolted
by the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

The Conference Board reading fell by 14.4 percent in September, taking the largest
one-month tumble since October 1990, when the United States was preparing to go to
war against Iraq following its invasion of Kuwait.
The University of Michigan index of consumers' expectations about the future fell to
73.5, a plunge of 13.7 percent from the August reading. The only two previous times
that this index has fallen by similar amounts was the 1990 period leading up to the
Gulf War and the 1973 Arab oil embargo.
Richard Curtin, director of the Michigan survey, said differences are significant between the short and successful Gulf War, after which consumer sentiment rebounded sharply, and the current, perhaps lengthy fight against an elusive foe. "Fear is the new element for the U.S. economy. ... This apprehension about domestic security and fearfulness of travel in general," he told reporters Monday.

I'm wondering if other pollsters are still experiencing high cooperation rates on surveys or whether this has returned to normal. Our Iowa Poll got a 65% cooperation rate, which is a little higher than usual for us. JAS
whether this has returned to normal. &nbsp;Our Iowa Poll got a 65% cooperation rate, which is a little higher than usual for us. &nbsp;J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.

Selzer & Company, Inc. &nbsp;Des Moines &nbsp;JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com &nbsp;Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com</FONT></HTML>

--part1_9a.1aa7d243.28eb3e99_boundary--

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Oct  2 09:38:44 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f92Gcie29660 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 09:38:44 -0700 (PDT)
(PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA03297 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 09:38:46 -0700 (PDT)
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f92GciC25340 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 09:38:44 -0700 (PDT)
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 2 Oct 2001 09:38:44 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: AP Consumer Conference Reporting
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110020927060.27601-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Folks,

I complimented Lydia Saad personally on her posting last week, and I wish to do so now again, for her posting of this morning, but this time on-list--on-list because I expect that I speak for many others of you here who also appreciate Lydia's fine analyses and interpretations of important and newsworthy consumer data, data on which vital government and corporate decisions might well be founded.

I wouldn't mind if someone--perhaps Council--could institutionalize a means by which such fine data analyses of breaking and current news could be quickly disseminated much more widely, so that they might have the same impact on the nation and the world as they do here on our list, or at least do for me.

One immediate step in that direction would be for posters of such messages to attach their permissions for all other list members to repost the message elsewhere, with the author's name still attached, but of course. We might also want to keep AAPOR's name attached (not AAPORNET's, because outsiders cannot join anyway), but I can't be sure without first hearing a wide discussion of the idea--and such
decisions ought to be left to Council, in any event.

So, Lydia, what do you say? Might I have your permission to forward your message here—with your name attached—to a few other lists, all of some intellectual and academic merit? Feel free to respond off-list, if you like—either on or off is fine with me.

And way to go—I've long suspected that you were somewhat more clever than Robert Rubin, but I've never before had the courage simply to come out and say so.

Seriously, congratulations—and please keep it up!

-- Jim

******

On Tue, 2 Oct 2001 Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

> To follow up on my note to aapornet last week about the AP headline,
> 'Consumer Confidence Plunges Following Terrorist Attacks,' here's another AP story misreporting the Conference Board data. In particular, see paragraph 4.
> > Remember, most of the Conference Board surveys (some 88%) were returned before September 11. The decline in confidence they show only mirrors what several consumer surveys found in early September, prior to the attack.
> > From all these surveys (Conference Board, ABC/Money, Gallup, etc.) it seems clear that consumer confidence took a hit in late August/early September, possibly due to the worsening unemployment figures. But the Conference Board September data offers no insights about the consumer post-September 11 (they don't claim to in their own release). Nevertheless these AP (and other) misleading stories continue. Misleading because they suggest cause and effect between the attack and the drop in confidence in September. Lumnaries as distinguished as Robert Rubin seem to have accepted this association as a fact.
> > There is also a reference to Michigan's consumer sentiment index for September in this article. While the article doesn't explain it, the Michigan index is based on data collected both before and after the 11th. If you've been following the news coverage of the Michigan data however, you've seen that their release of "late September" findings within their overall sample of 500 -- showing confidence rising the first week after the attack and dropping sharply the second week after the attack -- is getting lots of attention. There are some questions worth raising about the methodology involved in their reporting out "late September" findings based on a partial sample, but that's another issue...
> > At Gallup we attempted to summarize the available consumer data pre and post 9/11. The available and reliable survey evidence universally points to either no change in consumer attitudes toward the economy since September 11, or a slight "rally" in these attitudes.
> http://gallup.com/poll/index.asp
>
WASHINGTON -- The Federal Reserve, faced with an America gripped by fears of
more terrorist attacks, is expected on Tuesday to push a key interest rate
to its lowest level in four decades in an effort to get consumers spending
again.
In the wake of the worst terrorist attacks in U.S. history, consumer
confidence has plunged by the largest amount since the Persian Gulf War, an
ominous development given that consumer spending accounts for two-thirds of
total economic activity.
Wall Street, after two weeks of volatile trading, took a breather on
Monday, awaiting the Fed's next move. The Dow Jones industrial average closed down
10.73 points at 8,836.83.
Both of the major readings of consumer sentiment - done by the Conference
Board in New York and the University of Michigan - show that confidence has
been badly jolted by the attacks on the World Trade Center and the
Pentagon.

The Conference Board reading fell by 14.4 percent in September, taking
the largest one-month tumble since October 1990, when the United
States was preparing to go to war against Iraq following its invasion
of Kuwait. The University of Michigan index of consumers' expectations
about the future fell to 73.5, a plunge of 13.7 percent from the
August reading. The only two previous times that this index has fallen
by similar amounts was the 1990 period leading up to the Gulf War and
the 1973 Arab oil embargo. Richard Curtin, director of the Michigan
survey, said differences are significant between the short and
successful Gulf War, after which consumer sentiment rebounded sharply,
and the current, perhaps lengthy fight against an elusive foe. "Fear
is the new element for the U.S. economy. ... This apprehension about
domestic security and fearfulness of travel in general," he told
reporters Monday.

From caspar@rti.org Tue Oct 2 10:09:54 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/uscd) with ESP
    id f92H9se02874 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001
    10:09:54 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from rtints26.rti.org (rtints26.rti.org [152.5.128.111])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscd) with ESP
    id KAA04652 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 10:09:50 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by rtints26.rti.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    id <P4JXZ204>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 13:09:04 -0400
Message-ID: <66b8c3d72a23902428fde45b5ecc1b137c1fca8rtints26.rti.org>
From: "Caspar, Rachel A." <caspar@rti.org>
If you are interested in the positions described below, please use the email and web addresses provided at the end of the job description to get further information or to submit your resume. Please do not reply to this email directly (because the whole list will see your response) and please do not send an email to me personally (because I am not directly involved in this recruiting effort and probably can't answer your questions). Thanks!

Senior Research Survey Directors
Senior Epidemiologists

The founding R&D center in Research Triangle Park, NC, RTI International thrives on an exciting mission: to improve the lives of people around the world. We're strong on converting our world-class research into practical applications - in the fields of health, medicine, environmental protection, technology, commercialization, education and decision support systems. Allied with leading universities, we serve clients in government and industry domestically and abroad.

We currently have career opportunities for Senior Research Survey Directors and Senior Epidemiologists in our Research Triangle Park, Washington, D.C., Chicago, and Atlanta office locations. The successful candidate for these positions must possess the right combination of skills, experience, abilities, and cultural compatibility to serve as a leader in assisting in strategic planning, assisting in program development, building market share, developing proposals, directing projects, and developing staff.

Minimum Qualifications: The most successful candidates have an MPH/MA/MS or Ph.D. and 10+ years proven experience:

* Developing, communicating, and implementing strategic plans
* Developing, communicating, and implementing marketing plans
* Developing, communicating, and implementing strategic plans
* Building market share and assisting in program and business development
* Managing contract research
Gaining recognition from peers and clients for technical and substantive expertise
Authoring articles published in peer-reviewed scientific journal

Responsibilities: Responsibilities include:

- Identifying, articulating, and implementing winning strategies oriented toward capturing a specific business opportunity
- Contributing to and directing the preparation, presentation, and follow-up of winning research proposals
- Collaborating closely with staff across a wide variety of technical and substantive fields in the design, implementation, and management of primary data collection
- Working with clients as a project director, principal investigator, or in other senior management or scientific roles
- Managing the day-to-day activities of ongoing research studies
- Preparing and presenting research reports to clients
- Developing staff at all professional levels

JOB # 30828

The world's premier independent research institute, RTI International, provides competitive salaries and benefits. To find out more about career opportunities, refer to our website for a complete job listing: www.rti.org <http://www.rti.org>. Candidates may apply online or email resumes to: jobs@rti.org <mailto:jobs@rti.org>. Please indicate position number on all resumes. Equal Opportunity/Affirmation Action Employer.

Senior Research Survey Directors

Senior Epidemiologists

Technical and Substantive Areas of Operation

These positions require collaborating closely with staff across a wide variety of technical fields to design and implement primary data collection; fields include epidemiology study design and implementation, primary data collection operations and management, contract management, project financial management, survey methodology, advanced technology applications, advanced computer applications and design, web-enabled and web-based data collection design and applications.

The Survey Research Division provides our clients with a full range of epidemiologic, survey and primary data collection services. These include study design, instrument development and evaluation, pretests and pilot studies, mail
surveys, telephone surveys, face-to-face field surveys, web-enabled surveys, records
abstraction, field data collection of health information and biological specimens,
mixed-mode surveys, subject tracing, qualitative data collection through focus
groups
and key informant interviews, and health registries. The wide scope of our
capabilities allows us to meet any primary data collection need, to maintain
total control over the quality of our work, and to assemble efficient and effective
project teams.
*
Substantive fields include public health management, administration,
policy, communication, and education; and in related fields including
psychology and
sociology; biostatistics; epidemiology; economics; public
policy; criminology; demography; and public administration. Issues
addressed by RTI's public health programs include: bioterrorism; health
surveillance;
environmental protection; health care, delivery and outcomes; health services
organization and financing; Medicare and Medicaid; community health programs;
maternal and children's health; mental health; occupational health; food
safety and
nutrition; aging and long term care; alcohol, tobacco and illicit drugs;
sexual
behaviors; HIV. Epidemiologic programs address a wide range of topics
including acute
and chronic disease outcomes, environmental and children's health, and
behavioral
aspects of disease prevention.
*
Other major research programs include research in education involving large-
scale
national studies in elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education. Issues
addressed include costs to students and their families for obtaining a
postsecondary
education; amount of borrowing to pay for postsecondary education; family
characteristics of aided and non-aided students; total resources available for
education and expenses; how costs and financial aid influence students' choices of
schools and majors; how financial aid is related to academic performance;
critical
transitions experienced by young people as they develop, attend school, and
embark on
their careers; and topics related to persistence and attainment in postsecondary
education, employment, family formation, and satisfaction with the first-year
institution and education experiences.
>From lvoigt@fhcrc.org Tue Oct  2 10:54:31 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f92HsVe06379 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001
10:54:31 -0700
I would like to have a much better understanding than I do of how telephone systems actually work - i.e., switching, etc. I have not been find a basic book on telephone systems and would appreciate any recommendations.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist,
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
lvoigt@fhcrc.org
Jim,

I've always assumed that anything I post on aapornet is in the public domain, so I have no objection to your forwarding this or anything else I ever write. However, the point of my posting the latest AP article was really to get reaction from AAPOR members.

I was reminded a few years back that our professional code compels us to correct the record whenever and wherever we see our own data being misinterpreted. In this case I feel survey data, generally, is being misinterpreted so I would humbly suggest we are all bound to try to set matters straight. At least we should discuss the matter on aapornet.

Warren's committee has already looked into a narrow aspect of this, but perhaps they could take another look at the broader problem of the misconception growing out there about consumer confidence post-attack, largely based on the way people are handling the Conference Board data, but now also based on the potentially problematic data provided by Michigan.

The risk in taking a public stand against the erroneous reporting to date is that consumer confidence will drop in earnest over the next few weeks. Subsequent measures of consumer confidence will pick this up, and my/our criticisms of the early consumer analysis will look off-base. As long as well all understand and accept that risk, I think it's worth taking.

Lydia

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2001 12:39 PM
To: AAPORNENET
Subject: Re: AP Consumer Conference Reporting

Folks,

I complimented Lydia Saad personally on her posting last week, and I wish to do so now again, for her posting of this morning, but this time on-list--on-list because I expect that I speak for many others of
you here who also appreciate Lydia’s fine analyses and interpretations of important and newsworthy consumer data, data on which vital government and corporate decisions might well be founded.

I wouldn’t mind if someone--perhaps Council--could institutionalize a means by which such fine data analyses of breaking and current news could be quickly disseminated much more widely, so that they might have the same impact on the nation and the world as they do here on our list, or at least do for me.

One immediate step in that direction would be for posters of such messages to attach their permissions for all other list members to repost the message elsewhere, with the author’s name still attached, but of course. We might also want to keep AAPOR’s name attached (not AAPORNET’s, because outsiders cannot join anyway), but I can’t be sure without first hearing a wide discussion of the idea—and such decisions ought to be left to Council, in any event.

So, Lydia, what do you say? Might I have your permission to forward your message here—with your name attached—to a few other lists, all of some intellectual and academic merit? Feel free to respond off-list, if you like—either on or off is fine with me.

And way to go—I’ve long suspected that you were somewhat more clever than Robert Rubin, but I’ve never before had the courage simply to come out and say so.

Seriously, congratulations—and please keep it up! — Jim

******

On Tue, 2 Oct 2001 Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

> To follow up on my note to aapornet last week about the AP headline, > 'Consumer Confidence Plunges Following Terrorist Attacks,' here's > another > AP > story misreporting the Conference Board data. In particular, see paragraph > 4. > > Remember, most of the Conference Board surveys (some 88%) were > returned before September 11. The decline in confidence they show > only mirrors what > several consumer surveys found in early September, prior to the > attack. > > From all these surveys (Conference Board, ABC/Money, Gallup, etc.) it seems > clear that consumer confidence took a hit in late August/early > September, possibly due to the worsening unemployment figures. But > the Conference Board September data offers no insights about the > consumer post-September 11 > (they don't claim to in their own release). Nevertheless these AP > (and
other misleading stories continue. Misleading because they suggest cause and effect between the attack and the drop in confidence in September. Lumnaries as distinguished as Robert Rubin seem to have accepted this association as a fact.

There is also a reference to Michigan's consumer sentiment index for September in this article. While the article doesn't explain it, the Michigan index is based on data collected both before and after the 11th. If you've been following the news coverage of the Michigan data however, you've seen that their release of "late September" findings within their overall sample of 500 -- showing confidence rising the first week after the attack and dropping sharply the second week after the attack -- is getting lots of attention. There are some questions worth raising about the methodology involved in their reporting out "late September" findings based on a partial sample, but that's another issue...

At Gallup we attempted to summarize the available consumer data pre and post 9/11. The available and reliable survey evidence universally points to either no change in consumer attitudes toward the economy since September 11, or a slight "rally" in these attitudes. http://gallup.com/poll/index.asp

--Lydia Saad

Fed Expected to Cut Interest Rates
By Martin Crutsinger
AP Economics Writer
Monday, Oct. 1, 2001; 5:34 p.m. EDT
WASHINGTON -- The Federal Reserve, faced with an America gripped by fears of more terrorist attacks, is expected on Tuesday to push a key interest rate to its lowest level in four decades in an effort to get consumers spending again. In the wake of the worst terrorist attacks in U.S. history, consumer confidence has plunged by the largest amount since the Persian Gulf War, an ominous development given that consumer spending accounts for two-thirds of total economic activity.
Wall Street, after two weeks of volatile trading, took a breather on Monday, awaiting the Fed's next move. The Dow Jones industrial average closed down 10.73 points at 8,836.83. Both of the major readings of consumer sentiment -- done by the Conference Board in New York and the University of Michigan -- show that confidence has been badly jolted by the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

The Conference Board reading fell by 14.4 percent in September, taking
the largest one-month tumble since October 1990, when the United States was preparing to go to war against Iraq following its invasion of Kuwait. The University of Michigan index of consumers' expectations about the future fell to 73.5, a plunge of 13.7 percent from the August reading. The only two previous times that this index has fallen by similar amounts was the 1990 period leading up to the Gulf War and the 1973 Arab oil embargo. Richard Curtin, director of the Michigan survey, said differences are significant between the short and successful Gulf War, after which consumer sentiment rebounded sharply, and the current, perhaps lengthy fight against an elusive foe. "Fear is the new element for the U.S. economy... This apprehension about domestic security and fearfulness of travel in general," he told reporters Monday.

From mark@bisconti.com Tue Oct  2 11:42:56 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f92Igue14293 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001
11:42:56 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from janus.hosting4u.net (janus.hosting4u.net [209.15.2.37])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id LAA19754 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 11:42:56 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (qmail 21004 invoked from network); 2 Oct 2001 18:42:01 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
    by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 2 Oct 2001 18:42:01 -0000
Received: from mark ([138.88.86.160]) by bisconti.com ; Tue, 02 Oct 2001 13:41:57 -0500
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Public ready for war but patient
Date: Tue, 2 Oct 2001 14:37:15 -0400
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBCELEDJAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0021_01C14B4F.BB481ED0"
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 V6.00.2600.0000

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_0021_01C14B4F.BB481ED0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
The protests of disgust

They had to come, the anti-International Monetary Fund/World Bank protesters who gathered in Washington over the weekend. A little thing like 6,000-plus dead Americans wasn't about to change their minds—besides, it had taken them minutes and minutes to redo their cardboard placards to announce that violence isn't the answer and that America is the problem.

Perhaps those sentiments, more than any other, explain why they gathered on Saturday at Freedom Plaza. One protester wore a t-shirt that read, "I'm afraid of Americans." Another shirt proclaimed, "Columbus was the original terrorist." Others denounced "America's racist war" and "American imperialism." A few speakers actually expressed regret for the terrorist attack, but most seemed to think that the United States had it coming. They were denouncing America at such an aggrieved pitch that all dogs within earshot were barking and small furry rodents were scurrying away at top speed.

Perhaps the critters couldn't bear the sight of the crowd, where dirty yellow signs screamed that revenge is bad, youths in burnt umber costumes decried the famine in Afghanistan, and anarchists in black sweatsuits suspiciously lingered in the background.

There was also a heavy pink patina: Passing out pamphlets were what seemed to be every communist not tenured at Berkeley, attired in suits whose manufacture (and last laundering) probably occurred during the October Revolution. Not that anyone was reading the pamphlets. Perhaps they simply couldn't.

The organizers of the protest certainly couldn't count, which, coupled with their probable room temperature IQs, might help explain why they estimated the crowd...
at 25,000. After all, a sixth-grade level of math does little good when you run out
of fingers and toes and body piercings ("Seventeen, eighteen . . . 25,000").
Arresting the lot of them would have rocketed up the test scores at campuses around
the country. Police estimated the crown marching up Pennsylvania at 4,500, far
fewer
than were brutally murdered during the Sept 11 terrorist attacks.
There were no commemorations for the people who perished at the World
Trade
Center, the Pentagon or the crash in Pennsylvania. No one seemed to care about
the
widows and the orphans. The large-denomination donations requested were not even set
aside for disaster relief. In fact, aside from journalists and a few courageous and
patriotic counter-protesters, not a single person seemed to be thankful for their
hard-won freedom, that which enables protesters to spit in Uncle Sam's face. Nor did
it seem to matter that such behavior would have gotten them bloodied in
Beijing and
killed in Kabul.
America is too good for these people - the major-league practitioners of
the
protests of disgust.

Mark David RICHARDS, Sociologist
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008
202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com

-------=_NextPart_000_0021_01C14B4F.BB481ED0
Content-Type: text/html;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<html xmlns:o="urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office"
   xmlns:w="urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word"
   xmlns="http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40">
  <head>
    <meta http-equiv="Content-Type" content="text/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1">
    <meta name="ProgId" content="Word.Document">
    <meta name="Generator" content="Microsoft Word 9">
    <meta name="Originator" content="Microsoft Word 9">
    <link

Public is ready for war but patient

By Ralph Z. Hallow

THE WASHINGTON TIMES

http://www.washtimes.com/national/20011002-30712039.htm
The protests of disgust

They had to come, the anti-International Monetary Fund/World Bank protesters who gathered in Washington over the weekend. A little thing like 6,000-plus dead wasn't about to change their minds—besides, it had taken them minutes and minutes to redo their cardboard placards to announce that violence isn't the answer and that America is the problem. Perhaps those sentiments, more than any other, explain why they gathered on Saturday at Freedom Plaza.
One protester wore a t-shirt that read, "I'm afraid of Americans." Another shirt proclaimed, "Columbus was the original terrorist." Others denounced "America's racist war" and "American imperialism." A few speakers actually expressed regret for the terrorist attack, but most seemed to think that the United States had it coming. They were denouncing America at such an aggrieved pitch that all dogs within earshot were barking and small furry rodents were scurrying away at top speed. Perhaps the critters couldn't bear the sight of the crowd, where dirty yellow signs screamed that revenge is bad, youths in burnt umber costumes decried the famine in Afghanistan, and anarchists in black sweatsuits suspiciously lingered in the background. Perhaps they simply couldn't. The organizers of the protest certainly couldn't count, which, coupled with their probable room temperature IQs, might help explain why they estimated the crowd at 25,000. After all, a sixth-grade level of math does little good when you run out of fingers and toes and body piercings ("Seventeen, eighteen . . . 25,000"). Arresting the lot of them would have rocketed up the test scores at campuses around the country. Police estimated the crown marching up Pennsylvania at 4,500, far fewer than were brutally murdered during the Sept 11 terrorist attacks. There were no commemorations for the people who perished at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon or the crash in Pennsylvania. No one seemed to care about the widows and the orphans. The large-denomination donations requested were not even set aside for disaster relief. In fact, aside from journalists and a few courageous and patriotic counter-protesters, not a single person seemed to be thankful for their hard-won freedom, that which enables protesters to spit in Uncle Sam's face. Nor did it seem to matter that such behavior would have gotten them bloodied in Beijing and killed in Kabul. America is too good for these people —
major-league practitioners of the protests of disgust.
From shap.wolf@asu.edu Tue Oct  2 12:26:38 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f92JQce19503 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001
    12:26:38 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from post2.inre.asu.edu (post2.inre.asu.edu [129.219.110.73])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA12364 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 12:26:39 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from conversion.post2.inre.asu.edu by asu.edu (PMDF V6.0-025
    #47347) id
    <0GKL00201FBZJ5@asu.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 02 Oct 2001 12:26:23 -
    0700 (MST)
Received: from mainex1.asu.edu (mainex1.asu.edu [129.219.10.200]) by asu.edu
    (PMDF V6.0-025 #47347) with ESMTP id <0GKL001JTFBZM6@asu.edu> for
    aapornet@usc.edu;
    Tue, 02 Oct 2001 12:26:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: by mainex1.asu.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    id <4CC7GBK7>; Tue, 02 Oct 2001 12:26:23 -0700
Content-return: allowed
Date: Tue, 02 Oct 2001 12:26:20 -0700
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@asu.edu>
Subject: RE: recommendation sought re book on telephone systems
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "lvoigt@fhcrc.org" <IMCEAMAILTO-lvoigt+40fhcrc+2Eorg@MAINEX1.ASU.EDU>
Message-id: <B6426E926476D411B8E800B0D03D5C1A010315AE@mainex2.asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="Boundary_(ID_Ai6PQFKFEYG412DuWikDeA)"

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.

--Boundary_(ID_Ai6PQFKFEYG412DuWikDeA)
Content-type: text/plain;  charset="iso-8859-1"
I don't have a comprehensive text to refer to, but here are some links with bits & pieces:

General phone history:
http://phworld.netfirms.com/

Area codes:
http://www.lincmad.com/index.html

North American Numbering Plan:
http://www.nanpa.com/

eclectic history/pictures/sounds: http://www.sandman.com/telhist.html
and some training books & videos from same site:
http://www.sandman.com/video.html

Shapard Wolf
Survey Research Laboratory
Arizona State University
shap.wolf@asu.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]
Sent: 02 October 2001 10:54 AM
To: 'AAPORNET'
Subject: recommendation sought re book on telephone systems

I would like to have a much better understanding than I do of how telephone systems actually work - i.e., switching, etc. I have not been find a basic book on telephone systems and would appreciate any recommendations.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist,
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

--Boundary_(ID_Ai6PQFKFEY412DuWikDeA)
Content-type: text/html; charset="iso-8859-1"
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=3Diso-8859-
I don't have a comprehensive text to refer to, but here are some links with bits & pieces:

General phone history:
http://phworld.netfirms.com/

Area codes:
http://www.lincmad.com/index.html

North American Numbering Plan:
http://www.nanpa.com/

Eclectic history/pictures/sounds:
http://www.sandman.com/telhist.html
http://www.sandman.com/video.html

Shapard Wolf
Survey Research Laboratory
Arizona State University
shap.wolf@asu.edu

I would like to have a much better understanding than I do of how telephone systems actually work - i.e., switching, etc. I have not been find a basic book on
telephone systems and would appreciate any recommendations.</p>

<p>thanks!</p>

<p>Lynda Voigt</p>

<p>Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.</p>

Senior Staff Scientist,

Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

Seattle, WA

1voigt@fhcrc.org

</p>

In response to an increasingly asked question...

HOW TO ACCESS THE AAPORNET ARCHIVES

(Yes, every word ever posted to AAPORNET is available to all members of the list, any time, day nor night, even on major holidays.)

*** To: listproc@usc.edu , with *NO* subject header, send the one-line command: get aapornet logYYMM

where YY is the two-digit year (1999 is 99, etc.) and
where MM is the two-digit month (03 is March, etc.)

NOTE: The archives are available in one-month chunks only; they are *NOT* available by days, weeks, years, decades, or centuries

*** FOR EXAMPLE, to get the January 1999 archive, send to: listproc@usc.edu
the one-line command: get aapornet log9901
and *ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ELSE*

Within a minute or two after sending this, you will receive, from listproc@usc.edu, and with your own one-line command in the subject header, a massive file with every message received during January 1999, in the order posted.

To find then the topic of interest to you, you will do best to search the archive by keywords using your own internet mail software.

Because of the size of most monthly archives, I cannot personally recommend that you order more than one in a single message--the server can handle more, but I'm not sure you wish to have more than one sitting in your mail files at any one time.

-- Jim

------

Here's the beginning of the January 1999 archive, as mailed to me...

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2000 09:14:13 PST
From: "CREN ListProcessor(tm) at USC" <listproc@usc.edu>
To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Subject: GET aapornet log9901 (1/1)

Archive aapornet, file log9901.
Part 1/1, total size 199495 bytes:

--------------------------------------------------------------------
>From acep@sprintmail.com Fri Jan 1 18:26:17 1999
Received: from crow.prod.itd.earthlink.net (crow.prod.itd.earthlink.net [209.178.63.7])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id SAA12758 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Jan 1999 18:26:16 -0800 (PST)
Received: from a.parker (1Cust128.tnt5.tco2.da.uu.net [153.35.91.128])
   by crow.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA16231
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 1 Jan 1999 18:26:14 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <001301be35f7$7f0b6500$d7032599@a.parker>
From: "Albert Parker" <acep@sprintmail.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Census Sampling and New Speaker
Date: Fri, 1 Jan 1999 21:27:01 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

[Message content]

--------------------------------------------------------------------
AAPOR might have gained an important supporter of its position on Census sampling estimation. The latest estimates reported in the Washington Post today are that Illinois will just barely miss losing a seat in the 2000 reapportionment. Thus, Illinois might be one of the states that would...

*******

>From bmcCready@knowledgenetworks.com Tue Oct  2 18:23:11 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f931NBe08633 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001
18:23:11 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from nt-exchange.knowledgenetworks.com (nt-exchange.knowledgenetworks.com [64.75.23.141])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id SAA06936 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 18:23:11 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by nt-exchange.knowledgenetworks.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2650.21)
   id <SQQ5RP36>; Tue, 2 Oct 2001 18:22:13 -0700
Message-ID: <SA856DD1B725D511BBCE0008C733A7EE1FB97F8nt-exchange.knowledgenetworks.com>
From: Bill McCready <bmcCready@knowledgenetworks.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: recommendation sought re book on telephone systems
Date: Tue, 2 Oct 2001 18:22:12 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

There's a Wiley Series in Telecommunications that's pretty technical & costly. Telecommunications System Engineering, by Freeman & Digital Telephony by Bellamy are about $100 each.

Bill McCready
I would like to have a much better understanding than I do of how telephone systems actually work - i.e., switching, etc. I have not been find a basic book on telephone systems and would appreciate any recommendations.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist,
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

At 01:53 PM 10/2/01, you wrote:
>I would like to have a much better understanding than I do of how telephone systems actually work - i.e., switching, etc. I have not been find a basic book on telephone systems and would appreciate any recommendations.
>
You might contact your local phone company and ask for an explanation....there are lots of local technicians who do understand and would be flattered to "teach" you how they work.

Another possibility is to contact a science teacher at a local high school and ask for references.

Dick Halpern
Regarding my earlier note about the "perils of groupthink" affecting "peace" demonstrators, I refer you to today's NY Times (p. 14) story, "In the Bay Area, Pacifist Orthodoxy Races Dissent," which begins:

"Kevin Danaher cannot believe much of the news he hears these days. He says he cannot believe the polls that say 90 percent of Americans approve of a military response to the September 11 attacks.

"I'm a sociologist, and I know polls can be manipulated," said Mr. Danaher, co-founder of Global Exchange, an international human rights organization based here in San Francisco.

"Mr. Danaher is adamant because he is surrounded by people who are against any military response to the attacks. In San Francisco, or Berkeley, or Oakland, the three most politically liberal cities in the most politically liberal area, it is possible not to know a single person who supports a military response to the terrorist acts of Sept. 11."

This suggests that even people supposedly trained in social science can be victims of groupthink. On the other hand, to send us the editorial "The Protests of Disgust", while perhaps a salutary reminder of what the extreme right-wing sects are thinking, without noting its dubious origins, suggests that there is some blindness on both sides.

Anyone who wants to know what even more loonie sects are thinking are referred to Lyndon LaRouche's website which propounds the theory that the Sept. 11 atrocities were committed by schemers from US and British intelligence services, as was the Oklahoma City bombing. I got this fed back to me from a Serbian-nationalist sociologist in Belgrade who got it from the web.

Allen H. Barton
Visiting Scholar, School of Journalism and Mass Communications University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
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So how does "groupthink" relate to "spiral of silence"? Is the sociology professor an example of a "stubbornly vocal deviant" in spiral of silence terminology?

We've had sessions on this at AAPOR in recent years, but for those who aren't familiar with the work of Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, the Spiral of Silence is a model of why people are unwilling to publicly express their opinions when they believe they are in the minority. If I remember correctly from grad school, she believes that people have a "sixth sense" to know what the majority thinks, and are generally quiet when their own beliefs are not popular.

That's why the polling tactic that Allen suggested earlier is so important--of not just asking folks what THEY think, but also asking what they think most Americans think. That approach should provide some interesting data for analysis along these lines.

I've never been a big fan of this theory, but there have been some interesting data on dissent during the Gulf War and Bosnia conflict that does tend to support the spiral of silence. It would be interesting to see how this compares. But my guess is that an attack on American soil makes it a very different ball game, something new we haven't had to deal with before.

(And I feel a bit ashamed to find anything about this whole ghastly situation to be "interesting.")

Colleen
Thanks Allen Barton for clarifying that Rev. Moon owns The Washington Times, sorry for that omission. He is apparently distant from the editorial page and reporting of the newspaper (?!). Although The Times has a conservative readership in Washington, I expect and hope the editorial staff of the Times is far more contemptuous than most towards the protest, I don't know. Here is a related op-ed by Michael Kelly ("Phony Pacifists") published in The Washington Post today: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A61527-2001Oct3.html Mark Richards

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Allen Barton
Sent: Wednesday, October 03, 2001 9:37 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: Stephen Barton
Subject: Re: "The Protests of Disgust"

AAPORnet members should be aware that the editorial forwarded to us by Mark David Richards was from the Washington Times, a newspaper owned by the Rev. Moon's dubious organization.

Regarding my earlier note about the "perils of groupthink" affecting "peace" demonstrators, I refer you to today's NY Times (p. 14) story, "In the Bay
"Kevin Danaher cannot believe much of the news he hears these days. He
cannot believe the polls that say 90 percent of Americans approve of a
military response to the September 11 attacks.
"I'm a sociologist, and I know polls can be manipulated," said Mr.
Danaher, co-founder of Global Exchange, an international human rights organization
based here in San Francisco.
"Mr. Danaher is adamant because he is surrounded by people who are
against any military response to the attacks. In San Francisco, or Berkeley, or Oakland, the
three most politically liberal cities in the most politically liberal area, it
is possible not to know a single person who supports a military response to the
terrorist acts of Sept. 11."

This suggests that even people supposedly trained in social science can
be victims of groupthink. On the other hand, to send us the editorial "The
Protests of Disgust", while perhaps a salutary reminder of what the extreme right-wing
sects are thinking, without noting its dubious origins, suggests that there is some blindness
on both sides.

Anyone who wants to know what even more loonie sects are thinking are
referred to Lyndon LaRouche's website which propounds the theory that the Sept. 11 atrocities
were committed by schemers from US and British intelligence services, as was the
Oklahoma City bombing. I got this fed back to me from a Serbian-nationalist sociologist in Belgrade who got it from the web.

Allen H. Barton
Visiting Scholar, School of Journalism and Mass Communications University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
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Folks,

Here's a timely and important topic, I think, in search of few good probability samples.

The unscientific results are nevertheless somewhat frightening, at least for us Jeffersonians. I wouldn't mind at all if a major national scientific survey would find that most Americans are far more wary of surveillance by big government and big business than are the visitors to the Business Week website.

Perhaps the results are best understood from the five tables of results at the very bottom of the Business Week report below.

-- Jim
Online's recent interactive poll, "Personal Freedom vs. National Security." Over the course of three weeks, 1,344 of our readers responded to this poll -- which, having used a self-selected sample, isn't a scientific survey by any means.

Still, your responses are intriguing. While they failed to show strong support for a wholesale rollback of personal freedoms, the results indicate that a sizable portion of those who took the survey would be willing to agree to significant changes to fight terrorism. For example, 45.6% of respondents said they'd be "very willing," and 22.5% said they'd be "somewhat willing" to submit to more exhaustive vetting as part of a job-application process. An additional 7.6% said the practice "doesn't matter" to them. In sum, 75.7% of all respondents aren't concerned about more invasive background checks.

As for the controversial practice of installing facial-recognition scanners in public places and transportation hubs, some 43.1% said they'd be "very willing" to accept this step, and 17.4% said they were "somewhat willing." An additional 7.5% said it "doesn't matter." So nearly 73% of respondents would have no real problems with facial-recognition systems that could be used to spot terrorists, among other things.

JIMMY, GERRY, AND RON. While most respondents probably don't want Larry Ellison running a national ID card system (the outspoken Oracle chief offered his company's software for free to power such an effort), 47.3% said they'd be "very willing" to submit to such a system, 16% said they'd be "somewhat willing," and 5.8% said it "doesn't matter" to them. In total, just over 69% of respondents said they could accept national IDs, a concept that has been rejected by such politically disparate Presidents as Jimmy Carter, Gerald Ford, and Ronald Reagan.

We recorded far less support for more scanning of e-mail and more listening-in on phone calls. Only 22% of respondents said they'd be "very willing" to have more surveillance on these communications, while 21% said they'd be "somewhat willing," and 6% said it "doesn't matter." In contrast, 33.4% said they'd be "very
unwilling" to submit to these steps, and 16.2% said they'd be "somewhat unwilling."

So on the question of additional wiretapping and e-mail surveillance, respondents were split nearly 50-50. Likewise, on the question of installing government-mandated surveillance devices -- a.k.a. Carnivore boxes -- respondents were evenly split pro and con, with 10% saying they "don't know" how to answer.

The upshot? To help thwart terrorism, our survey takers seem willing to accede to some reductions in personal freedom or to some extensions of existing surveillance systems. After all, national ID cards merely take Social Security numbers and driver’s license numbers one step further. And facial recognition automates the type of surveillance that now takes place with video cameras everywhere. But more access to private communications systems, where we share our thoughts and feelings, remains a tough sell.

How willing would you be to see:

1) More extensive background checks when applying for a job or buying/renting a home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Willing</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>45.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Willing</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't Matter to Me</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unwilling</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unwilling</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>15.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Facial-recognition scans in public places and transit hubs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Willing</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>43.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Willing</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>17.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't Matter to Me</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unwilling</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>10.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unwilling</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>20.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) National identification cards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4) More surveillance by law-enforcement agencies of e-mail and phone calls?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Willing</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>47.31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Willing</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>16.02 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't Matter to Me</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unwilling</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6.89 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unwilling</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>21.86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.10 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Are you now more willing to accept the installation and use of sophisticated, government-mandated surveillance devices to track e-mail at your ISP than you were before the Sept. 11 attacks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>45.07 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>44.39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>10.54 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

------
By Alex Salkever in New York

www.businessweek.com:/print/bwdaily/dnflash/oct2001/nf2001103_6375.htm

Copyright 2000-2001 by Business Week - The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc

*****
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For lucid descriptions of the history of telecommunications and the technology behind it, explained for non-engineers, try http://www.TelecomWriting.com. You will also find some book recommendations and excerpts posted there.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

> Shapard Wolf wrote:
> > I don't have a comprehensive text to refer to, but here are some links with bits & pieces:
> > > General phone history:
> > > http://phworld.netfirms.com/
> > > > Area codes:
> > > http://www.lincmad.com/index.html
> > > > North American Numbering Plan:
> > > http://www.nanpa.com/
> > > > eclectic history/pictures/sounds: http://www.sandman.com/telhist.html
> > > and some training books & videos from same site:
> > http://www.sandman.com/video.html
> > > Shapard Wolf
> > Survey Research Laboratory
> > Arizona State University
> > shap.wolf@asu.edu
> > > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]
> > Sent: 02 October 2001 10:54 AM
> > To: 'AAPORNET'
> > Subject: recommendation sought re book on telephone systems
> > > I would like to have a much better understanding than I do of how telephone systems actually work - i.e., switching, etc. I have not been find a basic book on telephone systems and would appreciate any recommendations.
Lynda,

Here are some references from folks in IT who belong to a telecom user list....

The Irwin Handbook of Telecommunications by James Harry Green.

For campus administrators the recommended book has been "Campus Telecommunications Systems Managing Change" 131-page book published in 1995 *Written by campus telecommunications professionals and consultants *Provides a broad understanding of the campus telecom environment * Intended audience: the non-technical university administrator who may not have direct responsibility for telecommunications, but who needs to understand the environment in which the telecommunications manager functions as well as basic technological concepts. Order from the ACUTA e-Store at http://www.acuta.org/dynamic/store/store.cfm?CategoryID=9&do=list.

The best reference book is Newton's Telecom Dictionary, not a reading book,
but explains technology and acronyms in terms you can understand.

I found "The Essential Guide to Telecommunications" (second edition) by Annabel Z. Dodd to be informative, thorough, and written in plain English with good definitions and information not just on telecom but on the entire spectrum of electronic communications. While it's subject matter is general it is a good overview of telecommunications technology and convergence. I recommend it as a good starting place.

LAN Times Guide To Telephony by David Bezar published by McGraw Hill

Hope these prove helpful.

Bill McCready

-----Original Message-----
From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2001 12:54 PM
To: 'AAPORNET'
Subject: recommendation sought re book on telephone systems

I would like to have a much better understanding than I do of how telephone systems actually work - i.e., switching, etc. I have not been find a basic book on telephone systems and would appreciate any recommendations.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt
Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist,
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
lvoigt@fhcrc.org
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From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Received: from jannselzer@aol.com
   by imo-m04.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.7.) id 5.81.1103160f (25306)
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 3 Oct 2001 15:07:51 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <81.1103160f.28ecbc06@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 3 Oct 2001 15:07:50 EDT
In a message dated 10/3/01 11:07:16 AM Central Daylight Time, beniger@rcf.usc.edu writes:

> Over the course of three weeks, 
> 1,344 of our readers responded to this poll -- which, having used a 
> self-selected sample, isn't a scientific survey by any means. 
>
Which therefore means if a different set of 1,344 readers had responded, the findings would likely look different.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D. 
Selzer & Company, Inc. 
Des Moines 
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, 
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com 
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
AMEN!
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Received: from w5y0s9.bellsouth.net ([65.81.47.42])
    by imf07bis.bellsouth.net (InterMail vM.5.01.01.01 201-252-104)
    with ESMTP
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Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011004103924.0307c800@pop3.norton.antivirus>
X-Sender: dhalpern@mail.atl.bellsouth.net@pop3.norton.antivirus
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Thu, 04 Oct 2001 10:50:06 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>
Subject: Re: Britons most depressed in Europe (Reuters)
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110012100160.3280-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

For the fun of it sent this report off to some friends in England -- and
they were appalled. Why? Because the results were based on respondents
living in Liverpool which they, as Londoners, describe as one of the most
depressed cities in England. As one friend said who lives in Southern
England, he too would be depressed if he lived in Liverpool. It is pretty
dark and dismal.
How the researchers could talk about UK women when the only ones they talked to live in Liverpool is beyond me. And for Reuters to headline its article with "BRITONS MOST DEPRESSED IN EUROPE" is amazing all by itself. Be interesting to know what other cities in Europe were chosen to be "representative".

This kind of research and journalism taints the reputation of both. I'd be curious to know what Bob Worcester thinks -- but I think I can guess.

Dick Halpern

I At 12:12 AM 10/2/01, you wrote:

> ----------------------------------------------
> Copyright (C) 2001 Reuters Limited
> ----------------------------------------------
> http://uk.news.yahoo.com/011001/80/c5wwg.html
> 
> BRITONS MOST DEPRESSED IN EUROPE
> 
> LONDON (Reuters) - Britons are the most depressed people in Europe, according to a new study.
> Depression affects more women than men and is more common in urban areas, according to findings published on Monday in the British Journal of Psychiatry.
> Scientists compared patients in Britain, Spain, Finland, Norway and Ireland, looking at groups in busy cities and rural villages.
> "Depressive disorder is a highly prevalent condition among working age adults in Europe," the report's authors, including Professor Greg Wilkinson, of the University of Liverpool, said in the report. "Rural communities show a lower prevalence of depressive episodes."
> More than 14,000 people aged from 18 to 65 were randomly selected to take part in the study, the first of its kind to cover Europe.
> Researchers chose Liverpool and Dublin as their UK and Ireland urban research centres. The Vale of Clywd in Wales and the Irish county of Laois were the rural test centres.
> Researchers found that across Europe, 7.9 percent of women and 5.2 percent of men suffered from depression.
> The figures were much higher across the UK and Ireland, particularly in towns and cities.
> Some 21 percent of urban UK women were prone to depression, compared
> to only 4.7 percent in rural areas.
> One in 10 men in UK cities suffered depression -- the figure was halved among men in the country.
> The study found Spain had the lowest levels of depression with barely figures of barely two percent.
> In Finland and Norway there was not much difference between rates of depression in town and country, with the figure hovering between four percent and ten percent.
> The report concluded that fair treatment should be brought in across Europe to tackle depression.

http://uk.news.yahoo.com/011001/80/c5wwg.html

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     Copyright (C) 2001 Reuters Limited
-----------------------------------------------------------------------

----

******
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Date: Thu, 04 Oct 2001 14:00:38 -0400
From: "Scott Keeter" <skeeter@gmu.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.78 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Query: What is an American?
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A colleague of mine, Jon Gould, sent me this question. Since he's not an AAPOR member, I offered to forward it to the list. Reply to me privately and I'll forward responses to him -- or reply to the list since the topic is relevant to some discussions we've been having online lately.

Thanks,
Scott
Keeter

Query:

Do you know of any polls or studies that specifically asked respondents to define "what it means to be American"? I know that researchers often try to answer this question, but if I'm correct don't most pollsters use a battery of questions to estimate various aspects of the American experience (e.g., tolerance, respect for diversity, etc.)? Can you think of either quantitative or qualitative studies that directly ask respondents to define what "America" is, or what it means to be an American?

--

Scott Keeter
Dept. of Public and International Affairs
George Mason University MSN 3F4
Fairfax, VA 22030-4444
Voice 703 993 1412
Department fax 703 993 1399
Personal fax 703 832 0209
E-mail skeeter@gmu.edu
Web site http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter
Colleagues,

We just concluded a survey in Arizona asking questions about America's response to the terrorist attacks. Our questions are similar to those being asked on national surveys. One twist, we also asked about levels of support for diplomatic action.

Our Arizona numbers mirror the national numbers both in terms of support for the president and willingness to forego civil liberties in the pursuit of more security.

We found 91% support for military action, including the use of ground troops, to punish the terrorists responsible for these attacks. We also found 85% approval for diplomatic efforts to bring those responsible for the attacks before a court of law. When we asked people to state a preference for diplomatic efforts or military action, there was no clear consensus: 31% favor diplomatic efforts, 40% favor military action, and 28% have no preference.

Unfortunately, the dominant story in the nation only reflects support for military action. Have others asked questions about support for alternative responses to the Sept. 11 attacks?

Fred Solop

Frederic I. Solop, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
PO Box 15036
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
(928) 523-3135 - phone
(928) 523-6777 - fax
Fred.Solop@nau.edu
Colleagues,

We just concluded a survey in Arizona asking questions about America's response to the terrorist attacks. Our questions are similar to those being asked on national surveys. One twist, we also asked about levels of support for diplomatic action. Our Arizona numbers mirror the national numbers both in terms of support for the president and willingness to forego civil liberties in the pursuit of more security. We found 91% support for military action, including the use of ground troops, to punish the terrorists responsible for these attacks. We also found 85% approval for diplomatic efforts to bring those responsible for the attacks before a court of law. When we asked people to state a preference for diplomatic efforts or military action, there was no clear consensus: 31% favor diplomatic efforts, 40% favor military action, and 28% have no preference. Unfortunately, the dominant story in the nation only reflects support for military action. Have others asked questions about support for alternative responses to the Sept. 11 attacks?

Fred Solop

Department of Political Science
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
(928) 523-3135 - phone
(928) 523-6777 - fax
Fred.Solop@nau.edu

---Boundary_(_ID_vhyQJv1KRsa2H1ffqDbFJmg)--
This is in response to Scott Keeter's posting in search of surveys asking what it means to be an American.

The "Looking for America" survey, conducted in August 1997 for Wisconsin Public Television asks a number of questions about "What it means to be American." This was a national survey of 800 adults, conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates between 7/31/97 and 8/17/97. The dataset is archived at the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut. (www.ropercenter.uconn.edu) (860.486.4440) (ARCHIVE Number: USPSRA1997-COLUMBUS)

I summarize the results of two key batteries below:

(1): Things that make America different from all other countries (% saying makes different):

- Freedom of Speech (87%)
- Freedom of Religion (85%)
- Blending of many cultures into one culture (79%)
- Opportunity for poor to get ahead (77%)
- Motivation for exploration (74%)
- Opportunity for generations to live better (72%)
- Belief in self-reliance (72%)
- Emphasis on money as measure of success (58%)
- Children don't get guidance from parents (55%)
- High rates of crime and violence (54%)
- Problems with race relations (49%)
(2) Things that make AMERICANS different from people in other countries (% saying Americans are more... than people in other countries)

Materialistic (82%)
Individualistic (78%)
Self-Indulgent (77%)
Optimistic (74%)
Generous (69%)
Patriotic (63%)
Job-Oriented (60%)
Friendly (56%)
Creative (54%)
Rude (42%)
Hard-Working (41%)
Violent (41%)
Family-Oriented (35%)
Religious (32%)
Honest (31%)

Notes:

For analysis 1, percent responding "Don't know" ranges from 2% to 7%. Repercentaging excluding Don't know, or ranking by percent saying "No" does not change rank order.

For analysis 2, percent responding "Don't know" ranges from 3% to 8%. Ranking by percent saying "No" changes order of Religious (63% say NO) and Honest (61% say NO).

Respondents selected using "youngest male/oldest female" method.

Data weighted by undocumented "Weight" in Roper Center file.

Full question text:

(1) "We'd like to know in what ways, if any, you think the United States is different from ALL other countries. As I read you a list of possible ways the U.S. is unique, tell me which ones you think make the country different?"

"(First,) what about (INSERT ITEM - READ AND ROTATE) Does this make the U.S. different from all other countries, or not?"

"Freedom of Speech"

"Freedom of Religion"

"The blending of many cultures into one culture"

"The opportunity for a poor person to get ahead by working hard"

"The opportunity for each generation to live better than their parents"
"A belief in self-reliance, that people should be responsible for their own well-being"

"An emphasis on money and material possessions as the main measure of success"

"A motivation to explore new frontiers, on land, in space, and science"

"Children and teenagers not getting proper guidance from parents"

"High rates of crime and violence"

"Major Problems with race relations"

(2)
"Now we'd like to know in what ways, if any, you think the AMERICAN PEOPLE are different from people living in other countries. As I read you a list of possible ways the American people are unique, tell me which ones you think make Americans different."

"(First), do you think Americans are more...(INSERT ITEM-READ AND ROTATE) than people in other countries, or not?"

"Materialistic"

"Individualistic"

"Self-Indulgent"

"Optimistic"

"Generous"

"Patriotic"

"Job-Oriented"

"Friendly"

"Creative"

"Rude"

"Hard-Working"

"Violent"

"Family-Oriented"

"Religious"
"Honest"

=========
Chase H. Harrison
chase.harrison@uconn.edu
Chief Methodologist
Center for Survey Research and Analysis
University of Connecticut U-1032
341 Mansfield Rd. Room 404
Storrs, Connecticut 06269 USA

(860) 486-0653 (Office)
(860) 486-6655 (FAX)

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Scott Keeter [mailto:skeeter@gmu.edu]
> Sent: Thursday, October 04, 2001 2:01 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Query: What is an American?
> 
> A colleague of mine, Jon Gould, sent me this question. Since
> he's not an
> AAPOR member, I offered to forward it to the list. Reply to
> me privately
> and I'll forward responses to him -- or reply to the list since the
> topic is relevant to some discussions we've been having online lately.
> Thanks,
> Scott Keeter
> 
> Query:
> 
> Do you know of any polls or studies that specifically asked
> respondents
> to define "what it means to be American"? I know that
> researchers often
> try to answer this question, but if I'm correct don't most
> pollsters use a battery of questions to estimate various
> aspects of the American experience (e.g., tolerance, respect for
> diversity, etc.)? Can you think of either quantitative or
> qualitative
> studies that directly ask respondents to define what "America" is, or
> what it means to be an American?
> 
> --
> 
> Scott Keeter
> Dept. of Public and International Affairs
> George Mason University MSN 3F4
> Fairfax, VA 22030-4444
> Voice 703 993 1412
> Department fax 703 993 1399
> Personal fax 703 832 0209
From mark@bisconti.com Thu Oct  4 14:18:36 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f94LIae24039 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 4 Oct 2001
14:18:36 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from epimetheus.hosting4u.net (epimetheus.hosting4u.net
[209.15.2.70])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id OAA29677 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 4 Oct 2001 14:18:34 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: (gmail 11386 invoked from network); 4 Oct 2001 21:18:19 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
    by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 4 Oct 2001 21:18:19 -0000
Received: from mark ([138.88.86.160]) by bisconti.com ; Thu, 04 Oct 2001
16:18:14 -0500
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Resource: The ANSER Institute for Homeland Security
Date: Thu, 4 Oct 2001 17:13:30 -0400
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBKENKDJAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0038_01C14CF7.E4106F80"
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 V6.00.2600.0000

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

---------_NextPart_000_0038_01C14CF7.E4106F80
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

http://www.homelandsecurity.org/

Mark Richards

---------_NextPart_000_0038_01C14CF7.E4106F80
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=3Dhttp://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40>
Mark Richards
Chase,

Thank you for taking the time and trouble to post this to our list.

I forwarded just the rankings to a friend in Canada who is an editor on one of that country's major daily urban newspapers.
He says the rankings are almost the same as the relative frequencies for the comparable pejorative terms which Canadians most often use to *criticize* Americans generally—something I think we ought to take as high praise for the methodology used in the study you report.

To quote directly from my friend's message to me:

"Fascinating. The Canadian media appear to portray Americans as they, in fact, see themselves. Because the media are so often accused of misrepresenting groups, this is noteworthy.

"I should add that qualities which Americans may see as positive (e.g. Individualistic, Optimistic, Patriotic) are often portrayed as negative (e.g. selfish, naive, militaristic) by SOME Canadian media."

So—congratulations to all responsible for this study!

And, that said, I must ask: Are there surveys—like the one you report here—which attempt to do what my friend, in effect, does immediately above: Compare and contrast the ways a people see themselves with the ways they are perceived by other peoples, outside their own country?

-- Jim
Dear colleagues:

Has anyone done any studies of how children of various ages reacted to the events of September 11, or of how parents dealt with their children's exposure to the news images of the events. I'd appreciate any reports of research done or under way.

Leo Bogart
Dear Colleagues in Survey Research,

Virginia Commonwealth University has just released a national survey on new developments in science. The VCU Life Sciences Survey looks at public views about scientific progress, stem cell research, genetic testing and discrimination. The survey also touches on which groups providing information are most trusted in these areas (the media come out poorly!) and finds stark differences in opinion between those who are more and less religious.

A copy of the survey report is available on the web site at www.vcu.edu/lifesciencesurvey I would be happy to send you a copy via mail or email. Let me know if I can answer any questions.

Cary Funk

Dr. Carolyn L. Funk
Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Administration Director, The Commonwealth Poll Center for Public Policy 919 W. Franklin Street, PO Box 843061
Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, VA 23284-3061
804 827 1430 FAX: 804 828 6838
clfunk@vcu.edu
www.vcu.edu/commonwealthpoll/

A copy of the survey report is available on the web site at www.vcu.edu/lifesciencesurvey I would be happy to send you a copy via mail or email. Let me know if I can answer any questions.

Cary Funk

Dr. Carolyn L. Funk
Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Administration Director, The Commonwealth Poll Center for Public Policy 919 W. Franklin Street, PO Box 843061
Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, VA 23284-3061
804 827 1430 FAX: 804 828 6838
clfunk@vcu.edu
www.vcu.edu/commonwealthpoll/
I would be happy to send you a copy via mail or email. Let me know if I can answer any questions.

Cary Funk

Dr. Carolyn L. Funk
Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Administration
Director, The Commonwealth Poll
Center for Public Policy
919 W. Franklin Street, PO Box 843061
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, VA 23284-3061
804 827 1430
FAX: 804 828 6838
clfunk@vcu.edu

I stumbled across a site that some of you may find useful.

http://www.uselectionatlas.org/

I stumbled across a site that some of you may find useful.
Cary,

This is my area. I would love to see what you folks have a VCU, questionnaires, reports, whatever.

Is this going to become a Public Use dataset?

Thanks very much,

Susan

At 05:34 PM 10/5/01 -0400, you wrote:

>>>>
<excerpt><bigger><bigger>Dear Colleagues in Survey Research,

    Virginia Commonwealth University has just released a national survey on new developments in science. The VCU Life Sciences Survey looks at public views about scientific progress, stem cell research, genetic testing and discrimination. The survey also touches on which groups providing information are most trusted in these areas (the media come out poorly!) and finds stark differences in opinion between those who are more and less religious.
A copy of the survey report is available on the web site at
<<http://www.vcu.edu/lifesciencesurvey>www.vcu.edu/lifesciencesurvey I
would be happy to send you a copy via mail or email. Let me know if I can answer any
questions.

Cary Funk

</bigger></bigger>

Dr. Carolyn L. Funk Associate Professor of Political Science and Public
Administration Director, The Commonwealth Poll Center for Public Policy 919 W.
Franklin Street, PO Box 843061 Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, VA 23284-3061 804 827 1430 FAX: 804 828 6838 clfunk@vcu.edu
<<http://www.vcu.edu/commonwealthpoll/>www.vcu.edu/commonwealthpoll/

</excerpt>

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.

(850) 644-8778 Voice Mail Available

(850) 644-8776 FAX

Department of Educational Research

Florida State University

Tallahassee, FL 32306-4453

(904) 249-1683

Visit the site:

http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Sun Oct  7 09:06:21 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f97G6Le18827 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 7 Oct 2001
09:06:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from imf04bis.bellsouth.net (mail004.mail.bellsouth.net
[205.152.58.24])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id JAA22168 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 7 Oct 2001 09:06:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [209.214.132.176] by imf04bis.bellsouth.net
Sorry, list. Didn't even mean to send this to everyone once, let alone apparently twice.

Susan
Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
(850) 644-8778 Voice Mail Available
(850) 644-8776 FAX
Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4453
(904) 249-1683

Visit the site:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm
It's in the mail to you. I'll check about the public use dataset issue and the timeline for that.

Cary

At 11:34 PM 10/6/01 -0400, you wrote:

>Cary,
>  
>  This is my area. I would love to see what you folks have a VCU, questionnaires, reports, whatever.
>  
>Is this going to become a Public Use dataset?
>  
>Thanks very much,
>Susan
>
>At 05:34 PM 10/5/01 -0400, you wrote:
>  
>  Dear Colleagues in Survey Research,
>  Virginia Commonwealth University has just released a national survey on new developments in science. The VCU Life Sciences Survey looks at public views about scientific progress, stem cell research, genetic testing and discrimination. The survey also touches on which groups providing information are most trusted in these areas (the media come out poorly!) and finds stark differences in opinion between those who are more and less religious.
>  
>A copy of the survey report is available on the web site at
><%http://www.vcu.edu/lifesciencesurvey%
>  
>I would be happy to send you a copy via mail or email. Let me know if I can answer any questions.
>
>Cary Funk
>  
>Dr. Carolyn L. Funk Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Administration Director, The Commonwealth Poll Center for Public Policy
>919 W. Franklin Street, PO Box 843061 Virginia Commonwealth University
>Richmond, VA 23284-3061 804 827 1430 FAX: 804 828 6838 clfunk@vcu.edu
>  
>www.vcu.edu/commonwealthpoll/
>  
>Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
>(850) 644-8778 Voice Mail Available
>(850) 644-8776 FAX
It's in the mail to you. I'll check about the public use dataset issue and the timeline for that. At 11:34 PM 10/6/01 -0400, you wrote:

This is my area. I would love to see what you folks have a VCU, questionnaires, reports, whatever.

Is this going to become a Public Use dataset? Thanks very much,

Susan

At 05:34 PM 10/5/01 -0400, you wrote: &gt;&gt;&gt;

Dear Colleagues in Survey Research,

Virginia Commonwealth University has just released a national survey on new developments in science. The VCU Life Sciences Survey looks at public views about scientific progress, stem cell research, genetic testing and discrimination. The survey also touches on which groups providing information are most trusted in these areas (the media come out poorly!) and finds stark differences in opinion between those who are more and less religious.

A copy of the survey report is available on the web site at &lt;a href="http://www.vcu.edu/lifesciencesurvey"&gt;http://www.vcu.edu/lifesciencesurvey&lt;/a&gt; I would be happy to send you a copy via mail or email. Let me know if I can answer any questions.

Cary Funk

Dr. Carolyn L. Funk Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Administration Director, The Commonwealth Poll Center for Public Policy 919 W. Franklin Street, PO Box 843061 Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, VA 23284-3061 804 827 1430
Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.  
(850) 644-8778 Voice Mail Available  
(850) 644-8776 FAX  
Department of Educational Research  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4453  
(904) 249-1683  
Visit the site:  
<a href="http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm">http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/</a>

--=====================_6650375==_.ALT--

>From cgarcia@unm.edu Mon Oct  8 12:37:24 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f98JbNe25111 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 8 Oct 2001
12:37:23 -0700
Received: from linux06.unm.edu (IDENT:qmailr@linux06.unm.edu [129.24.15.38])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us) with SMTP
  id MAA12285 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 8 Oct 2001 12:37:22 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (gmail 24083 invoked by uid 124); 8 Oct 2001 19:36:41 -0000
Received: from cgarcia@unm.edu by mail.unm.edu with qmail-scanner-0.96 (. Clean.
Processed in 0.085382 secs); 08 Oct 2001 19:36:41 -0000
Received: from dhcp-208-0470.unm.edu (129.24.214.213)
  by linux06.unm.edu with SMTP; 8 Oct 2001 19:36:41 -0000
Date: Mon, 08 Oct 2001 13:37:18 -0600
From: "F. Chris Garcia" <cgarcia@unm.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: "F. Chris Garcia" <cgarcia@unm.edu>
Subject: Latino/Hispanic Oversamples?
Message-ID: <1820858162.1002548238@dhcp-208-0470.unm.edu>
X-Mailer: Mulberry (Win32) [1.4.5, s/n S-399010]
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Dear AAPORnet Colleagues,

Does anyone among you know whether or not the NES or the GSS oversamples for Latinos/Hispanics on a regular basis? (Or even if they do so occasionally?...or if any other major, ongoing surveys balloon their Hispanic samples regularly?)

Thanks in advance.

Chris Garcia

Susan Pinkus
Director, LA Times Poll

I over sample Latinos, but usually on statewide and local voter polls (i.e., gubernatorial race in California, Los Angeles mayoral race, etc.). In order to get likely voters in the state of California, you have to have large over samples of Latinos. At the LA Times, we do not look at any subgroup separately unless there is at least 100 respondents in that cell.

Susan Pinkus
Director, LA Times Poll

-----Original Message-----
From: F. Chris Garcia [SMTP:cgarcia@unm.edu]
Dear AAPORnet Colleagues,

Does anyone among you know whether or not the NES or the GSS oversamples for Latinos/Hispanics on a regular basis? (Or even if they do so occasionally...or if any other major, ongoing surveys balloon their Hispanic samples regularly?)

Thanks in advance.

Chris Garcia

---

The University of New Hampshire Survey Center has an opening for an experienced survey researcher in Durham NH. Minimum qualifications are an MA and 5 years survey research experience. Applicants should have strong analytic skills, proficiency in SPSS, and excellent written and oral communication skills. CATI experience is desirable.

For more information, see the UNH Human Services web site http://www.unh.edu/hr/employ/pat/01-pat.htm

Interested parties should send a cover letter and resume to: Andrew Smith UNH Survey Center Thompson Hall G16 University of New Hampshire Durham, NH 03824
Would appreciate any insight y'all may have on this....

My team has been hired to evaluate a pilot project in South Florida designed to offer health coverage for those who are currently without health insurance.

At the initial appointment when the outreach worker interviews the family to see which coverage they qualify for and will best meet their needs, our research team also has the opportunity to collect some data via a short questionnaire that clients fill out themselves, with pencil and paper. We're thinking one page, repeated in Spanish on the other side of the sheet.

I would love to hear from anyone who has tried this before. I am wondering if you felt y'all got good data, and how much a problem it was for clients to read and understand the instrument? (Can outreach workers help those with literacy issues?)

Thanks bunches,

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109  
University of Florida,  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015  
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195
NYAAPOR presents its first evening meeting of the season...

WAR, TERRORISM, AND THE MIDDLE EAST: PUBLIC OPINION AT HOME AND ABROAD

Gary Langer, ABC News
Tom Miller, RoperASW
David Moore, The Gallup Poll
Moderated by Murray Edelman, Editorial Director, Voter News Service

Date: Wednesday, October 17, 2001
Refreshments: 5:30-6:00 p.m.
Presentation: 6:00-8:00 p.m.
Place: The Lighthouse, Benay Venuta Hall, 111 E. 59th Street (between Park and Lexington)

As the United States and its allies prepare for war on terrorism, understanding public attitudes--here, in Europe, and in the Middle East--will be critical. NYAAPOR is pleased to convene a panel to discuss a range of vital issues:

* Current attitudes in America about the attack and how to respond
* Evolving American opinions toward the Middle East, Islam, terrorism, war, and peace
* Middle-Eastern values and feelings toward the U.S.
* Methodological considerations when conducting research in times of crisis
* And other topics

Attendance is by advance reservation only. If you are planning to attend, RSVP by Monday, October 15th.

To reserve your place, please E-mail MGMTOFFICE@aol.com or call (212) 684-0542.
Does anybody has information or links to sites with public opinion research outside USA after the bombings? More specifically about local responses to the call to participate in the Alliance against terrorism?

Ulises Beltran
BGC, S. C.
Mexico.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Feinberg, Geoff" <GFeinberg@roper.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, October 09, 2001 11:15 AM
Subject: NYAAPOR meeting on October 17

> NYAAPOR presents its first evening meeting of the season... 
>
WAR, TERRORISM, AND THE MIDDLE EAST: PUBLIC OPINION AT HOME AND ABROAD

Gary Langer, ABC News
Tom Miller, RoperASW
David Moore, The Gallup Poll
Moderated by Murray Edelman, Editorial Director, Voter News Service

Date: Wednesday, October 17, 2001
Refreshments: 5:30-6:00 p.m.
Presentation: 6:00-8:00 p.m.
Place: The Lighthouse, Benay Venuta Hall, 111 E. 59th Street (between Park and Lexington)

As the United States and its allies prepare for war on terrorism, understanding public attitudes--here, in Europe, and in the Middle East--will be critical. NYAAPOR is pleased to convene a panel to discuss a range of vital issues:

* Current attitudes in America about the attack and how to respond
* Evolving American opinions toward the Middle East, Islam, terrorism, war,
* and peace
* Middle-Eastern values and feelings toward the U.S.
* Methodological considerations when conducting research in times of crisis
* And other topics

Attendance is by advance reservation only. If you are planning to attend, RSVP by Monday, October 15th.

To reserve your place, please E-mail MGMTOFFICE@aol.com or call (212) 684-0542.

This meeting is free for current members, student members and HLMs.
Non-member students: $5; All other non-members: $15.

RE: Latino/Hispanic Oversamples -- KUDOS
I commend LA Times Poll for being a leader in recognizing distinct Latino-American thought as part of CA’s thinking, and where it matters most—at the voting booth. I’d love to see more ethnic-and other group-over-sampling reported on a regular basis. This might increase knowledge and understanding, and I love that. Also, LA Times Poll shows the N, so you can decide your comfort level (I like 100 for demos). Thanks Susan Pinkus. All the best from the East, where I’m wishing for wisdom and peace,
Mark Richards

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Pinkus, Susan
Sent: Monday, October 08, 2001 4:50 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: Latino/Hispanic Oversamples?

I over sample Latinos, but usually on statewide and local voter polls (i.e., gubernatorial race in California, Los Angeles mayoral race, etc.). In order to get likely voters in the state of California, you have to have large over samples of Latinos. At the LA Times, we do not look at any subgroup separately unless there is at least 100 respondents in that cell.

Susan Pinkus
Director, LA Times Poll

-----Original Message-----
From: F. Chris Garcia [SMTP:cngarcia@unm.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 08, 2001 12:37 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: F. Chris Garcia
Subject: Latino/Hispanic Oversamples?

Dear AAPORnet Colleagues,

Does anyone among you know whether or not the NES or the GSS
oversamples
   for Latinos/Hispanics on a regular basis? (Or even if they do so
occasionally?...or if any other major, ongoing surveys balloon their
Hispanic samples regularly?)

Thanks in advance.

Chris Garcia

>From simonetta@artsci.com Wed Oct 10 06:17:32 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9ADHVe25852 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001
06:17:31
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA19223 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001 06:17:31 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
   id <43H4X1J8>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001 09:15:19 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F33225F2A8AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: A minor problem with the census in the UK
Date: Wed, 10 Oct 2001 09:15:19 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

"Jedi Knights achieve official recognition as a religion"

"Coming very near the bottom of an official list of religions put out by the
Statistics Office, Jedi Knight is known by the code 896. Heathen comes in at
897.
Followed by Atheist at 898 and lastly None with 899. It's not exactly a
ringing
endorsement though since the 800s come after every other religion, no matter
how
obscure, and 700 is used for all 'other religions'. "

"With 95 per cent of census forms now received and scanning, coding and data
capture
due to be completed by August next year, we should know just how many
official
Jedi
Knights there are in the UK by the end of 2002."

"This is the official line: the Census does not provide recognition to any
religion
in the official statistics nor does it attempt to define religion. The list
that you
can see by checking out the pdf file above is merely a list of possible
answers that
people have been known to put in the box marked religion."
Apparently the same movement affected the Australian Census as well.

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

>From Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil Wed Oct 10 06:24:32 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9ADOWe26472 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001
06:24:32 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ddsmttayz003.sam.pentagon.mil (ddsmttayz003.sam.pentagon.mil [140.185.1.132])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA22150 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001 06:24:23 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by ddsmttayz003 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    id <4KFTGK9Q>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001 09:23:37 -0400
Message-ID: <F5D5DAE9D02BD511B23800805FBBC0242430DA@ddsmttayz066.int.dmdc.osd.mil>
From: "Caplan, James R ,,DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: A minor problem with the census in the UK
Date: Wed, 10 Oct 2001 09:23:37 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

All the more reason to say:
"May the forced choice be with you."
Jim Caplan
Arlington

Reply to:
James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Survey Technology Branch
Defense Manpower Data Center
703.696.5848
caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil <mailto:caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>

-----Original Message-----
From: Leo Simonetta [SMTP:simonetta@artsci.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 10, 2001 9:15 AM
To: Aapornet (E-mail)
Subject: A minor problem with the census in the UK

"Jedi Knights achieve official recognition as a religion"

"Coming very near the bottom of an official list of religions put out by the
Statistics Office, Jedi Knight is known by the code 896. Heathen comes
in at
897. Followed by Atheist at 898 and lastly None with 899. It's not
exactly a
ringing endorsement though since the 800s come after every other
religion,
no matter how obscure, and 700 is used for all 'other religions'. "
"With 95 per cent of census forms now received and scanning, coding and
data
capture due to be completed by August next year, we should know just
how
many official Jedi Knights there are in the UK by the end of 2002."  
"This is the official line: the Census does not provide recognition to
any
religion in the official statistics nor does it attempt to define
religion.
The list that you can see by checking out the pdf file above is merely
a
list of possible answers that people have been known to put in the box
marked religion."

http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/28/22113.html

Apparently the same movement affected the Australian Census as well.

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

>From expl12@psu.edu Wed Oct 10 07:25:31 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9AEFVe28764 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001
  07:25:31 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from f04n01.cac.psu.edu (f04s01.cac.psu.edu [128.118.141.31])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id HAA18288 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001 07:25:30 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ecuador.psu.edu (ecuador.la.psu.edu [128.118.17.50])
  by f04n01.cac.psu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA95746
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001 10:25:18 -0400
Message-Id: <4.3.1.2.2001101010100645.015571d0@mail.psu.edu>
X-Sender: expl12@mail.psu.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.1
Date: Wed, 10 Oct 2001 10:25:19 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Eric Plutzer <expl12@psu.edu>
Subject: self-administered point-of-service survey
In-Reply-To: <200110100707.f9A77je19433@listproc.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"
<html>
Colleen,<br>
This isn't exactly what you are doing but there are some similarities...

In 1985, Barbara Ryan and I worked with a family planning clinic to design a study that had their counselors administer both a brief questionnaire and also ask some semi-structured interviews during the normal pre-abortion counseling session. Generally, we got very good data -- good enough for two refereed articles and a cite in O'Connor's *Casey v. Planned Parenthood* opinion. However, pretests gave us several concerns that required some constant monitoring and some protocol adjustment. First, the helping professionals became too gung-ho about the survey and the refusal rate was far too low (under 3%) to believe that our informed consent paragraph really worked. (this paragraph was printed on two forms and given verbally also). Social workers and counsellors have real power over clients and potential clients and those interested in services or benefits may feel they *must* participate. So the normal informed consent protocol was far too weak. Indeed, some counsellors continued with the interview even after some sensitive questions elicited emotional responses that really demanded the counsellors' helping skills and not another survey question. So we did periodic debriefings to remind counsellors that this was an adjunct to their duties and not a replacement.

Second, in face to face interviewing, interviewers can easily provide tonal and facial cues about the socially desirable response. This is amplified when the interviewer is not a professional interviewer and whose training predisposes them to certain views about the respondents. Even a self-administered questionnaire can be tainted if the respondent thinks the interviewer will see the responses. So you might consider using a questionnaire in an envelope (or ballot box) protocol similar to what NORC uses for its sexual behavior questions on the GSS. This can project to respondents that any embarrassing admissions will really be confidential.
We didn't have major literacy problems but had some minor problems uncovered as we coded the data (predictably, from poorer young women). If you have the luxury of a pretest, you might be able to identify problems and provide interviewers with a list of neutral responses to anticipated questions.

-- Eric

From: "Colleen Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>

My team has been hired to evaluate a pilot project in South Florida designed to offer health coverage for those who are currently without health insurance.

At the initial appointment when the outreach worker interviews the family to see which coverage they qualify for and will best meet their needs, our research team also has the opportunity to collect some data via a short questionnaire that clients fill out themselves, with pencil and paper. We're thinking one page, repeated in Spanish on the other side of the sheet.

I would love to hear from anyone who has tried this before. I am wondering if you felt y'all got good data, and how much a problem it was for clients to read and understand the instrument? (Can outreach workers help those with literacy issues?)

---

Some pictures from our recent adoption trip to China are at:

---

>From pjlavarakas@tvratings.com Wed Oct 10 08:59:24 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f9AFxNe05401 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001 08:59:23 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from reliant.nielsenmedia.com (reliant.nielsenmedia.com [63.114.249.15])
We are in the field with a national multi-mode survey that includes a data collection instrument that is mailed to households.

Last night we started to pick up reluctance among a very small proportion of RDD households (linked directly to news recently about bio-terrorism possibilities) to receiving a mailing from a survey company.

In the spirit of AAPOR, I am sharing this information and hoping others will be willing to share any experiences they are having with mail surveys response rates in the coming weeks.

Thanks, PJL

>From 71501.716@compuserve.com Wed Oct 10 11:02:37 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9AI2Yel6153 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001
  11:02:36 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from siaaglaa.compuserve.com (siaaglaa.compuserve.com
  [149.174.40.3])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id LAA27356 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001 11:02:34 -0700
  (PDT)
Received: (from mailgate@localhost)
  by siaaglaa.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.12) id OAA09274
  for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 10 Oct 2001 14:01:37 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Wed, 10 Oct 2001 13:58:15 -0400
From: Margaret Roller <71501.716@compuserve.com>
Subject: Hispanics by Race
Sender: Margaret Roller <71501.716@compuserve.com>
To: "INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
I am seeing many survey respondents who identify themselves as Hispanic skip the race question. I am trying to get a feeling for how typical or atypical this is. In consulting the Census data and chatting with someone in the race branch, I see that all Hispanics are accounted for under one of the race categories, i.e., every Hispanic included in the Census identified with a race. When asked about no answers, I was told that every attempt was made to place a Hispanic person in a race slot regardless of whether a race was specified.

My question is: What levels of no answer or "don't know" have you folks received from Hispanics in answer to the race question? [This may be another question for Susan Pinkus...Susan?]

Thanks.

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com
This is consistent with the Census Bureau's experience. Experimental research conducted during Census 2000 shows that on self-administered mail questionnaires, about 21% of Hispanics left the race item blank. Missing data are edited and imputed in the census.

(If you would like a copy of the paper describing the research, please email me offline.)

Betsy Martin
Senior Survey Methodologist
U. S. Census Bureau
I am seeing many survey respondents who identify themselves as Hispanic skip the race question. I am trying to get a feeling for how typical or atypical this is. In consulting the Census data and chatting with someone in the race branch, I see that all Hispanics are accounted for under one of the race categories, i.e., every Hispanic included in the Census identified with a race. When asked about no answers, I was told that every attempt was made to place a Hispanic person in a race slot regardless of whether a race was specified.

My question is: What levels of no answer or "don't know" have you folks received from Hispanics in answer to the race question? [This may be another question for Susan Pinkus...Susan?]

Thanks.

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com
We recently completed a mail membership survey in Puerto Rico in which we asked ethnicity and race. We first asked if the individual was Hispanic or Latino. We then asked race. We got about a 7% no answer on race. The survey was available to our members in both Spanish and English - so it was a population that was often primarily Spanish speaking.

Gretchen Straw
Associate Research Director
AARP

-----Original Message-----
From: Margaret Roller [mailto:71501.716@compuserve.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 10, 2001 1:58 PM
To: INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Hispanics by Race

I am seeing many survey respondents who identify themselves as Hispanic skip the race question. I am trying to get a feeling for how typical or atypical this is. In consulting the Census data and chatting with someone in the race branch, I see that all Hispanics are accounted for under one of the race categories, i.e., every Hispanic included in the Census identified with a race. When asked about no answers, I was told that every attempt was made to place a Hispanic person in a race slot regardless of whether a race was specified.

My question is: What levels of no answer or "don't know" have you folks received from Hispanics in answer to the race question? [This may be another question for Susan Pinkus...Susan?]

Thanks.

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rnr@rollerresearch.com

>From HFienberg@stats.org Wed Oct 10 12:15:34 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9AJFXe00083 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001
12:15:33 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from cmpa01.workgroup (w042.z209220225.was-dc.dsl.cnc.net
   [209.220.225.42])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id MAA18574 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001 12:15:32 -0700
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
October 4, 2001 CONTACT:  Cary Funk
Director of the Commonwealth Poll
804/827-1430
Email: clfunk@vcu.edu
www.vcu.edu/uns

Americans Welcome Scientific Advancements with Caution
Life Sciences Survey Conducted by the VCU Center for Public Policy

RICHMOND, Va. Ð Americans are extremely supportive of the giant strides being made in science and technology but also are very concerned about the moral implications inherent in areas such as stem-cell research and genetic testing, according to a new nationwide survey conducted by Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond.

The VCU Life Sciences Survey was conducted with 1,122 adults nationwide. The margin of error for the poll is +/- 3 percent. Highlights of the survey found that:

Scientific Progress and Moral Values
An overwhelming majority of Americans (85 percent) believe that science and technology have made society better, but at the same time a majority (72 percent) also believe that science doesn't pay enough attention to moral values.

More religious Americans are especially likely to think that science doesn't pay enough attention to moral values.

Americans are more confident about the capacity of science and medicine to solve problems associated with disease than they are about society's capacity to address
many other problems. 83 percent are confident that genetic research will lead
to major advances in the treatment of diseases during the next 15 years. 73 percent
believe it is likely that mortality rates from cancer will be reduced by half
in the next 15 years compared to only 20 percent who think the crime rate will be reduced
by half and 31 percent who said the number of deaths from truck and automobile accidents will be reduced by half.

Stem Cell Research
Medical research that uses stem cells from human embryos is favored by a 48 to 43 percent plurality. There are clear divisions in viewpoint over stem cells depending on the importance of religious beliefs. 71 percent of those who say religion is not important to them favor stem cell research compared to 38 percent who say religion provides a great deal of guidance in their life. At the same time, the vast majority of Americans (78 percent) believe that ethical concerns over stem cell research are serious.

The public is more likely to trust information on stem cell research from scientific researchers and medical ethicists than information that comes from other groups. 86 percent say they would trust information on stem cell research that comes from scientific and medical researchers and 81 percent would trust information from specialists in medical ethics. This compares with 58 percent who would trust information from family and friends on this issue, 54 percent from religious leaders, and 46 percent from the media.

Genetic Testing and Discrimination
A clear majority (77 percent) believe that genetic testing should be made easily available. Six in ten report they would get tested if it was easily available and even more (67 percent) would get their children tested if it was easily available.

Large majorities believe that genetic testing results will lead to discrimination by health insurance companies and employers. 84 percent believe that health insurance companies will deny coverage and 69 percent believe that employers will deny people jobs because of genetic testing results. Americans are almost evenly
split (by 46 to 43 percent) over whether it is even possible to prevent discrimination from genetic testing results.

On the issue of which groups or individuals can protect people from the misuse of genetic information, large majorities express confidence in physicians, genetic counselors, and scientists. Just under half, 47 percent, have confidence that the federal or state government can protect people from misuse of this information. Confidence in the media is strikingly lower than any other group asked about. Only 21 percent of Americans have confidence in the media to protect people from the misuse of this information.

Trust and the News Media
While a 45 percent plurality say they would turn first to the news media to learn more about stem cell research, few appear to trust the information provided by the media. Trust for the media on this issue was lower than that for all but one other group “the U.S. Congress. Similarly, fewer people expressed confidence in the media to protect people from the misuse of genetic information than did so for any of ten other groups.

Religion, Catholics, and Science
While the Roman Catholic leadership has been active in the debate against stem cell research, Catholics in America hold views quite similar to the public at large on stem cells. The same holds for opinion on abortion. More religious Americans depart sharply from other Americans on new developments in science and medicine. Those who are more religious are more likely to oppose stem cell research, are less likely to think the benefits of genetic research outweigh the risks and are more likely to believe that "science doesn't pay enough attention to moral values."

>From hank@surveysystem.com Wed Oct 10 14:12:20 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9ALCKe16809 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 10 Oct 2001
  14:12:20 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from e4500a.callatg.com (IDENT:106@e4500a.atgi.net [216.174.194.60])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
Hi,

Has anyone heard of a polling firm called Dresner, Wickers & Associates, Inc. or DW&A, Inc.?

They are cited in an ad in local newspapers as having conducted a survey on a local political issue. The question wording was highly leading (and often misleading), and they are quoted as giving a "careful review" to the results of these highly biased questions, which leads to the conclusion the sponsors wanted published. DW&A also claims a margin of error of plus or minus 4, when the standard formula gives a confidence interval or 4.87 at 95%.

Clearly, the only reason for conducting this "poll" was to use its predetermined results as the contents of an ad designed to mislead the public as to the state of public opinion on a contentious issue. It seems to me to be clearly unethical/unprofessional. Is there any AAPOR (or CASRO) position on such surveys?

Also does anyone have any comments on this firm? Reply on- or off-list (hank@surveysystem.com), as seems appropriate.

Thank you all very much,

Hank

Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
Creative Research Systems
makers of The Survey System: Survey software that makes you look good.
It is my impression that some individuals who consider themselves to be Hispanic see the race question as asking for the same information a second time. I base this observation on a lot of cognitive interviews I did during the 1990's with individuals primarily of Mexican descent, who after answering the question on the U.S. Census form, "Is this person Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?" thought the next question, "What is this person's race?" was redundant, and would state something like, "I've already answered this question, I'm Mexican. That's my race." I do understand that the first question concerns an ethnicity, and the second question is about race, and thus the reasons for asking people who are Hispanic to answer both questions.

I have wondered, again based upon cognitive interviews, if the presentation of many "country" categories in the race question, including, e.g. Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, conveys to some respondents the idea
that these race categories aren't really different than the ethnicity categories (e.g. Mexican, Puerto Rican or Cuban) in the preceding question. And, it has been my impression that people who feel they have already answered a question are likely NOT to answer a question the second time it is asked. I don't know an easy solution to this problem, but would be interested in knowing of any solutions found by others.

Don

******************************************************************************
Don A. Dillman, Social and Economic Sciences Research Center and Departments of Sociology and Rural Sociology Washington State University Pullman, Washington 99164-4014
Tel: 509-335-1511 Fax: 509-335-0116
dillman@wsu.edu
http://survey.sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/
******************************************************************************

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Margaret Roller
Sent: Wednesday, October 10, 2001 10:58 AM
To: INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Hispanics by Race

I am seeing many survey respondents who identify themselves as Hispanic skip the race question. I am trying to get a feeling for how typical or atypical this is. In consulting the Census data and chatting with someone in the race branch, I see that all Hispanics are accounted for under one of the race categories, i.e., every Hispanic included in the Census identified with a race. When asked about no answers, I was told that every attempt was made to place a Hispanic person in a race slot regardless of whether a race was specified.

My question is: What levels of no answer or "don't know" have you folks received from Hispanics in answer to the race question? [This may be another question for Susan Pinkus...Susan?]

Thanks.

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
Hi Chris,

I am virtually positive that both GSS and NES do NOT oversample Latinos. They just do not have the $\$$ to do so.

The people who could absolutely confirm this are:

Tom Smith (PI of GSS, at U of Chicago)
Mike Traugott (Heads Center for Polit. Studies at IRS Michigan)

both are in the AAPOR directory (Tele # & Email address)

let me know if you want the ir contact data.

Rob

Dear AAPORnet Colleagues,

Does anyone among you know whether or not the NES or the GSS oversamples for Latinos/Hispanics on a regular basis? (Or even if they do so occasionally?...or if any other major, ongoing surveys balloon their Hispanic...
samples regularly?)

Thanks in advance.

Chris Garcia

---

Andy White
10/11/2001 09:35 AM

To: SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU
cc:

Subject: Seminar Announcement

The Committee on National Statistics cordially welcomes you to attend its Fall Seminar:

CENSUS CROSSROADS: The Decision on the 2000 Census Adjustment and Early Planning for 2010

Friday, October 26, 2001
3:30 -- 5:00 p.m.
Auditorium at the National Academy of Sciences
2100 C Street, NW
The decennial census has an impact on the entire federal statistical system and affects every U.S. resident. Join us for a discussion on the process and findings behind the October census adjustment decision and early 2010 census planning, featuring John Thompson (Principal Associate Director of the Census Bureau) and Preston J. Waite (Associate Director for the Decennial Census).

A brief tea from 3:00 - 3:30 p.m. in the Great Hall at the National Academy of Sciences will precede the seminar. A reception will follow from 5:00 -- 6:00 p.m. in the Members' Room.

All are welcome, but for security purposes, you must RSVP by October 23. To RSVP, or if you need further information, please contact Danelle Dessaint at (202) 334-3096 or email CNSTAT@nas.edu.

Please arrive early as parking is limited, and be prepared to show identification to enter the building. Please note that the entrance to the National Academy of Sciences building at 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, is closed to the public.

Guests wishing to take Metro to the seminar are encouraged to take the National Academies' shuttle, which departs from the Foggy Bottom/GWU Metro station every 30 minutes.

We look forward to seeing you on October 26.
My own experience with this matter in RDD telephone surveys from my university-based
days is that when you first ask for someone's ethnicity and then ask for their
race, with an open-end wording of the race question (e.g., What race or races do you
consider yourself?), a significant minority of those who gave a "Hispanic" answer to
their ethnicity will say that are the same for their race and when you probe them for
another answer (e.g., Native American, White, Black, Other) many will still will
insist that their race is Hispanic or Latino/Latina or Chicano/Chicana.

PJL
Exemple de "seminar" !!!!!!!

Phil

At 09:37 11/10/01, you wrote:

> ---------------------- Forwarded by Andy White on 10/11/2001 09:35 AM
> ----------------------
> >
> > Andy White
> > 10/11/2001 09:35 AM
> >
> > To: SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU
> > cc:
> >
> > Subject: Seminar Announcement
> >
> > The Committee on National Statistics cordially welcomes you to attend
> > its Fall Seminar:
> >
> > CENSUS CROSSROADS: The Decision on the 2000 Census Adjustment and
> > Early Planning for 2010
> >
> > Friday, October 26, 2001
> > 3:30 -- 5:00 p.m.
> > Auditorium at the National Academy of Sciences
> > 2100 C Street, NW
> >
> > The decennial census has an impact on the entire federal statistical
> > system and affects every U.S. resident. Join us for a discussion on
> > the process and findings behind the October census adjustment decision
> > and early 2010 census planning, featuring John Thompson (Principal Associate Director of the Census Bureau) and Preston J. Waite (Associate Director for the Decennial Census).
> >
> > A brief tea from 3:00 - 3:30 p.m. in the Great Hall at the National Academy of Sciences will precede the seminar. A reception will follow from 5:00 p.m. in the Members' Room.
> >
> > All are welcome, but for security purposes, you must RSVP by October 23.
> >
> To
RSVP, or if you need further information, please contact Danelle Dessaint at (202) 334-3096 or email CNSTAT@nas.edu.

Please arrive early as parking is limited, and be prepared to show identification to enter the building. Please note that the entrance to the National Academy of Sciences building at 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, is closed to the public.

Guests wishing to take Metro to the seminar are encouraged to take the National Academies' shuttle, which departs from the Foggy Bottom/GWU Metro station every 30 minutes.

We look forward to seeing you on October 26.

Philippe Ricard
C9tudes socio-graphiques inc.
1120 de Sainte-Foy
Saint-Bruno-de-Montarville (Québec)
J3V 3C2
(450) 441-6560
pricard@cam.org
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Exemple de "seminar" !!!!!!!!
<br>
Phil<br>
At 09:37 11/10/01, you wrote:<br>
<br>
<blockquote type=cite class=cite cite>---------------------- Forwarded by Andy White on 10/11/2001 09:35 AM<br> ---------------------------<br> <br> <br> Andy White<br> 10/11/2001 09:35 AM<br> <br> To:&nbsp;&nbsp;SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU<br> cc:&lt;br &gt; &lt;br &gt; Subject:&nbsp;&nbsp;Seminar Announcement<br> &lt;br &gt; &lt;br &gt; The Committee on National Statistics cordially welcomes you to attend its Fall Seminar:&lt;br &gt;<br> &lt;br &gt; CENSUS CROSSROADS:&nbsp;&nbsp;The Decision on the 2000 Census Adjustment and Early Planning for 2010&lt;br &gt; Friday, October 26, 2001&lt;br &gt; 3:30 -- 5:00 p.m.&lt;br &gt; Auditorium at the National Academy of Sciences&lt;br &gt; 2100 C Street, NW&lt;br &gt; The
The decennial census has an impact on the entire federal statistical system and affects every U.S. resident. Join us for a discussion on the process and findings behind the October census adjustment decision and early 2010 census planning, featuring John Thompson (Principal Associate Director of the Census Bureau) and Preston J. Waite (Associate Director for the Decennial Census). A brief tea from 3:00 - 3:30 p.m. in the Great Hall at the National Academy of Sciences will precede the seminar. A reception will follow from 5:00 -- 6:00 p.m. in the Members' Room. All are welcome, but for security purposes, you must RSVP by October 23. To RSVP, or if you need further information, please contact Danelle Dessaint at (202) 334-3096 or email CNSTAT@nas.edu.

Please arrive early as parking is limited, and be prepared to show identification to enter the building. Please note that the entrance to the National Academy of Sciences building at 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, is closed to the public. Guests wishing to take Metro to the seminar are encouraged to take the National Academies' shuttle, which departs from the Foggy Bottom/GWU Metro station every 30 minutes. We look forward to seeing you on October 26.

Philippe Ricard
Études socio-graphiques inc.
1120 de Sainte-Foy
Saint-Bruno-de-Montarville (Québec) J3V 3C2
(450) 441-6560
pricard@cam.org
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>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Thu Oct 11 07:27:11 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9BERBe08969 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Oct 2001 07:27:11 -0700 (PDT)
07:27:11 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from fuji.hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.145])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id HAA24388 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Oct 2001 07:27:10 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from HPDom-Message_Server by fuji.hp.ufl.edu
    with Novell GroupWise; Thu, 11 Oct 2001 10:26:43 -0400
Message-Id: <abc573e3.003@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.5.1
I am so glad y'all brought this up--I've been struggling with this issue all day yesterday.

I had not looked at the number of "don't know" responses to our race items, although I will be running that directly:)  But I also can add my voice to those who have noticed a lot of Hispanics choosing "other--specify" and giving "Hispanic" as the race.

This is a phone survey where we first ask about whether they are Hispanic, then what kind of Hispanic, then race.  So if they say "Hispanic" at that point, the interviewer is supposed to probe something along the lines of, "Thank you, we've recorded that you are of Hispanic descent.  But what is your race.  Would you say....?"

The first time this happened was in Florida, and we had 1,400 of "others" who specified "Hispanic" for race.  I blamed the subcontractor who did the fieldwork, and insisted we needed better training on race issues.  And indeed, I think the new training I developed was worthwhile...but when we repeated the survey in other states I was still getting a fair number of "other--Hispanic."  And in reading the interviewer's notes, there were comments like, "I know I'm not supposed to accept this, but he really insisted."  These showed that the interviewer had indeed paid attention to the training, but still.

I conclude that a lot of Hispanics genuinely see that as their race and either cannot or will not choose one or more of the "official" categories we offer.  Whether that translates into item nonresponse or an "Other--specify" answer depends in part on whether the latter option is even available.  One could do a nice experiment to test that theory, but it wouldn't be all that useful in helping us how to deal with this phenomenon.

I also wonder how much variation there is by the exact Hispanic group and region of the country.  I don't remember this being a factor in my work in Texas.

I also wonder about mode--wouldn't a mail survey have higher rates of skipped questions and "Other--Hispanic" than a telephone survey where an interviewer can probe to get a race?

Well, fast forward to the present, and I'm developing a
self-administered survey for use in South Florida, which has a high concentration of Hispanics. As it turns out, since this is a program evaluation, we can probably get race/ethnicity from administrative data. But if I have to ask it in a survey, I am seriously thinking of just asking one item that combines race and ethnicity, offering four all-that-apply choices--

Hispanic
Non-Hispanic White
Black or African American
Other (specify)

Has anyone else done that kind of thing?

I just can't see trying to force a respondent into a peg hole that they don't think fits them at all.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195
Just to add some specific data to Paul's observation, which matches our experience directly at UVA CSR:

We have completed telephone surveys in a large, urban county in Northern Virginia for nine successive years. Each of these includes a yes/no question on whether respondent considers him/herself to be of Hispanic or Spanish origin, and a separate, forced-choice race question. Hispanics are relatively rare in the area (4.1% of our complete interviews), and presumably underrepresented in this English-only survey. The surveys have varied in whether the Hispanic ID question is asked before or after the race question. But over the nine years (1993-2001) we have responses on the race question from 331 self-identified Hispanics. They report their race to be:

- 67.5% white
- 12.5% black
- 0.0% Asian
- 0.7% American Indian
- 0.7% Pacific Islander
- 18.6% other

We know from looking at the 'other/specify' responses that most of the 'others' for Hispanics are the respondents' restatement, in one phrase or another, that they are Hispanic.

I am sure that the tendency of Hispanics to think of Hispanic origin as a racial identification would vary regionally and perhaps by country of origin (which we do not record), as well as English-language proficiency, but thought these recent telephone results from one county in the East (Prince William County, VA) might be of interest nonetheless.

And I would further note what is perhaps obvious: that thinking of Hispanic-ness as 'race' is far from being an error or misunderstanding, but is for some people a strongly held view that can be important in ethnic ideology and group identification. Any workable, culturally sensitive interview protocol must allow for expression of this view in those who hold it.

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434) 243-5223
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE         CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research             FAX: (434) 243-5233
University of Virginia                EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767                        Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767        e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu
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Colleagues: I have a former student working in market research who has asked me something I can't answer. I am hoping someone on the list can give some citations for data. He is faced with a client who insists things such as a regional or even "professional" accent causes bad data. As he writes "a client who refuses to use our phone center because some of the interviewers have mid-west and southern accents. Pronunciation is fine, it's the accents he doesn't like."

Has anyone any data on this impact or a good citation.

Brian Vargus
Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory
The Chair of our Sociology dept. brought a recent study regarding this issue to my attention. The results: 1/3 of respondents with Hispanic descent considered themselves African American, 1/3 considered themselves Caucasian and 1/3 considered themselves as their own separate race.

We ask the race question with a separate follow-up question asking respondents if they consider themselves of Hispanic descent. Then we can crosstab and look at data that way if necessary.

Terrie Colleen Porter wrote:
> I am so glad y'all brought this up--I've been struggling with this issue all day yesterday.
> I had not looked at the number of "don't know" responses to our race items, although I will be running that directly:) But I also can add my voice to those who have noticed a lot of Hispanics choosing "other--specify" and giving "Hispanic" as the race.
> This is a phone survey where we first ask about whether they are Hispanic, then what kind of Hispanic, then race. So if they say "Hispanic" at that point, the interviewer is supposed to probe something along the lines of, "Thank you, we've recorded that you are of Hispanic descent. But what is your race. Would you say....?"
> The first time this happened was in Florida, and we had 1,400 of "others" who specified "Hispanic" for race. I blamed the subcontractor who did the fieldwork, and insisted we needed better training on race issues. And indeed, I think the new training I developed was worthwhile...but when we repeated the survey in other states I was still getting a fair number of "other--Hispanic." And in reading the interviewer's notes, there were comments like, "I know I'm not supposed to accept this, but he really insisted." These showed that the interviewer had indeed paid attention to the training, but still.
> I conclude that a lot of Hispanics genuinely see that as their race and either cannot or will not choose one or more of the "official" categories we offer. Whether that translates into item nonresponse or an "Other--specify" answer depends in part on whether the latter option is even available. One could do a nice experiment to test that theory, but it wouldn't be all that useful in helping us how to deal with this phenomenon.
> I also wonder how much variation there is by the exact Hispanic group
and region of the country. I don't remember this being a factor in my work in Texas.

I also wonder about mode—wouldn't a mail survey have higher rates of skipped questions and "Other--Hispanic" than a telephone survey where an interviewer can probe to get a race?

Well, fast forward to the present, and I'm developing a self-administered survey for use in South Florida, which has a high concentration of Hispanics. As it turns out, since this is a program evaluation, we can probably get race/ethnicity from administrative data. But if I have to ask it in a survey, I am seriously thinking of just asking one item that combines race and ethnicity, offering four all-that-apply choices--

Hispanic
Non-Hispanic White
Black or African American
Other (specify)

Has anyone else done that kind of thing?

I just can't see trying to force a respondent into a peg hole that they don't think fits them at all.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195
Field experiments as well as qualitative research conducted at the Census Bureau suggest that the perceived redundancy of the race and Hispanic origin questions is reduced when Hispanic origin precedes race in the questionnaire. The item nonresponse for Hispanic origin is much lower, and Hispanics are less likely to report their race as "Some other race" and write in Hispanic--though many still do this even in the reversed order. Item sequencing does not fully solve the problem, but it helps.

I apologize if this is going to the whole list, but I wasn't sure where to send this. Apparently I was dropped from the list on September 20th. What do I need to do?

I can be reached at cspratt@stcc.cc.tx.us
One solution to this issue is the use of a single question format where "Hispanic" is included as one of several alternatives with the five other categories of race. Hispanic becomes a mutually exclusive classification for what can be termed "race or ethnicity" and leave ambiguous whether one is referring to "race" or "ethnicity."

This is the way data collection in higher education has generally been done - and is currently being done - for years. The September 1997 Federal guidelines and the January 2001 guidelines for government collection and reporting of race and ethnicity leave ambiguous whether race and ethnicity should be collected as two independent questions or a single question. There is no ambiguity for government agencies (they must use two questions) nor for Federally funded research (they must use two questions). But at least one sector of the economy (higher education) is likely to continue to collect race/ethnicity data as a single question and to report it to the National Center for Education Statistics as a single formatted variable.
(although someone may be more up-to-date on collection forms than my last involvement with this issue).

Of course the problem with the single question format is that Census is typically not releasing the data in mutually exclusive categories even though older nomenclature such as "black, non-Hispanic" and "white, non-Hispanic) implies that this is a necessary calculation -- especially for anyone dealing with longitudinal data. Thus survey researchers wishing to calculate representativeness or weighting factors according to "known" race/ethnicity in the population at large would be at a loss with a single question format in their questionnaire.

But the pre-2000 census experiments suggested that the two question format currently being used resulted in very little reduction in the calculations of those identifying as either black or white. The greatest reduction was among American Indians and, to a lesser extent, Asians. My description is not exactly what the experiment was designed to do (which was to compare the order of the race and ethnic question), but logically the research implies that a single question format would not produce different results in the population for Hispanic, black, and white populations than would the procedures that were actually adopted for Census 2000. ETS and the College Board -- again for a higher education population -- have also done research on the comparison between the two formats.

Tony Broh
At the Center for Health Studies (in Seattle) we've fielded (via CATI) a few studies that combine the race and ethnicity questions. We used the following response categories:

- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Black or African American (not Hispanic)
- Native American
- Spanish or Hispanic
- White or Caucasian (not Hispanic)
- Other

- African-American
- American Indian or Native Alaskan
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Caucasian
- Hispanic or Mexican American
- Bi-racial or multi-racial
- Other (SPECIFY)

- Native American or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Black or African-American
- Hispanic/Latino/Latina
- White (not of Hispanic origin)
- Other (Specify)

As many of the studies we field are NIH funded, I am expecting most of our studies to switch to the ethnicity question followed by the race question to be in compliance with NIH guidelines.

Ellen Gordon

_________________________
Ellen Gordon, Ph.D.
Survey Program Director
I am so glad y'all brought this up--I've been struggling with this issue all day yesterday.

I had not looked at the number of "don't know" responses to our race items, although I will be running that directly:) But I also can add my voice to those who have noticed a lot of Hispanics choosing "other--specify" and giving "Hispanic" as the race.

This is a phone survey where we first ask about whether they are Hispanic, then what kind of Hispanic, then race. So if they say "Hispanic" at that point, the interviewer is supposed to probe something along the lines of, "Thank you, we've recorded that you are of Hispanic descent. But what is your race. Would you say....?"

The first time this happened was in Florida, and we had 1,400 of "others" who specified "Hispanic" for race. I blamed the subcontractor who did the fieldwork, and insisted we needed better training on race issues. And indeed, I think the new training I developed was worthwhile...but when we repeated the survey in other states I was still getting a fair number of "other--Hispanic." And in reading the interviewer's notes, there were comments like, "I know I'm not supposed to accept this, but he really insisted." These showed that the interviewer had indeed paid attention to the training, but still.

I conclude that a lot of Hispanics genuinely see that as their race and either cannot or will not choose one or more of the "official" categories we offer. Whether that translates into item nonresponse or an "Other--specify" answer depends in part on whether the latter option is even available. One could do a nice experiment to test that theory, but it wouldn't be all that useful in helping us how to deal with this phenomenon.

I also wonder how much variation there is by the exact Hispanic group and region of the country. I don't remember this being a factor in my work in Texas.

I also wonder about mode--wouldn't a mail survey have higher rates of skipped questions and "Other--Hispanic" than a telephone survey where an interviewer can probe to get a race?
Well, fast forward to the present, and I'm developing a self-administered survey for use in South Florida, which has a high concentration of Hispanics. As it turns out, since this is a program evaluation, we can probably get race/ethnicity from administrative data. But if I have to ask it in a survey, I am seriously thinking of just asking one item that combines race and ethnicity, offering four all-that-apply choices—

Hispanic  
Non-Hispanic White  
Black or African American  
Other (specify)

Has anyone else done that kind of thing?

I just can't see trying to force a respondent into a peg hole that they don't think fits them at all.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109  
University of Florida,  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015  
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195
All these problems with the "race" self-designation of "Hispanics" certainly show that "race" is a social construct with varying correlations with skin color, language, national origin of self and ancestors, and other indicators. It is particularly interesting that so few "Hispanics" mention native-American (American Indian) ancestry, which is historically an important part of the ancestry of Mexicans and many other Latin American populations. What did the new census "multiple choice" on race produce for these groups? Is being a mestizo considered such a bad thing, or have the questions used by survey researchers failed to offer "Caucasian (European) and Native-American (Indian)" as an option? There is now some pride attached to being "African-American." How about pride in Native-American ancestry among people of Latin American origin?

Allen Barton

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Teresa Hottle" <teresa.hottle@wright.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2001 10:37 AM
Subject: Re: Hispanics by Race

> The Chair of our Sociology dept. brought a recent study regarding this
> issue to my attention. The results: 1/3 of respondents with Hispanic
> descent considered themselves African American, 1/3 considered
> themselves Caucasian and 1/3 considered themselves as their own
> separate race.
> > We ask the race question with a separate follow-up question asking
> > respondents if they consider themselves of Hispanic descent. Then we
> > can crosstab and look at data that way if necessary.
> > Terrie
> > Colleen Porter wrote:
> > I am so glad y'all brought this up--I've been struggling with this
> > issue all day yesterday.
> > I had not looked at the number of "don't know" responses to our race
> > items, although I will be running that directly:)  But I also can
> > add my voice to those who have noticed a lot of Hispanics choosing
> > "other--specify" and giving "Hispanic" as the race.
> > This is a phone survey where we first ask about whether they are
> > Hispanic, then what kind of Hispanic, then race. So if they say
"Hispanic" at that point, the interviewer is supposed to probe something along the lines of, "Thank you, we've recorded that you are of Hispanic descent. But what is your race. Would you say....?"

The first time this happened was in Florida, and we had 1,400 of "others" who specified "Hispanic" for race. I blamed the subcontractor who did the fieldwork, and insisted we needed better training on race issues. And indeed, I think the new training I developed was worthwhile...but when we repeated the survey in other states I was still getting a fair number of "other--Hispanic." And in reading the interviewer's notes, there were comments like, "I know I'm not supposed to accept this, but he really insisted." These showed that the interviewer had indeed paid attention to the training, but still.

I conclude that a lot of Hispanics genuinely see that as their race and either cannot or will not choose one or more of the "official" categories we offer. Whether that translates into item nonresponse or an "Other--specify" answer depends in part on whether the latter option is even available. One could do a nice experiment to test that theory, but it wouldn't be all that useful in helping us how to deal with this phenomenon.

I also wonder how much variation there is by the exact Hispanic group and region of the country. I don't remember this being a factor in my work in Texas.

I also wonder about mode--wouldn't a mail survey have higher rates of skipped questions and "Other--Hispanic" than a telephone survey where an interviewer can probe to get a race?

Well, fast forward to the present, and I'm developing a self-administered survey for use in South Florida, which has a high concentration of Hispanics. As it turns out, since this is a program evaluation, we can probably get race/ethnicity from administrative data. But if I have to ask it in a survey, I am seriously thinking of just asking one item that combines race and ethnicity, offering four all-that-apply choices--

Hispanic
Non-Hispanic White
Black or African American
Other (specify)

Has anyone else done that kind of thing?

I just can't see trying to force a respondent into a peg hole that they don't think fits them at all.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
In our state of California, also with a high proportion of Hispanics, we routinely use only one question about ethnicity. What we have found when forced to use the two-question formulation is that many Hispanics are insulted when we ask them if, in essence, they are anything else. I personally don't see any merit in insulting our respondents for the sake of what to them is, at best, a technicality.

Jennifer D. Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.

Colleen Porter wrote:

> I am so glad y'all brought this up--I've been struggling with this
> issue all day yesterday.
> 
> I had not looked at the number of "don't know" responses to our race
> items, although I will be running that directly:)  But I also can add
> my voice to those who have noticed a lot of Hispanics choosing
> "other--specify" and giving "Hispanic" as the race.
> 
> This is a phone survey where we first ask about whether they are
> Hispanic, then what kind of Hispanic, then race. So if they say
"Hispanic" at that point, the interviewer is supposed to probe something along the lines of, "Thank you, we've recorded that you are of Hispanic descent. But what is your race. Would you say....?"

The first time this happened was in Florida, and we had 1,400 of "others" who specified "Hispanic" for race. I blamed the subcontractor who did the fieldwork, and insisted we needed better training on race issues. And indeed, I think the new training I developed was worthwhile...but when we repeated the survey in other states I was still getting a fair number of "other--Hispanic." And in reading the interviewer's notes, there were comments like, "I know I'm not supposed to accept this, but he really insisted." These showed that the interviewer had indeed paid attention to the training, but still.

I conclude that a lot of Hispanics genuinely see that as their race and either cannot or will not choose one or more of the "official" categories we offer. Whether that translates into item nonresponse or an "Other-specify" answer depends in part on whether the latter option is even available. One could do a nice experiment to test that theory, but it wouldn't be all that useful in helping us how to deal with this phenomenon.

I also wonder how much variation there is by the exact Hispanic group and region of the country. I don't remember this being a factor in my work in Texas.

I also wonder about mode--wouldn't a mail survey have higher rates of skipped questions and "Other--Hispanic" than a telephone survey where an interviewer can probe to get a race?

Well, fast forward to the present, and I'm developing a self-administered survey for use in South Florida, which has a high concentration of Hispanics. As it turns out, since this is a program evaluation, we can probably get race/ethnicity from administrative data. But if I have to ask it in a survey, I am seriously thinking of just asking one item that combines race and ethnicity, offering four all-that-apply choices--

Hispanic
Non-Hispanic White
Black or African American
Other (specify)

Has anyone else done that kind of thing?

I just can't see trying to force a respondent into a peg hole that they don't think fits them at all.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
AAPORnetters interested in more readings on this issue might check:


I also recommend the book shown below for an excellent discussion on the politics of measuring race in the census:

I can see the merit in combining the race and Hispanic ethnicity question. However, I have found that it is usually sampling statisticians (in addition to OMB) who discourage survey researchers from deviating from the standard 2-question format resulting from Directive 15. Because the statisticians use census data to calculate post-survey weights, they want all race and ethnicity data collected in a way that's consistent with the census bureau format. Otherwise, they cannot use race and ethnicity as criteria for calculating the weights.

Ed

---
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From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
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Folks,

I find the epistemology of this ongoing discussion of "Hispanics by Race" absolutely fascinating.

The item construction seems to me analogous to what one might expect, for example, at ETS, in designing its SAT questions to maximize the chances that those who actually know the answers will be able to find one--and only one--appropriate response category.

Of course this general idea does have many good applications in survey research. When it comes to a respondent's own perceived national origin and race, however, a number of you who have posted on AAPORNET in the past two days seem to be assuming that you know the correct answers already (ETS model) and want to design your items to maximize the chances that your respondents will give you back the answers you expect.

But such assumptions as these raise the questions of race and national origin to a political question: Who is to decide our own origins and race? Are these existential and objective facts, or are we free to decide them for ourselves, or are we forced to have them decided by others, including others whom we do not know, and have not given the authority to do this?

I myself have an open mind on this set of questions. I write here only because, although I find that the science behind all of the postings has been correct (as I would expect from AAPORNETters), I also think that there are much more important questions and issues also at stake here. Because I would like to see these other questions discussed in this same context, I hope to begin that discussion here, with this message.

It's much easier to design a question about integral calculus which has one and only one answer, after all, than it is to give anything nearly as certain an answer about the race or origins of our fellow human beings--people whom we in fact cherish so much precisely for this very diversity (AAPOR serving as an extreme example, I am pleased to say).

I welcome your comments, as always.

-- Jim

********

> Field experiments as well as qualitative research conducted at the
Census Bureau suggest that the perceived redundancy of the race and Hispanic origin questions is reduced when Hispanic origin precedes race in the questionnaire. The item nonresponse for Hispanic origin is much lower, and Hispanics are less likely to report their race as "Some other race" and write in Hispanic--though many still do this even in the reversed order. Item sequencing does not fully solve the problem, but it helps.
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Hi,

A number of people responded off-list with information about the polling firm in question. Their help is much appreciated, and I thanked them all.

I was also hoping for some discussion on-list about the ethics of designing and conducting a poll to achieve predetermined results for the purpose of enabling a client to cite the results in a newspaper ad. I realize that no one else on this list has seen the poll or ad in question; so we can keep the discussion at an "if this were the case" level.
I have read the AAPOR Code of Ethics and cannot find any specific reference to this type of poll, though it could be considered a violation of:

"We pledge ourselves to maintain high standards of scientific competence and integrity in conducting, analyzing, and reporting our work ... [to] the general public."

The Statement on Push Polls is close, but I believe gathering ammunition for the ad was more the goal of the survey than changing the views of the people contacted (though that would be a secondary effect).

Do others of you know of polls being conducted for this purpose?

Does AAPOR have an official position on this type of poll, and what do AAPOR members think of a poll conducted for this purpose?

Thanks again,

Hank Zucker

> Has anyone heard of a polling firm called Dresner, Wickers & Associates, Inc. or DW&A, Inc.?
> They are cited in an ad in local newspapers as having conducted a survey on a local political issue. The question wording was highly leading (and often misleading), and they are quoted as giving a "careful review" to the results of these highly biased questions, which leads to the conclusion the sponsors wanted published. DW&A also claims a margin of error of plus or minus 4, when the standard formula gives a confidence interval or 4.87 at 95%.
> Clearly, the only reason for conducting this "poll" was to use its predetermined results as the contents of an ad designed to mislead the public as to the state of public opinion on a contentious issue. It seems to me to be clearly unethical/unprofessional. Is there any AAPOR (or CASRO) position on such surveys?
> Also does anyone have any comments on this firm? Reply on- or off-list (hank@surveysystem.com), as seems appropriate.
> Thank you all very much,
Looking at the Census Bureau's "Profile of General Population Characteristics" online, I find it interesting that there are more than twice as people in the "Other race" category (15,359,073 or 5.5% of the population) than are in the "2 or more races" category (6,826,228 or 2.4%). Also about 46% of the "2 or more races" group used "Other race" as one of the categories.
In looking at 10000 interviews from the BRFSS survey over the past three years, my numbers are reasonably close to these although there is a lot of variability.

Edward C. Ratledge, Director
Center for Applied Demography & Survey Research
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-1684
ratledge@udel.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2001 10:38 AM
To: AAPORnet List server
Subject: RE: Hispanics by Race

Just to add some specific data to Paul's observation, which matches our experience directly at UVA CSR:

We have completed telephone surveys in a large, urban county in Northern Virginia for nine successive years. Each of these includes a yes/no question on whether respondent considers him/herself to be of Hispanic or Spanish origin, and a separate, forced-choice race question. Hispanics are relatively rare in the area (4.1% of our complete interviews), and presumably underrepresented in this English-only survey. The surveys have varied in whether the Hispanic ID question is asked before or after the race question. But over the nine years (1993-2001) we have responses on the race question from 331 self-identified Hispanics. They report their race to be:

67.5% white
12.5% black
0.0% Asian
0.7% American Indian
0.7% Pacific Islander
18.6% other

We know from looking at the 'other/specify' responses that most of the 'others' for Hispanics are the respondents' restatement, in one phrase or another, that they are Hispanic.

I am sure that the tendency of Hispanics to think of Hispanic origin as a racial identification would vary regionally and perhaps by country of origin (which we do not record), as well as English-language proficiency, but thought these recent telephone results from one county in the East (Prince William County, VA) might be of interest nonetheless.
And I would further note what is perhaps obvious: that thinking of Hispanic-ness as 'race' is far from being an error or misunderstanding, but is for some people a strongly held view that can be important in ethnic ideology and group identification. Any workable, culturally sensitive interview protocol must allow for expression of this view in those who hold it.

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock
Voice: (434) 243-5223
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE
Center for Survey Research
CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
University of Virginia
EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE
CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222

We don’t find that at all when in our polling. We ask two questions – first, are you of latino or hispanic descent, then ask the second question, are you white, black, Asian or do you consider yourself some other race. We have had virtually no refusals from Latinos answering the race question and very few Latinos mentioning another race. We have also put in a question similar to the one asked by the census (as a 3rd question) to get as many responses as the respondents want to check for race. We have not had a problem with the 2 stage question.
Susan Pinkus

-Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Franz [SMTP:jdfranz@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2001 9:11 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Hispanics by Race

In our state of California, also with a high proportion of Hispanics, we
routinely use only one question about ethnicity. What we have found
when forced to use the two-question formulation is that many Hispanics
are insulted when we ask them if, in essence, they are anything else.
I personally don't see any merit in insulting our respondents for the
sake of what to them is, at best, a technicality.

Jennifer D. Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.

Colleen Porter wrote:

> I am so glad y'all brought this up--I've been struggling with
> this issue all day yesterday.
> >
> > I had not looked at the number of "don't know" responses to our
> > race items, although I will be running that directly:) But I also
> > can add my voice to those who have noticed a lot of Hispanics
> > choosing "other--specify" and giving "Hispanic" as the race.
> >
> > This is a phone survey where we first ask about whether they are
> > Hispanic, then what kind of Hispanic, then race. So if they say
> > "Hispanic" at that point, the interviewer is supposed to probe
> > something along the lines of, "Thank you, we've recorded that
> > you are of Hispanic descent. But what is your race. Would
> > you say....?"
> >
> > The first time this happened was in Florida, and we had 1,400
> > of "others" who specified "Hispanic" for race. I blamed the
> > subcontractor who did the fieldwork, and insisted we needed
> > better training on race issues. And indeed, I think the new
> > training I developed was worthwhile...but when we repeated
> > the survey in other states I was still getting a fair number of
> > "other--Hispanic." And in reading the interviewer's notes,
> > there were comments like, "I know I'm not supposed to
> > accept this, but he really insisted." These showed that the
> > interviewer had indeed paid attention to the training, but
> > still.
> >
> > I conclude that a lot of Hispanics genuinely see that as their
> > race and either cannot or will not choose one or more of the
> > "official" categories we offer. Whether that translates into
> > item nonresponse or an "Other--specify" answer depends in part
> > on whether the latter option is even available. One could do
> > a nice experiment to test that theory, but it wouldn't be all
that useful in helping us how to deal with this phenomenon.

I also wonder how much variation there is by the exact Hispanic group and region of the country. I don't remember this being a factor in my work in Texas.

I also wonder about mode—wouldn't a mail survey have higher rates of skipped questions and "Other--Hispanic" than a telephone survey where an interviewer can probe to get a race?

Well, fast forward to the present, and I'm developing a self-administered survey for use in South Florida, which has a high concentration of Hispanics. As it turns out, since this is a program evaluation, we can probably get race/ethnicity from administrative data. But if I have to ask it in a survey, I am seriously thinking of just asking one item that combines race and ethnicity, offering four all-that-apply choices--

Hispanic
Non-Hispanic White
Black or African American
Other (specify)

Has anyone else done that kind of thing?

I just can't see trying to force a respondent into a peg hole that they don't think fits them at all.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

Colleen
A recent RDD CATI survey (December 2000, N=2500) in Santa Clara county, California, found 18.5% reporting they were Hispanic; 69% of the Hispanics then selected Other (specify) to the follow-up race questions and specified Hispanic for race.

-Vicky

At 09:45 AM 10/11/01, you wrote:

>My own experience with this matter in RDD telephone surveys from my university-based days is that when you first ask for someone's ethnicity and then ask for their race, with an open-end wording of the race question (e.g., What race or races do you consider yourself?) , a significant minority of those who gave a "Hispanic" answer to their ethnicity will say that are the same for their race and when you probe them for another answer (e.g., Native American, White, Black, Other) many will still insist that their race is Hispanic or Latino/Latina or Chicano/Chicana.

>PJL

Victoria A. Albright (Albright@Field.com)
VP/Research Director
Field Research Corporation
222 Sutter Street, 2nd floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
415 392 5763

>From simonetta@artsci.com Thu Oct 11 12:20:31 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
id f9BJKUel5228 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Oct 2001 12:20:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA26612 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Oct 2001 12:20:29 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <43H4XFJ3>; Thu, 11 Oct 2001 15:19:03 -0400
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CFD311A81900A0248FC2F332260B@AS_SERVER>
From: =?UTF-8?B?TGVvIFNpbW9uZXR0YQ==?= <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: =?UTF-8?B?QWFwb3JuZXQgKEUtbWFpbCk=?= <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: =?UTF-8?B?UkU6IEEgcG9sbCBkZXNpZ25lZCBmb3IgYW4gYWQsIFBhcnQgQSUk=?=
Date: Thu, 11 Oct 2001 15:19:03 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="UTF-8"
I am of multiple minds about this kind of thing. Perhaps because there are multiple dependent conditions.

On one hand a lot depends on how the results were reported and whether the actual language of the question was reported. If the ad said 80% favor Proposition Y and the question (which was not contained in the ad) was worded in such a way as to definitively mis-state Proposition Y then I would have strong ethical concerns.

The problem for me comes in what constitutes mis-statements. Much of what is characterized by one side as blatant falsehood is seen by the other side as fully laying out the ramifications of a policy. I think a perfect example of this that was discussed recently on the list was the conflicting wording of questions about the use of fetal stem cell cultures in studies commissioned by opposing groups with axes to grind.

Then there is the question of whether the wording of the question is actually contained in the advertisement. If (to conjure a silly example) a question worded "Would you prefer that the United States to immediately attack Afghanistan militarily or to act like a coward and do nothing" were contained in an advertisement headlined "99% of American Favor Attacking Afghanistan" I would have much less a problem than I would if the question wording were not included.

And on the fourth hand there is the legitimate kind of research which is done to find out how best to present an issue to make it resonate with voters - the "death tax" as opposed to an "inheritance tax."

Of course, others will disagree.

Am I the only one who see a small but real similarity between the Jedi Knight problem and the Hispanic by race problem?

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

> ------Original Message------
Hi,

A number of people responded off-list with information about the polling firm in question. Their help is much appreciated, and I thanked them all.

I was also hoping for some discussion on-list about the ethics of designing and conducting a poll to achieve predetermined results for the purpose of enabling a client to cite the results in a newspaper ad. I realize that no one else on this list has seen the poll or ad in question; so we can keep the discussion at an "if this were the case" level.

I have read the AAPOR Code of Ethics and cannot find any specific reference to this type of poll, though it could be considered a violation of:

"We pledge ourselves to maintain high standards of scientific competence and integrity in conducting, analyzing, and reporting our work ... [to] the general public."

The Statement on Push Polls is close, but I believe gathering ammunition for the ad was more the goal of the survey than changing the views of the people contacted (though that would be a secondary effect).

Do others of you know of polls being conducted for this purpose?

Does AAPOR have an official position on this type of poll, and what do AAPOR members think of a poll conducted for this purpose?

Thanks again,

Hank Zucker

Has anyone heard of a polling firm called Dresner, Wickers & Associates, Inc. or DW&A, Inc.? They are cited in an ad in local newspapers as having conducted a survey.
> on
> > a local political issue. The question wording was highly
> leading (and
> often
> > misleading), and they
> > are quoted as giving a "careful review" to the results of
> these highly
> > biased questions, which leads to the conclusion the sponsors wanted
> published. DW&A also claims a margin of error of plus or
> minus 4, when
> the
> > standard formula gives a confidence interval or 4.87 at 95%.
> >
> > Clearly, the only reason for conducting this "poll" was to use its
> > predetermined results as the contents of an ad designed to
> > mislead the
> > public as to the state of public opinion on a contentious
> > issue. It seems
> > to me to be clearly unethical/unprofessional. Is there any
> AAPOR (or
> > CASRO)
> > position on such surveys?
> >
> > Also does anyone have any comments on this firm? Reply on-
> or off-list
> > (hank@surveysystem.com), as seems appropriate.
> >
> > Thank you all very much,
> >
> > Hank
> >
> > Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
> > Creative Research Systems
> > makers of The Survey System: Survey software that makes
> you look good.
> > www.surveysystem.com
> > 707-765-1001
> >
> > From mitofsky@mindspring.com Thu Oct 11 15:42:05 2001
> Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> id f9BMg4e12224 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Oct 2001
> 15:42:04
> -0700 (PDT)
> Received: from johnson.mail.mindspring.net (johnson.mail.mindspring.net
> [207.69.200.177])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> id PAA24485 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Oct 2001 15:42:05 -0700
> (PDT)
> From: mitofsky@mindspring.com
> Received: from smui01.slb.mindspring.com (smui01.slb.mindspring.com
> [199.174.114.21])
> by johnson.mail.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id SAA05947;
> Thu, 11 Oct 2001 18:41:52 -0400 (EDT)
> Received: by smui01.slb.mindspring.com id SAA0000023219; Thu, 11 Oct 2001
What kind of discussion of ethics do you expect from the former partner of Dick Morris? You know, THAT Dick Morris, of twinkle toe fame. warren

Hank Zucker <hank@surveysystem.com> wrote:  
> Hi,

A number of people responded off-list with information about the polling firm in question. Their help is much appreciated, and I thanked them all.

I was also hoping for some discussion on-list about the ethics of designing and conducting a poll to achieve predetermined results for the purpose of enabling a client to cite the results in a newspaper ad. I realize that no one else on this list has seen the poll or ad in question; so we can keep the discussion at an "if this were the case" level.

I have read the AAPOR Code of Ethics and cannot find any specific reference to this type of poll, though it could be considered a violation of:

"We pledge ourselves to maintain high standards of scientific competence and integrity in conducting, analyzing, and reporting our work ... [to] the general public."

The Statement on Push Polls is close, but I believe gathering ammunition for the ad was more the goal of the survey than changing the views of the people contacted (though that would be a secondary effect).

Do others of you know of polls being conducted for this purpose?

Does AAPOR have an official position on this type of poll, and what do AAPOR members think of a poll conducted for this purpose?

Thanks again,
Hank Zucker

> Has anyone heard of a polling firm called Dresner, Wickers &
> Associates, Inc. or DW&A, Inc.?
>
> They are cited in an ad in local newspapers as having conducted a
> survey
> on
> a local political issue. The question wording was highly leading (and
> often
> misleading), and they
> are quoted as giving a "careful review" to the results of these highly
> biased questions, which leads to the conclusion the sponsors wanted
> published. DW&A also claims a margin of error of plus or minus 4,
> when
> the
> standard formula gives a confidence interval or 4.87 at 95%.
>
> Clearly, the only reason for conducting this "poll" was to use its
> predetermined results as the contents of an ad designed to mislead the
> public as to the state of public opinion on a contentious issue. It
> seems to me to be clearly unethical/unprofessional. Is there any
> AAPOR (or
> CASRO)
> position on such surveys?
>
> Also does anyone have any comments on this firm? Reply on- or
> off-list (hank@surveysystem.com), as seems appropriate.
>
> Thank you all very much,
>
> Hank
>
> Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
> Creative Research Systems
> makers of The Survey System: Survey software that makes you look
> good. www.surveysystem.com 707-765-1001

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Thu Oct 11 16:09:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9BN9ve14337 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Oct 2001
16:09:58 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id QAA21857 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Oct 2001 16:09:57 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from login4.isis.unc.edu (pmeyer@login4.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.101])
   by smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.1) with ESMTP id TAA14162
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 11 Oct 2001 19:09:45 -0400 (EDT)
Would it help if we broadened the discussion to include any use of a poll for advocacy? For example:

--Polls to assess the effect of pretrial publicity to support a change of venue motion in a criminal case.

--Polls to support a lobbying effort by an interest group.

--Polls to convince a prospective buyer of a business that its product has untapped demand.

As one whose livelihood as long depended on advertising, I sort of hate to see it singled out for special treatment.
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: FBI Press Release - Warning of Possible Future Terrorist Attacks (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110111714240.17092-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

10/11/01 - Warning of Possible Future Terrorist Attacks

http://www.fbi.gov/pressrel/pressrel01/101101.htm

U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation

For Immediate Release
October 11, 2001

Washington D.C.
FBI National Press Office

Certain information, while not specific as to target, gives the government reason to believe that there may be additional terrorist attacks within the United States and against U.S. interests overseas over the next several days. The FBI has again alerted all local law enforcement to be on the highest alert and we call on all people to immediately notify the FBI and local law enforcement of any unusual or suspicious activity.

###

http://www.fbi.gov/pressrel/pressrel01/101101.htm

*****
Since many of the Hispanics are Mexicans or of Mexican origin, a Mexican perspective could probably help.

1. I am sure every Mexican would have problems defining his/her race. In the Mexican census there is no question about race.

2. There is a question about ethnicity with two categories: Indian No-Indian, and the Census tries to measure it as a "true" variable by classifying as Indian those who live in a household where an Indian language is spoken.

3. Dillman is right, many of the definitions used mix country or regional origin, ethnicity and race.

I asked the following question in Mexico with the following results.

Do you think of yourself as Indian (Indio), Mestizo or White?

Indian 18%
Mestizo 65%
White 13%

Indian and whites were in the extremes of the income scale.

So, I am sure many Hispanics of Mexican origin would have problems answering those questions.

If you think you have to use ethnicity and race I would follow Susan advice. In any case I would not use those categories to weight my data, because they are not "true" variables as gender, age, etc. I think I would be introducing another random error.
----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com> 
To: <aapornet@usc.edu> 
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2001 12:55 PM 
Subject: RE: Hispanics by Race 

> We don't find that at all when in our polling. We ask two questions - first, are you of latino or hispanic descent, then ask the second question, are you white, black, Asian or do you consider yourself some other race. We have had virtually no refusals from Latinos answering the race question and very few Latinos mentioning an other race. We have also put in a question similar to the one asked by the census (as a 3rd question) to get as many responses as the respondents want to check for race. We have not had a problem with the 2 stage question. 
>
> Susan Pinkus 
>
> -Original Message------ 
> From: Jennifer Franz [SMTP:jdfranz@earthlink.net] 
> Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2001 9:11 AM 
> To: aapornet@usc.edu 
> Subject: Re: Hispanics by Race 
> 
> In our state of California, also with a high proportion of Hispanics, we routinely use only one question about ethnicity. What we have found when forced to use the two-question formulation is that many Hispanics are insulted when we ask them if, in essence, they are anything else. I personally don't see any merit in insulting our respondents for the sake of what to them is, at best, a technicality. 
>
> Jennifer D. Franz 
> JD Franz Research, Inc. 
> 
> Colleen Porter wrote: 
> 
> > I am so glad y'all brought this up--I've been struggling with this issue all day yesterday. 
> > > I had not looked at the number of "don't know" responses to our race items, although I will be running that directly:) But I also can add my voice to those who have noticed a lot of Hispanics choosing "other--specify" and giving "Hispanic" as the race. 
> > > This is a phone survey where we first ask about whether they are Hispanic, then what kind of Hispanic, then race. So if they say "Hispanic" at that pont, the interviewer is supposed to probe
something along the lines of, "Thank you, we've recorded that you are of Hispanic descent. But what is your race. Would you say....?"

The first time this happened was in Florida, and we had 1,400 of "others" who specified "Hispanic" for race. I blamed the subcontractor who did the fieldwork, and insisted we needed better training on race issues. And indeed, I think the new training I developed was worthwhile...but when we repeated the survey in other states I was still getting a fair number of "other--Hispanic." And in reading the interviewer's notes, there were comments like, "I know I'm not supposed to accept this, but he really insisted."

These showed that the interviewer had indeed paid attention to the training, but still.

I conclude that a lot of Hispanics genuinely see that as their race and either cannot or will not choose one or more of the "official" categories we offer. Whether that translates into item nonresponse or an "Other--specify" answer depends in part on whether the latter option is even available. One could do a nice experiment to test that theory, but it wouldn't be all that useful in helping us how to deal with this phenomenon.

I also wonder how much variation there is by the exact Hispanic group and region of the country. I don't remember this being a factor in my work in Texas.

I also wonder about mode--wouldn't a mail survey have higher rates of skipped questions and "Other--Hispanic" than a telephone survey where an interviewer can probe to get a race?

Well, fast forward to the present, and I'm developing a self-administered survey for use in South Florida, which has a high concentration of Hispanics. As it turns out, since this is a program evaluation, we can probably get race/ethnicity from administrative data. But if I have to ask it in a survey, I am seriously thinking of just asking one item that combines race and ethnicity, offering four all-that-apply choices--

Hispanic
Non-Hispanic White
Black or African American
Other (specify)

Has anyone else done that kind of thing?

I just can't see trying to force a respondent into a peg hole that they don't think fits them at all.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
Department of Health Services Administration
According to the popular Arab press, Jews & Zionists are subhuman creatures responsible for the worst abuses against humanity. Not surprisingly, Arab & Muslim newspapers and radical clerics blamed the Sept 11 WTC bombing on the Zionists. Then bin Ladin announced to the world that the bombing was an act of Allah and that he would pray that the heroes go to the highest part of heaven. Certainly, if this was an act of God, the Jews could not be involved, and bin Ladin would be the last to pray that Zionists go to the highest part of heaven.

What theory explains why the Arab masses and intellectuals continually buy in to the lies they are fed. And what theory explains why they continue to believe in the lies even when the story line changes -- i.e., that it was not the Zionists who did the bombing, but bin Ladin's organization?
Because I believe that AAPORNEN ought not to have anonymous postings, I wish to say that the address gso-gso@att.net belongs to Gary Siegel.

-- Jim

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Fri, 12 Oct 2001 02:47:29 +0000
From: gso-gso@att.net
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: What theory explains this?

According to the popular Arab press, Jews & Zionists are subhuman creatures responsible for the worst abuses against humanity. Not surprisingly, Arab & Muslim newspapers and radical clerics blamed the Sept 11 WTC bombing on the Zionists. Then bin Ladin announced to the world that the bombing was an act of Allah and that he would pray that the heroes go to the highest part of heaven. Certainly, if this was an act of God, the Jews could not be involved, and bin Ladin would be the last to pray that Zionists go to the highest part of heaven.

What theory explains why the Arab masses and intellectuals continually buy in to the lies they are fed. And what theory explains why they continue to believe in the lies even when the story line changes -- i.e., that it was not the Zionists who did the bombing, but bin Ladin's organization?

>From Claire.Durand@UMontreal.CA Fri Oct 12 02:45:47 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9C9jke08000 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Oct 2001
    02:45:47 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from jason.MAGELLAN.UMontreal.CA (jason.MAGELLAN.UMontreal.CA [132.204.2.30])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id CAA23404 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 12 Oct 2001 02:45:47 -0700 (PDT)
A few words from Canada and from sociology about that question. When I gave my first course in survey methods, I wanted to raise the question of how to measure racism and race with my students. I was reminded by my colleagues in ethnic studies that "race" does not exist, period. "There is only one human race, biologically speaking". I was quite stunned at first.

But then, think about it: There are more and more families where parents are from different "races" and so are kids. I remember a haitian "black" friend of mine telling me: "But my kid is white!". In a report on CBC, kids from bi-racial origins were asked how they see the future. One kid said: "In the future, everybody will be metis of some kind". You may also ask what is the ethnic identity (origin?) of a Chinese girl adopted by French-Canadian white parents?

In Quebec, language has played the same role as race in the US for a long time and is still used for weighting purposes. The same question arises: more and more, people say that they have more than one mother tongue or language spoken at home. It seems that more than half of English-speaking Montrealers marry with French-speaking people...The Canadian census now permits to declare more than one "mother tongue", defined as the first language learned and still understood. And then, in this frame, Spanish is a language, one indicator of ethnic origin, others being country of birth, "membership in a visible minority", parents' country of birth,... As for race, to my knowledge, there is a tendency here to ask a question like: "Are you a member of a visible minority?"... for what it is worth.

All this to raise the question: In societies where there people "mix" more and more, we will most probably have to change not only the measures we use but the concepts themselves. What do we want to measure? (it may vary according to the survey topic). How many indicators do we need to do so?

Claire Durand

At 09:45 2001-10-11 -0700, you wrote:
Folks,

I find the epistemology of this ongoing discussion of "Hispanics by Race" absolutely fascinating.

The item construction seems to me analogous to what one might expect, for example, at ETS, in designing its SAT questions to maximize the chances that those who actually know the answers will be able to find one--and only one--appropriate response category.

Of course this general idea does have many good applications in survey research. When it comes to a respondent's own perceived national origin and race, however, a number of you who have posted on AAPORNET in the past two days seem to be assuming that you know the correct answers already (ETS model) and want to design your items to maximize the chances that your respondents will give you back the answers you expect.

But such assumptions as these raise the questions of race and national origin to a political question: Who is to decide our own origins and race? Are these existential and objective facts, or are we free to decide them for ourselves, or are we forced to have them decided by others, including others whom we do not know, and have not given the authority to do this?

I myself have an open mind on this set of questions. I write here only because, although I find that the science behind all of the postings has been correct (as I would expect from AAPORNETters), I also think that there are much more important questions and issues also at stake here. Because I would like to see these other questions discussed in this same context, I hope to begin that discussion here, with this message.

It's much easier to design a question about integral calculus which has one and only one answer, after all, than it is to give anything nearly as certain an answer about the race or origins of our fellow human beings--people whom we in fact cherish so much precisely for this very diversity (AAPOR serving as an extreme example, I am pleased to say).

I welcome your comments, as always.

-- Jim

******

Field experiments as well as qualitative research conducted at the Census Bureau suggest that the perceived redundancy of the race and Hispanic origin questions is reduced when Hispanic origin precedes race in the questionnaire. The item nonresponse for Hispanic origin is much lower, and Hispanics are less likely to report their race as "Some other race" and write in Hispanic--though many still do this
As the story below from today's Boston Globe suggests, measurement of any single variable will require some consideration of relationship to other variables to establish the validity of our effort.

------------------------------------------
NEW YORK - Public advocate Mark Green won the Democratic nomination for New York City mayor last night, beating the Bronx borough president, Fernando Ferrer, 52 percent to 48 percent.

And while this city may seem remarkably unified after last month's attack on the World Trade Center, the vote in this primary runoff showed it to be sharply divided across race and class lines.

Ferrer, who hoped to be the city's first Puerto Rican mayor, ran on a slogan of ''two cities'' and pledged to be the mayor for ''the other New York,'' meaning those who did not share in the economic boom of the '90s.

Green, who is Jewish, ran a broader campaign and, toward the end, blasted Ferrer for being ''divisive'' in a time of crisis.

Green may have won the primary, but Ferrer may have been right about the nature of the city.

For example, according to exit polls, Green won among white voters by 84-16. Ferrer won among Hispanics by the same margin, 84-16, and, among blacks, 71-29.

Among those who earn more than $100,000 a year, Green won, 78-22. Among those who earn less than $15,000 a year, Ferrer won, 64-36.

The exit poll, by Edison Media Research, surveyed 1,380 Democratic voters at 40 precincts, and had a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percent. The poll had projected Green to be the winner, 53-47, just one point off the actual results.

The divisions indicated in the poll reflect positions the candidates took on key issues. Before Sept. 11, both platforms emphasized similar stances on education, housing, and health care.

After the attack, Green shifted ground, saying that the next mayor's top priority
must be to rebuild Manhattan's financial district and that the fiscal crisis meant
certain social goals must be deferred.

Ferrer's position changed little. "The towers have crumbled, but our
priorities have
not." he said.

The exit polls showed that among voters who still consider education to be the
most
important issue, Ferrer won, 63-37. Among those who see the economy as most
important, Green won, 65-35.

Yesterday's contest was a second-round runoff between the top two candidates
of a
four-way primary that took place Sept. 25.

Back then, only 1 percent of Demo- crats surveyed in exit polls said strong
leadership was an important quality for a mayor. Yesterday, 10 percent said this
quality was important, and among this group, Green won, 62-38.

In the past two weeks, opinion polls had indicated the runoff would be extremely
close.

Then, over the weekend, Green finally went on the attack against Ferrer from the
right and the left. He lambasted his economic ideas as "'borderline
irresponsible,'" accused him of not understanding how markets work, criticized his "'two
cities'"
slogan as divisive, and questioned his alliance with the Rev. Al Sharpton.

He also charged Ferrer with "'flip-flopping'" on such heartbeat liberal issues
as
abortion rights and the death penalty.

Ferrer fought back, mainly by criticizing Green for "'negative campaigning.'"

Tensions between the two camps remained high last night, even after the
contest was
over.

In his concession speech, Ferrer was pointedly unenthusiastic when he called on his
disappointed backers to rally behind the Democratic nominee in the general
election
on Nov. 6, against the Republican candidate, billionaire Mike Bloomberg.

Dennis Rivera, head of the hospital-workers' union, which endorsed Ferrer, expressed
anger at Green for his campaign attacks. "'All is not well inside the Democratic
Party right now,'" he told one TV reporter.
Bloomberg is financing his own campaign, and has spent $30 million so far. Democrats outnumber Republicans by 5-1, making Green's victory next month likely nonetheless. But he may have some problems if a lot of Ferrer's supporters stay home.

In his acceptance speech, Green made a more explicit overture, congratulating Ferrer for his skillful campaign and saying he ''can't wait'' for the two camps to unite.

Last week, before going on the offensive, Green was losing momentum - possibly the result of his accepting a proposal by Mayor Rudolph Giuliani to remain in office until April rather than step down on Jan. 1, as the City Charter requires.

Ferrer rejected the proposal, citing the rule of law. Many liberals applauded Ferrer for standing up to the mayor, and slammed Green for caving in to him. The deal has since died in the state legislature.

However, the exit polls show Green may have picked up nearly as much support as he lost from that decision. While 29 percent said it made them less likely to vote for Green, 22 percent said it made them more likely. Half said it had no effect.

Green also picked up more than three-quarters of those who voted in the first-round primary for the two other candidates, City Council speaker Peter Vallone and the comptroller, Alan Hevesi. Those voters together composed 20 percent of those surveyed yesterday, most of them outer-borough Catholics and Jews.

Over 800,000 - one-third of the city's Democrats - voted, a high turnout for a runoff, even a little more than the turnout in the primary's first round.

Green's 4-point margin translated to a difference of about 30,000 votes.

He won the support of all three major newspapers, as well as the police and firefighters unions. Ferrer won the support of the city's largest unions: the municipal workers, teachers, and hospital workers.

This story ran on page A2 of the Boston Globe on 10/12/2001.

© Copyright 2001 Globe Newspaper Company.
> A few words from Canada and from sociology about that question. When I
> gave my first course in survey methods, I wanted to raise the question
> of how to measure racism and race with my students. I was reminded by
> my colleagues in ethnic studies that "race" does not exist,
> period. "There is only one human race, biologically speaking". I was
> quite stunned at first.
> But then, think about it: There are more and more families where
> parents are from different "races" and so are kids. I remember a
> haitian "black" friend of mine telling me : "But my kid is white!".
> In a report on CBC, kids from bi-racial origins were asked how they
> see the future. One kid said : "In the future, everybody will be
> metis of some kind". You may
> also
> ask what is the ethnic identity (origin?) of a Chinese girl adopted by
> French-Canadian white parents? In Quebec, language has played the same
> role as race in the US for a long time and is still used for weighting
> purposes. The same question arises: more and more, people say that
> they have more than one mother tongue or language spoken at home. It
> seems that more than half of English-speaking Montrealers marry with
> French-speaking people...The Canadian census now permits to declare
> more than one "mother tongue", defined as the first language learned
> and still understood. And then, in this frame, Spanish
> is
> a language, one indicator of ethnic origin, others being country of
> birth, "membership in a visible minority", parents' country of
> birth,... As for race, to my knowledge, there is a tendency here to
> ask a question like : "Are you a member of a visible minority?"... for
> what it is worth.
> All this to raise the question: In societies where people "mix" more
> and more, we will most probably have to change not only the measures
> we use
> but the concepts themselves. What do we want to measure? (it may vary
> according to the survey topic). How many indicators do we need to do
> so?
> Claire Durand
> At 09:45 2001-10-11 -0700, you wrote:  
> Folks,
> I find the epistemology of this ongoing discussion of "Hispanics
> by Race" absolutely fascinating.
> The item construction seems to me analogous to what one might
expect, for example, at ETS, in designing its SAT questions
to maximize the chances that those who actually know the answers
will be able to find one--and only one--appropriate response
category.

Of course this general idea does have many good applications in
survey research. When it comes to a respondent's own perceived
national origin and race, however, a number of you who have
posted on AAPORNET in the past two days seem to be assuming that
you know the correct answers already (ETS model) and want to
design your items to maximize the chances that your respondents
will give you back the answers you expect.

But such assumptions as these raise the questions of race and
national origin to a political question: Who is to decide our
own origins and race? Are these existential and objective
facts, or are we free to decide them for ourselves, or are we
forced to have them decided by others, including others whom
we do not know, and have not given the authority to do this?

I myself have an open mind on this set of questions. I write
here only because, although I find that the science behind all
of the postings has been correct (as I would expect from
AAPORNETters), I also think that there are much more important
questions and issues also at stake here. Because I would like
to see these other questions discussed in this same context,
I hope to begin that discussion here, with this message.

It's much easier to design a question about integral calculus
which has one and only one answer, after all, than it is to
give anything nearly as certain an answer about the race or
origins of our fellow human beings--people whom we in fact
cherish so much precisely for this very diversity (AAPOR
serving as an extreme example, I am pleased to say).

I welcome your comments, as always.

--

Jim

********

Field experiments as well as qualitative research conducted at the
Census
Bureau suggest that the perceived redundancy of the race and
Hispanic origin questions is reduced when Hispanic origin precedes
race in the questionnaire. The item nonresponse for Hispanic
origin is much lower, and
Hispanics are less likely to report their race as "Some other
race" and
write in Hispanic--though many still do this even in the reversed
order.
Item sequencing does not fully solve the problem, but it helps.
What theory explains this? The issue is highly complex with new theories emerging almost daily.

Take a look at:

Israeli sources:

www.pmw.org
www.memri.org
http://www.geocities.com/mid_east_truth/

All have information dealing with the Mid East situation, particularly the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. The New York Time is also a pretty good source, especially columnists like Tom Friedman and William Safire.

For a almost totally opposite view take a look at these Arab and Palestinian sources:

http://64.226.129.19/pmw/index.asp (Palestine Media watch)
http://64.226.129.19/pmw/snakebite/ (their snake bite kit)
http://www.addameer.org/

Information overload is easy but you will quickly get the drift.

Dick Halpern
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Arab American Institute Poll Results:
Arab Americans are strong advocates of war against terrorism; Overwhelmingly endorse President Bush's actions; Significant numbers have experienced discrimination since Sept. 11
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Arab Americans are in strong support of an all-out war against countries which harbor or aid terrorists, and are overwhelmingly supportive of President's George W. Bush's handling of the response to the September 11 terrorist attacks, a new poll of Arab Americans reveals.

At the same time, one in three Arab Americans say they have experienced discrimination in the past as a result of their heritage. Nearly half say they know someone of Arab ethnicity or with an Arabic-speaking background who has experienced discrimination since the September 11 attacks. A significant number of say they have personally experienced discrimination since the attacks.

The poll, commissioned by the Arab American Institute, was conducted by Zogby International of 508 Arab American likely voters nationwide. Margin of sampling error is +/- 4.5%. Arab Americans give President Bush an 83% positive, 15% negative job performance rating, and a 88% positive, 11% negative rating, for his handling of the U.S. response to the terrorist attacks. An overwhelming 90%, also say Bush's comments
and conduct toward Arab Americans since the attacks has been reassuring.

Results show Arab Americans strongly endorse an all-out war (69% support, 22% oppose) against countries which harbor or aid the terrorists who attacked the United States. A majority also supports (56% agree, 34% disagree) such a war even if involved substantial American casualties.

At the same time, one-in-three Arab Americans (32% yes, 67% no) say they have experienced discrimination in the past because of their ethnicity. Nearly half (45% yes, 54% no) say they know of someone of Arabic ethnicity or with an Arabic-speaking background who has experienced discrimination since the terrorist attacks. One-in-five (20% yes, 79% no) say they have personally experienced discrimination since the attacks.

Pollster John Zogby: "Arab Americans are in the mainstream in their support for President Bush and the war against terrorism. This support, with some variations by age, religion and birthplace, includes typically the Muslim grocer in South Chicago, and the third generation software engineer in southern California."

AAI President James Zogby: "This poll shines much needed light on Arab American Attitudes at this critical time. Our results show Arab Americans to be proud and committed Americans, who are never the less fearful of prejudice and backlash resulting from the terror attacks."

In other results, 83% of Arab Americans say securing the rights of Palestinians is important, compared to 13% who say securing the rights is not important. Three in four (78%) agree that a U.S. commitment to settle the Israel-Palestinian dispute would help the President's efforts in the war against terrorism. In contrast, 15% disagree and another 7% are not sure. Seven in ten (69%) say there has been more profiling of Arab Americans since the terrorist attacks, compared to 3% who say less profiling and 16% who are not sure.

A majority of Arab Americans (54%), also say it is justified for law enforcement officials to engage in extra questioning and inspections of people with Middle Eastern accents or features. In contrast, 36% say such extra scrutiny is not
justified. Another 10% are not sure. Nearly three-five (57%) say they disagree with profiling of Arab Americans or Arab-speaking citizens by investigators due to the September 11 attacks. Another 35% agree with such profiling, and 7% are not sure.

Three in five (61%) also say they are worried about the long-term effects of discrimination against Arab Americans. In contrast, 38% say they are not worried.

///

Arab Americans stand behind Bush
http://www.washtimes.com/national/20011012-9748628.htm
By Ralph Z. Hallow
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Arab Americans strongly support an all-out war against countries that harbor terrorists as well as President Bush's handling of the Sept. 11 atrocities against the United States, a new Zogby poll shows. The poll, commissioned for the Arab American Institute, found that 63 percent of Arab-American Protestants and Orthodox Christians consider Mr. Bush's performance as commander in chief to be excellent, and another 34 percent say he is doing a good job.

"Arab Americans sense they are on the defensive - 65 percent say they are embarrassed because the terrorists are Arab," pollster John Zogby said in an interview. "So there is a desire to show a strong sense of patriotism."

Millionaire Saudi exile Osama bin Laden, suspected of being the mastermind behind the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, has called on all Muslims everywhere to wage a holy war against the United States. The U.S. government has identified the perpetrators of the attacks as Muslim extremists from the Middle East - apparently causing many Arab Americans to demonstrate their patriotism by supporting the war on terrorism to an even greater extent than other U.S. citizens.

"I suspect that feeling of embarrassment was reflected in the 69 percent Arab Americans who said they support an all-out war on terrorists, compared to 61 percent of Americans overall who support such a war," Mr. Zogby said.

"You see that sentiment reflected in other things," he said. "A substantial minority of Arab Americans said they favor profiling Arab Americans, and I think that's their way of saying, 'Yeah, I'll bear up under closer scrutiny.' It's a desire
to demonstrate they are good Americans."

The support for both Mr. Bush and the war on terrorism is stronger among Arab Christians than among Muslims, as well as among Americans with family ties to Lebanon or Syria than to other Arabic-speaking countries in the Middle East, according to Mr. Zogby's Oct. 6-8 poll, which has a margin of error of plus or minus 4.5 percentage points.

Among Arab Americans whose families came from Lebanon and Syria, 88 percent rated Mr. Bush's performance as excellent or good.

While most Muslims who were surveyed had a positive view of Mr. Bush's handling of the crisis, fully a quarter of them responded by giving the president a fair or poor rating.

The poll also showed that 31 percent of those "whose family originated in Palestine" oppose an all-out war on terrorism, compared with 23 percent of Arab Americans overall.

"But I think the poll shows that religion is not as important as national origin and generation," said Arab American Institute (AAI) President James Zogby, the pollster's brother. "Americans of Lebanese or Syrian extraction who have been in this country for several generations obviously have much stronger feelings of attachment to the United States."

Even among the more recent immigrants, "the degree of support for the president and the outrage toward the terrorists are very high," he said. "And the support for what President Bush has done for Arab Americans is very high across the board."

He added: "And outrage against what the terrorists did on September 11 is equally high among those born here and overseas."

Mr. Zogby, the AAI president, said the polling data show that among Arab Americans living in the United States, "75 percent to 80 percent were born here and more than 75 percent are Christian."

Asked if they would support an all-out war against countries that harbor or aid terrorists who have attacked the United States, 70 percent of Arab Americans born here said yes, compared with 65 percent of those not born here.

///

Israel braces for U.S. political offensive
http://www.washtimes.com/world/20011012-37765252.htm
JERUSALEM - Israel expects to be targeted by Washington for a political offensive as soon as the United States has wound down its military attack on Afghanistan. Israeli political sources said they believed the Bush administration was intending to revive and aggressively pursue a diplomatic initiative it had formulated before the Sept. 11 terrorist attack in New York and Washington.

That attack caused Secretary of State Colin L. Powell to postpone a speech he intended to deliver at the United Nations last month outlining Washington's proposal for resolving the Israel-Palestinian question.

Israeli sources said this proposal echoed that made by President Clinton in his last weeks in the White House, albeit in far less detail. It included the following central points:

- Two states for two peoples. Both Israel and the Palestinian Authority accept this formula, although Palestinian Islamists demand destruction of Israel.
- Jerusalem as the capital of both Israel and a Palestinian state. This is demanded by the Palestinians but has been rejected in the past by Israel.
- Recognition of the national character of each state. This is important to Israel since it appears to support its rejection of the return of millions of Palestinian refugees to Israel, which would negate the Jewish character of the state.

The Bush administration had intended at its outset to avoid the deep involvement in the Middle East that marked the Clinton administration. Within a few months, however, it became clear that stability in the region would not be restored without American intervention.

America's current anti-terror campaign, whose targets are entirely Muslim, makes it even more imperative for Washington to placate the Muslim world by seeking to resolve the Palestinian issue.

Just yesterday, Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak said at a joint press conference with British Prime Minister Tony Blair that there would be "no safety on our planet" without a comprehensive solution to the conflict.

German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, hosting Jordan's King Abdullah II in Berlin, said the peace process "needs new momentum."

"The United States, the European Union, the United Nations and other forces active in the region must bring pressure to bear on the two parties," he said.

Fear that Washington might pursue Arab support at Israel's expense led
Prime
Minister Ariel Sharon last week to publicly declare that Israel would not permit itself to become another Czechoslovakia, a reference to the concessions made to Nazi Germany by Great Britain in 1938, leading to the division of Czechoslovakia. Mr. Sharon had to apologize after an angry reaction in Washington. Mr. Powell reiterated this week that the United States was a firm friend of Israel and never would endanger its interests.
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Arab American Institute Poll Results:
Arab Americans are strong advocates of war against terrorism;
Overwhelmingly endorse President Bush's actions;
Significant numbers have experienced discrimination since Sept. = 11
Arab Americans are in strong support of an all-out war against countries which harbor or aid terrorists, and are overwhelmingly supportive of President's George W. Bush's handling of the response to the September 11 terrorist attacks, a new poll of Arab Americans reveals. At the same time, one in three Arab Americans say they have experienced discrimination in the past as a result of their heritage. Nearly half say they know someone of Arab ethnicity or with an Arabic-speaking background who has experienced discrimination since the September 11 attacks. A significant number say they have personally experienced discrimination since the attacks. The poll, commissioned by the Arab American Institute, was conducted by Zogby International of 508 Arab American likely voters nationwide. Margin of sampling error is +/- 4.5%. Arab Americans give President Bush an 83% positive, 15% negative, job performance rating, and a 88% positive, 11% negative rating, for his handling of the U.S. response to the terrorist attacks. An overwhelming 90%, also say Bush's comments and conduct toward Arab Americans since the attacks has been reassuring. Results show Arab Americans strongly endorse an all-out war (69% = support, 22% oppose) against countries which harbor or aid the terrorists who attacked the
United States. A majority also supports (56% agree, 34% disagree) such a war even if involved substantial American casualties.<br>At the same time, one-in-three Arab Americans (32% yes, 67% no) say they have experienced discrimination in the past because of their ethnicity. Nearly half (45% yes, 54% no) say they know of someone of Arabic ethnicity or with an Arabic-speaking background who has experienced discrimination since the terrorist attacks. One-in-five (20% yes, 79% no) say they have personally experienced discrimination since the attacks.<br>Pollster John Zogby: &quot;Arab Americans are in the mainstream in their support for President Bush and the war against terrorism. This support, with some variations by age, religion and birthplace, includes typically the Muslim grocer in South Chicago, and the third generation software engineer in southern California.&quot; <br>AAI President James Zogby: &quot;This poll shines much needed light on Arab American Attitudes at this critical time. Our results show Arab Americans to be proud and committed Americans, who are never the less fearful of prejudice and backlash resulting from the terror attacks.&quot;<br>In other results, 83% of Arab Americans say securing the rights of Palestinians is important, compared to 13% who say securing the rights is not important. Three in four (78%) agree that a U.S. commitment to settle the Israel-Palestinian dispute would help the President's efforts in the war against terrorism. In contrast, 15% disagree and another 7% are not sure. Seven in ten (69%) say there has been more profiling of Arab Americans since the terrorist attacks, compared to 3% who say less profiling and 16% who are not sure.<br>A majority of Arab Americans (54%), also say it is justified for law enforcement officials to engage in extra questioning and inspections of people with Middle Eastern accents or features. In contrast, 36% say such extra scrutiny is not justified. Another 10% are not sure. Nearly three-five (57%) say they disagree with profiling of Arab Americans or Arab-speaking citizens by investigators due to the September 11 attacks. Another 35% agree with such profiling, and 7% are not sure. Three in five (61%) also say they are worried about the long-term effects of discrimination against Arab Americans. In contrast, 38% say...
they are not worried.<o:p></o:p></span></font></p>
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States, a new Zogby poll shows.

The poll, commissioned for the Arab American Institute, found that 63 percent of Arab-American Protestants and Orthodox Christians consider Mr. Bush's performance as commander in chief to be excellent, and another 34 percent say he is doing a good job. Arab Americans sense they are on the defensive—65 percent say they are embarrassed because the terrorists are Arab; pollster John Zogby said in an interview. So there is a desire to show a strong sense of patriotism.

Millionaire Saudi exile Osama bin Laden, suspected of being the mastermind behind the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, has called on all Muslims everywhere to wage a holy war against the United States. The U.S. government has identified the perpetrators of the attacks as Muslim extremists from the Middle East—apparently causing many Arab Americans to demonstrate their patriotism by supporting the war on terrorism to an even greater extent than other U.S. citizens. I suspect that feeling of embarrassment was reflected in the 69 percent Arab Americans who said they support an all-out war on terrorists, compared to 61 percent of Americans overall who support such a war, Mr. Zogby said. You see that sentiment reflected in other things, he said. A substantial minority of Arab Americans said they favor profiling Arab Americans, and I think that's their way of saying, 'Yeah, I'll bear up under closer scrutiny.' It's a desire to demonstrate they are good Americans.

The support for both Mr. Bush and the war on terrorism is stronger among Arab Christians than among Muslims, as well as among Americans with family ties to Lebanon or Syria than to other Arabic-speaking countries in the Middle East, according to Mr. Zogby's Oct. 6-8 poll, which has a
Among Arab Americans whose families came from Lebanon and Syria, 88 percent rated Mr. Bush's performance as excellent or good. While most Muslims who were surveyed had a positive view of Mr. Bush's handling of the crisis, fully a quarter of them responded by giving the president a fair or poor rating. The poll also showed that 31 percent of those whose family originated in Palestine oppose an all-out war on terrorism, compared with 23 percent of Arab Americans overall. But I think the poll shows that religion is not as important as national origin and generation, said Arab American Institute (AAI) President James Zogby, the pollster's brother. Americans of Lebanese or Syrian extraction who have been in this country for several generations obviously have much stronger feelings of attachment to the United States. Even among the more recent immigrants, the degree of support for the president and the outrage toward the terrorists are very high, he said. And the support for what President Bush has done for Arab Americans is very high across the board. He added: And outrage against what the terrorists did on September 11 is equally high among those born here and overseas. Mr. Zogby, the AAI president, said the polling data show that among Arab Americans living in the United States, 75 percent to 80 percent were born here and more than 75 percent are Christian. Asked if they would support an all-out war against countries that harbor or aid terrorists who have attacked the United States, 70 percent of Arab Americans born here said yes, compared with 65 percent of those not born here.
JERUSALEM — Israel expects to be targeted by Washington for a political offensive as soon as the United States has wound down its military attack on Afghanistan.
Israeli political sources said they believed the Bush administration was intending to revive and aggressively pursue a diplomatic initiative it had formulated before the Sept. 11 terrorist attack in New York and Washington. That attack caused Secretary of State Colin L. Powell to postpone a speech he intended to deliver at the United Nations last month outlining Washington's proposal for resolving the Israel-Palestinian question. Israeli sources said this proposal echoed that made by President Clinton in his last weeks in the White House, albeit in far less detail. It included the following central points:

- Two states for two peoples. Both Israel and the Palestinian Authority accept this formula, although Palestinian Islamists demand destruction of Israel.
- Jerusalem as the capital of both Israel and a Palestinian state. This is demanded by the Palestinians but has been rejected in the past by Israel.
- Recognition of the national character of each state. This is important to Israel since it appears to support its rejection of the return of millions of Palestinian refugees to Israel, which would negate the Jewish character of the state.

The Bush administration had intended at its outset to avoid the deep involvement in the Middle East that marked the Clinton administration. Within a few months, however, it became clear that stability in the region would not be restored without American intervention. America's current anti-terror campaign, whose targets are entirely Muslim, makes it even more imperative for Washington to placate the Muslim world by seeking to resolve the Palestinian issue. Just yesterday, Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak said at a joint press conference with British Prime Minister Tony Blair that there would be "no safety on our planet" without a comprehensive solution to the conflict.
Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, hosting Jordan's King Abdullah II in Berlin, said the peace process "needs new momentum." The United States, the European Union, the United Nations and other forces active in the region must bring pressure to bear on the two parties, he said.

Fear that Washington might pursue Arab support at Israel's expense led Prime Minister Ariel Sharon last week to publicly declare that Israel would not permit itself to become another Czechoslovakia, a reference to the concessions made to Nazi Germany by Great Britain in 1938, leading to the division of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Sharon had to apologize after an angry reaction in Washington. Mr. Powell reiterated this week that the United States was a firm friend of Israel and never would endanger its interests.
The results of most surveys are ultimately used by someone to advocate something, even if the sponsor of the survey has a purely academic interest in wanting to know the "truth" of public opinion.

The ethical issue is what a research sponsor does with research findings of legitimate research (balanced questions, responsible sampling, multiple questions per topic) where the findings are not to its liking.

In doing work for a public relations firm, we often design research with the intention of public release and at times for use in litigation. We counsel our clients of the ethical need for all results be released, and not just the findings they like. In these situations we may avoid asking questions that carry too much risk of an "undesired" outcome.

At the same time, we counsel them that most newsworthy topics involve uncertainty, and therefore risk. They have the right to not publicize survey findings they consider unfavorable, but in truly tense situations, these findings can find their way into the courts. (Examination of pre-test results can help reduce risk, but this...
is a slippery slope.)

So while the truth will set you free, at times, ignorance is bliss. Our clients are not obliged to hand their adversaries or competition the rope for a public hanging. The key is to have the client think through these issues at the proposal stage, not the analysis stage of the research.

-----Original Message-----
From: Philip Meyer [mailto:pmeyer@email.unc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2001 6:10 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A poll designed for an ad, Part II

Would it help if we broadened the discussion to include any use of a poll for advocacy? For example:

--Polls to assess the effect of pretrial publicity to support a change of venue motion in a criminal case.

--Polls to support a lobbying effort by an interest group.

--Polls to convince a prospective buyer of a business that its product has untapped demand.

As one whose livelihood as long depended on advertising, I sort of hate to see it singled out for special treatment.

====================================================================
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
====================================================================
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As with any type of survey, the average varies widely depending upon a variety of factors such as the characteristics of the population under study; the sampling procedure, if any, employed; the quality of the sampling frame; and topic of the survey.

It seems that most web surveys focus on a specialized subpopulation, such as students at a university or employees within a company. Student surveys traditionally receive higher response rates because students at most universities have unlimited access to computing facilities with Web browsers and e-mail. With these types of Web surveys, the well designed Web survey has an "average" response rate of about 35-40%.

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias

-----Original Message-----
From: Teresa Hottle [mailto:teresa.hottle@wright.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 12, 2001 11:15 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: response rate for website surveys

Can anyone tell me what the "average" response rate for website surveys is?

Thanks,
Terrie
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Folks,

I am considerably heartened that so many of you have taken the time and trouble to point out difficulties in the definitions, classification, and study of race. Many of us on our list seem to conclude that—in real life, as we live it—the question of race is tentative, subtle, unclear, very personal, and far from determinate, not even to mention not universally determined.

Unfortunately, all of these facts do not diminish the crucial importance of race in our everyday lives. I wish it were otherwise, but alas, it is not.

Many of us who gather on our list wish to study the real world, as we find it, and to do so objectively—subject to the criticisms of other list members, of other researchers, and of the public at large.

This means—unfortunately for our efforts to conduct real science—that we must study race as we find it, in all of its various aspects, in the real world. To accomplish this, we must not aspire to tidy up the topic via the instruments by which we measure it. Tidying it up certainly would accomplish, but the results we collect will not then reflect the external world so much as the elegance and neatness of our own internal reasoning. To ask a respondent personally to report a race is nothing like asking a high school senior which of six listed words is the best synonym for, say, "insouciance." It would certainly save many of us a lot of time if this were true, but alack, it is not (Hark—why do I suddenly feel that I have been reading—out loud—too many fairy tales?).

One of the many, many ways to look at race might be from the perspective of individual rights and freedoms (it's hardly an accident, after all, that race is often associated with "civil rights"). I think the essential idea here is best captured by this perhaps familiar saying:

"On the day they come to take away the Xs, on that day we are—all of us—Xs."

I use X here merely to emphasize that it can stand, not only for any particular race, but for a much wider range of quite different
things with similar— in essence, if not in the severity of their ramifications— social and cultural categorizations, most with at least some political implications:

race
gender
religion
national origin
native language
sexual orientation
physical health and abilities
physical appearance

(I'm sure you all can add several others)

I bother to point this out at all only because I suspect— with no real proof— that good clues about how to improve survey items involving race might well lie in the methods and strategies for studying such other quite different existential facts of human life which at least share with race the fact that each and every one of them might easily stand in for X in my synthetic quotation above— and unfortunately have, around the world and throughout human history, and also in much very good science fiction, as I'm sure more than a few of you know.

I welcome your comments, of course— why else would I bother to post this to you all?

-- Jim

******
Clara E. Rodriguez  
CHANGING RACE: Latinos, the Census, and the History of Ethnicity in the United State  
"Much of the current dialogue on race does not sufficiently interrogate its meaning. In marked contrast Clara E. Rodriguez offers a stunning example of racial formation by illustrating how Latino identities are formed and transformed in dynamic engagement with state definitions. She reveals the gap between state imposed categories and group self-definition; the dramatic distinctions between U.S. and Latin American concepts of race: and the political claims advanced through the Census. Best of all, she provides a rich sense of how individuals constantly negotiate the prevailing terrain of racial meanings."
-- Michael Omi, University of California, Berkeley

Clara Rodriguez is Professor of Sociology at Fordham University

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: "Colleen Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Thu, 11 Oct 2001 10:26:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Hispanics by Race
Message-ID: <sbc573e3.003@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>

I am so glad y'all brought this up--I've been struggling with this issue all day yesterday.

I had not looked at the number of "don't know" responses to our race items, although I will be running that directly:) But I also can add my voice to those who have noticed a lot of Hispanics choosing "other--specify" and giving "Hispanic" as the race.

This is a phone survey where we first ask about whether they are Hispanic, then what kind of Hispanic, then race. So if they say "Hispanic" at that pont, the interviewer is supposed to probe something along the lines of, "Thank you, we've recorded that you are of Hispanic descent. But what is your race. Would you say...?"

The first time this happened was in Florida, and we had 1,400 of "others" who specified "Hispanic" for race. I blamed the subcontractor who did the fieldwork, and insisted we needed better training on race issues. And indeed, I think the new training I developed was worthwhile...but when we repeated
the survey in other states I was still getting a fair number of "other--Hispanic." And in reading the interviewer's notes, there were comments like, "I know I'm not supposed to accept this, but he really insisted." These showed that the interviewer had indeed paid attention to the training, but still.

I conclude that a lot of Hispanics genuinely see that as their race and either cannot or will not choose one or more of the "official" categories we offer. Whether that translates into item nonresponse or an "Other--specify" answer depends in part on whether the latter option is even available. One could do a nice experiment to test that theory, but it wouldn't be all that useful in helping us how to deal with this phenomenon.

I also wonder how much variation there is by the exact Hispanic group and region of the country. I don't remember this being a factor in my work in Texas.

I also wonder about mode--wouldn't a mail survey have higher rates of skipped questions and "Other--Hispanic" than a telephone survey where an interviewer can probe to get a race?

Well, fast forward to the present, and I'm developing a self-administered survey for use in South Florida, which has a high concentration of Hispanics. As it turns out, since this is a program evaluation, we can probably get race/ethnicity from administrative data. But if I have to ask it in a survey, I am seriously thinking of just asking one item that combines race and ethnicity, offering four all-that-apply choices--

Hispanic
Non-Hispanic White
Black or African American
Other (specify)

Has anyone else done that kind of thing?

I just can't see trying to force a respondent into a peg hole that they don't think fits them at all.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015
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A sobering case history:

A few years back, I worked on a national survey for a quasi-govt organization that required an over-sampling of Hispanics. To efficiently obtain the over-sample, we drew upon phone numbers from previous omnibus RDD surveys, conducted over a period of months, in which the respondent had self-identified as "Hispanic or Latino." We also had the respondent's gender, so that in recontact attempts the interviewers could ask to speak with an adult male/female in that household. Near the beginning of the interview, the interviewer re-asked if the respondent considers himself/herself "Hispanic or Latino" to confirm qualification to continue with the interview. To everyone's surprise, only 2/3 of those recontacted answered "yes."

True, there were no doubt some different respondents than those interviewed in the original omnibus surveys, but this number "should have been" rather small (and one would expect many of THEM to be Hispanic/Latino as well). =20

What this tells me is that ethnic/cultural identification is not as stable an attribute as many people (including many social scientists) think. And/or that people often answer inconsistently for other reasons, perhaps in some cases, to avoid disclosing their "true" ethnicity.

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting
sidg@his.com
301 469-0813
www.groeneman.com
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What do the public-and demographic groups-want to know about the War on Terrorism? What are people afraid of and hopeful for? What actions are they taking to protect their families in this new and yet undefined war? Has anyone asked, open-ended q.s, focus group?

I heard an interesting interview on cNBC, with Frank Luntz, a US News Poll. He had interesting data. 80 some percent are displaying the flag or taking other patriotic actions, the personal fears are having economic consequences, people are huddling and thinking, talking and going inward, wondering if the future will be better than the present, 29% plan to spend less this Christmas. The anchor challenged him a bit on his observation that Hollywood is the only place in America where they're still not flying flags. He said, "We are less free today than yesterday."

Yes; and I add: In the future we will be more secure and free than today.
History is full of "random" events that were eventually understood and controlled.

mark

"The RACE is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong."

"The race was not to the swift after all, it was to the indefatigably inconsequential and life was random."

--The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs

Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008
202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com
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For those interested in the attitudes of Palestinians this might be of interest. I can't vouch for its accuracy or validity but perhaps someone else can. The poll was conducted in June -- and unfortunately there is no later poll to reflect probable changes in attitude since the tragedy of Sept 11.

Dick

http://www.jmcc.org/polls/2001/no41.htm
Introduction
* This poll showed the continuation of popular support, 79 percent, for the intifada compared to 80.2 percent last April. In December 2000, support for the intifada was 70.1 percent.
* The majority of Palestinians, 54.4 percent, still continue to support both military and popular forms of the intifada. The percentage has decreased since the previous poll conducted in April, when support for both forms of the intifada was 62.3 percent. Palestinians who supported the continuation of only the popular forms of the intifada increased to 19.7 percent as opposed to 13.5 percent two months ago.
* The majority of Palestinians, 70.6 percent considered Palestinian military operations against Israeli targets a suitable response in the current circumstances, while only 19.8 percent opposed it and considered it disadvantageous for national interests. The results are similar to the December 2000 survey when this question was last asked.
* A significant number of Palestinians, 40.7 percent, supported the continuation of Palestinian armed operations within the occupied Palestinian territory and Israel at the same time. Those who only supported the continuation of these operations only within Israel reached 31.8 percent, while 3.6 percent said that they are with the continuation of these operations in the occupied territory only. Only 17.2 percent of those interviewed said they do not support the continuation of military operations.
* Support for suicide bombings continued as an adequate response during the current circumstances reaching 68.6 percent as opposed to 66.2 percent last April. It is worth noting that support for suicide bombings during March 1999 was only 26.1 percent, which was the last date this question was asked.
* A slight increase from 52 percent to 55.6 percent occurred amongst Palestinians believing that Palestinian interests demand the continuation of the intifada and negotiations at the same time. Those who support only the path of negotiations dropped from 21.1 percent in December 2000 to 11.5 percent in this survey.
* A large number of the Palestinian people, 45.6 percent, see that the aim of this intifada is to end the Israeli military occupation based on UN Security Council Resolution 242 and the establishment of a Palestinian state, while 41.2 percent of those interviewed said that the aim of the intifada is total liberation of Palestinian land and only 9.2 percent considered the intifada's aim a tactic for improving the negotiation track conditions.
* Sixty-nine percent of Palestinians believe that the current circumstances necessitates establishing a Palestinian national unity while 18.6 percent prefer to keep the internal political situation as is.
* The majority of those surveyed, 67.1 percent, did not approve ending the intifada in return to ending Jewish settlement. Only 25.1 percent of Palestinians said they approve ending the intifada in return to ending Jewish settlement.
* As for the public's opinion on Palestinian President Yasser Arafat's order to cease-fire, 52.3 percent strongly to somewhat supported this decision, while 44.2 strongly to somewhat opposed this decision. Those who support the cease-fire are more than those who oppose it.
* Palestinian opinion on discussions circulating only outside Palestine on Arafat's control of the situation shows that 71.6 percent see the Palestinian president in total or somewhat control of the situation while
only 25.8 percent say that he totally or somewhat not in control.

* There is an increase in the number of Palestinians who are
dissatisfied with Arab solidarity with the intifada reaching 84.7 percent
compared to 60.5 percent in December 2000.

* As for support of factions and politicians, Fatah Movement continued
to gain the same trust of 34.9 percent of Palestinians as well as Hamas
Movement remaining at 18.6 percent. Yasser Arafat continued to have the
highest trust of all Palestinian political personalities although the trust
went down to 27.8 percent from 32.3 percent in April 2001.

----------

Methodology

A random sample of 1201 people over the age of 18 were interviewed
face-to-face throughout the West Bank and Gaza Strip on 14,15,16,17 June
2001. The interviews were conducted in randomly selected homes, and the
subjects inside each home were also selected randomly according to Kish
tables. The interviews were conducted in 60 sampling points chosen randomly
according to population.

In the West Bank, 760 people were surveyed from the following areas:
Jenin: Jenin, Jenin Refugee Camp (RC), Ya'bad, Zababdeh, Kufr Rai', Fehmeh,
Fureek, Balata RC, Sabastia, Zawata. Tulkarem & Qalqilya: Tulkarem,
Tulkarem RC, Bala', Beit Leed, Qalqilia, Jayyous. Hebron: Hebron, Yatta,
Haltou, Dhahtiria, Kawar RC, Sureef, Targoumia. Bethlehem:
Betlehem, Beit Sahou, Duha, al-Khader, Artas, Deiheishe RC Jericho:
Jericho, Aqbat Jaber RC. Ramallah & al-Bireh: al-Bireh, Ramallah, Beit
Reema, Jalazon RC, Kufr Malik, Nilin . Jerusalem: a-Dahia, A-ram, Shufat,
Beit Hanelia, Old City, Wadi al-Joz, Ras al-Amoud, Beir Nabal, Qalandia RC,
Beit Hanaiian a-taha, al-'Isawia, Silwan.

In the Gaza Strip, 440 people were surveyed from: Gaza North: Jabalia
refugee camp, Jabalia, Beit Lahia and Beit Hanoun. Gaza: Sheikh Radwan,
a-Nasser, a-Daraj, a-Tufah, Sabra, a-Zeitoun, a-Shajai'a, Shati RC,
a-Rimal Deir al- Balah: al-Nusseirat RC, al-Maghazy RC, Deir al- Balah and
Younis, Bani Suheila and Abassan al-Saghira . Rafah: Rafah, Rafah RC and
Tal al-Sultan RC .

The margin of error is 3 percent, with a confidence level of 95.

----------

Sample Distribution

53.2% of the respondents were from West Bank, 10.2 % from Jerusalem, 36.6%
from the Gaza Strip. 30.2% said they live in villages, 16.3% in refugee
camps, 53.5% in towns/cities. 50.5% were male, 49.5% were female. 66.1%
were married, 25.9%, single, 4.2% widowed, 1.7% divorced, 2.1% no answer.

The average age of the respondents was 34 years.

----------

Occupation respondents
Students 11.7%  laborers 10.8%  Farmers/fishermen 1.9%  Craftsman 1.7%
Businessmen/private business 8.2%  Employees e.g. secretaries/municipal
employees/teachers/nurses 18.7% Professionals - e.g. doctors/lawyers/pharmacists/engineers 1.5% Housewives 34.9%, unemployed 8.2% and retired 1.6% no answer 0.8% For detailed results tap into their web site.

For those interested in the attitudes of Palestinians this might be of interest. I can't vouch for its accuracy or validity but perhaps someone else can. The poll was conducted in June -- and unfortunately there is no later poll to reflect probable changes in attitude since the tragedy of Sept 11. Dick

JMCC Public Opinion Poll No. 41 June 2001

Introduction

This poll showed the continuation of popular support, 79 percent, for the intifada compared to 80.2 percent last April. In December 2000, support for the intifada was 70.1 percent.

The majority of Palestinians, 54.4 percent, still continue to support both military and popular forms of the intifada. The percentage has decreased since the previous poll conducted in April, when support for both forms of the intifada was 62.3 percent. Palestinians who supported the continuation of only the popular forms...
of the intifada increased to 19.7 percent as opposed to 13.5 percent two months ago.</font>
</ul>
<ul><font size=2>
<li>The majority of Palestinians, 70.6 percent considered Palestinian military operations against Israeli targets a suitable response in the current circumstances, while only 19.8 percent opposed it and considered it disadvantageous for national interests. The results are similar to the December 2000 survey when this question was last asked.</font>
</ul>
<ul><font size=2>
<li>A significant number of Palestinians, 40.7 percent, supported the continuation of Palestinian armed operations within the occupied Palestinian territory and Israel at the same time. Those who only supported the continuation of these operations only within Israel reached 31.8 percent, while 3.6 percent said that they are with the continuation of these operations in the occupied territory only. Only 17.2 percent of those interviewed said they do not support the continuation of military operations.</li>
</ul>
<ul><font size=2>
<li>Support for suicide bombings continued as an adequate response during the current circumstances reaching 68.6 percent as opposed to 66.2 percent last April. It is worth noting that support for suicide bombings during March 1999 was only 26.1 percent, which was the last date this question was asked.</li>
</ul>
<ul><font size=2>
<li>A slight increase from 52 percent to 55.6 percent occurred amongst Palestinians believing that Palestinian interests demand the continuation of the intifada and negotiations at the same time. Those who support only the path of negotiations dropped from 21.1 percent in December 2000 to 11.5 percent in this survey.</li>
</ul>
<ul><font size=2>
<li>A large number of the Palestinian people, 45.6 percent, see that the aim of this intifada is to end the Israeli military occupation based on UN Security Council Resolution 242 and the establishment of a Palestinian state, while 41.2 percent of those interviewed said that the aim of the intifada is total liberation of Palestinian land and only 9.2 percent considered the intifada's aim a tactic
for improving the negotiation track conditions.

Sixty-nine percent of Palestinians believe that the current circumstances necessitates establishing a Palestinian national unity while 18.6 percent prefer to keep the internal political situation as is.

The majority of those surveyed, 67.1 percent, did not approve ending the intifada in return to ending Jewish settlement. Only 25.1 percent of Palestinians said they approve ending the intifada in return to ending Jewish settlement.

As for the public's opinion on Palestinian President Yasser Arafat's order to cease-fire, 52.3 percent strongly to somewhat supported this decision, while 44.2 strongly to somewhat opposed this decision. Those who support the cease-fire are more than those who oppose it.

Palestinian opinion on discussions circulating only outside Palestine on Arafat's control of the situation shows that 71.6 percent see the Palestinian president in total or somewhat control of the situation while only 25.8 percent say that he totally or somewhat not in control.

There is an increase in the number of Palestinians who are dissatisfied with Arab solidarity with the intifada reaching 84.7 percent compared to 60.5 percent in December 2000.

As for support of factions and politicians, Fateh Movement continued to gain the same trust of 34.9 percent of Palestinians as well as Hamas Movement remaining at 18.6 percent. Yasser Arafat continued to have the highest trust of all Palestinian political personalities although the trust went down to 27.8 percent from 32.3 percent in April 2001.

Methodology
A random sample of 1201 people over the age of 18 were interviewed face-to-face throughout the West Bank and Gaza Strip on 14, 15, 16, 17 June 2001. The interviews were conducted in randomly selected homes, and the subjects inside each home were also selected randomly according to Kish tables. The interviews were conducted in 60 sampling points chosen randomly according to population.


The margin of error is 3 percent, with a confidence level of 95.

% of the respondents were from West Bank, 10.2 % from Jerusalem, 36.6 % from the Gaza Strip. 30.2 % said they live in villages, 16.3 % in refugee camps, 53.5 % in towns/cities. 50.5 % were male, 49.5 % were female. 66.1 % were married, 25.9 %, single, 4.2 %
widowed,  
1.7% divorced, 2.1% no answer. The average age of the respondents was 34 years. 

Occupation respondents 

- Students 11.7%  
- Laborers 10.8%  
- Farmers/fishermen 1.9%  
- Craftsmen 1.7%  
- Businessmen/private business 8.2%  
- Employees e.g. secretaries/municipal employees/teachers/nurses 18.7%  
- Professionals - e.g. doctors/lawyers/ pharmacists/engineers 1.5%  
- Housewives 34.9%  
- Unemployed 8.2%  
- Retired 1.6%  
- No answer 0.8%  

For detailed results tap into their web site.

---

Folks,

The front page of the National Edition of The New York Times that landed in my driveway this morning contained—in a box at the bottom of its front page—the following notice:
To Our Readers

In answer to inquiries from readers, The Times wishes to point out that no copies of the newspaper are printed in its Manhattan headquarters, where a letter and an unidentified substance were handed over to health authorities yesterday for testing. All copies for the New York region and elsewhere, and all supplies of paper, come from plants outside Manhattan.

Said driveway is somewhere between 2.5 and 3 thousand miles from the Manhattan headquarters of The New York Times, depending on whether one measures from the garage door or from the street.

And so that's the way it is, in America, on this beautiful Saturday morning, October 13, 2001, apparently, because much the same tone prevails throughout the newspaper, and also throughout its companion in the driveway, The Los Angeles Times.

In fact, I did not even see the front page notice until after I had read much of the New York Times, at which point the notice seemed to me perfectly natural, or at least upon first reading it.

So if you should ever need a short primer on how terrorism actually works on its victims, I'd like to believe that you have just now finished reading one.
-- Jim

*******
Kudos to NORC for its National Disaster Survey, which produced this timely and hearting weekend coverage by The Chicago Triubune.

-- Jim
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From the Chicago Tribune

It made us cry and united us

TAKING THE PULSE OF THE CHICAGO AREA AFTER SEPT. 11, A STUDY FINDS PRAYER, PATRIOTISM, PRIDE, SUPPORT.

By Charles M. Madigan
Tribune staff reporter

If the goal of the terrorists who planned and carried out the Sept. 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon was to slash away at the nation's sense of itself and its confidence in government, those were two targets the suicide hijackers clearly missed.

From an unprecedented planting of death and havoc, the nation is reaping an unexpected harvest of patriotism, compassion and unity unseen in the United States in decades, even though the attacks shook the country to its foundation and left the much of its population confused, in shock and weeping.

A new nationwide study, the National Disaster Survey, conducted by the
National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, questioned 502 people in Cook, DeKalb, DuPage, Grundy, Kane, Kendall and Will Counties, as part of a larger national project that will be released later.

The report was obtained exclusively by the Tribune. The survey uncovered profound physiological responses, an outpouring of patriotism and national pride across the political spectrum, and rocketing support for government institutions, particularly the military.

President Bush, in his news conference Thursday, was not exaggerating when he said good character and strong citizenship had blossomed in the ruins.

"We have shown great love for our country and great tolerance and respect for all our countrymen," ..." the president said.

The results on one question alone seem to reflect the president's assessment. In the first moments after the attack, when the images of the burning World Trade Center were spreading across the nation, the first response from 84 percent of the people questioned in the Chicago area was prayer.

People told the university surveyors that they prayed for peace, for the victims and their families, and for help in finding out who was responsible for the attack. As that strong spiritual response played out, it was soon replaced by anger, particularly anger attached to concerns about personal safety.

If more than 8 in 10 Chicago-area residents turned to a higher spiritual power, many of them, 72 percent, also said they felt a "deep anger" about the event. About one-third of those questioned said they were "deeply concerned" about their personal safety, while 52 percent said they were worried about how terrorism might affect their own lives.

Many people felt a need to talk to others about the attack. More than 74 percent phoned, e-mailed or talked to someone just after they heard the news. Sixty percent said they contacted up to six other people. Thirty-one percent said they contacted as many as 20 other people.

About 15 percent of the respondents in the Chicago part of the survey said
they avoided government buildings after the attack. Of the 55 percent who said they were not able to carry on their daily duties as usual, most said they watched television or listened to the radio instead. How people cope

The responses in the survey, sponsored by the National Science Foundation, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation and the Chicago Tribune, reached beyond the standard measurements in common polling data.

They present a picture not only of how people felt immediately after the attack, but also what they did to cope with waves of anxiety, fear and depression sparked by the unavoidable media focus on the disaster.

Almost 10 percent of the people questioned in the Chicago area said they felt like getting drunk after the attack. In the rest of the United States, feeling like getting drunk was a response of just 6.4 percent.

The Chicago-area results will be followed by the release of complete national responses, based on questions asked of 2,100 people, and survey responses from New York and Washington in about a week, according to the university center, one of the nation's most respected social science institutions and the source of a landmark national survey that followed the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

The data show a powerful, patriotic reaction in the days after the attack, reflected in Chicago and its suburbs as well as across the nation. Given giving the historical adage that nations tend to unite when attacked by external enemies, that reaction might have been anticipated.

As asked whether they would rather be citizens of any other country in the world, 97 percent of the residents of the Chicago area agreed with the statement that they would rather be citizens of the United States than of anyplace else.

Confidence in the military, the survey showed, registered a striking increase.

Last year, in the year 2000, the General Social Survey estimated only 40 percent of the people in the nation and 34 percent in the 12 largest metropolitan areas expressed a great deal of confidence in the military.
After the attack, 72 percent of the people in the Chicago area and 77.9 percent of the nation as a whole expressed a great deal of confidence in the nation's military.

Emotional response

The part of the survey that focuses on emotional reactions is particularly revealing and somewhat surprising.

A full third of the respondents in the Chicago area reported they were so "dazed and confused" when they heard about the attack that they did not know how to feel, a reaction that apparently swept the nation.

Only the people of New York were more profoundly affected. Almost half of them said they did not know how to feel.

As elsewhere in the nation, Chicago and its suburbs reacted with compassion once the shock had dissipated.

While 13 percent of the respondents in the Chicago area began to stockpile food, gasoline or other necessities after the attack, the charitable response was much stronger.

Almost 55 percent of Chicagoans reported giving to charity after the attack, about 10 percent more than the national number. Chicagoans, in fact, contributed as heavily as people who lived in New York, the survey shows.

Some 24 percent of Chicago-area residents reported giving blood, about the same as the national number, but much lower than the 35.5 percent who said they donated blood in New York.

Asked to compare their feelings after the attack with feelings about other experiences in their lives, almost half of Chicago-area residents said they remembered other times when they had the same feelings. Some examples included the death of family members, the Oklahoma City bombing, the Persian Gulf war, the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

Physical response

The reactions reached far beyond emotion. Ninety-five percent of the people questioned in the Chicago region said they experienced strong physical
reactions when they heard of the terrorist attack, responses that make it clear that the assault felt close to home, even though it happened hundreds of miles away in lower Manhattan or at the Pentagon in Arlington, Va.

Almost three of every four people reported weeping, the most common physiological response. After crying, the second most common response was a feeling of nervousness or tension.

Almost half had trouble sleeping, just ahead of the 45.4 percent who said they felt "dazed and numb."

About a third said they felt more tired than usual. One in three said they had upset stomachs. Almost a third reported loss of appetite.

One in five said they had headaches, while about the same number said they had trouble controlling their temper. Seventeen percent said they smoked more. Increased their amount of smoking. About the same number had trouble with forgetfulness. Some 16.8 percent said they experienced rapid heartbeat. About 1 in 20 said they felt dizzy. About the same number reported sweaty hands.

All of these reports of clear signs of emotional response to the terrorist attack ranked Chicago alongside the rest of the nation, excluding New York and Washington.

The average number of symptoms experienced by Chicago-area residents was 4.3. In New York, the average number of symptoms was 5.2. However, when the survey specialists looked closely at the results, they found that many more Chicagoans reported crying in response to the attack than people in the rest of the country. Just under 60 percent of the respondents in the national survey reported crying, while 72.2 percent reported that, in Chicago, the catastrophe drew tears.

The reactions were about the same for everyone regardless of their health, which allowed the researchers to rule out bad health as the cause of the symptoms, which can be common to many psychological conditions and diseases.

Some differences were noticed in the responses of men and women in the Chicago-area results. Women reported suffering more symptoms than men, with men saying
they had 3.2 symptoms and women reporting they had 5.1 symptoms. Higher percentages of women reported loss of appetite, feeling nervous or tense, feeling more tired, feeling dizzy, feeling dazed or numb, or forgetting things.

In these statistics, too, researchers were able to rule out bad health as a possible cause of the reactions.

There were concerns here, and across the nation, that the attack would have a deleterious effect on American politics. About a third of the people here, and roughly the same number across the nation, said they "worried deeply" about the effect of the attack on politics in the U.S.

Thirteen percent of those questioned around the country, but 15 percent of those questioned in the Chicago area, reported they were "deeply concerned" that the United States was in some way responsible for the attack.

The survey was conducted between Sept. 13 and Sept. 27. The surveyors noted there was some decline in emotion as time passed. The margin of error for the Chicago part of the survey is plus or minus 4.5 percentage points.


Copyright (C) 2001 Chicago Tribune <http://www.chicagotribune.com/>
To educate members of the research community about telephone and privacy laws, the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) will be holding a one-day Privacy Law Seminar on November 30th in New York City.

The seminar will include must-have knowledge on legal issues facing survey research companies, provide for networking opportunities with industry colleagues over lunch and will conclude with a Question & Answer session.

WHEN:
Friday. November 30th from 10:30 am - 4:30 pm

WHERE:
641 Lexington Avenue*
New York, NY 10022
Phone: 212-751-5656
Fax: 212-751-5265

WHO SHOULD ATTEND:
- Attorneys representing companies in the survey research community
- All survey research professionals concerned about telephone and online privacy issues

WHAT WILL BE COVERED:
> Telephone Privacy - federal do-not-call laws and state do-not-call registry laws
> Online Privacy - email solicitations, privacy policies and the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA)
> Future do-not-call and online privacy legislation
> CMOR will also respond to the FTC Privacy Position announced on October
5th and its potential impact on the research industry

HOW TO REGISTER:
Register directly online at the CMOR website at www.cmor.org.

Contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs, Donna L. Gillin, at 631-696-2544 or via email at dgillin@cmor.org with any questions or for further details about the Seminar.

* CMOR would like to extend our appreciation to the Advertising Research Foundation for the use of its conference room for this important industry event.

REGISTER TODAY!!!

Jane M. Sheppard
Director Respondent Cooperation
Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR)
Ohio Office: 20
2012 Penhurst Circle N.E.
North Canton, OH 44720
Phone: (330) 244-8616
Fax: (330) 244-8626
Email: jsheppard@cmor.org
Visit CMOR's website www.cmor.org for your research resources.
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- Online Privacy - email solicitations, privacy policies and the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA)
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Kudos to all those involved in this New York Times and CBS News Poll, for generating this important and heartening report in yesterday's New York Times. Kudos also to Times reporters Dan Berry and Marjorie Connelly, for their unusually good writeup of these new poll results.

-- Jim
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NEW YORKERS ARE SHAKEN, BUT RESOLUTE, AFTER ATTACK

By DAN BARRY and MARJORIE CONNELLY

A month after the terrorist attack that killed 5,000 people, destroyed the World Trade Center and shook New York to its core, many city residents say that they feel great pride and faith in their wounded metropolis. But they also say that their civic allegiance is tempered -- though far from crushed -- by haunting memories and by concerns about future attacks, according to a new poll conducted by The New York Times and CBS News.

The city's already jittery residents could only have been further rattled by
events
that occurred since the poll's completion on Tuesday. Reports of a case of anthrax
at NBC News in Rockefeller Center surfaced yesterday, just a day after the F.B.I.
issued a warning about the possibility of more terrorist attacks.

Even before these incidents, three of four residents participating in the poll said
they were very concerned about another terrorist attack in New York. Despite those
fears, most residents said they have no intention of hiding in their homes or
moving away. Instead, nearly all of the poll's respondents -- 93 percent -- said
that they harbor a good image of the city, and two-thirds said that they plan to be
living in the city four years from now.

Over all, the poll seems to indicate that residents have adopted a reflexive,
almost defiant position on their city's resilience. In a New York Times poll conducted a few weeks before the Sept. 11 attack, 59 percent said that life in the
city had improved in the last four years. Now, after the disaster, those who saw an
improvement in city life jumped to 69 percent -- the highest percentage in at
least 10 years.

But these results do not suggest a cavalier approach to the dangers of the day; far
from it. A month later, the attack's reverberations continue to be felt by nearly
half of those polled in a telephone survey that was conducted Oct. 6 to Oct. 9, in
which 983 adult residents were interviewed and for which the margin of sampling
error is plus or minus three percentage points.

Some of those questioned cited aftereffects that range from the mundane to
the profound, from the loss of television service to the loss of peace of mind.
Thirteen percent cited problems with transportation and traffic; an equal number
cited depression and other forms of anxiety.

The poll also demonstrates how the collapse of the twin towers created a
dust that covered not just Lower Manhattan but an entire city in a blanket of grief.
One in every five residents contacted in the poll said that a relative or close friend is
missing or was hurt or killed in the attack. And three in five said that
someone in their circle of friends and relatives knew someone who was missing, hurt or killed.

Many of these jumbled emotions -- of resolve and despair, of civic pride and wrenching grief -- are harbored by the likes of Norman Steinmetz, of Staten Island. A retired New York police officer, he expressed great affection for his native city and deep pride in how New Yorkers shook off the paralysis of shock to begin rebuilding. He is resisting his daughter's pleas that he move to Florida because, he said, "I was born and raised here."

But in the same conversation, the enormity of the loss overcame the former officer, and he began to sob. "Look at what happened to my beautiful city!" whispered Mr. Steinmetz, who is 70. "I can't take it."

The attack has subtly changed some of his habits, he said. For example, he said that when he takes the bus over the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, which provides a majestic view of Lower Manhattan, he now sits on the side facing the ocean, away from the city.

"I sit so I don't have to see the emptiness," he said.

A security guard named Shirley White used to work in one of the buildings that once stood in that emptiness. She too said that she admired how New Yorkers rallied around one another -- "We have finally come together," she said -- and she too said that she had no intention of moving from her home in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn.

But as she carries on with her life, Ms. White said, the attack continues to disrupt her days and nights. The building she now guards is much shorter than the twin towers, which is fine by her. ("I'm trying not to get into any skyscraping buildings," she said.) But that building is in Midtown, which means that her round-trip commute by a slowed subway system is at least two hours longer.

More important, she said, are the memories of all those people she used to see, passing by her as she stood sentry in the south tower of the World Trade Center. "Every day I think about them," she said. "And every night I think about them."
"I'm afraid, but I can't let that stop me from doing my work," she continued. "I might as well lie down and say, 'Get me too.' I have to do what I have to do."

That last statement by Ms. White, who is 55 years old and the mother of six, might as well be inscribed on the city seal. At a time when there are security checkpoints at various tunnels and bridges, 9 of 10 city residents said they endorsed having more checkpoints and metal detectors at public events and public buildings — even if it meant waiting on line for an hour or more.

In addition, three-quarters of the respondents said that they would be willing to arrive at the airport three hours early for any domestic flight. And two-thirds said that they would support a requirement that people in the United States carry a national electronic identification card, or "smart card."

The poll also seems to suggest a growing tolerance for racial profiling — for law officers' stopping people of a specific race or ethnicity because they believe these groups are more likely to commit certain types of crimes.

In a poll conducted in April 2000, after the acquittal of four New York police officers charged with the shooting death of an unarmed African immigrant, Amadou Diallo, in the Bronx, 84 percent of the city's residents said that profiling was never justified.

But in the recent poll, only half the respondents said there was never justification, with 24 percent of the black respondents and 31 percent of the Hispanic respondents finding the practice acceptable. At the same time, 85 percent of all city residents who were questioned said that Arab-Americans, Muslims and immigrants from the Middle East were at least somewhat likely to be singled out unfairly as a result of last month's terrorist attack.

"During these times of heightened security, when you never know when they're going to strike or what's going to happen in the city," said Richard Collado, 36, "you more or less say, 'Fine, you can stop me; I'm Hispanic, but you can stop me
if you need to.’ But two years down the road, with the war over, and nothing going on anymore, then I don’t approve.”

Mr. Collado, a stockbroker who lives in Bay Ridge, added: "If Hispanics or any group are all of a sudden creating havoc like this, then I don't mind being stopped. If it's for the greater good of everyone else that I have to be stopped, then that's fine."

There were other indications that the city is trying to find its footing on unsettled ground, as personified by Sharifah Taylor, 24, an unemployed sales representative from Crown Heights. "I always had trouble with crime here, but just seeing everyone pull together after what's happened makes me feel real good about the city," she said. But she also said that she avoids the subways and has not been to Manhattan since the attack.

"If I had a choice, I would probably leave the city, but terrorism can happen anywhere," Ms. Taylor said. "I'm just watching what's going on, and staying where I am."

One in five city residents said that they are less likely to frequent restaurants. Two in five residents who described themselves as occasional or frequent air travelers said that they were now less likely to fly. Nearly 30 percent said that they are more likely to attend religious services. And more than half -- including John Ferruzzi of Forest Hills, Queens -- say that they find themselves spending more time with their family and close friends.

In the last month, Mr. Ferruzzi has gone through the experiences of a lifetime, and he is only 20 years old. He said he has seen a city of millions set aside cultural differences to come together in true "New York spirit." But a good friend of his lost a friend in the World Trade Center collapse, while the neighbor of another good friend lost a son.

"Everywhere I went there was another story," he said, his voice shaking. "Just talking about it -- forget about it."
These are excellent questions. Someone should ask them in public opinion surveys. Otherwise, we will have only the journalists' claims to be asking the questions "peoplele" are asking.

Jeanne Anderson

Mark David Richards wrote:

> What do the public-and demographic groups-want to know about the War
> on Terrorism?
> >
> > What are people afraid of and hopeful for? What actions are they taking
> > to protect their families in this new and yet undefined war? Has anyone
These are excellent questions. Someone should ask them in public opinion surveys. Otherwise, we will have only the journalists' claims to be asking the questions "people" are asking.

Jeanne Anderson
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What do the public and demographic groups want to know about the War on Terrorism?

What are people afraid of and hopeful for? Has anyone asked, open-ended questions, focus group?
A brief news report yesterday mentioned a recent poll in Pakistan reportedly showing some 90% of the population to be highly critical of U.S. attacks on Afghanistan. Does anyone know where details on the method and content of this poll can be found? Howard
This may be the source:
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Howard Schuman wrote:

> A brief news report yesterday mentioned a recent poll in Pakistan reportedly showing some 90% of the population to be highly critical of U.S. attacks on Afghanistan. Does anyone know where details on the method and content of this poll can be found? Howard

I don't know where the 90% number comes from. Here are the most recent results (including methodological details) published by Gallup Pakistan on their web site at http://www.gallup.com.pk/g_poll.html

Jan Werner

Islamabad, October 15, 2001

51% support Musharaf on his policy on current crisis. But 83% side with Taliban against America.

Only 16% favour to let America use Pakistani air bases: Gallup Survey According to the findings of a recent poll conducted by Gallup Pakistan the Pakistani public is undergoing a set of complex emotions. Around half of them, 51%, say they favour General Musharaf's policy on the current crisis, which is substantially higher compared to three weeks ago when the level of support was only 32%. Furthermore, 37% think that he has handled his job on this issue in a very good or good way. But having said that 83% of Pakistanis say that in the conflict between America and Taliban, their sympathies are with the Taliban. 82% of them believe Osama Bin Laden is a "Mjuahid" and not a terrorist and only 12% believe that he was responsible for the attacks on USA. Quite importantly only 16% favour that Americans should be allowed to use air bases in Pakistan, 75% are opposed.

The findings have emerged from a survey carried out by Gallup Pakistan on October 11-12 in the urban areas of all the four provinces of the country. The respondents were chosen statistically and they represented a cross section of people belonging to various age, education, income and language backgrounds.

The findings of this survey will also be published under a special arrangement by the international weekly Magazine "Newsweek" in its forthcoming issue.

The survey revealed an apprehension on the part of a sizable number of Pakistanis that after its action gets underway in Afghanistan, America may start similar action in Kashmir. Nearly 6 out of 10 Pakistanis believed that the chances of this happening were either very high, a view held by 17% or some chances, a view held by 42%. Only 41% ruled out such a possibility.

Pakistani public opinion is divided on whether the aid promised by
America would help solve the nation's economic problems. While 59% believe it would be useful, 38% think it would be harmful; 3% did not give a view. But most people are pessimistic about the unfolding economic scenario and believe that the national economy will be worse off in the aftermath of the crisis, a view held by 54%. Only 22% believed it would improve, while 24% think it would remain the same.

According to the survey 64% of Pakistanis believed that the attack on USA on September 11 was a terrorist attack and not Jihad. It is also notable that one third, or 34% of the respondents were of the view that Osama Bin Laden should present himself before a court of law for trial, while 57% disfavoured this idea.

The survey was conducted by Gallup Pakistan, the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International.

Sample Composition

The sample comprised 978 men and women age 18+. They were statistically selected from the urban areas of all the four provinces of Pakistan including Karachi, Lahore, Rawalpindi/Islamabad, Peshawar and Quetta. The sample comprised a cross section of various ages and socio-economic groups in the urban areas of the country. The error margin for a sample of this kind is + 3-4% at 95% confidence level.

Gallup Pakistan is the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International. It is Pakistan's most reputable polling organization.

Technical Details

Field Work: All field work was done through face to face interviews. The respondents were chosen through a random process. The sampling blocks were chosen randomly. The starting point was randomly identified, and a random process was followed to proceed from there. Within the household the first adult who responded and became available was interviewed.

Date: The field work was carried out on October 11-12, 2001

All four provinces are represented in the survey. The sample was re-weighted to correspond with the share of each province in the national urban population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Unweighted sample</th>
<th>Weighted sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field work was carried out in Karachi, Hyderabad and Sukkur (Sindh), Multan, Lahore, Faisalabad, Rawalpindi/Islamabad* (Punjab), Peshawar (NWFP), Quetta (Balochistan).

>From hschuman@umich.edu Mon Oct 15 07:24:37 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
Thanks Jan & Nick. The content is not quite as bad as the news report, but nevertheless ominous. Pakistan's population is over 150 million, it has nuclear weapons, and is important to the entire Islamic world. It would be helpful to have an urban/rural break, since the visible opposition to the U.S. has been largely in important cities.

Howard
51% support Musharaf on his policy on current crisis.
But 83% side with Taliban against America.

Only 16% favour to let America use Pakistani air bases: Gallup
Survey According to the findings of a recent poll conducted by Gallup Pakistan the Pakistani public is undergoing a set of complex emotions. Around half of them, 51%, say they favour General Musharaf's policy on the current crisis, which is substantially higher compared to three weeks ago when the level of support was only 32%. Furthermore, 37% think that he has handled his job on this issue in a very good or good way. But having said that 83% of Pakistanis say that in the conflict between America and Taliban, their sympathies are with the Taliban. 82% of them believe Osama Bin Laden is a "Mjauhid" and not a terrorist and only 12% believe that he was responsible for the attacks on USA. Quite importantly only 16% favour that Americans should be allowed to use air bases in Pakistan, 75% are opposed.

The findings have emerged from a survey carried out by Gallup Pakistan on October 11-12 in the urban areas of all the four provinces of the country. The respondents were chosen statistically and they represented a cross section of people belonging to various age, education, income and language backgrounds.

The findings of this survey will also be published under a special arrangement by the international weekly Magazine "Newsweek" in its forthcoming issue.

The survey revealed an apprehension on the part of a sizable number of Pakistanis that after its action gets underway in Afghanistan, America may start similar action in Kashmir. Nearly 6 out of 10 Pakistanis believed that the chances of this happening were either very high, a view held by 17% or some chances, a view held by 42%. Only 41% ruled out such a possibility.

Pakistani public opinion is divided on whether the aid promised by America would help solve the nation's economic problems. While 59% believe it would be useful, 38% think it would be harmful; 3% did not give a view. But most people are pessimistic about the unfolding economic scenario and believe that the national economy will be worse off in the aftermath of the crisis, a view held by 54%. Only 22% believed it would improve, while 24% think it would remain the same.

According to the survey 64% of Pakistanis believed that the attack
on USA on September 11 was a terrorist attack and not Jihad. It is also notable that one third, or 34% of the respondents were of the view that Osama Bin Laden should present himself before a court of law for trial, while 57% disfavoured this idea.

The survey was conducted by Gallup Pakistan, the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International.

Sample Composition

The sample comprised 978 men and women age 18+. They were statistically selected from the urban areas of all the four provinces of Pakistan including Karachi, Lahore, Rawalpindi/Islamabad, Peshawar and Quetta. The sample comprised a cross section of various ages and socio-economic groups in the urban areas of the country. The error margin for a sample of this kind is + 3-4% at 95% confidence level.

Gallup Pakistan is the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International. It is Pakistan's most reputable polling organization.

Technical Details

Field Work: All field work was done through face to face interviews. The respondents were chosen through a random process. The sampling blocks were chosen randomly. The starting point was randomly identified, and a random process was followed to proceed from there. Within the household the first adult who responded and became available was interviewed.

Date: The field work was carried out on October 11-12, 2001

All four provinces are represented in the survey. The sample was re-weighted to correspond with the share of each province in the national urban population

Unweighted sample Weighted sample
Punjab 47% 54%
Sindh 31% 35%
NWFP 10% 7%
Balochistan 12% 4%

Field work was carried out in Karachi, Hyderabad and Sukkur (Sindh), Multan, Lahore, Faisalabad, Rawalpindi/Islamabad* (Punjab), Peshawar (NWFP), Quetta (Balochistan).
51 Percent of Pakistanis Agree With Musharraf's Cooperation With the U.S.,
But 83 Percent Sympathize With the Taliban

Almost Half Believe Israel Was Behind Sept. 11 Attacks In U.S.

NEW YORK, Oct. 14 /PRNewswire/ -- While a narrow majority (51%) of Pakistanis agree with General Pervez Musharraf's policy of cooperation with the U.S. (41% disagree), according to a recent Gallup Poll in Pakistan commissioned by Newsweek, an overwhelming 83 percent say they sympathize with the Taliban in the current conflict. Only 3 percent say they sympathize with the U.S. and 14 percent with neither. The poll appears in the October 22 issue of Newsweek International.
Most Pakistanis view General Musharraf's performance in the current crisis as very good or good (37%) or just okay (42%), while 21 percent consider his performance to date as bad or very bad. And a large majority (75%) oppose allowing the U.S. to use Pakistani airfields in the military campaign (16% favor).

And almost half of those polled (48%) believe Israel was responsible for the attack on the U.S. Only 12 percent view Osama bin Laden as responsible, and 25 percent said a U.S. group was behind the Sept. 11 attacks. Five percent said the Palestinians were responsible for the attacks. A 64 percent majority says the attack on the U.S. was an act of terrorism, while 24 percent says it was a Jihad or "holy war."

Osama bin Laden is viewed by the majority (82%) of Pakistanis to be a mujahid (freedom fighter) as opposed to a terrorist (6%). And a smaller majority (57%) also opposes bin Laden presenting himself before a court of law, while 34 percent are in favor.

Commissioned by Newsweek, Gallup Pakistan, an affiliate of Gallup International, surveyed 978 adults across the country on October 11-12. The results have a margin of error of plus or minus 3-4 percentage points.

SOURCE Newsweek
Web Site: http://www.newsweek.msnbc.com
Photo Notes: NewsCom: http://www.newscom.com/cgi-bin/prnh/20011014/HSSA004 AP
PhotoExpress Network: PRN1 PRN Photo Desk, +1-888-776-6555 or +1-212-782-2840

Issuers of news releases and not PR Newswire are solely responsible for the accuracy of the content.

*****
The sample was "selected from the urban areas". Just imagine what the rural folks believe?

These findings are from Newsweek's PRNewswire release:

591361&EDATE=

"And almost half of those polled (48%) believe Israel was responsible for the attack on the U.S. Only 12 percent view Osama bin Laden as responsible, and 25 percent said a U.S. group was behind the Sept. 11 attacks."

"Osama bin Laden is viewed by the majority (82%) of Pakistanis to be a mujahid (freedom fighter) as opposed to a terrorist (6%). And a smaller majority (57%) also opposes bin Laden presenting himself before a court of law, while 34 percent are in favor."
Nick

Howard Schuman wrote:

> Thanks Jan & Nick. The content is not quite as bad as the news report, but nevertheless ominous. Pakistan's population is over 150 million, it has nuclear weapons, and is important to the entire Islamic world. It would be helpful to have an urban/rural break, since the visible opposition to the U.S. has been largely in important cities.
> Howard

> On Mon, 15 Oct 2001, Jan Werner wrote:
>
> > Howard Schuman wrote:
> > >
> > > A brief news report yesterday mentioned a recent poll in Pakistan reportedly showing some 90% of the population to be highly critical of U.S. attacks on Afghanistan. Does anyone know where details on the method and content of this poll can be found? Howard
> > >
> > I don't know where the 90% number comes from. Here are the most recent results (including methodological details) published by Gallup Pakistan on their web site at http://www.gallup.com.pk/g_poll.html
> >
> > Jan Werner
> > ______________________
> > Islamabad, October 15, 2001
> >
> > 51% support Musharaf on his policy on current crisis.
> > But 83% side with Taliban against America.
> >
> > Only 16% favour to let America use Pakistani air bases: Gallup Survey According to the findings of a recent poll conducted by Gallup Pakistan the Pakistani public is undergoing a set of complex emotions. Around half of them, 51%, say they favour General Musharaf's policy on the current crisis, which is substantially higher compared to three weeks ago when the level of support was only 32%. Furthermore, 37% think that he has handled his job on this issue in a very good or good way. But having said that 83% of Pakistanis say that in the conflict between America and Taliban, their sympathies are with the Taliban. 82% of them believe Osama Bin Laden is a "Mjuahid" and not a terrorist and only 12% believe that he was responsible for the attacks on USA. Quite importantly only 16% favour that Americans should be allowed to use air bases in Pakistan, 75% are opposed.
> >
> > The findings have emerged from a survey carried out by Gallup on Pakistan on October 11-12 in the urban areas of all the four provinces of the country. The respondents were chosen statistically and they represented a cross section of people belonging to various
The findings of this survey will also be published under a special arrangement by the international weekly Magazine "Newsweek" in its forthcoming issue.

The survey revealed an apprehension on the part of a sizable number of Pakistanis that after its action gets underway in Afghanistan, America may start similar action in Kashmir. Nearly 6 out of 10 Pakistanis believed that the chances of this happening were either very high, a view held by 17% or some chances, a view held by 42%. Only 41% ruled out such a possibility.

Pakistani public opinion is divided on whether the aid promised by America would help solve the nation's economic problems. While 59% believe it would be useful, 38% think it would be harmful; 3% did not give a view. But most people are pessimistic about the unfolding economic scenario and believe that the national economy will be worse off in the aftermath of the crisis, a view held by 54%. Only 22% believed it would improve, while 24% think it would remain the same.

According to the survey 64% of Pakistanis believed that the attack on USA on September 11 was a terrorist attack and not Jihad. It is also notable that one third, or 34% of the respondents were of the view that Osama Bin Laden should present himself before a court of law for trial, while 57% disfavoured this idea.

The survey was conducted by Gallup Pakistan, the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International.

Sample Composition

The sample comprised 978 men and women age 18+. They were statistically selected from the urban areas of all the four provinces of Pakistan including Karachi, Lahore, Rawalpindi/Islamabad, Peshawar and Quetta. The sample comprised a cross section of various ages and socio-economic groups in the urban areas of the country. The error margin for a sample of this kind is + 3-4% at 95% confidence level.

Gallup Pakistan is the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International. It is Pakistan's most reputable polling organization.

Technical Details

Field Work: All field work was done through face to face interviews. The respondents were chosen through a random process. The sampling blocks were chosen randomly. The starting point was randomly identified, and a random process was followed to proceed from there. Within the household the first adult who responded and became available was interviewed.

Date: The field work was carried out on October 11-12, 2001

All four provinces are represented in the survey. The sample was re-weighted to correspond with the share of each province in the
Field work was carried out in Karachi, Hyderabad and Sukkur (Sindh), Multan, Lahore, Faisalabad, Rawalpindi/Islamabad* (Punjab), Peshawar (NWFP), Quetta (Balochistan).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Unweighted sample</th>
<th>Weighted sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some 90% of the population to be highly critical of U.S. attacks on Afghanistan. Does anyone know where details on the method and content of this poll can be found? Howard

I don't know where the 90% number comes from. Here are the most recent results (including methodological details) published by Gallup Pakistan on their web site at http://www.gallup.com.pk/g_poll.html

Jan Werner

Islamabad, October 15, 2001

51% support Musharaf on his policy on current crisis. But 83% side with Taliban against America. Only 16% favour to let America use Pakistani air bases: Gallup Survey According to the findings of a recent poll conducted by Gallup Pakistan the Pakistani public is undergoing a set of complex emotions. Around half of them, 51%, say they favour General Musharaf's policy on the current crisis, which is substantially higher compared to three weeks ago when the level of support was only 32%. Furthermore, 37% think that he has handled this issue in a very good or good way. But having said that 83% of Pakistanis say that in the conflict between America and Taliban, their sympathies are with the Taliban. 82% of them believe Osama Bin Laden is a "Mjuahid" and not a terrorist and only 12% believe that he was responsible for the attacks on USA. Quite importantly only 16% favour that Americans should be allowed to use air bases in Pakistan, 75% are opposed. The findings have emerged from a survey carried out by Gallup on October 11-12 in the urban areas of all the four provinces of
the country. The respondents were chosen statistically and they represented a cross section of people belonging to various age, education, income and language backgrounds. The findings of this survey will also be published under a special arrangement by the international weekly Magazine "Newsweek" in its forthcoming issue. The survey revealed an apprehension on the part of a sizable number of Pakistanis that after its action gets underway in Afghanistan, America may start similar action in Kashmir. Nearly 6 out of 10 Pakistanis believed that the chances of this happening were either very high, a view held by 17% or some chances, a view held by 42%. Only 41% ruled out such a possibility. Pakistani public opinion is divided on whether the aid promised by America would help solve the nation's economic problems. While 59% believe it would be useful, 38% think it would be harmful; 3% did not give a view. But most people are pessimistic about the unfolding economic scenario and believe that the national economy will be worse off in the aftermath of the crisis, a view held by 54%. Only 22% believed it would improve, while 24% think it would remain the same. According to the survey 64% of Pakistanis believed that the attack on USA on September 11 was a terrorist attack and not Jihad. It is also notable that one third, or 34% of the respondents were of the view that Osama Bin Laden should present himself before a court of law for trial, while 57% disfavoured this idea. The survey was conducted by Gallup Pakistan, the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International. Sample Composition: The sample comprised 978 men and women age 18+. They were statistically selected from the urban
areas of all the four provinces of Pakistan including Karachi, Lahore, Rawalpindi/Islamabad, Peshawar and Quetta. The sample comprised a cross section of various ages and socio-economic groups in the urban areas of the country. The error margin for a sample of this kind is +3-4% at 95% confidence level.

Gallup Pakistan is the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International. It is Pakistan's most reputable polling organization. Technical Details

Field Work: All field work was done through face to face interviews. The respondents were chosen through a random process. The sampling blocks were chosen randomly. The starting point was randomly identified, and a random process was followed to proceed from there. Within the household the first adult who responded and became available was interviewed.

Date: The field work was carried out on October 11-12, 2001

All four provinces are represented in the survey. The sample was re-weighted to correspond with the share of each province in the national urban population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unweighted sample</th>
<th>Weighted sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab 47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh 31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP 10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan 12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Details

Field Work: All field work was done through face to face interviews. The respondents were chosen through a random process. The starting point was randomly identified, and a random process was followed to proceed from there. Within the household the first adult who responded and became available was interviewed.

Date: The field work was carried out on October 11-12, 2001

All four provinces are represented in the survey. The sample was re-weighted to correspond with the share of each province in the national urban population.
Field work was carried out in Karachi, Hyderabad and Sukkur (Sindh), Multan, Lahore, Faisalabad, Rawalpindi/Islamabad* (Punjab), Peshawar (NWFP), Quetta (Balochistan).

I agree that this is an important and heartening report, but I believe this along with several recent polls focus on our nation's resolve, determination and survival instincts to the fault of missing the intention of al Qaeda's attacks (I'm assuming al Qaeda's primary responsibility here, as I have nothing else to go on).

Bin Laden has stated that al Qaeda intends to destroy American lives and property until we abandon our current foreign policy objectives in the Middle East; he does not seem particularly interested in our patriotism, our unity nor our resolve to defend our way of life here at home. The U.S. foreign policy objectives he emphasizes include our support of Israel, our support of the Saudi and other Arab regimes he views as corrupt, and our embargo on Iraq. The order he mentions them seems to depend on current circumstances and whom he thinks he is addressing.

I would like to see more polling on the impact of the 9/11 attacks on American public opinion towards our policies in the Middle East. At this point, I view this as far more critical and open to debate, though national unity and patriotism may erode as this war drags on. Personally, I initially felt a great empathy toward the Israelis, but that was in part due to my proximity to the events at the WTC and the number of people in my town who are dead or missing. But as the shock of the moment has dimmed slightly, I have thought long and hard about our nation's policies towards the Palestinian crisis and the Saudi regime.
If recent polling has been done on the above, I would appreciate someone letting me know where to find the results.

Tom Duffy
ORC Macro
116 John Street, Suite 800
New York, NY 10038

Subject: Re: NYT/CBS News Poll: New Yorkers Are Shaken, But Resolute,
Author: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
Date: 10/14/01 5:14 PM

Kudos to all those involved in this New York Times and CBS News Poll, for generating this important and heartening report in yesterday's New York Times. Kudos also to Times reporters Dan Berry and Marjorie Connelly, for their unusually good writeup of these new poll results.

-- Jim


October 13, 2001

NEW YORKERS ARE SHAKEN, BUT RESOLUTE, AFTER ATTACK

By DAN BARRY and MARJORIE CONNELLY

A month after the terrorist attack that killed 5,000 people, destroyed the World Trade Center and shook New York to its core, many city residents say that they feel great pride and faith in their wounded metropolis. But they also say that their civic allegiance is tempered — though far from crushed — by haunting memories and by concerns about future attacks, according to a new poll conducted by The New York Times and CBS News.

The city's already jittery residents could only have been further rattled by events that occurred since the poll's completion on Tuesday. Reports of a
of anthrax at NBC News in Rockefeller Center surfaced yesterday, just a day after
the F.B.I. issued a warning about the possibility of more terrorist attacks.

Even before these incidents, three of four residents participating in the
poll said they were very concerned about another terrorist attack in New
York. Despite those fears, most residents said they have no intention of
hiding in their homes or moving away. Instead, nearly all of the poll's
respondents -- 93 percent -- said that they harbor a good image of the city, and two-thirds said
that they plan to be living in the city four years from now.

Over all, the poll seems to indicate that residents have adopted a
reflexive, almost defiant position on their city's resilience. In a New York Times poll
conducted a few weeks before the Sept. 11 attack, 59 percent said that life in the
city had improved in the last four years. Now, after the disaster, those who saw an
improvement in city life jumped to 69 percent -- the highest percentage in at least 10 years.

But these results do not suggest a cavalier approach to the dangers of the
day; far from it. A month later, the attack's reverberations continue
to be felt by nearly half of those polled in a telephone survey that was
conducted Oct. 6 to Oct. 9, in which 983 adult residents were interviewed
and for which the margin of sampling error is plus or minus three percentage
points.

Some of those questioned cited aftereffects that range from the mundane to the
profound, from the loss of television service to the loss of peace of mind. Thirteen percent cited problems with transportation and traffic;
an equal number cited depression and other forms of anxiety.

The poll also demonstrates how the collapse of the twin towers created a
dust that covered not just Lower Manhattan but an entire city in a blanket of
grief. One in every five residents contacted in the poll said
that a relative or close friend is missing or was hurt or killed in the attack. And
three in five said that someone in their circle of friends and relatives knew
someone who was missing, hurt or killed.

Many of these jumbled emotions -- of resolve and despair, of civic pride
and wrenching grief -- are harbored by the likes of Norman Steinmetz, of
Staten Island. A retired New York police officer, he expressed great affection for
his native city and deep pride in how New Yorkers shook off
the paralysis of shock to begin rebuilding. He is resisting his daughter's pleas
that he move to Florida because, he said, "I was born and raised here."

But in the same conversation, the enormity of the loss overcame the former officer,
and he began to sob. "Look at what happened to my beautiful city!" whispered Mr.
Steinmetz, who is 70. "I can't take it."

The attack has subtly changed some of his habits, he said. For example, he said
that when he takes the bus over the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, which provides a
majestic view of Lower Manhattan, he now sits on the side facing the ocean, away
from the city.

"I sit so I don't have to see the emptiness," he said.

A security guard named Shirley White used to work in one of the buildings
that once stood in that emptiness. She too said that she admired how New
Yorkers rallied around one another -- "We have finally come together," she said --
and she too said that she had no intention of moving from her
home in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn.

But as she carries on with her life, Ms. White said, the attack continues
to disrupt her days and nights. The building she now guards is much shorter than
the twin towers, which is fine by her. ("I'm trying not to get into any skyscraping
buildings," she said.) But that building is in Midtown, which means that her
round-trip commute by a slowed subway system is at least two hours longer.

More important, she said, are the memories of all those people she used to see,
passing by her as she stood sentry in the south tower of the World Trade Center.
"Every day I think about them," she said. "And every
night I think about them."
"I'm afraid, but I can't let that stop me from doing my work," she continued. "I might as well lie down and say, 'Get me too.' I have to do what I have to do."

That last statement by Ms. White, who is 55 years old and the mother of six, might as well be inscribed on the city seal. At a time when there are security checkpoints at various tunnels and bridges, 9 of 10 city residents said they endorsed having more checkpoints and metal detectors at public events and public buildings -- even if it meant waiting on line for an hour or more.

In addition, three-quarters of the respondents said that they would be willing to arrive at the airport three hours early for any domestic flight. And two-thirds said that they would support a requirement that people in the United States carry a national electronic identification card, or "smart card."

The poll also seems to suggest a growing tolerance for racial profiling -- for law officers' stopping people of a specific race or ethnicity because they believe these groups are more likely to commit certain types of crimes.

In a poll conducted in April 2000, after the acquittal of four New York police officers charged with the shooting death of an unarmed African immigrant, Amadou Diallo, in the Bronx, 84 percent of the city's residents said that profiling was never justified.

But in the recent poll, only half the respondents said there was never justification, with 24 percent of the black respondents and 31 percent of the Hispanic respondents finding the practice acceptable. At the same time, 85 percent of all city residents who were questioned said that Arab-Americans, Muslims and immigrants from the Middle East were at least somewhat likely to be singled out unfairly as a result of last month's terrorist attack.

"During these times of heightened security, when you never know when they're going to strike or what's going to happen in the city," said Richard Collado, 36, "you
more or less say, `Fine, you can stop me; I'm Hispanic, but you can stop me if you need to.' But two years down the road, with the war over, and nothing going on anymore, then I don't approve."

Mr. Collado, a stockbroker who lives in Bay Ridge, added: "If Hispanics or any group are all of a sudden creating havoc like this, then I don't mind being stopped. If it's for the greater good of everyone else that I have to be stopped, then that's fine."

There were other indications that the city is trying to find its footing on unsettled ground, as personified by Sharifah Taylor, 24, an unemployed sales representative from Crown Heights. "I always had trouble with crime here, but just seeing everyone pull together after what's happened makes me feel real good about the city," she said. But she also said that she avoids the subways and has not been to Manhattan since the attack.

"If I had a choice, I would probably leave the city, but terrorism can happen anywhere," Ms. Taylor said. "I'm just watching what's going on, and staying where I am."

One in five city residents said that they are less likely to frequent restaurants. Two in five residents who described themselves as occasional or frequent air travelers said that they were now less likely to fly. Nearly 30 percent said that they are more likely to attend religious services. And more than half -- including John Ferruzzi of Forest Hills, Queens -- say that they find themselves spending more time with their family and close friends.

In the last month, Mr. Ferruzzi has gone through the experiences of a lifetime, and he is only 20 years old. He said he has seen a city of millions set aside cultural differences to come together in true "New York spirit." But a good friend of his lost a friend in the World Trade Center collapse, while the neighbor of another good
friend lost a son.

"Everywhere I went there was another story," he said, his voice shaking.
"Just talking about it -- forget about it."


---

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
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*****

I want to publicly thank everyone who responded to my question regarding Hispanics and the race question. My desk is piled with your replies and papers on the issue. My only problem now is finding sufficient time to read and weigh your brilliant thoughts.

I can say at this juncture, however, that your responses confirm a feeling I've had for some time. The feeling that, in designing ethnicity and race questions, we are often talking to ourselves. That the respondent reality is something very
different
than our clever response categories.

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com
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Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/us) with ESMTP
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id <01K9IWQM9CRY8WW3EJ@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU> for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 15 Oct
2001
09:26:02 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Mon, 15 Oct 2001 09:26:02 -0700 (PDT)
From: Patricia Gwartney <PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01K9IWQM9CRK8WW3EJ@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
X-VMS-To: IN"aapornet@usc.edu"
X-VMS-Cc: PATTYGG
MIME-version: 1.0

Dear AAPORites,

I bring you a dilemma and seek your sage counsel.

Tomorrow OSRL is supposed to mail out n=2,500 precontact letters to potential survey respondents in the Pacific Northwest. They will be in official Univ of Oregon envelopes on letterhead stationary. With the anthrax scare, however, it seems like the worst possible timing. We fear that respondents will just toss the letters into the garbage un-opened (along with their cash incentive).

We have thought about rubber-stamping the envelopes' exterior "anthrax free," "NOT from Osama bin Laden," "official government- sponsored survey," or "Call this number if you are concerned about opening unexpected letters." But such messages all seem too goofy and could backfire.

We have thought about delaying a few weeks, but doing so bumps our 6-phase mail-out schedule into the holiday period and it's possible that the anthrax scare will worsen in the next several weeks.

We have thought about delaying until January, and the client's schedule could accommodate it. But we would have to re-print thousands of items and his budget
can't (accommodate the cost).

If we mail out this week, whatever the study's ultimate response rate, we will not know if it is lower due to the anthrax scare. Before this aspect of the terrorists' campaign, we were actually see *higher than usual* response rates to our telephone surveys since Sept 11th, due, I believe, to lessened alienation, increased interest in civic participation, etc. Have you too encountered this?

The letter-signing and -stuffing crew begins this afternoon. Your advice?

Thank you,
Patty

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
1291 University of Oregon 5245 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 USA Eugene OR 97403-5245 USA

E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
Telephone: (541) 346-5007
Facsimile: (541) 346-5026

Margaret,

I agree completely with your concluding paragraph here, and only wish I could have said this half as well. You have stated precisely what I think remains a major challenge for all who would hope to improve our collective understanding--of that most tentative cultural category we just so happen to find convenient to objectify as "race" (as in "racial profiling") -- using scientific surveys. Thank you for raising the
question on our list. -- Jim

******

On Mon, 15 Oct 2001, Margaret Roller wrote:

> I want to publicly thank everyone who responded to my question
> regarding Hispanics and the race question. My desk is piled with your
> replies and papers on the issue. My only problem now is finding
> sufficient time to read and weigh your brilliant thoughts.
> 
> I can say at this juncture, however, that your responses confirm a
> feeling I've had for some time. The feeling that, in designing
> ethnicity and race questions, we are often talking to ourselves. That
> the respondent reality is something very different than our clever
> response categories.
> 
> Margaret R. Roller
> Roller Marketing Research
> rmr@rollerresearch.com
> 
> From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Oct 15 09:43:18 2001
> Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> id f9FGr1e04306 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Oct 2001
> 09:43:18 -0700 (PDT)
> Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> id JAA26926 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Oct 2001 09:43:20 -0700
> (PDT)
> Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
> by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> id f9FGxcl5473 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Oct 2001 09:42:59 -0700
> (PDT)
> Date: Mon, 15 Oct 2001 09:42:59 -0700 (PDT)
> From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?
> In-Reply-To: <01K9IWQM9CRK8W3EJ@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
> Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110150937290.8698-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Patty,

Speaking only for myself, a U of Oregon envelope and a U of Oregon
postage meter imprint would satisfy me. Any type of would-be-
amusing rubber stamping about Osama bin Laden would only detract
from the authenticity and authority of the envelope and the
meter imprint. -- Jim

******
On Mon, 15 Oct 2001, Patricia Gwartney wrote:

> Dear AAPORites,
> I bring you a dilemma and seek your sage counsel.
> Tomorrow OSRL is supposed to mail out n=2,500 precontact letters to potential survey respondents in the Pacific Northwest. They will be in official Univ of Oregon envelopes on letterhead stationary. With the anthrax scare, however, it seems like the worst possible timing. We fear that respondents will just toss the letters into the garbage un-opened (along with their cash incentive).
> We have thought about rubber-stamping the envelopes' exterior "anthrax free," "NOT from Osama bin Laden," "official government-sponsored survey," or "Call this number if you are concerned about opening unexpected letters." But such messages all seem too goofy and could backfire.
> We have thought about delaying a few weeks, but doing so bumps our 6-phase mail-out schedule into the holiday period and it's possible that the anthrax scare will worsen in the next several weeks.
> We have thought about delaying until January, and the client's schedule could accommodate it. But we would have to re-print thousands of items and his budget can't (accommodate the cost).
> If we mail out this week, whatever the study's ultimate response rate, we will not know if it is lower due to the anthrax scare. Before this aspect of the terrorists' campaign, we were actually see *higher than usual* response rates to our telephone surveys since Sept 11th, due, I believe, to lessened alienation, increased interest in civic participation, etc.
> Have you too encountered this?
> The letter-signing and -stuffing crew begins this afternoon. Your advice?
> Thank you,
> Patty

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
1291 University of Oregon 5245 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 USA Eugene OR 97403-5245 USA

E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
Telephone: (541) 346-5007
Facsimile: (541) 346-5026

From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Mon Oct 15 09:45:38 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f9FGjbe04546 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Oct 2001 09:45:37
-0700 (PDT)
This interesting request is being forwarded from a colleague. Thanks for any input.

========================================

Do you know of any standard cognitive screening instrument for interview subjects selected from the general public? We are doing interviews of the general public to describe their preferences about post-stroke health states. The Mini-Mental Health Status questionnaire is far too long and intricate for use in the general public. It's really designed for patients who have a serious probability of cognitive impairment. We want a quick, dirty, and widely defensible screen to check if our subjects are "with it"? Any ideas?

========================================

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>From dhalpern@bellsouth.net Mon Oct 15 09:56:29 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9FGuSe07190 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Oct 2001 09:56:28
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from imf08bis.bellsouth.net (mail008.mail.bellsouth.net [205.152.58.28])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA10170 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Oct 2001 09:56:18 -0700
(PDT)
Suggestion:

Why not put a code number (randomized) on each envelope along with a phone number to call if there are any questions or doubts as to the survey's authenticity. This should provide an easy way to check along with reassurance. To see if that works -- try it out on a small sample. If they do call, the person answering could ask a few questions about respondent's fears/concerns.

Dick Halpern

At 12:26 PM 10/15/01, you wrote:
>Dear AAPORites,
>  
>  I bring you a dilemma and seek your sage counsel.
>  
>  Tomorrow OSRL is supposed to mail out n=2,500 precontact letters to
>  potential survey respondents in the Pacific Northwest. They will be in
>  official Univ of Oregon envelopes on letterhead stationary. With the
>  anthrax scare, however, it seems like the worst possible timing. We fear
>  that respondents will just toss the letters into the garbage un-opened
>  (along with their cash incentive).
>  
>  We have thought about rubber-stamping the envelopes' exterior
>  "anthrax free," "NOT from Osama bin Laden," "official government-
>  sponsored survey," or "Call this number if you are concerned about
>  opening unexpected letters." But such messages all seem too goofy and
>  could backfire.
>  
>  We have thought about delaying a few weeks, but doing so bumps
>  our 6-phase mail-out schedule into the holiday period and it's possible
>  that the anthrax scare will worsen in the next several weeks.
>  
>  We have thought about delaying until January, and the client's schedule
>  could accommodate it. But we would have to re-print thousands of items
>  and his budget can't (accommodate the cost).
>  
>  If we mail out this week, whatever the study's ultimate response rate, we
>  will not know if it is lower due to the anthrax scare. Before this aspect
>  of the terrorists' campaign, we were actually see *higher than usual*
response rates to our telephone surveys since Sept 11th, due, I believe, to lessened alienation, increased interest in civic participation, etc. Have you too encountered this?

The letter-signing and -stuffing crew begins this afternoon. Your advice?

Thank you,
Patty

It may be too late for this suggestion at Oregon, but a pre-notification post card might work better these days because it cannot contain any substances in noticeable quantities, though it is not as nice as a letter. Maybe a small graphic of the outgoing survey envelope could be shown as well, so they know what it will look like when it arrives. (Also, it might note that bin Laden or whoever is doing this anthrax insanity needs to know your home address before they mail you some free anthrax -- not to disparage...
any potential survey respondents, but most of the tainted letters seem to be going to more prominent addresses than we might find in a mail survey list.)
Jim Ellis
Virginia Commonwealth University

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Patricia Gwartney
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 12:26 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?

Dear AAPORites,

I bring you a dilemma and seek your sage counsel.

Tomorrow OSRL is supposed to mail out n=2,500 precontact letters to potential survey respondents in the Pacific Northwest. They will be in official Univ of Oregon envelopes on letterhead stationary. With the anthrax scare, however, it seems like the worst possible timing. We fear that respondents will just toss the letters into the garbage un-opened (along with their cash incentive).

We have thought about rubber-stamping the envelopes' exterior "anthrax free," "NOT from Osama bin Laden," "official government-sponsored survey," or "Call this number if you are concerned about opening unexpected letters." But such messages all seem too goofy and could backfire.

We have thought about delaying a few weeks, but doing so bumps our 6-phase mail-out schedule into the holiday period and it's possible that the anthrax scare will worsen in the next several weeks.

We have thought about delaying until January, and the client's schedule could accommodate it. But we would have to re-print thousands of items and his budget can't (accommodate the cost).

If we mail out this week, whatever the study's ultimate response rate, we will not know if it is lower due to the anthrax scare. Before this aspect of the terrorists' campaign, we were actually see *higher than usual* response rates to our telephone surveys since Sept 11th, due, I believe, to lessened alienation, increased interest in civic participation, etc. Have you too encountered this?

The letter-signing and -stuffing crew begins this afternoon. Your advice?

Thank you,
Patty

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
1291 University of Oregon 5245 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 USA Eugene OR 97403-5245 USA

E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
If your budget allows it, why not send out advance notice post-cards to recipients of the survey. On the post card, you could inform respondents of the legitimacy of your study, and you could inform them to be on the lookout for your survey, which, you could write, will be arriving in an official envelope from the University of Oregon. Using an advance-notice post-card, respondents will not have to "open" any mysterious envelope, and you can calm recipient's fears about opening your survey when it finally arrives.

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias
Grizzard Agency
229 Peachtree Street - 12th Floor
Atlanta, GA 30303

-----Original Message-----
From: dick halpern [mailto:dhalpern@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 12:53 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?

Suggestion:

Why not put a code number (randomized) on each envelope along with a phone number to call if there are any questions or doubts as to the survey's authenticity. This should provide an easy way to check along with reassurance. To see if that works -- try it out on a small sample. If they do call, the person answering could ask a few questions about respondent's
fears/concerns.

Dick Halpern

At 12:26 PM 10/15/01, you wrote:
> Dear AAPORites,
> > I bring you a dilemma and seek your sage counsel.
> > Tomorrow OSRL is supposed to mail out n=2,500 precontact letters to
> > potential survey respondents in the Pacific Northwest. They will be in
> > official Univ of Oregon envelopes on letterhead stationary. With the
> > anthrax scare, however, it seems like the worst possible timing. We fear
> > that respondents will just toss the letters into the garbage un-opened
> > (along with their cash incentive).
> > We have thought about rubber-stamping the envelopes' exterior
> > "anthrax free," "NOT from Osama bin Laden," "official government-
> > sponsored survey," or "Call this number if you are concerned about
> > opening unexpected letters." But such messages all seem too goofy and
> > could backfire.
> > We have thought about delaying a few weeks, but doing so bumps
> > our 6-phase mail-out schedule into the holiday period and it's possible
> > that the anthrax scare will worsen in the next several weeks.
> > We have thought about delaying until January, and the client's schedule
> > could accommodate it. But we would have to re-print thousands of items
> > and his budget can't (accommodate the cost).
> > If we mail out this week, whatever the study's ultimate response rate, we
> > will not know if it is lower due to the anthrax scare. Before this aspect
> > of the terrorists' campaign, we were actually see *higher than usual*
> > response rates to our telephone surveys since Sept 11th, due, I believe,
> > to lessened alienation, increased interest in civic participation, etc.
> > Have you too encountered this?
> > The letter-signing and -stuffing crew begins this afternoon. Your advice?
> > Thank you,
> > Patty
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
> > Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
> > Professor Founding Director
> > Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
> > 1291 University of Oregon 5245 University of Oregon
> > Eugene OR 97403-1291 USA Eugene OR 97403-5245 USA
> > E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
> > Telephone: (541) 346-5007
> > Facsimile: (541) 346-5026
> > <<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<
> > From YChun@air.org Mon Oct 15 11:31:51 2001
> > Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> > by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> > id f9FIVpe17008 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Oct 2001
Greetings,
In wake of the Daschle letter containing anthrax
(see below the AP news filed at 1:51 pm),
using post-card would be more effective both for advance
notification,
and thank-you/remindeer.

I didn't seriously think about how Laden's terror would affect the
ways
we administer surveys. Now we may all would ... including issues of
mode effects, response rates, and compliance model.

Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist
ychun@AIR.org
American Institutes for Research http://www.air.org
"More than 50 years of behavioral and social science research"
1000 Thomas Jefferson St. NW
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 944-5325

------------------
October 15, 2001
Letter Sent to Senate Majority Leader Has Anthrax
By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
Filed at 1:51 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON (AP) -- A letter opened Monday in the office of Senate Majority
Leader Tom Daschle ``had anthrax in it,'' President Bush said.

The letter was field-tested twice and in both cases came up positive for
anthrax, said Capitol Police Lt. Dan Nichols. He said the letter was sent to
an Army medical research facility at Fort Detrick, Md., for further tests.

``There was an exposure when the letter was opened,'' Nichols said.

People who were exposed were being treated with Cipro, an antibiotic, said a
Capitol physician.

The letter to Daschle was postmarked Sept. 18 from Trenton, N.J., said postal inspector Tony Esposito.

Daschle said his office in the Hart building a block from the Capitol had been quarantined and is closed now. Emergency medical vehicles were parked outside the building.

He said there were 40 people in the building at the time, but that he doesn't know how many of them may have come in contact with the letter. He said he also was gratified that the response was so quick.

``We have to be alert, we have to recognize that the risk is higher than it was a couple of weeks ago but we have to live our lives,'' he said.

Speaking to reporters at the White House, Bush said `there may be some possible link' between Osama bin Laden and a recent flurry of anthrax-related developments.

``I wouldn't put it past him but we don't have any hard evidence,'' he said of the man suspected as the leader behind Sept. 11 terrorist attacks in New York and Washington that killed thousands.

Within a few hours of the delivery of the letter to Daschle's office, officials in the House and Senate issued orders to all congressional offices to refrain from opening mail.

A memo from the House sergeant-at-arms said the mail would be `picked up ... for additional screening and returned to you as soon as possible.''

Doug Hattaway, a spokesman for Daschle, said the majority leader had informed his staff of the developments in a conference call.

The suspicious package was received at the majority leader's office in a Senate office building across the street from the Capitol.

Separately, one source said that when it was opened, a powdery white substance fell out. Capitol Police were summoned, the office sealed, and the workers immediately given a text for anthrax exposure. There was no immediate word on the results of those tests.

But Bush, in responding to a reporter's question, said he had just talked with Daschle. `His office received a letter and it had anthrax in it. The letter was field-tested. And the staffers that have been exposed are being treated.''

The president made his comments after a meeting with Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, the latest in a steady stream of foreign leaders to visit Washington in the wake of the terrorist attacks.

The president said additional tests are being conducted on the letter. It `had been wrapped a lot,'' he said, and there was `powder within the confines of the envelope.''

He said the powder itself had been sent to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for additional testing.
The disclosure came after days of unsettling reports of anthrax scares in three states, including the death of one man in Florida last week.

``The key thing for the American people is to be cautious,'' said Bush.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jim Ellis [mailto:jellis@saturn.vcu.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 1:56 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?

It may be too late for this suggestion at Oregon, but a pre-notification post card might work better these days because it cannot contain any substances in noticeable quantities, though it is not as nice as a letter. Maybe a small graphic of the outgoing survey envelope could be shown as well, so they know what it will look like when it arrives. (Also, it might note that bin Laden or whoever is doing this anthrax insanity needs to know your home address before they mail you some free anthrax -- not to disparage any potential survey respondents, but most of the tainted letters seem to be going to more prominent addresses than we might find in a mail survey list.)

Jim Ellis
Virginia Commonwealth University

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Patricia Gwartney
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 12:26 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?

Dear AAPORites,

I bring you a dilemma and seek your sage counsel.

Tomorrow OSRL is supposed to mail out n=2,500 precontact letters to potential survey respondents in the Pacific Northwest. They will be in official Univ of Oregon envelopes on letterhead stationary. With the anthrax scare, however, it seems like the worst possible timing. We fear that respondents will just toss the letters into the garbage un-opened (along with their cash incentive).

We have thought about rubber-stamping the envelopes' exterior "anthrax free," "NOT from Osama bin Laden," "official government-sponsored survey," or "Call this number if you are concerned about opening unexpected letters." But such messages all seem too goofy and could backfire.

We have thought about delaying a few weeks, but doing so bumps our 6-phase mail-out schedule into the holiday period and it's possible that the anthrax scare will worsen in the next several weeks.

We have thought about delaying until January, and the client's schedule
could accommodate it. But we would have to re-print thousands of items and his budget can't (accommodate the cost).

If we mail out this week, whatever the study's ultimate response rate, we will not know if it is lower due to the anthrax scare. Before this aspect of the terrorists' campaign, we were actually see *higher than usual* response rates to our telephone surveys since Sept 11th, due, I believe, to lessened alienation, increased interest in civic participation, etc. Have you too encountered this?

The letter-signing and -stuffing crew begins this afternoon. Your advice?

Thank you,
Patty

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
1291 University of Oregon 5245 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 USA Eugene OR 97403-5245 USA

E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
Telephone: (541) 346-5007
Facsimile: (541) 346-5026

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.
These two articles are for those with an interest in the impact of terrorist attacks on DC govt. and the tourism industry. Has anyone asked about willingness to visit different locations, including NY and DC, nationally? I have been seeing TV ads here encouraging people to visit NY. I have not yet seen any opinion research conducted within DC itself or the metro region (in Virginia-home to the Pentagon—and Maryland. together, nearly 70% of DC local and federal workers live and commute to the District from those states).

This may sound farfetched and it may be too early to talk about it, but don't be surprised if at some time the Capitol building is closed off like the White House; and if, at some point, the whole National Mall area from the Capital to the White House is closed to private traffic. Everyone wants to be secure, and it will be interesting to see where that leads.

One issue the DC govt./police is currently struggling with is how to stay "in the loop" on security issues, including which streets the federal government closes, etc., so they can coordinate to reroute traffic, as well as reassure residents that they too will be informed about what to do if there is an emergency. A new local emergency response center that was underway before the attack is operational in the case of future attacks, hopefully that will help. The Post has also reported that due to the increased need for DC's police force to stop and examine trucks, etc. around the National Mall, some residents are reporting long delays in getting emergency help, and there are some fears that crime could rise as the police spend less time in the 120 residential neighborhoods. I don't know if these issues are arising in NY and elsewhere.

Mark

/"

Analysis
Home Rule Is Losing Battle for D.C. Streets
City Administration Struggles for a Say as Federal Agencies Decide Security
By Serge F. Kovaleski
Washington Post Staff Writer
Monday, October 15, 2001; Page B01

The federal government's aggressive and often unilateral efforts to shore up security in Washington have frustrated and demoralized the Williams administration, which since Sept. 11 has fought largely in vain for a central role in decisions affecting the nation's capital. One immediate casualty is the notion that city leaders have carefully cultivated since Congress granted the District limited home rule 27 years ago -- that they are the proud and elected hosts of the federal government. In the wake of the attacks, a city of 572,000 residents has been reminded of the limitations that come with the distinction of
being the seat of power of a nation now at war.
Security measures implemented by the White House and federal law
enforcement agencies in and around the District -- from the extended
shutdown of Reagan National Airport to the closings of numerous
streets in the city -- have hindered efforts by Mayor Anthony A.
Williams to lure visitors back to Washington and revive its suddenly
suffering economy.
At stake, among other things, is the city's fragile fiscal recovery,
which has been years in the making and could suffer a setback if the
local economy continues to decline and tax revenue dwindles. Tourists,
who last year accounted for $4.8 billion in revenue for the District,
are pivotal to the area's economic vitality, but they have been shying
away from the city since hijacked jetliners slammed into the Pentagon
and the World Trade Center.
For their part, proponents of District statehood and full voting
rights in Congress said the newly expanded role of the federal
government in the capital will make what has long been a difficult and
frustrating lobbying campaign even tougher -- at least for the
foreseeable future.
In the meantime, they say, Williams (D) and other top D.C. officials
should be more assertive in demanding a greater role in security
planning for the District.
"It is completely inappropriate to not have the mayor at the center of
discussions about how we are going to change our lives in the District
of Columbia," said Amy Whitcomb Slemmer, executive director of the
advocacy group DC Vote. She added, "The mayor must be unapologetic
about inserting himself into the national dialogue on how to combat
terrorism in Washington and elsewhere."
In the latest episode in which District officials were caught off
guard by federal security initiatives, the U.S. Capitol Police
announced late Wednesday that it was barring commercial trucks and
buses along sections of Constitution and Independence avenues that it
controls.
Mayor aides said the decision by Capitol Police, though less
restrictive than an earlier proposal, still peeved the Williams
administration, which views street closings as an impediment to
restoring a sense of normalcy to the District.
"The mayor is unalterably opposed to the closing of any streets. It
creates problems, it does not solve problems and it worsens security
for others," said Tony Bullock, acting communications director for
Williams.
"If you give them an inch, they take a mile kind of thing," Bullock
said. "I think it is very narrow-minded on the part of federal
agencies who have a proclivity to close streets as part of an ongoing
situation."
City Administrator John A. Koskinen has been negotiating with the
federal government about impromptu street closures that various
agencies have made without warning around the White House, the State
Department, the Justice Department, the U.S. attorney's office, the
Department of Energy and other locations.
Bullock said the city administrator "has been out there with the giant
saber . . . fighting with great vigor any attempt by the federal
government to usurp a street."
Koskinen said he has not sensed that federal officials have tried to
exclude the District from security discussions. The federal
government, he said, has been making more of an effort to reach out to
the Williams administration on security and related issues.
At the White House, spokesman Scott McClellan said the Bush administration has been working with the District government on needed security precautions throughout the city. "The White House has a very positive and constructive working relationship with the District, and White House officials are regularly in contact with D.C. officials about security measures and local issues," McClellan said. "The president values his friendship with the mayor and is committed to maintaining a positive working relationship with him."

But Koskinen, even while noting the improved communication, acknowledged the new reality. "The bottom line," he said, "is that they [federal agencies] are going to do what they think is appropriate in the end."

That was evident with other street closings. For example, the Justice Department -- without consulting city officials -- issued an order banning parking around the agency's headquarters. Federal agencies have sought to ensure that they foresee every potential threat and are not blamed for a security lapse. When Koskinen repeatedly urged federal law enforcement officials to open specific downtown streets, they asked him to put it in writing, apparently to place responsibility at the feet of District officials. The closings along Constitution and Independence avenues in the area around the U.S. Capitol carried their own irony. Williams learned of the decision just after 6 p.m. Wednesday, moments after he finished an all-afternoon planning session with business leaders about how to convince tourists and residents that Washington was getting back to normal.

At the meeting, Washington, DC Convention and Tourism Corp. unveiled an advertising campaign to bring visitors back to the District that prominently feature images of the Capitol dome. Called "The City That Inspires," the campaign began Friday with newspaper ads. The slogan, set against the dome's backdrop, reads: "People everywhere are looking to be inspired. Here's one place you're sure to find it."

But in a city where security is now paramount, that campaign was largely rendered moot the day it was launched, when plans to greatly restrict access to the Capitol were announced.

Williams, reacting to the security measures, has encouraged President Bush to be more visible in the city and to reassure the public that Washington has not become an uninviting garrison. Bush had dinner with Williams at a Washington restaurant Oct. 2, when the reopening of Reagan National Airport was announced.

But that remains a small victory in a relationship now being redefined by war.

"We have always been supplicants, and now we are supposed to be obedient supplicants," said Mark Plotkin, political commentator for WAMU-FM radio and staunch promoter of District autonomy. "This mayor acts as a ceremonial figure. There is no advice and consent here. We are invisible. We just happen to live here."

Staff writers Spencer S. Hsu and Carol D. Leonnig and staff researcher Bobbye Pratt contributed to this report.

© 2001 The Washington Post Company
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Crowds Return to Some D.C. Areas, Skip Others
By Valerie Strauss and Patricia Davis
Bright red trolleys usually filled with eager tourists rumbled along D.C. streets virtually empty yesterday, but crowds still sought out patriotic exhibits at the National Museum of American History on the Mall. Cabdrivers complained of solitude, but many District restaurants were packed with diners.

There were mixed results for the District, which has struggled to regain its footing after tourism and other key industries were hit hard by the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks. The city spent $200,000 on a campaign to lure more people downtown during the weekend with free Metro rides and discounts at restaurants and hotels.

Metro had estimated that it could lose $600,000 as a result of fare waivers, but it was unclear how much it ultimately gave away because ridership figures were not available for yesterday. Metro officials reported a 7 percent increase in ridership on Saturday from an average Saturday in October.

Still, it appeared that attractions highly dependent on tourists fared much worse than those that also cater to Washington area residents. "The core of downtown, the federal enclave, seemed like it was undernourished," said Tony Bullock, spokesman for Mayor Anthony A. Williams (D). "I think a lot of that . . . has to do with a heavy volume of missing tourists. They are not here because, by and large, there is still around the country nervousness about flying."

"But I don't see any signs that people in the Washington region are staying at home."

Indeed, on Saturday night, Bullock found Dupont Circle so busy that he could not get a seat at three restaurants without long waits. Other areas of the city, such as Georgetown and Glover Park, also seemed busy over the weekend, with restaurants reporting normal business.

Even some downtown restaurants, such as the Palm, said they were fully booked Saturday night, and yesterday's business looked healthy, too. The Capitol City Brewing Co. downtown also reported no dip in business, and ESPN Zone said the weekend was packed with customers. Some hotels, while facing high vacancy rates, said they see some signs of revival.

But a worker for Martz Gray Line who sells tickets at Union Station for the tourist trolleys said he had fewer than 10 customers yesterday, leaving the trolleys running nearly empty. On a usual weekend October day, nine trolleys run all day, mostly filled.

"You offer incentives, and people still don't come," said the worker, who spoke on condition of anonymity. "How are you going to woo them back?"

Cabdriver Phillip Gordon doesn't usually work Sundays, but business has been so bad since Sept. 11 that he spent yesterday behind the wheel of his District taxi. He said Thursday's warning from the FBI to be alert may have confused Americans, who are also hearing that they should resume normal life.

"They're sending mixed signals," Gordon, 65, said of the government. "What are you supposed to do?"

Many of those who did visit the nation's capital yesterday said a short, unspecific FBI warning issued last week of the possibility of more terrorist attacks was too vague to worry about.

"The warnings they gave were so generic," said Brooke Larsen, 51, of Virginia Beach, who was visiting with her husband, Bart O'Hara, 53. "I can be just as alert here as anywhere else."

There was a question of how well the promotion was publicized. Some
visitors -- both tourists and area residents -- said they weren't aware of the free rides.
But others, including Howard Beck, 47, and his mother, Marie Beck, 71, took Metro up on its offer.
"We're kind of tired of hanging around the house," said Howard Beck, of Arlington. "I thought I'd come down and spend a little money 'cause they're hurting. These people are dying for business."
Outside the National Museum of American History along Constitution Avenue, business was slow at the concession trucks that line the street -- and where FBI, CIA and USA sweat shirts are getting prominent display. Tuan Do said that on a day he would normally sell about 100 hot dogs, he would be lucky to hawk 30.
But inside, the museum was bustling yesterday, and Lt. Andrea Robinson, in charge of security, said she has seen a marked improvement in recent days.
"We felt a pinch after the 11th with the school groups not coming," Robinson said. But there have been encouraging signs since then, she said.
The exhibit on the presidents, "The American Presidency -- A Glorious Burden," has attracted a growing number of visitors, Robinson said, because U.S. history suddenly seems more relevant.
And the Star-Spangled Banner, which inspired the national anthem, has been a steady draw since Sept. 11. Gloria Day, a special police officer and permanent fixture at the exhibit, said many people have been compelled to come see the 150-pound flag, which is undergoing conservation treatment.
One young child began crying when she saw a hole in the flag, saying she knew someone with needle and thread who could fix it, Day said.
And when Reagan National Airport was closed, a steady stream of flight attendants stopped by to see the 185-year-old flag on display on the second floor.
"It was real sentimental in here," said Day, 42. "They said they wanted to see the flag because they didn't know if they would make the trip back."
© 2001 The Washington Post Company
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These two articles are for those with an interest in the impact of terrorist attacks on DC govt. and the tourism industry. Has anyone asked about willingness to visit different locations, including NY and DC, nationally? I have been seeing TV ads here encouraging people to visit NY. I have not yet seen any opinion research conducted within DC itself or the metro region (in Virginia; home to the Pentagon; and Maryland; together, nearly 70% of DC local and federal workers live and commute to the District from those states).

This may sound farfetched and it may be too early to talk about it, but don’t be surprised if at some time the Capitol building is closed off like the White House; and if, at some point, the whole National Mall area from the Capital to the White House is closed to private traffic. Everyone wants to be secure, and it will be interesting to see where that leads.

One issue the DC govt./police is currently struggling with is how to stay in the loop on security issues, including which streets the federal government closes, etc., so they can coordinate to reroute traffic, as well as reassure residents that they too will be informed about what to do.
there is an emergency. A new local emergency response center that was underway before the attack is operational in the case of future attacks, hopefully that will help. The Post has also reported that due to the increased need for DC's police force to stop and examine trucks, etc. around the National Mall, some residents are reporting long delays in getting emergency help, and there are some fears that crime could rise as the police spend less time in the 120 residential neighborhoods. I don’t know if these issues are arising in NY and elsewhere.

Mark
The federal government's aggressive and often unilateral efforts to shore up security in Washington have frustrated and demoralized the Williams administration, which since Sept. 11 has fought largely in vain for a central role in decisions affecting the nation's capital.
is the notion that city leaders have carefully cultivated since Congress granted the District limited home rule 27 years ago -- that they are the proud and elected hosts of the federal government. In the wake of the attacks, a city of 572,000 residents has been reminded of the limitations that come with the distinction of being the seat of power of a nation now at war.

Security measures implemented by the White House and federal law enforcement agencies in and around the District -- from the extended shutdown of Reagan National Airport to the closings of numerous streets in the city -- have hindered efforts by Mayor Anthony A. Williams to lure visitors back to Washington and revive its suddenly suffering economy. At stake, among other things, is the city's fragile fiscal recovery, which has been years in the making and could suffer a setback if the local economy continues to decline and tax revenue dwindles. Tourists, who last year accounted for $4.8 billion in revenue for the District, are pivotal to the area's economic vitality, but they have been shying away from the city since hijacked jetliners slammed into the Pentagon and the World Trade Center.

For their part, proponents of District statehood and full voting rights in Congress said =
the newly expanded role of the federal government in the capital will make what has long been a difficult and frustrating lobbying campaign even tougher -- at least for the foreseeable future.

In the meantime, they say, Williams (D) and other top D.C. officials should be more assertive in demanding a greater role in security planning for the District.

"It is completely inappropriate to not have the mayor at the center of discussions about how we are going to change our lives in the District," said Amy Whitcomb Slemmer, executive director of the advocacy group DC Vote. She added, "The mayor must be unapologetic about inserting himself into the national dialogue on how to combat terrorism in Washington and elsewhere." 

In the latest episode in which District officials were caught off guard by federal security initiatives, the U.S. Capitol Police announced late Wednesday that it was barring commercial trucks and buses along sections of Constitution and Independence avenues that it controls.
Mayoral aides said the decision by Capitol Police, though less restrictive than an earlier proposal, still peeved the Williams administration, which views street closings as an impediment to restoring a sense of normalcy to the District. 

"The mayor is unalterably opposed to the closing of any streets. It creates problems, it does not solve problems and it worsens security for others," said Tony Bullock, acting communications director for Williams.

"If you give them an inch, they take a mile kind of thing," Bullock said. "I think it is very narrow-minded on the part of federal agencies who have a proclivity to close streets as part of an ongoing situation."

City Administrator John A. Koskinen has been negotiating with the federal government about impromptu street closures that various agencies have made without warning around the White House, the State Department, the Justice Department, the U.S. attorney's office, the Department of Energy and other =
Bullock said the city administrator "has been out there with the giant saber . . . fighting with great vigor any attempt by the federal government to usurp a street." Keskinnen said he has not sensed that federal officials have tried to exclude the District from security discussions. The federal government, he said, has been making more of an effort to reach out to the Williams administration on security and related issues. At the White House, spokesman Scott McClellan said the Bush administration has been working with the District government on needed security precautions throughout the city. "The White House has a very positive and constructive working relationship with the District, and White House officials are regularly in contact with D.C. officials about security measures and local issues," McClellan said.
values his friendship with the mayor and is committed to maintaining a positive working relationship with him.&quot;</p><p>But Koskinen, even while noting the improved communication, acknowledged the new reality. &quot;The bottom line,&quot; he said, &quot;is that they [federal agencies] are going to do what they think is appropriate in the end.&quot;</p><p>That was evident with other street closings. For example, the Justice Department -- without consulting city officials -- issued an order banning parking around the agency's headquarters. Federal agencies have sought to ensure that they foresee every potential threat and are not blamed for a security lapse. When Koskinen repeatedly urged federal law enforcement officials to open specific downtown streets, they asked him to put it in writing, apparently to place responsibility at the feet of District officials.</p><p>The closings along Constitution and Independence avenues in the area around the U.S. Capitol
carried their own irony. Williams learned of the decision just after 6 p.m.
Wednesday, moments after he finished an all-afternoon planning session
with business leaders about how to convince tourists and residents that
Washington was getting back to normal. </span></font><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack =
face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;ms-o-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color=\nblack;ms-o-color-alt:windowtext'&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;

At the meeting, Washington, DC Convention and Tourism Corp. unveiled an advertising
campaign to bring visitors back to the District that prominently feature images of the
Capitol dome. Called &quot;The City That Inspires,&quot; the campaign began
Friday with newspaper ads. </span></font><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack =
face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;ms-o-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color=\nblack;ms-o-color-alt:windowtext'&gt;&lt;o:p&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;

The slogan, set against the dome's backdrop, reads: &quot;People everywhere are looking to be inspired.
Here's one place you're sure to find it.&quot; But in a city where security is now paramount, that campaign was largely rendered moot the day it was launched, when plans to greatly restrict access to the Capitol were announced. 
</span></font><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;ms-o-bidi-font-size:
12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black;ms-o-color-alt:windowtext'&gt;&lt;o:p&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;

Williams, reacting to the security measures, has encouraged President Bush to be more visible in the
city and to reassure the public that Washington has not become an uninviting garrison. Bush had dinner with Williams at a Washington restaurant Oct. 2, when the reopening of Reagan National Airport was announced. </span></font><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;ms-o-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color=\nblack;ms-o-color-alt:windowtext'&gt;&lt;o:p&gt;&lt;/o:p&gt;&lt;/span&gt;&lt;/font&gt;
But that remains a small victory in a relationship now being redefined by war.

“We have always been supplicants, and now we are supposed to be obedient supplicants,” said Mark Plotkin, political commentator for WAMU-FM radio and staunch promoter of District autonomy. “This mayor acts as a ceremonial figure. There is no advice and consent here. We are invisible. We just happen to live here.”

Staff writers Spencer S. Hsu and Carol D. Leonnig and staff researcher Bobbye Pratt contributed to this report.
By Valerie Strauss and Patricia Davis

Bright red trolleys usually filled with eager tourists rumbled along D.C. streets virtually empty yesterday, but crowds still sought out patriotic =
exhibits at the National Museum of American History on the Mall. Cabdrivers complained of solitude, but many District restaurants were packed with diners.
The city spent $200,000 on a campaign to lure more people downtown during the weekend with free Metro rides and discounts at restaurants and hotels.
Metro had estimated that it could lose $600,000 as a result of fare waivers, but it was unclear how much it ultimately gave away because ridership figures were not available for yesterday. Metro officials reported a 7 percent increase in ridership on Saturday from an average Saturday in October.
Still, it appeared that attractions highly dependent on tourists fared much worse than those that also cater to Washington area residents.
"The core of downtown, the federal enclave, seemed like it was undernourished," said Tony Bullock, spokesman for Mayor Anthony A. Williams (D). "I think a lot of that . . . has to do with a heavy volume of missing tourists. They are not here because, by and large, there is still around the country nervousness about flying."

"But I don't see any signs that people in the Washington region are staying at home."

Indeed, on Saturday night, Bullock found Dupont Circle so busy that he could not get a seat at three restaurants without long waits. Other areas of the city, such as Georgetown and Glover Park, also seemed busy over the weekend, with restaurants reporting normal business. Indeed, on Saturday night, Bullock found Dupont Circle so busy that he could not get a seat at three restaurants without long waits. Other areas of the city, such as Georgetown and Glover Park, also seemed busy over the weekend, with restaurants reporting normal business. Indeed, on Saturday night, Bullock found Dupont Circle so busy that he could not get a seat at three restaurants without long waits. Other areas of the city, such as Georgetown and Glover Park, also seemed busy over the weekend, with restaurants reporting normal business. Indeed, on Saturday night, Bullock found Dupont Circle so busy that he could not get a seat at three restaurants without long waits. Other areas of the city, such as Georgetown and Glover Park, also seemed busy over the weekend, with restaurants reporting normal business. Even some downtown restaurants, such as the Palm, said they were fully booked Saturday night, and yesterday's business looked healthy, too. The Capitol City Brewing Co. downtown also reported no dip in business, and ESPN Zone said the weekend was packed with customers. Some hotels, while facing high vacancy rates, said they see some signs of revival."
But a worker for Martz Gray Line who sells tickets at Union Station for the tourist trolleys said he had fewer than 10 customers yesterday, leaving the trolleys running nearly empty. On a usual weekend October day, nine trolleys run all day, mostly filled.

"You offer incentives, and people still don't come," said the worker, who spoke on condition of anonymity. "How are you going to woo them back?"

Cabdriver Phillip Gordon doesn't usually work Sundays, but business has been so bad since Sept. 11 that he spent yesterday behind the wheel of his District taxi. He said Thursday's warning from the FBI to be alert may have confused Americans, who are also hearing that they should resume normal life.

"They're sending mixed signals," Gordon, 65, said of the government. "What are you supposed to do?"
Many of those who did visit the nation's capital yesterday said a short, unspecific FBI warning issued last week of the possibility of more terrorist attacks was too vague to worry about.

"The warnings they gave were so generic," said Brooke Larsen, 51, of Virginia Beach, who was visiting with her husband, Bart O'Hara, 53. "I can be just as alert here as anywhere else."

There was a question of how well the promotion was publicized. Some visitors -- both tourists and area residents -- said they weren't aware of the free rides.

But others, including Howard Beck, 47, and his mother, Marie Beck, 71, took Metro up on its offer. "We're kind of tired of hanging around the house," said Howard Beck, of Arlington.
"I thought I'd come down and spend a little money 'cause they're hurting. These people are dying for business." Outside the National Museum of American History along Constitution Avenue, business was slow at the concession trucks that line the street -- and where FBI, CIA and USA sweat shirts are getting prominent display. Tuan Do said that on a day he would normally sell about 100 hot dogs, he would be lucky to hawk 30. But inside, the museum was bustling yesterday, and Lt. Andrea Robinson, in charge of security, said she has seen a marked improvement in recent days. "We felt a pinch after the 11th with the school groups not coming," Robinson said. But there have been encouraging signs since then, she said. The exhibit on the presidents, "The American Presidency -- A Glorious Burden," has
attracted a growing number of visitors, Robinson said, because U.S. history suddenly seems more relevant.

And the Star-Spangled Banner, which inspired the national anthem, has been a steady draw since Sept. 11. Gloria Day, a special police officer and permanent fixture at the exhibit, said many people have been compelled to come see the 150-pound flag, which is undergoing conservation treatment.

One young child began crying when she saw a hole in the flag, saying she knew someone with needle and thread who could fix it, Day said. And when Reagan National Airport was closed, a steady stream of flight attendants stopped by to see the 185-year-old flag on display on the second floor. "It was real sentimental in here," said Day, 42. "They said they wanted to see the flag because they didn't know if they would make the trip back."
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An interesting aspect of this response is that it appears to accept that Bin Laden is responsible for the current spate of anthrax letter terrorism.

The administration and Mr. Bush himself seem to be pushing this viewpoint, but, as Juliette Kayyem, the executive director of the program on domestic preparedness at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard points out in an article in the Business section of today's NY Times, "[The media] has not been a particular target of Islamic fundamentalist groups or groups we associate with Sept. 11. It has been a target of right-wing groups in America."

This would certainly be consistent with the choice of Daschle's office as a target, since it is very hard to imagine any foreign terrorist targeting the leader of the opposition in the Congress rather than the President, but one should not jump to conclusions, as the Oklahoma City bombing proved.

Although I don't think that this would enter into their strategic thinking, I would suspect that, if a right-wing individual or group is in fact behind the anthrax letters, he/she/they would probably consider any disruption of public opinion polls a serendipitous bonus.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

---

"Chun, Young" wrote:
> Greetings,
> In wake of the Daschle letter containing anthrax
> (see below the AP news filed at 1:51 pm),
> using post-card would be more effective both for advance
> notification,
> and thank-you/remindeer.
> I didn't seriously think about how Laden's terror would affect the
> ways we administer surveys. Now we may all would ... including issues
> of
> mode effects, response rates, and compliance model.
> Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist
> ychun@AIR.org
> American Institutes for Research  http://www.air.org
> "More than 50 years of behavioral and social science research"
> 1000 Thomas Jefferson St. NW
> Washington, DC 20007
> (202) 944-5325
> From deanec@washpost.com Mon Oct 15 15:44:47 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
Topic: America's War on Terrorism: The Hawks and the Hesitants

Speaker: Richard Morin  
Director of Polling/Staff Writer  
The Washington Post

Date & Time: Friday, October 26, 2001, 12:30 - 2:00 p.m.

Location: BLS Conference and Training Center (basement level)  
Room #9, 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 an email to  
dc-aapor.admin@erols.com or theresa.j.demaio@census.gov or call Terry DeMaio at 301-457-4894 by Monday, October 22.

Abstract: By reporting on the public's reactions to the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon, the administration's response to the tragedies, and the ongoing war in Afghanistan and elsewhere, the Post's polling unit is an integral part of the paper's coverage of America's latest war. Morin, the paper's Director of Polling, will cover:  
* how the polling unit has reacted to this breaking news;  
* key findings of surveys thus far; and  
* the lessons he has learned from polling on previous military conflicts. He will also present research on the demographic groups most and least supportive of a protracted conflict.
Terrie,

Response rates for web surveys are heavily dependent on the population and sample source, so it is hard to answer this question. We are a web survey company. That is all we do. For what it is worth, we experience RR from 30% to 70%. The higher rates are generally obtained on customer/employee type research using client-supplied internal sample. Lower rates are obtained from commercially supplied sample from the larger panels and are generally from consumer/general population work.

Karl

-----Original Message-----
From: Teresa Hottle [mailto:teresa.hottle@wright.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 12, 2001 9:15 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: response rate for website surveys

Can anyone tell me what the "average" response rate for website surveys is?

Thanks,
Terrie

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Mon Oct 15 18:03:24 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9G13Oe04757 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Oct 2001
18:03:24
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from c001-snvw.cp.net (c001-h000.c001-snvw.cp.net [209.228.32.114])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id SAA19728 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 15 Oct 2001 18:03:22 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (cpmta 25022 invoked from network); 15 Oct 2001 18:02:31 -0700
Received: from mxfc15x13.chesco.com (HELO default) (209.195.197.141)
    by smtp.jpmurphy.com (209.228.32.114) with SMTP; 15 Oct 2001 18:02:31 -0700
X-Sent: 16 Oct 2001 01:02:31 GMT
Message-ID: <005a01c155de$602c4820$8dc5c3d1@default>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <jwerner@jwdp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
"I would suspect that, if a right-wing individual or group is in fact behind the anthrax letters, he/she/they would probably consider any disruption of public opinion polls a serendipitous bonus."

But I guess that wouldn't be true if it was the Weathermen, Black Panthers or SLA.

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@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Monday, October 15, 2001 4:34 PM
Subject: Re: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?

> An interesting aspect of this response is that it appears to accept that
> Bin Laden is responsible for the current spate of anthrax letter
> terrorism.
>
> The administration and Mr. Bush himself seem to be pushing this
> viewpoint, but, as Juliette Kayyem, the executive director of the
> program on domestic preparedness at the Kennedy School of Government at
> Harvard points out in an article in the Business section of today's NY
> Times, "[The media] has not been a particular target of Islamic
> fundamentalist groups or groups we associate with Sept. 11. It has been
> a target of right-wing groups in America."
>
> This would certainly be consistent with the choice of Daschle's office
> as a target, since it is very hard to imagine any foreign terrorist
> targeting the leader of the opposition in the Congress rather than the
> President, but one should not jump to conclusions, as the Oklahoma City
> bombing proved.
>
> Although I don't think that this would enter into their strategic
> thinking, I would suspect that, if a right-wing individual or group is
> in fact behind the anthrax letters, he/she/they would probably consider
> any disruption of public opinion polls a serendipitous bonus.
>
> Jan Werner
> jwerner@jwdp.com
> __________________
Chun, Young wrote:

Greetings,
In wake of the Daschle letter containing anthrax (see below the AP news filed at 1:51 pm), using post-card would be more effective both for advance notification, and thank-you/remindeer.

I didn't seriously think about how Laden's terror would affect the ways we administer surveys. Now we may all would ... including issues of mode effects, response rates, and compliance model.

Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist
ychun@AIR.org
American Institutes for Research    http://www.air.org
"More than 50 years of behavioral and social science research"
1000 Thomas Jefferson St. NW
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 944-5325

>From Reg_Baker@marketstrategies.com Tue Oct 16 05:03:39 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9GC3de12269 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001
  05:03:39 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from sharpie.marketstrategies.com (mail.marketstrategies.com [199.3.218.15])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id FAA27185 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 05:03:41 -0700 (PDT)
From: Reg_Baker@marketstrategies.com
Received: from killdeer.marketstrategies.com (killdeer.marketstrategies.com [10.10.30.125])
  by sharpie.marketstrategies.com (Switch-2.0.1/Switch-2.0.1) with ESMTP
  id f9GC2tt26619 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 08:02:55 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: RE: response rate for website surveys
To: aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.8 June 18, 2001
Message-ID: <OF53DC15F1.0FADE249-ON85256AE7.0041F7E1@marketstrategies.com>
Date: Tue, 16 Oct 2001 08:02:52 -0400
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on Killdeer/MSI (Release 5.0.5 |September 22, 2000) at 10/16/2001 08:02:55 AM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

In truth, it's often worse than this. While many panels can get you 30% or
so (SSI being an example), there is a lot of web work pulling down 5% response rates. This tends to be true of the list aggregators (Netcreations being an example).

Reg Baker
www.ms-interactive.com

Karl Feld
<KFeld@humanvoice.com> To: "aapornet@usc.edu"

Sent by: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

10/15/01 07:29 PM

Please respond to aapornet

Terrie,

Response rates for web surveys are heavily dependent on the population and sample source, so it is hard to answer this question. We are a web survey company. That is all we do. For what it is worth, we experience RR from 30% to 70%. The higher rates are generally obtained on customer/employee type research using client-supplied internal sample. Lower rates are obtained from commercially supplied sample from the larger panels and are generally from consumer/general population work.

Karl

-----Original Message-----
From: Teresa Hottle [mailto:teresa.hottle@wright.edu]
Can anyone tell me what the "average" response rate for website surveys is?

Thanks,
Terrie

---

After Patty Gwartney's note yesterday and the subsequent good suggestions, I thought I'd pass this along to you. It's a list of suggestions and guidelines from a friend of mine at the USPS dealing with mail security.

All best wishes...
SUGGESTIONS TO ADDRESS SECURITY ISSUES IN DIRECT MAIL CAMPAIGNS

Preserving the integrity of the $528 billion direct mail sector of the U.S. economy is one way we can respond to the President's call to continue to work and live undaunted by the threat of
terrorism.

In response to inquiries from member companies, consumers and the press regarding direct mail as a possible vehicle for distributing anthrax or other agents of bioterrorism, The DMA suggests the following guidelines to promote security and integrity in the direct mail business, and to ensure consumers of the safety of professional direct mail campaigns.

1. Avoid using plain envelopes. Printed envelopes, especially those using color are less likely to appear like the hand-prepared envelopes involved in the incidents so far.

2. Use a clear and identifiable return address. Consider including your company logo in the address.

3. Consider including a toll-free phone number and/or URL address on envelopes.

4. Utilize an e-mail and/or telemarketing campaign in conjunction with a letter drop to notify consumers that mail will be coming.

5. Consider temporarily delaying Business-to-Business mailings because of potential logjams in receiving mailrooms.

6. Utilize The DMA Member logo to demonstrate your company's credibility.

7. Contact your lettershop and other production services to stress the importance of security.

8. Consider performing a security audit throughout your operation.

9. Evaluate your campaign approach and consider that personalization is temporarily less likely to increase response rates.

10. If you are involved in production services, know who your customers are.

11. Reinforce your existing internal guidelines about forwarding press and consumer calls to appropriate internal channels.

12. Educate mailroom employees about identifying and dealing with possible threats.

13. Utilize The DMA as press resource. Feel free to forward press
calls to 212-768-7277.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * TALKING TO AUTHORITIES
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

In addition to issuing these suggestions, The DMA will continue to talk with government officials - including those at the U.S. Postal Service - as well as experts in bioterrorism, in order to keep you informed and prepared to respond appropriately as new developments arise.

At present, we know that the USPS has confirmed that the mail was used to transport anthrax bacteria in no more than two instances. However, it is imperative to point out that those mailpieces were sent from individuals and were not related to any direct mail campaign.

* * * * * * * * * OTHER RESOURCES * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Other information sources regarding the U.S. mail and anthrax include:


** Postal Inspection Service at http://www.usps.gov/websites/depart/inspect

** Center for Disease Control (CDC) at http://www.cdc.gov

** Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) at http://www.fbi.gov. The FBI has issued a consumer advisory regarding suspicious packages and letters, which can be accessed at http://www.fbi.gov/pressrel/pressrel101/poster101201.pdf

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Direct Marketing Association, Inc.
1120 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY  10036-6700
212.768.7277
http://www.the-dma.org

----------------------------- Forwarded with Changes
-----------------------------
From: ELENA M NEELY at PACA002L
Date: 10/15/01 2:44PM
To: ROBERT E EIDE at EAMN001L
*To: JAN E CHAMBERS at LVPA001L
I started doing research on the web and about the web in 1994 and discovered that, lo, the internet is just like physical space, only different. The difference is the technology, but ultimately the same rules regarding social behavior still apply. Web survey response rates are affected by the same things that affect telephone and mail response rates: quality of the sample list, interest in the subject of the survey, quality of the questionnaire design (phrasing, length, aesthetics), incentives. A technology variable is whether the survey is deployed via an email (opt-in list is a bit different than, say, an RDD sample) and whether it is a 'pop-up' survey off of a website (also know as 'intercept' or 'interstitial' method). Length of a pop-up survey must be very short and concise. We get about 15-30% for the intercepts, and anywhere from 5% for an email invite using a purchased list, to about 70% using a customer list with an engaged customer base (we tell our clients to expect about 20-25%).

I predict that the response rate will fall in the future, as the novelty wears off and as the marketing/sales efforts bombard people with their advertising pop-ups, causing people to automatically close the windows, delete emails, and install blocking software.

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Research
Terrie,

Response rates for web surveys are heavily dependent on the population and sample source, so it is hard to answer this question. We are a web survey company. That is all we do. For what it is worth, we experience RR from 30% to 70%. The higher rates are generally obtained on customer/employee type research using client-supplied internal sample. Lower rates are obtained from commercially supplied sample from the larger panels and are generally from consumer/general population work.

Karl

Can anyone tell me what the "average" response rate for website surveys is?

Thanks,
Terrie
Is "Latino" or "Latina" correct for women? We are modifying our interview forms based on the new OMB guidelines, and we are only interviewing women.

thanks!

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist,
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

> From: JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu Tue Oct 16 11:33:39 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/uscl with ESMTP
   id f9GIXce15387 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001
11:33:38
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscl with ESMTP
   id LAA01570 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 11:33:38 -0700
(PDT)
From: JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu
Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
   id <46WP18LK>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 11:31:57 -0700
Message-ID: <F4A1925B9E39D511B1320090272A5F2E1E4C4A@psgenet2-113.ucsf.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: "Latino" or "Latina"?
Date: Tue, 16 Oct 2001 11:31:56 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
Content-Type: text/plain

Latina

> -------
> From: Voigt, Lynda
> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2001 11:20 AM
> To: 'AAPORNET'
> Subject: "Latino" or "Latina"?
>
> Is "Latino" or "Latina" correct for women? We are modifying our interview
> forms based on the new OMB guidelines, and we are only interviewing women.
>
> thanks!
>
> Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
> Senior Staff Scientist,
> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
> Seattle, WA
> lvoigt@fhcrc.org
>
>
We have received a request from an author for permission to publish in a book data from our polls. We release our data publicly and consider our questions and results to be in the public domain, but the lawyer for the publisher says that specific written permission is needed to publish from each polling source. I was wondering if anyone else has come up against this kind of situation. What is the norm or policy about quoting poll questions in publications? 

Thanks,
Monica Wolford

Center on Policy Attitudes
We have received a request from an author for permission to publish in a book data from our polls. We release our data publicly and consider our questions and results to be in the public domain, but the lawyer for the publisher says that specific written permission is needed to publish from each polling source. I was wondering if anyone else has come up against this kind of situation. What is the norm or policy about quoting poll questions in publications?

Thanks,

Monica Wolford

Center on Policy Attitudes

---------=_NextPart_000_001C_01C15653.F424A0C0--

>From Frank_Newport@gallup.com Tue Oct 16 12:08:29 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9GJ8Se21209 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001
  12:08:28 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from exchng7.gallup.com (exchng7.gallup.com [198.175.140.71])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id MAA08565 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 12:08:25 -0700
(PDT)
From: Frank_Newport@gallup.com
Received: by Exchng7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
  id <4KDN1WRP>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 14:06:04 -0500
Message-ID: <BFCC17A2EB27CD411A9E3000D01ECEF408D916B9@Exchng7.gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Pakistan Poll?
Date: Tue, 16 Oct 2001 14:06:02 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
  boundary="----=_NextPart_001_01C15675.9963C720"

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_01C15675.9963C720
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"

Aapornet Colleagues:
You may see or hear news reports quoting a "Gallup Pakistan" poll showing strong opposition to the US and Allied air strikes on Afghanistan. Please be advised that this is the work of one of the "Gallup International" polling companies, and that company has chosen to release it with the Gallup name instead of its own. We are sending a news release to media outlets worldwide (translated into eight regional languages) alerting them to this fact, along with our concerns about the reliability of this poll. A copy of the release is included below.

Frank Newport
Editor in Chief
The Gallup Poll
Princeton

-- NEWS ADVISORY -- TO NATIONAL EDITOR:

The Gallup Organization Urges Caution in Reporting of Pakistan Poll

In scanning the news wires during this time of conflict, you may see stories from various countries reporting the results of "Gallup Polls." While The Gallup Organization (based in Princeton, New Jersey) has a direct presence in more than two dozen countries around the world, there are some polling companies that use the Gallup name in an unauthorized manner, and which have no connection whatsoever to The Gallup Organization. Similarly, the attribution that polls have been conducted by "members" of Gallup International should not be taken to connote any connection to The Gallup Organization or the Gallup Poll. "Gallup International" is in no way connected with The Gallup Organization.

More specifically, Gallup has been receiving numerous inquiries regarding a poll conducted by an entity which calls itself "Gallup Pakistan." While trademark and trade name issues are a matter for local authorities to adjudicate, The Gallup Organization wants to inform news organizations worldwide that this company is in no way connected with us, and has absolutely no authorization from us to use the Gallup name.

Gallup analysts have a number of concerns regarding the Pakistan poll which include -- but are not limited to -- technical issues. Our understanding is that its findings do not apply to Pakistan as such -- but rather, to nine urban areas which collectively account for just 16.7% of that country's population. Furthermore, none of the country's predominantly rural population receives any representation whatsoever in the poll's sampling frame.

In short, the poll leaves out the views of at least 83% of the country's citizenry. The Gallup Organization regrets that the survey's use of the Gallup name may imply a level of credibility which would not otherwise be merited. Upon our review, we have grave concerns about its reliability.

If you have any questions about the origins or methodology of a poll purporting to be a "Gallup Poll," please feel free to contact any of the executives of The Gallup Organization listed below. A complete global list of The Gallup Organization's offices and authorized subsidiaries is


SOURCE The Gallup Organization

-/Web site: http://www.gallup.com /

-----Original Message-----
From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 10:42 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Pakistan Poll?

The sample was "selected from the urban areas". Just imagine what the rural folks believe?

These findings are from Newsweek's PRNewswire release:

http://www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=104
&STORY=/www/story/10-14-2001/001591361&amp;EDATE=

"And almost half of those polled (48%) believe Israel was responsible for the attack on the U.S. Only 12 percent view Osama bin Laden as responsible, and 25 percent said a U.S. group was behind the Sept. 11 attacks."

"Osama bin Laden is viewed by the majority (82%) of Pakistanis to be a mujahid (freedom fighter) as opposed to a terrorist (6%). And a smaller majority (57%) also opposes bin Laden presenting himself before a court of law, while 34 percent are in favor."

Nick

Howard Schuman wrote:

Thanks Jan & Nick. The content is not quite as bad as the news report, but nevertheless ominous. Pakistan's population is over 150 million, it has nuclear weapons, and is important to the entire Islamic world. It would be helpful to have an urban/rural break, since the visible opposition to the U.S. has been largely in important cities.

Howard

On Mon, 15 Oct 2001, Jan Werner wrote:
Howard Schuman wrote:

A brief news report yesterday mentioned a recent poll in Pakistan reportedly showing some 90% of the population to be highly critical of U.S. attacks on Afghanistan. Does anyone know where details on the method and content of this poll can be found? Howard

I don't know where the 90% number comes from. Here are the most recent results (including methodological details) published by Gallup Pakistan on their web site at http://www.gallup.com.pk/g_poll.html

Jan Werner
____________________
Islamabad, October 15, 2001

51% support Musharaf on his policy on current crisis. But 83% side with Taliban against America.

Only 16% favour to let America use Pakistani air bases: Gallup Survey According to the findings of a recent poll conducted by Gallup Pakistan the Pakistani public is undergoing a set of complex emotions. Around half of them, 51%, say they favour General Musharaf's policy on the current crisis, which is substantially higher compared to three weeks ago when the level of support was only 32%. Furthermore, 37% think that he has handled his job on this issue in a very good or good way. But having said that 83% of Pakistanis say that in the conflict between America and Taliban, their sympathies are with the Taliban. 82% of them believe Osama Bin Laden is a "Mjuahid" and not a terrorist and only 12% believe that he was responsible for the attacks on USA. Quite importantly only 16% favour that Americans should be allowed to use air bases in Pakistan, 75% are opposed.

The findings have emerged from a survey carried out by Gallup Pakistan on October 11-12 in the urban areas of all the four provinces of the country. The respondents were chosen statistically and they represented a cross section of people belonging to various age, education, income and language backgrounds.

The findings of this survey will also be published under a special arrangement by the international weekly Magazine "Newsweek" in its forthcoming issue.

The survey revealed an apprehension on the part of a sizable number of Pakistanis that after its action gets underway in Afghanistan, America may start similar action in Kashmir. Nearly 6 out of 10 Pakistanis believed that the chances of this happening were either very high, a view held by 17% or some chances, a view held by 42%. Only 41% ruled out such a possibility.

Pakistani public opinion is divided on whether the aid promised by America would help solve the nation's economic problems. While 59% believe it would be useful, 38% think it would be harmful; 3% did
but most people are pessimistic about the unfolding economic scenario and believe that the national economy will be worse off in the aftermath of the crisis, a view held by 54%. Only 22% believed it would improve, while 24% think it would remain the same.

According to the survey 64% of Pakistanis believed that the attack on USA on September 11 was a terrorist attack and not Jihad. It is also notable that one third, or 34% of the respondents were of the view that Osama Bin Laden should present himself before a court of law for trial, while 57% disfavoured this idea.

The survey was conducted by Gallup Pakistan, the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International.

Sample Composition

The sample comprised 978 men and women age 18+. They were statistically selected from the urban areas of all the four provinces of Pakistan including Karachi, Lahore, Rawalpindi/Islamabad, Peshawar and Quetta. The sample comprised a cross section of various ages and socio-economic groups in the urban areas of the country. The error margin for a sample of this kind is + 3-4% at 95% confidence level.

Gallup Pakistan is the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International. It is Pakistan's most reputable polling organization.

Technical Details

Field Work: All field work was done through face to face interviews. The respondents were chosen through a random process. The sampling blocks were chosen randomly. The starting point was randomly identified, and a random process was followed to proceed from there. Within the household the first adult who responded and became available was interviewed.

Date: The field work was carried out on October 11-12, 2001

All four provinces are represented in the survey. The sample was re-weighted to correspond with the share of each province in the national urban population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unweighted sample</th>
<th>Weighted sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field work was carried out in Karachi, Hyderabad and Sukkur (Sindh), Multan, Lahore, Faisalabad, Rawalpindi/Islamabad* (Punjab), Peshawar (NWFP), Quetta (Balochistan).
Aapornet Colleagues:

You may see or hear news reports quoting a "Gallup Pakistan" poll showing strong opposition to the US and Allied air strikes on Afghanistan.

Please be advised that this is the work of one of the "Gallup International" polling companies, and that company has chosen to release it with the Gallup name instead of its own. We are sending a news release to media outlets worldwide (translated into eight regional languages) alerting them to this fact, along with our concerns about the reliability of this poll. A copy of the release is included below.

Frank Newport
Editor in Chief
The Gallup Poll
Princeton

In scanning the news wires during this time of conflict, you may see stories from various countries reporting the results of "Gallup Polls." While The Gallup Organization (based in Princeton, New Jersey) has a direct presence in more than two dozen countries around the world, there are some polling companies that use the Gallup name in an unauthorized manner, and which have no connection whatsoever to The Gallup Organization. Similarly, the attribution that polls have been conducted by "members" of Gallup International should not be taken to connote any connection to The Gallup Organization or the Gallup Poll. "Gallup International" is in no way connected with The Gallup Organization.

More specifically, Gallup has been receiving numerous inquiries regarding a poll conducted by an entity which calls itself "Gallup Pakistan." While trademark and trade name issues are a matter for local authorities to adjudicate, The Gallup Organization wants to inform news organizations worldwide that this company is in no way connected with us, and has absolutely no authorization from us to use the Gallup name.
Gallup analysts have a number of concerns regarding the Pakistan poll which include -- but are not limited to -- technical issues. Our understanding is that its findings do not apply to Pakistan as such -- but rather, to nine urban areas which collectively account for just 16.7% of that country's population. Furthermore, none of the country's predominantly rural population receives any representation whatsoever in the poll's sampling frame.

In short, the poll leaves out the views of at least 83% of the country's citizenry. The Gallup Organization regrets that the survey's use of the Gallup name may imply a level of credibility which would not otherwise be merited. Upon our review, we have grave concerns about its reliability.

If you have any questions about the origins or methodology of a poll purporting to be a "Gallup Poll," please feel free to contact any of the executives of The Gallup Organization listed below. A complete global list of The Gallup Organization's offices and authorized subsidiaries is available at www.gallup.com.


SOURCE The Gallup Organization

Contact: http://www.gallup.com

---

Sample was "selected from the urban areas". Just imagine what the rural folks believe?

These findings are from Newsweek's PRNewswire release:

"And almost half of those polled (48%) believe <B>Israel</B> was responsible for the attack on the U.S. Only 12 percent view Osama bin Laden as responsible, <BR>and 25 percent said a U.S. group was behind the Sept. 11 attacks."

"Osama bin Laden is viewed by the majority (82%) of Pakistanis to be a mujahid (<B>freedom fighter</B>) as opposed to a terrorist (6%). And a smaller majority (57%) also opposes bin Laden presenting himself before a court of law, while 34 percent are in favor."

Howard Schuman wrote:

Thanks Jan & Nick. The content is not quite as bad as the news report, <BR>but nevertheless ominous.
Pakistan's population is over 150 million, it has nuclear weapons, and is important to the entire Islamic world. It would be helpful to have an urban/rural break, since the visible opposition to the U.S. has been largely in important cities.

On Mon, 15 Oct 2001, Jan Werner wrote:

> Howard Schuman wrote: &gt; &gt; &gt; A brief news report yesterday mentioned a recent poll in Pakistan &gt; &gt; &gt; reportedly showing some 90% of the population to be highly critical of &gt; &gt; &gt; U.S. attacks on Afghanistan. Does anyone know where details on the method &gt; &gt; &gt; and content of this poll can be found? &gt; &gt; &gt; &gt; Howard &gt; &gt; &gt; &gt; &gt; &gt; I don't know where the 90% number comes from. Here are the most recent results (including methodological details) published by Gallup Pakistan on their web site at http://www.gallup.com.pk/g_poll.html

According to the findings of a recent poll conducted by Gallup Pakistan the Pakistani public is undergoing a set of complex emotions. Around half of them, 51%, say they favour General Musharaf's policy on the current crisis, which is substantially higher compared to three weeks ago when the level of support was only 32%. Furthermore, 37% think that he has handled his job on this issue in a very good or good way. But having said that 83% of Pakistanis say that in the conflict between America and Taliban, their sympathies are with the Taliban. 82% of them believe Osama Bin Laden is a "Mjuahid" and not a terrorist and only 12% believe that he was responsible for the attacks on USA. Quite importantly only 16% favour that Americans should be allowed to use air bases in Pakistan, 75% are opposed.

The findings have emerged from a survey carried out by Gallup on October 11-12 in the urban areas of Islamabad, October 15, 2001.
all the four provinces of the country. The respondents were chosen statistically and they represented a cross section of people belonging to various age, education, income and language backgrounds. The findings of this survey will also be published under a special arrangement by the international weekly Magazine "Newsweek" in its forthcoming issue.

The survey revealed an apprehension on the part of a sizable number of Pakistanis that after its action gets underway in Afghanistan, America may start similar action in Kashmir. Nearly 6 out of 10 Pakistanis believed that the chances of this happening were either very high, a view held by 17% or some chances, a view held by 42%. Only 41% ruled out such a possibility.

Pakistan public opinion is divided on whether the aid promised by America would help solve the nation's economic problems. While 59% believe it would be useful, 38% think it would be harmful; 3% did not give a view. But most people are pessimistic about the unfolding economic scenario and believe that the national economy will be worse off in the aftermath of the crisis, a view held by 54%. Only 22% believed it would improve, while 24% think it would remain the same.

According to the survey 64% of Pakistanis believed that the attack on USA on September 11 was a terrorist attack and not Jihad. It is also notable that one third, or 34% of the respondents were of the view that Osama Bin Laden should present himself before a court of law for trial, while 57% disfavoured this idea.

The survey was conducted by Gallup Pakistan, the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International. The sample comprised 978 men and women age 18+. They were statistically selected from the urban areas of all the four provinces of Pakistan including Karachi, Lahore, Rawalpindi/Islamabad, Peshawar and Quetta. The sample comprised a cross section of various ages and socio-economic groups in the urban areas of the country. The error margin for a sample of this kind is + 3-4% at 95% confidence level.
Gallup International. &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; It is Pakistan's most reputable polling organization. &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; Technical Details &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; Field Work: &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; All field work was done through face to face &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; interviews. &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; The respondents were chosen through a random process. &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; The sampling blocks were chosen randomly. &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; The starting point was randomly identified, and a random process was followed to proceed &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; from there. &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; Within the household the first adult who responded and became available was interviewed. &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; Date: &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; The field work was carried out on October 11-12, 2001 &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; All four provinces are represented in the survey. &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&lt;nbsp; The sample was re-weighted to correspond with the share of each province in the national urban population &lt;BR&gt;&lt;nbsp;&n
The Government Accounting Office released yesterday a substantial report on voting problems in the 2000 election, including results from surveys of jurisdictions and statistical analysis of voting problems.

In general, the conclusion is that about half of all jurisdictions had some problems in counting results, that about 2.3% of ballots were not counted, and that the problems skew heavily toward low income and minority districts. The authors point out that these results generally agree with those obtained by others.

One statistic that has interesting implications for pre-election polls and election campaigns is that 14% of all ballots were cast before election day.

There are 4 separate documents in the report which can be obtained in .pdf format from http://www.gao.gov/daybook/011015.htm. The main report (GAO-02-3) is a 22 megabyte file, so you should probably download it rather than trying to read it online.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com
Thanks Frank,
Your timely corrections and clarifications
have well prevented me from citing in media commentaries
my reference to "Gallup" in Newsweek findings!
Thanks a bunch again.

Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist
American Institutes for Research  http://www.air.org
"More than 50 years of behavioral and social science research"
1000 Thomas Jefferson St. NW
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 944-5325

-----Original Message-----
From: Frank Newport@gallup.com [mailto:Frank_Newport@gallup.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2001 3:06 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Pakistan Poll?

Aapornet Colleagues:

You may see or hear news reports quoting a "Gallup Pakistan" poll showing
strong opposition to the US and Allied air strikes on Afghanistan. Please be
advised that this is the work of one of the "Gallup International" polling
companies, and that company has chosen to release it with the Gallup name
instead of its own. We are sending a news release to media outlets worldwide
(translated into eight regional languages) alerting them to this fact, along
with our concerns about the reliability of this poll. A copy of the release
is included below.

Frank Newport
Editor in Chief
The Gallup Poll
Princeton

-- NEWS ADVISORY -- TO NATIONAL EDITOR:

The Gallup Organization Urges Caution in Reporting of Pakistan Poll

In scanning the news wires during this time of conflict, you may see stories
from various countries reporting the results of "Gallup Polls." While The
Gallup Organization (based in Princeton, New Jersey) has a direct presence
in more than two dozen countries around the world, there are some polling companies that use the Gallup name in an unauthorized manner, and which have no connection whatsoever to The Gallup Organization. Similarly, the attribution that polls have been conducted by "members" of Gallup International should not be taken to connote any connection to The Gallup Organization or the Gallup Poll. "Gallup International" is in no way connected with The Gallup Organization.

More specifically, Gallup has been receiving numerous inquiries regarding a poll conducted by an entity which calls itself "Gallup Pakistan." While trademark and trade name issues are a matter for local authorities to adjudicate, The Gallup Organization wants to inform news organizations worldwide that this company is in no way connected with us, and has absolutely no authorization from us to use the Gallup name.

Gallup analysts have a number of concerns regarding the Pakistan poll which include -- but are not limited to -- technical issues. Our understanding is that its findings do not apply to Pakistan as such -- but rather, to nine urban areas which collectively account for just 16.7% of that country's population. Furthermore, none of the country's predominantly rural population receives any representation whatsoever in the poll's sampling frame.

In short, the poll leaves out the views of at least 83% of the country's citizenry. The Gallup Organization regrets that the survey's use of the Gallup name may imply a level of credibility which would not otherwise be merited. Upon our review, we have grave concerns about its reliability.

If you have any questions about the origins or methodology of a poll purporting to be a "Gallup Poll," please feel free to contact any of the executives of The Gallup Organization listed below. A complete global list of The Gallup Organization's offices and authorized subsidiaries is available at www.gallup.com.


SOURCE The Gallup Organization

-/Web site: http://www.gallup.com /

-----Original Message-----
From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 10:42 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Pakistan Poll?

The sample was "selected from the urban areas". Just imagine what the rural folks believe?

These findings are from Newsweek's PRNewswire release:
"And almost half of those polled (48%) believe Israel was responsible for the attack on the U.S. Only 12 percent view Osama bin Laden as responsible, and 25 percent said a U.S. group was behind the Sept. 11 attacks."

"Osama bin Laden is viewed by the majority (82%) of Pakistanis to be a mujahid (freedom fighter) as opposed to a terrorist (6%). And a smaller majority (57%) also opposes bin Laden presenting himself before a court of law, while 34 percent are in favor."

Nick

Howard Schuman wrote:

Thanks Jan & Nick. The content is not quite as bad as the news report, but nevertheless ominous. Pakistan's population is over 150 million, it has nuclear weapons, and is important to the entire Islamic world. It would be helpful to have an urban/rural break, since the visible opposition to the U.S. has been largely in important cities.

Howard

On Mon, 15 Oct 2001, Jan Werner wrote:

> Howard Schuman wrote:
> >
> > > A brief news report yesterday mentioned a recent poll in Pakistan
> > > reportedly showing some 90% of the population to be highly critical of
> > > U.S. attacks on Afghanistan. Does anyone know where details on the
> > > and content of this poll can be found? Howard
> > >
> > I don't know where the 90% number comes from. Here are the most recent
> > results (including methodological details) published by Gallup Pakistan
> > on their web site at http://www.gallup.com.pk/g_poll.html
> <http://www.gallup.com.pk/g_poll.html>
> >
> > Jan Werner
> > ______________________
> > Islamabad, October 15, 2001
> >
> > 51% support Musharaf on his policy on current crisis.
> > But 83% side with Taliban against America.
> >
> > Only 16% favour to let America use Pakistani air bases: Gallup
> > Survey According to the findings of a recent poll conducted by
Gallup Pakistan the Pakistani public is undergoing a set of complex emotions. Around half of them, 51%, say they favour General Musharaf's policy on the current crisis, which is substantially higher compared to three weeks ago when the level of support was only 32%. Furthermore, 37% think that he has handled his job on this issue in a very good or good way. But having said that 83% of Pakistanis say that in the conflict between America and Taliban, their sympathies are with the Taliban. 82% of them believe Osama Bin Laden is a "Mjuahid" and not a terrorist and only 12% believe that he was responsible for the attacks on USA. Quite importantly only 16% favour that Americans should be allowed to use air bases in Pakistan, 75% are opposed.

The findings have emerged from a survey carried out by Gallup Pakistan on October 11-12 in the urban areas of all the four provinces of the country. The respondents were chosen statistically and they represented a cross section of people belonging to various age, education, income and language backgrounds. The findings of this survey will also be published under a special arrangement by the international weekly Magazine "Newsweek" in its forthcoming issue.

The survey revealed an apprehension on the part of a sizable number of Pakistanis that after its action gets underway in Afghanistan, America may start similar action in Kashmir. Nearly 6 out of 10 Pakistanis believed that the chances of this happening were either very high, a view held by 17% or some chances, a view held by 42%. Only 41% ruled out such a possibility.

Pakistani public opinion is divided on whether the aid promised by America would help solve the nation's economic problems. While 59% believe it would be useful, 38% think it would be harmful; 3% did not give a view. But most people are pessimistic about the unfolding economic scenario and believe that the national economy will be worse off in the aftermalth of the crisis, a view held by 54%. Only 22% believed it would improve, while 24% think it would remain the same.

According to the survey 64% of Pakistanis believed that the attack on USA on September 11 was a terrorist attack and not Jihad. It is also notable that one third, or 34% of the respondents were of the view that Osama Bin Laden should present himself before a court of law for trial, while 57% disfavoured this idea.

The survey was conducted by Gallup Pakistan, the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International.

Sample Composition

The sample comprised 978 men and women age 18+. They were statistically selected from the urban areas of all the four provinces of Pakistan including Karachi, Lahore, Rawalpindi/Islamabad, Peshawar and Quetta. The sample comprised a cross section of various ages and socio-economic groups in the urban areas of the country. The error margin for a sample of this kind is + 3-4% at 95% confidence level.
Gallup Pakistan is the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International. It is Pakistan's most reputable polling organization.

Technical Details

Field Work: All field work was done through face to face interviews. The respondents were chosen through a random process. The sampling blocks were chosen randomly. The starting point was randomly identified, and a random process was followed to proceed from there. Within the household the first adult who responded and became available was interviewed.

Date: The field work was carried out on October 11-12, 2001

All four provinces are represented in the survey. The sample was re-weighted to correspond with the share of each province in the national urban population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Unweighted sample</th>
<th>Weighted sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field work was carried out in Karachi, Hyderabad and Sukkur (Sindh), Multan, Lahore, Faisalabad, Rawalpindi/Islamabad* (Punjab), Peshawar (NWFP), Quetta (Balochistan).
Hi all:
What about for a mixed mode type survey? If we wanted a general population sample (say of the Kansas City area--including wealthy suburbs and urban core), have any of you all tried a mail survey with those least likely to have a computer (arguably the urban core)? The individuals most likely to have a computer would be sent a letter asking them to go to a website and answer the survey.

I'm toying with such a design--so I've been interested in the discussion about web survey response rates. Just wondering if anyone has tried or had success with such a mixed mode survey.

Thanks,
Martha Kropf

Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
213 Haag Hall
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO  64110-2499
816-235-5948

-----Original Message-----
From: Karl Feld [mailto:KFeld@humanvoice.com]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 6:30 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: response rate for website surveys

Terrie,

Response rates for web surveys are heavily dependent on the population and sample source, so it is hard to answer this question. We are a web survey company. That is all we do. For what it is worth, we experience RR from 30% to 70%. The higher rates are generally obtained on customer/employee type research using client-supplied internal sample. Lower rates are obtained from commercially supplied sample from the larger panels and are generally from consumer/general population work.

Karl

-----Original Message-----
From: Teresa Hottle [mailto:teresa.hottle@wright.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 12, 2001 9:15 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: response rate for website surveys

Can anyone tell me what the "average" response rate for website surveys is?

Thanks,
Terrie

>From efielder@issr.ucla.edu Tue Oct 16 14:30:03 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9GLU2e07465 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001
14:30:02
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from weber.sscnet.ucla.edu (weber.sscnet.ucla.edu [128.97.42.3])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA08905 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 14:30:03 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from BRIAN.issr.ucla.edu (ts11-66.dialup.bol.ucla.edu
[164.67.21.75])
   by weber.sscnet.ucla.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id OAA06207
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 14:29:48 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <4.3.1.2.20011016142639.00a78100@pop.sscnet.ucla.edu>
X-Sender: efielder@pop.sscnet.ucla.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.1
Date: Tue, 16 Oct 2001 14:26:50 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Eve Fielder <efielder@issr.ucla.edu>
Subject: Re: "Latino" or "Latina"?
In-Reply-To: <9667A0D2033CD51195F90002B330A3BF35E267@moe.fhcrc.org>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>
<font size=3>Latina<br>
<br>
At 11:20 AM 10/16/01 -0700, you wrote:<br>
<blockquote type=cite cite>Is &quot;Latino&quot; or &quot;Latina&quot; correct for women?&nbsp; We are modifying our interview<br>
   forms based on the new OMB guidelines, and we are only interviewing<br>
   women.&lt;br&gt;
   thanks!</blockquote>
</html>
It is good that Frank has clarified the non-relation of the "Pakistan Poll," to Gallup, but we still need information on the nature and sponsors of the poll. If anyone has such, please provide.

However, the results are not out of keeping with news reports from Pakistan, nor comments by knowledgeable Pakistanis (e.g., a Pakistani journalist speaking on public radio today). The results themselves were not particularly strange, showing (bare) majority support for the government position, though even more for the Taliban. It would be helpful if the cities could be disaggregated, since the Punjab region is usually considered the heartland from a political standpoint (and so far the protests against the U.S. have been less strong there). The paucity of reasonably good survey data from Islamic countries is unfortunate, and it would be good if Gallup itself could do more. -Howard
Martha,

I recently read a paper by the U.S. Census on mixed mode data collection used for the 2000 Short Form. The method used was very much like what you are considering here. I recommend you contact Sid Schneider at Westat and ask for a copy of the paper "An Experiment Comparing Computer-Assisted and Paper Modes of Data Collection for the Short Form in Census 2000". The conclusions were essentially that giving respondents a choice of mixed modes to respond (web, inbound CATI, IVR and paper) increased response rates. He can be reached at schneis1@westat.com.

Karl G. Feld
Vice President, Research Development
humanvoice, inc.
2155 North Freedom Blvd.
Provo, Utah 84601
http://www.surveyguardian.com
http://www.humanvoice.com
p: +1 801 344 5500
f: +1 801 370 1008
e: kfeld@humanvoice.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Kropf, Martha E. [mailto:KropfM@umkc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2001 1:35 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: response rate for website surveys

Hi all:
What about for a mixed mode type survey? If we wanted a general population sample (say of the Kansas City area--including wealthy suburbs and urban core), have any of you all tried a mail survey with those least likely to have a computer (arguably the urban core)? The individuals most likely to have a computer would be sent a letter asking them to go to a website and answer the survey.

I'm toying with such a design--so I've been interested in the discussion about web survey response rates. Just wondering if anyone has tried or had success with such a mixed mode survey.

Thanks,
Martha Kropf

Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
213 Haag Hall
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO  64110-2499
816-235-5948

-----Original Message-----
From: Karl Feld [mailto:KFeld@humanvoice.com]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 6:30 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: response rate for website surveys

Terrie,

Response rates for web surveys are heavily dependent on the population and sample source, so it is hard to answer this question. We are a web survey company. That is all we do. For what it is worth, we experience RR from 30% to 70%. The higher rates are generally obtained on customer/employee type research using client-supplied internal sample. Lower rates are obtained from commercially supplied sample from the larger panels and are generally from consumer/general population work.

Karl

-----Original Message-----
From: Teresa Hottle [mailto:teresa.hottle@wright.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 12, 2001 9:15 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: response rate for website surveys

Can anyone tell me what the "average" response rate for website surveys is?

Thanks,
Terrie

>From Mark.Lamias@grizzard.com Tue Oct 16 16:24:00 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9GNNxe28947 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001
16:23:59 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from atl_intmail.grizzard.com ([208.178.112.229])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id QAA20243 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 16:23:58 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by atl_intmail.grizzard.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
If I recall correctly, I think the University of Michigan's Detroit Area Study conducted a mixed mode survey a few years ago, where one mode was a Web based survey. You can probably contact the project's contacts for more information. Further information about the DAS can be found at http://www.tcaup.umich.edu/workfolio/DAS2001/index.html.

Mark J. Lamias
Grizzard Agency
229 Peachtree Street - 12th Floor
Atlanta, GA  30303

-----Original Message-----
From: Kropf, Martha E. [mailto:KropfM@umkc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2001 3:35 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: response rate for website surveys

Hi all:
What about for a mixed mode type survey? If we wanted a general population sample (say of the Kansas City area--including wealthy suburbs and urban core), have any of you all tried a mail survey with those least likely to have a computer (arguably the urban core)? The individuals most likely to have a computer would be sent a letter asking them to go to a website and answer the survey.

I'm toying with such a design--so I've been interested in the discussion about web survey response rates. Just wondering if anyone has tried or had success with such a mixed mode survey.

Thanks,
Martha Kropf

Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
213 Haag Hall
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO  64110-2499
816-235-5948

-----Original Message-----
From: Karl Feld [mailto:KFeld@humanvoice.com]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 6:30 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: response rate for website surveys

Terrie,

Response rates for web surveys are heavily dependent on the population and sample source, so it is hard to answer this question. We are a web survey company. That is all we do. For what it is worth, we experience RR from 30% to 70%. The higher rates are generally obtained on customer/employee type research using client-supplied internal sample. Lower rates are obtained from commercially supplied sample from the larger panels and are generally from consumer/general population work.

Karl

-----Original Message-----
From: Teresa Hottle [mailto:teresa.hottle@wright.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 12, 2001 9:15 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: response rate for website surveys

Can anyone tell me what the "average" response rate for website surveys is?

Thanks,
Terrie

>From 1bourque@ucla.edu Tue Oct 16 18:13:42 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9H1Dgel1241 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001
18:13:42 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from serval.noc.ucla.edu (serval.noc.ucla.edu [169.232.10.12])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id SAA23729 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 18:13:43 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from e4t59 (ts17-2.dialup.bol.ucla.edu [164.67.27.11])
    by serval.noc.ucla.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id SAA05082
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 18:13:30 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <200110170113.SAA05082@serval.noc.ucla.edu>
X-Sender: lbourque@pop.bol.ucla.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
Date: Tue, 16 Oct 2001 18:14:26 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Linda Bourque <lbourque@ucla.edu>
Subject: Re: "Latino" or "Latina"?
In-Reply-To: <9667A0D2033CD51195F90002B330A3BF35E267@moe.fhcrc.org>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Latina

At 11:20 AM 10/16/01 -0700, you wrote:
>Is "Latino" or "Latina" correct for women? We are modifying our interview
>forms based on the new OMB guidelines, and we are only interviewing women.
>
>thanks!
>
>Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
>Senior Staff Scientist,
>Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
>Seattle, WA
>lvoigt@fhcrc.org
>
>
>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Oct 16 20:10:31 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9H3AVEe22688 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001
20:10:31
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (europa.your-site.com [140.186.45.14])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id UAA06448 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 16 Oct 2001 20:10:12 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com ([151.203.181.4]) by jwdp.com ; Tue, 16 Oct 2001
23:09:31
-0400
Message-ID: <3BCCF69A.A35E2AE7@jwdp.com>
Date: Tue, 16 Oct 2001 23:10:18 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.78 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: David_Moore@gallup.com, AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Florida recount redux
References: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1EEFE407214F13@Exchng7.gallup.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

The following article appeared in the Toronto Globe & Mail last Friday,
stating that the media consortium had agreed to kill the NORC study of
the Florida election results:

News they won't share

Friday, October 12, 2001 - Print Edition, Page A18

Executives of the five major U.S. television networks have met
and decided, on the advice of the U.S. government, that there
are some things it would be best for the American people not to
know. This is a startling act of collective self-censorship.

The networks paint it more benignly. After talking with White
House National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice, they agreed

from now on to edit any videotaped statements by Osama bin Laden and his followers so as not to give their more inflammatory statements airtime. A secondary consideration, voiced by Ms. Rice, was that the terrorists might sneak coded messages into their tapes. (Wouldn't they be more likely to use the Internet, a source less vulnerable to editorial interception?)

All news organizations edit. There is much material they don't print or broadcast, including hate-mongering, be it on grounds of taste, libel or news judgment. What is astounding here is the collective prejudgment by the major players that the hatred spewed by a dangerous enemy of the country cannot be newsworthy, and does not provide a useful glimpse of the enemy that Americans should have the chance to assess. That the executives arrived at this view after consulting with the government adds an uncomfortable overlay, suggesting too close a relationship with the main institution they report on. Solidarity under attack does not stretch to surrendering credibility.

In a parallel development, a group of major U.S. print and electronic media, including such respected sources as The New York Times and The Wall Street Journal, have agreed among themselves to give up on an investigation they funded into the conduct of last November's U.S. election. They had spent more than $1-million to have an independent body analyze the ballots that were cast but not officially counted in Florida, in the seesaw battle that saw George W. Bush squeak past Al Gore and win the presidency.

The participants say that, given the dramatic shift in priorities since Sept. 11, they have neither the staff nor the space to pursue a stale-dated story. Come again? The issue is who would have won the U.S. election if the choices of 180,000 voters had been respected; the story has major implications for American democracy and the U.S. Supreme Court's intervention in the vote. Even with a war to cover, that's a tale that needs to be told.

It is hard not to see this as further subordination of news judgment to the desire not to rock the government's boat at a perilous time. Once again, journalistic independence is the loser.

In yesterday's Washington Post (10/15/2001), Howard Kurtz had the following to say on the subject:

There are conspiracy theories bouncing around the Internet that the news organizations studying last November's Florida vote are suppressing the results for fear of tarnishing President Bush in time of war.

Not true. In fact, participants say, the results have not been tabulated or analyzed. No journalist has a clue whether they favor Bush or Al Gore.

The eight news organizations -- including the New York Times,
The Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, Chicago Tribune and CNN -- have delayed the project, which was slated to be published shortly after Sept. 11. They say they don't have the resources to finish the Florida effort -- in which 175,000 questionable ballots must be compared to county-by-county standards -- while crashing on war coverage. The findings are now expected by year's end.

Finally, Mickey Kaus reports the following on his kausfiles.com website:

Contrary to the impression left in this Globe and Mail story (but in keeping with Howie Kurtz's report), the big media consortium recount of Florida has not been "spiked." The raw data compiled by the National Opinion Research Center was scheduled to be released to the consortium members in mid-September, but the 9/11 attacks resulted in a postponement. Will the results be published? "Oh, yeah," says Alan Murray of the WSJ. ... What about the earlier kf report that the raw data from NORC was beset with methodological problems and therefore inconclusive? I'll get back to you on that one. ...

(10/15)

Any comments from NORC on this?

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

>From hschuman@umich.edu Wed Oct 17 05:30:14 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9HCUEe06244 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001
  05:30:14 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.162])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id FAA02425 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 05:30:11 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from galaxian.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (smtp@galaxian.gpcc.itd.umich.edu [141.211.2.146])
  by berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id
    IAA01547 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 08:30:01 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from localhost (hschuman=localhost)
  by galaxian.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with ESMTP id
    IAA18064 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 08:30:00 -0400 (EDT)
Precedence: first-class
Date: Wed, 17 Oct 2001 08:30:00 -0400 (EDT)
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
X-X-Sender: <hschuman@galaxian.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: p.s. on "Pakistan Poll"
In-Reply-To: <BFC17A2E27CD4119A30000D1ECEFE408D916B9@Exchng7.gallup.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.33.0110170819380.12380-
The fullest account of the October 11-12 Pakistan Poll seems to be at:


The site clearly states that the poll covered only urban areas, though these were in all major areas of the country. The account, though lacking information it would certainly be useful to have, is not inferior to many reports of commercial polls in the U.S. The organization seems to be primarily a marketing group, with training claimed at U.S. universities. I have emailed the organization for more details. Howar

We've got some data coming in on a similar project. There are three conditions: web-only, web with paper option, and paper with web option. Anyone interested can drop me an email.

Jim Caplan
Arlington

Reply to:
James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Survey Technology Branch
Defense Manpower Data Center
703.696.5848
caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil
Martha,

I recently read a paper by the U.S. Census on mixed mode data collection used for the 2000 Short Form. The method used was very much like what you are considering here. I recommend you contact Sid Schneider at Westat and ask for a copy of the paper "An Experiment Comparing Computer-Assisted and Paper Modes of Data Collection for the Short Form in Census 2000". The conclusions were essentially that giving respondents a choice of mixed modes to respond (web, inbound CATI, IVR and paper) increased response rates. He can be reached at schneisl@westat.com.

Karl G. Feld
Vice President, Research Development
humanvoice, inc.
2155 North Freedom Blvd.
Provo, Utah 84601
http://www.surveyguardian.com
http://www.humanvoice.com
p: +1 801 344 5500
f: +1 801 370 1008
e: kfeld@humanvoice.com

Hi all:
What about for a mixed mode type survey? If we wanted a general population sample (say of the Kansas City area—including wealthy suburbs and urban core), have any of you all tried a mail survey with those least likely to have a computer (arguably the urban core)? The individuals most likely to have a computer would be sent a letter asking them to go to a website and answer the survey.

I'm toying with such a design—so I've been interested in the discussion
about web survey response rates. Just wondering if anyone has tried
or
had success with such a mixed mode survey.

Thanks,
Martha Kropf

Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
213 Haag Hall
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO  64110-2499
816-235-5948

-----Original Message-----
From: Karl Feld [mailto:KFeld@humanvoice.com]
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 6:30 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: response rate for website surveys

Terrie,

Response rates for web surveys are heavily dependent on the
population
and
sample source, so it is hard to answer this question. We are a web
survey
company. That is all we do. For what it is worth, we experience RR
from
30% to 70%. The higher rates are generally obtained on
customer/employee
type research using client-supplied internal sample. Lower rates
are
obtained from commercially supplied sample from the larger panels
and
are
generally from consumer/general population work.

Karl

-----Original Message-----
From: Teresa Hottle [mailto:teresa.hottle@wright.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 12, 2001 9:15 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: response rate for website surveys

Can anyone tell me what the "average" response rate for
website surveys is?

Thanks,
Terrie

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed Oct 17 06:37:46 2001
This is the survey for which I posted the summary to AAPORNET on Monday, but with the full results of each question added.

Whatever their qualifications and whatever the legitimacy of their using the Gallup name, I was impressed with the level of technical detail provided about the survey, which included weighting information. I wish many polling firms in this country would be as openly informative about their published surveys.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Howard Schuman wrote:
> 
> The fullest account of the October 11-12 Pakistan Poll seems to be at:
> 
> The site clearly states that the poll covered only urban areas, though
> these were in all major areas of the country. The account, though lacking
> information it would certainly be useful to have, is not inferior to many
> reports of commercial polls in the U.S. The organization seems to be
> primarily a marketing group, with training claimed at U.S. universities.
> I have emailed the organization for more details.    Howard
This is from the Newsweek release I sent earlier. The poll was apparently intended for Newsweek International.

"Commissioned by Newsweek, Gallup Pakistan, an affiliate of Gallup International, surveyed 978 adults across the country on October 11-12. The results have a margin of error of plus or minus 3-4 percentage points." http://www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=104&STORY=/www/story/10-14-2001/0001591361&EDATE=

Given Frank's comments below, shouldn't Newsweek inform or caution readers that Gallup International is not affiliated with the Gallup Organization (this, of course, assumes that Newsweek *is* affiliated with Newsweek International). Moreover, why is Newsweek even doing business with a company which, according to Frank, "use[s] the Gallup name in an unauthorized manner"? And why should they be given any credibility if, for starters, they deceive us about who they are?

Nick
> advised that this is the work of one of the "Gallup International" polling
> companies, and that company has chosen to release it with the Gallup name
> instead of its own. We are sending a news release to media outlets
> worldwide
> (translated into eight regional languages) alerting them to this fact, along
> with our concerns about the reliability of this poll. A copy of the release
> is included below.
> > Frank Newport
> > Editor in Chief
> > The Gallup Poll
> > Princeton
> > -- NEWS ADVISORY -- TO NATIONAL EDITOR:
> > The Gallup Organization Urges Caution in Reporting of Pakistan Poll
> > In scanning the news wires during this time of conflict, you may see stories
> from various countries reporting the results of "Gallup Polls." While The
> Gallup Organization (based in Princeton, New Jersey) has a direct presence
> in more than two dozen countries around the world, there are some polling
> companies that use the Gallup name in an unauthorized manner, and which have
> no connection whatsoever to The Gallup Organization. Similarly, the
> attribution that polls have been conducted by "members" of Gallup
> International should not be taken to connote any connection to The Gallup
> Organization or the Gallup Poll. "Gallup International" is in no way
> connected with The Gallup Organization.
> > More specifically, Gallup has been receiving numerous inquiries regarding a
> poll conducted by an entity which calls itself "Gallup Pakistan." While
> trademark and trade name issues are a matter for local authorities to
> adjudicate, The Gallup Organization wants to inform news organizations
> worldwide that this company is in no way connected with us, and has
> absolutely no authorization from us to use the Gallup name.
> > Gallup analysts have a number of concerns regarding the Pakistan poll which
> include -- but are not limited to -- technical issues. Our understanding is
> that its findings do not apply to Pakistan as such -- but rather, to nine
> urban areas which collectively account for just 16.7% of that country's
> population. Furthermore, none of the country's predominantly rural
> population receives any representation whatsoever in the poll's sampling
> frame.
> > In short, the poll leaves out the views of at least 83% of the country's
> citizenry. The Gallup Organization regrets that the survey's use of the
> Gallup name may imply a level of credibility which would not otherwise be
> merited. Upon our review, we have grave concerns about its reliability.
> > If you have any questions about the origins or methodology of a poll
> purporting to be a "Gallup Poll," please feel free to contact any of the
executives of The Gallup Organization listed below. A complete global list
of The Gallup Organization’s offices and authorized subsidiaries is

CONTACT: Richard Burkholder, +1-609-924-9600, Steve O’Brien,
+1-202-715-3030, or Frank Newport, +1-609-924-9600, all of The Gallup
Organization.

SOURCE The Gallup Organization

- Web site: http://www.gallup.com /

From PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU Wed Oct 17 08:37:42 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9HFbfe14230 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001
08:37:41 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from oregon.uoregon.edu (oregon.uoregon.edu [128.223.32.18])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA07749 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 08:37:42 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from OREGON.UOREGON.EDU by OREGON.UOREGON.EDU (PMDF V6.0-025
#47272)
   id <01K9LNQ25RTQ8WXCAQ@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU> for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed,
17 Oct 2001 08:37:28 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Wed, 17 Oct 2001 08:37:28 -0700 (PDT)
From: Patricia Gwartney <PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: Follow-up on delaying a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01K9LNQ25SR48WXCAQ@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
X-VMS-To: IN%"aapornet@usc.edu"
X-VMS-Cc: PATTYGG
MIME-version: 1.0

Dear AAPORnetters,

Thank you for your swift and thoughtful replies to my inquiry about delaying
OSRL's long-planned n=2,500 mail-out this week, due to the current anthrax
mail scares. I received 14 replies within one hour. AAPOR's professional
collegiality is incredible.

The consensus in the replies supported my hunch - that official UO stationary
should suffice in allaying fears. (Jim B. - UO does not have its own postage
meter imprint; we are using pretty stamps, affixed by hand.)

Our mail-out is delayed a few days by a last-minute human subjects snafu,
and we are using this time to consider implementing a couple of experiments:
1) mailing a random subgroup an pre-notification postcard (thank you Jim
Ellis), and 2) conducting short follow-up telephone calls to both compliant
and non-compliant respondents about their anthrax concerns, to ascertain
whether the nonrespondents' concerns exceeded respondents'.

An unexpected twist may interest some of you. OSRL is enclosing an
incentive with each precontact letter: a crisp $2 bill to n=2,000 and a free Forest Service day pass to n=500. Did you realize that crisp, new bills have a little powder of some kind on them to keep them from sticking together? Tonight, several thousand dollars of $2 bills will go through my home washer and/or dryer to remove the powder, to prevent it from potentially adding to respondents' anthrax fears.

To other AAPORnetters implementing mail surveys at this time: Please contact me about the possibility of putting together a panel for the next annual meeting, about the effects of random historical events, like the anthrax mail scare, on survey response.

Thank you again,
Patty

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
1291 University of Oregon 5245 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 USA Eugene OR 97403-5245 USA

E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
Telephone: (541) 346-5007
Facsimile: (541) 346-5026

Patricia,
I really wouldn't wash and dry those new bills, as the "used" look may not work to your advantage at all, based on some of our own experiences! PJL

-----Original Message-----
From: Patricia Gwartney [mailto:PATTYGG@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU]
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2001 11:37 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Follow-up on delaying a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare

Dear AAPORnetters,

Thank you for your swift and thoughtful replies to my inquiry about delaying OSRL's long-planned n=2,500 mail-out this week, due to the current anthrax mail scares. I received 14 replies within one hour. AAPOR's professional collegiality is incredible.

The consensus in the replies supported my hunch - that official UO stationary should suffice in allaying fears. (Jim B. - UO does not have its own postage meter imprint; we are using pretty stamps, affixed by hand.)

Our mail-out is delayed a few days by a last-minute human subjects snafu, and we are using this time to consider implementing a couple of experiments:

1) mailing a random subgroup an pre-notification postcard (thank you Jim Ellis), and 2) conducting short follow-up telephone calls to both compliant and non-compliant respondents about their anthrax concerns, to ascertain whether the nonrespondents' concerns exceeded respondents'.

An unexpected twist may interest some of you. OSRL is enclosing an incentive with each precontact letter: a crisp $2 bill to n=2,000 and a free Forest Service day pass to n=500. Did you realize that crisp, new bills have a little powder of some kind on them to keep them from sticking together? Tonight, several thousand dollars of $2 bills will go through my home washer and/or dryer to remove the powder, to prevent it from potentially adding to respondents' anthrax fears.

To other AAPORnetters implementing mail surveys at this time: Please contact me about the possibility of putting together a panel for the next annual meeting, about the effects of random historical events, like the anthrax mail scare, on survey response.

Thank you again,
Patty

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor                            Founding Director
Department of Sociology              Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
1291 University of Oregon            5245 University of Oregon
Eugene OR  97403-1291 USA            Eugene OR  97403-5245 USA
This might be too last a response to be helpful, but consider NOT using an envelope and stapling the folded survey shut. This should overcome any fear about what might be inside. Properly printed, it could look almost as official as a letter. You'd need to reformat for the reply, as well. We've gone this route with an upcoming survey. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
You'd need to reformat for the reply, as well. We've gone this route with an upcoming survey. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com


> The consensus in the replies supported my hunch - that official UO stationary
> should suffice in allaying fears. (Jim B. - UO does not have its own postage meter imprint; we are using pretty stamps, affixed by hand.)

As we leave the years AD for the years AA (after anthrax), it might be worth remembering that even terrorists can buy pretty postage stamps. I think personal postage meters might soon become a necessity of life, as the only way to get others to open the mail we send. And if that should happen, I can see legislation passed to make it a serious crime to postage-meter (new verb) under the guise of another's name or trademark (what AAPOR members might call "PMUGAIing," for "postage-metering under the guise of another's identity.") Remember that you heard it first here on AAPORNET...

-- Jim
Patty have you seen the paper presented in 98 at AAPOR entitled "The Effect of Prepaid Monetary Incentives on Mail Survey Response Rates and Response Quality." They suggest that sending two $1 bills rather than a $2 bill (wad effect) resulted in a higher response rate with no statistical significance differences for the "wad" effect.

Toni Genalo
Director of Data Collection
Prevention Research Center
Arizona State University
PO Box 876005
Tempe, AZ 85287-6005
480-727-6142 480-727-6282 (FAX)
Dear AAPORnetters,

Thank you for your swift and thoughtful replies to my inquiry about delaying OSRL's long-planned n=2,500 mail-out this week, due to the current anthrax mail scares. I received 14 replies within one hour. AAPOR's professional collegiality is incredible.

The consensus in the replies supported my hunch - that official UO stationary should suffice in allaying fears. (Jim B. - UO does not have its own postage meter imprint; we are using pretty stamps, affixed by hand.)

Our mail-out is delayed a few days by a last-minute human subjects snafu, and we are using this time to consider implementing a couple of experiments:

1) mailing a random subgroup an pre-notification postcard (thank you Jim Ellis), and 2) conducting short follow-up telephone calls to both compliant and non-compliant respondents about their anthrax concerns, to ascertain whether the nonrespondents' concerns exceeded respondents'.

An unexpected twist may interest some of you. OSRL is enclosing an incentive with each precontact letter: a crisp $2 bill to n=2,000 and a free Forest Service day pass to n=500. Did you realize that crisp, new bills have a little powder of some kind on them to keep them from sticking together? Tonight, several thousand dollars of $2 bills will go through my home washer and/or dryer to remove the powder, to prevent it from potentially adding to respondents' anthrax fears.

To other AAPORnetters implementing mail surveys at this time: Please contact me about the possibility of putting together a panel for the next annual meeting, about the effects of random historical events, like the anthrax mail scare, on survey response.

Thank you again,
Patty

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor                            Founding Director
Department of Sociology              Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
1291 University of Oregon            5245 University of Oregon
Eugene OR  97403-1291 USA            Eugene OR  97403-5245 USA
E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu  http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
Telephone: (541) 346-5007
Facsimile: (541) 346-5026

Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2001 8:37 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Follow-up on delaying a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare
RE: Follow-up on delaying a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare

Patty have you seen the paper presented in 98 at AAPOR entitled "The Effect of Prepaid Monetary Incentives on Mail Survey Response Rates and Response Quality." They suggest that sending two $1 bills rather than a $2 bill (wad effect) resulted in a higher response rate with no statistical significance differences for the wad effect.

Toni Genalo
Director of Data Collection
Prevention Research Center
Arizona State University
PO Box 876005
Tempe, AZ 85287-6005
480-727-6142 480-727-6282 (FAX)

Dear AAPORnetters,

Thank you for your swift and thoughtful replies to my inquiry about delaying OSRL's long-planned n=2,500 mail-out this week, due to the current anthrax mail scares. I received 14 replies within one hour. AAPOR's professional collegiality is incredible.
The consensus in the replies supported my hunch—that official UO stationary should suffice in allaying fears. (Jim B. - UO does not have its own postage)

Our mail-out is delayed a few days by a last-minute human subjects snafu, and we are using this time to consider implementing a couple of experiments: 1) mailing a random subgroup an pre-notification postcard (thank you Jim), and 2) conducting short follow-up telephone calls to both compliant and non-compliant respondents about their anthrax concerns, to ascertain whether the nonrespondents' concerns exceeded respondents'.

An unexpected twist may interest some of you. OSRL is enclosing an incentive with each precontact letter: a crisp $2 bill to n=3,200 and a free Forest Service day pass to n=3,500. Did you realize that crisp, new bills have a little powder of some kind on them to keep them from sticking together? Tonight, several thousand dollars of $2 bills will go through my home washer and/or dryer to remove the powder, to prevent it from potentially adding to respondents' anthrax fears.

To other AAPORnetters implementing mail surveys at this time: Please contact me about the possibility of putting together a panel for the next annual meeting, about the effects of random historical events, like the anthrax mail scare, on survey response.

Thank you again,
Ph.D. &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;  
<br/>

Professor &nbsp;&n

--Boundary (ID_BN3Sq1TRZgL1wJZHU0H1w)--

From bzolling@fhsu.edu Wed Oct 17 10:02:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9HH2we21912 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001
10:02:58 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from tiger.fhsu.edu (tiger.fhsu.edu [164.113.60.1])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA26292 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 10:02:56 -0700 (PDT)
From: bzolling@fhsu.edu
Subject: Re: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?
To: aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.5 September 22, 2000
Message-ID: <OFC8B5E475.1616960C-ON86256AE8.005B1C05@fhsu.edu>
Date: Wed, 17 Oct 2001 12:02:30 -0500
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on NotesHub/FHSU(Release 5.0.8 |June 18, 2001) at
10/17/2001 12:02:45 PM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Just a footnote on stapling...

I would not recommend stapling the survey shut. As a procedure for returning survey booklets via the mail, we use business reply postage on the back of survey booklets and ask respondents to TAPE the booklet shut. We have given respondents the option to TAPE or STAPLE shut in the past, and our university post office let us know quickly that the Postal Service does not appreciate the sharp edges of a staple.

The tape seems to work well.

> From JAnnSelzer@aol.com Wed Oct 17 11:07:42 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9HI7ee05127 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001
11:07:40 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from imo-d08.mx.aol.com (imo-d08.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.40])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id LAA10463 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 11:07:38 -0700
   (PDT)
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Received: from JAnnSelzer@aol.com
   by imo-d08.mx.aol.com (mail_out v31_r1.8.) id 5.79.1cab4cbb (25308)
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 14:06:06 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <79.1cab4cbb.28ff228d@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 17 Oct 2001 14:06:05 EDT
Subject: Re: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="part1_79.1cab4cbb.28ff228d_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10535

--part1_79.1cab4cbb.28ff228d_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 10/17/01 12:12:43 PM Central Daylight Time,
bzolling@fhsu.edu writes:

> the Postal Service
> does not appreciate the sharp edges of a staple.
> 
Actually, we're using stickers to fasten the survey shut. The problem is there is no verb form of the word "sticker," as their is "staple," so you can see I was in a rush to help a colleague and should have reworded. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
In a message dated 10/17/01 12:12:43 PM Central Daylight Time, bzolling@fhsu.edu writes:

quote style="BORDER-LEFT: #0000ff 2px solid; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px;
MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px">the Postal Service does not appreciate the sharp edges of a staple.
end quote

Actually, we're using stickers to fasten the survey shut. The problem is there is no verb form of the word "sticker," as their is "staple," so you can see I was in a rush to help a colleague and should have reworded. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JAelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

---

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Wed Oct 17 11:32:31 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id f9HIWUe16147 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 11:32:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from imo-d06.mx.aol.com (imo-d06.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.38])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id LAA11855 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 11:32:16 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Wed, 17 Oct 2001 14:31:00 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: RE: disposition restricted residences
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: <miltgold@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Unknown (No Version)
In urban cities this is a serious issue, and has been dealt with years ago by Juarez Associates, in their comparisons of resident availability in various urban cities.

I suggest that it also be useful to report any additional information in the methodology section of the report about the multiple housing unit buildings that could not be reached, such as the likelihood of their having small children, relevant if the survey content related to residents having children living with them. (For example, if senior citizen residences comprised all or part of these restricted dwellings.) In the case I'm offering, such families--even if contacted---might have been screened out by some filter questions beginning particular questionnaire sections. Thus, they still could be considered in the sampling frame.

This is not a refusal, as some have suggested; some might not have refused if given the chance to respond. This is an inaccessible, almost like a permanent "not at home" in a sense.

Also, is there some knowledge of how individual housing units are there in each multiple unit building, which could provide some input into nonresponse/inaccessible weighting factors?

Finally, as I responded privately, no one seems to have mentioned something our Latino consulting firm did some years ago: refusal conversion techniques with such units' overall board of directors, owners, managers, superintendants or other gatekeepers. We made presentations with handouts to those that could permit our interviewers access to residents. We even offered them feedback at an individual census tract level to those gatekeepers for community block grant and other urban planning purposes. However, basically we reassured them that our purposes were valid and we would not disturb the residents' life style more than we had to. To some extent we succeeded in winning over these gatekeepers, and with the signed letters of ID our interviewers had, we were allowed to directly contact residents, but granted not always. Is this too costly or too late an approach to try and preserve the original sample, or in other ways "qualify" the findings? Does the "value" or put anoth!
Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice (and former member of the Questionnaire Design Section of
miltgold@aol.com

>From jankiley@soltec.net Wed Oct 17 13:08:41 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9HKe9ee00848 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001
13:08:40 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from femail41.sdc1.sfba.home.com (femail41.sdc1.sfba.home.com
[24.254.60.35])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id NAA20890 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 13:08:39 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from c1566320c ([65.6.40.113]) by femail41.sdc1.sfba.home.com
   (InterMail vM.4.01.03.20 201-229-121-120-20010223) with SMTP
   id <200111017200816.PHGK5211.femail41.sdc1.sfba.home.com@c1566320c>
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 13:08:16 -0700
Reply-To: <jankiley@soltec.net>
From: "Jan Kiley" <jankiley@soltec.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Errors and omissions insurance
Message-ID: <NEBBLCDDGKEDOKAPKABNGEMMCJAA.jankiley@soltec.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 (9.0.2910.0)
In-Reply-To: <0109059997.AA999716270@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4522.1200

We have been asked by a client to provide evidence of our having errors and
omissions insurance. Any suggestions or help will be appreciated.

Jan Kiley, President, Research Survey Service, Inc., Tel. 217-239-7880, Fax
217-239-7875, researchsurveyservice.com
Dear AAPORNET Members,

Our research center is involved in several projects that necessitate the use of CAPI instruments on laptop computers. The data are highly confidential (e.g., respondent names, addresses, social security numbers, possible child abuse, etc.).

I'd appreciate any advice you could share about possible methods of protecting data, in the event a laptop is lost or stolen. The data cannot be scrambled in conjunction with our CAPI software, and although we plan to use passwords, we're concerned that they could be circumvented by someone who's knowledgeable.

Thank you very much for any assistance.

Linda Hawkins
Senior Information Processing Consultant     EMAIL: lhawkins@uwm.edu
Institute for Survey and Policy Research     PHONE: 414-229-4199
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee            FAX:   414-229-2579
AAPORNNetters,

I'm in the process of evaluating / stocking my modest survey library and was looking for input on the must have textbooks, handbooks, or otherwise just good books on survey research. I seem to recall a similar discussion taking place on AAPORNNet awhile ago, but my initial searches of the archives did not result in a coherent thread.

And for those more in the marketing research arena, I would be especially interested to hear your recommendations regarding the must-have books. My library is even more modest in this area and so I would appreciate some direction about where to look for discussions of the foundational concepts and measures as well as the latest techniques.

I realize this is a busy time for many of us, so share if you can, and if not, continue on guilt free. As Patty has already pointed out, in a pinch AAPORNNetters always come through.

It's probably best to reply off-list, but I will be happy to summarize at a later date so as to add officially to the archive.

Best Wishes,

John
First of all, I would require that all information be uploaded to a secure desktop computer or secure server every night after field work is completed. Furthermore, any files uploaded should be wiped, rather than deleted, from each laptop nightly. Next, I would look into purchasing a relatively inexpensive product called PC Access or PC Immobilizer, which requires an authorized chip card to be inserted into a computer and a corresponding PIN must be entered into a combination lock before the laptop can even be started.

Hope this helps.

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias
Grizzard Agency
229 Peachtree Street - 12th Floor
Atlanta, GA  30303

-----Original Message-----
From: Linda L Hawkins [mailto:lhawkins@csd.uwm.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2001 4:22 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Laptop Data Protection

Dear AAPORNET Members,

Our research center is involved in several projects that necessitate the use of CAPI instruments on laptop computers. The data are highly confidential (e.g., respondent names, addresses, social security numbers, possible child abuse, etc.).

I'd appreciate any advice you could share about possible methods of protecting data, in the event a laptop is lost or stolen. The data cannot be scrambled in conjunction with our CAPI software, and although we plan to use passwords, we're concerned that they could be circumvented by someone who's knowledgeable.
Here is something to start with...

INTRODUCTORY SURVEY RESEARCH TEXTS

The following texts were recommended by nine members of AAPORNET, the on-line Internet discussion group of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). Results compiled by Mark Richards, August 17-19, 1999.

Question: Dear Professors: Thinking of available (text) books on survey research, which one or two would you recommend to someone (a client) who would like to understand the survey research process and methods without becoming an expert in any one aspect? Key features sought: Accurate information, excellent for self study, very good information on telephone survey research, concise, easy to read, limited technical jargon, includes
some simple standard tables with info on how to read (sampling error) and
bibliography for follow-up in specific areas.

* Priscilla Salant & Don A. Dillman (Contributor), How to Conduct Your Own
  Survey, John Wiley & Sons.

* Paul J. Lavrakas. Telephone Survey Methods: Sampling, Selection, and
  Supervision (Applied Social Research Methods, Vol 7) 2nd edition Vol 007,

* Don A. Dillman, Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method, John
  Wiley & Sons, April 1978.

* Floyd J. Fowler. Survey Research Methods (Applied Social Research Methods

* James H. Frey, Survey Research by Telephone (Sage Library of Social

* Herbert Asher. Polling and the Public: What Every Citizen Should Know 4th

* Herbert F. Weisberg, Jon A. Krosnick and Bruce D. Bowen, An Introduction
  to Survey Research, Polling, and Data Analysis 3rd edition, Sage


* Thomas E. Mann (Editor), Gary R. Orren (Editor), Media Polls in American

* Ronald Czaja, Johnny Blair: Designing Surveys: A Guide to Decisions and
  Procedures (The Pine Forge Press Series in Research Methods and Statistics),

* Introduction to Survey Sampling, Sage Publications; October 1983.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
John Fries
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2001 4:37 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Survey Research Staples....

AAPORNetters,

I'm in the process of evaluating / stocking my modest survey library and was
looking for input on the must have textbooks, handbooks, or otherwise just
good
books on survey research. I seem to recall a similar discussion taking
place on
AAPORNet awhile ago, but my initial searches of the archives did not result
in a
coherent thread.
And for those more in the marketing research arena, I would be especially interested to hear your recommendations regarding the must-have books. My library is even more modest in this area and so I would appreciate some direction about where to look for discussions of the foundational concepts and measures as well as the latest techniques.

I realize this is a busy time for many of us, so share if you can, and if not, continue on guilt free. As Patty has already pointed out, in a pinch AAPORNetters always come through.

It's probably best to reply off-list, but I will be happy to summarize at a later date so as to add officially to the archive.

Best Wishes,

John

First (if you have not already) check that they did not intend to ask you about business liability insurance, which many government agencies and NGOs
are required to require of their vendors. Your insurer may then have to produce a letter to that effect, possibly stating that you have $X amount of coverage.

Whenever I have asked insurance brokers about E&O insurance for the commercial market research industry they said that no industry-specific underwriting had been done so the best they could do was place you in some NEC category where the rates were extremely high. The best places to check would probably be groups like the American Marketing Assn. or maybe CASRO.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Jan Kiley <jankiley@soltec.net>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Wednesday, October 17, 2001 4:09 PM
Subject: Errors and omissions insurance

> 
> We have been asked by a client to provide evidence of our having errors and omissions insurance. Any suggestions or help will be appreciated.
> 
> Jan Kiley, President, Research Survey Service, Inc., Tel. 217-239-7880, Fax 217-239-7875, researchsurveyservice.com
>
>
> From JAnnSelzer@aol.com Wed Oct 17 21:01:43 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9141ge20091 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001
21:01:43 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from imo-m03.mx.aol.com (imo-m03.mx.aol.com [64.12.136.6])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTIP
  id VAA22306 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 21:01:44 -0700 (PDT)
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Received: from JAnnSelzer@aol.com
  by imo-m03.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.8.) id 5.33.1c8c3ba5 (4329)
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Oct 2001 00:00:55 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <33.1c8c3ba5.28ffadf7@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 18 Oct 2001 00:00:55 EDT
Subject: Re: Errors and omissions insurance
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="part1_33.1c8c3ba5.28ffadf7_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10535

--part1_33.1c8c3ba5.28ffadf7_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
This is the kind of thing that is common in government contracts, along with absurdly high liability limits. I've asked several lawyers to concoct a scenario where my client would be liable for any sort of liability damages associated with a public opinion research project and they've failed to come up with anything approaching plausibility. In terms of errors and omissions, again, it's so remotely implausible that anyone could ever file a claim on this sort of insurance that it's galling when a client's contract requires it. We typically doublecheck that this requirement applies to the research we will be conducting and if there is a process for having the requirement waived. If we can't get it waived, we mention in the RFP that we will show evidence of this insurance upon notification that we have been granted the contract. This year, we actually had to get the insurance. Everyone admits it's ridiculous (even my insurance agent), but some contracts are immutable on this point. Good luck.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
get
the insurance. !

Everyone admits it's ridiculous (even my insurance agent), but some contracts are immutable on this point. &nbsp;Good luck.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer &amp; Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com</HTML>

--part1_33.1c8c3ba5.28ffadf7_boundary--

We just completed a municipal services survey for a city government. We have conducted an identical survey for this city for the past six or seven years. The field dates were roughly the first two weeks in October.

For this entire period, the evaluations have been remarkably stable. This year, a first pass examination of the data reveal moderate but consistent (and significant) increases in performance ratings on nearly all measures. While I am sure our clients would love to believe that they are suddenly doing a much better job, I am skeptical.
We have seen, I think I recall, an increase in public confidence measures for major governmental institutions since Sept 11th. I wonder if this has trickled down to state and local government evaluations as well?

My theory is that in the wake of Sept 11th, government-bashing at all levels has fallen out of favor. No "let the private sector do it" rhetoric, as we watched a largely governmental (state, federal and local) response to tragedy. And, we have been reminded of the bonds that unite us.

There may be a global generosity of spirit that would color evaluations of local government services (and perhaps of other organizations as well).

But, this is just speculation. If others have observed similar results, it would support the "generosity of spirit" hypotheses, at least generalized to government agencies. Have other aaporneters conducted governmental service evaluation studies after Sept 11 for which you have several years of comparable tracking data? If so, has there been a conspicuous increase in evaluations this year?

Michael O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

--From mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu Wed Oct 17 21:15:33 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9I4FWe21592 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001
21:15:32 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from scaup.mail.pas.earthlink.net (scaup.mail.pas.earthlink.net
   [207.217.121.49])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id VAA01684 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 21:15:33 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: from home (cpe-24-221-59-115.az.sprintbbd.net [24.221.59.115])
   by scaup.mail.pas.earthlink.net (EL-8_9_3_3/8.9.3) with SMTP id
   VAA00657
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 17 Oct 2001 21:15:21 -0700 (PDT)
Reply-To: <mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>
From: "Michael O'Neil" <mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>
To: "Aapornet@Usc.Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?
Message-ID: <NEBBKEFNCLONIIEECEAPIEIJCJAA.mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="----=_NextPart_000_002B_01C15751.BCFDC640"
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 V5.00.2615.200

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

----=_NextPart_000_002B_01C15751.BCFDC640
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
The Post Office does not require EITHER tape OR staple. A tri-folded paper without any form of sealing is fine. Getting respondents to understand, however, is another matter. We once sent out such a survey with instructions "Do not staple or tape". Many came back glued.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

Actually, we're using stickers to fasten the survey shut. The problem is there is no verb form of the word "sticker," as their is "staple," so you can see I was in a rush to help a colleague and should have reworded. JAS
Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]
On Behalf Of JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2001 11:06 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: delay a mail-out survey due to anthrax scare?

In a message dated 10/17/01 12:12:43 PM Central Daylight Time, bzolling@fhsu.edu writes:

> the Postal Service does not appreciate the sharp edges of a staple. 
> The problem is there is no verb form of the word "sticker," as their is "staple," so you can see I was in a rush to help a colleague and should have reworded. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

-----=_NextPart_000_002B_01C15751.BCFDC640--
ANTHRAX MAY CHANGE US MAIL DELIVERY

By RON KAMPEAS, Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) - Greeting cards may lose their envelopes and become glorified - and powder-proof - postcards. Your e-mail file may grow. Hackers once made online billing a hard sell; terrorists are making it popular.

It's too early to say for sure how the anthrax scare will affect how we get stuff from one person or business to another, but delivery professionals predict that alternatives to enveloped mail will benefit.

The post office is clearly worried about anthrax-infected letters that have been discovered in New York and Washington. Also, an anthrax-tainted letter is suspected of fatally infecting a Florida man; and envelopes containing suspicious powders - mostly hoaxes - have been reported by nervous citizens nationwide.

``If people just use prudent judgment, use common sense, there is nothing to fear,'' Postmaster General Jack Potter said Wednesday on NBC's ``Today.''

The mail is safe.''

In Washington, all mail delivery has been suspended in the Capitol complex while authorities install new security procedures, and lawmakers have warned constituents not to expect answers to mailed requests anytime soon.

With Christmas around the corner, Hallmark was not counting out reintroducing the staple that got founder Joyce Hall started in 1910 - postcards.

``If one of the terrorists' major aims is to scare a population, they've done that,'' spokeswoman Rachel Bolton said. ``It may be like never before.''

One-third of card sales are for the hand-delivered variety, Bolton said, so enveloped greeting cards will survive. In fact, sales of sympathy and
Care cards have spiked 10 percent to 14 percent since the Sept. 11 terror attacks.

In the wake of the anthrax scare, Bolton said Hallmark would be "more vocal" about reminding people of existing U.S. Postal Service guidelines: use complete return addresses with name, address, city, state and zip.

"Use your own handwriting, and include your name and return address," she said.

Post office sales figures are steady for now, probably because the terrorists' apparent focus on media, big business and government has left many Americans unconcerned.

"It doesn't seem like the kind of thing that'll end up in my mailbox," said Tiffani Belk, a Washington meeting planner. "I'm just an everyday person."

Still, analysts predicted that would change if the letters keep arriving.

David Farber, a former Federal Communications Commission chief technologist, said he predicted a spike in online billing, which is already biting into the U.S. Postal Service's revenues.

"It's likely people are going to bias away from using paper, especially envelopes, at least for a while," he said.

Judy Wicks, a vice president at Atlanta-based CheckFree, the online biller for Macy's and AT&T, said the anthrax scare prompted a rush of anxious inquiries in recent days—a marked change from the earlier skepticism about Internet security.

"Before, the questions were about encryption and security," she said. "Now, folks are asking what bills they can pay online."

A broader shift to e-mail has yet to result, America Online spokesman Nicholas Graham said. Numbers were up, but "this has always been a very strong time of year for us" because of back-to-school traffic.

The Arizona Daily Star said Tuesday that from now on, it will only accept e-mailed or faxed letters to the editor, but most other newspapers are not going that far, instead introducing plastic gloves in the mailroom.

If trends do change, the post office would launch appeals to Americans' "emotional commitment to mail," said Anita Bizzotto, the top post office marketing executive.

In any case, she said, 75 percent of the post office's dealings are with large businesses that have shown no interest in going elsewhere.

That could change, Farber predicted.

"E-mail advertising will go way up, because of people's reluctance to open envelopes not addressed to them," he said. "That kills mail advertising."
Not quite, said John Schulte, the chairman of Minneapolis-based National Mail Order Association. There's no substitute for a pitch in the hand.

``Direct mailers will start using clear, identifiable return addresses ... backing it up with telemarketing campaigns or infomercials saying 'Watch for this in the mail.'''

There are already signs that another direct marketing staple - the unsolicited product sample - could be rolled back.

On Tuesday, authorities in Minnesota and Louisiana reported nervous calls prompted by mailed white powder - a 1 1/2 pound package of detergent - sent as a bonus to customers who placed an order with Publishers Clearinghouse.

In Knoxville, Tenn., postal inspector Larry Dodson expressed concern about a nationwide LifeSavers contest asking participants to mail in a piece of candy.

``If it gets crushed, guess what it becomes,'' he said.

-------

Associated Press writers John Curran in Atlantic City, N.J., and Danny Freedman in Washington contributed to this report.


Copyright (C) 2001 Yahoo! Inc., and Powerful Media Inc.

******

>From parmelee@ropercenter.uconn.edu Thu Oct 18 06:32:18 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9IDWIEel7979 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Oct 2001
06:32:18 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from ropercenter.uconn.edu (mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu
[137.99.36.157])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA09242 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Oct 2001 06:32:18 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from lisa-nt ([137.99.84.10])
   by ropercenter.uconn.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3) with SMTP id JAA06102
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 18 Oct 2001 09:28:34 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.20011018093717.012fb460@mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu>
X-Sender: parmelee@mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Thu, 18 Oct 2001 09:37:17 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Lisa Ferraro Parmelee <parmelee@ropercenter.uconn.edu>
Subject: Public Perspective seeking articles
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Dear AAPORnet members --

Public Perspective, the only magazine dedicated to public opinion and polling, invites the submission of articles on topics relating to public opinion, the polling community, and the theory and practice of public opinion research.

Our article submission guidelines have just been posted on the Roper Center's website. You can see them by going to

http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pp_curr.html

and clicking on "Submit an Article" at the bottom of the page.

We are presently looking not only for articles relating to public opinion and polling in the wake of September 11, but also pieces on any of the many other topics of interest to the polling community and our general readers.

If you have article that fits our specifications already on hand or would like to propose one, please contact me directly at my email address or by way of the link to our editorial offices that appears in the guidelines.

I look forward to hearing from you!

-- Lisa Parmelee

Lisa Ferraro Parmelee, Ph.D.
Editor, Public Perspective
Senior Research Analyst, The Roper Center
341 Mansfield Road, Unit 1164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164
(860) 486-4440
Hi Kiyomi:

I will be there on Monday, I do need your phone number at work so that if I do get lost, I can call and find out where you are.

I hope that you might be able to work on a health care related study in the future.

Thanks for your interest.

I need to talk with you about the survey you want to conduct among the head start people. I do have a tentative set of questions, but I feel it is better if we talk about what you need as responses from the participants and the non participants.

jon

JAnnSelzer@aol.com wrote:

> This is the kind of thing that is common in government contracts, along with absurdly high liability limits. I've asked several lawyers to concoct a scenario where my client would be liable for any sort of liability damages associated with a public opinion research project and they've failed to come up with anything approaching plausibility. In terms of errors and omissions, again, it's so remotely implausible that anyone could ever file a claim on this sort of insurance that it's galling when a client's contract requires it. We typically doublecheck that this requirement applies to the research we will be conducting and if there is a process for having the requirement waived. If we can't get it waived, we mention in the RFP that we will show evidence of this insurance upon notification that we have been granted the contract. This year, we actually had to go get the insurance!

> !! Everyone admits it's ridiculous (even my insurance agent), but some contracts are immutable on this point. Good luck.

> JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
Hi Kiyomi:

I will be there on Monday, I do need your phone number at work so that if I do get lost, I can call and find out where you are.

I hope that you might be able to work on a health care related study in the future.

Thanks for your interest.

I need to talk with you about the survey you want to conduct among the head start people. I do have a tentative set of questions, but I feel it is better if we talk about what you need as responses from the participants and the non participants.

jon

JAnnSelzer@aol.com wrote:

This is the kind of thing that is common in government contracts, along with absurdly high liability limits. I've asked several lawyers to concoct a scenario where my client would be liable for any sort of liability damages associated with a public opinion research project and they've failed to come up with anything approaching plausibility. In terms of errors and omissions, again, it's so remotely implausible that anyone could ever file a claim on this sort of insurance that it's galling when a client's contract requires it. We typically doublecheck that this requirement applies to the research we will be conducting and if there is a process for having the requirement waived. If we can't get it waived, we mention in the RFP that we will show evidence of this insurance upon notification that we have been granted the contract. This year, we actually had to go get the insurance! Everyone admits it's ridiculous (even my insurance agent), but some contracts are immutable on this point. Good luck.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.

Selzer & Company, Inc.

Des Moines

JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com

Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
OOOPS

My apologies for the accidental note I sent out to you all. I guess I was thinking of other things.

Sorry about that.

Jon Ebeling
Can anyone tell me if their is a standard survey introduction that asks for the female head of household? We wanted to stay away from this phrase and thought about asking for the female that makes or shares in the decisions of the household. The client is concerned that we will exclude women who feel they are not the head of household or do not make the decisions.

Thanks in advance,
Terrie

I meant to comment earlier on Jim's lament. It is important to note that attempts to improve survey measurements of race do not necessarily rely upon an understanding of race as an
"objective" construct. Indeed, the government standards for collecting race explicitly define race in terms of self-identification, not "objective" characteristics. If you recall your Census 2000 questionnaire (and who can forget it??) it asked, "What is this person's race? Mark one or more races to indicate what this person considers himself/herself to be." Thus, in the census, your race is what you (or a household proxy reporting for you) report it to be. There is no "right" answer. The Office of Management and Budget standards for collecting data on race explicitly state that "The racial and ethnic categories set forth in the standards should not be interpreted as being primarily biological or genetic in reference. Race and ethnicity may be thought of in terms of social and cultural characteristics..."

Race is a social construct. I don't know anybody who has conducted research in this area who does not come to appreciate that measurement of race and related constructs is very complex and presents profound difficulties at many levels.

Betsy Martin
U. S. Census Bureau

James Beniger
<beniger@rcf.usc.edu> To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
cc:
Sent by: Subject: RE: Hispanics by Race
owner-aaporne
t@usc.edu

10/11/2001
12:45 PM

Please
respond to
aapornet
Folks,

I find the epistemology of this ongoing discussion of "Hispanics by Race" absolutely fascinating.

The item construction seems to me analogous to what one might expect, for example, at ETS, in designing its SAT questions to maximize the chances that those who actually know the answers will be able to find one—and only one—appropriate response category.

Of course this general idea does have many good applications in survey research. When it comes to a respondent's own perceived national origin and race, however, a number of you who have posted on AAPORNTER in the past two days seem to be assuming that you know the correct answers already (ETS model) and want to design your items to maximize the chances that your respondents will give you back the answers you expect.

But such assumptions as these raise the questions of race and national origin to a political question: Who is to decide our own origins and race? Are these existential and objective facts, or are we free to decide them for ourselves, or are we forced to have them decided by others, including others whom we do not know, and have not given the authority to do this?

I myself have an open mind on this set of questions. I write here only because, although I find that the science behind all of the postings has been correct (as I would expect from AAPORNETters), I also think that there are much more important questions and issues also at stake here. Because I would like to see these other questions discussed in this same context, I hope to begin that discussion here, with this message.

It's much easier to design a question about integral calculus which has one and only one answer, after all, than it is to give anything nearly as certain an answer about the race or origins of our fellow human beings—people whom we in fact cherish so much precisely for this very diversity (AAPOR serving as an extreme example, I am pleased to say).

I welcome your comments, as always.

-- Jim

*******

> Field experiments as well as qualitative research conducted at the Census Bureau suggest that the perceived redundancy of the race and Hispanic origin questions is reduced when Hispanic origin precedes race in the
> questionnaire. The item nonresponse for Hispanic origin is much lower, and
> Hispanics are less likely to report their race as "Some other race" and
> write in Hispanic--though many still do this even in the reversed order.  
> Item sequencing does not fully solve the problem, but it helps.
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Maybe AAPOR should offer E&O insurance to the industry, probably saving =
 firms a lot through bulk buying. I've been asked for it, too, and there =
 are few suppliers -- so it's pricey. Just a thought.

Marc Zwelling =20
Vector Research + Development Inc.
    Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
    Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991
=20
See what's new at Vector:
    http://www.vectorresearch.com/
This is the kind of thing that is common in government contracts, along with absurdly high liability limits. I've asked several lawyers to concoct a scenario where my client would be liable for any sort of liability damages associated with a public opinion research project and they've failed to come up with anything approaching plausibility. In terms of errors and omissions, again, it's so remotely implausible that anyone could ever file a claim on this sort of insurance that it's galling when a client's contract requires it. We typically doublecheck that this requirement applies to the research we will be conducting and if there is a process for having the requirement waived. If we can't get it waived, we mention in the RFP that we will show evidence of this insurance upon notification that we have been granted the contract. This year, we actually had to go get the insurance. ! ! Everyone admits it's ridiculous (even my insurance agent), but some contracts are immutable on this point. Good luck.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, =
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
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This is the kind of thing that is common in government contracts, along with absurdly high liability limits. I've asked several lawyers to concoct a scenario where my client would be liable for any sort of liability damages associated with a public opinion research project and they've failed to come up with anything approaching plausibility. In terms of errors and omissions, again, it's so remotely implausible that anyone could ever file a claim on this sort of insurance that it's galling when a client's contract requires it. We typically doublecheck that this requirement applies to the research we will be conducting and if there is a process for having the requirement waived. If we can't get it waived, we mention in the RFP that we will show evidence of this insurance upon notification that we have been granted the contract. This year, we actually had to go get the insurance. Everyone admits it's ridiculous (even my insurance agent), but some contracts are immutable on this point. Good luck.
Betsy,

I'm on your side, believe me.

My comments were not on all items concerning race, perhaps 99.9 percent of which I have never seen, let alone read. My comments were rather directed to the messages--posted to our list--which seemed to me (and to several others who followed me with postings) to be proposing more objectified measures of race, in the name of scientific rigor (or positivistic rigor, as it might be seen).

That said, I'm obviously pleased you took the time and trouble to post your message here, which puts no less a cachet than that of the U.S. Census Bureau on what seems to me an unusually enlightened approach to the measurement and study of race via scientific survey research. We can do no more than to hope that such approaches will be widely emulated.

So what took you so long to help me out, here, Betsy?

In any event--seriously--thank you! -- Jim

********

On Thu, 18 Oct 2001 elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov wrote:


I meant to comment earlier on Jim's lament.

It is important to note that attempts to improve survey measurements of race do not necessarily rely upon an understanding of race as an "objective" construct. Indeed, the government standards for collecting race explicitly define race in terms of self-identification, not "objective" characteristics. If you recall your Census 2000 questionnaire (and who can forget it??) it asked, "What is this person's race? Mark one or more races to indicate what this person considers himself/herself to be." Thus, in the census, your race is what you (or a household proxy reporting for you) report it to be. There is no "right" answer. The Office of Management and Budget standards for collecting data on race explicitly state that "The racial and ethnic categories set forth in the standards should not be interpreted as being primarily biological or genetic in reference. Race and ethnicity may be thought of in terms of social and cultural characteristics..."

Race is a social construct. I don't know anybody who has conducted research in this area who does not come to appreciate that measurement of race and related constructs is very complex and presents profound difficulties at many levels.

Betsy Martin
U. S. Census Bureau

James Beniger
<beniger@rcf.ucsb.edu>  To: AAPORNET
<uscnetsn@usc.edu>  cc:
Sent by: Subject: RE: Hispanics by Race
owner-aapornet

t@usc.edu

10/11/2001
12:45 PM
Please respond to
aapornet
Folks,

I find the epistemology of this ongoing discussion of "Hispanics by Race" absolutely fascinating.

The item construction seems to me analogous to what one might expect, for example, at ETS, in designing its SAT questions to maximize the chances that those who actually know the answers will be able to find one--and only one--appropriate response category.

Of course this general idea does have many good applications in survey research. When it comes to a respondent's own perceived national origin and race, however, a number of you who have posted on AAPORNET in the past two days seem to be assuming that you know the correct answers already (ETS model) and want to design your items to maximize the chances that your respondents will give you back the answers you expect.

But such assumptions as these raise the questions of race and national origin to a political question: Who is to decide our own origins and race? Are these existential and objective facts, or are we free to decide them for ourselves, or are we forced to have them decided by others, including others whom we do not know, and have not given the authority to do this?

I myself have an open mind on this set of questions. I write here only because, although I find that the science behind all of the postings has been correct (as I would expect from AAPORNETters), I also think that there are much more important questions and issues also at stake here. Because I would like to see these other questions discussed in this same context, I hope to begin that discussion here, with this message.

It's much easier to design a question about integral calculus which has one and only one answer, after all, than it is to give anything nearly as certain an answer about the race or origins of our fellow human beings--people whom we in fact cherish so much precisely for this very diversity (AAPOR serving as an extreme example, I am pleased to say).

I welcome your comments, as always.

-- Jim
Field experiments as well as qualitative research conducted at the Census Bureau suggest that the perceived redundancy of the race and Hispanic origin questions is reduced when Hispanic origin precedes race in the questionnaire. The item nonresponse for Hispanic origin is much lower, and Hispanics are less likely to report their race as "Some other race" and write in Hispanic—though many still do this even in the reversed order. Item sequencing does not fully solve the problem, but it helps.

---

Census Head Count to Stand
Adjustments Rejected; U.S. Funds at Stake
Census Bureau officials said yesterday that they will not statistically adjust the 2000 Census numbers and instead will go ahead with plans to use the door-to-door head count as the basis for distributing billions of dollars in federal program funds. They said they could not improve on that basic count by adjusting the numbers, as they had hoped, because a quality-check survey they conducted was seriously flawed.

The decision disappointed Democrats, civil rights groups and big-city mayors, who had hoped the adjusted numbers would raise the population total for minorities, who were disproportionately missed in the head count. Republicans, who have questioned whether the adjusted numbers would be more accurate, praised it.

The contentious debate over which set of census numbers is the most reliable has been raging for years because of the high stakes: Democrats believe they benefit from adjusted figures, while Republicans say the figures add "virtual" people to the Democrats' advantage. The issue was fought in a lawsuit that went to the Supreme Court, which ruled that adjusted numbers could not be used to apportion House seats among the states.

Then, in a surprise decision in March, the Census Bureau said that a statistically adjusted count could not be used to redraw other political boundaries within states, from congressional to local school districts. Commerce Secretary Donald L. Evans had the final say in that decision, but he left yesterday's ruling in the hands of the career officials at the bureau.

The latest decision means adjusted figures will not be used to parcel out funds for Medicaid and other social service programs. In addition, government measures of poverty and unemployment, which are now based on adjusted counts, likely will use the basic count in the future.

Acting Census Director William G. Barron Jr. said he and other bureau officials made the decision because, over the summer, they discovered problems with the household survey that they had conducted to double-check the raw census count. That survey, he said, failed to detect that a significant number of people had been counted twice by the census.

Many of them, census officials said, could have been college students, children in joint custody and people with second homes -- all of whom have more than one address during the year.

Because of that shortcoming, Barron told a news conference, the post-census survey results "simply cannot be used in their current form" to adjust the census. The new information, he said, makes it even more clear that it "would have been a terrible mistake" to release adjusted figures for political redistricting.

Furthermore, Barron said it is "unlikely" that it will be practical for the bureau to release adjusted redistricting numbers in the future because the tight deadline set by law does not allow enough time for a proper determination of whether an adjustment would improve data quality. Redistricting counts are due by April 1 after a census year.

"A census is tough enough without the political maelstrom" that surrounds the adjustment issue, he said. "I wish it would just stop."

Political agreement on this issue appears unlikely, however. Shortly after the decision was announced, Rep. Dan Miller (R-Fla.), chairman of the House Government Reform Committee's census panel, issued a statement saying that "it is time to put adjustment, for political
purposes, to rest."
Rep. Carolyn B. Maloney (D-N.Y.), a former ranking member of that
subcommittee, put out a statement saying that the announcement "gave
us more questions than answers" and challenging the bureau's
reasoning. The U.S. Conference of Mayors, some of whose members are
threatening to sue over the decision, said the decision is "unfair and
unwise" and means that "America's cities will get the short end of the
stick."

However, Barron said the discovery that the census erred in counting
more people twice than was previously thought is not entirely bad
news. It means that, at the national level, the double-counts
compensate for those who were missed, yielding a more accurate net
total. Census officials said, however, that this may not be true at
the local level.

The Census Bureau has acknowledged that it missed 1.6 percent of the
population in 1990. According to the new research, it missed less than
1 percent in 2000.

The net undercount of Hispanics and African Americans has been
reduced, Barron said. On the other hand, he said, "there may actually
have been an over-count of the white population."

Barron said he hopes the quality-check survey results can be improved
enough so they can be used in the future for distributing federal
funds.

ASSOCIATED PRESS
Census Bureau rejects using sampling to distribute funds
http://www.washtimes.com/national/20011018-53976889.htm

The Census Bureau, citing errors in statistically adjusted data,
said yesterday it would not permit use of sampled population numbers
to help distribute more than $185 billion in federal aid to state and
local governments.

Acting Census Bureau Director William Barron said at a news
conference yesterday his agency would have to conduct additional
research before determining if there would be any public release of
the adjusted data.

But he did not give a time frame for such a decision.

The announcement means the federal government now will use the
numbers from the actual 2000 count to disburse the U.S. dollars, which
support a host of social programs including Medicaid and foster care.

Bureau officials had weighed whether adjusting population figures
with statistical sampling would improve the already completed head
count.

Most Democrats and activist groups said sampling would be better,
yielding a better tally of minorities, the poor and children.

Republicans said sampling would insert more errors into a 2000
census that already was better than the one in 1990, because of a
lower national net undercount. They also have said that while
adjustment may count people originally missed, it may not place them
in the correct neighborhoods.

The bureau had said there was a net national undercount of 1.2
percent of the country's 281 million people in 2000, or about 3.2
million. The 1990 undercount was 1.6 percent, or about 4 million then.

But Mr. Barron said yesterday that current estimates showed the
net undercount in 2000 was reduced to less than 1 percent.

The decision was made by career Census Bureau professionals, officials said, and came as Commerce Secretary Donald L. Evans was in Russia for his first foreign trade mission.

The Census Bureau is a part of the Commerce Department.

The bureau faced a similar decision in March, and recommended against adjusted data as the basis for redrawing congressional, state and local political districts.

There were too many discrepancies between adjusted data, the actual count and a third survey used to measure accuracy, and not enough time for further analysis, Mr. Barron said then. Mr. Evans agreed.

House Republicans praised the earlier decision, which angered Democrats and civil rights groups.

Groups such as the U.S. Conference of Mayors also supported sampling, which could boost population figures for cities with larger minority populations and, likewise, federal dollars into those cities.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008
202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com
Census Head Count to Stand
Adjustments Rejected; U.S. Funds at Stake

By D'Vera Cohn
Washington Post Staff Writer
Thursday, October 18, 2001; Page A37

Census Bureau officials said yesterday that they will not statistically adjust the 2000 Census numbers and instead will go ahead with plans to use the door-to-door head count as the basis for distributing billions of dollars in federal program funds.

They said they could not improve on that basic count by adjusting the numbers, as they had hoped, because a quality-check survey they conducted was seriously flawed.

The decision disappointed Democrats, civil rights groups and big-city mayors, who had hoped the adjusted numbers would raise the population total for minorities, who were disproportionately missed in the head count. Republicans, who have questioned whether the adjusted numbers would be more accurate, praised it.

The contentious debate over which set of census numbers is the most reliable has been raging for years because of the high stakes: Democrats believe they benefit from adjusted figures, while Republicans say the figures add "virtual" people to the Democrats' advantage. The issue was fought in a lawsuit that went to the Supreme Court, which...
adjusted numbers could not be used to apportion House seats among the states.

Then, in a surprise decision in March, the Census Bureau said that a statistically adjusted count could not be used to redraw other political boundaries within states, from congressional to local school districts. Commerce Secretary Donald L. Evans had the final say in that decision, but he left yesterday's ruling in the hands of the career officials at the bureau.

The latest decision means adjusted figures will not be used to parcel out funds for Medicaid and other social service programs. In addition, government measures of poverty and unemployment, which are now based on adjusted counts, likely will use the basic count in the future.

Acting Census Director William G. Barron Jr. said he and other bureau officials made the decision because, over the summer, they discovered problems with the household survey that they had conducted to double-check the raw census count. That survey, he said, failed to detect that a significant number of people had been counted twice by the census.

Many of them, census officials said, could have been college students, children in joint custody and people with second...
Because of that shortcoming, Barron told a news conference, the post-census survey results "simply cannot be used in their current form" to adjust the census. The new information, he said, makes it even more clear that it "would have been a terrible mistake" to release adjusted figures for political redistricting.

Furthermore, Barron said it is "unlikely" that it will be practical for the bureau to release adjusted redistricting numbers in the future because the tight deadline set by law does not allow enough time for a proper determination of whether an adjustment would improve data quality. Redistricting counts are due by April 1 after a census year.

"A census is tough enough without the political maelstrom" that surrounds the adjustment issue, he said. "I wish it would just stop."

Political agreement on this issue appears unlikely, however. Shortly after the decision was announced, Rep. Dan Miller (R-Fla.), chairman of the House Government Reform Committee's census panel, issued a statement saying that "it is time to put adjustment, for political purposes, to rest."
Rep. Carolyn B. Maloney (D-N.Y.), a former ranking member of that subcommittee, put out a statement saying that the announcement "gave us more questions than answers" and challenging the bureau's reasoning. The U.S. Conference of Mayors, some of whose members are threatening to sue over the decision, said the decision is "unfair and unwise" and means that "America's cities will get the short end of the stick."

However, Barron said the discovery that the census erred in counting more people twice than was previously thought is not entirely bad news. It means that, at the national level, the double-counts compensate for those who were missed, yielding a more accurate net total. Census officials said, however, that this may not be true at the local level.

The Census Bureau has acknowledged that it missed 1.6 percent of the population in 1990. According to the new research, it missed less than 1 percent in 2000.

The net undercount of Hispanics and African Americans has been reduced, Barron said. On the other hand, he said, "there may actually have been an over-count of the white population."
Barron said he hopes the quality-check survey results can be improved enough so they can be used in the future for distributing federal funds. (A9 2001)

Census Bureau rejects using sampling to distribute funds

http://www.washtimes.com/national/20011018-53976889.htm
The Census Bureau, citing errors in statistically adjusted data, said yesterday it would not permit use of sampled population numbers to help distribute more than $185 billion in federal aid to state and local governments.

Acting Census Bureau Director William Barron said at a news conference yesterday his agency would have to conduct additional research before determining if there would be any public release of the adjusted data. But he did not give a time frame for such a decision.

The announcement means the federal government now will use the numbers from the actual 2000 count to disburse the U.S. dollars, which support a host of social programs including Medicaid and foster care.

Bureau officials had weighed whether adjusting population figures with statistical sampling would improve the already completed head count.

Most Democrats and activist groups said sampling would be better, by offering a better tally of minorities, the poor and children. Republicans said sampling would insert more errors into a 2000 census that already was better than the one in 1990, because of a lower national net undercount. They also have said that while adjustment may count people originally missed, it may not place them in the correct neighborhoods.

The bureau had said there was a net national undercount of 1.2 percent of the country's 281 million people in 2000, or about 3.2 million. The 1990 undercount was 1.6 percent, or about 4 million then.

But Mr. Barron said yesterday that current estimates showed the net undercount in 2000 was reduced to less than 1 percent. The decision was made by career Census Bureau professionals, officials said, and came as Commerce Secretary Donald L. Evans was in Russia for his first foreign trade mission.
The Census Bureau is a part of the Commerce Department. The bureau faced a similar decision in March, and recommended against adjusted data as the basis for redrawing congressional, state and local political districts. There were too many discrepancies between adjusted data, the actual count and a third survey used to measure accuracy, and not enough time for further analysis, Mr. Barron said then. Mr. Evans agreed.

House Republicans praised the earlier decision, which angered Democrats and civil rights groups. Groups such as the U.S. Conference of Mayors also supported sampling, which could boost population figures for cities with larger minority populations and, likewise, federal dollars into those cities.
Dear Lisa,

I'm not sure if this fits the bill about articles regarding public opinion on the September 11 tragedy, but I have a project in progress that involves studying references to world opinion on the attacks and their aftermath in ten international newspapers, from the U.S., Britain, Argentina, Nigeria, Russia, India, China, and a few others.

Would you be interested in this type of quantitative analysis? What time frame are you thinking about?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Frank L. Rusciano

Lisa Ferraro Parmelee wrote:

> Dear AAPORnet members --
> > Public Perspective, the only magazine dedicated to public opinion and
polling, invites the submission of articles on topics relating to public opinion, the polling community, and the theory and practice of public opinion research.

Our article submission guidelines have just been posted on the Roper Center's website. You can see them by going to http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pp_curr.html and clicking on "Submit an Article" at the bottom of the page.

We are presently looking not only for articles relating to public opinion and polling in the wake of September 11, but also pieces on any of the many other topics of interest to the polling community and our general readers.

If you have an article that fits our specifications already on hand or would like to propose one, please contact me directly at my email address or by way of the link to our Editorial Offices that appears in the guidelines.

I look forward to hearing from you!

-- Lisa Parmelee

Lisa Ferraro Parmelee, Ph.D.
Editor, Public Perspective
Senior Research Analyst, The Roper Center
341 Mansfield Road, Unit 1164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164
(860) 486-4440
There was a session at AAPOR on Internet Data Collection by Government Agencies. The papers covered a variety of surveys including an establishment survey, an organizational climate survey, and a demographic survey. Some offered the Web in addition to other modes while others tested Web response rates in split-panel experiments. The response rates were extremely variable depending upon the design, population, etc. and ranged from 2% to 67%. These papers will be documented in the 2001 ASA Proceedings volume of the Survey Methods Section.

For more information contact Nancy Bates (nancy.a.bates@census.gov)

---

Folks,

Syndicated columnist Arianna Huffington seems to have become a one-person crusader bent on the discrediting of all public opinion polls--it seems increasingly to be just about the only topic she talks about (on talk radio) or writes on these days.

If you wish to email her on the subject, she presents her address just below her byline on her column below.
The world has changed forever. That's what everyone has been saying since Sept. 11. In many ways, it's obviously true: Who would have thought that opening your mail without a hazmat crew standing by would qualify as risky behavior?

But some things, apparently, remain impervious to suicide hijackings, bioterrorism or even patriotism. Like, for instance, the media's indestructible infatuation with meaningless opinion polls--and, far more ominously, our political leaders' continued reliance on polls as their primary means of making policy decisions.

Take the latest numbers, which show President Bush enjoying a 92% approval rating. Or, as Cokie Roberts gushed on "This Week": "Franklin Roosevelt didn't hit this level." But even the pollsters admit that, as the fine print in this week's ABCNews/Washington Post poll put it, "results of overnight polls that attempt to measure opinions about fast-changing news events should be interpreted with extra caution." In other words, the results are meaningless.

Or worse. Take this week's startling--and widely reported--finding that 83% of Pakistanis side with the Taliban in the current conflict. It was, we were told by Newsweek, CNN and assorted pundits, the result of a Gallup poll.

Trouble is, it was "Gallup Pakistan," a dubious organization with no ties to the well-known U.S. polling company.

But even if media outlets had not been warned by the real Gallup Poll's reliability, shouldn't they have been skeptical of such an outrageous number and asked how the pollsters had gotten it? Had they stopped by an
anti-U.S. demonstration? Or had they randomly called any Pakistani who had recently purchased an American flag and some lighter fluid?

Instead, the media turned a blind eye to Gallup's "grave concerns" about the poll's reliability and reported it as fact.

This willingness to just tout the numbers is standard operating procedure for both pundits and politicians; it's a habit with often disastrous consequences.

Back in May 2000, a Zogby International poll asked Americans to name the most important issue facing the next president of the United States. Terrorism didn't even crack the top 10. And so our always eager to please politicians led by following and allowed the safety and protection of the American people to slide.

Real leadership--one driven by vision, not polls--would have seen the iceberg lurking beneath the placid surface of our prosperity.

But tell that to our "leaders" in Congress, where Bush's chart-topping approval has given him almost complete protection against criticism of his domestic agenda. The Democratic leadership has been cowed into silence, even as the president rides a Trojan horse filled with his highly partisan political agenda--drilling in the Arctic, building a missile shield, more corporate tax cuts--through the gate of this tragedy.

So the off-the-cuff reactions of a small sampling of randomly selected adults who didn't have the good sense to hang up when the pollsters called have silenced a less-than-brave opposition. This despite the fact that history shows that even soaring approval ratings are, at best, highly ephemeral. All the president has to do is put in a call to his father, whose post-Gulf War 89% approval rating had an even shorter shelf life than the new Daniel Stern sitcom.

The terrorist attacks have laid bare, once again, the danger of having leaders who can't even get dressed in the morning without consulting the latest poll numbers. And while the tragic events have clearly provided our 92% president with an aura of heroic leadership, they have also cast in high relief the deficiencies inherent in the system from which he sprang.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Unfortunately she has been on this kick for a long time now. It is quite tedious.

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 18, 2001 1:25 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Arianna Huffington: Politics by Polls Led Us Astray (LATimes)

Folks,

Syndicated columnist Arianna Huffington seems to have become a one-person crusader bent on the discrediting of all public opinion polls--it seems increasingly to be just about the only topic she talks about (on talk radio) or writes on these days.

If you wish to email her on the subject, she presents her address just below her byline on her column below.

If you wish to send a letter to the editor of the Los Angeles Times about this column, the email address is

Letters to the Editor
Los Angeles Times
letters@latimes.com

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Politics by Polls Led Us Astray

By ARIANNA HUFFINGTON

Arianna Huffington is a syndicated columnist.
E-mail: arianna@ariannaonline.com

The world has changed forever. That's what everyone has been saying since Sept. 11. In many ways, it's obviously true: Who would have thought that opening your mail without a hazmat crew standing by would qualify as risky behavior?

But some things, apparently, remain impervious to suicide hijackings, bioterrorism or even patriotism. Like, for instance, the media's indestructible infatuation with meaningless opinion polls--and, far more ominously, our political leaders' continued reliance on polls as their primary means of making policy decisions.

Take the latest numbers, which show President Bush enjoying a 92% approval rating. Or, as Cokie Roberts gushed on "This Week": "Franklin Roosevelt didn't hit this level." But even the pollsters admit that, as the fine print in this week's ABCNews/Washington Post poll put it, "results of overnight polls that attempt to measure opinions about fast-changing news events should be interpreted with extra caution." In other words, the results are meaningless.

Or worse. Take this week's startling--and widely reported--finding that 83% of Pakistanis side with the Taliban in the current conflict. It was, we were told by Newsweek, CNN and assorted pundits, the result of a Gallup poll.

Trouble is, it was "Gallup Pakistan," a dubious organization with no ties to the well-known U.S. polling company.

But even if media outlets had not been warned by the real Gallup Poll's reliability, shouldn't they have been skeptical of such an outrageous number and asked how the pollsters had gotten it? Had they stopped by an anti-U.S. demonstration? Or had they randomly called any Pakistani who had recently purchased an American flag and some lighter fluid?

Instead, the media turned a blind eye to Gallup's "grave concerns" about the poll's reliability and reported it as fact.

This willingness to just tout the numbers is standard operating procedure for both pundits and politicians; it's a habit with often disastrous consequences.

Back in May 2000, a Zogby International poll asked Americans to name the most important issue facing the next president of the United States.
Terrorism didn't even crack the top 10. And so our always eager to please politicians led by following and allowed the safety and protection of the American people to slide.

Real leadership--one driven by vision, not polls--would have seen the iceberg lurking beneath the placid surface of our prosperity.

But tell that to our "leaders" in Congress, where Bush's chart-topping approval has given him almost complete protection against criticism of his domestic agenda. The Democratic leadership has been cowed into silence, even as the president rides a Trojan horse filled with his highly partisan political agenda--drilling in the Arctic, building a missile shield, more corporate tax cuts--through the gate of this tragedy.

So the off-the-cuff reactions of a small sampling of randomly selected adults who didn't have the good sense to hang up when the pollsters called have silenced a less-than-brave opposition. This despite the fact that history shows that even soaring approval ratings are, at best, highly ephemeral. All the president has to do is put in a call to his father, whose post-Gulf War 89% approval rating had an even shorter shelf life than the new Daniel Stern sitcom.

The terrorist attacks have laid bare, once again, the danger of having leaders who can't even get dressed in the morning without consulting the latest poll numbers. And while the tragic events have clearly provided our 92% president with an aura of heroic leadership, they have also cast in high relief the deficiencies inherent in the system from which he sprang.

---
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We routinely either try to negotiate our way out of errors and omissions insurance or decline projects that require it. As J Ann Selzer points out, the whole concept is pretty ridiculous in terms of what we do. We are not, after all, building bridges. For us, in Sacramento (if location has any relevance to this discussion), a minimalist policy would cost around $3,000 a year.

Jennifer D. Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.

JAnnSelzer@aol.com wrote:

> This is the kind of thing that is common in government contracts,
> along with absurdly high liability limits. I've asked several lawyers
> to concoct a scenario where my client would be liable for any sort of
> liability damages associated with a public opinion research project
> and they've failed to come up with anything approaching plausibility.
> In terms of errors and omissions, again, it's so remotely implausible
> that anyone could ever file a claim on this sort of insurance that
> it's galling when a client's contract requires it. We typically
> doublecheck that this requirement applies to the research we will be
> conducting and if there is a process for having the requirement
> waived. If we can't get it waived, we mention in the RFP that we will
> show evidence of this insurance upon notification that we have been
> granted the contract. This year, we actually had to go get the
> insurance. ! ! Everyone admits it's ridiculous (even my insurance
> agent), but some contracts are immutable on this point. Good luck.
> JAS
> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
> Selzer & Company, Inc.
> Des Moines
> JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
> JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
> Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
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We routinely either try to negotiate our way out of errors and omissions insurance or decline projects that require it. As J Ann Selzer points out, the whole concept is pretty ridiculous in terms of what we do. We are not, after all, building bridges. For us, in Sacramento (if location has any relevance to this discussion), a minimalist policy would cost around $3,000 a year.

Jennifer D. Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.

JAnnSelzer@aol.com wrote:

This is the kind of thing that is common in government contracts, along with absurdly high liability limits. I've asked several lawyers to concoct a scenario where my client would be liable for any sort of liability damages associated with a public opinion research project and they've failed to come up with anything approaching plausibility. In terms of errors and omissions, again, it's so remotely implausible that anyone could ever file a claim on this sort of insurance that it's galling when a client's contract requires it. We typically doublecheck that this requirement applies to the research we will be conducting and if there is a process for having the requirement waived. If we can't get it waived, we mention in the RFP that we will show evidence of this insurance upon notification that we have been granted the contract. This year, we actually had to go get the insurance. ! ! ! Everyone admits it's ridiculous (even my insurance agent), but some contracts are immutable on this point. Good luck.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JA Selzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
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I share these quotes because I found the language interesting. The social construct of "white" versus "black" appeared later in American history. The black/white construct is obviously being rethought and evolving as our newest citizens arrive.

Mark

"I had always hoped that this land might become a safe and agreeable asylum to the virtuous and persecuted part of mankind, to whatever nation they might belong."
--George Washington to Francis Adrian Van der Kemp, May 28, 1788

///

"Non-English settlers came to Pennsylvania from the beginning; they were encouraged by the proprietary, and were soon found in the region west of the Susquehanna. Thence through York, Cumberland, and Adams counties to the Maryland line following an Indian trail, later developed into the Monocacy Road, the pioneers came into Maryland about 1729. The route crossed the Ridge by Crampton's Gap in the region later made famous by the Antietam campaign, and then across the Potomac by a ford above present Harper's Ferry. Though there may have been earlier attempts, the first permanent settlement of the [Shenandoah] Valley begin in 1727.

The portion of the Valley drained by the Shenandoah, the part with which Washington was first acquainted and where his own lands were, was settled mostly by Germans. Benjamin Rush in 1789 noted the special characteristic of these "Pennsylvania Dutch," and it is interesting to trace in them possible influences upon Washington's own traits as a scientific farmer... Mixed with these Germans were some Scotch-Irish, but for the most part the
latter continued on to the upper part of the Shenandoah and over the watershed to the southern slope of the Valley. For this there is a probably reason in the character of the people. Logan, Penn's agent, in 1724 wrote of the Scotch-Irish as "bold and indigent strangers, saying as their excuse, when challenged for titles, that we had solicited for colonists and they had come accordingly."

Again, in 1727: "They say the Proprietor invited people to come and settle his country; they came for that end, and must live. Both they and the Palatines pretend that they will buy, but not one in twenty has anything to pay with. The Irish settle generally toward the Maryland line, where no lands can honestly be sold till the dispute with Lord Baltimore is decided." In 1730 Logan wrote that the Irish alleged that "it was against the laws of God and nature, that so much land should be idle while so many Christians wanted it to labor on and raise their bread." The Germans, while many of them were originally squatters in the Valley, would pay for the land if the alternative was to move on. They were, in other words, permanent settlers by instinct. With the Scotch-Irish the reverse was true: they were in the van of the pioneers not only because of their adventurous spirit, but because of their unwillingness to acknowledge the rights of the holders of great grants. ... These Scotch-Irish were not the only border settlers; there was a mingling of Germans, English, Scots, some Huguenots, and even a few Catholic-Irish, Hollanders, and Swedes. Of this mixture, Roosevelt has written: "A single operation, passed under the hard conditions of life in the wilderness, was enough to weld together into one people the representatives of these numerous and widely different races; and the children of the next generation became indistinguishable from one another."

"One of the largest landgrants in Virginia was the Northern Neck grant owned by Lord Fairfax, one of the few titled English-men to make his home in Virginia. Lord Fairfax was Washington's patron, and selected the youth in 1748 for his first experiences on the frontier. This was more than twenty years after the first movement into the Valley."

More:

Here are two entries of Washington's own description of his frontier surveying experience as a young man:

"Monday 4th [April 1748] ...we did two Lots and was attended by a great Company of People Men and Women and Children that attended us through ye. Woods as we went showing there Antick tricks I really think they seemed to be as Ignorant a Set of People as the Indians they would never speak English but when spoken to they speak all Dutch..."

"Tuesday 15th [March 1748] We ...return'd to Penningtons we got our Supper and was lighted into a Room and I not being so good a Woodsman as ye rest of my Company striped myself very orderly and went in to ye Bed as they called it when to my Surprize I found it to be nothing but a Little Straw-Matted together without Sheets or anything else but only one thread Bear blanket with double its Weight of Vermin such as Lice Fleas &c I was glad to get up (as soon as y. Light was carried from us) I put on my Cloths and Lay as my Companions."

And here is more that is a bit fun:
In the early 1700s, the coast colonies were pushing westward. Governor Alexander Spotswood of Virginia launched an expedition into the Blue Ridge in 1716, setting up new border settlements. He wanted to settle the Shenandoah Valley and open up a western route to trade with the Indians and check the French advance in the Mississippi Valley. John Fontaine, part of the Spotswood expedition, described the good cheer they shared as they crossed the rich forest, full of black and white Oak, Walnut, Cherry, Poplar, and Spice Bushes so dense it was difficult to move through on horseback:

"We crossed the river, which we called Euphrates... We drank some healths on the other side, and returned; ... We had a good dinner, and after it we got the men together, and loaded all their arms, and we drank the King's health in Champagne, and fired a volley--the Princess's health, in Burgundy, and fired a volley, and the rest of the Royal Family in claret, and a volley. We drank the Governor's health and fired another volley. We had several sorts of liquors, viz., Virginia red wine and white wine, Irish usquebaugh, brandy, shrub, two sorts of rum, champage, canary, cherry, punch, water, cider, &c..." (Matteson, 1932)
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Jim and others,

I have been, and still am, of the school of thought that considers self-identification to be the most important aspect of race or ethnicity.
However, in my graduate survey research methods class yesterday, an African American student argued forcefully against that position, and I found her argument interesting. According to her, what really matters is how others categorize a person, because that influences how one is treated more than does self-identification.

Norval Glenn

Looking in the Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary (1996), there are many definitions for "race."

Most relevant are:

2a: a family, tribe, or nation belonging to the same stock.
2b: a class or kind of people unified by community of interests, habits, or characteristic [the English race]
3c: a division of mankind possessing traits that are transmissible by descent and sufficient to characterize it as a distinct human type.

I have typically assumed definition 3c when asked to indicate race on the Census form or on my application for a driver's license (which I note is no longer on the Missouri license--the color picture replaces this designation).

Is definition 2b closer to the federal government's intention? In this
context, is "American race" a valid category?

I also checked the definitions for the words used for the race categories. Their definitions do not consistently include "race."

-----Original Message-----
From: elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov
[mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov]
Sent: Thursday, October 18, 2001 10:31 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Hispanics by Race

I meant to comment earlier on Jim's lament.

It is important to note that attempts to improve survey measurements of race do not necessarily rely upon an understanding of race as an "objective" construct. Indeed, the government standards for collecting race explicitly define race in terms of self-identification, not "objective" characteristics. If you recall your Census 2000 questionnaire (and who can forget it??) it asked, "What is this person's race? Mark one or more races to indicate what this person considers himself/herself to be." Thus, in the census, your race is what you (or a household proxy reporting for you) report it to be. There is no "right" answer. The Office of Management and Budget standards for collecting data on race explicitly state that "The racial and ethnic categories set forth in the standards should not be interpreted as being primarily biological or genetic in reference. Race and ethnicity may be thought of in terms of social and cultural characteristics..."

Race is a social construct. I don't know anybody who has conducted research in this area who does not come to appreciate that measurement of race and related constructs is very complex and presents profound difficulties at many levels.

Betsy Martin
U. S. Census Bureau
Folks,

I find the epistemology of this ongoing discussion of "Hispanics by Race" absolutely fascinating.

The item construction seems to me analogous to what one might expect, for example, at ETS, in designing its SAT questions to maximize the chances that those who actually know the answers will be able to find one--and only one--appropriate response category.

Of course this general idea does have many good applications in survey research. When it comes to a respondent's own perceived national origin and race, however, a number of you who have posted on AAPORNET in the past two days seem to be assuming that you know the correct answers already (ETS model) and want to design your items to maximize the chances that your respondents will give you back the answers you expect.

But such assumptions as these raise the questions of race and national origin to a political question: Who is to decide our own origins and race? Are these existential and objective facts, or are we free to decide them for ourselves, or are we forced to have them decided by others, including others whom we do not know, and have not given the authority to do this?

I myself have an open mind on this set of questions. I write here only because, although I find that the science behind all of the postings has been correct (as I would expect from AAPORNETters), I also think that there are much more important questions and issues also at stake here. Because I would like to see these other questions discussed in this same context, I hope to begin that discussion here, with this message.
It's much easier to design a question about integral calculus which has one and only one answer, after all, than it is to give anything nearly as certain an answer about the race or origins of our fellow human beings--people whom we in fact cherish so much precisely for this very diversity (AAPOR serving as an extreme example, I am pleased to say).

I welcome your comments, as always.

-- Jim

******

> Field experiments as well as qualitative research conducted at the Census Bureau suggest that the perceived redundancy of the race and Hispanic origin questions is reduced when Hispanic origin precedes race in the questionnaire. The item nonresponse for Hispanic origin is much lower, and Hispanics are less likely to report their race as "Some other race" and write in Hispanic--though many still do this even in the reversed order. Item sequencing does not fully solve the problem, but it helps.
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To be frank, the first ten paragraphs are relatively sound. It is her further conclusions that are the problem -- particularly, claiming that random sample surveys are garbage.

Howard Fienberg

-----Original Message-----
Folks,

Syndicated columnist Arianna Huffington seems to have become a one-person crusader bent on the discrediting of all public opinion polls--it seems increasingly to be just about the only topic she talks about (on talk radio) or writes on these days.

If you wish to email her on the subject, she presents her address just below her byline on her column below.

If you wish to send a letter to the editor of the Los Angeles Times about this column, the email address is

   Letters to the Editor
   Los Angeles Times
   letters@latimes.com

-- Jim
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Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
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   story?coll=la%2Dnews%2Dcommen%2Dopinions

October 18 2001

COMMENTARY

Politics by Polls Led Us Astray

By ARIANNA HUFFINGTON

Arianna Huffington is a syndicated columnist.
E-mail: arianna@ariannaonline.com

The world has changed forever. That's what everyone has been saying since Sept. 11. In many ways, it's obviously true: Who would have thought that opening your mail without a hazmat crew standing by would qualify as risky behavior?

But some things, apparently, remain impervious to suicide hijackings, bioterrorism or even patriotism. Like, for instance, the media's indestructible infatuation with meaningless opinion polls--and, far more ominously, our political leaders' continued reliance on polls as their
primary means of making policy decisions.

Take the latest numbers, which show President Bush enjoying a 92% approval rating. Or, as Cokie Roberts gushed on 'This Week': "Franklin Roosevelt didn't hit this level." But even the pollsters admit that, as the fine print in this week's ABCNews/Washington Post poll put it, "results of overnight polls that attempt to measure opinions about fast-changing news events should be interpreted with extra caution." In other words, the results are meaningless.

Or worse. Take this week's startling—and widely reported—finding that 83% of Pakistanis side with the Taliban in the current conflict. It was, we were told by Newsweek, CNN and assorted pundits, the result of a Gallup poll.

Trouble is, it was "Gallup Pakistan," a dubious organization with no ties to the well-known U.S. polling company.

But even if media outlets had not been warned by the real Gallup Poll's reliability, shouldn't they have been skeptical of such an outrageous number and asked how the pollsters had gotten it? Had they stopped by an anti-U.S. demonstration? Or had they randomly called any Pakistani who had recently purchased an American flag and some lighter fluid?

Instead, the media turned a blind eye to Gallup's "grave concerns" about the poll's reliability and reported it as fact.

This willingness to just tout the numbers is standard operating procedure for both pundits and politicians; it's a habit with often disastrous consequences.

Back in May 2000, a Zogby International poll asked Americans to name the most important issue facing the next president of the United States. Terrorism didn't even crack the top 10. And so our always eager to please politicians led by following and allowed the safety and protection of the American people to slide.

Real leadership—one driven by vision, not polls—would have seen the iceberg lurking beneath the placid surface of our prosperity.

But tell that to our "leaders" in Congress, where Bush's chart-topping approval has given him almost complete protection against criticism of his domestic agenda. The Democratic leadership has been cowed into silence, even as the president rides a Trojan horse filled with his highly partisan political agenda—drilling in the Arctic, building a missile shield, more corporate tax cuts—through the gate of this tragedy.

So the off-the-cuff reactions of a small sampling of randomly selected adults who didn't have the good sense to hang up when the pollsters called have silenced a less-than-brave opposition. This despite the fact that history shows that even soaring approval ratings are, at best, highly ephemeral. All the president has to do is put in a call to his father, whose post-Gulf War 89% approval rating had an even shorter shelf life than the new Daniel Stern sitcom.

The terrorist attacks have laid bare, once again, the danger of having
leaders who can't even get dressed in the morning without consulting the latest poll numbers. And while the tragic events have clearly provided our 92% president with an aura of heroic leadership, they have also cast in high relief the deficiencies inherent in the system from which he sprang.

Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
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Dear Fellow AAPORneters,

I apologize (once again) for posting a message meant for one person to the entire net.

Frank Rusciano
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Title: Research Associate I
Number: Job # 01105-ANF
Center: Executive Office Research-Assessing the New Federalism
Status: Regular, Full-time
Reports To: Survey Director

Summary:

Responsibilities include the management and oversight of all tasks associated with producing and preparing data files from a large-scale multi-year household survey. Will take the lead or assist on all aspects of the data preparation process including data checking and editing, imputations, analytic variable construction, coding, analytic file construction and evaluating data quality. Will coordinate project work assignments and monitor work flow between SAS programmers (2-3), survey management staff (survey director, survey associate, research assistants), subcontractors and researchers. Reports on project status to senior staff. Also participates in survey methodological research, including participation at professional conferences on survey research.

Experience:

Three or more years in the preparation of large survey data sets for internal and/or external researchers; analyzing data for consistency and quality, data context/content knowledge. Experience in writing SAS programs to perform data reconstruction and database management. Experience in working with large scale, hierarchical data sets.

Education:

Masters or above in Survey Methodology, Economics, Statistics, Mathematics or related social science discipline.

To Apply:

Send cover letter and resume to-

The Urban Institute
HR Dept: Job# 01105-EOR/ANF
2100 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
We are able to accept resumes via e-mail at resumes@ui.urban.org. Send text only, no attachments please. The Urban Institute is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Adam Safir  
The Urban Institute  
asaifir@ui.urban.org  
202-261-5247 (voice)  
202-293-1918 (fax)
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This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand
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Please forgive redundancy in this posting, which was previously posted for
the AAPORExecCouncil [AAPORExecCouncil@umich.edu]. I have also attached
both Word and WordPerfect versions of the announcement. <<2002 final call
for papers (WP).wpd>> <<2002 final call for papers (wrd).doc>>
To submit a proposal for the conference, go to the AAPOR website and click
on Conference 2002 (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. RAK
57th Annual Conference
AAPOR May 16-19, 2002 > The TradeWinds Resort > St. Pete Beach, FL
American Association for Public Opinion Research a joint WAPOR & AAPOR Year
CALL FOR CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION
STRENGTHENING OUR COMMUNITY
The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) will hold its
57th Annual Conference at the TradeWinds Beach Resorts and Conference
Centers in St. Pete Beach, Florida on May 16-19, 2002. AAPOR's Conference
Committee seeks proposals for papers, poster presentations, panels and round
tables that will illuminate important research questions, increase the
knowledge and skills of AAPOR's membership, 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 strongly encourage participants
to organize panel proposals with common themes and submit their papers
together.
CONFERENCE THEME
In his presidential address to conference attendees last year, Murray
Edelman aptly described AAPOR as a community, a community of survey and
public opinion professionals and researchers who influence, support and
define each other and our profession in a multitude of different ways. From
the beginning, AAPOR's founding members and their successors understood the
importance of this special community and the need to nurture the Association
as a unique and vital source of affirmation, support, and fellowship for
those in the profession, independent of our employers, institutions and
clients.
And, especially in the wake of September 11, 2001, never has this community
been more important, or our need to value, nurture and strengthen it been
greater. That 2002 is also a joint AAPOR/WAPOR conference year--where we
will meet jointly with colleagues from nations throughout the world to share
experiences, research innovations and data--provides an important additional
rationale for a thematic focus on papers, presentations, panels, and other
events which serve to recognize, celebrate, and strengthen our community.
It is our goal to implement this theme quite broadly, and we seek innovative
ideas from a diverse range of potential participants on how to both promote
and reflect this focus. The attack on America on September 11 has had a
significant impact on all of our lives and will be a major focus of many
papers at the conference. These will include not only manifest issues such
as (1) public opinion and responses to the Attack on America and its
aftermath; (2) evolving attitudes and opinions in America and abroad toward
Arabs, Arab-Americans, and Muslims; and (3) attitudes and beliefs toward the
U.S. in Arab nations and the Islamic world, but also such topics as (4)
evolving opinions on terrorism, war, and peace; (5) patriotism; (6)
stereotyping, prejudice, and racial profiling; (7) emergency preparedness
and management; (8) airport safety; (9) fear of bioterrorism; (10) law
enforcement; (11) defense and the military; (12) national security, privacy
and civil liberties; and (12) historical perspectives on public opinion and
survey research in times of war. Other paper topics likely to emerge from
these events include: assessments of consumer confidence; religion and
spirituality; and charity and volunteerism. Papers and panels that offer
data and insights on public opinion in these and other areas will be part of
the conference agenda.

More generally, the conference will continue to explore several major legacy
and emergent methodological issues and challenges that confront the survey
research community today, including: (1) Internet- and web-based data
collection; (2) survey participation and nonresponse; (3) interviewer selection, training and attrition/retention; (4) use of respondent and interviewer incentives; (5) response and nonresponse error stemming from questionnaires, interviewers and survey modes; (6) sampling design; (7) statistical data management, analysis and presentation; and (8) cognitive interviewing, focus groups and qualitative research. Methodological papers emerging from unintended experiments created by the events of September 11 and its aftermath will also be of significant interest, including effects on response rates and data from surveys in the field at the time of the attacks, and decisions on whether or not to suspend interviewing. We also welcome papers on: legislative and regulatory (e.g., IRB) threats to survey and public opinion research; privacy and confidentiality of survey data; use of polls to enlist support for/justify political decisions; methods for determining presidential approval ratings; and the use of surveys and polls for juror selection, legal strategy and other legal research.

It is important to emphasize that, while broad and wide-ranging, these topics are only a small sample of those which could be mentioned in support of the overall theme, and are not intended to be restrictive. Potential participants are encouraged to submit for consideration their ideas on any topic in public opinion and survey research, and we anticipate broad-based participation in this conference.

AAPOR/WAPOR CONFERENCE

As noted earlier, this conference is a joint AAPOR/WAPOR conference year. We encourage especially submissions on topics of interest to WAPOR's world-wide membership.

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION PROCESS

Proposals for the conference should be submitted electronically to www.aapor.org/conference/submission.html by December 13, 2002. 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 or are included as part of an organized panel proposal.

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, 2002. You will be notified about the status of your proposal shortly thereafter.

**PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

We will evaluate the presentation 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, 2002.

Multiple proposals may be submitted, but it is unlikely that more than one proposal will be accepted from any given researcher or research team. Also, please do not submit multiple abstracts that are similar in content or abstracts dealing with results previously reported at an AAPOR meeting unless the new paper reports findings that are clearly differentiated from the previous paper.

**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.

**SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS**

At recent conferences a number groups with special, common interests have met informally to share methods, research and other information with one another. Consistent with this year's conference theme, we would like to formally encourage such gatherings throughout the meetings and include these gatherings on the official program. If you would like to organize such a group, please contact the conference chair.
INQUIRIES
If you have any questions concerning the conference or the proposal submission process, please contact this year's Conference Chair:
Richard A. Kulka, Ph.D. Email: <rak@rti.org>
Research Triangle Institute Voice: (919) 541-7008
P.O. Box 12194 Fax: (919) 541-7004
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194

AAPOR
American Association for Public Opinion Research
4221 Institute for Social Research 734.764.1555 phone
426 Thompson Street 734.764.3341 fax
P.O. Box 1248 AAPOR@umich.edu
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248 <http://www.aapor.org>
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ANNUAL AAPOR STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION
IN MEMORY OF SEYMOUR SUDMAN

Open to Current Students and Recent Degree Recipients

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) will award its 36th Annual Student Paper Prize this year. Beginning last year, this award was designated as "In Memory of Seymour Sudman" to recognize his many important contributions to AAPOR and in teaching and mentoring students in our profession.

The prize is open both to current students (graduate or undergraduate) and to those who receive their degrees in calendar year 2001. 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, marketing 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's 57th Annual Conference, which will be held May 16-19, 2002 at the TradeWinds Beach Resorts and Conference Centers in St. Pete Beach, Florida. 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 and public opinion 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 each entry TO ARRIVE BY DECEMBER 13, 2001, to this year's Chair of the Student Paper Competition:
Johnny Blair  
Survey Research Center  
University of Maryland  
1103 Art-Sociology Building  
College Park, MD 20742-1315  

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.

***********************************************************

Richard A. Kulka, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Vice President  
Social and Statistical Sciences  
Research Triangle Institute  
P.O. Box 12194  
Research Triangle Park, NC  27709-2194  

Voice:  (919) 541-7008  
Fax:  (919) 541-7004  
Email: rak@rti.org  
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I know - she’s obsessed. I told her that if she hated polling so much, why does she quote one when it suits her or defends what she says in her article. All she did was laugh.

Susan Pinkus

-----Original Message-----
From: Krane, David [SMTP:DKrane@harrisinteractive.com]
Unfortunately she has been on this kick for a long time now. It is quite tedious.

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 18, 2001 1:25 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Arianna Huffington: Politics by Polls Led Us Astray (LATimes)

Folks,

Syndicated columnist Arianna Huffington seems to have become a one-person crusader bent on the discrediting of all public opinion polls--it seems increasingly to be just about the only topic she talks about (on talk radio) or writes on these days.

If you wish to email her on the subject, she presents her address just below her byline on her column below.

If you wish to send a letter to the editor of the Los Angeles Times about this column, the email address is

Letters to the Editor
Los Angeles Times
letters@latimes.com

-- Jim

------------------------------------------------------------------------
---
Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times


October 18 2001

COMMENTARY
Politics by Polls Led Us Astray

By ARIANNA HUFFINGTON
The world has changed forever. That's what everyone has been saying since Sept. 11. In many ways, it's obviously true: Who would have thought opening your mail without a hazmat crew standing by would qualify as risky behavior?

But some things, apparently, remain impervious to suicide hijackings, bioterrorism or even patriotism. Like, for instance, the media's indestructible infatuation with meaningless opinion polls--and, far more ominously, our political leaders' continued reliance on polls as their primary means of making policy decisions.

Take the latest numbers, which show President Bush enjoying a 92% approval rating. Or, as Cokie Roberts gushed on "This Week": "Franklin Roosevelt didn't hit this level." But even the pollsters admit that, as the fine print in this week's ABCNews/Washington Post poll put it, "results of overnight polls that attempt to measure opinions about fast-changing news events should be interpreted with extra caution."

In other words, the results are meaningless.

Or worse. Take this week's startling--and widely reported--finding that 83% of Pakistanis side with the Taliban in the current conflict. It was, we were told by Newsweek, CNN and assorted pundits, the result of a Gallup poll.

Trouble is, it was "Gallup Pakistan," a dubious organization with no ties to the well-known U.S. polling company.

But even if media outlets had not been warned by the real Gallup Poll's reliability, shouldn't they have been skeptical of such an outrageous number and asked how the pollsters had gotten it? Had they stopped by an anti-U.S. demonstration? Or had they randomly called any Pakistani who had recently purchased an American flag and some lighter fluid?

Instead, the media turned a blind eye to Gallup's "grave concerns" about the poll's reliability and reported it as fact.

This willingness to just tout the numbers is standard operating procedure for both pundits and politicians; it's a habit with often disastrous consequences.
Back in May 2000, a Zogby International poll asked Americans to name the most important issue facing the next president of the United States. Terrorism didn't even crack the top 10. And so our always eager to please politicians led by following and allowed the safety and protection of the American people to slide.

Real leadership—one driven by vision, not polls—would have seen the iceberg lurking beneath the placid surface of our prosperity.

But tell that to our "leaders" in Congress, where Bush's chart-topping approval has given him almost complete protection against criticism of his domestic agenda. The Democratic leadership has been cowed into silence, even as the president rides a Trojan horse filled with his highly partisan political agenda—drilling in the Arctic, building a missile shield, more corporate tax cuts—through the gate of this tragedy.

So the off-the-cuff reactions of a small sampling of randomly selected adults who didn't have the good sense to hang up when the pollsters called have silenced a less-than-brave opposition. This despite the fact that history shows that even soaring approval ratings are, at best, highly ephemeral. All the president has to do is put in a call to his father, whose post-Gulf War 89% approval rating had an even shorter shelf life than the new Daniel Stern sitcom.

The terrorist attacks have laid bare, once again, the danger of having leaders who can't even get dressed in the morning without consulting the latest poll numbers. And while the tragic events have clearly provided our 92% president with an aura of heroic leadership, they have also cast in high relief the deficiencies inherent in the system from which he sprang.
This is why "third-person" identification continues to be "in force" by affirmative action and civil-rights monitoring authorities (e.g., Civil Rights Commission). They have traditionally opposed self-identification for precisely the reason that your student gave in class.

On Thu, 18 Oct 2001, Norval D. Glenn wrote:

>Jim and others,
>
>: I have been, and still am, of the school of thought that considers
>: self-identification to be the most important aspect of race or ethnicity.
>: However, in my graduate survey research methods class yesterday, an
>: African American student argued forcefully against that position, and I
>: found her argument interesting. According to her, what really matters is
>: how others categorize a person, because that influences how one is treated
>: more than does self-identification.
>
>: Norval Glenn
>

**************************************************************************
Alice Robbin, Associate Professor
SLIS, The Information Science School
Indiana University
005A Main Library
1320 East 10th Street
Bloomington, IN 47405-3907
Office: (812) 855-5389    Fax: (812) 855-6166
Her gripe is not with "all public opinion polls." It's with what she or the headline writer calls "politics by polls," which is different.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Thursday, October 18, 2001 1:26 PM
Subject: Arianna Huffington: Politics by Polls Led Us Astray (LATimes)

> 
> 
> Folks,
> 
> Syndicated columnist Arianna Huffington seems to have
> become a one-person crusader bent on the discrediting of
> all public opinion polls--it seems increasingly to be just
> about the only topic she talks about (on talk radio) or
> writes on these days.
> 
> If you wish to email her on the subject, she presents her
The world has changed forever. That's what everyone has been saying since Sept. 11. In many ways, it's obviously true: Who would have thought that opening your mail without a hazmat crew standing by would qualify as risky behavior?

But some things, apparently, remain impervious to suicide hijackings, bioterrorism or even patriotism. Like, for instance, the media's indestructible infatuation with meaningless opinion polls--and, far more ominously, our political leaders' continued reliance on polls as their primary means of making policy decisions.

Take the latest numbers, which show President Bush enjoying a 92% approval rating. Or, as Cokie Roberts gushed on "This Week": "Franklin Roosevelt didn't hit this level." But even the pollsters admit that, as the fine print in this week's ABCNews/Washington Post poll put it, "results of overnight polls that attempt to measure opinions about fast-changing news events should be interpreted with extra caution." In other words, the results are meaningless.

Or worse. Take this week's startling--and widely reported--finding that 83% of Pakistanis side with the Taliban in the current conflict. It was, we were told by Newsweek, CNN and assorted pundits, the result of a Gallup poll.

Trouble is, it was "Gallup Pakistan," a dubious organization with no ties to the well-known U.S. polling company.

But even if media outlets had not been warned by the real Gallup Poll's
reliability, shouldn't they have been skeptical of such an outrageous number and asked how the pollsters had gotten it? Had they stopped by an anti-U.S. demonstration? Or had they randomly called any Pakistani who had recently purchased an American flag and some lighter fluid?

Instead, the media turned a blind eye to Gallup's "grave concerns" about the poll's reliability and reported it as fact.

This willingness to just tout the numbers is standard operating procedure for both pundits and politicians; it's a habit with often disastrous consequences.

Back in May 2000, a Zogby International poll asked Americans to name the most important issue facing the next president of the United States. Terrorism didn't even crack the top 10. And so our always eager to please politicians led by following and allowed the safety and protection of the American people to slide.

Real leadership--one driven by vision, not polls--would have seen the iceberg lurking beneath the placid surface of our prosperity.

But tell that to our "leaders" in Congress, where Bush's chart-topping approval has given him almost complete protection against criticism of his domestic agenda. The Democratic leadership has been cowed into silence, even as the president rides a Trojan horse filled with his highly partisan political agenda--drilling in the Arctic, building a missile shield, more corporate tax cuts--through the gate of this tragedy.

So the off-the-cuff reactions of a small sampling of randomly selected adults who didn't have the good sense to hang up when the pollsters called have silenced a less-than-brave opposition. This despite the fact that history shows that even soaring approval ratings are, at best, highly ephemeral. All the president has to do is put in a call to his father, whose post-Gulf War 89% approval rating had an even shorter shelf life than the new Daniel Stern sitcom.

The terrorist attacks have laid bare, once again, the danger of having leaders who can't even get dressed in the morning without consulting the latest poll numbers. And while the tragic events have clearly provided our 92% president with an aura of heroic leadership, they have also cast in high relief the deficiencies inherent in the system from which he sprang.
In Swedish there is a term "husmor," (literally, house mother) which is understood to mean what I think you mean. Of course that wouldn't do here. How about "woman of the house?"

Jeanne Anderson

Teresa Hottle wrote:

> Can anyone tell me if their is a standard survey introduction that asks for the female head of household? We wanted to stay away from this phrase and thought about asking for the female that makes or shares in the decisions of the household. The client is concerned that we will exclude women who feel they are not the head of household or do not make the decisions.
>
> Thanks in advance,
> Terrie
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Norval,

I, too, have students. Here's the distribution of USC's new Freshman Class, for which the number who identify as white has dropped more than 5 percent in the past 5 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined To State</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I asked a group of Pacific Islanders how many students who were not themselves Pacific Islanders they thought would be able to identify them as such. They seemed quite surprised by the question. They said that those not in their group, including faculty, administrators and staff, routinely confuse them with Asians from many other countries, and also with Hawaiians. "Only we can say who is a Pacific Islander," was the common response.

When I told them that a black student in Texas believed that what matters is not one's own self-identification with any particular group, but rather how others categorize them, because that most influences how they are treated, they laughed. When they saw that I was indeed serious, however, they simply repeated their original position: "Only we can say who is a Pacific Islander."

I'd be willing to meet you half way, Glenn, and say that the truth of race, entirely a social and cultural construct, lies somewhere between self and others. But this only reinforces what I have been attempting to say all along—that to attempt to legislate objective categories of race into survey response categories (as if one were constructing SAT questions) is simply to engineer the very results that we wish to be objectively studying. The objective truth is that race, as we use that term, is subjective, contingent, and continuously under social and cultural negotiation and renegotiation.

Because race is such an important topic for us to study, I'd give
a lot to make it more tractable to large-scale survey research efforts, but I'm afraid it is not. We can make it so only by defining away many aspects of race which a number of quite savvy Pacific Islanders on my campus know race to possess, both in the histories of their own families, and also in day-to-day life, as they live it.

I think that the US Census work which Betsy Martin reports to us today is about as good as we can do, and I've found that Census staffers themselves are quite cautious and restrained in the uses they make of such data--a strategy both intelligent and wise, in my opinion.

-- Jim

On Thu, 18 Oct 2001, Norval D. Glenn wrote:

> Jim and others,
> 
> I have been, and still am, of the school of thought that considers
> self-identification to be the most important aspect of race or ethnicity.
> However, in my graduate survey research methods class yesterday, an
> African American student argued forcefully against that position, and I
> found her argument interesting. According to her, what really matters is
> how others categorize a person, because that influences how one is treated
> more than does self-identification.
>
> Norval Glenn
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X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10535

--part1_5a.5b118f.2900ffbb7_boundary
In a message dated 10/18/01 5:29:53 PM Central Daylight Time, jdfranz@earthlink.net writes:

> .  For us, in Sacramento (if location has any relevance to this discussion),
> 
I welcome the idea of AAPOR looking into a group policy, I must say. How can we start the ball rolling?  JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, 
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
Clearly Arianna Huffington stood outside the circle of the visionaries she extolls, or she would have dutifully warned us about the forthcoming terrorist attacks.

Perhaps we can govern by crystal ball.

The one area where she is right, of course, is that many aspects of opinions are ephemeral. But think about it: would we prefer the public to be rigid? Unchanging in the face of new information or events of the day? I point out to both my social psychology and to my methods students the difficulties of "trying to hit a moving target," which is inherent in much of public opinion (and attitudes, more generally) research. But consider the opposite.

Susan

At 03:29 PM 10/18/01 -0700, you wrote:
> I know - she's obsessed. I told her that if she hated polling so much, why does she quote one when it suits her or defends what she says in her article. All she did was laugh.
> >
> > Susan Pinkus
> >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Krane, David [SMTP:DKrane@harrisinteractive.com]
> > Sent: Thursday, October 18, 2001 10:35 AM
> > To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> > Subject: RE: Arianna Huffington: Politics by Polls Led Us Astray (LATimes)
> >
> > Unfortunately she has been on this kick for a long time now. It is quite tedious.
> >
Folks,

Syndicated columnist Arianna Huffington seems to have become a one-person crusader bent on the discrediting of all public opinion polls—it seems increasingly to be just about the only topic she talks about (on talk radio) or writes on these days.

If you wish to email her on the subject, she presents her address just below her byline on her column below.

If you wish to send a letter to the editor of the Los Angeles Times about this column, the email address is

Letters to the Editor
Los Angeles Times
letters@latimes.com

-- Jim


October 18 2001

COMMENTARY

Politics by Polls Led Us Astray

By ARIANNA HUFFINGTON

Arianna Huffington is a syndicated columnist.
E-mail: arianna@ariannaonline.com

The world has changed forever. That's what everyone has been saying since Sept. 11. In many ways, it's obviously true: Who would have thought that
opening your mail without a hazmat crew standing by would qualify as risky behavior?

But some things, apparently, remain impervious to suicide hijackings, bioterrorism or even patriotism. Like, for instance, the media's indestructible infatuation with meaningless opinion polls--and, far more ominously, our political leaders' continued reliance on polls as their primary means of making policy decisions.

Take the latest numbers, which show President Bush enjoying a 92% approval rating. Or, as Cokie Roberts gushed on "This Week": "Franklin Roosevelt didn't hit this level." But even the pollsters admit that, as the fine print in this week's ABCNews/Washington Post poll put it, "results of overnight polls that attempt to measure opinions about fast-changing news events should be interpreted with extra caution."

In other words, the results are meaningless.

Or worse. Take this week's startling--and widely reported--finding that 83% of Pakistanis side with the Taliban in the current conflict. It was, we were told by Newsweek, CNN and assorted pundits, the result of a Gallup poll.

Trouble is, it was "Gallup Pakistan," a dubious organization with no ties to the well-known U.S. polling company.

But even if media outlets had not been warned by the real Gallup Poll's reliability, shouldn't they have been skeptical of such an outrageous number and asked how the pollsters had gotten it? Had they stopped by an anti-U.S. demonstration? Or had they randomly called any Pakistani who had recently purchased an American flag and some lighter fluid?

Instead, the media turned a blind eye to Gallup's "grave concerns" about the poll's reliability and reported it as fact.

This willingness to just tout the numbers is standard operating procedure for both pundits and politicians; it's a habit with often disastrous consequences.

Back in May 2000, a Zogby International poll asked Americans to name the most important issue facing the next president of the United States. Terrorism didn't even crack the top 10. And so our always eager to please politicians led by following and allowed the safety and protection of American people to slide.
Real leadership--one driven by vision, not polls--would have seen the
iceberg lurking beneath the placid surface of our prosperity.

But tell that to our "leaders" in Congress, where Bush's chart-topping
approval has given him almost complete protection against criticism of
his domestic agenda. The Democratic leadership has been cowed into
silence, even as the president rides a Trojan horse filled with his
highly partisan political agenda--drilling in the Arctic, building a
missile shield, more corporate tax cuts--through the gate of this
tragedy.

So the off-the-cuff reactions of a small sampling of randomly selected
adults who didn't have the good sense to hang up when the pollsters
called have silenced a less-than-brave opposition. This despite the
fact that history shows that even soaring approval ratings are, at best,
highly ephemeral. All the president has to do is put in a call to his
father, whose post-Gulf War 89% approval rating had an even shorter
shelf life than the new Daniel Stern sitcom.

The terrorist attacks have laid bare, once again, the danger of having
leaders who can't even get dressed in the morning without consulting
the latest poll numbers. And while the tragic events have clearly provided
our 92% president with an aura of heroic leadership, they have also
cast in high relief the deficiencies inherent in the system from which he
sprang.

-------------------------------------------
---
Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
---
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Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
(850) 644-8778 Voice Mail Available
(850) 644-8776 FAX
Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4453
(904) 249-1683

Visit the site:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm
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Jim,

I don't disagree with anything you say.

It seems to me that how one regards oneself and how oneself is regarded by others are both important aspects of reality that have important consequences. And both are "objective" from the standpoint of an outside observer. Given the way the 2000 Census was conducted, the Census Bureau was able to deal with only one of these aspects of reality. Whether survey researchers should try to deal with both is debatable. What your Pacific Islander students say is interesting, and not surprising, but my guess is that a majority of African Americans would agree with my student. (Perhaps someone has evidence on this issue that I don't have.) I would also argue that if the Pacific Islander students are lumped in with Asians by students and faculty, that has consequences and is an important aspect of reality.

Norval Glenn

On Thu, 18 Oct 2001, James Beniger wrote:

> Norval,
> I, too, have students. Here's the distribution of USC's new Freshman Class, for which the number who identify as white has dropped more than 5 percent in the past 5 years:
> White 46.4 %
> Asian/Pacific Islander 21.5
> Latino 13.0
> International 7.8
> African American 6.8
> Native American 1.1
I asked a group of Pacific Islanders how many students who were not themselves Pacific Islanders they thought would be able to identify them as such. They seemed quite surprised by the question. They said that those not in their group, including faculty, administrators and staff, routinely confuse them with Asians from many other countries, and also with Hawaiians. "Only we can say who is a Pacific Islander," was the common response.

When I told them that a black student in Texas believed that what matters is not one's own self-identification with any particular group, but rather how others categorize them, because that most influences how they are treated, they laughed. When they saw that I was indeed serious, however, they simply repeated their original position: "Only we can say who is a Pacific Islander."

I'd be willing to meet you half way, Glenn, and say that the truth of race, entirely a social and cultural construct, lies somewhere between self and others. But this only reinforces what I have been attempting to say all along—that to attempt to legislate objective categories of race into survey response categories (as if one were constructing SAT questions) is simply to engineer the very results that we wish to be objectively studying. The objective truth is that race, as we use that term, is subjective, contingent, and continuously under social and cultural negotiation and renegotiation.

Because race is such an important topic for us to study, I'd give a lot to make it more tractable to large-scale survey research efforts, but I'm afraid it is not. We can make it so only by defining away many aspects of race which a number of quite savvy Pacific Islanders on my campus know race to possess, both in the histories of their own families, and also in day-to-day life, as they live it.

I think that the US Census work which Betsy Martin reports to us today is about as good as we can do, and I've found that Census staffers themselves are quite cautious and restrained in the uses they make of such data—a strategy both intelligent and wise, in my opinion.

-- Jim

*******

On Thu, 18 Oct 2001, Norval D. Glenn wrote:

> 
> > Jim and others,
> > 
> > I have been, and still am, of the school of thought that considers self-identification to be the most important aspect of race or ethnicity. However, in my graduate survey research methods class yesterday, an African American student argued forcefully against that position, and I
found her argument interesting. According to her, what really matters is how others categorize a person, because that influences how one is treated more than does self-identification.

Norval Glenn

Norval,

First of all, I didn't intend to be rude in calling you "Glenn" in the middle of my message--it's way past my bedtime, but unfortunately it was not past that of my two daughters, at the time of my error. I apologize.

Like you, I do find that--between the two of us--we have a few interestingly similar and I think compatible ideas here. I'm hoping that others on our list--perhaps Betsy, once again--might jump in now with additional ideas, perhaps about developing the concept of race as emergent from reciprocal impressions of viewer and viewed. This is hardly a major breakthrough, obviously, but it might be one step in a fruitful new direction.

I do like thinking about the resulting question: Does one's race depend as much on that of the person judging as it does on one's own self? Those who study race most often think of themselves as social scientists or cultural scientists (ethnographers), after all, and rarely think of themselves as physiologists or objective classifiers. Perhaps survey research has grown too content with finding correlations among
classifications, for example, at the expense of a social science dedicated to the study of the interactions and behaviors of everyday life--like the classifications we make of our own selves (including our race), and the adjustments we make as we come to see our own selves reflected in the eyes and actions of others. Survey research might not be the best means to study such phenomena, but I see no reason to rule out the idea entirely.

My own core belief is that it is possible to have an objective science of subjective phenomenon. Much of survey research is based on just this premise, it seems to me. If so, then we certainly have no need to force subjective phenomena (like race) into objective classifications merely to count or measure them, or to hold them still--and in place. A true science would seek to follow them, wherever they might lead us--to a dead end, perhaps, but perhaps not.

-- Jim

******

On Thu, 18 Oct 2001, Norval D. Glenn wrote:

> Jim,
> I don't disagree with anything you say.
> It seems to me that how one regards oneself and how oneself is regarded by others are both important aspects of reality that have important consequences. And both are "objective" from the standpoint of an outside observer. Given the way the 2000 Census was conducted, the Census Bureau was able to deal with only one of these aspects of reality. Whether survey researchers should try to deal with both is debatable. What your Pacific Islander students say is interesting, and not surprising, but my guess is that a majority of African Americans would agree with my student. (Perhaps someone has evidence on this issue that I don't have.) I would also argue that if the Pacific Islander students are lumped in with Asians by students and faculty, that has consequences and is an important aspect of reality.
>
> Norval Glenn
>
> On Thu, 18 Oct 2001, James Beniger wrote:
>
> I, too, have students. Here's the distribution of USC's new Freshman Class, for which the number who identify as white has dropped more than 5 percent in the past 5 years:
>
> White 46.4 %
> Asian/Pacific Islander 21.5
> Latino 13.0
> International 7.8
> African American 6.8
I asked a group of Pacific Islanders how many students who were not themselves Pacific Islanders they thought would be able to identify them as such. They seemed quite surprised by the question. They said that those not in their group, including faculty, administrators and staff, routinely confuse them with Asians from many other countries, and also with Hawaiians. "Only we can say who is a Pacific Islander," was the common response.

When I told them that a black student in Texas believed that what matters is not one's own self-identification with any particular group, but rather how others categorize them, because that most influences how they are treated, they laughed. When they saw that I was indeed serious, however, they simply repeated their original position: "Only we can say who is a Pacific Islander."

I'd be willing to meet you half way, Glenn, and say that the truth of race, entirely a social and cultural construct, lies somewhere between self and others. But this only reinforces what I have been attempting to say all along--that to attempt to legislate objective categories of race into survey response categories (as if one were constructing SAT questions) is simply to engineer the very results that we wish to be objectively studying. The objective truth is that race, as we use that term, is subjective, contingent, and continuously under social and cultural negotiation and renegotiation.

Because race is such an important topic for us to study, I'd give a lot to make it more tractable to large-scale survey research efforts, but I'm afraid it is not. We can make it so only by defining away many aspects of race which a number of quite savvy Pacific Islanders on my campus know race to possess, both in the histories of their own families, and also in day-to-day life, as they live it.

I think that the US Census work which Betsy Martin reports to us today is about as good as we can do, and I've found that Census staffers themselves are quite cautious and restrained in the uses they make of such data--a strategy both intelligent and wise, in my opinion.

-- Jim

******

On Thu, 18 Oct 2001, Norval D. Glenn wrote:

> Jim and others,
> > I have been, and still am, of the school of thought that considers
In the context where race is asked as a measure of self-identity, cultural identity, etc., what does it add to other measures that are used like ethnic identity i.e. African American, hispanic, etc.? Would another set of questions, leaving aside race, be as valid and informative i.e. Ethnic identity, mother tongue, country of birth,... in short, do we need "race" as such or is self-identity well covered and better covered by other measures?
following Jim Beniger:
"An objective science of subjective phenomena is certainly better than a
subjective science of objective phenomena..." The same goes for
measurement... : An objective measurement...

Claire Durand

At 11:31 2001-10-18 -0400, you wrote:

> I meant to comment earlier on Jim's lament.
> It is important to note that attempts to improve survey measurements of
> race do not necessarily rely upon an understanding of race as an
> "objective" construct. Indeed, the government standards for collecting
> race explicitly define race in terms of self-identification, not
> "objective" characteristics. If you recall your Census 2000 questionnaire
> (and who can forget it??) it asked, "What is this person's race? Mark one
> or more races to indicate what this person considers himself/herself to
> be." Thus, in the census, your race is what you (or a household proxy
> reporting for you) report it to be. There is no "right" answer. The
> Office of Management and Budget standards for collecting data on race
> explicitly state that "The racial and ethnic categories set forth in the
> standards should not be interpreted as being primarily biological or
> genetic in reference. Race and ethnicity may be thought of in terms of
> social and cultural characteristics..."
>
> Race is a social construct. I don't know anybody who has conducted
> research in this area who does not come to appreciate that measurement of
> race and related constructs is very complex and presents profound
> difficulties at many levels.
>
> Betsy Martin
> U. S. Census Bureau

James

Beniger
<aapornet@usc.edu>  To:  AAPORNET

<beniger@rcf. usc.edu>  cc:

Sent by:  Subject:  RE: Hispanics by

Race
owner-aaporne

t@usc.edu

10/11/2001
Folks,

I find the epistemology of this ongoing discussion of "Hispanics by Race" absolutely fascinating.

The item construction seems to me analogous to what one might expect, for example, at ETS, in designing its SAT questions to maximize the chances that those who actually know the answers will be able to find one--and only one--appropriate response category.

Of course this general idea does have many good applications in survey research. When it comes to a respondent's own perceived national origin and race, however, a number of you who have posted on AAPORNET in the past two days seem to be assuming that you know the correct answers already (ETS model) and want to design your items to maximize the chances that your respondents will give you back the answers you expect.

But such assumptions as these raise the questions of race and national origin to a political question: Who is to decide our own origins and race? Are these existential and objective facts, or are we free to decide them for ourselves, or are we forced to have them decided by others, including others whom we do not know, and have not given the authority to do this?

I myself have an open mind on this set of questions. I write here only because, although I find that the science behind all of the postings has been correct (as I would expect from AAPORNETters), I also think that there are much more important questions and issues also at stake here. Because I would like to see these other questions discussed in this same context, I hope to begin that discussion here, with this message.

It's much easier to design a question about integral calculus which has one and only one answer, after all, than it is to give anything nearly as certain an answer about the race or
Field experiments as well as qualitative research conducted at the Census Bureau suggest that the perceived redundancy of the race and Hispanic origin questions is reduced when Hispanic origin precedes race in the questionnaire. The item nonresponse for Hispanic origin is much lower, and Hispanics are less likely to report their race as "Some other race" and write in Hispanic--though many still do this even in the reversed order. Item sequencing does not fully solve the problem, but it helps.

Claire Durand
Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca
http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc/

"Il y a 50% de chances, ì¿¾ 3,1%, qu'il fasse beau demain".
"There is a 50% chance, ì¿¾ 3,1%, that tomorrow will be sunny".

Université de Montréal, dept. de sociologie,
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3C 3J7
Actuellement à Paris : 01-45-81-58-52
Simply ask for the "female head of house".

> Teresa Hottle wrote:
> > Can anyone tell me if their is a standard survey introduction that asks for the female head of household? We wanted to stay away from this phrase and thought about asking for the female that makes or shares in the decisions of the household. The client is concerned that we will exclude women who feel they are not the head of household or do not make the decisions.
> > Thanks in advance,
> > Terrie

The following article appears in today's Washington Post.

I must admit that I find some irony in the notion that the very leaders who were criticized for relying too much on polls are now being taken to task for not properly gauging public opinion on major issues.

Jan Werner
Military Plans Informed by Polls

Carefully Chosen Words Prepare Americans for Potential Toll in Ground War

By Karen DeYoung and Dana Milbank
Washington Post Staff Writers
Friday, October 19, 2001; Page A19

The Bush administration has sent U.S. ground forces into Afghanistan secure in the knowledge that the American public overwhelmingly backs the action and is prepared, if necessary, to accept significant casualties.

That confidence is due, in part, to widespread and consistent nationwide polls. In virtually every survey since the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, strong majorities have backed both air and ground action by the military, even when the prospect of large numbers of casualties is mentioned.

But according to White House aides, political strategists and well-informed diplomats, moving the public mind-set toward acceptance of American troops in Afghanistan has also been a key component of administration strategy since initial military plans were drawn up after the attacks.

Fearing that the public's image of war was the 100-hour Persian Gulf conflict and that Americans would tire of the Afghan campaign before ground operations could begin, Bush has repeatedly spoken of the need for patience, invoking the memory of World War II as a way of conditioning Americans to expect a higher level of sacrifice.

"As Americans did 60 years ago, we have entered a struggle of uncertain duration," Bush said at a memorial last week for victims of the attack on the Pentagon. "But now, as then . . . we have the patience to fight and win on many fronts."

When pressed to explain what kind of sacrifice he has in mind, Bush has retreated to relatively benign examples such as longer lines at airports. But several aides, who did not want to be named or quoted directly, said the language of sacrifice has also been intended to prepare the public to accept the loss of American lives in combat.

Although Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld has avoided saying when and exactly how the ground phase of the military campaign would take place, he has said publicly from the start that aerial bombardment was "creating conditions that we believe will be necessary for sustained anti-terrorist operations throughout the country."

The planning premise, said one source knowledgeable about the strategy, has been that "at the right stage, you're going to need ground forces. . . . The principle of having called up reservists, of being ready to put troops in, albeit special forces . . . no one has argued about that. The president has made a judgment about American public opinion, including the awareness that this could lead to casualties."
The deaths of more than 5,000 Americans in New York, Virginia and Pennsylvania in terrorist events witnessed for the most part on live television seem to have abruptly changed the American psyche on questions of war and its costs.

Since Vietnam, the long-standing political assumption has been that Americans were unwilling to die in long wars in faraway lands where there were uncertain U.S. interests. Casualties in conflicts since then have been either nonexistent, as in Kosovo, or relatively small -- 19 in Grenada, 23 in Panama, 148 in the Gulf War and 43 in Somalia. Fighting on the ground has been brief.

But in the current conflict, "the interest at stake is so clear . . . the risks you're willing to take to achieve the objective are much, much larger," said Ivo H. Daalder of the Brookings Institution. "I think the administration understands this, and that's why they don't hem and haw about ground troops. Nobody is, not on the Hill, not anywhere."

"It makes little sense to say, 'Let's not invade, we might get stuck like we did in Vietnam and the Soviets did in Afghanistan,' " he said. "Casualty tolerance is extremely high, I would argue, as long as we are engaged in military operations to get the bastards."

Daalder, who coordinated Clinton administration policy in the Balkans on the National Security Council in 1995-96, argues along with many others that the so-called Vietnam syndrome ended long before the last overseas U.S. military engagement, in Kosovo, and that the Clinton administration badly misjudged public opinion.

When NATO decided to go to war in the Balkans in March 1999, after a year of negotiations failed to stop Serbian attacks on the Kosovar Albanian population, it did so with the understanding that the war would be fought only from the air. European allies did not want to use ground troops without U.S. participation, and President Clinton was convinced the American public would not support ground action.

"I do not intend to put our troops in Kosovo to fight a war," Clinton said on March 24, 1999, as aerial bombing of Serbia began. By April, British Prime Minister Tony Blair and some others in NATO had become convinced that it would be prudent to at least start contingency planning for the introduction of ground troops, but he was unable to convince the U.S. president and his advisers.

"They believed that the public was zero casualty-tolerant," Daalder said.

That belief was perhaps understandable given that the first foreign policy crisis faced by Clinton, in 1993, was the death of 18 U.S. soldiers in Somalia. For the Clinton administration, Daalder said, "Somalia demonstrated that when you have 18 casualties, the world blows up in public opinion. Therefore, you could never risk casualties, certainly not on the ground."

But according to a study released last March by Steven Kull and Clay Ramsay of the Program on International Policy Attitudes at the
University of Maryland, "this image of the public is largely a myth and is not sustained by available evidence."

In the event of casualties, they wrote, the public is not likely to demand withdrawal but "if anything . . . is more likely to want to respond assertively."

Other experts argue that public tolerance for American casualties in war is not so predictable and depends largely on how large and tangible the threat is.

After Pearl Harbor, said Ohio State University political scientist John Mueller, who wrote a book on public opinion and war casualties, there was near limitless acceptance of whatever sacrifice it took to defeat the enemy.

But during Cold War battles, when the enemy was an abstract notion of international communism, support dropped precipitously if an action did not go well.

Mueller said public opinion during the current conflict is likely to be fickle. Americans start with a sense of fury and desire for revenge similar to the reaction to Pearl Harbor. But because of the nebulous aim of the war against terrorism, they will judge the sacrifice on the perceived value of each individual battle.

"I have trouble treating this as a war," Mueller said. "Terrorism is not like taking a hill. It's like fighting crime. It can never go to zero."

Ramsay noted that "given the additional factor of self-defense, which has never played before in any of the conflicts of the '90s," public opinion in favor of strong military action started out "at a far higher baseline."

But the same polls that indicate public support for both air and ground action in the fight against terrorism also show that Americans would much rather engage in conflict as part of an international alliance than unilaterally.

"The short answer is that Americans don't want to be the world's policeman, but they do want a more orderly and livable world and are ready to participate in creating that," Ramsay said.

Americans, he added, are pleased the administration has formed an international coalition to fight terrorism, both because it makes them more comfortable than going it alone and because they think it is necessary for the war to succeed.

The administration has emphasized that the anti-terrorism war is being waged by an international coalition of forces, although most are not participating militarily. Canada has offered military assistance, as has Germany, where Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder was reported yesterday as saying his government was ready to provide anti-chemical and anti-biological warfare forces and medical teams to support the U.S.-led campaign.
French Defense Minister Alain Richard also said yesterday that French soldiers could take part in a U.S. ground operation.

But according to current military plans, only U.S. and British special forces components are expected to be involved in ground operations that will include coordinating with Afghan forces fighting against the Taliban militia and searching for Osama bin Laden and his associates.

It remains unclear who will keep the peace once the U.S. offensive is over in Afghanistan, where opposition groups are far from united. Intensive negotiations are underway with the United Nations, which the administration hopes will play a central role in rebuilding the country.

"It is unlikely the United States would end up active in a troop role as peacekeepers in Afghanistan," Rumsfeld said yesterday.

Although the United States expects to help financially and with humanitarian aid, the "peace-time" ground mission will be left to others while the United States moves on to other targets in the anti-terrorism war.

The administration has pledged to take the battle to all nations that harbor international terrorists, an ongoing campaign that coalition partners in Europe and the Middle East have shown little interest thus far in supporting.

If public opinion surveys are right, the American public might begin to balk at a unilateral U.S. military effort beyond Afghanistan.
I noted earlier having written the Pakistan Poll for further information. I received a lengthy reply (in excellent English) from Ijaz Gilani, Chairman of "Gallup Pakistan." In it he details training from earlier important figures in the U.S., such as Ithiel Pool and Hayward Alker Jr. It sounds as though they know what they are doing. He also mentions unfortunate "acrimonious" relations with Gallup USA, but doesn't detail them. As Jan Werner notes, the Pakistan Poll report available on the web is as informative (or more so) as many U.S. poll reports, and it is a mistake to dismiss it because it wasn't carried out by Gallup USA or done by Americans! Having had a long interest in Pakistan myself, I plan to try to learn more and will relay anything that seems of importance.

Howard

In earlier surveys I obtained race as both self-identification and interviewer identification where the main focus was on black/white
Correlations between the two were almost perfect, and I doubt that they would be much lower today, unless one allows more categories. New issues have arisen especially with Hispanics and some other increasing ethnic groups in the U.S. where both social and self definitions are much more ambiguous.

Both self and other definitions are obviously important, as are the correspondences and differences between them, including causal (it is hard to think of yourself as X if everyone else treats you as Y.)

Race is clearly a construct, as are just about all other social science classifications including class. Also gender as we have learned in recent years. It's also worth noting that the term "race" has been used in the past in various ways, so that at points the English were referred to as a race (maybe even by Churchill?). And there are other oddities, e.g., Jews usually don't like to be referred to as a race (pointing out that there are black Jews), but as a "people" is often ok. Etc. Howard

I have a client who has been told by her client (a government agency) that myriad surveys have been done of parents relative to what motivates them to seek out parenting information or resources as well as what barriers there are to seeking such resources. She, however, has found almost nothing on these topics. Can any of you kind aapornet-ers help?

Jennifer D. Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.
jdfranz@earthlink.net

I have a client who has been told by her client (a government agency) that myriad surveys have been done of parents relative to what motivates them to seek out parenting information or resources as well as what barriers there are to seeking such resources. She, however, has found almost nothing on these topics. Can any of you kind aapornet-ers help?
Howard Schuman [mailto:hschuman@umich.edu] said:
> He also mentions
> unfortunate "acrimonious" relations with Gallup USA, but
> doesn't detail
> them. As Jan Werner notes, the Pakistan Poll report
> available on the web
> is as informative (or more so) as many U.S. poll reports, and it is a
> mistake to dismiss it because it wasn't carried out by Gallup
> USA or done
> by Americans! Having had a long interest in Pakistan myself,
> I plan to
> try to learn more and will relay anything that seems of importance.
> Howard

I could be wrong here but I thought most of the concerns expressed were about their sampling frame (all big cities no other areas) rather than the fact that they have testy relations with Gallup and are from another country. I personally was impressed with the level of sophistication necessary to do a multi-language study of this nature in a very short period of time.

Did anyone else notice that this statement from that page: "The respondents were chosen statistically and they represented a cross section of people belonging to various age, education, income and language backgrounds." does not include gender? I am guessing that their first available adult selection method skews heavily male (perhaps inevitably so).

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com
Has anyone done a survey or detailed study of poll respondents' attitudes toward the questions of race and ethnicity, by, of course, race and ethnicity, as well as other relevant variables? It sounds as though there could be some interesting variations among groups.

Cecilie Gaziano
Research Solutions, Inc.
Minneapolis, MN
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Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
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  by berzerk.gpcc.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id LAA11326
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Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 11:08:44 -0400 (EDT)
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>
X-X-Sender: <hschuman@seawolf.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
Yes, but they make it clear that their sample is from major cities, which are indeed of greatest importance in a country like Pakistan, though of course one would like national results as well.

I have asked them about gender, probably a difficult issue there. It may well be unsafe to send female interviewers alone to many parts of the country, while at the same time many potential female respondents (or their husbands) would probably not accept a male interviewer. Having myself worked once in what was then East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), there are many issues not encountered in the U.S., though some like response rates are often easier. -Howard

On Fri, 19 Oct 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:

> I could be wrong here but I thought most of the concerns expressed were
> about their sampling frame (all big cities no other areas) rather than the
> fact that they have testy relations with Gallup and are from another
> county.
> I personally was impressed with the level of sophistication necessary to do
> a multi-language study of this nature in a very short period of time.
> Did anyone else notice that this statement from that page: "The respondents
> were chosen statistically and they represented a cross section of people
> belonging to various age, education, income and language backgrounds." does
> not include gender?  I am guessing that their first available adult
> selection method skews heavily male (perhaps inevitably so).
>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, LLC
> simonetta@artsci.com
>
>From mark@bisconti.com Fri Oct 19 08:09:12 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9JF9Be23666 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001
08:09:11 -0700 (PDT)
Received: (qmail 7755 invoked from network); 19 Oct 2001 15:08:59 -0000
Is the Pentagon conducting opinion studies among our military men and women? Would be interesting to compare American to British, and other participants. Mark Richards

///

The American Soldiers Studies at The Roper Center: http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/ams1.html

The American Soldiers Studies
- Black Men
- Men regardless of race
- White Men
- Women regardless of race
- Miscellaneous

On the day after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the Research Branch of the Information and Education Division of the War Department conducted the first in a series of large-scale surveys of personnel in the United States armed forces. In the words of project staff director Samuel A. Stouffer, the purpose of the project was "to provide the army command quickly and accurately with facts about the attitudes of soldiers which...might be helpful in policy formation."

By the end of World War II, more than half a million soldiers had been interviewed on such subjects as their feelings toward the army, their living conditions and entertainment, their attitudes toward the enemy and the war, their mental health, their actual combat experiences, and many others. The data gathered in the course of this massive project today represent a trove of research material whose historical, sociological, and methodological value extends well beyond the original intent of the investigators. These data are now available in their entirety from the Roper Center in the form of over 100 studies with complete documentation.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Jan Werner
The following article appears in today's Washington Post.

I must admit that I find some irony in the notion that the very leaders who were criticized for relying too much on polls are now being taken to task for not properly gauging public opinion on major issues.

Jan Werner

Military Plans Informed by Polls

Carefully Chosen Words Prepare Americans for Potential Toll in Ground War

By Karen DeYoung and Dana Milbank
Washington Post Staff Writers
Friday, October 19, 2001; Page A19

The Bush administration has sent U.S. ground forces into Afghanistan secure in the knowledge that the American public overwhelmingly backs the action and is prepared, if necessary, to accept significant casualties.

That confidence is due, in part, to widespread and consistent nationwide polls. In virtually every survey since the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, strong majorities have backed both air and ground action by the military, even when the prospect of large numbers of casualties is mentioned.

But according to White House aides, political strategists and well-informed diplomats, moving the public mind-set toward acceptance of American troops in Afghanistan has also been a key component of administration strategy since initial military plans were drawn up after the attacks.

Fearing that the public's image of war was the 100-hour Persian Gulf conflict and that Americans would tire of the Afghan campaign before ground operations could begin, Bush has repeatedly spoken of the need for patience, invoking the memory of World War II as a way of conditioning Americans to expect a higher level of sacrifice.

"As Americans did 60 years ago, we have entered a struggle of uncertain duration," Bush said at a memorial last week for victims of the attack on the Pentagon. "But now, as then . . . we have the patience to fight and win on many fronts."

When pressed to explain what kind of sacrifice he has in mind, Bush has retreated to relatively benign examples such as longer lines at airports. But several aides, who did not want to be named or quoted directly, said the language of sacrifice has also been intended to prepare the public to accept the loss of American lives in combat.

Although Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld has avoided saying
when and exactly how the ground phase of the military campaign would take place, he has said publicly from the start that aerial bombardment was "creating conditions that we believe will be necessary for sustained anti-terrorist operations throughout the country."

The planning premise, said one source knowledgeable about the strategy, has been that "at the right stage, you're going to need ground forces... The principle of having called up reservists, of being ready to put troops in, albeit special forces... no one has argued about that. The president has made a judgment about American public opinion, including the awareness that this could lead to casualties."

The deaths of more than 5,000 Americans in New York, Virginia and Pennsylvania in terrorist events witnessed for the most part on live television seem to have abruptly changed the American psyche on questions of war and its costs.

Since Vietnam, the long-standing political assumption has been that Americans were unwilling to die in long wars in faraway lands where there were uncertain U.S. interests. Casualties in conflicts since then have been either nonexistent, as in Kosovo, or relatively small -- 19 in Grenada, 23 in Panama, 148 in the Gulf War and 43 in Somalia. Fighting on the ground has been brief.

But in the current conflict, "the interest at stake is so clear... the risks you're willing to take to achieve the objective are much, much larger," said Ivo H. Daalder of the Brookings Institution. "I think the administration understands this, and that's why they don't hem and haw about ground troops. Nobody is, not on the Hill, not anywhere."

"It makes little sense to say, 'Let's not invade, we might get stuck like we did in Vietnam and the Soviets did in Afghanistan,'" he said. "Casualty tolerance is extremely high, I would argue, as long as we are engaged in military operations to get the bastards."

Daalder, who coordinated Clinton administration policy in the Balkans on the National Security Council in 1995-96, argues along with many others that the so-called Vietnam syndrome ended long before the last overseas U.S. military engagement, in Kosovo, and that the Clinton administration badly misjudged public opinion.

When NATO decided to go to war in the Balkans in March 1999, after a year of negotiations failed to stop Serbian attacks on the Kosovar Albanian population, it did so with the understanding that the war would be fought only from the air. European allies did not want to use ground troops without U.S. participation, and President Clinton was convinced the American public would not support ground action.

"I do not intend to put our troops in Kosovo to fight a war," Clinton said on March 24, 1999, as aerial bombing of Serbia began. By April, British Prime Minister Tony Blair and some others in NATO had become convinced that it would be prudent to at least start contingency planning for the introduction of ground troops, but he was unable to convince the U.S. president and his advisers.
"They believed that the public was zero casualty-tolerant," Daalder said.

That belief was perhaps understandable given that the first foreign policy crisis faced by Clinton, in 1993, was the death of 18 U.S. soldiers in Somalia. For the Clinton administration, Daalder said, "Somalia demonstrated that when you have 18 casualties, the world blows up in public opinion. Therefore, you could never risk casualties, certainly not on the ground."

But according to a study released last March by Steven Kull and Clay Ramsay of the Program on International Policy Attitudes at the University of Maryland, "this image of the public is largely a myth and is not sustained by available evidence."

In the event of casualties, they wrote, the public is not likely to demand withdrawal but "if anything . . . is more likely to want to respond assertively."

Other experts argue that public tolerance for American casualties in war is not so predictable and depends largely on how large and tangible the threat is.

After Pearl Harbor, said Ohio State University political scientist John Mueller, who wrote a book on public opinion and war casualties, there was near limitless acceptance of whatever sacrifice it took to defeat the enemy.

But during Cold War battles, when the enemy was an abstract notion of international communism, support dropped precipitously if an action did not go well.

Mueller said public opinion during the current conflict is likely to be fickle. Americans start with a sense of fury and desire for revenge similar to the reaction to Pearl Harbor. But because of the nebulous aim of the war against terrorism, they will judge the sacrifice on the perceived value of each individual battle.

"I have trouble treating this as a war," Mueller said. "Terrorism is not like taking a hill. It's like fighting crime. It can never go to zero."

Ramsay noted that "given the additional factor of self-defense, which has never played before in any of the conflicts of the '90s," public opinion in favor of strong military action started out "at a far higher baseline."

But the same polls that indicate public support for both air and ground action in the fight against terrorism also show that Americans would much rather engage in conflict as part of an international alliance than unilaterally.

"The short answer is that Americans don't want to be the world's policeman, but they do want a more orderly and livable world and are ready to participate in creating that," Ramsay said.
Americans, he added, are pleased the administration has formed an international coalition to fight terrorism, both because it makes them more comfortable than going it alone and because they think it is necessary for the war to succeed.

The administration has emphasized that the anti-terrorism war is being waged by an international coalition of forces, although most are not participating militarily. Canada has offered military assistance, as has Germany, where Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder was reported yesterday as saying his government was ready to provide anti-chemical and anti-biological warfare forces and medical teams to support the U.S.-led campaign.

French Defense Minister Alain Richard also said yesterday that French soldiers could take part in a U.S. ground operation.

But according to current military plans, only U.S. and British special forces components are expected to be involved in ground operations that will include coordinating with Afghan forces fighting against the Taliban militia and searching for Osama bin Laden and his associates.

It remains unclear who will keep the peace once the U.S. offensive is over in Afghanistan, where opposition groups are far from united. Intensive negotiations are underway with the United Nations, which the administration hopes will play a central role in rebuilding the country.

"It is unlikely the United States would end up active in a troop role as peacekeepers in Afghanistan," Rumsfeld said yesterday.

Although the United States expects to help financially and with humanitarian aid, the "peacetime" ground mission will be left to others while the United States moves on to other targets in the anti-terrorism war.

The administration has pledged to take the battle to all nations that harbor international terrorists, an ongoing campaign that coalition partners in Europe and the Middle East have shown little interest thus far in supporting.

If public opinion surveys are right, the American public might begin to balk at a unilateral U.S. military effort beyond Afghanistan.

(c) 2001 The Washington Post Company
Here, thanks to the Associated Press, is an idea likely to save mail surveys in 2001 AA (After Anthrax): Stamp each envelope with "Iron Before Opening!"

Now all we need is some donated advertising time and space to introduce American males to the concept of "ironing"...

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
(C) Copyright 2001 The Associated Press
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
    sns-ap-anthrax-ironing-mail1018oct18.story

Expert: Ironing Mail Kills Spores

By Associated Press WASHINGTON --

An expert on germ warfare is telling Americans to use a steam iron on the mail if they're afraid to open it.

Ken Alibek said the combination of heat and moisture would kill any anthrax lurking in an envelope.

"If you are scared, just iron this letter," he said. "After that, they (the spores) become harmless." Microwaves are somewhat less effective than steam ironing because they don't emit moist heat, he said.

Alibek defected to the United States in 1992 after serving as deputy head of the huge Biopreparat venture linked to germ warfare in the former Soviet Union. The Soviet Union produced hundreds of tons of anthrax at its sprawling biological weapons facilities.

And here is another method that the post office could use to kill unwanted and dangerous germs ... irradiate the mail ... it would probably be more effective and less risky than ironing (and microwaving letters doesn't work, by the way) ... see:

http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/011017/law117_1.html

Mark Richards

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of James Beniger
Sent: Friday, October 19, 2001 11:53 AM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Mail Surveys Rescued
Here, thanks to the Associated Press, is an idea likely to save mail surveys in 2001 AA (After Anthrax): Stamp each envelope with "Iron Before Opening!"

Now all we need is some donated advertising time and space to introduce American males to the concept of "ironing"...

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------
(C) Copyright 2001 The Associated Press
---------------------------------------------

Expert: Ironing Mail Kills Spores

By Associated Press WASHINGTON --

An expert on germ warfare is telling Americans to use a steam iron on the mail if they're afraid to open it.

Ken Alibek said the combination of heat and moisture would kill any anthrax lurking in an envelope.

"If you are scared, just iron this letter," he said. "After that, they (the spores) become harmless." Microwaves are somewhat less effective than steam ironing because they don't emit moist heat, he said.

Alibek defected to the United States in 1992 after serving as deputy head of the huge Biopreparat venture linked to germ warfare in the former Soviet Union. The Soviet Union produced hundreds of tons of anthrax at its sprawling biological weapons facilities.
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>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Fri Oct 19 09:20:31 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
Why not have the USPS iron first class mail? They already have equipment that automates weighing, reading of addresses, sorting, and canceling. Maybe for a few extra cents postage we could send a letter "with."

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

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNIT <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Friday, October 19, 2001 11:53 AM
Subject: Mail Surveys Rescued

> >
> >
> > Here, thanks to the Associated Press, is an idea likely to
> > save mail surveys in 2001 AA (After Anthrax): Stamp each
> > envelope with "Iron Before Opening!"
> >
> > Now all we need is some donated advertising time and space
> > to introduce American males to the concept of "ironing"...
> >
> > -- Jim
> 
> >----------------------------------------------------------
> > (C) Copyright 2001 The Associated Press
> >----------------------------------------------------------
> > sns-ap-anthrax-ironing-mail1018oct18.story
Expert: Ironing Mail Kills Spores

By Associated Press WASHINGTON --

An expert on germ warfare is telling Americans to use a steam iron on the
mail if they're afraid to open it.

Ken Alibek said the combination of heat and moisture would kill any
anthrax lurking in an envelope.

"If you are scared, just iron this letter," he said. "After that, they
(the spores) become harmless." Microwaves are somewhat less effective
than steam ironing because they don't emit moist heat, he said.

Alibek defected to the United States in 1992 after serving as deputy head
of the huge Biopreparat venture linked to germ warfare in the former
Soviet Union. The Soviet Union produced hundreds of tons of anthrax at
its sprawling biological weapons facilities.

Alibek spoke Tuesday at a Capitol Hill briefing organized by Reps. Edward
Markey, D-Mass., and Christopher Shays, R-Conn.
From: Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>
Subject: RE: Mail Surveys Rescued
In-Reply-To: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLCLIIIIOEMMDKAA.mark@bisconti.com>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110190843050.19826-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

How about "burn before reading"?

(Just kidding, in case anyone took it seriously!)

Don Ferree

At 12:09 PM 10/19/2001 -0400, you wrote:
> And here is another method that the post office could use to kill unwanted
> and dangerous germs ... irradiate the mail ... it would probably be more
> effective and less risky than ironing (and microwaving letters doesn't work,
> by the way) ... see:
> http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/011017/1aw117_1.html
>
> Mark Richards
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
> James Beniger
> Sent: Friday, October 19, 2001 11:53 AM
> To: AAPORNET
> Subject: Mail Surveys Rescued
> >
> > Here, thanks to the Associated Press, is an idea likely to
> > save mail surveys in 2001 AA (After Anthrax): Stamp each
> > envelope with "Iron Before Opening!"
> >
> > Now all we need is some donated advertising time and space
> > to introduce American males to the concept of "ironing"...
> >
> > -- Jim
>
> >------------------------------------------------------------------------------
> > (C) Copyright 2001 The Associated Press
> >------------------------------------------------------------------------------
> >     sns-ap-anthrax-ironing-mail1018oct18.story
> >
> > Expert: Ironing Mail Kills Spores
> >
> > By Associated Press WASHINGTON --
An expert on germ warfare is telling Americans to use a steam iron on the mail if they're afraid to open it.

Ken Alibek said the combination of heat and moisture would kill any anthrax lurking in an envelope.

"If you are scared, just iron this letter," he said. "After that, they (the spores) become harmless." Microwaves are somewhat less effective than steam ironing because they don't emit moist heat, he said.

Alibek defected to the United States in 1992 after serving as deputy head of the huge Biopreparat venture linked to germ warfare in the former Soviet Union. The Soviet Union produced hundreds of tons of anthrax at its sprawling biological weapons facilities.


I apologize in advance for this but...
This method is highly desirable. Tends to produce glowing results.

Jim Caplan
Arlington

-----Original Message-----
From: Mark David Richards [SMTP:mark@bisconti.com]
Sent: Friday, October 19, 2001 12:09 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Mail Surveys Rescued

And here is another method that the post office could use to kill unwanted
and dangerous germs ... irradiate the mail ... it would probably be more
effective and less risky than ironing (and microwaving letters doesn't work,
by the way) ... see:

http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/011017/law117_1.html

Mark Richards

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
James Beniger
Sent: Friday, October 19, 2001 11:53 AM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Mail Surveys Rescued

Here, thanks to the Associated Press, is an idea likely to save mail surveys in 2001 AA (After Anthrax): Stamp each envelope with "Iron Before Opening!"

Now all we need is some donated advertising time and space to introduce American males to the concept of "ironing"...

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
(C) Copyright 2001 The Associated Press
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
sns-ap-anthrax-ironing-mail1018oct18.story

Expert: Ironing Mail Kills Spores

By Associated Press WASHINGTON --
An expert on germ warfare is telling Americans to use a steam iron on the mail if they're afraid to open it.

Ken Alibek said the combination of heat and moisture would kill any anthrax lurking in an envelope.

"If you are scared, just iron this letter," he said. "After that, they (the spores) become harmless." Microwaves are somewhat less effective than steam ironing because they don't emit moist heat, he said.

Alibek defected to the United States in 1992 after serving as deputy head of the huge Biopreparat venture linked to germ warfare in the former Soviet Union. The Soviet Union produced hundreds of tons of anthrax at its sprawling biological weapons facilities.

Has some sort of moratorium been called on media-sponsored presidential approval rating polls? Seems like before 9/11 we were constantly deluged with them. After 9/11, what happened to them all? At least, they aren't surfacing on the news sources I attend to at nearly the level they formerly did. I suppose it's possible that all the media simply collectively decided that President Bush's unprecedentedly high level of public support (as I have heard rumored) does not qualify as "news". Possible, but hardly likely. Does anyone have any ideas?

Ray Funkhouser

I don't see any change in frequency based on Polling Report data (see link below). If anything, frequency has increased in some cases.

Poll stories may be getting less attention given the crush of other news in recent weeks.

Nick

http://www.pollingreport.com/BushJob.htm

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

> Has some sort of moratorium been called on media-sponsored presidential approval rating polls? Seems like before 9/11 we were constantly deluged
> with them. After 9/11, what happened to them all? At least, they aren't
> surfacing on the news sources I attend to at nearly the level they formerly
> did. I suppose it's possible that all the media simply collectively
> decided
> that President Bush's unprecedentedly high level of public support (as I
> have
> heard rumored) does not qualify as "news". Possible, but hardly likely.
> Does anyone have any ideas?
>
> Ray Funkhouser

>From godard@virginia.edu Fri Oct 19 10:22:35 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9JHMZel2406 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001
10:22:35 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/us) with SMTP
   id KAA13143 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001 10:22:35 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtp.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id ab17387;
   19 Oct 2001 13:22 EDT
Received: from Jose (vsat-148-70-64-146.pool.starband.net [148.70.64.146])
   by smtp.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id NAA15906
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001 13:22:16 -0400
From: Ellis Godard <godard@virginia.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Mail Surveys Rescued
Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 10:22:16 -0700
Message-ID: <NCEELGJNGFLOAJBFAFFOIECMDGAA.godard@virginia.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 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110190843050.19826-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

How might ironing affect contents? Gumming on envelope flaps and stamps
inside would be lost. Some checks and other documents which have
heat-sensitive security features might be rendered worthless. That seems to
let the terrorists win - but perhaps every security measure does, as well.

Regards,
Ellis

> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
> James Beniger
> Sent: Friday, October 19, 2001 8:53 AM
> To: AAPORNET
> Subject: Mail Surveys Rescued
> >
Here, thanks to the Associated Press, is an idea likely to save mail surveys in 2001 AA (After Anthrax): Stamp each envelope with "Iron Before Opening!"

Now all we need is some donated advertising time and space to introduce American males to the concept of "ironing"

-- Jim

----------------------------------------------------------------------
--------
(C) Copyright 2001 The Associated Press
----------------------------------------------------------------------
--------
sns-ap-anthrax-ironing-mail1018oct18.story

Expert: Ironing Mail Kills Spores

By Associated Press WASHINGTON --

An expert on germ warfare is telling Americans to use a steam iron on the mail if they're afraid to open it.

Ken Alibek said the combination of heat and moisture would kill any anthrax lurking in an envelope.

"If you are scared, just iron this letter," he said. "After that, they (the spores) become harmless." Microwaves are somewhat less effective than steam ironing because they don't emit moist heat, he said.

Alibek defected to the United States in 1992 after serving as deputy head of the huge Biopreparat venture linked to germ warfare in the former Soviet Union. The Soviet Union produced hundreds of tons of anthrax at its sprawling biological weapons facilities.


----------------------------------------------------------------------
--------
(C) Copyright 2001 The Associated Press
----------------------------------------------------------------------
--------

******
I regularly chart the Gallup approval polls to show to my classes and they have been coming out at the usual interval. I suspect that these polls are simply getting less news coverage. As long as Bush's ratings remain at such high levels there is no newsworthy element to them. If they begin dropping, we'll see a surge of media attention (and probably calls to many of us on the list) attempting to explain the loss of support.

Bruce Altschuler
SUNY Oswego

On Fri, 19 Oct 2001 RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

> Has some sort of moratorium been called on media-sponsored presidential approval rating polls? Seems like before 9/11 we were constantly deluged with them. After 9/11, what happened to them all? At least, they aren't surfacing on the news sources I attend to at nearly the level they formerly did. I suppose it's possible that all the media simply collectively decided that President Bush's unprecedentedly high level of public support (as I have heard rumored) does not qualify as "news". Possible, but hardly likely.
> Does anyone have any ideas?
>
> Ray Funkhouser

>
First, Bush's high approval ratings have been covered and, I believe, are generally publicly known.

However, there seems to be less political news lately, and perhaps as a consequence, fewer stories where Bush's job approval ratings would be relevant.

Bruce Altschuler wrote:

I regularly chart the Gallup approval polls to show to my classes and they have been coming out at the usual interval. I suspect that these polls are simply getting less news coverage. As long as Bush's ratings remain at such high levels there is no newsworthy element to them. If they begin dropping, we'll see a surge of media attention (and probably calls to many of us on the list) attempting to explain the loss of support.

Bruce Altschuler
SUNY Oswego

On Fri, 19 Oct 2001 R Funkhouser wrote:

Has some sort of moratorium been called on media-sponsored presidential approval rating polls? Seems like before 9/11 we were constantly deluged with them. After 9/11, what happened to them all? At least, they aren't surfacing on the news sources I attend to at nearly the level they formerly did. I suppose it's possible that all the media simply collectively decided that President Bush's unprecedentedly high level of public support (as I have heard rumored) does not qualify as "news". Possible, but hardly likely.

Does anyone have any ideas?
It would be good for us all if a few AAPORNETters from the DC area could attend this meeting on Monday, and report back to our list on the highlights for survey research and government, and all of our other passions. Some of our clients will be there, after all, and also a few of our respondents, perhaps. If you do attend, please take a few notes to share with us all.

-- Jim

ANNOUNCEMENT
National Press Club
Panel Discussion
October 22

Security or Surveillance?
Technology's Impact After September 11

On October 22, the Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC) and the Privacy Foundation will sponsor a policy briefing at the National Press Club in Washington to explore the implications of new systems for identification and tracking on personal privacy.

Questions to be considered include the reliability of face recognition technology, the limitations of national ID cards, and the role of authentication and identification in computer networks and communication
services.

The speakers will include Privacy Foundation CTO Richard Smith, Privacy Journal Editor Robert Ellis Smith, New Republic Legal Affairs Editor Jeffrey Rosen, RAND Senior Policy Analyst John Woodward, and Sun Distinguished Engineer Whitfield Diffie. The discussion will be moderated by EPIC Executive Director Marc Rotenberg.

Registration 12:30 - 12:50. Panel begins 1 pm - 2:30 pm.

The event is open to the press and the public. Please contact EPIC Research Director Sarah Andrews for further information.

EPIC is a public interest research center in Washington, D.C. It was established in 1994 to focus public attention on emerging civil liberties issues and to protect privacy, the First Amendment, and constitutional values.

The Privacy Foundation exists to educate the public, in part by conducting research into communications technologies and services that may pose a threat to personal privacy. The foundation will attempt to be fair and objective in its research projects and public reports.

Both organizations provide extensive resources on emerging privacy issues at their web sites -- www.epic.org and www.privacyfoundation.org.

Contact:

Sarah Andrews
EPIC Research Director
202-483-1140 ext 107
andrews@epic.org

-----------------------------
-----------------------------

*******

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Oct 19 15:18:53 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9JMIRE20981 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001
15:18:53 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id PAA25594 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001 15:18:51 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9JMIRM01628 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001 15:18:27 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 15:18:27 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
New Reports on the Elections

_Elections: Perspectives on Activities and Challenges Across the Nation_
http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?gao-02-3

"Elections: Statistical Analysis of Factors That Affected Uncounted Votes in the 2000 Presidential Election"
http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?gao-02-122

"Elections: Status and Use of Federal Voting Equipment Standards"
http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?gao-02-52

_Elections: A Framework for Evaluating Reform Proposal_
http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?gao-02-90

Even as many in the United States are focused on the threat of biological terrorism, some are turning their attention to last year's national crisis -- election difficulties and reform. These four reports, released this week by the Government Accounting Office (GAO), give a wealth of information on how elections are currently conducted in the United States, what contributed toward votes going uncounted in the last presidential elections, and how various reform proposals should be evaluated. The first report, weighing in at 436 pages, covers the various stages of elections -- registration, absentee voting, election day administration, vote counts, and recounts. The report also addresses the potential to use the Internet in voting and the technologies employed in the November 2000 elections. The second report, at 25 pages, correlates Census data with data on voting equipment, turnout, and presidential vote data. The report finds that the state in which counties were located, the counties' demographic characteristics, and their voting equipment all correlated with the percentage of uncounted votes. The third report, which is 33 pages, recommends a more explicit assignment of federal responsibility for maintaining and implementing voting equipment standards. The last report, at 80 pages, is the "capping report" from the GAO and addresses the challenges of undertaking any reform proposal. GAO emphasizes that the federal election system is fundamentally "51 individual systems that in turn are administered and principally funded by more than 10,000 counties, cities, townships, and villages."

http://scout.cs.wisc.edu/
Even less attention was given to the equally or more remarkable surge in Congressional approval ratings except as submerged in general stories on vanishing anti-government sentiment.

Seemingly, the surge in Congressional approval did not escape Administration strategist attention, however. I attribute the triple-barrelled "security leak" PR campaign as aimed at the Congress and at the media, some of which was beginning to chafe about censorship. That, together with the amazingly dim-bulb approval by Dems of skedaddling by the House should help cement the Administration's Gleichschaltung efforts neatly, particularly with the remarkably contrapuntal surfacing of Dick Cheney.

Albert D. Biderman
abider@earthlink.net

Bruce Altschuler wrote:
>
I regularly chart the Gallup approval polls to show to my classes
> and they have been coming out at the usual interval. I suspect that these
polls are simply getting less news coverage. As long as Bush's ratings remain at such high levels there is no newsworthy element to them. If they begin dropping, we'll see a surge of media attention (and probably calls to many of us on the list) attempting to explain the loss of support.

Bruce Altschuler
SUNY Oswego

On Fri, 19 Oct 2001 RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

>>Has some sort of moratorium been called on media-sponsored presidential approval rating polls? Seems like before 9/11 we were constantly deluged with them. After 9/11, what happened to them all? At least, they aren't surfacing on the news sources I attend to at nearly the level they formerly did. I suppose it's possible that all the media simply collectively decided that President Bush's unprecedentedly high level of public support (as I have heard rumored) does not qualify as "news". Possible, but hardly likely. Does anyone have any ideas?

>>

Ray Funkhouser

From abider@earthlink.net Fri Oct 19 16:15:16 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9JNFGe28558 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001 16:15:16 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from snipe.mail.pas.earthlink.net (snipe.mail.pas.earthlink.net [207.217.120.62])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id QAA10840 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001 16:14:58 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from earthlink.net (washdc3-ar2-4-3-184-108.elnk.dsl.gtei.net [4.3.184.108])
  by snipe.mail.pas.earthlink.net (8.11.5/8.9.3) with ESMTP id f9JNEjg04131
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001 16:14:45 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <3BD0B4C2.6090801@earthlink.net>
Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 19:18:26 -0400
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
X-Accept-Language: en-us
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: p.s. on "Pakistan Poll"
References: <Pine.SOL.4.33.0110170819380.12380-100000@galaxian.gpcc.itd.umich.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Many days ago, I heard on a radio news program a one sentence
statement about results of a poll in Pakistan on low support for the U.S. (32%) in the current crisis. I didn't write down information about the source because I thought surely I would be immediately hearing far more about a very frightening result it reported. After all, there was a prospect that we would be sending a thin American force into a region where one would be hard put to find a reliably friendly power and where the safety of our force might not be independent of the safety of the current Pakistani government. Despite hours upon hours of media exposure day after day, I heard nothing further at all about this or any other polling in Pakistan. Finally, a later Gallup/BRB Pakistan poll <http://www.gallup.com.pk/> got attention three [a few] days ago..

The day [Quickly] after The NYTimes wrote on the PK poll, a post on AAPORNET, by Frank Newport of The Gallup Organization derogated it. Principal among its objections was this:

> The Gallup Organization wants to inform news organizations worldwide that this company is in no way connected with us, > and has absolutely no authorization from us to use the Gallup > name.

I believe that I understand well The Gallup Organization's desire to protect its proprietary interest in its invaluable name—a name threatened in the strange world of trademarks by such success as to threaten the exclusivity of TM's that get used as generically. I know also that the profitability lent by the caché [accented "e" many not show on your font] of the name provides the basis for the organization's adherence to standards that are not necessarily transparent to clients. Generic is not the basis of the claim to the name Gallup International (or its Pakistan affiliate) represents on its web site (that the PK Gallup's URL duplicates the Princeton one except for the added <.pk> must be particularly galling in Princeton.). The Gallup Organization claims presence in 25 countries but Pakistan is not among them. Gallup International claims "55+." (I can well understand TGO not venturing into Pakistan, even were there not a well established affiliate of George Gallup-founded international network there already. I doubt that conditions there make it much easier for polling than when I was in Pakistan in 1960 to evaluate available survey capabilities for a joint US-PK project that Al Gollin was coordinating.) I find in Newport's comment no reference to any professional or legal authority conferring on The Gallup Organization an exclusive world-wide right to use the name "Gallup." I see no valid attempt in it at rebuttal of the historical bases of the claim to legitimacy on the web-sites of Gallup International and Gallup/BRB Pakistan.

Frank Newport's post also states unspecified doubts about the polls reliability and deplores that it was done only in major cities [Schuman has already dealt here with that criticism and with the above par disclosures of methodology by Gallup/BRB.] Gallup in Princeton points us to no better source of recent data on Pakistani political opinion.]
Even if the polls in question have even worse faults than The Gallup Organization alleges, on their face they remain the best source I've seen. Unless a far better case can be made than Newport's post, I hate to see the press intimidated out of using them and find the attempt to do so deplorable. Public opinion in Pakistan's key cities is too important to the American public and to opinion leaders (and military lives) for reliance on the only other indicator I have heard used regularly: the Bush-Rice-Rumsfeld Index. This is the tiny ratio to total population of demonstrators, i.e., presumably, people able and willing to risk life, limb and jail by taking to the streets in anti-government demonstrations. I hope our leaders have a secret source superior to that one.

[This reply was composed early this week and I have left it largely intact except for bracketed changes. The onset of pneumonia kept me from finishing and posting it until now. No, no. I owe my lung disease not to Anthrax but to a sneaky toxic chemical campaign centered in Raleigh-Durham (but as a long-time Virginian, I must add 'pace friends at RTI').--Al Biderman]

Howard Schuman wrote:

> The fullest account of the October 11-12 Pakistan Poll seems to be at:
>
> The site clearly states that the poll covered only urban areas, though these were in all major areas of the country. The account, though lacking information it would certainly be useful to have, is not inferior to many reports of commercial polls in the U.S. The organization seems to be primarily a marketing group, with training claimed at U.S. universities. I have emailed the organization for more details. Howard

> From abider@earthlink.net Fri Oct 19 16:28:16 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9JNSGe29604 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001 16:28:16 -0700 (PDT)
16:28:16 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from snipe.mail.pas.earthlink.net (snipe.mail.pas.earthlink.net [207.217.120.62])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id QAA21566 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 19 Oct 2001 16:28:13 -0700 (PDT)
For those whose mail programs don't identify sender
it was I:  Albert D. Biderman, abider@earthlink.net,
a.k.a. abider@american.edu

Albert D. Biderman wrote:

> Many days ago, I heard on a radio news program a one sentence statement
> about results of a poll in Pakistan on low support for the U.S. (32%) in
> the current crisis. . . . [Cut. See previous post.]
We are preparing to field a telephone survey that is rather lengthy and involved. Our client wants to provide incentives to respondents who have refused to participate in earlier contacts. Would anyone be willing share their procedures on how they have done this and any sample "telephone scripts" for wording the refusal conversion/incentive offering? Any suggestions for keeping respondents on the phone for long surveys?

Also, we are using a pre-notification postcard (instead of a letter due to the anthrax scare). Has anyone had any experience with using a photo of the interviewing staff in pre-notifications for telephone surveys? Thanks!

Kristi Kay Hagen, MA, MA
Research Operations Manager
Social Research Laboratory,
Northern Arizona University
PO Box 15301, Flagstaff AZ 86011-5301
PH: 520-523-1515
Fax:520-523-6654

My memory (which could be false) is that when The Gallup Organization was sold to the folks in Nebraska, it retained Gallup International. The people in Lincoln then started Gallup Worldwide. Thus there are two legitimate holders of the Gallup name operating internationally. Would someone who knows the situation better than I confirm, clarify, or deny?
On Fri, 19 Oct 2001, Albert D. Biderman wrote:

> Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 19:18:26 -0400
> From: Albert D. Biderman <abider@earthlink.net>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: p.s. on "Pakistan Poll"
>
> Many days ago, I heard on a radio news program a one sentence
> statement about results of a poll in Pakistan on low support
> for the U.S. (32%) in the current crisis. I didn't write
> down information about the source because I thought surely I
> would be immediately hearing far more about a very frightening
> result it reported. After all, there was a prospect that we
> would be sending a thin American force into a region where one
> would be hard put to find a reliably friendly power and where
> the safety of our force might not be independent of the safety
> of the current Pakistani government. Despite hours upon hours
> of media exposure day after day, I heard nothing further at
> all about this or any other polling in Pakistan. Finally, a
> later Gallup/BRB Pakistan poll <http://www.gallup.com.pk/> got
> attention three [a few] days ago..
>
> The day [Quickly] after The NYTimes wrote on the PK poll, a
> post on AAPORNET, by Frank Newport of The Gallup Organization
> derogated it. Principal among its objections was this:
>
> >The Gallup Organization wants to inform news organizations
> >worldwide that this company is in no way connected with
> >us, >and has absolutely no authorization from us to use the
> >Gallup >name.
>
> I believe that I understand well The Gallup Organization's
> desire to protect its proprietary interest in its invaluable
> name—a name threatened in the strange world of trademarks by
> such success as to threaten the exclusivity of TM's that get
> used as generically. I know also that the profitability lent
> by the cachê [accented "e" many not show on your font] of the
> name provides the basis for the organization's adherence to
> standards that are not necessarily transparent to clients.
> Generic is not the basis of the claim to the name Gallup
> International (or its Pakistan affiliate) represents on its
> web site (that the PK Gallup's URL duplicates the Princeton
> one except for the added <.pk> must be particularly galling in
> Princeton.). The Gallup Organization claims presence in 25
> countries but Pakistan is not among them. Gallup
> International claims "55+." (I can well understand TGO not
> venturing into Pakistan, even were there not a well
> established affiliate of George Gallup-founded international
> network there already. I doubt that conditions there make it
much easier for polling than when I was in Pakistan in 1960 to evaluate available survey capabilities for a joint US-PK project that Al Gollin was coordinating.) I find in Newport's comment no reference to any professional or legal authority conferring on The Gallup Organization an exclusive world-wide right to use the name "Gallup." I see no valid attempt in it at rebuttal of the historical bases of the claim to legitimacy on the web-sites of Gallup International and Gallup/BRB Pakistan.

Frank Newport's post also states unspecified doubts about the polls reliability and deplores that it was done only in major cities [Schuman has already dealt here with that criticism and with the above par disclosures of methodology by Gallup/BRB.] Gallup in Princeton points us to no better source of recent data on Pakistani political opinion.]

Even if the polls in question have even worse faults than The Gallup Organization alleges, on their face they remain the best source I've seen. Unless a far better case can be made than Newport's post, I hate to see the press intimidated out of using them and find the attempt to do so deplorable. Public opinion in Pakistan's key cities is too important to the American public and to opinion leaders (and military lives) for reliance on the only other indicator I have heard used regularly: the Bush-Rice-Rumsfeld Index.: This is the tiny ratio to total population of demonstrators, i.e., presumably, people able and willing to risk life, limb and jail by taking to the streets in anti-government demonstrations. I hope our leaders have a secret source superior to that one.

[This reply was composed early this week and I have left it largely intact except for bracketed changes. The onset of pneumonia kept me from finishing and posting it until now. No, no. I owe my lung disease not to Anthrax but to a sneaky toxic chemical campaign centered in Raleigh-Durham (but as a long-time Virginian, I must add 'pace friends at RTI').--Al Biderman]

Howard Schuman wrote:

> The fullest account of the October 11-12 Pakistan Poll seems to be at: http://www.gallup.com.pk/archives/oct15_2001.html
> The site clearly states that the poll covered only urban areas, though these were in all major areas of the country. The account, though lacking information it would certainly be useful to have, is not inferior to many reports of commercial polls in the U.S. The organization seems to be primarily a marketing group, with training claimed at U.S. universities. I have emailed the organization for more details. Howard
Let me add my two cents worth. It is my understanding that there is or was a lawsuit as to the legitimate holder of the name Gallup in the British courts. Can anyone tell us what happened and in fact who can or cannot legally use the name Gallup? I have seen some of the work produced by Gallup, Denmark (not the US Gallup Organization). What I have seen is high quality stuff.
Hal Kassarjian

--------------------

At 12:28 AM 10/20/01 -0400, you wrote:
> My memory (which could be false) is that when The Gallup Organization was sold to the folks in Nebraska, it retained Gallup International. The people in Lincoln then started Gallup Worldwide. Thus there are two legitimate holders of the Gallup name operating internationally. Would
On Fri, 19 Oct 2001, Albert D. Biderman wrote:

> Many days ago, I heard on a radio news program a one sentence
> statement about results of a poll in Pakistan on low support
> for the U.S. (32%) in the current crisis. I didn't write
> down information about the source because I thought surely I
> would be immediately hearing far more about a very frightening
> result it reported. After all, there was a prospect that we
> would be sending a thin American force into a region where one
> would be hard put to find a reliably friendly power and where
> the safety of our force might not be independent of the safety
> of the current Pakistani government. Despite hours upon hours
> of media exposure day after day, I heard nothing further at
> all about this or any other polling in Pakistan. Finally, a
> later Gallup/BRB Pakistan poll <http://www.gallup.com.pk/> got
> attention three [a few] days ago.

> The day [Quickly] after The NYTimes wrote on the PK poll, a
> post on AAPORNET, by Frank Newport of The Gallup Organization
> derogated it. Principal among its objections was this:

> The Gallup Organization wants to inform news organizations
> worldwide that this company is in no way connected with
> us, and has absolutely no authorization from us to use the
> name. I believe that I understand well The Gallup Organization's
> desire to protect its proprietary interest in its invaluable
> name—a name threatened in the strange world of trademarks by
> such success as to threaten the exclusivity of TM's that get
> used as generically. I know also that the profitability lent
> by the caché [accented "e" many not show on your font] of the
> name provides the basis for the organization's adherence to
> standards that are not necessarily transparent to clients.
> Generic is not the basis of the claim to the name Gallup
> International (or its Pakistan affiliate) represents on its
> web site (that the PK Gallup's URL duplicates the Princeton
one except for the added <.pk> must be particularly galling in Princeton.). The Gallup Organization claims presence in 25 countries but Pakistan is not among them. Gallup International claims "55+." (I can well understand TGO not venturing into Pakistan, even were there not a well established affiliate of George Gallup-founded international network there already. I doubt that conditions there make it much easier for polling than when I was in Pakistan in 1960 to evaluate available survey capabilities for a joint US-PK project that Al Gollin was coordinating.) I find in Newport's comment no reference to any professional or legal authority conferring on The Gallup Organization an exclusive world-wide right to use the name "Gallup." I see no valid attempt in it at rebuttal of the historical bases of the claim to legitimacy on the web-sites of Gallup International and Gallup/BRB Pakistan.

Frank Newport's post also states unspecified doubts about the polls reliability and deprecates that it was done only in major cities [Schuman has already dealt here with that criticism and with the above par disclosures of methodology by Gallup/BRB.]

Gallup in Princeton points us to no better source of recent data on Pakistani political opinion.

Even if the polls in question have even worse faults than The Gallup Organization alleges, on their face they remain the best source I've seen. Unless a far better case can be made than Newport's post, I hate to see the press intimidated out of using them and find the attempt to do so deplorable.

Public opinion in Pakistan's key cities is too important to the American public and to opinion leaders (and military lives) for reliance on the only other indicator I have heard used regularly: the Bush-Rice-Rumsfeld Index. This is the tiny ratio to total population of demonstrators, i.e., presumably, people able and willing to risk life, limb and jail by taking to the streets in anti-government demonstrations. I hope our leaders have a secret source superior to that one.

[This reply was composed early this week and I have left it largely intact except for bracketed changes. The onset of pneumonia kept me from finishing and posting it until now. No, no. I owe my lung disease not to Anthrax but to a sneaky toxic chemical campaign centered in Raleigh-Durham (but as a long-time Virginian, I must add 'pace friends at RTI').--Al Biderman]

Howard Schuman wrote:

The fullest account of the October 11-12 Pakistan Poll seems to be at:


The site clearly states that the poll covered only urban areas, though these were in all major areas of the country. The account, though=20 lacking information it would certainly be useful to have, is not inferior to=
Let me add my two cents worth. It is my understanding that there is or was a lawsuit as to the legitimate holder of the name Gallup in the British courts. Can anyone tell us what happened and in fact who can or cannot legally use the name Gallup? I have seen some of the work produced by Gallup, Denmark (not the US Gallup Organization). What I have seen is high quality stuff.

Hal Kassarjian

At 12:28 AM 10/20/01 -0400, you wrote:

My memory (which could be false) is that when The Gallup Organization was sold to the folks in Nebraska, it retained Gallup International. The people in Lincoln then started Gallup Worldwide. Thus there are two legitimate holders of the Gallup name operating internationally. Would someone who knows the situation better than I confirm, clarify, or deny?

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
On Fri, 19 Oct 2001, Albert D. Biderman wrote:

Date: Fri, 19 Oct 2001 19:18:26 -0400
From: Albert D. Biderman &lt;abider@earthlink.net&gt;
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: p.s. on &quot;Pakistan Poll&quot;

Many days ago, I heard on a radio news program a one sentence statement about results of a poll in Pakistan on low support for the U.S. (32%) in the current crisis. I didn't write down information about the source because I thought surely I would be immediately hearing far more about a very frightening result it reported. After all, there was a prospect that we would be sending a thin American force into a region where one would be hard put to find a reliably friendly power and where the safety of our force might not be independent of the safety of the current Pakistani government. Despite hours upon hours of media exposure day after day, I heard nothing further at all about this or any other polling in Pakistan. Finally, a later Gallup/BRB Pakistan poll got attention three [a few] days ago...

The day [Quickly] after The NYTimes wrote on the PK poll, a post on AAPORNET, by Frank Newport of The Gallup Organization derogated it. Principal among its objections was this:

The Gallup Organization wants to inform news organizations worldwide that this company is in no way connected with us, and has absolutely no authorization from us to use the name-a name threatened in the strange world of trademarks by
such success as to threaten the exclusivity of TM's that get used as generically. I know also that the profitability lent by the caché of the name provides the basis for the organization's adherence to standards that are not necessarily transparent to clients. Generic is not the basis of the claim to the name Gallup International (or its Pakistan affiliate) represents on its web site (that the PK Gallup's URL duplicates the Princeton one except for the added &lt;.pk&gt; must be particularly galling in Princeton.). The Gallup Organization claims presence in 25 countries but Pakistan is not among them. Gallup International claims "55+." (I can well understand TGO not venturing into Pakistan, even were there not a well established affiliate of George Gallup-founded international network there already. I doubt that conditions there make it much easier for polling than when I was in Pakistan in 1960 to evaluate available survey capabilities for a joint US-PK project that Al Gollin was coordinating.) I find in Newport's comment no reference to any professional or legal authority conferring on The Gallup Organization an exclusive world-wide right to use the name &quot;Gallup.&quot; I see no valid attempt in it at rebuttal of the historical bases of the claim to legitimacy on the web-sites of Gallup International and Gallup/BRB Pakistan.

Frank Newport's post also states unspecified doubts about the polls reliability and deplores that it was done only in major cities [Schuman has already dealt here with that criticism and with the above par disclosures of methodology by Gallup/BRB.] Gallup in Princeton points us to no better source of recent data on Pakistani political opinion.

Even if the polls in question have even worse faults than The Gallup Organization alleges, on their face they remain the best source I've seen. Unless a far better case can be made than Newport's post, I hate to see the press intimidated out of using them and find the attempt to do so deplorable. Public opinion in Pakistan's key cities is too important to the American public and to opinion leaders (and military) for reliance on the only other indicator I have heard used regularly: the Bush-Rice-Rumsfeld Index. This is the tiny ratio to total population of demonstrators, i.e., people able and willing to risk life, limb and
jail by taking to the streets in anti-government demonstrations. I hope our leaders have a secret source superior to that one.

[This reply was composed early this week and I have left it largely intact except for bracketed changes. The onset of pneumonia kept me from finishing and posting it until now. No, no; I owe my lung disease not to Anthrax but to a sneaky toxic chemical campaign centered in Raleigh-Durham (but as a long-time Virginian, I must add 'pace friends at RTI').--Al Biderman]

Howard Schuman wrote:

The fullest account of the October 11-12 Pakistan Poll seems to be at:


The site clearly states that the poll covered only urban areas, though these were in all major areas of the country. The account, though lacking information it would certainly be useful to have, is not inferior to many reports of commercial polls in the U.S. The organization seems to be primarily a marketing group, with training claimed at U.S. universities. I have emailed the organization for more details.

--=====================_4135007==_.ALT--
Don't ask me--I don't know, either. It's timely, however, and in the news, as it were. At least its encouraging to see how many different countries have media organizations that aspire to conduct polls, whether legitimate or not, it's difficult say. Perhaps it will be public opinion polling that finally makes the world safe for democracy, even in countries were government is not yet democratic. Stranger things have happened.....

-- Jim

P.S. I've already word-searched this entire posting, and the word "Gallup" has not been used--not even once.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
http://www.afghan-web.com/aop/poll.html
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

AOP/Azadi Radio Poll

PREVIOUS POLL RESULTS

July 1, 2001 -- July 7, 2001

[151 votes total]

A poll, termed "relatively scientific," and "an exercise to see current trends," released by the U.S. Department of State last week, suggests that out of 4995 Afghans in 27 provinces, 50% of the women polled and 46% of the men named former King Zahir Shah as the leader "who can most successfully address the problems facing Afghanistan today." Taliban leader Mullah Omar received the backing of 11% of males and 6% of women. Veteran resistance leader, Ahmad Shah Massoud is said to have received 2%. Twenty percent said they "don't know," but there is no available data on the remaining 20% or so. The State Department said it could not reveal who conducted the recent poll or give other operational and methodological details.
Given current conditions in Afghanistan, where at least a third of the population lives outside the country, millions are displaced internally, scores of villages and towns are depopulated or destroyed, fear and hopelessness are rampant, which opinion do you identify with more closely concerning the poll:

1) It seems like a fairly accurate reading of Afghan opinion, and seems fairly conducted. It is appropriate for such a poll to be released by the State Department even if operational details are not provided. (62) -- 41%.

2) It does not seem to reflect a fairly accurate reading of Afghan opinion. It does not seem to have been conducted fairly. It is not appropriate for such a poll to be released by the US government under current conditions. Operational details about methodology and data collection should be provided. (77) -- 51%.

3) Does not matter either way. (12) -- 8%.

4) No opinion. (0) -- 0%

May 1, 2001 -- May 7, 2001
[196 votes total]

According to news reports, General Pervez Musharraf has declared that 99 per cent of Pakistan is being "held hostage" by Taliban-like religious extremists who constitute just one per cent of the population. Reacting to this statement, which opinion do you agree with the most:

1. The military leader of Pakistan is reflecting a real fear and sentiment, is opposed to the Talibanization of Pakistan, but faces challenges coping with the extremist threat. (35) -- 18%

2. Gen. Musharraf does not really believe in the extremist threat, is part of the establishment supporting it, and he is manipulating world public opinion by publicly denouncing Talibanism while promoting it. (130) -- 66%

3. I am not convinced either way, and think that it is too early to make any judgments about the statement. (14) -- 7%

4. None of the above. (17) -- 9%

March 2, 2001 -- March 10, 2001
[393 votes total]

In light of the new "edict" by Taliban militia leader Mullah M. Omar that all pre-Islamic artifacts and statues in Afghanistan should be destroyed, which reaction do you relate to and agree with the most:

1. I am happy and agree with the Taliban decision. It is wrong to preserve non-Islamic artifacts, thus all pre-Islamic artifacts and statues should be destroyed in Afghanistan. (34) -- 9%
2. I am distressed and do not agree. These artifacts and statues are not idolized and are part of the country's pre-Islamic history. They belong to all humanity as Muslim leaders past and present have not attempted to destroy them. (353) -- 89%

3. No opinion either way. (11) -- 3%

December 20, 2000 -- December 25, 2000
[100 votes total]

The United Nations Security Council adopted a resolution by majority vote Tuesday against the Taliban movement calling for a second set of sanctions, including an arms embargo, closure of terrorist camps, Taliban travel restrictions and freezing of Usama Bin Laden's assets among others. Which statement do you agree with the most:

1. As explained by most UN member states - the US and Russia in particular - the new set of sanctions approved Tuesday is specifically aimed at the Taliban leadership and allied terrorist networks, their sources of funding, will have minimal impact on the existing economic/humanitarian situation, and may be understood by most Afghans. (66) -- 66%

2. As advocated by Pakistani propaganda and pro-Taliban circles, the sanctions are targeting the Afghan people and Taliban's "Islamic Emirate", will prolong the war, deepen the human tragedy, and cause resentment among Afghans. (29) -- 29%

3. no opinion either way. (5) -- 5%

November 2, 2000 -- November 7, 2000

Do you believe that the United States will launch another attack on Osama bin Laden's bases in Afghanistan?
[142 votes total]

YES (49) -- 35%
NO (52) -- 37%
MAYBE (41) -- 29%

June 3, 2000 -- June 10, 2000
[196 votes total]

Although Russia has been very vocal in its threats to carry out air strikes on Afghanistan, there has been relatively little condemnation from The United States. Do you believe that this is because:

1. The United States supports the idea of Russian strikes on the alleged Terrorist Training Camps. (116)--59%

2. The United States knows that Russia will never carry out such threats. (24)--12%
3. The United States is not involved in the Russian threats, and therefore they do not want to become entangled in this political web. (24) -- 12%

4. None of the above. (32) -- 16%

January 20, 2000 --- January 26, 2000

[210 votes total]

As new evidence emerges about the roles of all parties involved in the hijacking of the Indian Airlines plane last month, India is insisting that the incident was planned by Pakistan, while Islamabad denies the charge. The Taliban, who did not allow a commando operation and let the hijackers get away, are now viewed with a certain amount of suspicion. Which of these scenarios is most believable:

1. The hijacking was staged by Pakistan, with no involvement of the Taliban. (45) -- 21%
2. The hijacking was staged by India. (26) -- 12%
3. The hijacking was planned by Pakistan with the involvement of some elements within the Taliban leadership. (59) -- 28%
4. The hijacking was staged by Kashmiri militants with the tacit support of Pakistani and Taliban circles. (57) -- 27%
5. Other scenario. (23) -- (10%)

December 19, 1999 --- December 26, 1999

[253 votes total]

According to an NNI report, and several other news agencies, the United States has made it clear that if any Americans are attacked by supporters of Osama bin Laden, the Taliban would be held responsible. Do you agree with this?

1) Yes, since the Taliban have chosen to protect and defend Osama bin Laden. (147) -- 58%
2) No, the Taliban are not responsible for other people's actions. (91) -- 35%
3) No comment. (15) -- 5%

December 1, 1999 -- December 8, 1999

[258 votes total]

1) The biggest obstacle are the Taliban (minus Pakistan) themselves who would not agree to this plan for fear of losing power. (56) -- 22%
2) The biggest obstacle is the United Front, even though they have not opposed the plan. (30) -- 12%
3) The biggest obstacle is Pakistan, who may consider this move as against its strategic interests. (65)--25%

4) The biggest obstacle is Iran, who may consider the former King's role as a symbol as unacceptable. (6)--2%

5) The biggest obstacle is a lack of enough international support and attention to Afghanistan. (12)--5%

6) All of the above, more or less equally. (62)--24%

7) None of the above. (27)--10%

November 4, 1999 -- November 11, 1999

[181 votes total]

As of this date, the case of Osama Bin Laden has not reached a conclusive ending. UN sanctions on the Taliban is to take effect on Nov. 14. Meanwhile, the pro-Taliban/Osama lobby in Pakistan is spreading reports that Afghans oppose Bin Laden's extradition. Which of these assessments do you agree with the most:

1) As claimed by a Pakistani lobby, Osama is a symbol of pride for Afghans who consider him as a guest and hero. He should not be extradited under any condition. (37)--20%

2) As claimed by the United States and the UN, Bin Laden is accused of masterminding anti-American terrorist activities and should be brought to justice for that reason under any condition. (19)--10%

3) As claimed by other Afghans, Bin Laden - allied with the Taliban - is no longer a mujahed. His network is responsible for the massacre of Afghan citizens, the destruction of Afghanistan and for using Afghan soil for illegal activities. He should leave Afghanistan or be held responsible according to Afghan penal laws. (110)--61%

4) None of the above. (15)--8%

October 14, 1999 --October 24, 1999

Given Pakistan's interventionist policy toward Afghanistan in past years, what is your initial impression of the Pakistani military coup d'etat in relation to the on-going Afghan crisis:

[194 votes total]

A) Will lead to a change in policy, less interventionist, to exert pressure on the Taliban and pursue a more constructive approach. (25)--13%

B) More or less the same policy will be pursued in support of the Taliban with no change in the balance of power in sight. (70)--36%

C) Will result in an escalation in Pakistan's intervention in Afghan affairs to assist the Taliban gain total control as soon as possible. (82)--42%
D) Other possibilities. (17)--9%

September 27, 1999 -- October 4, 1999

In advance of the U.N. General Assembly, pro-Taliban Pakistani propaganda is unsubstantially claiming that most Afghans would like to see the UN Afghan seat be vacated. Since this has been a top Pakistani goal for the past few years. Which option do you favor:

[214 votes total]

A) The Pakistani option for the UN to vacate the Afghan seat and suspend Afghanistan's representation at the UN for an undetermined period of time. (10)--5%

B) The Taliban option, to give the Afghanistan seat to the Islamic Emirate representative. (59)--28%

C) The existing option, to keep the seat in the hands of the nominal Islamic State of Afghanistan representative until the will of the people is expressed in the future. (127)--59%

D) None of the above. (18)--8%

September 21, 1999 -- September 26, 1999

The Pakistani government has once again undertaken a so-called "peace initiative" to facilitate a distant dialogue between the two warring Afghan factions. Which statement best describes the current Pakistani effort:

[143 votes total]

A) This is not a ploy. As described by the Taliban and Islamabad itself, Pakistan is an impartial and "honest broker" who can and should help resolve the Afghan crisis according to its own views and interests. (15) --10%

B) This is another ploy. As described by the United Front opposition and many countries, Pakistan cannot be counted on because of its support for the Taliban. Instead, the UN should play a mediating role. (100)--70%

C) Neither statement is correct. (28)--20%

September 11, 1999 -- September 19, 1999

A US State Department report recently gave evidence of widespread religious persecution in Afghanistan under the Taliban rule. It also stated that atheism is considered "apostasy" and is punishable by death. However, the Taliban continue to state that they respect the rights of all people, regardless of their religious affiliations. What do you believe?

[260 votes total]

A) The Taliban are lying. They are oppressing people not adhering to
their views on Islam. They are openly terrorizing the Shi'a minority as well as Hindus, Sikhs, etc. (179) -- 69%

B) The Taliban are protecting the rights of everyone, regardless of religion. (57) -- 22%

C) I don't care, those people should not have rights in Afghanistan. (7) -- 3%

D) No Comment. (17) -- 7%

August 11, 1999 -- August 16, 1999

Taliban leaders and several Pakistani religious institutions, have asked the NWFP Pakistani religious madrassas to close down so that thousands of trained Talibs could join the war against the Afghan resistance and anti-Taliban forces. Do you consider this call and action to fight against Moslem Afghans in their own country as:

[187 votes total]

A) A religious and Jehadi duty, in which any Pakistani, Arab, or muslim can and should take part of. (39) -- 21%

B) A Foreign, ie. Pakistani conspiracy to extend its proxy rule over Afghanistan, in the name of Islam, but in reality for geo-strategic goals. (122) -- 65%

C) None of the above. (26) -- 14%

August 2, 1999 -- August 8, 1999

In light of the recent Taliban offensive against the Afghan opposition forces, what do you think the outcome will be?

[230 votes total]

A) The Taliban, and their foreign recruits will be able to take the remaining portion of Afghanistan. (72) -- 31%

B) The opposition will continue to survive. (139) -- 60%

C) I don't know. (19) -- 8%

July 26, 1999 -- August 1, 1999

Several press and eyewit ness reports indicate that several thousand armed Pakistani and Arab extremist fighters have crossed into Afghanistan to join the Taliban's imminent offensive against the Afghan resistance, and Anti-Taliban forces. How would you consider and deal with such a development?

[168 votes total]

A) Regardless of their nationality, I consider them as legitimate Taliban allies whose involvement in the Afghan conflict is legitimate. (33) -- 20%
B) I consider the Taliban's foreign fighters as illegitimate invaders who should be dealt with as spies and criminals according to Afghan penal and national security laws. (109) -- 65%

C) It does not matter either way. Pakistani and Arab extremists involvement is not a major issue in the conflict. (21) -- 12%

D) None of the above (5) -- 3%

July 18, 1999 -- July 25, 1999

The Taliban have announced that Osama bin Laden can be tried in a third country (excluding Saudi Arabia and the United States) on the condition that the suspected terrorist agrees to it. Do you agree with this?

[101 votes total]

A) I disagree. Osama bin Laden should be sent to the United States for trial, whether he agrees or not. He is a terrorist! (45) -- 45%

B) I agree. Osama bin Laden should be sent to a third country (excluding Saudi Arabia and USA), this is the only way he will receive a fair trial. (35) -- 35%

C) I disagree completely. Osama bin Laden is not a terrorist. He should not be forced to leave Afghanistan or anywhere else. (21) -- 21%

July 13, 1999 -- July 18, 1999

United States policy and attitude toward the Taliban movement has fluctuated over the past four years. Taking into consideration the main bilateral policy contentions dealing with terrorism, human/women rights, narcotics production and Taliban unwillingness to reach a political settlement, which of these courses do you consider the best for policy-makers to adopt:

[108 votes total]

A) The "carrot approach," by offering the Taliban positive incentives, dialogue and cooperation. (22) -- 20%

B) The "stick approach," by exerting further political, economic and other pressures on the Taliban and Pakistan to force some changes. (16) -- 15%

C) Multilateral efforts to undermine and ultimately help replace the Taliban with a more acceptable alternative. (55) -- 51%

D) Maintain the status-quo and follow a policy of irregular-engagement (3) -- 3%

E) None of the above. (12) -- 11%

July 4, 1999 -- July 11, 1999
Jason Burke, in an article for the Observer, (UK) reported that Osama bin Laden is currently believed to be in the village of Farmhidda. He also reported that the Taliban are aware of bin Laden's location, and that they had even deployed guards to protect his new base. What do you believe?

[140 votes total]

1. Jason Burke is correct. Osama bin Laden is in Farmhidda and the Taliban are aware of it. They are even helping him. (60) -- 43%
2) The report is false. Osama bin Laden is not in Farmhidda, and the Taliban have no idea where he is hiding. (22) -- 16%
3) The Taliban are hiding him in Kandahar or somewhere else. (40) -- 29%
4) Osama bin Laden is not in Afghanistan. (8) -- 6%
5) None of the above. (10) -- 7%

June 28, 1999 -- July 4, 1999

The first step in former Afghan King M. Zahir Shah's peace/Loya Jirga initiative has just been launched with the gathering of a consultative/work group in Rome. Other steps are to follow in the next few months. In your opinion, of the events and causes listed below, which one is the most serious and dangerous factor that could derail and/or damage the Loya Jirga peace process:

[105 votes total]

1. The Taliban's total military victory on the battlefield against the Afghan opposition resistance forces. (25) -- 24%
2. Pakistan and the Taliban's invisible undermining and/or overt opposition to the King's initiative. (28) -- 27%
3. The international community's lukewarm reaction and/or lack of commitment to support and promote the initiative. (8) -- 8%
4. Iran's opposition to a role being played by the former King. (7) -- 7%
5. Favoritism and organizational mismanagement within the former King's work circle (28) -- 27%
6. None of the above. (9) -- 9%

June 20, 1999 -- June 27, 1999

The North West Frontier Province of Pakistan is former Afghan land. Most of the inhabitants want to have the province renamed Pakhtunkhwa. Do you believe that:

[138 votes total]

The Pashtuns have a right to be recognized as Pakhtunkhwa (52) -- 38%
The Frontier Province is a part of Pakistan now (28)-- 20%
Only the first step to reuniting with Afghanistan (38)--28%
None of these (20)--14%

May 30, 1999 -- June 6, 1999

Recently, the Indian government has charged that Afghan nationals are involved in the Kashmiri war. Do you believe this to be true, or just a false accusation made by Indian officials?

[226 votes total]

It is true. Afghans are involved. (129) -- 57%
It is not true. Afghans are not involved. (55) -- 24%
Maybe, or it is possible. (42) -- 19%

May 23, 1999 -- May 30, 1999

Recent reports indicate again that Afghans, specifically Shia Afghans in the provinces of Bamyan and now Herat, have been the target of mass murder and persecution by the Taliban. From all accounts, which one of the following statements is closer to reality to describe the ongoing situation:

[369 votes total]

1. The Taliban and their foreign supporter are waging a "reign of terror" specifically aimed at disrupting Afghan ethnic unity, to consolidate their rule through fear and intimidation. These popular uprisings are not foreign-inspired. (179) -- 49%

2. The Taliban care and believe in "peace and security," and will try to maintain them for the people's sake, and not their own power-driven agenda. These popular riots are foreign-inspired. (177) -- 48%

3. None of the above. (13) -- 4%

May 16, 1999 -- May 23, 1999

Recently the Taliban Governor of Kandahar, Mohammad Hassan Rehmani told the BBC that the recent destruction of some opium poppy fields, was a signal to the world, showing that the Taliban is serious in its intentions to rid Afghanistan of the crop. Do you feel that the Taliban's intentions are genuine or a ploy to keep the UN and other Western critics quiet?

[259 votes total]

It is a ploy, the Taliban are not serious. (149) -- 58%
The Taliban's intentions are genuine. (110) -- 42%

May 9, 1999 -- May 16, 1999

The former King of Afghanistan recently announced an initiative to send delegations to meet with both Afghan warring factions, extend an invitation to them to attend an emergency Loya Jirga and convene a 30-member Jirga organizing team in the near future. Which of the
following best describes the former King's latest decisions and initiatives?

[224 votes total]

1. He is now more serious than before and believes that conditions are ripe for such activities to convene an emergency Jirga. (51) --23%

2. He is out of touch with the realities on the ground, and as the Taliban claim, he has lost the trust of the people and his initiative is as a result of foreign pressure. (76) -- 34%

3. As an afghan, his role in convening a Jirga is acceptable, but as the United Front (Talib opposition) claims, he should demonstrate more sincerity, realism and activism. (73) -- 33%

4. None of the above. (24) -- 11%

May 1, 1999 -- May 9, 1999

The Taliban have recently told the citizens of Kabul to paint their walls white in order to "beautify" the city. Do you feel that:

[264 votes total]

A) It is a bad idea. Many people cannot even afford to buy food. How can they be expected to pay for paint. (141) -- 53%

B) I think it is a good idea. Kabul needs to be touched up. (59) -- 22%

C) It is a good idea, but a bad time to do it. (58) -- 22%

D) No comment. (6) -- 2%

April 24, 1999 -- May 1, 1999

The latest fall of Bamiyan city into opposition hands and subsequent Taliban retreat from the area is an indication that:

[275 votes total]

1. The Taliban hold on central and northern Afghanistan is weak and not supported by the local inhabitants. (161) -- 59%

2. The opposition Front is comparatively better organized and militarily unified. (24) -- 9%

3. The Taliban retreat is tactical or temporary and they will regain control of the area. (72) -- 26%

4. None of the above. (18) -- 7%

April 17, 1999 -- April 24, 1999

The Pakistanis have made it clear that they favor recent moves to seal the borders between Pakistan and Afghanistan, as well as supporting
efforts to expel Afghan refugees in Pakistan. Do you think that Pakistan has the right to repatriate the Afghan refugees against their will, knowing that many of the refugees would return to great hardships and/or peril?

[369 votes total]

Yes, the Pakistanis should force them to go back to Afghanistan. (53) -- 14%
No, the Pakistanis should not force them. (311) -- 84%
Maybe (5) -- 1%

April 10, 1999 -- April 17, 1999

Many believe that the Afghan problem requires a durable political solution. In case a settlement is reached to end the war and pursue a political solution, which mechanism and/or type of gathering do you favor to decide on the form of government, constitution and leadership that may be acceptable to most Afghans and the international community:

[247 votes total]

A referundum under UN supervision (48) -- 19%
Elections under international supervision (51) -- 21%
A representative Loya Jirga (93) -- 38%
A council of Mollahs and religious figures (24) -- 10%
none of the above (31) -- 13%

April 4, 1999 -- April 10, 1999

Recently Jehanzeb Khan Shinwari, a prominent Afghan commander and close confidant of ex-governor of Ningarhar, Haji Qadeer was gunned down in Pakistan. Shinwari is just one of many well known Afghans to be killed in this fashion. Some theorize that the Pakistani government is secretly behind these killings. Do you believe that the Pakistani Government is somehow behind the assassinations of prominent Afghan Commanders and other Afghan Personalities?

[299 votes total]

YES, Pakistan is involved. (227) -- 76%
NO, the Pakistani government is not involved. (45) -- 15%
MAYBE (27) -- 9%

March 27, 1999 - April 3, 1999

Many international organizations, governments, humanitarian, human rights, women and children's rights groups, experts, journalists, individuals and now the entertainment industry celebrities are accusing the Taliban of grave women's rights abuses and "gender apartheid" in Afghanistan. Do you approve of this growing worldwide condemnation of the Taliban, and think it is valid and should continue?

[616 votes total]

YES, the Taliban should be condemned. (370) -- 60%
NO, the Taliban should not be condemned. (234) -- 38%
March 21, 1999 -- March 27, 1999

Since the people of Afghanistan have so little, do you think it is right for the Taliban to prevent them from enjoying Nowruz?

[584 votes total]

NO. It is wrong. The Taliban should not ban Nowruz. (429) -- 73%
YES. The Taliban should prevent them from enjoying Nowruz. (155) -- 27%

March 14, 1999 -- March 20, 1999

Do you think that the return of former king Amanullah Khan's son could help bring about peace in Afghanistan?

[465 votes total]

YES (123) -- 26%
NO (232) -- 50%
POSSIBLY (110) -- 24%

http://www.afghan-web.com/aop/poll.html

*****
Colleagues...

This list is very helpful and timely for me, as I have been commissioned to update the entry in the Encyclopaedia Britannica's standing article on 'Public Opinion', by 31 December 2001. It was last done some years ago by the esteemed Philips Davison, and I'm honoured to follow on from him.

This gives me a good and helpful start, but is rather parochical, and I would appreciate it if there are those who can broaden it somewhat to more philosophical works on the role of public opinion in policy formation and practical politics, and also take it outside the borders of the US?

Thanks for your thoughts on this.

Bob Worcester, MORI/LSE

Robert M. Worcester
Chairman, MORI
32 Old Queen Street
London SW1H 9HP
(44)207 222 0232 Tel
(44)207 227 0404 Fax
worc@mori.com

Here is something to start with... mark

INTRODUCTORY SURVEY RESEARCH TEXTS

The following texts were recommended by nine members of AAPORNENET, the on-line Internet discussion group of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). Results compiled by Mark Richards, August 17-19, 1999.

Question: Dear Professors: Thinking of available (text) books on survey research, which one or two would you recommend to someone (a client) who would like to understand the survey research process and methods without becoming an expert in any one aspect? Key features sought: Accurate information, excellent for self study, very good information on telephone survey research, concise, easy to read, limited technical jargon, includes some simple standard tables with info on how to read (sampling error) and bibliography for follow-up in specific areas.
* Priscilla Salant & Don A. Dillman  (Contributor), How to Conduct Your Own Survey, John Wiley & Sons.


* Don A. Dillman, Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method, John Wiley & Sons, April 1978.


* Thomas E. Mann (Editor), Gary R. Orren (Editor), Media Polls in American Politics Brookings Institute, October 1992.


* Introduction to Survey Sampling, Sage Publications; October 1983.

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of John Fries
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2001 4:37 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Survey Research Staples....

AAPORNetters,

I'm in the process of evaluating / stocking my modest survey library and was looking for input on the must have textbooks, handbooks, or otherwise just good books on survey research. I seem to recall a similar discussion taking place on AAPORNet awhile ago, but my initial searches of the archives did not result in a coherent thread.

And for those more in the marketing research arena, I would be especially interested to hear your recommendations regarding the must-have books. My
library
is even more modest in this area and so I would appreciate some direction
about
where to look for discussions of the foundational concepts and measures as
well as
the latest techniques.

I realize this is a busy time for many of us, so share if you can, and if
not,
continue on guilt free. As Patty has already pointed out, in a pinch
AAPORNNetters
always come through.

It's probably best to reply off-list, but I will be happy to summarize at a
later
date so as to add officially to the archive.

Best Wishes,

John

================================
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) 20 7347 3000
or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.

================================
>From mark@bisconti.com Sat Oct 20 15:38:38 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9KMcbe28695 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 20 Oct 2001
  15:38:37 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net (falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net
  [207.217.120.74])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id PAA16424 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 20 Oct 2001 15:38:39 -0700
  (PDT)
Received: from mark (dialup-209.244.228.221.Dial1.Washington1.Level3.net
  [209.244.228.221])
Yesterday, on a DC Metrobus, there was graffiti in front of my seat: "Kill all Arabs." Over dinner last night, my brother and sister-in-law (both Caucasians, not Arab Americans) in Silver Spring, MD, said that after they started attending an Interfaith service at the Islamic Mosque near their home (they are on a calling list and are notified of Interfaith services to show support for Arab residents), their home has been singled out twice in two weeks. Mailbox destroyed with baseball bat, a dead rabbit-throat slit and bleeding-left at the front door. Nobody took credit. They reported it to local police; I think it is classified as a "hate crime." There is no proof that these attacks were related to attending the Interfaith service at the Mosque, but they seem convinced of the relationship. How frequently is this kind of thing happening?

Has anyone seen data on what proportion of Americans know or are friends with an Arab American, what proportion feel more uncomfortable around Arab Americans in general, and the ones they know, post-Sept. 11th? And what proportion of Americans feel they have experienced a "personal" attack or act of discrimination post-Sept. 11 because of (1) their personal opinions, (2) their associations, (3) their race, color, ethnicity, or "look"? Mark Richards

///

Zogby International poll of Arab Americans:
http://www.aaiusa.org/polls/101001poll.html
Question: "Since the terrorist attacks on the U.S. on September 11, have you personally experienced discrimination because of your ethnicity; do you know anyone of Arabic ethnicity or with an Arabic-speaking background who has experienced discrimination; have any of your children or any member of your household experienced discrimination?"
Percent saying Yes
Know anyone of Arabic ethnicity or with an Arabic-speaking background experienced discrimination 45%
Personally experienced discrimination 20%
Children or any member of household experienced discrimination 17%

Should civil rights protests cease until after the war?
Total Comments: 30

NAACP Poll Readership "poll" and verbatim comments by participants
*The opinions expressed here are not necessarily a reflection of the positions of NAACP.

http://www.naacp.org/polls/comment_results.php?action=results&poll_id=25
<http://www.naacp.org/polls/comment_results.php?action=results&poll_id=25>

The Oct. 20-26, 2001 issue of The Washington AFRO American has an article on the front page featuring a photo and interview with James J. Zogby, president and founder of the Arab-American Institute http://www.aaiusa.org/ [I don't know if there is any relationship between he and John Zogby, President/CEO of Zogby International] The article says Zogby has been racially profiled while flying since the Sept. 11 attacks on America. The AFRO also reports that Dr. Zogby's daughter has received threatening phone calls, his brother has been threatened, and he has received bomb threats as well. I could not find the article, titled "Flying while Arab": Arab Americans feel targeted" in the online version of the AFRO. The article discusses Congressional anti-terrorism legislation, the Senate bill USA Act of 2001 (S. 1510), which it reports passed 96-1 on 10/11. It says Senator Russ Feingold (D-Wisc.) was the only Senator to oppose the legislation. The House approved similar legislation 337-79 "that would increase government's powers to spy on, detain and punish suspected terrorists, according to the ACLU." http://www.aclu.org/
The House apparently put a five-year expiration deadline on the most intrusive of the new measures, including roving wiretaps, because of misgivings about civil liberties.
ACLU's "Letter to Congress":
http://www.aclu.org/congress/1101201a.html

The Post's assessment of suspected hijacker Hani Hanjour [front page, Oct. 15] was the same I had when I sat next to him on a flight last summer. He was demure. He was placid. When the names of the terrorists started to surface last month, the name Hani Hanjour sounded familiar. Slowly, in the wee hours of one night, it came back to me.

I had been on a flight between Washington and California and was in an aisle seat with two young men next to me. The man directly next to me was holding papers that had "Federal Aviation" something or other at the top.

I had been an official with the U.S. Department of Transportation during the Clinton administration, and I am also an outgoing woman and a mom.

So when I noticed that one of the men appeared about the same age as my son, I said, "Are you in transportation?"

He told me that he was studying to be a pilot. I remarked how wonderful that was and then I told him I had been with the Transportation Department. Mr. Hanjour leaned over and told his friend. They both seemed to express mild disdain. I shrugged it off. In my much-too-friendly posture, I then suggested to Mr. Hanjour that he should talk to the flight crew about visiting the cockpit. I was sure they would be willing to show it to a young man who was studying to be a pilot, I said. He did not seem to respond. I just thought he was shy, so I backed off. But somehow I saw his name on the papers. I didn't ask him what kind of name that was, because something told me that my curiosity would not be well received -- but the name registered.

I don't remember much more except something that will forever haunt me. As we stood to leave I entered the crowded aisle and moved forward slightly. I turned back to Mr. Hanjour and smiled. "Good luck to you," I said. He looked puzzled.

"You know, being a student pilot. Good luck." No response, only blank stares from both men. I just figured they were socially inept.

The episode came back to me slowly, but once I was certain, I contacted the FBI.

I fly a lot. I'm not sure I'll ever be as friendly again, but I am sure I'll be more observant and cautious.

EVELYN FIERRO
Alexandria

© 2001 The Washington Post Company

Interesting discussion of "White" vs. "black," versus "gray" propaganda

Jerusalem Post: http://www.jpost.com/

Gray patriotism
http://www.jpost.com/Editions/2001/10/14/Features/Features.36163.html
"As always, Israel has limited itself to "white" propaganda, in which an official source provides authoritative information in an open manner. But this has gone awry, with more than a dozen government spokespeople sending out often conflicting messages, while the IDF operate with apparent autonomy. Military action is followed by formal reaction, frequently diplomatic damage control over unsightly Palestinian suffering caused by Israeli soldiers.

"We know how to fight, that's all," is the usual refrain of army top brass, when asked to help the propaganda effort, apparently in ignorance of Sun Tzu's axiom that "to subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill." Israel's leadership is also burdened by the misperception that all propaganda is perforce "black" (disinformation), outright untrue and morally untenable."

"The PA has, thus, specialized in gray propaganda - relaying questionable or partial messages through formal channels, strengthened by public iteration."

"But changes are under way in Jerusalem, and Meir is upbeat. Not only does a new hasbara team meet daily at the Foreign Ministry to coordinate policy, but the ministry "is now involved at the highest level of political and intelligence decision-making."

"For once," says Meir, "the status of the Defense Ministry has diminished because the army finally understands that there are limits to wielding brute military force in the face of a war against terror. In this war, shaping public opinion and exercising military power go hand in hand.""

This site have a readership "poll":

Current Poll
Do you think there should be a Palestinian State in the near future?
http://cgis.jpost.com/cgi-bin/Poll/poller.cgi

Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008
202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com
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Yesterday, on a DC Metrobus, there was graffiti in front of my seat: “Kill all Arabs.”

Over dinner last night, my brother and sister-in-law (both Caucasians, not Arab Americans) in Silver Spring, MD, said that after they started attending an Interfaith service at the Islamic Mosque near their home (they are on a calling list and are notified of Interfaith services to show support for Arab residents), their home has been singled out twice in two weeks; mailbox destroyed with baseball bat, a dead rabbit throat slit and bleeding left at the front door. Nobody took credit. They reported it to local police; I think it is classified as a hate crime. There is no proof that these attacks were related to attending the Interfaith service at the Mosque, but they seem convinced of the relationship.

Has anyone seen data on what proportion of Americans know or are friends with an Arab American, what proportion feel more uncomfortable around Arab Americans in general, and the ones they know, post-Sept. 11th?
Americans feel they have experienced a personal attack or act of discrimination post-Sept. 11 because of (1) their personal opinions, (2) their associations, (3) their race, color, ethnicity, or look? Mark Richards

Zogby International poll of Arab Americans: http://www.aaiusa.org/polls/101001poll.html Question: Since the terrorist attacks on the U.S. on September 11, have you personally experienced discrimination because of your ethnicity; do you know anyone of Arabic ethnicity or with an Arabic-speaking background who has experienced discrimination; have any of your children or any member of your household experienced discrimination?
Percent saying = Yes

Know anyone of Arabic ethnicity or with an Arabic-speaking background experienced discrimination = 45%

Personally experienced discrimination = 20%

Children or any member of household experienced discrimination = 20%
17% Should civil rights protests cease until after the war?

Total Comments: 30

*The opinions expressed here are not necessarily a reflection of the positions of NAACP.*

[Read poll results here](http://www.naacp.org/polls/comment_results.php?action=3Dresults&...
The Oct. 20-26, 2001 issue of The Washington AFRO American has an article on the front page featuring a photo and interview with James J. Zogby, president and founder of the Arab-American Institute. The article says Zogby has been racially profiled while flying since the Sept. 11 attacks on America. Dr. Zogby's daughter has received threatening phone calls, his brother has been threatened, and he has received bomb threats as well. I could not find the article, titled
Flying while Arab: Arab Americans feel targeted in the online version of the AFRO. The article discusses Congressional anti-terrorism legislation, the Senate bill USA Act of 2001 (S. 1510), which it reports passed 96-1 on 10/11. It says Senator Russ Feingold (D-Wisc.) was the only Senator to oppose the legislation. The House approved similar legislation 337-79 that would increase government's powers to spy on, detain and punish suspected terrorists, according to the ACLU. Letter to Congress: ACLU's "Letter to Congress":

ACLU's "Letter to Congress":

ACLU's "Letter to Congress":

ACLU's "Letter to Congress":

ACLU's "Letter to Congress":

ACLU's "Letter to Congress":

ACLU's "Letter to Congress":

ACLU's "Letter to Congress":

ACLU's "Letter to Congress":
Detroit Free Press: [http://www.freep.com/index/terror.htm](http://www.freep.com/index/terror.htm)

Portrait of a Suspected Terrorist<!--plsfield:stop-->

Saturday, October 20, 2001; Page A26 =

The Post's assessment of suspected hijacker Hani Hanjour [front page, Oct. 15] was the same I had when I sat next to him on a flight last summer. He was demure. He was placid.

When the names of the terrorists started to surface last month, the name Hani Hanjour sounded familiar. Slowly, in the wee hours of one night, it came back to me.

I had been on a flight between Washington and California and was in an aisle seat with two young men next to me. The man directly next to me was holding papers that had "Federal Aviation" something or other at the top.

I had been an official with the U.S. Department of Transportation during the Clinton administration, and I am also an outgoing woman and a mom.

So when I noticed that one of the men appeared about the same age as my son, I said, "Are you in transportation?" He told me that he was studying to be a pilot. I remarked how wonderful that was and then I told him I had been with the Transportation Department. Mr. Hanjour leaned over and told his friend. They both seemed to express mild disdain. I shrugged it off.

He told me that he was studying to be a pilot. I remarked how wonderful that was and then I told him I had been with the Transportation Department. Mr. Hanjour leaned over and told his friend. They both seemed to express mild disdain. I shrugged it off.
In my much-too-friendly posture, I then suggested to Mr. Hanjour that he should talk to the flight crew about visiting the cockpit. I was sure they would be willing to show it to a young man who was studying to be a pilot, I said. He did not seem to respond. I just thought he was shy, so I backed off. But somehow I saw his name on the papers. I didn't ask him what kind of name that was, because something told me that my curiosity would not be well received -- but the name registered.

I don't remember much more except something that will forever haunt me. As we stood to leave I entered the crowded aisle and moved forward slightly. I turned back to Mr. Hanjour and smiled. "Good luck to you," I said. He looked puzzled.

"You know, being a student pilot. Good luck." No response, only blank stares from both men. I just figured they were socially inept.

The episode came back to me slowly, but once I was certain, I contacted the FBI.

I fly a lot. I'm not sure I'll ever be as friendly again, but I am sure I'll be more observant and cautious.

EVELYN FIERRO
Alexandria
Interesting discussion of "White" vs. "black," versus "gray" propaganda.

Jerusalem Post: https://www.jpost.com/
As always, Israel has limited itself to "white" propaganda, in which an official source provides authoritative information in an open manner. But this has gone awry, with more than a dozen government spokespeople sending out often conflicting messages, while the IDF operate with apparent autonomy. Military action is followed by formal reaction, frequently diplomatic damage control over unsightly Palestinian suffering caused by Israeli soldiers. 

We know how to fight, that's all, is the usual refrain of army top brass, when asked to help the propaganda effort, apparently in ignorance of Sun Tzu's axiom that to subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill. Israel's leadership is also burdened by the misperception that all propaganda is perforce (disinformation), outright untrue and morally untenable.
The PA has, thus, specialized in gray propaganda - relaying questionable or partial messages through formal channels, strengthened by public iteration.

But changes are under way in Jerusalem, and Meir is upbeat. Not only does a new hasbara team meet daily at the Foreign Ministry to coordinate policy, but the ministry "is now involved at the highest level of political and intelligence decision-making. For once," says Meir, "the status of the Defense Ministry has diminished because the army finally understands that there are limits to wielding brute military force in the face of a war against terror. In this war, shaping public opinion and exercising military power go hand in hand."
This site have a readership &ldquo;poll&rdquo;:

Current Poll

Do you think there should be a Palestinian State in the near future?

http://cgis.jpost.com/cgi-bin/Poll/poller.cgi
I am forwarding this message to our list on the request of its original poster, Jeanne Anderson, who has good reason to believe that not all of
us received it when first she posted it, late on Thursday. -- Jim

Date: Thu, 18 Oct 2001 20:58:43 -0700
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Hispanics by Race

The problem is that many Latinos and Latinas, at least in New York City, believe firmly that there *should* be no distinctions by whatever is called "race." They believe that there are only gradations in skin color, in the same way that there are differences in eye color, etc.

Thus, to ask what race such a person considers himself or herself to be means to pose a question that the person does not *want* to answer. Which category the person then checks off or writes in is not a good indicator of "self-identification."

That over time the proportions of survey respondents/census respondents placing themselves in a given racial category changes may be interesting, but it is not a good indicator of the social experience of people "of color," regardless of race, and it doesn't help in administering affirmative action programs. These programs were devised to compensate for the effects of social experience, and it is the Federal government that mainly sponsored them.

elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov wrote:

> If you recall your Census 2000 questionnaire
> (and who can forget it??) it asked, "What is this person's race? Mark one
> or more races to indicate what this person considers himself/herself to
> be." Thus, in the census, your race is what you (or a household proxy
> reporting for you) report it to be. There is no "right" answer.

*****

>From mail@marketsharescorp.com Sun Oct 21 09:37:53 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9LGbre03723 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 21 Oct 2001
09:37:53 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from tisch.mail.mindspring.net (tisch.mail.mindspring.net
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Received: from marketsharescorp.com (sdn-ar-003ilchicP019.dialsprint.net
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Message-ID: <3BD2F965.EB9EFB32@marketsharescorp.com>
Date: Sun, 21 Oct 2001 11:35:57 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
Newsweek's web edition makes a distinction between the two Gallups in the second graph below.

A NEWSWEEK poll shows that public sympathy in Pakistan is firmly on the side of the Taliban NEWSWEEK WEB EXCLUSIVE
Oct. 18 - Is the West winning the battle for Muslim hearts and minds? Not according to a poll commissioned by NEWSWEEK and conducted in Pakistan less than a week after the United States began bombing Afghanistan.

PAKISTAN is one of the few Muslim countries that allows scientific opinion polling. Polls are banned, for instance, in Saudi Arabia and Egypt. This survey's methodology has been criticized by some U.S. polling groups, but the poll, "conducted by Gallup International (not a division of The Gallup Organization, based in Princeton, N.J.)," provides some sobering insights into the dangerous volatility of the country.

The above is from their web edition. I couldn't find this poll in the print edition.

As background, in Newsweek's 10/14 release, the lead sentence described the poll as "...according to a recent Gallup Poll in Pakistan commissioned by Newsweek...". which led to the news stories that Schuman brought to our attention last Monday. And in Newsweek's International edition, the poll was described as ".... a Gallup poll commissioned in Pakistan by NEWSWEEK".

The issue here may be more journalistic that legalistic or methodological. For example here in Illinois, we have a Governor George Ryan who has decided not to run for reelection which most observers call a wise decision. We now have Jim Ryan, also a Republican who is running to succeed him. Most news stories about Jim point out that he is "no relation to George" on the chance that some small percentage of readers may confuse Jim with George.

The issue is one of clarity - anticipation of reader confusion. In stories about Gallup polls when (in this case) only a small percentage can be expected to know there are two Gallups, some distinction should be made.
Nick

"H.H. Kassarjian" wrote:

> Let me add my two cents worth. It is my understanding that the there
> is or was a lawsuit as to the legitimate holder of the name Gallup in
> the British courts. Can anyone tell us what happened and in fact who
> can or cannot legally use the name Gallup? I have seen some of the
> work produced by Gallup, Denmark (not the US Gallup Organization).
> What I have seen is high quality stuff.
> Hal Kassarjian
> **************
>
> At 12:28 AM 10/20/01 -0400, you wrote:
> >> My memory (which could be false) is that when The Gallup
> >> Organization
> >> was sold to the folks in Nebraska, it retained Gallup International.
> >> The
> >> people in Lincoln then started Gallup Worldwide. Thus there are two
> >> legitimate holders of the Gallup name operating internationally.
> >> Would
> >> someone who knows the situation better than I confirm, clarify, or
> >> deny?
> >>
> >> ================================================================
> >>
> >> 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
> >> ================================================================
>
> Newsweek's web edition makes a distinction between the two Gallups in the
> second graph below.
> A NEWSWEEK poll shows that public sympathy in Pakistan is firmly on
> the side of
> the Taliban NEWSWEEK WEB EXCLUSIVE
> Oct. 18 - Is the West winning the battle for Muslim hearts
> and minds? Not according to a poll commissioned by
> NEWSWEEK and conducted in Pakistan less than a week
> after the United States began bombing Afghanistan.
> .......
> PAKISTAN is one of the few Muslim countries that allows scientific
> opinion polling. Polls are banned, for instance, in Saudi Arabia and
> Egypt. This survey's methodology has been criticized by some U.S.
> polling groups, but the poll, *conducted by Gallup International (not a
division of The Gallup Organization, based in Princeton, N.J.),*
provides some sobering insights into the dangerous volatility of the
country.
The above is from their web edition. I couldn't find this poll in the
print edition.
As background, in Newsweek's 10/14 release, the lead sentence described
the poll as "...according to a recent Gallup Poll in Pakistan commissioned
by Newsweek...". which led to the news stories that Schuman brought to
our attention last Monday. And in Newsweek's International edition, the
poll was described as ".... a Gallup poll commissioned in Pakistan by
NEWSWEEK".
The issue here may be more journalistic that legalistic or methodological.
For example here in Illinois, we have a Governor George Ryan who has decided
not to run for reelection which most observers call a wise decision. We
now have Jim Ryan, also a Republican who is running to succeed him. Most
news stories about Jim point out that he is "no relation to George" on
the chance that some small percentage of readers may confuse Jim with George.
The issue is one of clarity - anticipation of reader confusion. In stories
about Gallup polls when (in this case) only a small percentage can be
expected
to know there are two Gallups, some distinction should be made.
Nick
"H.H. Kassarjian" wrote:
Let me add my two cents worth.&nbsp;
It is my understanding that the there is or was a lawsuit as to the
legitimate
holder of the name Gallup in the British courts.&nbsp; Can anyone tell
us what happened and in fact who can or cannot legally use the name
Gallup?&nbsp;
I have seen some of the work produced by Gallup, Denmark (not the US Gallup
Organization). What I have seen is high quality stuff.</font>
Hal Kassarjian</font>
***************</font>
Hal Kassarjian

At 12:28 AM 10/20/01 -0400, you wrote:</font>
My memory (which could be false) is that when The Gallup Organization</font>
was sold to the folks in Nebraska, it retained Gallup
International. The</font>
people in Lincoln then started Gallup Worldwide. Thus
there are two</font>
legitimate holders of the Gallup name operating
internationally.
Would</font>
someone who knows the situation better than I confirm,
clarify, or deny?</font>
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism&nbsp; Voice:
919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll
Hall
Might ironing affect contents, such as gumming on envelope flaps and stamps inside? Some checks and other documents have heat-sensitive security...
features that might be rendered worthless. Perhaps every security measure is a bit of success for the terrorists, just as it is a bit larger restriction on our lives.

Regards,
Ellis

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]
On Behalf Of James Beniger
Sent: Friday, October 19, 2001 8:53 AM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Mail Surveys Rescued

Here, thanks to the Associated Press, is an idea likely to save mail surveys in 2001 AA (After Anthrax): Stamp each envelope with "Iron Before Opening!"

Now all we need is some donated advertising time and space to introduce American males to the concept of "ironing"...

-- Jim

(C) Copyright 2001 The Associated Press


Expert: Ironing Mail Kills Spores

By Associated Press WASHINGTON --

An expert on germ warfare is telling Americans to use a steam iron on the mail if they're afraid to open it.

Ken Alibek said the combination of heat and moisture would kill any anthrax lurking in an envelope.

"If you are scared, just iron this letter," he said. "After that, they (the spores) become harmless." Microwaves are somewhat less effective than steam ironing because they don't emit moist heat, he said.

Alibek defected to the United States in 1992 after serving as deputy head of the huge Biopreparat venture linked to germ warfare in the former Soviet Union. The Soviet Union produced hundreds of tons of anthrax at its sprawling biological weapons facilities.

Alibek spoke Tuesday at a Capitol Hill briefing organized by Reps. Edward
For what it's worth, a recent Iowa Poll asked about changes Iowans expect to make in coming months as a consequence of the attacks (poll taken mid to late September). One item in the list was: Be less trusting of people from Middle Eastern countries: 17% very likely, 24% somewhat likely, 56% not likely, 3% not sure. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
For what it's worth, a recent Iowa Poll asked about changes Iowans expect to make in coming months as a consequence of the attacks (poll taken mid to late September). One item in the list was: Be less trusting of people from Middle Eastern countries: 17% very likely, 24% somewhat likely, 56% not likely, 3% not sure. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
Hi Bob,

You might want to add The Practice of Social Research (9th edition) by Earl Babbie to your list of good introductory texts. It's excellent.

Dick

---
From abider@earthlink.net Sun Oct 21 21:11:26 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9M4BQe17469 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 21 Oct 2001
   21:11:26 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net (falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net
[207.217.120.74])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id VAA10094 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 21 Oct 2001 21:11:28 -0700
   (PDT)
[63.215.154.209])
   by falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net (8.11.5/8.9.3) with SMTP id
   f9M4Bu06091
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 21 Oct 2001 21:11:11 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <003501c15ab0$0b0363c0$d19ad73f@alvbynsy>
From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <3BD0B4C2.6090801@earthlink.net>
   <5.0.0.25.2.200111019214500.00a21150@pop.ucla.edu>
   <3BD2F965.EB9FB32@marketsharescorp.com>
Subject: Re: The two Gallups
Date: Mon, 22 Oct 2001 00:12:41 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="---_NextPart_000_0032_01C15A8E.4444CCE0"
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
Good to have the information about Newsweek's sponsorship and their handling of "the two Gallups." I did not see the Newsweek connection on the PK outfit's website.

For Newsweek, maybe "[t]he issue is one of clarity - anticipation of reader confusion." For me and some others posting to this thread, the main issue was an intense and unusual effort to circulate broadly to the media and us a decidedly unfair and less than forthright trashing of the poll and its source. In light of the lengths to which officialdom and media have gone (see, for instance the story on PK that Newsweek's sis, The Washington Post, fronted Sunday) to push a contrary view of PK opinion, I cannot rule out the presence of yet another impetus for The Gallup Organization's initiative than has been mentioned in this thread.

How does Panagakis think The Gallup Organization would regard adoption as universal media practice of this alternative footnote when one of its polls was carried?

"*conducted by The Gallup Organization (not a division of Gallup International based in London)"

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

----- Original Message -----=
From: Nick Panagakis
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Sent: Sunday, October 21, 2001 12:35 PM
Subject: Re: The two Gallups

Newsweek's web edition makes a distinction between the two Gallups in the second graph below.

A NEWSWEEK poll shows that public sympathy in Pakistan is firmly on the side of the Taliban NEWSWEEK WEB EXCLUSIVE Oct. 18 - Is the West winning the battle for Muslim hearts and minds? Not according to a poll commissioned by NEWSWEEK and conducted in Pakistan less than a week after the United States began bombing Afghanistan.

PAKISTAN is one of the few Muslim countries that allows scientific opinion polling. Polls are banned, for instance, in Saudi Arabia and Egypt. This survey's methodology has been criticized by some U.S. polling groups, but the poll, *conducted by Gallup International (not a division of The Gallup Organization, based in Princeton, N.J.),* provides some sobering insights into the dangerous volatility of the country.
The above is from their web edition. I couldn't find this poll in the print edition.

As background, in Newsweek's 10/14 release, the lead sentence described the poll as "...according to a recent Gallup Poll in Pakistan commissioned by Newsweek...". which led to the news stories that Schuman brought to our attention last Monday. And in Newsweek's International edition, the poll was described as ".... a Gallup poll commissioned in Pakistan by NEWSWEEK".

The issue here may be more journalistic that legalistic or methodological. For example here in Illinois, we have a Governor George Ryan who has decided not to run for reelection which most observers call a wise decision. We now have Jim Ryan, also a Republican who is running to succeed him. Most news stories about Jim point out that he is "no relation to George" on the chance that some small percentage of readers may confuse Jim with George.

The issue is one of clarity - anticipation of reader confusion. In stories about Gallup polls when (in this case) only a small percentage can be expected to know there are two Gallups, some distinction should be made.

Nick

"H.H. Kassarjian" wrote:

Let me add my two cents worth. It is my understanding that the there is or was a lawsuit as to the legitimate holder of the name Gallup in the British courts. Can anyone tell us what happened and in fact who can or cannot legally use the name Gallup? I have seen some of the work produced by Gallup, Denmark (not the US Gallup Organization). What I have seen is high quality stuff.

Hal Kassarjian

My memory (which could be false) is that when The Gallup Organization was sold to the folks in Nebraska, it retained Gallup International. The people in Lincoln then started Gallup Worldwide. Thus there are two legitimate holders of the Gallup name operating internationally. Would someone who knows the situation better than I confirm, clarify, or deny?

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
Good to have the information about Newsweek's sponsorship and their handling of "the two Gallups." I did not see the Newsweek connection on the PK outfit's website. For Newsweek, maybe "[t]he issue is one of clarity - anticipation of reader confusion." For me and some others posting to this thread, the main issue was an intense and unusual effort to circulate broadly to the media and us a decidedly unfair and less than forthright trashing of the poll and its source. In light of the lengths to which officialdom and media have gone (see, for instance the story on PK that Newsweek's sis, The Washington Post, fronted Sunday) to push a contrary view of PK opinion, I cannot rule out the presence of yet another impetus for The Gallup Organization's initiative than has been mentioned in this thread.

IHow does Panagakis think The Gallup Organization would regard adoption as universal media practice of this alternative footnote when one of its polls was carried? =

"conducted by The Gallup Organization (not a division of Gallup International based in London)"

Albert D. Biderman

Albert D. Biderman

mailto:abider@american.edu
Newsweek's web edition makes a distinction between the two Gallups in the second graph below.

A NEWSWEEK poll shows that public sympathy in Pakistan is firmly on the side of the Taliban NEWSWEEK WEB EXCLUSIVE Oct. 18 — Is the West winning the battle for Muslim hearts and minds? Not according to a poll commissioned by NEWSWEEK and conducted in Pakistan less than a week after the United States began bombing Afghanistan. NEWSWEEK is one of the few Muslim countries that allows scientific opinion polling. Polls are banned, for instance, in Saudi Arabia and Egypt. This survey's methodology has been criticized by some U.S. polling groups, but the poll, *conducted by Gallup International (not a division of The Gallup Organization, based in Princeton, N.J.),* provides some sobering insights into the dangerous volatility of the country.

The above is from their web edition. I couldn't find this poll in the print edition. As background, in Newsweek's 10/14 release, the lead sentence described the poll as "...according to a recent Gallup Poll in Pakistan commissioned by Newsweek...". which led to the news stories that Schuman brought to our attention last Monday. And in Newsweek's International edition, the poll was described as "... a Gallup poll commissioned in Pakistan by NEWSWEEK".
methodological.

For example here in Illinois, we have a Governor George Ryan who has decided not to run for reelection which most observers call a wise decision. We now have Jim Ryan, also a Republican who is running to succeed him. Most stories about Jim point out that he is "no relation to George" on the chance that some small percentage of readers may confuse Jim with George. The issue is one of clarity - anticipation of reader confusion. In stories about Gallup polls when (in this case) only a small percentage can be expected to know there are two Gallups, some distinction should be made.

Let me add my two cents worth. It is my understanding that there is or was a lawsuit as to the legitimate holder of the name Gallup in the British courts. Can anyone tell us what happened and in fact who can or cannot legally use the name? I have seen some of the work produced by Gallup, not the US Gallup Organization. What I have seen is high quality stuff.

My memory (which could be false) is that when The Gallup Organization was sold to the folks in Nebraska, it retained Gallup International. The people in Lincoln then started Gallup Worldwide. Thus there are two legitimate holders of the Gallup name operating internationally. Would someone who knows the situation better than I confirm, clarify, or deny?

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll
ON the role of surveys and of public opinion:<br><br> If you can read French, you may be interested in Blondiaux, “La fabrique de l’opinion”, Seuil, a very interesting history of public opinion and of the role of surveys in US and in France. On the author’s site, you may find one or two texts in English.<br><br> <a href="http://www2.univ-lille2.fr/droit/CRAPS/enseignants/blondiaux/blondiaux.html" eudora="autourl">http://www2.univ-lille2.fr/droit/CRAPS/enseignants/blondiaux/blondiaux.html</a>
Another interesting book, translated in English is the following:


At the following address, you will find other references by the same author:

Claire Durand

At 19:23 2001-10-20 +0100, you wrote:

This list is very helpful and timely for me, as I have been commissioned to update the entry in the Encyclopaedia Britannica's standing article on 'Public Opinion', by 31 December 2001. It was last done some years ago by the esteemed Philips Davison, and I'm honoured to follow on from him.

This gives me a good and helpful start, but is rather parochical, and I would appreciate it if there are those who can broaden it somewhat to more philosophical works on the role of public opinion in policy formation and practical politics, and also take it outside the borders of the US?

Thanks for your thoughts on this.

Bob Worcester, MORI/LSE

Robert M. Worcester

Chairman, MORI

32 Old Queen Street

London SW1H 9HP

(44)207 222 0232 Tel

(44)207 227 0404 Fax

worc@mori.com

Here is something to start with... mark

INTRODUCTORY SURVEY RESEARCH TEXTS

The following texts were recommended by nine members of AAPORNET, the on-line Internet discussion group of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). Results compiled by Mark Richards, August 17-19, 1999.

Question: Thinking of available (text) books on survey research, which one or two would you recommend to someone (a client) who would like to understand the survey research process and methods without
becoming an expert in any one aspect? 

Key features sought:

- Accurate information, excellent for self study, very good information on telephone research, concise, easy to read, limited technical jargon, includes
- some simple standard tables with info on how to read (sampling error) and
- bibliography for follow-up in specific areas.

* Priscilla Salant & Don A. Dillman (Contributor), How to Conduct Your Own Survey, John Wiley & Sons.
* Don A. Dillman, Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method, John Wiley & Sons, April 1978.
* Thomas E. Mann (Editor), Gary R. Orren (Editor), Media Polls in American Politics Brookings Institute, October 1992.
* Introduction to Survey Sampling, Sage Publications; October 1983.
Subject: Survey Research Staples....

AAPORNetters,

I'm in the process of evaluating / stocking my modest survey library and was looking for input on the must have textbooks, handbooks, or otherwise just good books on survey research. I seem to recall a similar discussion taking place awhile ago, but my initial searches of the archives did not result in a coherent thread. And for those more in the marketing research arena, I would be especially interested to hear your recommendations regarding the must-have books. My library is even more modest in this area and so I would appreciate some direction about where to look for discussions of the foundational concepts and measures as well as the latest techniques.

I realize this is a busy time for many of us, so share if you can, and if not, continue on guilt free. As Patty has already pointed out, in a pinch AAPORNetters always come through.

It's probably best to reply off-list, but I will be happy to summarize at a later date so as to add officially to the archive.

Best Wishes,

John

---

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) 20 7347 3000
or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title
line.

Claire Durand
Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca
http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc/
"Il y a 50% de chances, ± 3,1%, qu'il fasse beau demain.
There is a 50% chance, ± 3,1%, that tomorrow will be sunny.
Université de Montréal, dept. de sociologie,
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3C 3J7
Actuellement à Paris : 01-45-81-58-52

Kristi Hagen wrote:
> We are preparing to field a telephone survey that is rather lengthy and
> involved. Our client wants to provide incentives to respondents who have
> refused to participate in earlier contacts. Would anyone be willing share
> their procedures on how they have done this and any sample "telephone
> scripts" for wording the refusal conversion/incentive offering? Any
> suggestions for keeping respondents on the phone for long surveys?
>
> Also, we are using a pre-notification postcard (instead of a letter due to
> the anthrax scare). Has anyone had any experience with using a photo of
> the interviewing staff in pre-notifications for telephone surveys?
> Thanks!
>
> Kristi Kay Hagen, MA, MA
> Research Operations Manager
> Social Research Laboratory,
> Northern Arizona University
> PO Box 15301, Flagstaff AZ 86011-5301
> PH: 520-523-1515
> Fax:520-523-6654

>From mail@marketsharescorp.com Mon Oct 22 06:17:36 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9MDHZel8873 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 22 Oct 2001
06:17:35 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from maynard.mail.mindspring.net (maynard.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.243])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscd) with ESMTP
    id GAA19204 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 22 Oct 2001 06:17:34 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from marketsharescorp.com (sdn-ar-004ilchicP275.dialsprint.net
[168.191.105.205])
    by maynard.mail.mindspring.net (8.9.3/8.8.5) with ESMTP id JAA07645
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 22 Oct 2001 09:17:19 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <3BD41C05.F5ABE782@marketsharescorp.com>
Date: Mon, 22 Oct 2001 08:15:54 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: The two Gallups
References: <3BD0B4C2.6090801@earthlink.net>
<5.0.0.25.2.20011019214500.00a21150@pop.ucla.edu>
<3BD2F965.EB9EFB32@marketsharescorp.com>
<003501c15ab060b0363c0$d19ad73f@alvbnsy>
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="-----------------53AC23FB0D78FD56E17BA14E"

-----------------53AC23FB0D78FD56E17BA14E
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

> "(not a division of Gallup International based in London)" would be
inaccurate.
>
The complete name of the organization is "Gallup International Association". There are 55 members in 55 countries. There is no member in Great Britain.

Importantly, few members adopt the name Gallup as part of their company name.

I could be wrong - but this association bestows membership on a limited basis providing member companies with some marketing advantage through their affiliation due to the Gallup name - not quite like AAPOR but not quite like Wendy's or Burger King either. Cam anyone think of a similar organization here in the U.S.

See:
http://www.gallup-international.com/

Nick

Albert Biderman wrote:

> Good to have the information about Newsweek's sponsorship and their handling of "the two Gallups." I did not see the Newsweek connection on the PK outfit's website. For Newsweek, maybe "[t]he issue is one of clarity - anticipation of reader confusion." For me and some others posting to this thread, the main issue was an intense and unusual effort to circulate broadly to the media and us a decidedly unfair and less than forthright trashing of the poll and its source.
> In light of the lengths to which officialdom and media have gone (see, for instance the story on PK that Newsweek's sis, The Washington Post, fronted Sunday) to push a contrary view of PK opinion, I cannot rule out the presence of yet another impetus for The Gallup Organization's initiative than has been mentioned in this thread. How does Panagakis think The Gallup Organization would regard adoption as universal media practice of this alternative footnote when one of its polls was carried? "*conducted by The Gallup Organization (not a division of Gallup International based in London)" Albert D.
> Bidermanabider@american.edu

> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: Nick Panagakis 
> To: aapornet@usc.edu 
> Sent: Sunday, October 21, 2001 12:35 PM 
> Subject: Re: The two Gallups 
> 
> Newsweek's web edition makes a distinction between the two Gallups in the second graph below. 
> 
> A NEWSWEEK poll shows that public sympathy in Pakistan is firmly on the side of the Taliban NEWSWEEK WEB EXCLUSIVE Oct. 18 - Is the West winning the battle for Muslim hearts and minds? Not according to a poll commissioned by NEWSWEEK and conducted in Pakistan less than a week after the United States began bombing Afghanistan. 
> 
> PAKISTAN is one of the few Muslim countries that allows scientific opinion polling. Polls are banned, for instance, in Saudi
Arabia and Egypt. This survey's methodology has been criticized by some U.S. polling groups, but the poll, "conducted by Gallup International (not a division of The Gallup Organization, based in Princeton, N.J.)," provides some sobering insights into the dangerous volatility of the country.

The above is from their web edition. I couldn't find this poll in the print edition.

As background, in Newsweek's 10/14 release, the lead sentence described the poll as "...according to a recent Gallup Poll in Pakistan commissioned by Newsweek...". which led to the news stories that Schuman brought to our attention last Monday. And in Newsweek's International edition, the poll was described as ".... a Gallup poll commissioned in Pakistan by NEWSWEEK".

The issue here may be more journalistic than legalistic or methodological. For example here in Illinois, we have a Governor George Ryan who has decided not to run for reelection which most observers call a wise decision. We now have Jim Ryan, also a Republican who is running to succeed him. Most news stories about Jim point out that he is "no relation to George" on the chance that some small percentage of readers may confuse Jim with George.

The issue is one of clarity - anticipation of reader confusion. In stories about Gallup polls when (in this case) only a small percentage can be expected to know there are two Gallups, some distinction should be made.

Nick

"H.H. Kassarjian" wrote:

> Let me add my two cents worth. It is my understanding that the there is or was a lawsuit as to the legitimate holder of the name Gallup in the British courts. Can anyone tell us what happened and in fact who can or cannot legally use the name Gallup? I have seen some of the work produced by Gallup, Denmark (not the US Gallup Organization). What I have seen is high quality stuff.

Hal Kassarjian

***************
people in Lincoln then started Gallup Worldwide. Thus there are two legitimate holders of the Gallup name operating internationally. Would someone who knows the situation better than I confirm, clarify, or deny?

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

The complete name of the organization is "Gallup International Association". There are 55 members in 55 countries. There is no member in Great Britain. Importantly, few members adopt the name Gallup as part of their company name.

I could be wrong - but this association bestows membership on a limited basis providing member companies with some marketing advantage through their affiliation due to the Gallup name - not quite like AAPOR but not quite like Wendy's or Burger King either. Cam anyone think of a similar organization here in the U.S.

See: http://www.gallup-international.com/

Nick Albert Biderman wrote:
Good to have the information about Newsweek's sponsorship and their handling of "the two Gallups." I did not see the Newsweek connection on the PK outfit's website. For Newsweek, maybe "[t]he issue is one of clarity - anticipation of reader confusion." For me and some others posting to this thread, the main issue was an intense and unusual effort to circulate broadly to
the media and us a decidedly unfair and less than forthright trashing of
the poll and its source. In light of the lengths to which officialdom
and media have gone (see, for instance the story on PK that Newsweek's
sis, The Washington Post, fronted Sunday) to push a contrary view
of PK opinion, I cannot rule out the presence of yet another impetus
for The Gallup Organization's initiative than has been mentioned in this
thread.

IHow does Panagakis think The Gallup Organization would regard adoption as universal media
practice of this alternative footnote when one of its polls was
carried?

"*conducted by The Gallup Organization (not a division of Gallup
International
based in London)"

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

----- Original Message -----
From: Nick Panagakis
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Sent: Sunday, October 21, 2001 12:35 PM
Subject: Re: The two Gallups

Newsweek's web edition makes a distinction between the two Gallups
in the second graph below.

A NEWSWEEK poll shows that public sympathy in Pakistan is firmly on
the side of
the Taliban NEWSWEEK WEB EXCLUSIVE
Oct. 18 - Is the West winning the battle for Muslim hearts
and minds? Not according to a poll commissioned by
NEWSWEEK and conducted in Pakistan less than a week
after the United States began bombing Afghanistan.

PKISTAN is one of the few Muslim countries that allows scientific
opinion polling. Polls are banned, for instance, in Saudi Arabia and
Egypt. This survey's methodology has been criticized by some U.S.
polling groups, but the poll, *conducted by Gallup International (not a
division of The Gallup Organization, based in Princeton, N.J.)*,
provides some sobering insights into the dangerous volatility of the
country.
The above is from their web edition. I couldn't find this poll in the
print edition.

As background, in Newsweek's 10/14 release, the lead sentence described
the poll as "...according to a recent Gallup Poll in Pakistan commissioned
by Newsweek...". which led to the news stories that Schuman brought to
our attention last Monday. And in Newsweek's International edition, the poll was described as ".... a Gallup poll commissioned in Pakistan by NEWSWEEK".

The issue here may be more journalistic than legalistic or methodological. For example here in Illinois, we have a Governor George Ryan who has decided not to run for reelection which most observers call a wise decision. We now have Jim Ryan, also a Republican who is running to succeed him. Most news stories about Jim point out that he is "no relation to George" on the chance that some small percentage of readers may confuse Jim with George. The issue is one of clarity - anticipation of reader confusion. In stories about Gallup polls when (in this case) only a small percentage can be expected to know there are two Gallups, some distinction should be made.

Nick

"H.H. Kassarjian" wrote:

It is my understanding that there is or was a lawsuit as to the legitimate holder of the name Gallup in the British courts. Can anyone tell us what happened and in fact who can or cannot legally use the name Gallup?

I have seen some of the work produced by Gallup, Denmark (not the US Gallup Organization). What I have seen is high quality stuff.

Hal Kassarjian

At 12:28 AM 10/20/01 -0400, you wrote:

My memory (which could be false) is that when The Gallup Organization was sold to the folks in Nebraska, it retained Gallup International. The people in Lincoln then started Gallup Worldwide. Thus there are two legitimate holders of the Gallup name operating internationally. Would someone who knows the situation better than I confirm, clarify, or deny?

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
The evolution of the "Hispanics by Race" thread has been most rewarding. I am left, however, with the underlying question I had at the beginning of this conversation --- namely, how do we construct a race question that respondents can knowledgeably answer?

This thread has suggested (to me) that research designers are not clear what is being asked in the race question. Unlike sex, age, or income, we are not sure what we are asking when we ask about "race." And if we don't know what we are asking, how can we possibly expect respondents to figure it out?

Our race questions may be as good an example as any of a research truism --- Ask someone a question (even a poorly conceived or constructed question) and you will get an answer, any answer. After all, as Betsy
Martin stated, "measurement of race and related constructs is very complex and presents profound difficulties at many levels." It makes one wonder what we are getting back to our race questions that throw "race" out to the respondents with the hope that THEY can interpret our meaning.

While I appreciate the political implications of the thought, I will repeat Claire's question to the group --- "Do we need 'race'?"

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com

---Original Message---
From: Margaret Roller [mailto:71501.716@compuserve.com]
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2001 1:10 PM
To: INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu

Margaret,

I am coming into this conversation late, but have a quick comment:

Any variable that has the predictive utility (i.e., it's not explained away when it's in a multivariate mix) that the "race" variable has had in social science research has "value" to social science.

PJL
The evolution of the "Hispanics by Race" thread has been most rewarding. I am left, however, with the underlying question I had at the beginning of this conversation --- namely, how do we construct a race question that respondents can knowledgeably answer?

This thread has suggested (to me) that research designers are not clear what is being asked in the race question. Unlike sex, age, or income, we are not sure what we are asking when we ask about "race." And if we don't know what we are asking, how can we possibly expect respondents to figure it out?

Our race questions may be as good an example as any of a research truism --- Ask someone a question (even a poorly conceived or constructed question) and you will get an answer, any answer. After all, as Betsy Martin stated, "measurement of race and related constructs is very complex and presents profound difficulties at many levels." It makes one wonder what we are getting back to our race questions that throw "race" out to the respondents with the hope that THEY can interpret our meaning.

While I appreciate the political implications of the thought, I will repeat Claire's question to the group --- "Do we need 'race'?"

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com
Has anyone tried having outreach workers give homeless clients phone cards as a reward for calling into an '800' number to complete a phone survey?

Hi!

We are looking for databases containing information on youth (target group ages 11-13) in California or Western US with a focus on youth styles and preferences that would be useful in targeting a health communication campaign. We understand that some youth databases may be commercial and available only through subscription, but we are interested in all possible sources.

Many thanks!  ~Vicky
Vicky,

I've listed several California youth surveys below, however, not all focus on the age group of interest to you. Hope this is of some use.

Joel

CA Healthy Kids Survey (CA Dept of Education)
http://www.wested.org/cs/wew/view/pj/245
http://www.wested.org/hks/

CA Tobacco Surveys (UC San Diego) - adolescent surveys
http://ssdc.ucsd.edu/ssdc/cpc00001.html
http://www.dhs.ca.gov/tobacco/html/Evaluation_Resources.htm

CA Youth Tobacco Survey (Public Health Institute)

National Household Survey on Drug Abuse - CA sample
http://www.samhsa.gov/oas/nhsda/nhsda97/nhsda987.htm#E10E39

In-School Youth Survey http://www.health.org/dbases/factoids/CA1.html

Youth Voices (Children Now)
http://www.youthvoices.org/pr-00-3-1-youth-voices.html

CA Youth and Law Survey (CA State Bar)
http://www.calbar.org/2rel/3nr6/3re10430.htm


California Children's Healthy Eating & Exercise Practices Survey, 1999 (CalCHEEPS) http://www.cnr.berkeley.edu/cwh/surveys_ca.html#chks
http://www.ca5aday.com/research/rsch_state.htm

California Research Bureau (CRB) Children's Healthy Lifestyle project
http://www.library.ca.gov/crb/00/08/00-008.pdf
Youth Media Network Survey Form
http://www.ymn.org/survey/survey.shtml

At 10/22/2001 03:36 PM, you wrote:
>Hi!
>
>We are looking for databases containing information on youth (target group
>ages 11-13) in California or Western US with a focus on youth styles and
>preferences that would be useful in targeting a health communication
>campaign. We understand that some youth databases may be commercial and
>available only through subscription, but we are interested in all possible
>sources.
>
>Many thanks!  -Vicky
>
>
>Victoria A. Albright ( Albright@Field.com )
>VP/Research Director
>Field Research Corporation
>222 Sutter Street, 2nd floor
>San Francisco, CA  94108
>415 392 5763

=====================================================================
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
=====================================================================

>From abider@earthlink.net Mon Oct 22 21:02:34 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
      id f9N42Xe08718 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 22 Oct 2001
21:02:33 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from harrier.mail.pas.earthlink.net (harrier.mail.pas.earthlink.net
[207.217.121.12])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
      id VAA05230 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 22 Oct 2001 21:02:25 -0700
      (PDT)
Received: from default (dialup-166.90.26.253.Dial1.Washington1.Level3.net
[166.90.26.253])
   by harrier.mail.pas.earthlink.net (EL-8_9_3_3/8.9.3) with SMTP id
   VAA24672
      for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 22 Oct 2001 21:02:12 -0700 (PDT)
Message-ID: <000901c15b78$33520160$fd1a5aa6@default>
Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: The two Gallups
Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2001 00:07:13 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

Just to avoid confusion: The following is the contact given by the link below:

> Gallup International Association - 25 Coborn Road - London E3 2DA - UK
> Phone: + 44 20 8983 4509 - Fax: + 44 20 8983 4105
> <info@gallup-international.com>

Sorry I misled, but my previous message gave Sunday as the date of a Washington Post article which appeared on Saturday's front page.

Now, please pardon this personal note and flag wave: Although George Gallup was a member of BSSR's small Board of trustees for about 25 of my years there, we were not an affiliate of anything and, until last week, I never would have thought I'd have a dog in a fight over organizations' use of his name. My dander rose because I care about the quality of the information considered when putting our armed forces. and much else, in harm's way. I cannot think of a time when opinion research was more critical. I hope my first intervention in this thread made that clear. Blessed be seekers of peace in the polling profession and business, but a real war is a real war and that's where the Pakistan poll and its attempted thrashing are at.

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

-----

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Oct 22 22:08:52 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9N58qe13465 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 22 Oct 2001
    22:08:52 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id WAA19515 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 22 Oct 2001 22:08:53 -0700
    (PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9N58Na05269 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 22 Oct 2001 22:08:23 -0700
On Mon, 22 Oct 2001, Lavrakas, Paul wrote:

> Margaret,
> >
> > I am coming into this conversation late, but have a quick comment:
> >
> > Any variable that has the predictive utility (i.e., it's not explained away
> > when it's in a multivariate mix) that the "race" variable has had in social
> > science research has "value" to social science.
> >
> > PJL
>
> -----Original Message-----
> > From: Margaret Roller [mailto:71501.716@compuserve.com]
> > Sent: Monday, October 22, 2001 1:10 PM
> > To: INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: "Race"
> >
> -----
>
> But Paul,

*any* variable could have high "predictive utility... in a multivariate
mix," as you term it, if that variable's value is decided by a researcher
with prior knowledge of the direction of that *already known* "predictive
utility"--a prior knowledge we most often call "prejudice" (as in "to
prejudge").

This is precisely why, for example, people conclude that blacks are
"lazy," say, based on the high likelihood that blacks will not have
employment, or at least will be under-employed. It will take much
more than a regression equation to expose such correlations as SDTPPAOO--
spurious due to prior prejudice (in this case simple discrimination
in hiring practices) against other outcomes.

"Predictive utility in a multivariate mix" certainly has its benefits in
research and analysis (in scale construction, for example). My own
complaints with those who would attempt to "diddle" race items to
"improve" the overall measurement of the "races" of individuals is
precisely the same as my complaint with the researcher/coder above:
Prior knowledge of what existential and objective features and factors
of one's life best correlate with "race" is knowledge which cannot help
but give race's multivariate mix the best "predictive utility"--but in the
direction of preconceptions and not findings (findings like the inability to hold jobs, for example—which results from nothing if not prejudice, and a prejudice not only of employers, but also of all those who believe that this second-order result is somehow a causal relationship, what is so often associated with "predictive utility in a multivariate mix."

Carried to this extreme, "predictive utility" is plain-'ol race prejudice, as in "all blacks are X." Here I use X only to show that the statement "all blacks are X" is equally prejudiced, regardless of what X might be, whether positive or negative—makes no difference, 'tis prejudice either way.

Prejudice resides entirely in the finding of all members of a particular class of people to be the same—whether they are all something good or all something bad is entirely beside the point, so far as the finding of prejudice is concerned. And science itself understands this point better than any other realm of culture, it seems to me. Which is why science does not allow its practitioners to "diddle" measures to yield the measurements expected, a priori, as are the expectations resulting from lusting after "predictive utility in a multivariate mix."

And so, in short, to "diddle" race items in order to "improve" their "predictive utility" is nothing more than to build the already known prejudices—good or bad, makes no difference—into the measure itself. This is hardly science, I'm afraid, and though it might fool others, we ought not to be so unscientific as to let it fool ourselves.

I'm obviously not directing any of this at you, personally, Paul—I'm merely using your message to make clearer (I hope) what I've already said on our list several times over the past few weeks. It seems especially useful to me to see the similarity of problems between prejudices (however innocent or ignorant they might be in intent), on the one hand, and faulty data analysis ("finding" what one has in fact built into both one's data and one's analysis of it), on the other.

And the essential point at stake here has little to do with racial prejudice, in its essence, and much more to do with our conceptions of what qualifies as a "good measure" or even an "adequate measure."

-- Jim

******

On Mon, 22 Oct 2001, Lavrakas, Paul wrote:

> Margaret,
> 
> I am coming into this conversation late, but have a quick comment:
> 
> Any variable that has the predictive utility (i.e., it's not explained away when it's in a multivariate mix) that the "race" variable has had in social science research has "value" to social science.
> 
> PJL
IMHO,
The problem with race is not one of predictive utility but of comprehensive utility. When there is a relationship between a variable and another set of variables, we want to know why and how this relationship operates. Saying "the colour of your skin" predicts your political opinions and behaviour" is not that useful for that purpose. Is this true, whatever the social class, education, place of residence, country of origin? Whether this is true or not, more information would be needed to explain such a situation.

Second, though race may have had a clear "usefulness" in the US as it permitted to "categorize" "genuine" Americans for a long time, right now and more so in the future, when you use race, you try to fit all new immigrants into the US categories. How is a Pakistani supposed to answer the race question? Black? or Asian? Are North Africans white or black? Do you want to distribute Venezuelan, Mexican or Cuban immigrants into the two White - Black categories? In short, indicators that are closer to measuring "culture" would achieve a better job (ethnic origin, country of birth, language, religion, etc).

"Race" lacks a universal meaning: In most countries in the world, the colour of the skin is not the main "differentiator" between people and race has a different meaning (see Bob Steen's posting). In the sixties in Quebec, some people used "our race" as meaning the French Canadians; besides, if you spoke French in Toronto, you could be told to "Speak White".
Finally, some respondents may react negatively to the request that they identify themselves as being of one "race". A precedent posting stated that race was not used in the Mexican Census. To my knowledge, it is not used in Canada or in France either. It would be interesting to see which countries, besides US, ask a question about "race" in their Census.

Claire Durand

At 13:53 2001-10-22 -0400, you wrote:
> Margaret,
> 
> I am coming into this conversation late, but have a quick comment:
> 
> Any variable that has the predictive utility (i.e., it's not explained away when it's in a multivariate mix) that the "race" variable has had in social science research has "value" to social science.
> 
PJL
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Margaret Roller [mailto:71501.716@compuserve.com]
> Sent: Monday, October 22, 2001 1:10 PM
> To: INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: "Race"
> 
> The evolution of the "Hispanics by Race" thread has been most rewarding. I am left, however, with the underlying question I had at the beginning of this conversation --- namely, how do we construct a race question that respondents can knowledgeably answer?
> 
> This thread has suggested (to me) that research designers are not clear what is being asked in the race question. Unlike sex, age, or income, we are not sure what we are asking when we ask about "race." And if we don't know what we are asking, how can we possibly expect respondents to figure it out?
> 
> Our race questions may be as good an example as any of a research truism ---- Ask someone a question (even a poorly conceived or constructed question) and you will get an answer, any answer. After all, as Betsy Martin stated, "measurement of race and related constructs is very complex and presents profound difficulties at many levels." It makes one wonder what we are getting back to our race questions that throw "race" out to the respondents with the hope that THEY can interpret our meaning.
> 
> While I appreciate the political implications of the thought, I will repeat Claire's question to the group --- "Do we need 'race'?"
> 
> Margaret R. Roller
> Roller Marketing Research
> rmr@rollerresearch.com
>

Claire Durand

Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca
"Il y a 50% de chances, ± 3,1%, qu'il fasse beau demain".
"There is a 50% chance, ± 3,1%, that tomorrow will be sunny".

Université de Montréal, dept. de sociologie,
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3C 3J7

>From MACHADJ1@WESTAT.com Tue Oct 23 05:51:37 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9NCpbel5042 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 23 Oct 2001
  05:51:37 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from smtp.westat.com (smtp.westat.com [198.232.249.95])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id FAA17513 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 23 Oct 2001 05:51:37 -0700
  (PDT)
Received: from smtp.westat.com (smtp1.westat.com) by smtp.westat.com
  (LSMT for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.00016A78@smtp.westat.com>
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 23 Oct 2001 8:51:08 -0400
Received: from 10.1.0.184 by smtp.westat.com (InterScan E-Mail VirusWall NT)
  id <VJK8K738>; Tue, 23 Oct 2001 08:51:07 -0400
Received: by reconnt1.westat.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
  id <VJK8K738>; Tue, 23 Oct 2001 08:51:31 -0400
Message-ID: <66AED4702958D511B58C009027B6BD7F12B471@rpmailntb1.westat.com>
From: Janice Machado <MACHADJ1@WESTAT.com>
To: '"aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Looking for Youth Databases
Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2001 08:51:28 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"

Vicky: The University of California San Diego under contract to RWJ and the
State Health Agency has conducted several surveys of youth 12 to 15 years of
age. There are a few questions on the media, youth preferences, etc. You
may want to contact them.

Janice Machado
Senior Study Director
WESTAT
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850
Tel: (301) 294-2801
Fax: (301) 294-2829

-----Original Message-----
From: victoria albright [mailto:albright@field.com]
Hi!

We are looking for databases containing information on youth (target group ages 11-13) in California or Western US with a focus on youth styles and preferences that would be useful in targeting a health communication campaign. We understand that some youth databases may be commercial and available only through subscription, but we are interested in all possible sources.

Many thanks!  -Vicky

Victoria A. Albright ( Albright@Field.com )
VP/Research Director
Field Research Corporation
222 Sutter Street, 2nd floor
San Francisco, CA  94108
415 392 5763

There are a variety of resources available through the CDC's Division of Adolescent and School Health:

http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dash/index.htm

Click on the "Research and Evaluation" link. Many of the datasets are
limited to 9th grade and over, but there may be enough overlap to help. You will want to explore the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System.

At 03:36 PM 10/22/01 -0700, victoria albright wrote:
> We are looking for databases containing information on youth (target group ages 11-13) in California or Western US with a focus on youth styles and preferences that would be useful in targeting a health communication campaign. We understand that some youth databases may be commercial and available only through subscription, but we are interested in all possible sources.

Dept. of Education surveys may be useful.

http://nces.ed.gov/

victoria albright wrote:

> Hi!
>
> We are looking for databases containing information on youth (target group ages 11-13) in California or Western US with a focus on youth styles and preferences that would be useful in targeting a health communication campaign. We understand that some youth databases may be commercial and available only through subscription, but we are interested in all possible
For anyone using Robert Erikson and Kent Tedin, American Public Opinion, 6th edition as a textbook, my research assistant and I have updated most of the tables and figures reporting 1996 NES, GSS and VNS data with the equivalent data for the year 2000. The updates can be found at: http://crystal.polsci.uh.edu/apo (the web address can also be found on page 15 of the textbook).
Kent Tedin  
Professor and Chairman  
Department of Political Science  
University of Houston  
Houston, Texas 77201-3101  
ktedin@uh.edu  
Ph: 713.743.3896  

Content-type: application/ms-tnef; name=winmail.dat  
Content-disposition: attachment; filename=winmail.dat  
Content-transfer-encoding: BASE64  

---Boundary__(ID_+_Jg8uOb26oHg5+7pyXhPEQ)--  
From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Tue Oct 23 10:25:33 2001
If I may be so bold as to interpret Claire:

I think the issue is that we need to know what the demographics we use "stand for." Before I moved back into a psychology program, I used to explain to some of my psych friends that the issues weren't typically "race" or "gender" or "age" but each term as a shorthand for a set of experiences that people might have because they are female or Hispanic or born in 1950. For example, age could reflect maturation factors, life-cycle factors, or, on in a one-shot cross-sectional survey, generational or cohort factors. Ideally, we would measure directly the experiences that we think reflect the particular demographic (e.g., life-cycle information), but this isn't always possible, especially with secondary analysis. However, I have always felt uncomfortable trying to interpolate whatever I believe the set of factors or experiences are when I only have a demographic variable. Most are multidimensional (I consider education one of the worse, but as you can see, age is pretty bad too), and that is partly what I think our entire discussion on "race" reflects.

When we ask "what race do you consider yourself," clearly we get a strong dose of subjective self-identification with an unknown tad of other-identification mixed in (I have never seen a question along the likes of "what race do most people consider you to be," although it might be interesting to try that one out.) When we ask "what is your race?" we appear to treat color/ethnicity as "an objective fact." When we ask "which of the following groups do you belong to?" there is strong overtones of ethnic identification and solidary (which I see as missing from the first version of the question.)

I am reminded of a chapter that James Davis wrote about 25 years ago in a
lovely text that quickly went out of print. He pointed out that the wordings of survey questions are really scapels not cudgels (forgive my paraphrasing) and that members of the general public often see strong differences across questions that survey researchers may see as conceptually similar.

Susan

At 06:33 AM 10/23/2001 -0400, you wrote:
>IMHO,
>The problem with race is not one of predictive utility but of comprehensive utility. When there is a relationship between a variable and another set of variables, we want to know why and how this relationship operates. Saying "the colour of your skin" predicts your political opinions and behaviour" is not that useful for that purpose. Is this true, whatever the social class, education, place of residence, country of origin? Whether this is true or not, more information would be needed to explain such a situation.
>
>Second, though race may have had a clear "usefulness" in the US as it permitted to "categorize" "genuine" Americans for a long time, right now and more so in the future, when you use race, you try to fit all new immigrants into the US categories. How is a Pakistani supposed to answer the race question? Black? or Asian? Are North Africans white or black? Do you want to distribute Venezuelan, Mexican or Cuban immigrants into the two White - Black categories? In short, indicators that are closer to measuring "culture" would achieve a better job (ethnic origin, country of birth, language, religion, etc).
>
>"Race" lacks a universal meaning : In most countries in the world, the colour of the skin is not the main "differentiator" between people and race has a different meaning (see Bob Steen's posting) . In the sixties in Quebec, some people used "our race" as meaning the French Canadians; besides, if you spoke French in Toronto, you could be told to "Speak White".
>
>Finally, some respondents may react negatively to the request that they identify themselves as being of one "race". A precedent posting stated that race was not used in the Mexican Census. To my knowledge, it is not used in Canada or in France either. It would be interesting to see which countries, besides US, ask a question about "race" in their Census.
>
>Claire Durand
>
>At 13:53 2001-10-22 -0400, you wrote:
>>Margaret,
>>
>>I am coming into this conversation late, but have a quick comment:
>>
>>Any variable that has the predictive utility (i.e., it's not explained away when it's in a multivariate mix) that the "race" variable has had in social science research has "value" to social science.
>>
>>PJL
>>
>>------Original Message------
>>From: Margaret Roller [mailto:71501.716@compuserve.com]
The evolution of the "Hispanics by Race" thread has been most rewarding. I am left, however, with the underlying question I had at the beginning of this conversation --- namely, how do we construct a race question that respondents can knowledgeably answer?

This thread has suggested (to me) that research designers are not clear what is being asked in the race question. Unlike sex, age, or income, we are not sure what we are asking when we ask about "race." And if we don't know what we are asking, how can we possibly expect respondents to figure it out?

Our race questions may be as good an example as any of a research truism --- Ask someone a question (even a poorly conceived or constructed question) and you will get an answer, any answer. After all, as Betsy Martin stated, "measurement of race and related constructs is very complex and presents profound difficulties at many levels." It makes one wonder what we are getting back to our race questions that throw "race" out to the respondents with the hope that THEY can interpret our meaning.

While I appreciate the political implications of the thought, I will repeat Claire's question to the group --- "Do we need 'race'?"

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com

Claire Durand
Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca
http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc/
"Il y a 50% de chances, ½ 3,1%, qu'il fasse beau demain".
"There is a 50% chance, ½ 3,1%, that tomorrow will be sunny".

Université de Montréal, dept. de sociologie,
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3C 3J7
Actuellement à Paris : 01-45-81-58-52

Susan Carol Losh, PhD
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
visit the site at: http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453
Susan Losh's posting of earlier today inspires me to try out yet another argument on the question of 'race' and its measurement:

If I were the American male child of, say, a blonde-haired Swedish mother and a black Nigerian father, both naturalized citizens, I believe that I would--placing my own current self into the body of that child--grow up thinking of myself as something like a Nigerian-Swedish American. When I became old enough to vote, I would add the terms 'citizen' and 'voter' to that description, soon to be followed by 'taxpayer.' After I married I would add 'husband' and 'homeowner' and probably 'mortgage holder.' When my wife and I had our first child, I would add 'father' and--to emphasize the teamwork necessary in child rearing--'parent.' And I would want eventually to attain 'grandparent.' If my family lived near Lake Wobegone, and we were active in the local church, I might also consider myself 'Lutheran.' If I had voted for both Bushes, both father and son, I might well think of myself as 'Republican.' Were I to join a labor union, I might think of myself as 'pro-union.' And this list of self-labels and identifications goes on and on, throughout my life, as you all well know.
That said, I think that any behavioral or social scientist who wished to understand my thinking, opinion formation, purchasing decisions, use of leisure time, voting behavior, or television viewing habits—as an adult American male—would need to consider me as I saw myself:

a Nigerian-Swedish American citizen and voter, taxpayer, homeowner and mortgage-holder, husband and father, parent and likely grandparent, church-going Lutheran, and pro-union Republican

[End of example--I'm now Jim B. once again]

The problem confronting survey researchers and public opinion pollsters, however, is that this adult respondent would be routinely given the 'race' of African American, a category with "predictive utility in a multivariate mix" (a fact which I can only thank Paul Lavrakas again for usefully bringing to all of our attention, in this particular context).

But I myself, while the adult Nigerian-Swedish American, did not think that I belonged to any of the researcher's categories of race, because I had thought of myself, for as long as I could remember, as a 50-50 combination of what might be called the "races" of both my father *and* my mother. The convenient convention of considering anyone not entirely "white" (whatever that could possibly mean) as "black" is simply not how real people actually experience the situation.

That 'race' can be used to account for a considerable amount of behavior I do not question. That the correlations of race and behavior are often presented without any mention of intervening and possibility explanatory variables ought to be cause for feelings of great shame, not among those who merely collect the data, certainly, but among those who report them in the mass media, flaunt them in political debates, or use to them to bolster personal prejudices they would hold no less strongly even without scientific support.

The real question for behavioral and social science, it seems to me, is why survey research and public opinion polling methods do not make much greater attempts to understand what respondents see their *own* races to be—often a much more complex and difficult question than I think most of us quite removed from it can really appreciate. Simplying it merely to make coding cheaper and easier, however, is hardly acting to advance the science of the subject.

I conclude that it's time to stop letting multivariate analysis and unlimited computing power do all our work for us. It's time to apply all such resources to the task of unpacking the question of 'race' in explanations of human behavior. Survey research is one good way to do this, it seems to me, if we greatly elaborate what we mean by "race"—by simply listening to what our respondents mean by it. Those who find 'race' an especially powerful explanatory variable ought to be among the first to welcome such a proposal.

-- Jim

*******
NOTE: I do not wish to end this message without disclosing that many of
the examples I have drawn upon above come from one real life experience
I have had over the past several years. A girl of early-mid grade school
age, and not quite twice the age of my two daughters, struck up a
friendship with them--out of loneliness, I would now guess--and indeed
wound up giving them several toys which she had outgrown. She was the
child of a white Californian mother, with whom she lived, and who was
quite diligent in watching after her, and a black father from a
Caribbean country I prefer not to disclose, who was only rarely seen.
She also had a brother--older by a year or two--who was Asian by
simplest classification, and shared time between his Asian father, who
lived in another city perhaps an hour's drive away, and the mother he
shared with his one sister, the young girl that I and my family came
to know quite well.

Although I knew nothing about any of this when I first met the child,
she was quite forthcoming in telling me what it was like to be seen at
school and by strangers, wherever she went, as the 'race' of her father,
whom she rarely saw, and which was not the same 'race' as that of either
her mother or her brother, with whom she did live. And all five of
these people seemed to me to be healthy, well-adjusted members of
society, with the three adults all holding down quite good jobs. Other
judgments I leave for you to make.

Based on this experience, not atypical of much of America today, as I
understand it, I can certainly see why the U.S. Census Bureau has led
the way in innovating the field of coding for 'race'--what else could
Census do, after all, under the real-world circumstances? What I don't
understand is why so much of behavioral and social science--at least
in the United States--has been so slow even to appreciate the problems
with such variables and such measures. Perhaps one one good impetus
for change would be simply to get more researchers simply to read the
Census reports on race.

I welcome your responses, as always.

-- Jim

******
Good thread, but I haven't seen any mention of the political implications of classification schemes. My daughter Melissa Meyer has two children who are of mixed European, African, and Native American ancestry.

For several years before the 2000 census she was active in an interest group that lobbied for multiple classification. Some black interest groups opposed it at first, fearing that it would dilute black representation in counts that would determine various government policies. I attended one meeting with her where I pointed out that multiple classification would make it possible for the government to count anyone with any fractional claim to any race as part of that race if analysts so chose. That seemed to help, at least for that particular group (of college students).

When my grandson was ready for school, Melissa refused to answer the race question on the N.C. form because it allowed only one choice, and the boy was denied enrollment. She came back the next day accompanied by print and broadcast crews, the school relented, and the state changed the rules that required single-category classification.

Two years later, she moved to Miami and repeated exactly the same routine with the same good result.

One unrelated political note: I've been told that the separation of Hispanic from the racial categories was the result of a decision by Casper Weinberger in the first Nixon administration when it was decided at that last minute that Hispanics had become politically potent enough to include. But because it was a last-minute decision, it was made a separate question from race. That was the source of the confusion that led many Hispanics to check "other" on the race question. But I can't cite a source for this story, so maybe it's an urban legend. The part about my daughter's campaign, is true, however, and I have clippings and videotapes to prove it.

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
Phil--what a terrific post! I laughed right out loud when I suddenly found myself reading "accompanied by print and broadcast crews..." Rarely has so much politics been accomplished by so slight an expenditure of perspiration. Please pass my admiration along to Melissa.

-- Jim

******

On Tue, 23 Oct 2001, Philip Meyer wrote:

> Good thread, but I haven't seen any mention of the political implications of classification schemes. My daughter Melissa Meyer has two children who are of mixed European, African, and Native American ancestry. 
> For several years before the 2000 census she was active in an interest group that lobbied for multiple classification. Some black interest groups opposed it at first, fearing that it would dilute black representation in counts that would determine various government policies. I attended one meeting with her where I pointed out that multiple classification would make it possible for the government to count anyone with any fractional claim to any race as part of that race if analysts so chose. That seemed to help, at least for that particular group (of college students). 
> When my grandson was ready for school, Melissa refused to answer the race question on the N.C. form because it allowed only one choice, and the boy was denied enrollment. She came back the next day accompanied by print and broadcast crews, the school relented, and the state changed the rules that required single-category classification. 
> Two years later, she moved to Miami and repeated exactly the same routine with the same good result. 
> One unrelated political note: I've been told that the separation of Hispanic from the racial categories was the result of a decision by Casper Weinberger in the first Nixon administration when it was decided at that last minute that Hispanics had become politically potent enough to include. But because it was a last-minute decision, it was made a separate question from race. That was the source of the confusion that led many
Hispanics to check "other" on the race question. But I can't cite a source
for this story, so maybe it's an urban legend. The part about my
daughter's campaign, is true, however, and I have clippings and videotapes
to prove it.

Phil 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
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To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: RE: "Race" (inspired by Susan Losh, 10/23/01)

Wow, an inspiration no less.

Actually I would be thinking more along these lines. And stick with the
variable "race" for starters:

Do I see the world as more difficult or easier to navigate in terms of
freedom of movement, being watched or stopped by authorities?

What is the difference between my self-efficacy (what I feel that I
personally can accomplish) and any social barriers I see to my performance?

How much do I feel that my contributions are valued at work?

How much do I get irritated or amused by "flesh-colored bandaids" (one of my
long-term favorites), "boo-boo" flesh-colored concealers, or particular hair
products that do or do not reflect my needs?

Etc.
For age or life cycle, I might be interested in measures of retirement or other labor force status, the presence of young children at home, my estimates of spare time, engagement in church, synagogue, or mosque. (Rob Boatright & I did a poster session on this one at Montreal looking at what age means for jury duty attitudes and former juror summonses behavior).

I think we move further ahead if we give some preliminary thought to what our demographics "really mean" and how we might want to use them later in analysis. I got very impressed a while back at the idea of using "proxy variables" in the age-period-cohort morass (thanks, Duane Alwin!) and it got me thinking of what these "proxy variables" can mean in a wide variety of contexts.

Always inspiring,
Susan

At 02:31 PM 10/23/2001 -0700, you wrote:

> Susan Losh's posting of earlier today inspires me to try out yet another argument on the question of 'race' and its measurement:
> If I were the American male child of, say, a blonde-haired Swedish mother and a black Nigerian father, both naturalized citizens, I believe that I would--placing my own current self into the body of that child--grow up thinking of myself as something like a Nigerian-Swedish American. When I became old enough to vote, I would add the terms 'citizen' and 'voter' to that description, soon to be followed by 'taxpayer.' After I married I would add 'husband' and 'homeowner' and probably 'mortgage holder.' When my wife and I had our first child, I would add 'father' and--to emphasize the teamwork necessary in child rearing--'parent.' And I would want eventually to attain 'grandparent.' If my family lived near Lake Wobegone, and we were active in the local church, I might also consider myself 'Lutheran.' If I had voted for both Bushes, both father and son, I might well think of myself as 'Republican.' Were I to join a labor union, I might think of myself as 'pro-union.' And this list of self-labels and identifications goes on and on, throughout my life, as you all well know.
>
> That said, I think that any behavioral or social scientist who wished to understand my thinking, opinion formation, purchasing decisions, use of leisure time, voting behavior, or television viewing habits--as an adult American male--would need to consider me as I saw myself:
>
> a Nigerian-Swedish American citizen and voter, taxpayer, homeowner and mortgage-holder, husband and father, parent and likely grandparent, church-going Lutheran, and pro-union Republican
>
> [End of example--I'm now Jim B. once again]
>
> The problem confronting survey researchers and public opinion pollsters, however, is that this adult respondent would be routinely given the 'race' of African American, a category with "predictive utility in a
multivariate mix" (a fact which I can only thank Paul Lavrakas again for usefully bringing to all of our attention, in this particular context).

But I myself, while the adult Nigerian-Swedish American, did not think that I belonged to any of the researcher's categories of race, because I had thought of myself, for as long as I could remember, as a 50-50 combination of what might be called the "races" of both my father and my mother. The convenient convention of considering anyone not entirely "white" (whatever that could possibly mean) as "black" is simply not how real people actually experience the situation.

That 'race" can be used to account for a considerable amount of behavior I do not question. That the correlations of race and behavior are often presented without any mention of intervening and possibility explanatory variables ought to be cause for feelings of great shame, not among those who merely collect the data, certainly, but among those who report them in the mass media, flaunt them in political debates, or use to them to bolster personal prejudices they would hold no less strongly even without scientific support.

The real question for behavioral and social science, it seems to me, is why survey research and public opinion polling methods do not make much greater attempts to understand what respondents see their *own* races to be--often a much more complex and difficult question than I think most of us quite removed from it can really appreciate. Simplicity is merely to make coding cheaper and easier, however, is hardly acting to advance the science of the subject.

I conclude that it's time to stop letting multivariate analysis and unlimited computing power do all our work for us. It's time to apply all such resources to the task of unpacking the question of 'race' in explanations of human behavior. Survey research is one good way to do this, it seems to me, if we greatly elaborate what we mean by "race"--by simply listening to what our respondents mean by it. Those who find 'race' an especially powerful explanatory variable ought to be among the first to welcome such a proposal.

-- Jim

NOTE: I do not wish to end this message without disclosing that many of the examples I have drawn upon above come from one real life experience I have had over the past several years. A girl of early-mid grade school age, and not quite twice the age of my two daughters, struck up a friendship with them--out of loneliness, I would now guess--and indeed wound up giving them several toys which she had outgrown. She was the child of a white Californian mother, with whom she lived, and who was quite diligent in watching after her, and a black father from a Caribbean country I prefer not to disclose, who was only rarely seen. She also had a brother--older by a year or two--who was Asian by simplest classification, and shared time between his Asian father, who lived in another city perhaps an hour's drive away, and the mother he shared with his one sister, the young girl that I and my family came to know quite well.

Although I knew nothing about any of this when I first met the child, she was quite forthcoming in telling me what it was like to be seen at
school and by strangers, wherever she went, as the 'race' of her father, whom she rarely saw, and which was not the same 'race' as that of either her mother or her brother, with whom she did live. And all five of these people seemed to me to be healthy, well-adjusted members of society, with the three adults all holding down quite good jobs. Other judgments I leave for you to make. Based on this experience, not atypical of much of America today, as I understand it, I can certainly see why the U.S. Census Bureau has led the way in innovating the field of coding for 'race'—what else could Census do, after all, under the real-world circumstances? What I don't understand is why so much of behavioral and social science—at least in the United States—has been so slow even to appreciate the problems with such variables and such measures. Perhaps one one good impetus for change would be simply to get more researchers simply to read the Census reports on race.

I welcome your responses, as always. -- Jim

*******

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

visit the site at: http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm
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NYAAPOR Presents On...

October 31, 2001

The second in a series of informal "brown bag" lunch meetings for those new to the survey research field...

WHAT IS MARKETING RESEARCH?

BARRY FEINBERG
CUSTOM RESEARCH INC.

In the second installment of our "brown bag" tour of the research industry, Barry Feinberg, director of the New York office of Custom Research Inc., will offer an overview of the practice of marketing research. Directed toward people who have little or no experience in the field, Barry will discuss the variety of common marketing research techniques and applications. He will also offer pointers to those interested in pursuing a career in marketing research. The format will be informal, and questions and discussion from participants will be encouraged.

Barry Feinberg, Ph.D., joined Custom Research Inc. in 1999, where he is director of the New York office. He has also held senior positions at Audits & Surveys Worldwide, Warner Brothers Records, and Burson Marsteller. He is a member of the Market Research Council, has served as president of NYAAPOR,
and has taught courses on survey research in area universities, including NYU.

Beverages will be served, but please bring your own lunch!

Details:

Wednesday, October 31, 2001
12:30 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.
CUSTOM RESEARCH INC.
One Penn Plaza
250 West 34th Street, Suite 1520

THIS MEETING IS FREE OF CHARGE TO NYAAPOR MEMBERS AND THEIR GUESTS. ATTENDANCE IS STRICTLY LIMITED AND BY ADVANCE RESERVATION ONLY.

If you are planning to attend, RSVP by Monday, October 29th.

To reserve your place, please E-mail MGMTOFFICE@aol.com
<mailto:MGMTOFFICE@aol.com> or call (212) 684-0542.

You are receiving this email because you requested to receive info and updates via email. To unsubscribe, reply to this email with "unsubscribe" in the subject or simply click on the following link:
Unsubscribe
<mailto:unsubs-b3ed89cf41-jholz=oxygen.com@b.verticalresponse.com?subject=unsubscribe>
<http://i.verticalresponse.com/blank.gif?b3ed89cf41/d3ba33fd76>

This e-mail is the property of Oxygen Media, LLC. It is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure. Distribution or copying of this e-mail or the information contained herein by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify us by sending an e-mail to postmaster@oxygen.com and destroy all electronic and paper copies of this e-mail.
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NYAAPOR Presents On...
October 31, 2001
The second in a series of informal "brown bag" lunch meetings for those new to the survey research field...
WHAT IS MARKETING RESEARCH?
BARRY FEINBERG

Barry Feinberg, director of the New York office of Custom Research Inc., will offer an overview of the practice of marketing research. Directed toward people who have little or no experience in the field, Barry will discuss the variety of common marketing research techniques and applications. He will also offer pointers to those interested in pursuing a career in marketing research. The format
will be informal, and questions and discussion from participants will be encouraged.

Barry Feinberg, Ph.D., joined Custom Research Inc. in 1999, where he is director of the New York office. He has also held senior positions at Audits & Surveys Worldwide, Warner Brothers Records, and Burson Marsteller. He is a member of the Market Research Council, has served as president of NYAAPOR, and has taught courses on survey research in area universities, including NYU.

Beverages will be served, but please bring your own lunch!

This meeting is free of charge to NYAAPOR members and their guests. Attendance is strictly limited and by advance reservation only.

If you are planning to attend, RSVP by Monday, October 29th.

To reserve your place, please E-mail MGMTOFFICE@aol.com or call (212) 684-0542.

This e-mail is the property of Oxygen Media, LLC. It is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure. Distribution or copying of this e-mail or the information contained herein by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please
This is an interesting book about race/ethnicity in United States: "A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America," by Ronald Takaki.

http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itsv/0897/ijse/takaki2.htm
http://www.flint.lib.mi.us/race/takaki.html
http://www.chsa.org/resources/takaki.htm
http://www.commoncouragepress.com/takaki_mirror.html
http://hallevents.com/current_events/1200.shtml

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Susan Losh
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2001 8:32 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: "Race" (inspired by Susan Losh, 10/23/01)
Wow, an inspiration no less.

Actually I would be thinking more along these lines. And stick with the variable "race" for starters:

Do I see the world as more difficult or easier to navigate in terms of freedom of movement, being watched or stopped by authorities?

What is the difference between my self-efficacy (what I feel that I personally can accomplish) and any social barriers I see to my performance?

How much do I feel that my contributions are valued at work?

How much do I get irritated or amused by "flesh-colored bandaids" (one of my long-term favorites), "boo-boo" flesh-colored concealers, or particular hair products that do or do not reflect my needs?

Etc.

For age or life cycle, I might be interested in measures of retirement or other labor force status, the presence of young children at home, my estimates of spare time, engagement in church, synagogue, or mosque. (Rob Boatright & I did a poster session on this one at Montreal looking at what age means for jury duty attitudes and former juror summonses behavior).

I think we move further ahead if we give some preliminary thought to what our demographics "really mean" and how we might want to use them later in analysis. I got very impressed a while back at the idea of using "proxy variables" in the age-period-cohort morass (thanks, Duane Alwin!) and it got me thinking of what these "proxy variables" can mean in a wide variety of contexts.

Always inspiring,

Susan

At 02:31 PM 10/23/2001 -0700, you wrote:
> 
> 
> > Susan Losh's posting of earlier today inspires me to try out yet another argument on the question of 'race' and its measurement:
> > 
> > > If I were the American male child of, say, a blonde-haired Swedish mother and a black Nigerian father, both naturalized citizens, I believe that I would--placing my own current self into the body of that child--grow up thinking of myself as something like a Nigerian-Swedish American. When I became old enough to vote, I would add the terms 'citizen' and 'voter' to that description, soon to be followed by 'taxpayer.' After I married I would add 'husband' and 'homeowner' and probably 'mortgage holder.' When my wife and I had our first child, I would add 'father' and--to emphasize the teamwork necessary in child rearing--'parent.' And I would want eventually to attain 'grandparent.' If my family lived near Lake Wobegone, and we were active in the local church, I might also consider myself 'Lutheran.' If I had voted for both Bushes, both father and son, I might well think of myself as 'Republican.' Were I to join a labor union, I might think of myself as 'pro-union.' And this list of self-
labels and identifications goes on and on, throughout my life, as you all well know.

That said, I think that any behavioral or social scientist who wished to understand my thinking, opinion formation, purchasing decisions, use of leisure time, voting behavior, or television viewing habits—as an adult American male—would need to consider me as I saw myself:

a Nigerian-Swedish American citizen and voter, taxpayer, homeowner and mortgage-holder, husband and father, parent and likely grandparent, church-going Lutheran, and pro-union Republican

[End of example—I'm now Jim B. once again]

The problem confronting survey researchers and public opinion pollsters, however, is that this adult respondent would be routinely given the 'race' of African American, a category with "predictive utility in a multivariate mix" (a fact which I can only thank Paul Lavrakas again for usefully bringing to all of our attention, in this particular context).

But I myself, while the adult Nigerian-Swedish American, did not think that I belonged to any of the researcher's categories of race, because I had thought of myself, for as long as I could remember, as a 50-50 combination of what might be called the "races" of both my father *and* my mother. The convenient convention of considering anyone not entirely "white" (whatever that could possibly mean) as "black" is simply not how real people actually experience the situation.

That 'race" can be used to account for a considerable amount of behavior I do not question. That the correlations of race and behavior are often presented without any mention of intervening and possibility explanatory variables ought to be cause for feelings of great shame, not among those who merely collect the data, certainly, but among those who report them in the mass media, flaunt them in political debates, or use to them to bolster personal prejudices they would hold no less strongly even without scientific support.

The real question for behavioral and social science, it seems to me, is why survey research and public opinion polling methods do not make much greater attempts to understand what respondents see their *own* races to be—often a much more complex and difficult question than I think most of us quite removed from it can really appreciate. Simplying it merely to make coding cheaper and easier, however, is hardly acting to advance the science of the subject.

I conclude that it's time to stop letting multivariate analysis and unlimited computing power do all our work for us. It's time to apply all such resources to the task of unpacking the question of 'race' in explanations of human behavior. Survey research is one good way to do this, it seems to me, if we greatly elaborate what we mean by "race"—by simply listening to what our respondents mean by it. Those who find 'race' an especially powerful explanatory variable ought to be among the first to welcome such a proposal.

-- Jim
NOTE: I do not wish to end this message without disclosing that many of the examples I have drawn upon above come from one real life experience I have had over the past several years. A girl of early-mid grade school age, and not quite twice the age of my two daughters, struck up a friendship with them--out of loneliness, I would now guess--and indeed wound up giving them several toys which she had outgrown. She was the child of a white Californian mother, with whom she lived, and who was quite diligent in watching after her, and a black father from a Caribbean country I prefer not to disclose, who was only rarely seen. She also had a brother--older by a year or two--who was Asian by simplest classification, and shared time between his Asian father, who lived in another city perhaps an hour's drive away, and the mother he shared with his one sister, the young girl that I and my family came to know quite well.

Although I knew nothing about any of this when I first met the child, she was quite forthcoming in telling me what it was like to be seen at school and by strangers, wherever she went, as the 'race' of her father, whom she rarely saw, and which was not the same 'race' as that of either her mother or her brother, with whom she did live. And all five of these people seemed to me to be healthy, well-adjusted members of society, with the three adults all holding down quite good jobs. Other judgments I leave for you to make.

Based on this experience, not atypical of much of America today, as I understand it, I can certainly see why the U.S. Census Bureau has led the way in innovating the field of coding for 'race'--what else could Census do, after all, under the real-world circumstances? What I don't understand is why so much of behavioral and social science--at least in the United States--has been so slow even to appreciate the problems with such variables and such measures. Perhaps one good impetus for change would be simply to get more researchers simply to read the Census reports on race.

I welcome your responses, as always.

-- Jim

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

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

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

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776
Another political/historical footnote: A PBS videotape, "The First Measured Century" traces the roots of quantitative social science to efforts in the late 19th century to define race for the purpose of imposing various legal forms of discrimination. Not a happy beginning.

I haven't viewed the full 3 hours and 20 minutes, but the story of how the various forms of our field evolved is well told, and some of our good friends have speaking parts. It is distributed by PBS Home Video.
There's a new book out that I've just bought on the subject of "historical connections between the development of the idea of race and the birth of social statistics":


On Tue, 23 Oct 2001, Philip Meyer wrote:

> Another political/historical footnote: A PBS videotape, "The First Measured Century" traces the roots of quantitative social science to efforts in the late 19th century to define race for the purpose of imposing various legal forms of discrimination. Not a happy beginning.
> I haven't viewed the full 3 hours and 20 minutes, but the story of how the various forms of our field evolved is well told, and some of our good friends have speaking parts. It is distributed by PBS Home Video.

---

Alice Robbin, Associate Professor
In a message dated 10/23/01 4:41:58 PM Central Daylight Time, beniger@rcf.usc.edu writes:

> That said, I think that any behavioral or social scientist who wished to
> understand my thinking, opinion formation, purchasing decisions, use of
> leisure time, voting behavior, or television viewing habits--as an adult
> American male--would need to consider me as I saw myself:
>
> Public opinion research is often conducted not just to measure opinion today,
but to effect change in opinion in the future. To do that, our clients need
to know how to communicate with the target audience. Amazingly enough,
demographics predict exposure to certain media. The higher the income, the
higher the probability of newspaper exposure; the lower the income the more
hours spent watching television are two obvious examples. If we did not
ascertain race, we would miss out on other information useful in crafting the
message. How you think of yourself is less important in this scenario than
how you and others like you in some way act. Sometimes race plays no role
and the function of grandparenting is crucial. Just a matter of the research
question at stake and the ultimate goal of the client.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company
Des Moines, Iowa

In a message dated 10/23/01 4:41:58 PM Central Daylight Time, beniger@rcf.usc.edu writes:

That said, I think that any behavioral or social scientist who wished to understand my thinking, opinion formation, purchasing decisions, use of leisure time, voting behavior, or television viewing habits--as an adult American male--would need to consider me as I saw myself:

Public opinion research is often conducted not just to measure opinion today, but to effect change in opinion in the future. To do that, our clients need to know how to communicate with the target audience. Amazingly enough, demographics predict exposure to certain media. The higher the income, the higher the probability of newspaper exposure; the lower the income the more hours spent watching television are two obvious examples. If we did not ascertain race, we would miss out on other information useful in crafting the message. How you think of yourself is less important in this scenario than how you and others like you in some way act. Sometimes race plays no role and the function of grandparenting is crucial. Just a matter of the research question at stake and the ultimate goal of the client.
Do not forget Paul Sniderman and Thomas Piazza, _The Scar of Race_. One of the best works based on public opinion research I have seen on a most difficult issue to deal with. Racism and prejudice.

I do not think anybody would dispute the importance of race as a meaningful variable. It would be impossible to understand contemporary American politics, and probably the contemporary American Ethos without it. The problem is how to define it to capture its real and complete variance.

Ulises Beltran
Cide

-------- Original Message --------
From: "Alice Robbin" <arobbin@indiana.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2001 8:26 AM
Subject: RE: "Race" (inspired by Susan Losh, 10/23/01)

> There's a new book out that I've just bought on the subject of historical connections between the development of the idea of race and the birth of social statistics:
>
Another political/historical footnote: A PBS videotape, "The First Measured Century" traces the roots of quantitative social science to efforts in the late 19th century to define race for the purpose of imposing various legal forms of discrimination. Not a happy beginning.

I haven't viewed the full 3 hours and 20 minutes, but the story of how the various forms of our field evolved is well told, and some of our good friends have speaking parts. It is distributed by PBS Home Video.

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

Alice Robbin, Associate Professor
SLIS, The Information Science School
Indiana University
005A Main Library
1320 East 10th Street
Bloomington, IN 47405-3907
Office: (812) 855-5389  Fax: (812) 855-6166
Email: arobbin@indiana.edu
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Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9OHzXe09011 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 24 Oct 2001 10:39:33 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaal.usc.edu (beniger@almaal.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
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Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaal.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f90Hd2d17276 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 24 Oct 2001 10:39:02 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Wed, 24 Oct 2001 10:38:45 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: On the Future of Western Civilization
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110241025220.10635-100000@almaal.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
I am listening to a local National Public Radio station as I prepare for my courses today. There are frequent advisories from Atlanta and the Center for Disease Control (CDC) telling us Americans to wear gloves while handling our mail, and to wash our hands carefully immediately afterward, to avoid any possible prolonged contact with anthrax.

After an hour or so, these advisories have begun to make me think of my mother--when I was a little boy--reminding me to put on my mittens before going out on an especially cold day.

As a little boy, I distinctly remember thinking that my then long-distant adulthood would look very much like the world of Captain Video, an early TV version of what would eventually be done much better by Paramount as Star Trek.

Just now, listening to two acronyms--CDC and NPR--repeatedly reminding me, in effect, to put on my mittens, I conclude that the little boy hardly needed to look as far as outer space to see his future. This morning, at least, the future of Western civilization looks much more like Orwell's '1984' (which the boy first read long before he understood any of the implied-sex passages)--with its dictatorial ministries--and also like kindergarten, where his daughters tell him children are still reminded to put on their mittens, on cold days here, near the beach.

The little boy would have been extremely disappointed and disheartened, had he known that the world would turn out this way. I'm afraid his current edition isn't taking it very well, just now, either.

Which is why he decided to turn this into a public opinion.

-- Jim

******

>From ande271@attglobal.net Wed Oct 24 13:24:42 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9OK0ge28433 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 24 Oct 2001
13:24:42 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from prserv.net (out2.prserv.net [32.97.166.32])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
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Received: from attglobal.net (slip-32-100-251-95.ny.us.prserv.net[32.100.251.95])
    by prserv.net (out2) with SMTP
    id <20011024202427202030ju3ue>; Wed, 24 Oct 2001 20:24:28 +0000
Message-ID: <3BD74E17.A02D4DFA@attglobal.net>
Date: Wed, 24 Oct 2001 16:26:16 -0700
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net>
The NYC Department of Health had outreach workers distribute phone cards each of which contained two survey questions. These questions had to be answered in order to activate the cards. The 800 number was involved.

The community organizations thought they were tremendously helpful in reaching people they otherwise would not have been able to. I am not sure how useful the "survey" results were -- I did not do the analysis. Everything depends on the quality of the survey questions and the manner in which they are introduced. This is always true, of course, but people can feel somewhat intimidated when they try to use a phone card and find, suddenly, that they have to supply some information in order to get what to them is the only value of the phone card. It is like SUGging, only the other way around.

Virginia Harris Bartot wrote:

> Has anyone tried having outreach workers give homeless clients phone cards as a reward for calling into an '800' number to complete a phone survey?
Public bounces back after Sept. 11 attacks, national study shows

Americans responded with resilience to the events of Sept. 11, registering large increases in their feelings of national pride, confidence in many institutions, and faith in people, according to the National Tragedy Study by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. The study, publicly funded by the National Science Foundation, and privately by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Russell Sage Foundation, also contrasted public response to Sept. 11 with response to the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy (also studied by NORC).

People reported a large drop in their normally positive feelings toward life after the Kennedy assassination, but reported few similar responses after Sept. 11, Smith found.

"Emotionally, Kennedy's assassination seems to have had a larger impact on psychological well being than the terrorist attacks," said Tom W. Smith, Director of the General Social Survey (GSS) at NORC and co-author of a report on the findings, "America Rebounds: A National Study of Public Responses to the September 11 Terrorist Attacks."

Researchers found a much stronger feeling of anger after the Sept. 11 attacks than after the 1963 assassination. In 1963, people reported feeling ashamed as well as angry; however, feeling ashamed was not a strong response to the terrorist attacks.

The study, which measured a wide range of attitudes and included an over sample (special survey) for New York, was based on random telephone calls to more than 2,100 U.S. residents in the two weeks following Sept. 11. The results were compared with similar questions asked recently on the GSS, a continuing study of American values, attitudes and behaviors on a wide variety of subjects. The GSS provides a baseline for American opinions and is used extensively by social scientists to chart and study changes in public perceptions.

"We found, with the exceptions of New Yorkers, that Americans appear to have had weaker physical reactions to the recent national tragedy than to the Kennedy assassination," said Kenneth Rasinski, a co-author of the report and senior research scientist at NORC.

For instance, 68 percent of people felt very nervous and upset as a result the 1963 tragedy, compared with 51 percent in 2001. While 57 percent of the people reported feeling dazed and numb in 1963, 46 percent had a similar response in 2001. In contrast, 60 percent of the people in 2001 reported crying, compared to 53 percent in 1963.

Researchers asked about 15 physical and emotional symptoms and found 11 of these symptoms were reported by a significantly higher proportion of New York City residents than by the rest of the nation. According to Rasinski, New Yorkers were more likely to have felt very nervous and tense, cried, had trouble getting to sleep, not felt like eating, felt more tired than usual, had rapid heartbeats or headaches, lost their temper more than usual, had sweaty and clammy hands, felt dizzy at times, and felt like getting drunk.

Among the findings contrasting post-Sept. 11 attitudes with earlier General Social Surveys:

* Increased faith in fellow citizens. 67 percent (up 21 percentage points) said that most people are helpful, and 63 percent (up 12 percentage points) said that they felt people in general are fair.

* Increased confidence in selected institutions. 77 percent (up 27 percentage points) had a great deal of confidence in the military, compared with 61 percent in 1991 during the Gulf War. Confidence in the executive branch tripled to 52 percent. People also expressed more confidence in organized religion, corporations and Congress. This was the highest confidence level in these areas in nearly three decades.
* Increased feelings of national pride. 97 percent (up 7 percentage points) felt they felt they would rather be citizens of the U.S. than of any other country.

Other findings of the National Tragedy Study:
* Stronger reactions in New York. Residents of New York were more likely than the nation as a whole to report feeling very nervous and tense. They also reported crying more often.
* Positive action. 49 percent made contributions to charities, and 24 percent donated or tried to donate blood.

Other findings comparing the Sept. 11 attacks to the 1963 assassination:
* More prayer. 84 percent reporting saying "special prayers," compared with 75 percent in 1963.
* Television as a key source. 37 percent first learned of the Sept. 11 events from television, while 24 percent learned of the 1963 tragedy that way. In 1963, 36 percent learned of the assassination by personal contact; in 2001, 15 percent learned it that way.

###
Attachment: For the explanatory charts see:  

Program Contact: Pat White, 703-292-8762, pwhite@nsf.gov
<mailto:pwhite@nsf.gov>

Howard Fienberg  
Research Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e-mail) hfienberg@stats.org
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Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])  
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08:41:36 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from ropercenter.uconn.edu (mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu  
[137.99.36.157])  
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
    id IAA14470 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001 08:41:35 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from richard-nt.ropercenter.uconn.edu (d37h91.public.uconn.edu  
[137.99.37.91])  
    by ropercenter.uconn.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA28741  
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001 11:38:30 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.0.20011025114125.03060d90@mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu>  
X-Sender: richard@mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1  
Date: Thu, 25 Oct 2001 11:45:19 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Richard C. Rockwell" <richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu>  
Subject: Re: presidential approval ratings?
Numerous polls on presidential approval ratings have been conducted since 9/11/01. They are available at the Roper Center Web site. Click Online Access to Data and then click Presidential Approval Rating. This list is current to 10/12/01.

--------------------------------------
Richard C. ROCKWELL
Executive Director, The Roper Center & Institute for Social Inquiry
Professor of Sociology
University of Connecticut
341 Mansfield Road, U-164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA
V +1 860 486-4440
F +1 860 486-6308
Richard.Rockwell@uconn.edu

-- Jim

----------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 (c) Jewish Telegraphic Agency
NEW YORK, Oct. 23 (JTA) -- In the run-up to the 2000 presidential elections, Jewish leaders fretted about the perceived surge in influence of American Muslims -- both politically and numerically -- and how it might affect U.S. support for Israel.

Now Jewish leaders have statistics contradicting earlier claims that said Muslims make up more than 2 percent of the American population.

The American Jewish Committee this week released a new survey, commissioned soon after the Sept. 11 terror attacks, that its author describes as "the most credible estimate" to date of the size of America's Muslim community.

While the media routinely cites a population of 6 million to 7 million U.S. Muslims -- in the wake of the Sept. 11 terror attacks, estimates have been as high as 10 million -- University of Chicago researcher Tom Smith says the real number is anywhere from 1.9 million to 2.8 million.

"The Muslim community is an important part of the American mosaic, but they are not as large a part as the figures cited in the media and by others would lead some to believe," said Smith, who directs the General Social Survey at the university's National Opinion Research Center.

"It's quite common that groups overestimate the size of their community since they are very involved with the community, and tend to see themselves as larger than an objective standard can verify," he said.

An American Muslim leader immediately denounced the survey as inaccurate and the AJCommittee as politically motivated.

The report is a "desperate attempt to discount the role of American Muslims," Ibrahim Hooper of the Council on American-Islamic Relations told the Associated Press.

"Very often the representatives of the extremist wing of the pro-Israel lobby, such as the American Jewish Committee, seek to block Muslim political participation," Hooper reportedly said.

The AJCommittee denied the charge. Spokesman Kenneth Bandler said his organization instead is "working to advance Muslim-Jewish relations." "We're not seeking to diminish their influence in this country, but it's important to know accurately what their population is," Bandler said. "We're anxious to develop ties with Muslim groups with whom we can seriously have a relationship, meaning groups that don't endorse terrorism." The AJCommittee also was eager to give guidance to media that it believes unwittingly publish dramatically inflated population figures.

When the report was completed late last week, the AJCommittee passed it...
along to both The New York Times and The Associated Press.

The 6-7 million figure appears as "an established fact, even in the pages of The New York Times," Bandler said. "We wanted to set the record straight on these numbers, and that's it. People in the newsrooms, in political offices and the general reader can draw their own conclusions." Smith, for his part, said he is not concerned about rising Muslim political influence.

"I'm only interested in scientifically bad numbers," said Smith, who is not Jewish. "If one is given wrong information, one will be guided inappropriately." For the past decade, Smith said, he has read publications that printed Muslim population estimates that didn't jive with his research.

He said he wrote to the editors of USA Today and American Demographer, a trade journal, contesting their population estimates, but neither letter was published.

The U.S. census tabulates national origin and language use, but not religious affiliation. Without it, a range of faulty methods have been used to calculate the Muslim population, Smith said.

For example, one researcher figured that an immigrant group from a given country would accurately mirror the ethnic and religious composition of the home country, discounting persecution as a motivation for emigration, Smith said.

Smith poked holes in that method with two examples: Lebanon is a Muslim-majority state, but most Lebanese emigres over the years have been Christians. And immigrants from Russia a century ago overwhelmingly were Jewish -- though the vast majority of Russians belonged to the Russian Orthodox Church.

In other cases, Smith said researchers have overestimated several numbers:

* Muslims with limited English who would have been deterred from participating in surveys;
* Muslims reluctant to identify their religion;
* Muslim African-Americans;
* Islamic sects not immediately recognizable as Muslim;
* Islamic centers, schools and mosques;
* Muslims affiliated per mosque; and
* Muslims not affiliated with mosques.

In contrast, Smith states in his report that he took several population surveys and found that 0.2 to 0.6 percent of households had at least one Muslim adult.

He then considered estimates of Muslim immigrants with limited English skills -- who would be less likely to participate in surveys -- since figures indicate that a sizeable majority of Muslims in America are foreign-born.

Taking this into account, Smith estimated that Muslims make up 0.7 percent of the adult population. Extrapolating that out to the general
population produced a range of 1.9 million to 2.8 million.

As the quote variously attributed to British politician Benjamin Disraeli and novelist Mark Twain goes, there are "lies, damned lies and statistics." When reading population studies, Smith says it always critical to consider the source. "When there aren't scientifically credible numbers, someone supplies those numbers and they usually represent an advocacy group," he said. "Many counts are not actually counts. It's based on someone saying, 'Oh, there's that many.' And those numbers could be wildly inaccurate."

---

Copyright 2001 (c) Jewish Telegraphic Agency

---

*******
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Received: from atlas.csd.net (root@atlas.csd.net [204.181.152.140])
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Message-Id: <200110251638.f9PGcRl16861@atlas.csd.net>
Date: Thu, 25 Oct 2001 10:35:20 -0600
From: Craig Hill <chill@medrock.com>
Subject: help in locating a colleague...
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: GoldMine [5.50.10424]
X-GM-Private: 41
Content-Type: text/html

<html>
<head>
<!-- Written by GoldMine : Version 5.50.10424 -->
<title></title>
</head>
<BODY text="#000000" link="#0000FF">
<font style="font-family:'Arial';font-size:10pt;"> At this past May's conference in AAPOR, I sat at a table for lunch with a woman who worked at a survey research center or lab attached (if I recall correctly) to the University of Colorado in Boulder. For the life of me, I cannot recall her name. Can anyone out there help?</font></body>
</html>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Oct 25 11:07:52 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9PI7pe27375 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001
Folks,

I post this for possible use by teachers of research theory and methods everywhere, because it neatly illustrates how two apparently conflicting macro- and micro-level explanations of collective behavior can both be correct, on their respective levels.

My own objections to objective measures of 'race'--used exclusively, or used exclusively as the one measure of 'race'--are simply that they do not have the same power to predict micro-level and subjective interpretations of human behavior that measures of 'economic climate,' say, have to predict changes in the number of mothers of newborns opting out of the work force, regardless of what these same mothers might sincerely believe to be their own personal reasons.

Even if you do not find these two examples analogous, or do not agree with what I say about them here, I hope we can at least agree that all supposedly objective, macro-level variables ought to judged, at least in part, by their micro-level manifestations, as we see them here.

The value of Diane Volzer's letter for social researchers, it seems to me, is that it demonstrates the value of both micro- and macro-level research, and also how misleading all research might well be, if it is conducted at only one of the levels, and not at both.

I welcome your responses, as always.

-- Jim

WHY I STAY AT HOME: A MOTHER'S STORY

To the Editor:

Re "More Mothers of Babies Under 1 Are Staying Home" (news article, Oct. 19):

Martin O'Connell, an author of the Census Bureau report "Fertility of American Women, 2000," suggests that a favorable economic climate is one reason for an increase in the number of stay-at-home mothers of newborns.

There are many moms motivated by other than money. I chose to leave the security and salary of a federal government job for reasons that were not economic. I left the work force believing that it is best, and my responsibility, to raise my children myself.

When my children have questions, hurts or cause to celebrate, I'm right there. They don't have to wait until 6 p.m. Financial confidence is not my motivation; it's love for my children.

DIANE VOLZER
Calhoun, Ga., Oct. 19, 2001


Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

*****
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Received: from ims.hub.nih.gov (ims.hub.nih.gov [128.231.90.111])
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Received: by ims.hub.nih.gov with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
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Message-ID: <73456EC4BBEC6A45AE7D91398877B846018A1EEB8@nihexchange5.nih.gov>
From: "Kay, Ward (NIAAA)" <wkay@mail.nih.gov>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Why I Stay at Home: A Mother's Story (D Volzer, Letters, NYT)
Date: Thu, 25 Oct 2001 15:20:47 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
Jim,
The letter writer misses the big picture while viewing her own circumstances. Data is the collection of all the individual "stories" in order to see trends, the analysis of the data will, of course, not be truth for every individual story. And as we know from the r-square, will only be true for a small proportion, while still being a reason for the change observed.

The letter writer does not see her staying home as an indicator of good financial times because it is a financial hardship to give up the income. But is able to do it, in part because of the economic climate. If the economic climate was worse, she would be working regardless of her desire to be with her children. I say this as a parent of two toddlers in daycare. My wife and I work --not because of economic conditions, we could afford to live on one income, and did while I was in graduate school. We could interpret the increase in stay-at-home mothers as a trend toward the old traditional family and that we are deficient as parents because we choose to work (we don't feel that way.)

Many of the "stories" about race will be at odds with the overall data. It doesn't mean that the data is wrong. Race continues to be a significant predictor variable in study and study, even when controlling for all economic, geography, urbanicity, and other demographics. Sociologists know that the differences are due to the culture and not the color of the skin, but the way to get at the concept is through race -- and self-identified race gets at the cultural issue better. To ignore race because the construct is fuzzy is bad science.

To put it bluntly, several of your (I assume devil advocate's) postings on race data collection, sound very similar to Arianna's position on polling in general.
have to predict changes in the number of mothers of newborns opting out of the work force, regardless of what these same mothers might sincerely believe to be their own personal reasons.

Even if you do not find these two examples analogous, or do not agree with what I say about them here, I hope we can at least agree that all supposedly objective, macro-level variables ought to judged, at least in part, by their micro-level manifestations, as we see them here.

The value of Diane Volzer's letter for social researchers, it seems to me, is that it demonstrates the value of both micro- and macro-level research, and also how misleading all research might well be, if it is conducted at only one of the levels, and not at both.

I welcome your responses, as always.

-- Jim

WHY I STAY AT HOME: A MOTHER'S STORY

To the Editor:

Re "More Mothers of Babies Under 1 Are Staying Home" (news article, Oct. 19):

Martin O'Connell, an author of the Census Bureau report "Fertility of American Women, 2000," suggests that a favorable economic climate is one reason for an increase in the number of stay-at-home mothers of newborns.

There are many moms motivated by other than money. I chose to leave the security and salary of a federal government job for reasons that were not economic. I left the work force believing that it is best, and my responsibility, to raise my children myself.

When my children have questions, hurts or cause to celebrate, I'm right there. They don't have to wait until 6 p.m. Financial confidence is not my motivation; it's love for my children.

DIANE VOLZER
Calhoun, Ga., Oct. 19, 2001
First of all, the explanation that mothers stay home when the economic situation is better is quite awkward. It means that when there is plenty of jobs, women stay home; and when unemployment is high, they go look for a job!!!! Perhaps the reverse is more likely...

Second, race again,...

In yesterday's Le Monde, a French newspaper, there is a paper about the reaction of Harlem people to the Sept. 11 events. The following quote is interesting : " A black nurse says "Of course, I have always been an American, like the descendants of the Irish of Wall Street, the Italians of Little Italy, the Jewish of Upper Manhattan. But in this country with such a painful history, my color used to define me more than anything else. I felt I was a member of the Black community, period. Today, I feel terribly American."

Can the plain "race" question trace such a trend, if it exists at the community level. Of course not. If self-identity is what we want to
measure, other variables will do a better job and permit to trace changes in identification. However, if race is used as a proxy for membership in a community, perhaps a switch toward broad categories of ethnic origin would do a better job and permit to get rid of a "fuzzy" variable without "throwing the baby with the bathwater".

Claire Durand

P.s

> To put it bluntly, several of your (I assume devil advocate's) postings on race data collection, sound very similar to Arianna's position on polling in general.
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> > From: James Beniger [SMTP:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
> > Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2001 2:07 PM
> > To: AAPORNENET
> > Subject: Why I Stay at Home: A Mother's Story (D Volzer, Letters, NYT)
> > 
> > Folks,
> > 
> > I post this for possible use by teachers of research theory and methods everywhere, because it neatly illustrates how two apparently conflicting macro- and micro-level explanations of collective behavior can both be correct, on their respective levels.
> > 
> > My own objections to objective measures of 'race'--used exclusively, or used exclusively as the one measure of 'race'--are simply that they do not have the same power to predict micro-level and subjective interpretations of human behavior that measures of 'economic climate," say, have to predict changes in the number of mothers of newborns opting out of the work force, regardless of what these same mothers might sincerely believe to be their own personal reasons.
> > 
> > Even if you do not find these two examples analogous, or do not agree with what I say about them here, I hope we can at least agree that all supposedly objective, macro-level variables ought to judged, at least in part, by their micro-level manifestations, as we see them here.
> > 
> > The value of Diane Volzer's letter for social researchers, it seems to me, is that it demonstrates the value of both micro- and macro-level research, and also how misleading all research might well be, if it is conducted at only one of the levels, and not at both.
> > 
> > I welcome your responses, as always.
> 
> -- Jim
To the Editor:

Re "More Mothers of Babies Under 1 Are Staying Home" (news article, Oct. 19):

Martin O'Connell, an author of the Census Bureau report "Fertility of American Women, 2000," suggests that a favorable economic climate is one reason for an increase in the number of stay-at-home mothers of newborns.

There are many moms motivated by other than money. I chose to leave the security and salary of a federal government job for reasons that were not economic. I left the work force believing that it is best, and my responsibility, to raise my children myself.

When my children have questions, hurts or cause to celebrate, I'm right there. They don't have to wait until 6 p.m. Financial confidence is not my motivation; it's love for my children.

DIANE VOLZER
Calhoun, Ga., Oct. 19, 2001

--- Claire Durand
Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca
http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc/
"Il y a 50% de chances, ± 3,1%, qu'il fasse beau demain".
"There is a 50% chance, ± 3,1%, that tomorrow will be sunny".

Université de Montréal, dept. de sociologie,
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3C 3J7
Actuellement à Paris : 01-45-81-58-52

>From lvoigt@fhcrc.org Thu Oct 25 16:08:23 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9PN8Le26453 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001
16:08:21 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from fhcrc.org (umpc01.fhcrc.org [140.107.92.11])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id QAA13738 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001 16:08:20 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from moe.fhcrc.org (moe [140.107.92.13])
  by fhcrc.org (8.10.2/8.10.2) with ESMTP id f9PN86600782
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001 16:08:07 -0700 (PDT)
Received: by moe.fhcrc.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
  id <Q8WZQMTC>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001 16:08:06 -0700
Message-ID: <9667A0D2033CD51195F90002B330A3BF35E2DE@moe.fhcrc.org>
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@fhcrc.org>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Do young men refuse more often than young women?
Date: Thu, 25 Oct 2001 16:07:59 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain

We are doing a study of men < 45 years of age, and are finding a much higher refusal rate than our past studies of women in this same age group. Have others found the same thing? I took a look at the papers that I have on response rates, but could not find anything by both gender and age.

Thanks!

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist,
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

>From ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu Thu Oct 25 17:35:56 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9Q02ue23040 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001
17:35:56 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from snfc21.pbi.net (mta6.snfc21.pbi.net [206.13.28.240])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id RAA20822 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001 17:35:56 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mail.csuchico.edu ([63.195.17.28])
Does anyone have the name or phone number for a firm that might sell the phone numbers of registered voters in California? I have a friend that needs the information really quite quickly.

I've tried to figure it out myself but am unable to do so.

Thanks for all your ideas on this matter.

jon ebeling

>From gladwin@fiu.edu Thu Oct 25 19:22:09 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9Q2M9e04085 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001
  19:22:09 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from spn25c0.fiu.edu (spf02n09-boot.fiu.edu [131.94.68.193])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id TAA13665 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001 19:22:09 -0700
  (PDT)
Received: from hughathlon ([208.61.4.51]) by spn25c0.fiu.edu
  (InterMail vK.4.03.04.01 201-232-130-101 license
d3ed443c752af15f51469a1cf3bdca8d5)
  with ESMTP id <20011026021620.EXOV17582.spn25c0@hughathlon>;
Message-ID: <200110252221570419.000C98AD@mailhost.fiu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110251027300.7236-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110251027300.7236-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
X-Mailer: Calypso Version 3.20.02.00 (4)
Reply-To: gladwin@fiu.edu
From: "Hugh Gladwin" <gladwin@fiu.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: gladwin@fiu.edu
Subject: poll on post 9/11 reactions and needs in Florida
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Hi list --
We have just completed a poll on reactions of Florida residents to the events of Sept. 11 and anthrax. The results pretty much mirror what we have seen reported on the list from national polls. A focus in the poll is on what people think government should be doing, and it indicates there might be another side to the surge in confidence in government (a flip side for Florida’s government given its current financial problems) along with increased confidence are increased expectations for what government has to do, and some concerns over its ability to do so.

Poll results are at http://www.fiu.edu/orgs/ipor/911/

Hugh Gladwin
Director, Institute for Public Opinion Research
Assoc. Professor, Sociology/Anthropology
Florida International University
gladwin@fiu.edu
http://www.fiu.edu/orgs/ipor
305-919-5778

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Oct 25 21:52:16 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9Q4qGe13573 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001
21:52:16
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id VAA16804 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001 21:52:16 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9Q4pfP09285 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 25 Oct 2001 21:51:41 -0700
(PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Terrorism Tops Lists of Priorities (Pew Research Center)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110252150310.6310-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Terrorism Tops List Of Priorities
Although administration officials have repeatedly warned that the fight against terrorism will be long and difficult, a new Council on Foreign Relations poll conducted by the Pew Research Center shows terrorism to be the top foreign policy priority for Americans.

Pollsters asked respondents whether various long-range foreign policy goals should be considered a top priority, given some priority or left off the priority list entirely. "Taking measures to protect the United States from terrorist attacks" was named as a top priority more often than any other issue -- 93 percent of respondents gave it that designation.

Other issues that respondents saw as top priorities were preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction (81 percent), protecting the jobs of American workers (74 percent), insuring adequate energy supplies for the United States (69 percent) and reducing the spread of AIDS and other infectious diseases (59 percent). The two issues seen as top priorities by the fewest number of respondents were promoting democracy in other nations (24 percent) and helping to improve the living standards in developing nations (20 percent).

Poll: Government Responds Satisfactorily

While criticisms of the Bush administration's handling of the anthrax cases pile up, more than three out of four adults surveyed for ABC News Wednesday night said they were either "somewhat" or "very" satisfied with the way government authorities have handled the situation.

Fifty-nine percent said the government "should have done more" to prepare for biological attacks before they happened, while 39 percent said the feds did all that they could. The poll also suggested confidence in the federal government's ability to respond effectively to a wide-spread biological or chemical attack: 75 percent said they were "very" or "somewhat" confident, and 23 percent said they were not.

GOP Trusted On Terrorism

Americans trust Republican congressional candidates more than they trust Democrats on the issues of fighting terrorism and strengthening and supporting the military, a Fabrizio McLaughlin (R) poll suggests.

Fifty-six percent of respondents said they trusted Republicans running for Congress more on the issue of fighting terrorism, and 17 percent said they trusted Democrats more. On the issue of strengthening and supporting the military, Republicans were trusted more by a margin of 66 percent to 18 percent.

Democrats got the nod when it came to education, the environment, "saving Social Security and Medicare" and "allowing Americans to sue their HMOs."

The Public Pulse -- Latest Opinions At A Glance
The table below offers the latest key national numbers. Click on the
number in question for poll details, or the archive links for previous
polling on the topic. (Last updated Oct. 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Job Approval</td>
<td>84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush Job Approval Rating</td>
<td>88 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy Positive Rating</td>
<td>39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Congressional Ballot</td>
<td>+ 4 % Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Of The Nation</td>
<td>71 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What NationalJournal.com Tracks And How

NationalJournal.com's Poll Track aims to be the definitive resource for
tracking public opinion on campaigns and legislative and policy issues.
The latest survey results are posted here as soon as they become
available, and compared to any previous polls in order to show emerging
trends in a race or on an issue.

If you have questions or suggestions concerning this section, please let
us know.

Campaigns

For White House, Senate, House and gubernatorial races the numbers in
each contest are divided into head-to-head match-ups, candidates' favorable/unfavorable ratings and miscellaneous questions, which include incumbents' job approval ratings. Each type of polling data is then grouped by pollster, where the results are stored in reverse chronological order.

National Figures And Institutions

This category includes approval ratings and miscellaneous polling data on the president; vice president; Congress; the federal government in general; the media; and other individuals and institutions that are often evaluated in national polls. This information is organized by individual or institution, and as with the campaign polls, these results are grouped by pollster, then stored in reverse chronological order.

http://nationaljournal.com/scripts/printpage.cgi?/members/polltrack/

Copyright 2001 by National Journal Group Inc

********

>From Alisu@email.com Fri Oct 26 04:34:35 2001
About a year ago I a list sample matched against voters records for address and phone updates. A firm called Aristotle did it for us. They can be reached at www.Aristotle.com

Alisu Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.
General Partner
Research Support Services
906 Ridge Ave. Evanston, IL 60202
847.864.5677 - fax: 847.869.5565

---Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
[mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of jon ebeling
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2001 7:46 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Phone numbers for Registered voters

> Does anyone have the name or phone number for a firm that
There was an AAPOR paper from the early 1990s I did with Sandy Bauman and Dan Merkle that showed that in general RRD studies of the public, women are more likely to initially refuse than are men, but that men are more difficult to contact than women. The paper also showed that women were more likely to be converted from their refusals than were men who had previously refused.

PJL
We are doing a study of men < 45 years of age, and are finding a much higher refusal rate than our past studies of women in this same age group. Have others found the same thing? I took a look at the papers that I have on response rates, but could not find anything by both gender and age.

Thanks!

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist,
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Fri Oct 26 05:47:42 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9QClgel0357 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 26 Oct 2001 05:47:42 -0700 (PDT)
05:47:42 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from fuji.hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.145])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id FAA27018 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 26 Oct 2001 05:47:42 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from hp.ufl.edu
    (ppp-s250-n102-as2.nerdc.ufl.edu [128.227.250.102])
    by fuji.hp.ufl.edu; Fri, 26 Oct 2001 08:46:46 -0400
Message-ID: <3BD95B49.917C330@hp.ufl.edu>
Date: Fri, 26 Oct 2001 08:47:05 -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: Re: Why I Stay at Home: A Mother's Story (D Volzer, Letters, NYT)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jim, I understand your point about micro- versus macro analysis, but this is a horrible analogy to employ. While race cannot be chosen and can be observed by others, workforce status is both a choice and something that no one can guess from the outside.

I know this because I readily lied about being a mom at home for many years. I HAD to, in order to be taken seriously for things like getting decent medical care. When a specialist at the Mayo Clinic refused to order needed tests and told me that I would suddenly get better once I returned to paid work, I started calling myself a freelance writer (click!). I did sell a few articles in those years; it wasn't a total lie. And unfortunately I didn't get better when I returned to the workforce; it was just his prejudice.

Claire writes:
>First of all, the explanation that mothers stay home when the economic situation is better is quite awkward. It means that when there is plenty of jobs, women stay home; and when
Good point. Not to mention that many families choose to have one parent at home BECAUSE it is better financially for the family. This will certainly change when the "marriage penalty" in the U.S. tax code is removed, but when I totalled my contribution to the family in terms of reduced daycare costs, not needing a second car, raising and canning food, etc. we were much better off with me at home.

As far as "race," I think everyone agrees that it has had predictive value in the past. I only question whether it will continue to be useful in the future, because the face of America is, literally, changing.

The other day I took a little old black lady from church to the hospital for tests, and the nurse asked, "So is she your aunt?" We're in the South, and 10 years ago that would never have been considered.

My son married a lovely young woman whose last name was Chiu. Her dad was born in mainland China. My grandchildren will be of mixed race.

My neighbors have a Hispanic surname; both of them could pass for white but their son seems clearly African American.

Not to mention the impact of immigration. Did y'all know that in Kansas, there are more Hispanics than Blacks? I didn't know that last February when we designed the sample for a big statewide survey; we oversampled to humor the client, and by the time we were ready to do post-stratification weighting the new Census 2000 figures were available.

And of course, I have a different take on all this from having lived in Brazil, where mixed-race families are the norm. There was a piece on NPR the other night about struggles to establish a "black pride" movement. Only 6% of Brazilians self-identify as "black" even though walking down the street, one would think it much higher. It's just that most folks consider themselves to be polyglot Brazilians and leave it at that. The archetypical gorgeous Brazilian woman has full lips and curly hair from the African heritage, high cheekbones and coppery skin from the Indian influence, and (in the south, anyway) Japanese eyes.

I would expect that the rates of "refusals" and "don't knows" to the race question would have gone up over time, as American society shifts in that direction and more and more people want to write in answers like "American" and "human being."

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, University of Florida
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
Try Aristotle Industries (or some such). They have enhanced voter lists for the whole country. Whether they added phone number is not obvious, but they will tell you PDQ, and sell you the stuff.

Andy

Andrew A. Beveridge                 Home Office
209 Kissena Hall              50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology             Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY   Phone:  914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597                   Fax:  914-337-8210
Phone:  718-997-2837                E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Fax:    718-997-2820                Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

On Thu, 25 Oct 2001, jon ebeling wrote:

> Does anyone have the name or phone number for a firm that might sell the phone
> numbers of registered voters in California? I have a friend that needs the
> information really quite quickly.
> 
> I've tried to figure it out myself but am unable to do so.
> 
> Thanks for all your ideas on this matter.
> 
> jon ebeling
Jon,

If you can't find anyone with this type of list, you might want to contact the California Secretary of State's office of Voter Registration [(916) 657-2166] for a list of registered voters. You could then hire a data provider such as Axciom to match phone numbers to the addresses of those listed.

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias
Grizzard Agency
229 Peachtree Street - 12th Floor
Atlanta, GA 30303

-----Original Message-----
From: jon ebeling [mailto:ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2001 8:46 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Phone numbers for Registered voters

Does anyone have the name or phone number for a firm that might sell the phone numbers of registered voters in California? I have a friend that needs the information really quite quickly.
I've tried to figure it out myself but am unable to do so.

Thanks for all your ideas on this matter.

jon ebeling

>From HFienberg@stats.org Fri Oct 26 06:58:41 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9QDwfe14066 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 26 Oct 2001
06:58:41 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from cmpa01.workgroup (w042.z209220225.was-dc.dsl.cnc.net
[209.220.225.42])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA18958 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 26 Oct 2001 06:58:39 -0700
   (PDT)
Received: by CMPA01 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
   id <VP2DFS5H>; Fri, 26 Oct 2001 09:50:31 -0400
Message-ID: <F58FF1B42337D311813400C0F0304A1E4ADA520CMPA01>
From: Howard Fienberg <HFienberg@stats.org>
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Reuters: Poll shows Americans not overwrought over anthrax
Date: Fri, 26 Oct 2001 09:50:29 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

Poll shows Americans not overwrought over anthrax
WASHINGTON, Oct 25 (Reuters) - Most Americans are not gripped by anxiety
over the anthrax attacks that have killed three people this month in the
United States, according to an ABC News poll released on Thursday.
Seventy-two percent of those polled expressed concern but not fear about the
danger of exposure to the potentially deadly bacteria that has turned up in
letters mailed through the United States postal system. Eleven percent said
they were not concerned at all.
An overwhelming 92% of respondents also said they think their own mail is
safe, despite the discovery of anthrax at Postal Service facilities.
However, about half said they were handling their mail with more caution.
Just under half of those polled by ABC expressed some concern that they or a
relative or close friend might become an anthrax victim. That is compared to
54% in a survey conducted last week.
Anthrax-tainted letters sent through the mail killed two Washington postal
workers and a Florida photo editor this month.
At least nine others have been infected from letters mailed since the
September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.
While authorities have taken some criticism for not seeing the threat to
postal facilities sooner, the ABC News survey suggested that most Americans
do not seem to be in the mood for finger-pointing.
Seventy-eight percent said they were satisfied with the government's
response to the anthrax scare and three-fourths also said they had
confidence in the government's ability to respond effectively to a
large-scale chemical or biological attack. The response was about the same
as a week ago.
The telephone poll of 508 adults, conducted on Wednesday, had a margin of
error of 4.5 percentage points.

Howard Fienberg  
Research Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St., NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e-mail) hfienberg@stats.org

>From 71501.716@compuserve.com Fri Oct 26 08:57:27 2001  
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])  
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP  
   id f9QFvRe20696 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 26 Oct 2001  
08:57:27 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from siaag1ac.compuserve.com (siaag1ac.compuserve.com  
[149.174.40.5])  
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP  
   id IAA01204 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 26 Oct 2001 08:57:26 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: (from mailgate@localhost)  
   by siaag1ac.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.12) id LAA28619  
   for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 26 Oct 2001 11:56:43 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Fri, 26 Oct 2001 11:53:13 -0400  
From: Margaret Roller <71501.716@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Race & the Respondent's "Huh?"  
Sender: Margaret Roller <71501.716@compuserve.com>  
To: "INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-ID: <200110261155_MC3-E4C6-D5F8@compuserve.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
   charset=us-ascii  
Content-Disposition: inline

The philosophical yet all-too-real discussion and debate concerning race  
has been fascinating. So fascinating that I hesitate to try (once again)  
to bring this down to a more practical level. But here is my problem...

The predictive and otherwise utility value of the race question has been  
pretty much substantiated. But I just can't seem to shake this picture I  
have in my head of a respondent slumped over his/her self-administered  
questionnaire reading the race question. The picture I see is a respondent  
who sailed through the other demographic questions but is now staring at  
the race question saying, "Huh?"

Talking to ourselves about all aspects of the race issue is good. But  
could we just shift for a moment to this respondent. Particularly after  
reading our lengthy thread, I am less confident than ever that we know what  
we are getting back to the race question. I am left wondering how I pose a  
question that reduces the "Huh?" response. Personally, I think the answer
lies in the definition of terms. But what specific questions have you folks used that (you felt) were explicit enough for a well-reasoned response?

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com

This is the lead editorial in this morning's Los Angeles Times. I post it to AAPORNET with the hope that those of you who are closely following the national polls will be able to tell me—and all of us—just how true are the claims about the American public's "shaken" confidence in government, as made in the editorial's opening paragraph.

-- Jim

October 26 2001

EDITORIAL

Drifting in the Homeland

The federal government's response to the anthrax attack has been a
debacle. From Health and Human Services head Tommy G. Thompson's statement that the first anthrax case might have resulted from a Florida photo editor drinking stream water to the failure to protect postal employees adequately, public confidence in the government's ability to handle this and future crises has been shaken. It must be restored quickly.

The Bush administration's point man on terrorism is Thomas J. Ridge, the head of the new Office of Homeland Security. Unfortunately, Ridge so far has failed to carry out his mandate--coordinating information and agencies. The lack of information and the conflicting messages from various agencies have increased public concern. At his White House press conference Thursday, Ridge did little to dispel it. On the contrary, he did not display a command of the facts or offer much sense of reassurance that progress is being made in creating a domestic counterterrorism program. Instead, he retreated to vague generalities and expressions of confidence in government experts.

To be sure, no one expects Ridge to command all expertise about biological weapons; on technical details he of course must defer to medical and bioterrorism authorities. Still, he is a skillful politician and he might be able to pull federal agencies into line--if he had the power to do so. He doesn't. Ridge has steadfastly maintained that his closeness to the president provides him with enough power to align federal agencies, but the incoherence of the past week suggests he doesn't have the clout. The Homeland Security Council, which is made up of law enforcement agencies, will have its first meeting next week, but the president or the vice president will be in charge, not Ridge.

Ridge's ability to intervene is critical. Poor cooperation between the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Army's biological laboratory at Ft. Detrick, Md., and the FBI may well have hampered efforts to protect postal employees. Indeed, it is abundantly clear that the CDC, the FBI, the Department of Defense and other agencies continue to regard each other as bureaucratic foes.

Various congressional bills are being proposed to enhance Ridge's powers. Specifically, Ridge needs a budgetary veto over counterterrorism programs in the FBI, Defense Department and other agencies. He should have an official Cabinet post that is subject to congressional confirmation and funding. The White House opposes boosting Ridge's position because it doesn't want Congress to oversee the Homeland Security Office; that stance is shortsighted and feckless.

Pretty soon Ridge is going to start looking more like an ineffectual drug czar than the chief coordinator of U.S. security. Before he can strengthen homeland security effectively, his own position must be strengthened.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

*****
The flow of mail to the Washington Post hardly qualifies as a scientific survey, but the following, from Howard Kurtz's column this Wednesday would seem to indicate that there is dissatisfaction, at least in the nation's capital:

* * * * * * * * * * *

Feds Fiddled While Anthrax Spread
By Howard Kurtz
Washington Post Staff Writer
Wednesday, October 24, 2001; 9:06 AM

We have a new Ground Zero.

It's called the White House.

"Good evening. President Bush said tonight he does not have anthrax," Tom Brokaw intoned.

There was little chance of that, of course. A tiny amount of the potentially deadly bacteria was found in a White House mail-handling facility several miles from 1600 Penn - too small to infect someone, at least according to experts. Still, you could sense the quickening pulses among the presidential press corps when Ari Fleischer made the announcement at 4 p.m.

A reporter popped the question when the president allowed the press into a Cabinet meeting, no doubt to send a reassuring message amid all the government fumbling of the past several days.
If anthrax is in Tom Daschle's office and Dan Rather's office and at the supermarket tabloids and the New York Post, why should the White House be immune?

And yet the red-alert status at the White House - all mail stopped, for the moment - is a reminder of how aggressively authorities can move when politicians are in danger. The same thing happened when an anthrax-tainted letter reached the Senate last week.

But when the potential victims are not white-collar leaders but working-stiff postal employees, the response seems to be very different. There was no rush to shut down the Washington post office that handles mail for the Hill, although that Daschle letter obviously didn't arrive by carrier pigeon. No rush to test the men and women who worked there. No special sensitivity when two of them went to the hospital with flu-like symptoms, with one sent home. They are now dead.

Now comes word that Capitol Hill police dogs were tested before anyone got around to checking the postal workers for anthrax.

This is the first time since Sept. 11 that widespread support for the administration has started to crack. People are outraged about this, if our e-mail is any indication (and it's the best way to reach us, now that The Washington Post has adopted restrictive new procedures for handling snail mail in a special, inconvenient room).

And how can you blame them? To watch CDC officials - who originally advised that workers at the Brentwood post office need not take antibiotics but changed that after workers became sick - say their crisis management is "evolving" is to see bureaucratic denial in the purest form.

Some White House officials, it turns out, were given Cipro six weeks ago - just in case.

* * * * * * * * * * *

I suspect it will be a few days before anyone starts asking specific questions about the handling of the anthrax scare, but if anyone has any such results, please post it.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

James Beniger wrote:
>
> This is the lead editorial in this morning's Los Angeles Times. I post it to AAPORNET with the hope that those of you who are closely following the national polls will be able to tell me--and all of us--just how true are the claims about the American public's "shaken" confidence in government, as made in the editorial's opening paragraph.
EDITORIAL

Drifting in the Homeland

The federal government's response to the anthrax attack has been a debacle. From Health and Human Services head Tommy G. Thompson's statement that the first anthrax case might have resulted from a Florida photo editor drinking stream water to the failure to protect postal employees adequately, public confidence in the government's ability to handle this and future crises has been shaken. It must be restored quickly.

The Bush administration's point man on terrorism is Thomas J. Ridge, the head of the new Office of Homeland Security. Unfortunately, Ridge so far has failed to carry out his mandate—coordinating information and agencies. The lack of information and the conflicting messages from various agencies have increased public concern. At his White House press conference Thursday, Ridge did little to dispel it. On the contrary, he did not display a command of the facts or offer much sense of reassurance that progress is being made in creating a domestic counterterrorism program. Instead, he retreated to vague generalities and expressions of confidence in government experts.

To be sure, no one expects Ridge to command all expertise about biological weapons; on technical details he of course must defer to medical and bioterrorism authorities. Still, he is a skillful politician and he might be able to pull federal agencies into line—if he had the power to do so. He doesn't. Ridge has steadfastly maintained that his closeness to the president provides him with enough power to align federal agencies, but the incoherence of the past week suggests he doesn't have the clout. The Homeland Security Council, which is made up of law enforcement agencies, will have its first meeting next week, but the president or the vice president will be in charge, not Ridge.

Ridge's ability to intervene is critical. Poor cooperation between the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Army's biological laboratory at Ft. Detrick, Md., and the FBI may well have hampered efforts to protect postal employees. Indeed, it is abundantly clear that the CDC, the FBI, the Department of Defense and other agencies continue to regard each other as bureaucratic foes.

Various congressional bills are being proposed to enhance Ridge's powers. Specifically, Ridge needs a budgetary veto over counterterrorism programs in the FBI, Defense Department and other agencies. He should have an official Cabinet post that is subject to congressional confirmation and funding. The White House opposes boosting Ridge's position because it
doesn't want Congress to oversee the Homeland Security Office; that stance is shortsighted and feckless.

Pretty soon Ridge is going to start looking more like an ineffectual drug czar than the chief coordinator of U.S. security. Before he can strengthen homeland security effectively, his own position must be strengthened.

---
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Hello All -

I'm sure that there is an appropriate person that I should be addressing these questions to - I just don't know who that person is, so I'm asking all of you:

-Does anyone know anything about the World Bank and the type of survey work that they do?

-A public opinion question: Do Americans distinguish between people who are Indian as opposed to Arab, or are they both just lumped together as "foreigners?"

-And finally a foreign affairs question (since I live under a rock): How has the current war changed our relationship with India?

Please forgive me for showing my ignorance with these questions. Any replies can be directed to me below. Thanks in advance!
Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at http://explorer.msn.com/intl.asp

A lot of the recent developments with anthrax in the mail reminds me of the scares about 20 years ago about cyanide placed in Tylenol capsules (which allows us now to enjoy blister packs and often near-impenetrable seals on pharmaceutical products). For a bit this also led to copycat hoaxes and other tamperings.

So I have a couple of Qs that I hoped AAPOR-neters can answer (Q2 is a compound question):

(1) Was the person(s) responsible for the Tylenol poisonings ever caught and brought to justice? (My building is debating this one and no one can produce hard evidence.)

(2) What was public opinion around that time? Did people believe foreign terrorists were involved? A conspiracy? How nervous was the general American public about this? Did this lead to drops in Tylenol sales (my memory is that it did, temporarily)—and analgesics more generally? Were there even any measures of public opinion about this at that time? Would these data be
easily accessible online? (I am thinking about referencing for my methods and social psychology courses.)

In other words, I am curious about parallels between what my memory tells me was one of the first documentable instances of biochemical terrorism in the United States and the current situation.

Thanks, list!

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

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

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

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Sat Oct 27 11:28:57 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9RISvel16800 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 27 Oct 2001
11:28:57
-0700 (PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (europa.your-site.com [140.186.45.14])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
  id LAA20492 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 27 Oct 2001 11:28:51 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com ([151.203.181.4]) by jwdp.com ; Sat, 27 Oct 2001
14:28:32
-0400
Message-ID: <3BDAPF0B.2D7F0P53@jwdp.com>
Date: Sat, 27 Oct 2001 14:29:31 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.78 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: The Cyanide in the Tylenol
References: <200110271721.NAA60326@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>
The Tylenol murderer was never caught, or at least charged with the crimes, although one man went to prison for trying to extort money from Johnson & Johnson as a result of them. That affair is widely cited as a benchmark in corporate crisis handling and public relations management. I don't believe there was ever any real concern about foreign terrorists or chemical warfare being involved in the matter.

When I was young, I read a short story in the old "Alfred Hitchcock's Mystery Magazine" probably dating back to the 50's, about a serial murderer who puts poison in milk bottles, and who is done in when one of his poisoned bottles randomly shows up on his own door step. I remember wondering whether the Tylenol murderer had been inspired by that story.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Susan Losh wrote:

> A lot of the recent developments with anthrax in the mail reminds me of the
> scares about 20 years ago about cyanide placed in Tylenol capsules (which
> allows us now to enjoy blister packs and often near-impenetrable seals on
> pharmaceutical products). For a bit this also led to copycat hoaxes and
> other tamperings.
>
> So I have a couple of Qs that I hoped AAPOR-neters can answer (Q2 is a
> compound question):
>
> (1) Was the person(s) responsible for the Tylenol poisonings ever caught
> and
> brought to justice? (My building is debating this one and no one can
> produce
> hard evidence.)
>
> (2) What was public opinion around that time? Did people believe foreign
> terrorists were involved? A conspiracy? How nervous was the general
> American
> public about this? Did this lead to drops in Tylenol sales (my memory is
> that it did, temporarily)--and analgesics more generally? Were there even
> any measures of public opinion about this at that time? Would these data be
> easily accesible online? (I am thinking about referencing for my methods
> and
> social psychology courses.)
>
> In other words, I am curious about parallels between what my memory tells
> me
> was one of the first documentable instances of biochemical terrorism in the
> United States and the current situation.
>
> Thanks, list!
>
> Susan
> Susan Carol Losh, PhD
This poll is very useful.

The US Postal Service, in addition to the obvious serious health concerns, is also concerned about what the effect of the anthrax attacks will be on mail volume. Does anyone know of data on:

1. Whether people's behavior has changed in terms of opening their mail.
2. Whether there has been a drop in response to direct marketing mail.
3. Whether there is any evidence that businesses are encouraging alternatives to use of the mail, such as electronic bill payment, fax, e-mail, etc. and whether the public is turning to such alternatives, more than they had before the anthrax attacks.

The Direct Marketing Association web site at www.the-dma.org had suggestions on how to make it more likely that mail will be opened.
My company does forecasting of the volume of mail for the Postal Service so we are wondering about how our forecasts will be affected.

Eleanor Hall
Survey Research Associate
RCF Economic and Financial Consulting
333 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 804
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 431-1540
ehall@rcfecon.com
www.rcfecon.com

--- Howard Fienberg <HFienberg@stats.org> wrote:
> Poll shows Americans not overwrought over anthrax
> WASHINGTON, Oct 25 (Reuters) - Most Americans are 
> not gripped by anxiety
> over the anthrax attacks that have killed three
> people this month in the
> United States, according to an ABC News poll
> released on Thursday.
> Seventy-two percent of those polled expressed
> concern but not fear about the
> danger of exposure to the potentially deadly
> bacteria that has turned up in
> letters mailed through the United States postal
> system. Eleven percent said
> they were not concerned at all.
> An overwhelming 92% of respondents also said they
> think their own mail is
> safe, despite the discovery of anthrax at Postal
> Service facilities.
> However, about half said they were handling their
> mail with more caution.
> Just under half of those polled by ABC expressed
> some concern that they or a
> relative or close friend might become an anthrax
> victim. That is compared to
> 54% in a survey conducted last week.
> Anthrax-tainted letters sent through the mail killed
> two Washington postal
> workers and a Florida photo editor this month.
> At least nine others have been infected from letters
> mailed since the
> September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and
> the Pentagon.
> While authorities have taken some criticism for not
> seeing the threat to
> postal facilities sooner, the ABC News survey
> suggested that most Americans
> do not seem to be in the mood for finger-pointing.
> Seventy-eight percent said they were satisfied with
> the government's
> response to the anthrax scare and three-fourths also
> said they had
> confidence in the government's ability to respond
> effectively to a
Do You Yahoo!?  
Make a great connection at Yahoo! Personals.  
http://personals.yahoo.com

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Sun Oct 28 05:55:39 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9SDtde15066 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 28 Oct 2001
    05:55:39 -0800 (PST)
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Received: from jwdp.com ([151.203.181.4]) by jwdp.com ; Sun, 28 Oct 2001
    08:55:26 -0500
Message-ID: <3BDC0E46.D5AB6A70@jwdp.com>
Date: Sun, 28 Oct 2001 08:55:18 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.78 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Zogby rides again
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

>From today's (Sunday, 10/28/01) Washington Post:

    Zogby Joins Sununu in Race Against Smith

Smith (R-N.H.) in next year's GOP Senate primary in New Hampshire, signed up some big-name help last week, announcing that pollster John Zogby would conduct surveys for the campaign.

Zogby, who has gained something of a national reputation for accuracy, quickly released results of a survey showing Sununu trouncing Smith in the GOP primary, 45 percent to 22 percent. Of course, those numbers directly contradict another recent New Hampshire poll, conducted by the American Research Group, showing Smith slightly ahead, and perhaps proving only that polls conducted this early are to be taken with a grain of salt.

Whatever the case, the conventional wisdom continues to hold that Smith, who angered many Republicans by lashing out at the party and running for president (albeit briefly) as an independent last year, will have a hard time holding off Sununu.

Perhaps, but Mr. Zogby's work for the NY State Republican Party and the New York Post have earned him a reputation for designing polls that show what his sponsor wants, and that seems to be precisely why Sununu hired him.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com
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Subject: Polls Find People Calm, Apprehensive (RT Cooper LATimes)
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MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII


October 28 2001
Polls Find People Calm, Apprehensive

ANTHRAX: AMERICANS SAY THEY ARE TAKING SCARE IN STRIDE.

WHILE CONCERNED, MOST ARE CONFIDENT THEY WON'T BECOME VICTIMS.

By RICHARD T. COOPER
Times Staff Writer

Americans across the country insist they are taking the anthrax scare in stride, voicing concern but remaining confident that they won't become victims too. Mental health specialists, however, predict greater anxiety lies ahead.

"We haven't seen any great increase in worrying about being a victim of terrorist attacks generally in our polls," said Andrew Kohut, a public opinion specialist who directs the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. "There's not panic in the streets, and there has not been a general upsurge in concern in the country."

ABC-TV polls earlier this month showed a decline in the number of people who considered themselves worried "a great deal" or "somewhat" about being bioterrorism victims. The worriers slipped from 55% on Oct. 15 to 47% on Wednesday.

A Newsweek poll released over the weekend found that 43% of respondents said the government had given the public reliable information about the anthrax threat. Of the rest, 23% said the government had not told people enough to stave off panic; and 30% thought officials didn't have the necessary information themselves.

The appearance of reasoned calm is born out by the comments of people in many parts of the country. But the comments are laced with apprehension.

In Elburn, Ill., a farm village in the heart of the homeland, "people are talking about anthrax. They are concerned, because they're not sure what will happen next," said Judith Miller, who writes the Love of Community column for the local paper.

"But I guess we feel pretty safe out here in the cornfields."

Sarah Conley, a firefighter and emergency medical technician, said the Fire Department has had several calls about possible anthrax, including one that closed the high school for a day.

"When that happens, people get kind of crazy," she said. For the most part, though, "people feel like we're a little community. There's no reason for the terrorists to come out here."

At a post office in Houston, a U.S. flag flapped at half staff Friday and a postal clerk wore latex gloves to set out fresh mailing supplies. But customers seemed unconcerned.

"So few people have been infected or exposed that you really have to look at the odds," Jennifer Dial said.
In suburban Atlanta, Susan Domingo, who works at a medical facility, said she now wears gloves and a mask to open her office mail. "I probably will get gloves for home," she said. "And I've decided that anything that looks like junk mail will go into the trash."

Some mental health specialists, predict that the slow, uncertain pace of the investigation will heighten public apprehension significantly in the next several weeks, especially if anthrax is found in other parts of the country.

Signs of pressure--anxiety, mild depression, sleeplessness, free-floating emotions, feeling on edge--are increasing, said Jay Segal, a specialist in emotional trauma at Temple University's Center for Public Health in Pennsylvania.

"This threat is one where it's very difficult to predict exactly when it's going to materialize and where," said Richard Zinbarg, director of the Anxiety Treatment Program at Northwestern University's Family Institute in Chicago.

Psychological studies have repeatedly shown that when people are faced with two equally serious threats, "if one is predictable and the other is not predictable, the unpredictable one will arouse significantly more anxiety," Zinbarg said.

"So you would predict that this situation would lead to fairly widespread anxiety."

Indeed, Zinbarg said, the anthrax letters in Florida, Washington and New York don't seem designed to kill large numbers of people. "It's more aimed at planting the seeds of fear for any of us that, next time you go to the mailbox, it could be waiting for you."

-------

Times researchers Lianne Hart in Houston, Lynn Marshall in Seattle and Edith Stanley in Atlanta contributed to this report.
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Can anyone direct me to state level surveys on dental/periodontal care?

For example, does the SLAITS survey for the National Center for Health Statistics cover dental care?

Please contact me directly.

Thanks.
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Commiskey, Patricia
> Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 11:51 AM
> To: 'AAPORnet (E-mail)'
> Subject: A question...
>
> Hello! I was wondering about the success (or lack of success) of telephone interviewing during the various December holidays, particularly between Christmas and New Year's Day. I realize the holiday itself is out, but wasn't sure how other call centers handle telephone interviewing during that time. What has your experience been with interviewing during the holidays?
>
> Any guidance you could give would be extremely helpful.
>
> Thanks! Patricia
>
> Patricia Commiskey, MA
> Research Director - CATI Facility
> Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research
> University of Maryland School of Medicine
> (410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702
> pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu

--
From teresa.hottle@wright.edu Mon Oct 29 09:07:40 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9TH7de25231 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 09:07:39
    -0800 (PST)
Received: from mailserv.wright.edu (mailserv.wright.edu [130.108.131.37])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA21654 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 09:07:40 -0800
    (PST)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON.mailserv.wright.edu by mailserv.wright.edu
    (PMDF V6.0-24 #45557) id <OGLZ005018VP0C@mailserv.wright.edu> for
    aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 12:07:01 -0500 (EST)
Received: from wright.edu (al131037.wright.edu [130.108.131.37])
    by mailserv.wright.edu (PMDF V6.0-24 #45557)
    with ESMTP id <OGLZ002F28VOPFW@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
    Mon, 29 Oct 2001 12:07:01 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 29 Oct 2001 12:05:53 -0500
From: Teresa Hottle <teresa.hottle@wright.edu>
Subject: Alumni surveys
To: aapornet@usc.edu
We are working on formulating a survey of alumni students in Wright State University's School of Business. Some schools that have gone through the accreditation process may have done an alumni survey. I was wondering if anyone has conducted a survey of business alumni, and if so, may I have a copy of the survey? If you cannot provide a copy, could you please give examples of some questions that were asked, including questions regarding core competencies such as leadership, problem solving, analytical thinking, and computer skills? Also, if an alumni survey was not conducted, a needs assessment survey that helps develop course curriculums would also be useful. If you can provide assistance, please respond asap.

Thanks,
Terrie

I would be interested in this same information.
Jan Kiley
rss@soltec.net

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Teresa Hottle
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 11:06 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Alumni surveys

We are working on formulating a survey of alumni students in Wright State University's School of Business. Some schools that have gone through the accreditation process may have done an alumni survey. I was wondering if anyone has conducted a survey of business alumni, and if so, may I have a copy of the survey? If you can not provide a copy, could you please give examples of some questions that were asked, including questions regarding core competencies such as leadership, problem solving, analytical thinking, and computer skills? Also, if an alumni survey was not conducted, a needs assessment survey that helps develop course curriculums would also be useful. If you can provide assistance, please respond asap.

Thanks,
Terrie

>From teresa.hottle@wright.edu Mon Oct 29 10:16:12 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id f9TIGBe19499 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001
10:16:12 -0800 (PST)
Received: from mailserv.wright.edu (mailserv.wright.edu [130.108.128.60]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA07974 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 10:16:12 -0800 (PST)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON.mailserv.wright.edu by mailserv.wright.edu
   (PMDF V6.0-24 #45557) id <OGLZ00H01C2M9Q@mailserv.wright.edu> for
   aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 13:15:58 -0500 (EST)
Received: from wright.edu (al131037.wright.edu [130.108.131.37])
   by mailserv.wright.edu (PMDF V6.0-24 #45557)
   with ESMTP id <OGLZ00G4LC2LIY@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
   Mon, 29 Oct 2001 13:15:57 -0500 (EST)
Date: Mon, 29 Oct 2001 13:14:49 -0500
From: Teresa Hottle <teresa.hottle@wright.edu>
Subject: Re: Do young men refuse more often than young women?
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3BDD9C99.3B8B7C8C@wright.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <9667A0D2033CD51195F90002B330A3BF35E2DE@moe.fhcrc.org>
We recently conducted a male only study on fatherhood and found the response rate horrible! But here's the interesting thing...the men weren't the ones refusing, the women of the house were the ones who were "gatekeeping". They wouldn't let us speak to their husbands/boyfriends.

Terrie

"Voigt, Lynda" wrote:
> We are doing a study of men < 45 years of age, and are finding a much higher refusal rate than our past studies of women in this same age group. Have others found the same thing? I took a look at the papers that I have on response rates, but could not find anything by both gender and age.
> Thanks!

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist,
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

From jpearson@stanford.edu Mon Oct 29 10:29:20 2001
Received: from smtp2.Stanford.EDU (smtp2.Stanford.EDU [171.64.14.116]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA21558 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 10:29:21 -0800 (PST)
Received: from LAP-JPEARSO-2K.stanford.edu (lap-jpearso-2k.Stanford.EDU [171.66.227.43]) by smtp2.Stanford.EDU (8.11.3/8.11.3) with ESMTPT id f9TIT6a22427 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 10:29:07 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <4.3.1.2.20011029102334.00blafc0@jpearson.pobox.stanford.edu>
X-Sender: jpearson@jpearson.pobox.stanford.edu (Unverified)
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.1
Date: Mon, 29 Oct 2001 10:29:04 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@stanford.edu>
Subject: Re: Do young men refuse more often than young women?
In-Reply-To: <3BDD9C99.3B8B7C8C@wright.edu>
References: <9667A0D2033CD51195F90002B330A3BF35E2DE@moe.fhcrc.org>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

> found the response rate horrible! But here's the interesting thing...the men weren't the ones refusing, the women of the house were the ones who were "gatekeeping". They wouldn't let us speak to their husbands/boyfriends.

Am I the only man on this list who doesn't find this surprising? Women
Our experience has been so bad in the month of December that we do not call from Dec 1 to Jan 1.

Terrie

"Commiskey, Patricia" wrote:

> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Commiskey, Patricia
> > Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 11:51 AM
> > To: 'AAPORnet (E-mail)'
> > Subject: A question...
> >
> > Hello! I was wondering about the success (or lack of success) of telephone interviewing during the various December holidays, particularly between Christmas and New Year's Day. I realize the holiday itself is out, but wasn't sure how other call centers handle telephone interviewing during that time. What has your experience been with interviewing during the holidays?
Any guidance you could give would be extremely helpful.

Thanks! Patricia

Patricia Commiskey, MA
Research Director - CATI Facility
Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research
University of Maryland School of Medicine
(410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702
pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu

From pjlavarakas@tvratings.com Mon Oct 29 13:02:43 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9TL2hel8471 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001
13:02:43
-0800 (PST)
Received: from reliant.nielsenmedia.com (reliant.nielsenmedia.com
[63.114.249.15])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA01142 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 13:02:42 -0800
(PST)
Received: from nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com (nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com
[10.9.11.121])
    by reliant.nielsenmedia.com (reliant.nielsenmedia.com
[8.9.3/8.9.3]) with ESMTP id QAA06362
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 16:02:14 -0500 (EST)
Received: by nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2653.19)
    id <4R0Z1P4V>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 16:02:13 -0500
Message-ID:
    <F9BC190B7DE9D11196500805FA7C60B05BFA221@nmrusnysx1.nielsenmedia.com>
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavarakas@tvratings.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: FW: A question...
Date: Mon, 29 Oct 2001 16:02:05 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Our experience with December RDD studies of the public at Northwestern
(prior to 1996) and at Ohio State (1996-2000), was very different from what
Terrie has shared.

We even did well enough between Xmas (12/27-12/30) and New Year's Eve to
have a smaller-than-normal staff continue to do interviewing those days.
 Granted productivity per hour was a bit lower than usual, but not so bad as
to make it a waste of the client's resources.

PJL

-----Original Message-----
From: Teresa Hottle [mailto:teresa.hottle@wright.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 3:48 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: FW: A question...
Our experience has been so bad in the month of December that we do not call from Dec 1 to Jan 1.

Terrie

"Commiskey, Patricia" wrote:

> 
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Commiskey, Patricia
> > Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 11:51 AM
> > To: 'AAPORnet (E-mail)'
> > Subject: A question...
> > 
> > Hello! I was wondering about the success (or lack of success) of telephone interviewing during the various December holidays, particularly between Christmas and New Year's Day. I realize the holiday itself is out, but wasn't sure how other call centers handle telephone interviewing during that time. What has your experience been with interviewing during the holidays?
> > 
> > Any guidance you could give would be extremely helpful.
> > 
> > Thanks! Patricia
> > "
> > Patricia Commiskey, MA
> > Research Director - CATI Facility
> > Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research
> > University of Maryland School of Medicine
> > (410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702
> > pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu
> > "
> > From simonetta@artsci.com Mon Oct 29 13:10:20 2001
> > Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> > by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> > id f9TLAKel9699 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 13:10:20 -0800 (PST)
> > Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
> > by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> > id NAA08104 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 13:10:19 -0800 (PST)
> > Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
> > id <VXBACX8B>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 16:10:33 -0500
> > Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF51D311A81900A0248FC2F33226A40AS_SERVER>
> > From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
> > To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > Subject: RE: FW: A question...
> > Date: Mon, 29 Oct 2001 16:10:33 -0500
> > MIME-Version: 1.0
> > X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
> > Content-Type: text/plain;
> > charset="iso-8859-1"
For what it is worth my experience at Georgia State University and the University of New Hampshire doing RDDs much more closely mirror Paul's experience than it does Teresa's. We also had relatively good success between Thanksgiving and Christmas.

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

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Lavrakas, Paul [mailto:pjlavrakas@tvratings.com]
> Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 4:02 PM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: RE: FW: A question...
>
> Our experience with December RDD studies of the public at Northwestern
> (prior to 1996) and at Ohio State (1996-2000), was very
different from what
> Terrie has shared.
>
> We even did well enough between Xmas (12/27-12/30) and New Year's Eve to
> have a smaller-than-normal staff continue to do interviewing
> those days.
> Granted productivity per hour was a bit lower than usual, but
> not so bad as
> to make it a waste of the client's resources.
>
PJL
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Teresa Hottle [mailto:teresa.hottle@wright.edu]
> Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 3:48 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: FW: A question...
>
> Our experience has been so bad in the month of December that
we do not call from Dec 1 to Jan 1.
>
Terrie

"Commiskey, Patricia" wrote:
> >
> >> -----Original Message-----
> >> From: Commiskey, Patricia
> >> Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 11:51 AM
> >> To: 'AAPORnet (E-mail)'
> >> Subject: A question...
> >>
> >> Hello! I was wondering about the success (or lack of success) of
> >> telephone interviewing during the various December holidays,
> >> particularly
> >> between Christmas and New Year's Day. I realize the
> >> holiday itself is
out, but wasn't sure how other call centers handle telephone interviewing during that time. What has your experience been with interviewing during the holidays? Any guidance you could give would be extremely helpful. Thanks! Patricia

Patricia Commiskey, MA
Research Director - CATI Facility
Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research
University of Maryland School of Medicine
(410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702
pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu

We've generally had good success interviewing between Christmas and New Year's. People tend to be less stressed and friendlier, and they aren't receiving a lot of other solicitations. We always make a point of not doing all of our call attempts within that one week, in case people are out of town the entire time.

------ Original Message ------
From: "Commiskey, Patricia" <PCommiskey@som.umaryland.edu>
Hello! I was wondering about the success (or lack of success) of telephone interviewing during the various December holidays, particularly between Christmas and New Year's Day. I realize the holiday itself is out, but wasn't sure how other call centers handle telephone interviewing during that time. What has your experience been with interviewing during the holidays?

Any guidance you could give would be extremely helpful.

Thanks! Patricia

Patricia Commiskey, MA
Research Director - CATI Facility
Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research
University of Maryland School of Medicine
(410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702
pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu
Gosh,
What are we doing wrong? :) We also have a terrible time getting our student interviewers to work because the majority of them go home for Christmas break. Any suggestions would be helpful. I do know that I read in the literature that December had the worst response rate out of all months so I don't feel too bad...yet :).

Terrie

Leo Simonetetta wrote:
>
> For what it is worth my experience at Georgia State University and the University of New Hampshire doing RDDs much more closely mirror Paul's experience than it does Teresa's. We also had relatively good success between Thanksgiving and Christmas.
>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, LLC
> simonetta@artsci.com
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Lavrakas, Paul [mailto:pjlavrakas@tvratings.com]
> > Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 4:02 PM
> > To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> > Subject: RE: FW: A question...
> > >
> > > Our experience with December RDD studies of the public at Northwestern (prior to 1996) and at Ohio State (1996-2000), was very different from what Terrie has shared.
> > >
> > > We even did well enough between Xmas (12/27-12/30) and New Year's Eve to have a smaller-than-normal staff continue to do interviewing those days. Granted productivity per hour was a bit lower than usual, but not so bad as to make it a waste of the client's resources.
> > >
> > >------Original Message------
Our experience has been so bad in the month of December that we do not call from Dec 1 to Jan 1.

Terrie

"Commiskey, Patricia" wrote:

Hello! I was wondering about the success (or lack of success) of telephone interviewing during the various December holidays, particularly between Christmas and New Year's Day. I realize the holiday itself is out, but wasn't sure how other call centers handle telephone interviewing during that time. What has your experience been with interviewing during the holidays?

Any guidance you could give would be extremely helpful.

Thanks! Patricia

Patricia Commiskey, MA
Research Director - CATI Facility
Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research
University of Maryland School of Medicine
(410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702
pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu
The Public Policy Institute of California is looking for a Survey Research Manager. Details of the position are described below. If you are aware of qualified candidates, please feel free to forward this to their attention.

JOB ANNOUNCEMENT: SURVEY RESEARCH MANAGER
PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) is a private operating foundation established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett. PPIC is dedicated to independent, nonpartisan research on political, social, and economic issues that affect the lives of Californians. PPIC is currently looking for a Survey Research Manager.

Summary of Position: This is a new, regular, full-time position to support the ongoing and expanding PPIC Statewide Survey series on Californians' public policy preferences, ballot choices, and attitudes towards political, social, and economic issues. The position will report to the Survey Director of the PPIC Statewide Survey. PPIC offers a salary and benefits package that is competitive with similar positions in comparable research organizations.

Responsibilities: The Survey Research Manager will oversee both the planning and day-to-day operations of a frequently-conducted public opinion survey series. The Survey Research Manager will be directly involved in all aspects of the public opinion research process, including questionnaire design, data management, statistical analysis, and writing the reports. Other responsibilities include the supervision of the in-house staff of survey research associates, overseeing the off-site relations with the telephone interviewing firm and other service providers, consulting with PPIC research fellows about survey research projects, and coordinating the planning and release of surveys with PPIC's communications and administrative staff. The Survey Research Manager will also provide survey information to news organizations, elected officials and their staff, and other interested parties.

Qualifications: Professional experience in public opinion research is essential, including the use of both qualitative and quantitative research methods. Knowledge of focus group methods, in-depth interviews, survey samples, questionnaire design, telephone interviewing techniques, sample weighting, and multivariate statistics is required. Solid computer skills such as the use of SPSS, Excel, Word, and PowerPoint are needed. Strong written and verbal communications skills are essential for communicating with foundation officers, policymakers, and journalists. Proficiency in the Spanish language is desirable. A graduate degree in a social science-related discipline (e.g. political science, sociology, social psychology, economics, public health, public policy, urban...
planning) with coursework in public opinion research is required; a Ph.D.
is preferred.

Application Process: We seek to fill this position as soon as possible; applications will continue to be accepted until the search is completed. As an equal opportunity employer, PPIC particularly encourages women and members of minority groups to apply. Please send letter of interest, resume, a list of three references, and any examples of published work to:

Human Resources Manager- MB
Public Policy Institute of California
500 Washington, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94111
<e-mail: resumes@ppic.org or fax: 415-291-4401>

Any opinions expressed in this message are those of the author alone and do not necessarily reflect any position of the Public Policy Institute of California.

---

From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Mon Oct 29 18:23:17 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id f9U2NHe22755 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001
18:23:17 -0800 (PST)
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id SAA03594 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 18:23:15 -0800
(PST)
Received: from garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (garnet3.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.23])
  by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (garnet3.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.3])
  with ESMTP id VAA387988 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 21:20:07 -0500
Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial707.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.35.97])
  by garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id VAA40044
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 21:20:05 -0500
Date: Mon, 29 Oct 2001 21:20:05 -0500
Message-Id: <200110300220.VAA40044@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Do young men refuse more often than young women?

Try having a male interviewer call back. Been there, done that.

Susan

At 01:14 PM 10/29/2001 -0500, you wrote:
> We recently conducted a male only study on fatherhood and
> found the response rate horrible! But here's the interesting
> thing...the men weren't the ones refusing, the women of the
> house were the ones who were "gatekeeping". They wouldn't
> let us speak to their husbands/boyfriends.
"Voigt, Lynda" wrote:

We are doing a study of men < 45 years of age, and are finding a much higher refusal rate than our past studies of women in this same age group. Have others found the same thing? I took a look at the papers that I have on response rates, but could not find anything by both gender and age.

Thanks!

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist,
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

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

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

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

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776
I think I hear two separate sets of observations:

1. Staffing is difficult during Holiday periods. And not just for student employees. Most employees want time off, often considerable time off. Years ago, there was a phenomena known as "Christmas season employment" wherein people sought seasonal work to pay for holiday expenses. I am convinced this is a thing of the past, a product of affluence and increasing demands on peoples time.

2. For those who do stay and work, except of a couple of days that are obviously off-limits, there is no appreciable difference in productivity. My guess is that even that is mostly a result of interviewer expectations.

Both of these observations are consistent with our own experiences.

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Teresa Hottle
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 2:53 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: FW: A question...

Gosh, What are we doing wrong? :) We also have a terrible time getting our student interviewers to work because the majority of them go home for Christmas break. Any suggestions would be helpful. I do know that I read in the literature that December had the worst response rate out of all months so I don't feel too bad...yet :).

Terrie

Leo Simonetta wrote:
For what it is worth my experience at Georgia State University and the University of New Hampshire doing RDDs much more closely mirror Paul's experience than it does Teresa's. We also had relatively good success between Thanksgiving and Christmas.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Lavrakas, Paul [mailto:pjlavrakas@tvratings.com]
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 4:02 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: FW: A question...

Our experience with December RDD studies of the public at Northwestern (prior to 1996) and at Ohio State (1996-2000), was very different from what Terrie has shared.

We even did well enough between Xmas (12/27-12/30) and New Year's Eve to have a smaller-than-normal staff continue to do interviewing those days. Granted productivity per hour was a bit lower than usual, but not so bad as to make it a waste of the client's resources.

PJL

-----Original Message-----
From: Teresa Hottle [mailto:teresa.hottle@wright.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 3:48 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: FW: A question...

Our experience has been so bad in the month of December that we do not call from Dec 1 to Jan 1.

Terrie

"Commiskey, Patricia" wrote:

-----Original Message-----
From: Commiskey, Patricia
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 11:51 AM
To: 'AAPORnet (E-mail)'
Subject: A question...

Hello! I was wondering about the success (or lack of success) of telephone interviewing during the various December holidays, particularly between Christmas and New Year's Day. I realize the
holiday itself is out, but wasn't sure how other call centers handle telephone interviewing during that time. What has your experience been with interviewing the holidays? Any guidance you could give would be extremely helpful. Thanks! Patricia

Patricia Commiskey, MA

Research Director - CATI Facility

Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research

University of Maryland School of Medicine

(410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702

pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Oct 29 21:09:51 2001

Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9U59pe28543 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001
    21:09:51 -0800 (PST)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id VAA00558 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 21:09:52 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id f9U599K27611 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 29 Oct 2001 21:09:09 -0800 (PST)
Date: Mon, 29 Oct 2001 21:09:09 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: NYT/CBS NEWS POLL: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War (NYTimes)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0110292059040.23138-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

October 30, 2001

THE POLL

SURVEY SHOWS DOUBTS STIRRING ON TERROR WAR

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/30/national/30POLL.html

October 30, 2001
Americans for the first time are raising doubts about whether the nation can accomplish its objectives in fighting terrorism at home and abroad, including capturing or killing Osama bin Laden, saving the international alliance from unraveling and protecting people from future attacks, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows.

Despite threats about anthrax unfolding virtually every day and little discernible progress in the air campaign against the Taliban, Americans are still offering President Bush their overwhelming approval. Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which soared after Sept. 11, stands firm at 87 percent. And Congress has an approval rating of 67 percent, the highest since the Times/CBS News Poll began asking about it in the 1970's.

Even so, after six weeks in which people were not inclined to critique aspects of the government's response, there are stirrings of discontent that extend both to how the nation is responding to domestic terrorism and to how it is handling the war.

The public is questioning whether the government is doing enough to forestall what it increasingly expects to be another terrorist attack in this country within months. Fifty-three percent say another attack is very likely, up from 46 percent two weeks ago and 36 percent two weeks before that. Most people say they expect the attack to be in the form of bioterrorism. These responses came before Attorney General John Ashcroft announced yesterday that new terrorist attacks were expected as soon as this week.

Yet more than half the public says the government in Washington has not done enough to prepare for a biological attack, and nor have state and local governments.

Nearly half of Americans say the government is withholding information they need to know about the recent anthrax cases. More than a quarter say public health officials are wrong in advising people not to ask their own doctors for Cipro, an antibiotic used in treating anthrax.

While security has been tightened at airports, leading to the now-common sight of long lines, Americans are still jumpy about flying. They want the federal government to take complete control of hiring and supervising all airport security personnel.

The nationwide telephone poll of 1,024 adults was conducted Thursday through Sunday. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points.

Tom Cale, a poll respondent who sells cars in Fairmont, W.Va., is among those who support the nation's leaders but have nagging concerns.

"It's not that we don't have competent people in positions of authority," Mr. Cale, 50, said in a follow-up interview. "They just haven't written the book yet about the potential dangers that are out there."
Bracing for more terror, Mr. Cale said: "The next attack would be what you least suspect. It's going to be something that few people would see that would affect the most people, like sabotaging gas supply lines, or taking out two or three main power stations."

Joan Kautz, 49, a clerk for a rental car agency in Linden, N.J., said: "With the added security at the airport, bioterrorism is the only way to get in here. That's why they've used the mail, and even now the government is not protecting our postal workers."

In one of the most striking shifts, only 18 percent of Americans said they had a great deal of confidence that the government could protect them from terrorism; a month ago, 35 percent had such confidence. A majority, 58 percent, said they had a fair amount of confidence. The rest had little or no confidence.

Similarly, people feel that the government can protect them from anthrax and smallpox, but the degree of confidence is another matter. Only 15 percent have a great deal of confidence that the government can protect them from anthrax; 19 percent say the same about smallpox.

Beyond the efforts at home, Americans are not entirely satisfied with the military action in Afghanistan and seem less hopeful than they were before the bombing began. Although most respondents said the war was going well for the United States, the largest proportion--58 percent--said it was going only somewhat well. Twenty-five percent said it was going very well, and 13 percent said the war was going badly.

Only 28 percent are very confident that the United States will capture or kill Mr. bin Laden, who is believed to be the mastermind behind the Sept. 11 attacks. In a CBS News poll two weeks earlier, 38 percent said they were very confident.

"Osama bin Laden is like a ghost," said Eleanor Roth, 67, a retired receptionist from Dayton, Ohio. "I would rather him be captured than killed to avoid him being labeled a martyr. Maybe they will find him, but then again, many of these terrorists have been on the loose for years. And with all of our technology, it doesn't seem to make a difference."

James Oleszcsuk, 57, a longshoreman from Baltimore, was even less optimistic.

"It won't be easy getting bin Laden," Mr. Oleszcsuk said. "First it was weeks, then months, now years to get this guy. It makes me wonder what kind of intelligence reports the government is getting. You hear so many things, you don't know what to believe. The political implications of capturing him would be problematic with many of the Middle Eastern countries. I don't think it's going to happen."

In another sign of mounting uneasiness about the war, only 29 percent said they were very confident in the ability of the United States government to maintain the international alliance of countries that support the military campaign; two weeks ago, 46 percent were very confident.

The public is prepared for a long and bloody conflict in Afghanistan; a
majority of Americans say they are willing to accept the deaths of
several thousand American troops there. Eight out of 10 respondents said
they thought the conflict would extend beyond Afghanistan into
neighboring countries and other parts of the world.

"I wouldn't be surprised if this war took three to five years," said Judy
Adams, 48, a homemaker from Jonesville, La. "We have fought for our
country for over 200 years to keep our land and our families safe. If we
don't stand behind our president and pull together as a nation, we're not
going to see our land stand."

Americans continue to view Israel favorably while they back the
establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of
the West Bank and Gaza Strip. About half the public views Saudi Arabia as
a friend of the United States but not an ally.

There were signs of anxiety in the poll, perhaps because it was conducted
at a time when developments have made people feel more vulnerable. In
recent days, the Bush administration and leaders on Capitol Hill appeared
to lack a coordinated message in responding to the anthrax threat.

Most Americans say they have been closely following the news about
anthrax sent through the mail, and many have begun handling their own
mail more cautiously.

The poll turned up mixed messages about the extent to which people are
panicky. While they are concerned about whether the government can
protect them, Americans are calm at home. Only a quarter say they are
worried about terrorism in their own communities. While 20 percent of
Americans say they are more on edge now than they were before the attacks
on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, few say they are having
trouble sleeping or are experiencing a loss of income.

For all their misgivings about the government's capacity to protect them,
the public remains steadfast behind its leaders. Most people say that Mr.
Bush has clearly explained the goals of both the military action in
Afghanistan and the war against terrorism in general.

Nearly 8 in 10 respondents approve of the way Mr. Bush is handling the
war on terrorism; more than 6 in 10 approve his handling of the economy.
Six in 10 Americans now say the country is moving in the right direction.
Last June, well before the attacks, only 4 in 10 said the same thing.

The public's support for its leaders and government extends far beyond
the White House. Over almost the last three decades, the job approval
rating for Congress has never approached 67 percent, where it stands
today.

The Watergate scandals first eroded the public's trust in government. For
more than 27 years, people said they were more distrustful of government
than trusting.

But in the aftermath of Sept. 11, people hold a different view. Now, more
than half of Americans said they trusted the government to do what was
right just about always or most of the time. In 1998, when the Times/CBS
News Poll last asked the question, only 26 percent said they trusted the
government.
Still, the poll found that the public was not prepared for a more activist government. Despite the high profile of many government agencies since Sept. 11, people still favored a smaller government with fewer services over a bigger government with more services, 52 percent to 43 percent.

Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did not know what to expect now.

"I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, 'What's next?'"

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/30/national/30POLL.html
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*****
Compare this article to the article on the same poll on the CBS News site. Are they looking at the same numbers?

NYT: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
CBS: Support For War Effort Is Strong

CBS article is attached.

--Stephen Salmore
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Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2001 12:09 AM 
Subject: NYT/CBS NEWS POLL: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War (NYTimes)
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> > Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company 
> > -------------------------------------------------------------------------- 
> > http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/30/national/30POLL.html 
> > 
> > October 30, 2001 
> > 
> > THE POLL 
> > 
> > SURVEY SHOWS DOUBTS STIRRING ON TERROR WAR 
> > 
> > By RICHARD L. BERKE and JANET ELDER 
> > 
> > Americans for the first time are raising doubts about whether the nation can accomplish its objectives in fighting terrorism at home and abroad, including capturing or killing Osama bin Laden, saving the international alliance from unraveling and protecting people from future attacks, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows. 
> > 
> > Despite threats about anthrax unfolding virtually every day and little discernible progress in the air campaign against the Taliban, Americans are still offering President Bush their overwhelming approval. 
> > 
> > Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which soared after Sept. 11, stands firm at 87 percent. And Congress has an approval rating of 67 percent, the highest since the Times/CBS News Poll began asking about it in the 1970's.
Even so, after six weeks in which people were not inclined to critique aspects of the government's response, there are stirrings of discontent that extend both to how the nation is responding to domestic terrorism and to how it is handling the war.

The public is questioning whether the government is doing enough to forestall what it increasingly expects to be another terrorist attack in this country within months. Fifty-three percent say another attack is very likely, up from 46 percent two weeks ago and 36 percent two weeks before that. Most people say they expect the attack to be in the form of bioterrorism. These responses came before Attorney General John Ashcroft announced yesterday that new terrorist attacks were expected as soon as this week.

Yet more than half the public says the government in Washington has not done enough to prepare for a biological attack, and nor have state and local governments.

Nearly half of Americans say the government is withholding information they need to know about the recent anthrax cases. More than a quarter say public health officials are wrong in advising people not to ask their own doctors for Cipro, an antibiotic used in treating anthrax.

While security has been tightened at airports, leading to the now-common sight of long lines, Americans are still jumpy about flying. They want the federal government to take complete control of hiring and supervising all airport security personnel.

The nationwide telephone poll of 1,024 adults was conducted Thursday through Sunday. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points.

Tom Cale, a poll respondent who sells cars in Fairmont, W.Va., is among those who support the nation's leaders but have nagging concerns.

"It's not that we don't have competent people in positions of authority," Mr. Cale, 50, said in a follow-up interview. "They just haven't written the book yet about the potential dangers that are out there."

Bracing for more terror, Mr. Cale said: "The next attack would be what you least suspect. It's going to be something that few people would see that would affect the most people, like sabotaging gas supply lines, or taking out two or three main power stations."

Joan Kautz, 49, a clerk for a rental car agency in Linden, N.J., said: "With the added security at the airport, bioterrorism is the only way to get in here. That's why they've used the mail, and even now the government is not protecting our postal workers."

In one of the most striking shifts, only 18 percent of Americans said they had a great deal of confidence that the government could protect them from terrorism; a month ago, 35 percent had such confidence. A majority, 58 percent, said they had a fair amount of confidence. The rest had little or no confidence.

Similarly, people feel that the government can protect them from anthrax and smallpox, but the degree of confidence is another matter. Only 15
percent have a great deal of confidence that the government can protect 
them from anthrax; 19 percent say the same about smallpox.

Beyond the efforts at home, Americans are not entirely satisfied with the 
military action in Afghanistan and seem less hopeful than they were 
before the bombing began. Although most respondents said the war was 
going well for the United States, the largest proportion--58 percent-- 
said it was going only somewhat well. Twenty-five percent said it was 
going very well, and 13 percent said the war was going badly.

Only 28 percent are very confident that the United States will capture or 
kill Mr. bin Laden, who is believed to be the mastermind behind the Sept. 
11 attacks. In a CBS News poll two weeks earlier, 38 percent said they 
were very confident.

"Osama bin Laden is like a ghost," said Eleanor Roth, 67, a retired 
receptionist from Dayton, Ohio. "I would rather him be captured than 
killed to avoid him being labeled a martyr. Maybe they will find him, but 
then again, many of these terrorists have been on the loose for years. 
And with all of our technology, it doesn't seem to make a difference."

James Oleszcsuk, 57, a longshoreman from Baltimore, was even less 
optimistic.

"It won't be easy getting bin Laden," Mr. Oleszcsuk said. "First it was 
weeks, then months, now years to get this guy. It makes me wonder what 
kind of intelligence reports the government is getting. You hear so many 
things, you don't know what to believe. The political implications of 
capturing him would be problematic with many of the Middle Eastern 
countries. I don't think it's going to happen."

In another sign of mounting uneasiness about the war, only 29 percent 
said they were very confident in the ability of the United States 
government to maintain the international alliance of countries that 
support the military campaign; two weeks ago, 46 percent were very 
confident.

The public is prepared for a long and bloody conflict in Afghanistan; a 
majority of Americans say they are willing to accept the deaths of 
several thousand American troops there. Eight out of 10 respondents said 
they thought the conflict would extend beyond Afghanistan into 
neighboring countries and other parts of the world.

"I wouldn't be surprised if this war took three to five years," said Judy 
Adams, 48, a homemaker from Jonesville, La. "We have fought for our 
country for over 200 years to keep our land and our families safe. If we 
don't stand behind our president and pull together as a nation, we're not 
going to see our land stand."

Americans continue to view Israel favorably while they back the 
establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of 
the West Bank and Gaza Strip. About half the public views Saudi Arabia as 
a friend of the United States but not an ally.

There were signs of anxiety in the poll, perhaps because it was conducted 
at a time when developments have made people feel more vulnerable. In 
recent days, the Bush administration and leaders on Capitol Hill appeared
to lack a coordinated message in responding to the anthrax threat.

Most Americans say they have been closely following the news about anthrax sent through the mail, and many have begun handling their own mail more cautiously.

The poll turned up mixed messages about the extent to which people are panicky. While they are concerned about whether the government can protect them, Americans are calm at home. Only a quarter say they are worried about terrorism in their own communities. While 20 percent of Americans say they are more on edge now than they were before the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, few say they are having trouble sleeping or are experiencing a loss of income.

For all their misgivings about the government's capacity to protect them, the public remains steadfast behind its leaders. Most people say that Mr. Bush has clearly explained the goals of both the military action in Afghanistan and the war against terrorism in general.

Nearly 8 in 10 respondents approve of the way Mr. Bush is handling the war on terrorism; more than 6 in 10 approve his handling of the economy. Six in 10 Americans now say the country is moving in the right direction. Last June, well before the attacks, only 4 in 10 said the same thing.

The public's support for its leaders and government extends far beyond the White House. Over almost the last three decades, the job approval rating for Congress has never approached 67 percent, where it stands today.

The Watergate scandals first eroded the public's trust in government. For more than 27 years, people said they were more distrustful of government than trusting.

But in the aftermath of Sept. 11, people hold a different view. Now, more than half of Americans said they trusted the government to do what was right just about always or most of the time. In 1998, when the Times/CBS News Poll last asked the question, only 26 percent said they trusted the government.

Still, the poll found that the public was not prepared for a more activist government. Despite the high profile of many government agencies since Sept. 11, people still favored a smaller government with fewer services over a bigger government with more services, 52 percent to 43 percent.

Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did not know what to expect now.

"I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, 'What's next?'

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/30/national/30POLL.html
--------------------------------------------------------------------
Poll: U.S. Not Prepared For Bioterror

* Support For War Effort Is Strong; President Still Gets Very High Ratings
* But 53% Say Government Is Not Doing Enough To Fight Bioterror
* Majority Think Another Terrorist Attack Likely In Next Few Months

NEW YORK, Oct. 29, 2001

(CBS) President Bush continues to receive extremely high approval ratings, but the high levels of confidence expressed early this fall that the government would be able to capture the terrorists and protect the public show signs of weakening, according to the latest CBS News/New York Times poll.

And in the wake of the recent deaths of several postal workers from anthrax and its discovery in letters sent to government leaders and the news media, majorities of the public think the government - national and state and local - has not done enough to prepare for a biological attack.

While Americans in many parts of the country say they are not very concerned about a possible terrorist attack where they live, the percentage expecting an attack somewhere in the U.S. in the next few months has been steadily growing since September 11. Now, 53 percent say an attack in the next few months is very likely.

Many feel that they haven't been told enough about the current threat from anthrax. Although 94 percent say they've been following the news about anthrax closely (with 56 percent following it very closely), less than half thinks that the government has been telling people everything they need to know about the anthrax attacks, a problem that may be alleviated by the decision made this weekend to have Homeland Security Director Tom Ridge brief the news media on a daily basis. Just 15 percent say they have a great deal of confidence that the =
government can protect its citizens from terrorist attacks involving anthrax, though most have at least some confidence. And evaluations of government units' handling of the anthrax attacks are mixed - though the Bush administration is viewed more positively than Congress, both are viewed more positively than the Postal Service.

Perhaps as a consequence, minorities of the public are prepared to dismiss public health officials' advice and take action on their own. Over one in four have decided that people should ask their doctors for the drug Cipro as a precaution, and not wait for public health officials to recommend it for them. And 8 percent say they want to be tested for the possibility of anthrax exposure now.

One group that is especially cynical is the young. Just under two-thirds of those under age 30 do not think the government is telling people all they need to know. Younger adults are more likely to want to be tested for anthrax exposure, and to believe people should ask doctors now for Cipro.

There is also a behavioral impact. One in four Americans say they have become more cautious when opening their mail - and another 22 percent are seriously considering doing that. Even more of those under 30 say their behavior has changed.

WINNING THE WAR: A MATTER OF CONFIDENCE

Most Americans continue to be confident that the U.S. will succeed in its war against terrorism, but as the war continues, some of the initial optimism Americans expressed seems to be fading.

Now, 28 percent are very confident that the U.S. government will capture or kill bin Laden, and 42 percent are somewhat confident. Three weeks ago, as the military attacks began, 38 percent were very confident, and 38 percent were somewhat so, in the ability of the U.S. to capture or kill bin Laden.

And fewer now think the war is going very well for the U.S. than thought so three weeks ago. Twenty-five percent now say the war is going very well for the U.S. Just after the initial air attacks began, 36 percent said that. Fifty-eight percent now think the war is going somewhat well, while 13 percent think it is going somewhat or very badly.

Anti-American rallies in Pakistan and in some Middle Eastern countries may have reduced public confidence that America's allies will all stand behind her. Now, 29 percent are very confident the U.S. government will be able to hold together the international alliance of countries supporting U.S. military
efforts; three weeks ago, 46 percent felt that way.

There are limits as well in the public's confidence that the government will be able to catch those responsible for sending anthrax through the mail - 23 percent are very confident about that, fewer than are still confident that the U.S. will capture or kill bin Laden.

Most still have some confidence in the U.S.'s ability to protect its citizens from another terrorist attack, but even there confidence is shrinking. Confidence in the government's ability to protect its citizens from a terrorist attack involving anthrax is slightly lower, with less than one in five expressing a great deal of confidence in government being able to do either.

But this lowered confidence level hasn't made people more concerned about terrorism in their community. In fact, if anything, most people's concerns about terrorism in their own backyards has lessened. Twenty-six percent now are very concerned about a terrorist attack where they live. Three weeks ago 30 percent felt that way. On September 11, that figure was 43 percent. There are differences by gender, and differences based on where people live.

About the same number - 28 percent - are very concerned about a biological or chemical attack such as anthrax in their area.

SUPPORTING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

Support for the U.S.-led military attacks in Afghanistan, despite the increased worries, remains extremely high. Now, 88 percent approve of the attacks, and 8 percent disapprove, unchanged since the attacks began three weeks ago.

Fewer Americans - although still a sizable majority - support the U.S. providing humanitarian aid to the people of Afghanistan. Seventy-eight percent approve of the U.S. doing so, and 18 percent disapprove.

As has been the case since just after the September 11th attacks, Americans expect this to be a drawn out conflict; 64 percent think the military attacks will take longer than several months. Twenty-three percent expect it to take several months, and 7 percent think the conflict will last several more weeks.

But the much larger war on terrorism is expected to take longer than the military action in Afghanistan.

Eighty-eight percent now think the war on terrorism will last a year or longer, up from 65 percent three weeks ago. Only 6 percent think that war will last several months.

Many also expect the conflict to spread to other parts of the Middle
East. Thirty-two percent think it is very likely that the military action in Afghanistan will become a more widespread military action in neighboring countries and other parts of the world, and 51 percent think this is somewhat likely. But this lengthy and potentially broader war is viewed as worthwhile, even in the face of significant American military casualties. Sixty-one percent think the war in Afghanistan would be worth it even if it meant several thousand American troops would lose their lives; 27 percent say the war there would not be worth that cost.

At the start of the Gulf War, 45 percent thought a ground war would be worth fighting even if it meant several thousand American military casualties, and 42 percent thought it would not be worthwhile.

Many Americans see the goal of the military action in Afghanistan as much broader than just getting rid of Osama bin Laden. Forty-eight percent think the main goal is to eliminate all terrorists from the country; 18 percent think the goal is to topple the Taliban government, and 16 percent think the goal is to eliminate bin Laden. Those goals are in accordance with what Americans believe the U.S. ought to be doing in Afghanistan. Fifty-seven percent of the public thinks the goal there should be to eliminate all terrorists.

When it comes to dissent in the U.S., 53 percent believe Americans who oppose U.S. military action in Afghanistan should be free to hold protest marches and rallies, while 38 percent think that hurts the war effort.

THE NATIONAL IMPACT: PERSONAL REACTIONS

The September 11th terrorist attacks affected more than just the people in New York City and Washington. More than a third of all Americans say they have felt nervous or edgy since the attacks (one in five say they still do), and 17 percent have had trouble sleeping.

Not surprisingly, people living in big cities and the Northeast are more likely than others to report suffering from these adverse effects. The national level of edginess and sleeplessness is significantly lower than that recorded among New Yorkers in a CBS News/New York Times poll conducted earlier this month. In that poll, 42 percent of New Yorkers said they still felt nervous, and 22 percent said they were still having trouble sleeping.

Women are much more likely than men to have experienced - and to be still experiencing - these effects of the terrorist attacks. More than a quarter of women nationwide say they =
still feel nervous nowadays, and one in ten are still having trouble sleeping, compared with 14 percent and 3 percent of men respectively.

The terrorist attacks have had an economic impact nationally as well. Nearly one in ten people in the U.S. say they have lost their job or a significant amount of income since the attack. The economic aftermath of the attack has been felt in all regions, though less so in the South. The national impact is about half the size of the impact in New York City.

The improvement in perceptions of the economy that happened after the September 11th attacks has all but disappeared. Now, 56 percent think the economy is in good shape, and 42 percent think it is in bad shape. Three weeks ago, 66 percent thought the economy was good, and 29 percent thought it was bad. Just before the September attacks, the outlook was about what it is now, marking some of the lowest levels in positive assessment of the economy in years.

Thirty-seven percent now think the economy is getting worse, 14 percent think it is getting better and 46 percent think it is staying the same.

The terrorist attacks made Americans spend more time with their families and friends. More than one-third of Americans say they have been spending more time with their family and close friends in the weeks after the terrorist attacks.

Women are more likely than men to have spent more time with families and friends since the September 11th attacks, 40 percent to 29 percent. Those in the Northeast are also more likely to have spent more time together with their family and close friends than the rest of Americans.

Just under one in ten Americans has canceled trips because of the terrorist attacks, and travel over the upcoming holidays may also be lower than usual. Seventeen percent of Americans say they plan to travel by plane during the Thanksgiving or Christmas holidays this year; that number is lower than the percentage who traveled by air for last year's holidays.

Half of those who traveled last year won't this year - but one in ten Americans who didn't travel by plane during the 2000 holiday season will in 2001.

Fear of flying is a factor in the expected drop in air travel for the holidays. Among those who say they are not at all afraid of flying, just about the same percentage - one in four - report plans to fly this Thanksgiving or Christmas as say they flew last year.
But far fewer of those afraid or bothered by flying plan to travel by =
plane this year than did so for the 2000-20
holidays. Just 8 percent of fearful fliers say they plan to travel by =
plane this year, while twice as many, 15-20
percent, say they flew last year. Twelve percent of those bothered =
slightly by flying say they'll fly this year;=20
18 percent of that group say they flew last year.=20
=20
AIRPORT SECURITY=20
=20
The public clearly believes the government should take an increased role =
in airport security - and take the=20
responsibility for hiring and supervising airport security employees. =
And while more think the government=20
has done enough to improve airport security since September 11 than =
think the airlines have, it's clear that=20
many think both the government and the airlines need to be doing more. =20
=20
Half of Americans say the federal government has done enough to improve =
airport security, but 42 percent=20
feel the government hasn't done enough. When asked about the airlines, =
just 42 percent say the airlines=20
have done enough to improve airport security, while 50 percent think =
they have not. =20
=20
The federal government has a major role in providing airport security, =
according to nearly all Americans.=20
When asked who should be responsible for airport security personnel, 91 =
percent say the federal=20
government should have some responsibility. But the president and the =
U.S. Senate currently are at odds on=20
what kind of government responsibility. =20
=20
The airport security bill passed by the Senate places the full =
responsibility for airport security on the federal=20
government, making those workers government employees. President Bush =
favors government supervision=20
of private contractors. The public clearly takes the Senate's side, 52 =
percent to 39 percent. Forty-six percent=20
of Republicans agree with the Democratic-controlled Senate on this =
issue.=20
=20
Despite Americans' focus on airport security and the significant decline =
in air travel, 46 percent the public=20
say they are not at all afraid to fly, up just slightly from September, =
immediately after the attacks. Thirty-
one percent say flying bothers them slightly and 21 percent admit they =
are afraid of flying. But fears do=20
influence behavior. Among those who have actually flown since September =
11, only 3 percent say they're=20
afraid of flying.=20
=20
THE PRESIDENT=20
=20
The president continues to enjoy exceptionally high approval ratings for =
his handling of the attacks on the=20
World Trade Center and the Pentagon, but they have gone down slightly =
from earlier this month. As was the case at the start of the U.S. military attacks on Afghanistan, Americans overwhelmingly approve of the job President Bush is doing. Large majorities approve of his handling of the war on terrorism, foreign policy and the economy.

Eighty-seven percent of Americans now approve of Mr. Bush's job as president while only 8 percent disapprove. A few weeks ago, Mr. Bush received an overall job approval of 90 percent, his highest to date.

When it comes to his handling of foreign policy, Mr. Bush's rating has gone up significantly since before the terrorist attacks in September. Currently, 74 percent of Americans approve of the way the president is handling foreign policy, up from 49 percent two months ago.

Now, 88 percent approve of his handling of the attacks and 8 percent disapprove. Earlier this month, 92 percent approved and 4 percent disapproved. When asked specifically how Mr. Bush is handling the war on terrorism, 79 percent approve of the job he is doing, while 16 percent disapprove.

Despite the impact of the terrorist attacks on the U.S. economy, a majority of Americans also approve of the job Mr. Bush is doing handling it. Almost two-thirds now approve of his handling of this issue.

However, this is down somewhat from a few weeks ago when 71 percent of the public approved of the job Mr. Bush was doing - the highest economic approval rating Bush had received since assuming office. Only 25 percent disapprove of his handling of the economy.

Congressional approval has also risen since September. Now, 67 percent approve of the job Congress is doing, up from 43 percent in August.

TRUSTING GOVERNMENT MORE - UP TO A POINT

The increase in government support that has been noted since September 11th as the nation rallied itself after the attack may, even now, have limits. While trust in government is higher than before the attacks, it is lower than that recorded in some polls just a few weeks ago. And there is no indication that the public is significantly more supportive of a larger government supplying more services than it was before the attacks.

In this poll, 61 percent say that things in this country are generally headed in the right direction, a level not reached or neared since two other rally points - the end of the Persian Gulf War and the revelations about President Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky in early 1998. Just 29 percent say things are on the wrong
track. But in the week following September 11, as many as 72 percent of Americans in an NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll said things were headed in the right direction.

More than half—55 percent—say they trust the government in Washington to do what is right all or most of the time—more than ever recorded in a CBS News/New York Times poll. But that figure, too, is down from one recorded in a Washington Post poll conducted in late September.

There is a partisan cast to those figures, with Republicans more trusting of government than Democrats—at least for now. Independents look more like Democrats than like Republicans on this question.

However, while more Americans trust government, more also say they do not want government to get bigger. Only four in ten say they want to have a bigger government, providing more services. Nearly half want a smaller government providing fewer services. The percentages are not all that much different from those seen earlier this year.

In addition, a majority still believes that people in government waste a lot of money paid in taxes.

THE MIDDLE EAST

The terrorist attacks appear to have changed little in American overall attitudes towards Israel, nor have they lessened public support for Israel in the Middle East conflict. Forty-eight percent now say they are more in sympathy with Israel with regard to the situation in the Middle East, 19 percent say they sympathize more with the Arab nations and 13 percent sympathize with neither. These views are largely unchanged compared with those ten years ago.

Six in ten Americans have a favorable opinion about Israel. Just under a quarter have an unfavorable opinion of Israel—views that are virtually unchanged since April 1998.

In contrast, 22 percent say they have a favorable opinion about the Palestine Liberation Organization, while 57 percent say their opinion is unfavorable. Favorable views of the P.L.O. have doubled, however, from three and a half years ago; then, only 11 percent said their opinion of the P.L.O. was favorable.

Most Americans reject charges that that the U.S. has failed to adequately promote itself in the Middle East. Sixty-two percent think the government is currently doing enough to help people in the Arab world understand what the U.S. is trying to do there, and 28 percent think it is not.
Many also reject the statement that a major cause of the problems for the U.S. in the Middle East is that we have paid too much attention to Israel, and not enough attention to the Arab nations. Thirty-nine percent agree with that, but 46 percent disagree.

Men are more critical of the U.S. Middle East policy than women. Forty-nine percent of men think U.S. policy in the Middle East is a major cause of the problems in the region, compared with 29 percent of women who think so.

There has been a slight increase in support for one Arab goal - the establishment of a Palestinian state. Thirty-eight percent favor the establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Twenty-nine percent oppose that, and another one-third have no opinion.

But opinions of Saudi Arabia are not as positive as they have been in the past. Most Americans do view Saudi Arabia as friendly towards the United States, but fewer see it as an ally than did so one year ago. Only one in ten consider Saudi Arabia an ally of the United States, and about half now view Saudi Arabia as friendly but not an ally. In a Gallup poll in May 2000, 19 percent of those polled thought of Saudi Arabia as an ally. Now, 37 percent said it was friendly but not an ally. Nearly a third now consider Saudi Arabia as unfriendly or an enemy.

This poll was conducted among a nationwide random sample of 1,024 adults, interviewed by telephone October 25-28, 2001. The error due to sampling could be plus or minus three percentage points for results based on the entire sample.
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Please post the following on AAPORNET  
Thanks Patsy

Subject: Survey Operations Site Director, St. Louis Missouri

Battelle, a world leader in research and technology, has an opening for the Director of our survey operations office in St. Louis, Missouri. This office is part of Battelle's Centers for Public Health Research and Evaluation (CPHRE) and supports CPHRE's survey operations.  

This Director is responsible for providing significant leadership in procuring and managing funded work, as well as being responsible for the personnel and financial management of the St. Louis office. This Director participates in a management team involved in CPHRE's strategic planning.

The qualified candidate should hold an advanced degree in a field relevant to survey research/survey methodology. Must possess 10 or more years of experience in operational management and procuring government and private research contracts. Excellent technical, managerial and communications skills are essential. An outstanding professional reputation for the successful conduct of survey research projects is mandatory.

Battelle offers a comprehensive salary and benefits package. If qualified, please respond to http://www.battelle.org/jobs position #102784. Battelle is an Affirmative Action/EOE.

Patricia M. Henderson  
Site Manager / Battelle's St. Louis Office  
Centers for Public Health Research and Evaluation  
1101 Olivette Executive Office Parkway, Suite 200  
Saint Louis, Missouri 63132  
314-993-5234, ext. 101  
Tollfree: 800-444-5234, ext. 101  
FAX: 314-993-5163  
hendersp@battelle.org
There are many elements to this crisis and the NYT/CBS poll has covered them very well. The writers emphasis seems to be on any changes in measures observed since prior waves which is not unusual.

The Polling Report has a good summary of this and other national polls at: http://www.pollingreport.com/terror.htm

For a Tribune Poll in Illinois that ran last Sunday, I tried more of a "global" question which could be used over time to measure the progress the nation is making regardless of the form of terrorist activity now or in the future. "Thinking about the progress the nation is making in its campaign against terrorism, how satisfied are you with the progress we are making...?"

Satisfied (Net)  80
Very satisfied      36
Somewhat satisfied 45

Dissatisfied (Net) 14
Very dissatisfied  5
Somewhat dissatisfied 9

No opinion 5
Stephen Salmore wrote:
> Compare this article to the article on the same poll on the CBS News site.
> Are they looking at the same numbers?
> NYT: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
> CBS: Support For War Effort Is Strong
> CBS article is attached.
> --Stephen Salmore
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
> To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2001 12:09 AM 
> Subject: NYT/CBS NEWS POLL: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
> (NYTimes)
> 
> October 30, 2001
> 
> THE POLL
> 
> SURVEY SHOWS DOUBTS STIRRING ON TERROR WAR
> 
> By RICHARD L. BERKE and JANET ELDER
> 
> Americans for the first time are raising doubts about whether the nation can accomplish its objectives in fighting terrorism at home and abroad, including capturing or killing Osama bin Laden, saving the international alliance from unraveling and protecting people from future attacks, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows.
> 
> Despite threats about anthrax unfolding virtually every day and little discernible progress in the air campaign against the Taliban, Americans are still offering President Bush their overwhelming approval.
> 
> Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which soared after Sept. 11, stands firm at 87 percent. And Congress has an approval rating of 67 percent, the highest since the Times/CBS News Poll began asking about it in the 1970's.
> 
> Even so, after six weeks in which people were not inclined to critique
aspects of the government's response, there are stirrings of discontent
that extend both to how the nation is responding to domestic terrorism
and to how it is handling the war.

The public is questioning whether the government is doing enough to
forestall what it increasingly expects to be another terrorist attack in
this country within months. Fifty-three percent say another attack is
very likely, up from 46 percent two weeks ago and 36 percent two weeks
before that. Most people say they expect the attack to be in the form of
bioterrorism. These responses came before Attorney General John Ashcroft
announced yesterday that new terrorist attacks were expected as soon as
this week.

Yet more than half the public says the government in Washington has not
done enough to prepare for a biological attack, and nor have state and
local governments.

Nearly half of Americans say the government is withholding information
they need to know about the recent anthrax cases. More than a quarter say
public health officials are wrong in advising people not to ask their
own doctors for Cipro, an antibiotic used in treating anthrax.

While security has been tightened at airports, leading to the now-common
sight of long lines, Americans are still jumpy about flying. They want
the federal government to take complete control of hiring and supervising
all airport security personnel.

The nationwide telephone poll of 1,024 adults was conducted Thursday
through Sunday. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three
percentage points.

Tom Cale, a poll respondent who sells cars in Fairmont, W.Va., is among
those who support the nation's leaders but have nagging concerns.

"It's not that we don't have competent people in positions of authority,"
Mr. Cale, 50, said in a follow-up interview. "They just haven't written
the book yet about the potential dangers that are out there."

Bracing for more terror, Mr. Cale said: "The next attack would be what
you least suspect. It's going to be something that few people would see
that would affect the most people, like sabotaging gas supply lines, or
taking out two or three main power stations."

Joan Kautz, 49, a clerk for a rental car agency in Linden, N.J., said:
"With the added security at the airport, bioterrorism is the only way to
get in here. That's why they've used the mail, and even now the
government is not protecting our postal workers."

In one of the most striking shifts, only 18 percent of Americans said
they had a great deal of confidence that the government could protect
them from terrorism; a month ago, 35 percent had such confidence. A
majority, 58 percent, said they had a fair amount of confidence. The rest
had little or no confidence.

Similarly, people feel that the government can protect them from anthrax and smallpox, but the degree of confidence is another matter. Only 15 percent have a great deal of confidence that the government can protect them from anthrax; 19 percent say the same about smallpox.

Beyond the efforts at home, Americans are not entirely satisfied with the military action in Afghanistan and seem less hopeful than they were before the bombing began. Although most respondents said the war was going well for the United States, the largest proportion—58 percent—said it was going only somewhat well. Twenty-five percent said it was going very well, and 13 percent said the war was going badly.

Only 28 percent are very confident that the United States will capture or kill Mr. bin Laden, who is believed to be the mastermind behind the Sept. 11 attacks. In a CBS News poll two weeks earlier, 38 percent said they were very confident.

"Osama bin Laden is like a ghost," said Eleanor Roth, 67, a retired receptionist from Dayton, Ohio. "I would rather him be captured than killed to avoid him being labeled a martyr. Maybe they will find him, but then again, many of these terrorists have been on the loose for years. And with all of our technology, it doesn't seem to make a difference."

James Oleszcsuk, 57, a longshoreman from Baltimore, was even less optimistic.

"It won't be easy getting bin Laden," Mr. Oleszcsuk said. "First it was weeks, then months, now years to get this guy. It makes me wonder what kind of intelligence reports the government is getting. You hear so many things, you don't know what to believe. The political implications of capturing him would be problematic with many of the Middle Eastern countries. I don't think it's going to happen."

In another sign of mounting uneasiness about the war, only 29 percent said they were very confident in the ability of the United States government to maintain the international alliance of countries that support the military campaign; two weeks ago, 46 percent were very confident.

The public is prepared for a long and bloody conflict in Afghanistan; a majority of Americans say they are willing to accept the deaths of several thousand American troops there. Eight out of 10 respondents said they thought the conflict would extend beyond Afghanistan into neighboring countries and other parts of the world.

"I wouldn't be surprised if this war took three to five years," said Judy Adams, 48, a homemaker from Jonesville, La. "We have fought for our country for over 200 years to keep our land and our families safe. If we don't stand behind our president and pull together as a nation, we're not
going to see our land stand."

Americans continue to view Israel favorably while they back the establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. About half the public views Saudi Arabia as a friend of the United States but not an ally.

There were signs of anxiety in the poll, perhaps because it was conducted at a time when developments have made people feel more vulnerable. In recent days, the Bush administration and leaders on Capitol Hill appeared to lack a coordinated message in responding to the anthrax threat.

Most Americans say they have been closely following the news about anthrax sent through the mail, and many have begun handling their own mail more cautiously.

The poll turned up mixed messages about the extent to which people are panicky. While they are concerned about whether the government can protect them, Americans are calm at home. Only a quarter say they are worried about terrorism in their own communities. While 20 percent of Americans say they are more on edge now than they were before the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, few say they are having trouble sleeping or are experiencing a loss of income.

For all their misgivings about the government's capacity to protect them, the public remains steadfast behind its leaders. Most people say that Mr. Bush has clearly explained the goals of both the military action in Afghanistan and the war against terrorism in general.

Nearly 8 in 10 respondents approve of the way Mr. Bush is handling the war on terrorism; more than 6 in 10 approve his handling of the economy. Six in 10 Americans now say the country is moving in the right direction.

Last June, well before the attacks, only 4 in 10 said the same thing.

The public's support for its leaders and government extends far beyond the White House. Over almost the last three decades, the job approval rating for Congress has never approached 67 percent, where it stands today.

The Watergate scandals first eroded the public's trust in government. For more than 27 years, people said they were more distrustful of government than trusting.

But in the aftermath of Sept. 11, people hold a different view. Now, more than half of Americans said they trusted the government to do what was right just about always or most of the time. In 1998, when the Times/CBS News Poll last asked the question, only 26 percent said they trusted the government.
Still, the poll found that the public was not prepared for a more activist government. Despite the high profile of many government agencies since Sept. 11, people still favored a smaller government with fewer services over a bigger government with more services, 52 percent to 43 percent.

Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did not know what to expect now.

"I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, 'What's next?'"

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/30/national/30POLL.html
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There are many elements to this crisis and the NYT/CBS poll has covered them very well. The writers emphasis seems to be on any changes in measures observed since prior waves which is not unusual.

The Polling Report has a good summary of this and other national polls at:
http://www.pollingreport.com/terror.htm

For a Tribune Poll in Illinois that ran last Sunday, I tried more of a "global" question which could be used over time to measure the progress the nation is making regardless of the form of terrorist activity now or in the future.
"Thinking about the progress the nation is making in its campaign against terrorism, how satisfied are you with the progress we are making...?"

Satisfied (Net) 80
Very satisfied 36
Somewhat satisfied 45
Dissatisfied (Net) 14
Very dissatisfied 5
Somewhat dissatisfied 9
No opinion 5

Stephen Salmore wrote:

Compare this article to the article on the same poll on the CBS News site.
Are they looking at the same numbers?
NYT: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
CBS: Support For War Effort Is Strong
CBS article is attached.

--- Stephen Salmore

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" &lt;beniger@rcf.usc.edu&gt;
To: "AAPORNET" &lt;aapornet@usc.edu&gt;
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2001 12:09 AM
Subject: NYT/CBS NEWS POLL: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War

(NYTimes)

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/30/national/30POLL.html
Americans for the first time are raising doubts about whether the nation can accomplish its objectives in fighting terrorism at home and abroad, including capturing or killing Osama bin Laden, saving the international alliance from unraveling and protecting people from future attacks, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows.

Despite threats about anthrax unfolding virtually every day and little discernible progress in the air campaign against the Taliban, Americans are still offering President Bush their overwhelming approval. Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which soared after Sept. 11, stands firm at 87 percent. And Congress has an approval rating of 67 percent, the highest since the Times/CBS News Poll began asking about it in the 1970's.

Even so, after six weeks in which people were not inclined to critique aspects of the government's response, there are stirrings of discontent that extend both to how the nation is responding to domestic terrorism and to how it is handling the war.

The public is questioning whether the government is doing enough to forestall what it increasingly expects to be another terrorist attack in this country within months. Fifty-three percent say another attack is very likely, up from 46 percent two weeks ago and 36 percent two weeks before that. Most people say they expect the attack to be in the form of bioterrorism. These responses came before Attorney General John Ashcroft announced yesterday that new terrorist attacks were expected as soon as this week.
Yet more than half the public says the government in Washington has not done enough to prepare for a biological attack, and nor have state and local governments.

Nearly half of Americans say the government is withholding information they need to know about the recent anthrax cases. More than a quarter say public health officials are wrong in advising people not to ask their own doctors for Cipro, an antibiotic used in treating anthrax.

While security has been tightened at airports, leading to the now-common sight of long lines, Americans are still jumpy about flying. They want the federal government to take complete control of hiring and supervising all airport security personnel.

The nationwide telephone poll of 1,024 adults was conducted Thursday through Sunday. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points.

Tom Cale, a poll respondent who sells cars in Fairmont, W.Va., is among those who support the nation's leaders but have nagging concerns.

"It's not that we don't have competent people in positions of authority," Mr. Cale, 50, said in a follow-up interview. "They just haven't written the book yet about the potential dangers that are out there."

Bracing for more terror, Mr. Cale said: "The next attack would be what you least suspect. It's going to be something that few people would see that would affect the most people, like sabotaging gas supply lines, or taking out two or three main power stations."

Joan Kautz, 49, a clerk for a rental car agency in Linden, N.J., said: "With the added security at the airport, bioterrorism is the only way to get in here. That's why they've used the mail, and even now the government is not protecting our postal workers."

In one of the most striking shifts, only 18 percent of Americans
they had a great deal of confidence that the government could protect
them from terrorism; a month ago, 35 percent had such confidence. A
majority, 58 percent, said they had a fair amount of confidence. The rest
had little or no confidence.

Similarly, people feel that the government can protect them from anthrax
and smallpox, but the degree of confidence is another matter. Only 15
percent have a great deal of confidence that the government can protect
them from anthrax; 19 percent say the same about smallpox.

Beyond the efforts at home, Americans are not entirely satisfied with the
combat mission in Afghanistan and seem less hopeful than they were
before the bombing began. Although most respondents said the war was
going well for the United States, the largest proportion—58 percent—said it was
going only somewhat well. Twenty-five percent said it was
going very well, and 13 percent said the war was going badly.

Only 28 percent are very confident that the United States will capture or
kill Mr. bin Laden, who is believed to be the mastermind behind the Sept.
11 attacks. In a CBS News poll two weeks earlier, 38 percent said they
were very confident.

"Osama bin Laden is like a ghost," said Eleanor Roth, 67, a retired
receptionist from Dayton, Ohio. "I would rather him be captured than
killed to avoid him being labeled a martyr. Maybe they will find him, but
then again, many of these terrorists have been on the loose for years.
And with all of our technology, it doesn't seem to make a difference."

James Oleszcsuk, 57, a longshoreman from Baltimore, was even less
optimistic.

"It won't be easy getting bin Laden," Mr. Oleszcsuk said. "First it was
weeks, then months, now years to get this guy. It makes me wonder what
kind of intelligence reports the government is getting. You hear so many
things, you don't know what to believe. The political implications of capturing him would be problematic with many of the Middle Eastern countries. I don't think it's going to happen."

In another sign of mounting uneasiness about the war, only 29 percent said they were very confident in the ability of the United States government to maintain the international alliance of countries that support the military campaign; two weeks ago, 46 percent were very confident. The public is prepared for a long and bloody conflict in Afghanistan; a majority of Americans say they are willing to accept the deaths of several thousand American troops there. Eight out of 10 respondents said they thought the conflict would extend beyond Afghanistan into neighboring countries and other parts of the world. "I wouldn't be surprised if this war took three to five years," said Judy Adams, 48, a homemaker from Jonesville, La. "We have fought for our country for over 200 years to keep our land and our families safe. If we don't stand behind our president and pull together as a nation, we're not going to see our land stand."

Americans continue to view Israel favorably while they back the establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. About half the public views Saudi Arabia as a friend of the United States but not an ally. There were signs of anxiety in the poll, perhaps because it was conducted at a time when developments have made people feel more vulnerable. In recent days, the Bush administration and leaders on Capitol Hill appeared to lack a coordinated message in responding to the anthrax threat.
Most Americans say they have been closely following the news about anthrax sent through the mail, and many have begun handling their own mail more cautiously. The poll turned up mixed messages about the extent to which people are panicky. While they are concerned about whether the government can protect them, Americans are calm at home. Only a quarter say they are worried about terrorism in their own communities. While 20 percent of Americans say they are more on edge now than they were before the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, few say they are having trouble sleeping or are experiencing a loss of income. For all their misgivings about the government's capacity to protect them, the public remains steadfast behind its leaders. Most people say that Mr. Bush has clearly explained the goals of both the military action in Afghanistan and the war against terrorism in general. Nearly 8 in 10 respondents approve of the way Mr. Bush is handling the war on terrorism; more than 6 in 10 approve his handling of the economy. Six in 10 Americans now say the country is moving in the right direction. Last June, well before the attacks, only 4 in 10 said the same thing. The public's support for its leaders and government extends far beyond the White House. Over almost the last three decades, the job approval rating for Congress has never approached 67 percent, where it stands today. The Watergate scandals first eroded the public's trust in government. For more than 27 years, people said they were more distrustful of government than trusting. But in the aftermath of Sept. 11, people hold a different view. Now, more than half of Americans said they trusted the government to do what was
right just about always or most of the time. In 1998, when the Times/CBS News Poll last asked the question, only 26 percent said they trusted the government.

Still, the poll found that the public was not prepared for a more activist government. Despite the high profile of many government agencies since Sept. 11, people still favored a smaller government with fewer services over a bigger government with more services, 52 percent to 43 percent.

Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did not know what to expect now. "I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, 'What's next?'

Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did not know what to expect now. "I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, 'What's next?'"
On Wed, 31 Oct 2001, Nick Panagakis wrote:

> For a Tribune Poll in Illinois that ran last Sunday, I tried more of a "global"
> question which could be used over time to measure the progress the nation is
> making regardless of the form of terrorist activity now or in the future.

> Thinking about the progress the nation is making in its campaign against
> terrorism, how satisfied are you with the progress we are making...?

Nick,
Doesn't using the word "progress"--two times, in a single, two-line sentence--bias the responses? Isn't it rather difficult for any one of us to be "dissatisfied" with anything we are told is "progress," as made by anyone (not to mention our own "nation"--and against "terrorism" yet)?

-- Jim

********

> Satisfied (Net) 80
> Very satisfied 36
> Somewhat satisfied 45
>
> Dissatisfied (Net) 14
> Very dissatisfied 5
> Somewhat dissatisfied 9
>
> No opinion 5
>
> Stephen Salmore wrote:
>
> Compare this article to the article on the same poll on the CBS News site.
> Are they looking at the same numbers?
>
> NYT: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
> CBS: Support For War Effort Is Strong
>
> CBS article is attached.
>
> --Stephen Salmore
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Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2001 12:09 AM
Subject: NYT/CBS NEWS POLL: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
(NYTimes)
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Americans for the first time are raising doubts about whether the nation can accomplish its objectives in fighting terrorism at home and abroad, including capturing or killing Osama bin Laden, saving the international alliance from unraveling and protecting people from future attacks, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows. Despite threats about anthrax unfolding virtually every day and little discernible progress in the air campaign against the Taliban, Americans are still offering President Bush their overwhelming approval. Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which soared after Sept. 11, stands firm at 87 percent. And Congress has an approval rating of 67 percent, the highest since the Times/CBS News Poll began asking about it in the 1970's. Even so, after six weeks in which people were not inclined to critique aspects of the government's response, there are stirrings of discontent that extend both to how the nation is responding to domestic terrorism and to how it is handling the war. The public is questioning whether the government is doing enough to forestall what it increasingly expects to be another terrorist attack in this country within months. Fifty-three percent say another attack is very likely, up from 46 percent two weeks ago and 36 percent two weeks before that. Most people say they expect the attack to be in the form of bioterrorism. These responses came before Attorney General John Ashcroft announced yesterday that new terrorist attacks were expected as soon as this week. Yet more than half the public says the government in Washington has not done enough to prepare for a biological attack, and nor have state and local governments. Nearly half of Americans say the government is withholding information they need to know about the recent anthrax cases. More than a quarter say public health officials are wrong in advising people not to ask their
doctors for Cipro, an antibiotic used in treating anthrax.

While security has been tightened at airports, leading to the now-common sight of long lines, Americans are still jumpy about flying. They want the federal government to take complete control of hiring and supervising all airport security personnel.

The nationwide telephone poll of 1,024 adults was conducted Thursday through Sunday. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points.

Tom Cale, a poll respondent who sells cars in Fairmont, W.Va., is among those who support the nation's leaders but have nagging concerns.

"It's not that we don't have competent people in positions of authority," Mr. Cale, 50, said in a follow-up interview. "They just haven't written the book yet about the potential dangers that are out there."

Bracing for more terror, Mr. Cale said: "The next attack would be what you least suspect. It's going to be something that few people would see that would affect the most people, like sabotaging gas supply lines, or taking out two or three main power stations."

Joan Kautz, 49, a clerk for a rental car agency in Linden, N.J., said: "With the added security at the airport, bioterrorism is the only way to get in here. That's why they've used the mail, and even now the government is not protecting our postal workers."

In one of the most striking shifts, only 18 percent of Americans said they had a great deal of confidence that the government could protect them from terrorism; a month ago, 35 percent had such confidence. A majority, 58 percent, said they had a fair amount of confidence. The rest had little or no confidence.

Similarly, people feel that the government can protect them from anthrax and smallpox, but the degree of confidence is another matter. Only 15 percent have a great deal of confidence that the government can protect them from anthrax; 19 percent say the same about smallpox.

Beyond the efforts at home, Americans are not entirely satisfied with the military action in Afghanistan and seem less hopeful than they were before the bombing began. Although most respondents said the war was going well for the United States, the largest proportion--58 percent--
said it was going only somewhat well. Twenty-five percent said it was
going very well, and 13 percent said the war was going badly.

Only 28 percent are very confident that the United States will capture
or
kill Mr. bin Laden, who is believed to be the mastermind behind the
Sept. 11 attacks. In a CBS News poll two weeks earlier, 38 percent said they
were very confident.

"Osama bin Laden is like a ghost," said Eleanor Roth, 67, a retired
receptionist from Dayton, Ohio. "I would rather him be captured than
killed to avoid him being labeled a martyr. Maybe they will find him, but
then again, many of these terrorists have been on the loose for years.
And with all of our technology, it doesn't seem to make a difference."

James Oleszcsuk, 57, a longshoreman from Baltimore, was even less
optimistic.

"It won't be easy getting bin Laden," Mr. Oleszcsuk said. "First it was
weeks, then months, now years to get this guy. It makes me wonder what
kind of intelligence reports the government is getting. You hear so many
things, you don't know what to believe. The political implications of
capturing him would be problematic with many of the Middle Eastern
countries. I don't think it's going to happen."

In another sign of mounting uneasiness about the war, only 29 percent
said they were very confident in the ability of the United States
government to maintain the international alliance of countries that
support the military campaign; two weeks ago, 46 percent were very
confident.

The public is prepared for a long and bloody conflict in Afghanistan;
a majority of Americans say they are willing to accept the deaths of
several thousand American troops there. Eight out of 10 respondents said
they thought the conflict would extend beyond Afghanistan into
neighboring countries and other parts of the world.

"I wouldn't be surprised if this war took three to five years," said Judy
Adams, 48, a homemaker from Jonesville, La. "We have fought for our
country for over 200 years to keep our land and our families safe. If we
don't stand behind our president and pull together as a nation, we're not
going to see our land stand."

Americans continue to view Israel favorably while they back the
establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of
the West Bank and Gaza Strip. About half the public views Saudi Arabia as
a friend of the United States but not an ally.
There were signs of anxiety in the poll, perhaps because it was conducted at a time when developments have made people feel more vulnerable. In recent days, the Bush administration and leaders on Capitol Hill appeared to lack a coordinated message in responding to the anthrax threat. Most Americans say they have been closely following the news about anthrax sent through the mail, and many have begun handling their own mail more cautiously.

The poll turned up mixed messages about the extent to which people are panicky. While they are concerned about whether the government can protect them, Americans are calm at home. Only a quarter say they are worried about terrorism in their own communities. While 20 percent of Americans say they are more on edge now than they were before the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, few say they are having trouble sleeping or are experiencing a loss of income.

For all their misgivings about the government's capacity to protect them, the public remains steadfast behind its leaders. Most people say that Mr. Bush has clearly explained the goals of both the military action in Afghanistan and the war against terrorism in general. Nearly 8 in 10 respondents approve of the way Mr. Bush is handling the war on terrorism; more than 6 in 10 approve his handling of the economy.

Six in 10 Americans now say the country is moving in the right direction. Last June, well before the attacks, only 4 in 10 said the same thing.

The public's support for its leaders and government extends far beyond the White House. Over almost the last three decades, the job approval rating for Congress has never approached 67 percent, where it stands today.

The Watergate scandals first eroded the public's trust in government. For more than 27 years, people said they were more distrustful of government than trusting.

But in the aftermath of Sept. 11, people hold a different view. Now, more than half of Americans said they trusted the government to do what was right just about always or most of the time. In 1998, when the Times/CBS News Poll last asked the question, only 26 percent said they trusted the government.

Still, the poll found that the public was not prepared for a more activist government. Despite the high profile of many government
since Sept. 11, people still favored a smaller government with fewer services over a bigger government with more services, 52 percent to 43 percent.

Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did not know what to expect now.

"I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, 'What's next?'"
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I am personally less troubled by the second "progress" which seems to me to be close to asking about "how well we are doing" than the first, which COULD imply there is progress, in contrast to "Thinking about the campaign against terrorism, how satisfied". Still, I would tend to avoid the word "progress", or add "if any", to increase the "face neutrality" of the question.

At 07:41 AM 10/31/2001 -0800, Jim Beniger wrote:

> On Wed, 31 Oct 2001, Nick Panagakis wrote:
> >> For a Tribune Poll in Illinois that ran last Sunday, I tried more of a "global"
> >> question which could be used over time to measure the progress the nation is making regardless of the form of terrorist activity now or in the future.
> >> Thinking about the progress the nation is making in its campaign against terrorism, how satisfied are you with the progress we are making...?
>
> Nick,
>
> Doesn't using the word "progress"--two times, in a single, two-line sentence--bias the responses? Isn't it rather difficult for any one of us to be "dissatisfied" with anything we are told is "progress," as made by anyone (not to mention our own "nation"--and against "terrorism" yet)?

    -- Jim

> ********

>> Satisfied (Net) 80
>> Very satisfied 36
>> Somewhat satisfied 45
>>
>> Dissatisfied (Net) 14
>> Very dissatisfied 5
>> Somewhat dissatisfied 9
>>
>> No opinion 5

>> Stephen Salmore wrote:
>>
>> > Compare this article to the article on the same poll on the CBS News site.
Are they looking at the same numbers?

NYT: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
CBS: Support For War Effort Is Strong

CBS article is attached.

--Stephen Salmore

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2001 12:09 AM
Subject: NYT/CBS NEWS POLL: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
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THE POLL

SURVEY SHOWS DOUBTS STIRRING ON TERROR WAR

By RICHARD L. BERKE and JANET ELDER

Americans for the first time are raising doubts about whether the nation can accomplish its objectives in fighting terrorism at home and abroad, including capturing or killing Osama bin Laden, saving the international alliance from unraveling and protecting people from future attacks, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows.

Despite threats about anthrax unfolding virtually every day and little discernible progress in the air campaign against the Taliban, Americans are still offering President Bush their overwhelming approval. Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which soared after Sept. 11, stands firm at 87 percent. And Congress has an approval rating of 67 percent, the
highest since the Times/CBS News Poll began asking about it in the 1970's.

Even so, after six weeks in which people were not inclined to critique aspects of the government's response, there are stirrings of discontent that extend both to how the nation is responding to domestic terrorism and to how it is handling the war.

The public is questioning whether the government is doing enough to forestall what it increasingly expects to be another terrorist attack in this country within months. Fifty-three percent say another attack is very likely, up from 46 percent two weeks ago and 36 percent two weeks before that. Most people say they expect the attack to be in the form of bioterrorism. These responses came before Attorney General John Ashcroft announced yesterday that new terrorist attacks were expected as soon as this week.

Yet more than half the public says the government in Washington has not done enough to prepare for a biological attack, and nor have state and local governments.

Nearly half of Americans say the government is withholding information they need to know about the recent anthrax cases. More than a quarter say public health officials are wrong in advising people not to ask their own doctors for Cipro, an antibiotic used in treating anthrax.

While security has been tightened at airports, leading to the now-common sight of long lines, Americans are still jumpy about flying. They want the federal government to take complete control of hiring and supervising all airport security personnel.

The nationwide telephone poll of 1,024 adults was conducted Thursday through Sunday. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points.

Tom Cale, a poll respondent who sells cars in Fairmont, W.Va., is among those who support the nation's leaders but have nagging concerns.

"It's not that we don't have competent people in positions of
Mr. Cale, 50, said in a follow-up interview. "They just haven't written the book yet about the potential dangers that are out there."

Bracing for more terror, Mr. Cale said: "The next attack would be what you least suspect. It's going to be something that few people would see that would affect the most people, like sabotaging gas supply lines, or taking out two or three main power stations."

Joan Kautz, 49, a clerk for a rental car agency in Linden, N.J., said: "With the added security at the airport, bioterrorism is the only way to get in here. That's why they've used the mail, and even now the government is not protecting our postal workers."

In one of the most striking shifts, only 18 percent of Americans said they had a great deal of confidence that the government could protect them from terrorism; a month ago, 35 percent had such confidence. A majority, 58 percent, said they had a fair amount of confidence. The rest had little or no confidence.

Similarly, people feel that the government can protect them from anthrax and smallpox, but the degree of confidence is another matter. Only 15 percent have a great deal of confidence that the government can protect them from anthrax; 19 percent say the same about smallpox.

Beyond the efforts at home, Americans are not entirely satisfied with the military action in Afghanistan and seem less hopeful than they were before the bombing began. Although most respondents said the war was going well for the United States, the largest proportion—58 percent—said it was going only somewhat well. Twenty-five percent said it was going very well, and 13 percent said the war was going badly.

Only 28 percent are very confident that the United States will capture or kill Mr. bin Laden, who is believed to be the mastermind behind the Sept. 11 attacks. In a CBS News poll two weeks earlier, 38 percent said they were very confident.

"Osama bin Laden is like a ghost," said Eleanor Roth, 67, a retired receptionist from Dayton, Ohio. "I would rather him be captured than killed to avoid him being labeled a martyr. Maybe they will find him, but then again, many of these terrorists have been on the loose for years."
And with all of our technology, it doesn't seem to make a difference."

James Oleszcsuk, 57, a longshoreman from Baltimore, was even less optimistic.

"It won't be easy getting bin Laden," Mr. Oleszcsuk said. "First it was weeks, then months, now years to get this guy. It makes me wonder what kind of intelligence reports the government is getting. You hear so many things, you don't know what to believe. The political implications of capturing him would be problematic with many of the Middle Eastern countries. I don't think it's going to happen."

In another sign of mounting uneasiness about the war, only 29 percent said they were very confident in the ability of the United States government to maintain the international alliance of countries that support the military campaign; two weeks ago, 46 percent were very confident.

The public is prepared for a long and bloody conflict in Afghanistan; a majority of Americans say they are willing to accept the deaths of several thousand American troops there. Eight out of 10 respondents said they thought the conflict would extend beyond Afghanistan into neighboring countries and other parts of the world.

"I wouldn't be surprised if this war took three to five years," said Judy Adams, 48, a homemaker from Jonesville, La. "We have fought for our country for over 200 years to keep our land and our families safe. If we don't stand behind our president and pull together as a nation, we're not going to see our land stand."

Americans continue to view Israel favorably while they back the establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. About half the public views Saudi Arabia as a friend of the United States but not an ally.

There were signs of anxiety in the poll, perhaps because it was conducted at a time when developments have made people feel more vulnerable. In recent days, the Bush administration and leaders on Capitol Hill appeared to lack a coordinated message in responding to the anthrax threat.

Most Americans say they have been closely following the news about anthrax sent through the mail, and many have begun handling their own mail more cautiously.
The poll turned up mixed messages about the extent to which people are panicky. While they are concerned about whether the government can protect them, Americans are calm at home. Only a quarter say they are worried about terrorism in their own communities. While 20 percent of Americans say they are more on edge now than they were before the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, few say they are having trouble sleeping or are experiencing a loss of income.

For all their misgivings about the government's capacity to protect them, the public remains steadfast behind its leaders. Most people say that Mr. Bush has clearly explained the goals of both the military action in Afghanistan and the war against terrorism in general.

Nearly 8 in 10 respondents approve of the way Mr. Bush is handling the war on terrorism; more than 6 in 10 approve his handling of the economy.

Six in 10 Americans now say the country is moving in the right direction.

Last June, well before the attacks, only 4 in 10 said the same thing.

The public's support for its leaders and government extends far beyond the White House. Over almost the last three decades, the job approval rating for Congress has never approached 67 percent, where it stands today.

The Watergate scandals first eroded the public's trust in government. For more than 27 years, people said they were more distrustful of government than trusting.

But in the aftermath of Sept. 11, people hold a different view. Now, more than half of Americans said they trusted the government to do what was right just about always or most of the time. In 1998, when the Times/CBS News Poll last asked the question, only 26 percent said they trusted the government.

Still, the poll found that the public was not prepared for a more activist government. Despite the high profile of many government agencies since Sept. 11, people still favored a smaller government with fewer services over a bigger government with more services, 52 percent to 43 percent.

Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did
"I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, `What's next?'"

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/30/national/30POLL.html
A client of ours is seeking a PR consulting. The area of expertise is higher learning at a major university. I would appreciate your help--name and contact information.

Jan Kiley
217-239-7880
I didn't think of the word "progress" as a bias because the answer choices do include very/somewhat dissatisfied. Isn't "Not making progress" a common term? I think it appears on grade school report cards. I believe progress in this context means status as in "in progress". Could be wrong about that. As for the more commonly used "U.S." (I think Jim was implying that) the war against terrorism is being waged by state and local governments and by the private sector so I used nation..

The top box "very satisfied" is the score to watch - now 36%. In light of the very tragic events, "somewhat satisfied" falls far short. Note that this is the plurality of opinion - 45%.

Nonetheless, there is room for improvement.

RE: Don's comments below. The question could read: "Thinking about the nation's campaign against terrorism, how much HEADWAY, IF ANY, do you think we are making...a lot, some, etc." Or "Thinking about the nation's campaign against terrorism, how
satisfied are you with the HEADWAY we are making...very satisfied, etc.?”

Thanks for the comments. But I do believe you agree that some "global" measure would be useful.

Nick

rom: Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>

> "I am personally less troubled by the second "progress" which seems to me to
> be close to asking about "how well we are doing" than the first, which
> COULD imply there is progress, in contrast to "Thinking about the campaign
> against terrorism, how satisfied". Still, I would tend to avoid the word
> "progress", or add "if any", to increase the "face neutrality" of the
> question.
>
> James Beniger wrote:
>
>   Nick,
>
>   Doesn't using the word "progress"--two times, in a single, two-line
>   sentence--bias the responses? Isn't it rather difficult for any one of
>   us to be "dissatisfied" with anything we are told is "progress," as made
>   by anyone (not to mention our own "nation"--and against "terrorism" yet)?
>   -- Jim
>
> On Wed, 31 Oct 2001, Nick Panagakis wrote:
>
> > For a Tribune Poll in Illinois that ran last Sunday, I tried more of a
> > "global"
> > question which could be used over time to measure the progress the nation
> > is
> > making regardless of the form of terrorist activity now or in the future.
> >
> > Thinking about the progress the nation is making in its campaign against
> > terrorism, how satisfied are you with the progress we are making...?
> > *******
>>
> > Satisfied (Net)     80
> > Very satisfied     36
> > Somewhat satisfied  45
> >
> > Dissatisfied (Net)  14
> > Very dissatisfied   5
> > Somewhat dissatisfied  9
> >
> > No opinion 5
> >
> > Stephen Salmore wrote:
> Compare this article to the article on the same poll on the CBS News site.
> Are they looking at the same numbers?
> NYT: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
> CBS: Support For War Effort Is Strong
> CBS article is attached.
> --Stephen Salmore
>
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
> To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2001 12:09 AM
> Subject: NYT/CBS NEWS POLL: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
> (NYTimes)
> 
> The Poll
> Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
> By RICHARD L. BERKE and JANET ELDER
> Americans for the first time are raising doubts about whether the nation
> can accomplish its objectives in fighting terrorism at home and
> abroad, including capturing or killing Osama bin Laden, saving the
> international alliance from unraveling and protecting people from future attacks, the
> Despite threats about anthrax unfolding virtually every day and little
discernible progress in the air campaign against the Taliban,
Americans are still offering President Bush their overwhelming approval.
Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which soared after Sept. 11, stands firm at 87 percent. And Congress has an approval rating of 67 percent, the highest since the Times/CBS News Poll began asking about it in the 1970's.

Even so, after six weeks in which people were not inclined to critique aspects of the government's response, there are stirrings of discontent that extend both to how the nation is responding to domestic terrorism and to how it is handling the war.

The public is questioning whether the government is doing enough to forestall what it increasingly expects to be another terrorist attack in this country within months. Fifty-three percent say another attack is very likely, up from 46 percent two weeks ago and 36 percent two weeks before that. Most people say they expect the attack to be in the form of bioterrorism. These responses came before Attorney General John Ashcroft announced yesterday that new terrorist attacks were expected as soon as this week.

Yet more than half the public says the government in Washington has not done enough to prepare for a biological attack, and nor have state and local governments.

Nearly half of Americans say the government is withholding information they need to know about the recent anthrax cases. More than a quarter say public health officials are wrong in advising people not to ask their own doctors for Cipro, an antibiotic used in treating anthrax.

While security has been tightened at airports, leading to the now-common sight of long lines, Americans are still jumpy about flying. They want the federal government to take complete control of hiring and supervising all airport security personnel.
The nationwide telephone poll of 1,024 adults was conducted Thursday through Sunday. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points.

Tom Cale, a poll respondent who sells cars in Fairmont, W.Va., is among those who support the nation's leaders but have nagging concerns. "It's not that we don't have competent people in positions of authority," Mr. Cale, 50, said in a follow-up interview. "They just haven't written the book yet about the potential dangers that are out there."

Bracing for more terror, Mr. Cale said: "The next attack would be what you least suspect. It's going to be something that few people would see that would affect the most people, like sabotaging gas supply lines, or taking out two or three main power stations."

Joan Kautz, 49, a clerk for a rental car agency in Linden, N.J., said: "With the added security at the airport, bioterrorism is the only way to get in here. That's why they've used the mail, and even now the government is not protecting our postal workers."

In one of the most striking shifts, only 18 percent of Americans said they had a great deal of confidence that the government could protect them from terrorism; a month ago, 35 percent had such confidence. A majority, 58 percent, said they had a fair amount of confidence. The rest had little or no confidence.

Similarly, people feel that the government can protect them from anthrax and smallpox, but the degree of confidence is another matter. Only 15 percent have a great deal of confidence that the government can protect them from anthrax; 19 percent say the same about smallpox.

Beyond the efforts at home, Americans are not entirely satisfied with the military action in Afghanistan and seem less hopeful than they were before the bombing began. Although most respondents said the war was going well for the United States, the largest proportion--58 percent--
said it was going only somewhat well. Twenty-five percent said it was going very well, and 13 percent said the war was going badly. Only 28 percent are very confident that the United States will capture or kill Mr. bin Laden, who is believed to be the mastermind behind the Sept. 11 attacks. In a CBS News poll two weeks earlier, 38 percent said they were very confident.

"Osama bin Laden is like a ghost," said Eleanor Roth, 67, a retired receptionist from Dayton, Ohio. "I would rather him be captured than killed to avoid him being labeled a martyr. Maybe they will find him, but then again, many of these terrorists have been on the loose for years. And with all of our technology, it doesn't seem to make a difference."

James Oleszcsuk, 57, a longshoreman from Baltimore, was even less optimistic.

"It won't be easy getting bin Laden," Mr. Oleszcsuk said. "First it was weeks, then months, now years to get this guy. It makes me wonder what kind of intelligence reports the government is getting. You hear so many things, you don't know what to believe. The political implications of capturing him would be problematic with many of the Middle Eastern countries. I don't think it's going to happen."

In another sign of mounting uneasiness about the war, only 29 percent said they were very confident in the ability of the United States government to maintain the international alliance of countries that support the military campaign; two weeks ago, 46 percent were very confident.

The public is prepared for a long and bloody conflict in Afghanistan; a majority of Americans say they are willing to accept the deaths of several thousand American troops there. Eight out of 10 respondents said they thought the conflict would extend beyond Afghanistan into neighboring countries and other parts of the world.

"I wouldn't be surprised if this war took three to five years," said Judy Adams, 48, a homemaker from Jonesville, La. "We have fought for our country for over 200 years to keep our land and our families safe. If..."
we
> > > > don't stand behind our president and pull together as a nation,
we're not
> > > > going to see our land stand."
> > > > Americans continue to view Israel favorably while they back the
> > > > establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories
of
> > > > the West Bank and Gaza Strip. About half the public views Saudi
Arabia as
> > > > a friend of the United States but not an ally.
> > > > There were signs of anxiety in the poll, perhaps because it was
conducted
> > > > at a time when developments have made people feel more vulnerable. In
> > > > recent days, the Bush administration and leaders on Capitol Hill
appeared
> > > > to lack a coordinated message in responding to the anthrax threat.
> > > > Most Americans say they have been closely following the news about
> > > > anthrax sent through the mail, and many have begun handling their
own
> > > > mail more cautiously.
> > > > The poll turned up mixed messages about the extent to which people
are
> > > > panicky. While they are concerned about whether the government can
> > > > protect them, Americans are calm at home. Only a quarter say they are
worried about terrorism in their own communities. While 20 percent of
> > > > Americans say they are more on edge now than they were before the
attacks
> > > > on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, few say they are having
trouble sleeping or are experiencing a loss of income.
> > > > For all their misgivings about the government's capacity to protect
them,
> > > > the public remains steadfast behind its leaders. Most people say
that Mr.
> > > > Bush has clearly explained the goals of both the military action in
> > > > Afghanistan and the war against terrorism in general.
> > > > Nearly 8 in 10 respondents approve of the way Mr. Bush is handling the
war on terrorism; more than 6 in 10 approve his handling of the
economy.
> > > > Six in 10 Americans now say the country is moving in the right
direction.
> > > > Last June, well before the attacks, only 4 in 10 said the same
thing.
> > > > The public's support for its leaders and government extends far
beyond
the White House. Over almost the last three decades, the job approval rating for Congress has never approached 67 percent, where it stands today.

The Watergate scandals first eroded the public's trust in government. For more than 27 years, people said they were more distrustful of government than trusting.

But in the aftermath of Sept. 11, people hold a different view. Now, more than half of Americans said they trusted the government to do what was right just about always or most of the time. In 1998, when the Times/CBS News Poll last asked the question, only 26 percent said they trusted the government.

Still, the poll found that the public was not prepared for a more activist government. Despite the high profile of many government agencies since Sept. 11, people still favored a smaller government with fewer services over a bigger government with more services, 52 percent to 43 percent.

Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did not know what to expect now. "I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, 'What's next?'"

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/30/national/30POLL.html
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I didn't think of the word "progress" as a bias because the answer choices do include very/somewhat dissatisfied. Isn't "Not making progress" a common term? I think it appears on grade school report cards. I believe progress in this context means status as in "in progress". Could be wrong about that. As for the more commonly used "U.S." (I think Jim was implying that) the war against terrorism is being waged by state and local governments and by the private sector so I used nation.

The top box "very satisfied" is the score to watch - now 36%. In light of the very tragic events, "somewhat satisfied" falls far short. Note that this is the plurality of opinion - 45%.

Nonetheless, there is room for improvement.

RE: Don's comments below. The question could read: "Thinking about the nation's campaign against terrorism, how much HEADWAY, IF ANY, do you think we are making...a lot, some, etc." Or "Thinking about the nation's campaign against terrorism, how satisfied are you with the HEADWAY we are making...very satisfied, etc.?"

Thanks for the comments. But I do believe you agree that some "global" measure would be useful.

Nick

Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>

"I am personally less troubled by the second "progress" which seems to me to be close to asking about "how well we are doing" than the first, which COULD imply there is progress, in contrast to "Thinking about the campaign against terrorism, how satisfied". Still, I would tend to avoid the word "progress", or add "if any", to increase the "face neutrality" of the question."
made by anyone (not to mention our own "nation"--and against "terrorism" yet)?

On Wed, 31 Oct 2001, Nick Panagakis wrote:

>> For a Tribune Poll in Illinois that ran last Sunday, I tried more of a "global" question which could be used over time to measure the progress the nation is making regardless of the form of terrorist activity now or in the future.

Thinking about the progress the nation is making in its campaign against terrorism, how satisfied are you with the progress we are making...?

Satisfied (Net) 80

Satisfied 36

Somewhat satisfied 45

Dissatisfied (Net) 14

Dissatisfied 5

Somewhat dissatisfied 9

No opinion 5

Stephen Salmore wrote:

> Compare this article to the article on the same poll on the CBS News site.

Are they looking at the same numbers?

NYT: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War
Americans for the first time are raising doubts about whether the nation can accomplish its objectives in fighting terrorism at home and abroad, including capturing or killing Osama bin Laden, saving the international alliance from unraveling and protecting people from future attacks, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows.
Despite threats about anthrax unfolding virtually every day and little discernible progress in the air campaign against the Taliban, Americans are still offering President Bush their overwhelming approval. Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which soared after Sept. 11, stands firm at 87 percent. And Congress has an approval rating of 67 percent, the highest since the Times/CBS News Poll began asking about it in the 1970's.

Even so, after six weeks in which people were not inclined to critique aspects of the government's response, there are stirrings of discontent that extend both to how the nation is responding to domestic terrorism and to how it is handling the war. The public is questioning whether the government is doing enough to forestall what it increasingly expects to be another terrorist attack in this country within months. Fifty-three percent say another attack is very likely, up from 46 percent two weeks ago and 36 percent two weeks before that. Most people say they expect the attack to be in the form of bioterrorism. These responses came before Attorney General John Ashcroft announced yesterday that new terrorist attacks were expected as soon as this week.

Yet more than half the public says the government in Washington has not done enough to prepare for a biological attack, and nor have state and local governments. Nearly half of Americans say the government is withholding information they need to know about the recent anthrax cases. More than a quarter say public health officials are wrong in advising people not to ask their own doctors for Cipro, an antibiotic used in treating anthrax.

While security has been tightened at airports, leading
sight of long lines, Americans are still jumpy about flying. They want the federal government to take complete control of hiring and supervising all airport security personnel. The nationwide telephone poll of 1,024 adults was conducted Thursday through Sunday. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points. Tom Cale, a poll respondent who sells cars in Fairmont, W.Va., is among those who support the nation's leaders but have nagging concerns. "It's not that we don't have competent people in positions of authority," Mr. Cale, 50, said in a follow-up interview. "They just haven't written the book yet about the potential dangers that are out there." Bracing for more terror, Mr. Cale said: "The next attack would be what you least suspect. It's going to be something that few people would see that would affect the most people, like sabotaging gas supply lines, or taking out two or three main power stations."

Joan Kautz, 49, a clerk for a rental car agency in Linden, N.J., said: "With the added security at the airport, bioterrorism is the only way to get in here. That's why they've used the mail, and even now the government is not protecting our postal workers."

In one of the most striking shifts, only 18 percent of Americans said they had a great deal of confidence that the government could protect them from terrorism; a month ago, 35 percent had such confidence. A majority, 58 percent, said they had a fair amount of confidence. The rest had little or no confidence. Similarly, people feel that the government can protect them from anthrax and smallpox, but the degree of confidence is another matter. Only 15 percent have a great deal of confidence that the government can protect
them from anthrax; 19 percent say the same about smallpox.

Beyond the efforts at home, Americans are not entirely satisfied with the military action in Afghanistan and seem less hopeful than they were before the bombing began. Although most respondents said the war was going well for the United States, the largest proportion—58 percent—said it was going only somewhat well. Twenty-five percent said it was going very well, and 13 percent said the war was going badly.

Only 28 percent are very confident that the United States will capture or kill Mr. bin Laden, who is believed to be the mastermind behind the Sept. 11 attacks. In a CBS News poll two weeks earlier, 38 percent said they were very confident.

"Osama bin Laden is like a ghost," said Eleanor Roth, 67, a retired receptionist from Dayton, Ohio. "I would rather him be captured than killed to avoid him being labeled a martyr. Maybe they will find him, but then again, many of these terrorists have been on the loose for years.

And with all of our technology, it doesn't seem to make a difference."

James Oleszcsuk, 57, a longshoreman from Baltimore, was even less optimistic.

"It won't be easy getting bin Laden," Mr. Oleszcsuk said. "First it was weeks, then months, now years to get this guy. It makes me wonder what kind of intelligence reports the government is getting. You hear so many things, you don't know what to believe. The political implications of capturing him would be problematic with many of the Middle Eastern countries. I don't think it's going to happen."

In another sign of mounting uneasiness about the war, only 29 percent said they were very confident in the ability of the United States government to maintain the international alliance of countries
that support the military campaign; two weeks ago, 46 percent were very confident. The public is prepared for a long and bloody conflict in Afghanistan; a majority of Americans say they are willing to accept the deaths of several thousand American troops there. Eight out of 10 respondents said they thought the conflict would extend beyond Afghanistan into neighboring countries and other parts of the world. "I wouldn't be surprised if this war took three to five years," said Judy Adams, 48, a homemaker from Jonesville, La. "We have fought for our country for over 200 years to keep our land and our families safe. If we don't stand behind our president and pull together as a nation, we're not going to see our land stand."

Americans continue to view Israel favorably while they back the establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. About half the public views Saudi Arabia as a friend of the United States but not an ally. There were signs of anxiety in the poll, perhaps because it was conducted at a time when developments have made people feel more vulnerable. In recent days, the Bush administration and leaders on Capitol Hill appeared to lack a coordinated message in responding to the anthrax threat.

Most Americans say they have been closely following the news about anthrax sent through the mail, and many have begun handling their own mail more cautiously. The poll turned up mixed messages about the extent to which people are panicky. While they are concerned about whether the government can protect them, Americans are calm at home. Only a quarter say they are worried about terrorism in their own communities. While 20 percent of
Americans say they are more on edge now than they were before the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, few say they are having trouble sleeping or are experiencing a loss of income. For all their misgivings about the government's capacity to protect them, the public remains steadfast behind its leaders. Most people say that Mr. Bush has clearly explained the goals of both the military action in Afghanistan and the war against terrorism in general. Nearly 8 in 10 respondents approve of the way Mr. Bush is handling the war on terrorism; more than 6 in 10 approve his handling of the economy. Six in 10 Americans now say the country is moving in the right direction. Last June, well before the attacks, only 4 in 10 said the same thing. The public's support for its leaders and government extends far beyond the White House. Over almost the last three decades, the job approval rating for Congress has never approached 67 percent, where it stands today. The Watergate scandals first eroded the public's trust in government. For more than 27 years, people said they were more distrustful of government than trusting. But in the aftermath of Sept. 11, people hold a different view. Now, more than half of Americans said they trusted the government to do what was right just about always or most of the time. In 1998, when the Times/CBS News Poll last asked the question, only 26 percent said they trusted the government. Still, the poll found that the public was not prepared for a more activist government. Despite the high profile of many government agencies since Sept. 11, people still favored a smaller government with fewer services over a bigger government with more services, 52 percent to 43 percent.
Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did not know what to expect now. 

"I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, 'What's next?'

---
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I'm looking for research comparing response bias between paper and web surveys. Particularly I'm interested in whether responses by web are more/less positive, contradictory, shorter/longer, more complete than the same surveys done on paper. Can anyone recommend some of this literature? (I'm interested particularly in a population that has web access like professionals not general population.) Thanks!

Holly M. Hart, Ph.D.
The Consortium on Chicago School Research
The University of Chicago
1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
773-834-3629 (office)
773-702-2010 (fax)
hhart@consortium-chicago.org
I would appreciate anyone willing to share examples of any CLOSED-END item used in a telephone survey that measures Occupational Status (e.g., professional, skilled, service, etc.) -- i.e., items that do NOT require open-end coding ala the three-item sequence used in many government surveys.

Thanks, PJL
See attached job description for Research Analyst position.

Beth Schapiro

--

Beth S. Schapiro, Ph.D.
President
Schapiro Research Group, Inc.
127 Peachtree Street, Suite 812
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
404-584-5215 (voice)
404-581-0058 (fax)
http://www.schapiroresearchgroup.com
As with any survey question, I'd prefer to only breakout the analytical categories of interest. Which means having a large other category, but if I'm only using occupation as a predictor variable, that doesn't bother me. If you are trying to get some measurement of occupation, using categories on a phone survey, I'd rethink it.

The question is also tricky if you are interested in executives as a category. Many executives view themselves as professional or technical people first. I am statistician, nevermind that most of my time is spent in supervision, reviewing other's work, or in management meetings. I recommend a follow-up question about management responsibilities (or number of people supervised).

---Original Message---
From: Lavrakas, Paul [SMTP:pjlavrakas@tvratings.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2001 12:39 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: Measuring Occupational Status in a phone survey

I would appreciate anyone willing to share examples of any CLOSED-END item used in a telephone survey that measures Occupational Status (e.g., professional, skilled, service, etc.) -- i.e., items that do NOT require open-end coding ala the three-item sequence used in many government surveys.

Thanks, PJL
There was an article in POQ by Garth Taylor about 1975 testing several different closed-ended occupational questions.

As with any survey question, I'd prefer to only breakout the analytical categories of interest. Which means having a large other category, but if I'm only using occupation as a predictor variable, that doesn't bother me. If you are trying to get some measurement of occupation, using categories on a phone survey, I'd rethink it.

The question is also tricky if you are interested in executives as a category. Many executives view themselves as professional or technical people first. I am statistician, nevermind that most of my time is spent in supervision, reviewing other's work, or in management meetings. I recommend a follow-up question about management responsibilities (or number of people supervised).

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Lavrakas, Paul [SMTP:pjlavrakas@tvratings.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2001 12:39 PM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: Measuring Occupational Status in a phone survey
> 
> I would appreciate anyone willing to share examples of any CLOSED-END item
> used in a telephone survey that measures Occupational Status (e.g.,
> professional, skilled, service, etc.) -- i.e., items that do NOT require
> open-end coding ala the three-item sequence used in many government
> surveys.
>
Just a few minutes ago I sent you a job announcement as an attached file. I was advised that sending it as plain text would be better, so here it is:

JOB OPENING: RESEARCH ANALYST

Public opinion research firm seeks research analyst with superior research, analytical, and writing skills. Must have quantitative and qualitative experience and be able to manage several research projects and clients at one time. Looking for inquisitive, analytical person who enjoys working on public policy and political issues for a national clientele of political, corporate, and public policy clients.

Responsibilities

Responsibilities include: managing projects; supervising research staff; determining research needs; designing questionnaires and moderator's guides; analyzing data; writing reports; and communicating findings to clients.

Education, Skills & Experience
The ideal candidate will be an excellent communicator, a talented researcher, and an organized detail-oriented manager with high professional standards and ethics. The ideal candidate will have: advanced degree in the social sciences; 3+ years experience in quantitative and qualitative analysis; 3+ years experience managing research projects; knowledge of SPSS and proficiency in statistical analysis; ability to summarize pertinent information; and superior writing skills.

Salary & Benefits

Competitive salary and good benefits package. Equal opportunity employer: do not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, age, religion, disability, sexual orientation or nationality.

Application Process

Send resume (no phone calls) and salary history or requirements to:

Beth S. Schapiro, Ph.D.
Schapiro Research Group, Inc.
127 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 812
 Atlanta GA 30303

Materials must be received by Friday November 30, 2001.

--
Beth S. Schapiro, Ph.D.
President
Schapiro Research Group, Inc.
127 Peachtree Street, Suite 812
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
404-584-5215 (voice)
404-581-0058 (fax)
http://www.schapiroresearchgroup.com
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Just a few minutes ago I sent you a job announcement as an attached file. I was advised that sending it as plain text would be better, so here it is:
<p>JOB OPENING: RESEARCH ANALYST</p>
<p>Public opinion research firm seeks research analyst with superior research, analytical, and writing skills. Must have quantitative and qualitative experience and be able to manage several research projects and clients at one time. Looking for inquisitive, analytical person who enjoys working on public policy and political issues for a national clientele of political, corporate, and public policy clients.</p>
<p><u>Responsibilities</u></p>
Responsibilities include: managing projects; supervising research staff; determining research needs; designing questionnaires and moderator's guides; analyzing data; writing reports; and communicating findings to clients.

The ideal candidate will be an excellent communicator, a talented researcher, and an organized detail-oriented manager with high professional standards and ethics. The ideal candidate will have: advanced degree in the social sciences; 3+ years experience in quantitative and qualitative analysis; 3+ years experience managing research projects; knowledge of SPSS and proficiency in statistical analysis; ability to summarize pertinent information; and superior writing skills.

Competitive salary and good benefits package. Equal opportunity employer: do not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, age, religion, disability, sexual orientation or nationality.

Send resume (no phone calls) and salary history or requirements to:
Beth S. Schapiro, Ph.D.
Schapiro Research Group, Inc.
127 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 812
Atlanta GA 30303
Materials must be received by Friday November 30, 2001.

---
Beth S. Schapiro, Ph.D.
President
Schapiro Research Group, Inc.
127 Peachtree Street, Suite 812
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
404-584-5215 (voice)
404-581-0058 (fax)

http://www.schapiroresearchgroup.com
I have a keen interest in any references dealing with recall effects in surveys. I am particularly interested in recall errors related to frequency questions (such as, how many gizmos did you purchase over the past so many weeks?). Does anyone have suggested readings?

I have found Norman Bradburn's chapter ("Response Effects") in "Handbook of Survey Research" (1983) very illuminating. Sudman, Finn and Lannom's article in Public Opinion Quarterly ("The use of bounded recall procedures in single interviews", 1984) is the last reference I have on the issue.

Thanks for your help. I am looking forward to discussing the issue of recall effects off-list or on-list, at your convenience.
There's a draft paper on web vs. mail modes of administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement at:
http://www.indiana.edu/~csr/AAPOR_NSSE.pdf

Karen Segar
Data Manager
Social Development Research Group
University of Washington
ksegar@u.washington.edu

On Wed, 31 Oct 2001, Holly Hart wrote:

> I'm looking for research comparing response bias between paper and web
> surveys. Particularly I'm interested in whether responses by web are
> more/less positive, contradictory, shorter/longer, more complete than the
> same surveys done on paper. Can anyone recommend some of this
> literature? (I'm interested particularly in a population that has web
> access like professionals not general population.) Thanks!
> 
> Holly M. Hart, Ph.D.
> The Consortium on Chicago School Research
> The University of Chicago
> 1313 East 60th Street
> Chicago, Illinois 60637
> 773-834-3629 (office)
> 773-702-2010 (fax)
> hhart@consortium-chicago.org
> 
> From abider@earthlink.net Wed Oct 31 13:31:53 2001
The discussion raises for me the question of whether polls should define issues independently or as they have been defined by those who have (or had) strong enough voices in public political life as to be "the issue definers, even when those definitions seem to make no earthly sense whatsoever. As a social scientist, I am inclined to the former position; as a citizen to the latter. The premise that this "war against terrorism" is or can be a war against terrorism seems absurd. We're supposed to be eliminating the bases of support of terrorism in Afghanistan when, clearly, the major bases for financing, training and support of the 09/17 attacks were in Saudi Arabia, Germany, Florida, New Jersey, etc. Look where Theodore Kaczynski was based. An [The?] anthrax terrorist seems based near (at?) that seat of opinion research, Princeton. (I can speak with some credentialled authority on the subject of terrorism because, during my years of active service in the Cold Wa, planning and support of "unarmed resistance" was for a time my major. field." That should not, however, restrict me, as is my wont, from claiming expertise at everything else.)

Albert Biderman
abider@earthlink.net
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[207.217.120.12])
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Message-ID: <000001c16253$f42bbfc0$899cd73f@alvbynsy>
From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
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MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0063_01C16229.9C277FA0"
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_0063_01C16229.9C277FA0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The discussion raises for me the question of whether polls should define = issues independently or as they have been defined by those who have (or = had) strong enough voices in public political life as to be "the issue = definers, even when those definitions seem to make no earthly sense = whatsoever. As a social scientist, I am inclined to the former = position; as a citizen to the latter. The premise that this " war = against terrorism" is or can be a war against terrorism seems absurd. = We're supposed to be eliminating the bases of support of terrorism in = Afghanistan when, clearly, the major bases for financing, training and = support of the 09/17 attacks were in Saudi Arabia, Germany, Florida, = New Jersey, etc. Look where Theodore Kaczynski was based. An [The?] = anthrax terrorist seems based near (at?) that seat of opinion research, = Princeton. (I can speak with some credentialled authority on the = subject of terrorism because, during my years of active service in the = Cold Wa, planning and support of "unarmed resistance" was for a time my = "major. field." That should not, however, restrict me, as is my wont, = from claiming expertise at everything else.)
Definitions of public issues often rest on absurd premises. Economic issues often are presented with meanings clueless with regard to the logic of NIPA or the rationales of money and banking. Few "opinion leaders" who bandy about issues involving "inflation" (and what issue involving money doesn't?) know what many of our colleagues know about the CPS and its successors, or consumer expenditure surveys, establishment surveys, etc. Think of surveying our own profession on its problems when cards had been stacked for us by dividing all of them into two, exhaustive heaps: "sampling error" and "non-sampling" error (or "measurement error," in the less-stacked, AAPOR-favored construction). The questions I am raising here are apart from any dealt with by the proposed definition of "Scientific Survey" (Summer 2001 = AAPOR Newsletter). How surveys deal with a war we're waging raises tougher issues than do any other. The allegiances, duties and habits of mind we have as citizens are owed special due. So is our duty to do our job right. Particularly so because we can be especially aware of how crowded the last refuge of scoundrels can become when a nation is at war.

My hope is that there will be a bit of balance in opinion survey construction; favoring keeping the objects of our questions phrased in keeping with how they are framed by identifiably legitimate political contenders, but also, where we think something vital out there is being missed, by following our own lights as independent, objective and skeptical experts, trained and equipped for objective, theoretically sound understanding of social phenomena. That's how I see the citizenship role as researcher or pollster. That's above and beyond my duty as citizen to respect the actions of legitimate authority, salute the flag, preserve protect and defend. . . . Oh, yes, and to cheer for my team in the World Series.

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

----- Original Message -----
From: Nick Panagakis
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2001 10:43 AM
Subject: Re: NYT/CBS NEWS POLL: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror (NYTimes)

I didn't think of the word "progress" as a bias because the answer choices do include very/somewhat dissatisfied. Isn't "Not making progress" a common term? I think it appears on grade school report cards. I believe progress in this context means status as in "in progress". Could be wrong about that. As for the more commonly used "U.S." (I think Jim was implying that) the war against terrorism is being waged by state and local governments and by the private sector so I used nation...=20

The top box "very satisfied" is the score to watch - now 36%. In light of the very tragic events, "somewhat satisfied" falls far short. Note that this is the plurality of opinion - 45%.

Nonetheless, there is room for improvement.

RE: Don's comments below. The question could read: "Thinking about the =
nation's campaign against terrorism, how much HEADWAY, IF ANY, do you think we are making...a lot, some, etc." Or "Thinking about the nation's campaign against terrorism, how satisfied are you with the HEADWAY we are making...very satisfied, etc.?"

Thanks for the comments. But I do believe you agree that some "global" measure would be useful.

Nick

rom: Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>

"I am personally less troubled by the second "progress" which seems to me to be close to asking about "how well we are doing" than the first, which COULD imply there is progress, in contrast to "Thinking about the campaign against terrorism, how satisfied". Still, I would tend to avoid the word "progress", or add "if any", to increase the "face neutrality" of the question.

James Beniger wrote:

Nick,

Doesn't using the word "progress"--two times, in a single, two-line sentence--bias the responses? Isn't it rather difficult for any one of us to be "dissatisfied" with anything we are told is "progress," as made by anyone (not to mention our own "nation"--and against "terrorism" yet)?

--

Jim

On Wed, 31 Oct 2001, Nick Panagakis wrote:

> For a Tribune Poll in Illinois that ran last Sunday, I tried more of a "global" question which could be used over time to measure the progress the nation is making regardless of the form of terrorist activity now or in the future.

> Thinking about the progress the nation is making in its campaign against terrorism, how satisfied are you with the progress we are making...?

******

> Satisfied (Net) 80
> Very satisfied 36
> Somewhat satisfied 45
> Dissatisfied (Net) 14
> Very dissatisfied 5
Somewhat dissatisfied 9=20
>20
No opinion 5=20
>20
>20
Stephen Salmore wrote:=20
>20
> Compare this article to the article on the same poll on the CBS =
News site.=20
> > Are they looking at the same numbers?=20
> >20
> > NYT: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War=20
> > CBS: Support For War Effort Is Strong=20
> >20
> > CBS article is attached.=20
> >20
> > --Stephen Salmore=20
> >20
> > ----- Original Message -----=20
> > From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>=20
> > To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>=20
> > Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2001 12:09 AM=20
> > Subject: NYT/CBS NEWS POLL: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on =
Terror War=20
> > (NYTimes)=20
> >20
> > >20
> > >20
> > >20
> > >20
> > > =
> >=====================================================================
>=20
> > ==20
> > > ==
> > Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company=20
> > ==
> >=====================================================================
>=20
> > ==20
> > > ==
> > http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/30/national/30POLL.html=20
> > > ==20
> > > October 30, 2001=20
> > > ==20
> > > ==20
> > > THE POLL=20
> > > ==20
> > > SURVEY SHOWS DOUBTS STIRRING ON TERROR WAR=20
> > > ==20
> > > By RICHARD L. BERKE and JANET ELDER=20
> > > ==20
> > > ==20
> > > Americans for the first time are raising doubts about whether =
the nation=20
> > > can accomplish its objectives in fighting terrorism at home =
and abroad=20
> > > including capturing or killing Osama bin Laden, saving the =
international=20
alliance from unraveling and protecting people from future attacks, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows. Despite threats about anthrax unfolding virtually every day and little discernible progress in the air campaign against the Taliban, are still offering President Bush their overwhelming approval. Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which soared after Sept. 11, stands firm at 87 percent. And Congress has an approval rating of 67 percent, the highest since the Times/CBS News Poll began asking about it in the 1970's. Even so, after six weeks in which people were not inclined to critique aspects of the government's response, there are stirrings of discontent that extend both to how the nation is responding to domestic terrorism and to how it is handling the war. The public is questioning whether the government is doing enough to forestall what it increasingly expects to be another terrorist attack in this country within months. Fifty-three percent say another attack is very likely, up from 46 percent two weeks ago and 36 percent two weeks before that. Most people say they expect the attack to be in the form of bioterrorism. These responses came before Attorney General John Ashcroft announced yesterday that new terrorist attacks were expected as soon as this week. Yet more than half the public says the government in Washington has not done enough to prepare for a biological attack, and nor have state and local governments. Nearly half of Americans say the government is withholding information they need to know about the recent anthrax cases. More than a quarter say public health officials are wrong in advising people not to ask their own doctors for Cipro, an antibiotic used in treating anthrax.
While security has been tightened at airports, leading to the now-common sight of long lines, Americans are still jumpy about flying. They want the federal government to take complete control of hiring and supervising all airport security personnel. The nationwide telephone poll of 1,024 adults was conducted Thursday through Sunday. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points.

Tom Cale, a poll respondent who sells cars in Fairmont, W.Va., is among those who support the nation's leaders but have nagging concerns.

"It's not that we don't have competent people in positions of authority," Mr. Cale, 50, said in a follow-up interview. "They just haven't written the book yet about the potential dangers that are out there."

Bracing for more terror, Mr. Cale said: "The next attack would be what you least suspect. It's going to be something that few people would see that would affect the most people, like sabotaging gas supply lines, or taking out two or three main power stations."

Joan Kautz, 49, a clerk for a rental car agency in Linden, N.J., said: "With the added security at the airport, bioterrorism is the only way to get in here. That's why they've used the mail, and even now the government is not protecting our postal workers."

In one of the most striking shifts, only 18 percent of Americans said they had a great deal of confidence that the government could protect them from terrorism; a month ago, 35 percent had such confidence. A majority, 58 percent, said they had a fair amount of confidence. The rest had little or no confidence.

Similarly, people feel that the government can protect them from anthrax and smallpox, but the degree of confidence is another matter. Only 15 percent have a great deal of confidence that the government =
can protect them from anthrax; 19 percent say the same about smallpox.

> > > Beyond the efforts at home, Americans are not entirely satisfied with the military action in Afghanistan and seem less hopeful than before the bombing began. Although most respondents said the war was going well for the United States, the largest proportion—58 percent—said it was going only somewhat well. Twenty-five percent said it was going very well, and 13 percent said the war was going badly.

> > > Only 28 percent are very confident that the United States will capture or kill Mr. bin Laden, who is believed to be the mastermind behind the Sept. 11 attacks. In a CBS News poll two weeks earlier, 38 percent said they were very confident.

> > > "Osama bin Laden is like a ghost," said Eleanor Roth, 67, a retired receptionist from Dayton, Ohio. "I would rather him be captured than killed to avoid him being labeled a martyr. Maybe they will find him, but then again, many of these terrorists have been on the loose for years. And with all of our technology, it doesn't seem to make a difference." 

> > > James Oleszcsuk, 57, a longshoreman from Baltimore, was even less optimistic.

> > > "It won't be easy getting bin Laden," Mr. Oleszcsuk said. "First it was weeks, then months, now years to get this guy. It makes me wonder what kind of intelligence reports the government is getting. You hear so many things, you don't know what to believe. The political implications of capturing him would be problematic with many of the Middle Eastern countries. I don't think it's going to happen."

> > > In another sign of mounting uneasiness about the war, only 29 percent said they were very confident in the ability of the United States government to maintain the international alliance of countries that
support the military campaign; two weeks ago, 46 percent were very confident. The public is prepared for a long and bloody conflict in Afghanistan; a majority of Americans say they are willing to accept the deaths of several thousand American troops there. Eight out of 10 respondents said they thought the conflict would extend beyond Afghanistan into neighboring countries and other parts of the world. "I wouldn't be surprised if this war took three to five years," said Judy Adams, 48, a homemaker from Jonesville, La. "We have fought for our country for over 200 years to keep our land and our families safe. If we don't stand behind our president and pull together as a nation, we're not going to see our land stand." Americans continue to view Israel favorably while they back the establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. About half the public views Saudi Arabia as a friend of the United States but not an ally. There were signs of anxiety in the poll, perhaps because it was conducted at a time when developments have made people feel more vulnerable. In recent days, the Bush administration and leaders on Capitol Hill appeared to lack a coordinated message in responding to the anthrax threat. Most Americans say they have been closely following the news about anthrax sent through the mail, and many have begun handling their own mail more cautiously. The poll turned up mixed messages about the extent to which people are panicky. While they are concerned about whether the government can protect them, Americans are calm at home. Only a quarter say they are worried about terrorism in their own communities. While 20 percent of Americans say they are more on edge now than they were before the attacks
on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, few say they are having trouble sleeping or are experiencing a loss of income. For all their misgivings about the government's capacity to protect them, the public remains steadfast behind its leaders. Most people say that Mr. Bush has clearly explained the goals of both the military action in Afghanistan and the war against terrorism in general. Nearly 8 in 10 respondents approve of the way Mr. Bush is handling the war on terrorism; more than 6 in 10 approve his handling of the economy. Six in 10 Americans now say the country is moving in the right direction. Last June, well before the attacks, only 4 in 10 said the same thing.

The public's support for its leaders and government extends far beyond the White House. Over almost the last three decades, the job approval rating for Congress has never approached 67 percent, where it stands today. The Watergate scandals first eroded the public's trust in government. For more than 27 years, people said they were more distrustful of government than trusting. But in the aftermath of Sept. 11, people hold a different view. Now, more than half of Americans said they trusted the government to do what was right just about always or most of the time. In 1998, when the Times/CBS News Poll last asked the question, only 26 percent said they trusted the government.

Still, the poll found that the public was not prepared for a more activist government. Despite the high profile of many government agencies since Sept. 11, people still favored a smaller government with fewer services over a bigger government with more services, 52 percent to 43 percent. Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did
not know what to expect now.

"I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, 'What's next?'

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/30/national/30POLL.html
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The discussion raises for me the question of whether polls should define issues independently or as they have been defined by those who have (or had) strong enough voices in public political life as to be
"the issue definers, even when those definitions seem to make no earthly sense whatsoever. As a social scientist, I am inclined to the former position; as a citizen to the latter. The premise that this "war against terrorism" is or can be a war against terrorism seems absurd. We're supposed to be eliminating the bases of support of terrorism in Afghanistan when, clearly, the major bases for financing, training and support of the 09/17 attacks were in Saudi Arabia, Germany, Florida, New Jersey, etc. Look where Theodore Kaczynski was based. An anthrax terrorist seems based near (at?) that seat of opinion research, Princeton. (I can speak with some credentialled authority on the subject of terrorism because, during my years of active service in the Cold War, planning and support of "unarmed resistance" was for a time my "major field." That should not, however, restrict me, as is my wont, from claiming expertise at everything else.)

Definitions of public issues often rest on absurd premises. Economic issues are presented with meanings clueless with regard to the logic of NIPA or the rationales of money and banking. Few "opinion leaders" who bandy about issues involving "inflation" (and what issue involving money doesn't?) know what many of our colleagues know about the CPS and its successors, or consumer expenditure surveys, establishment surveys, etc. The allegiances, duties and habits of mind we have as citizens are owed special due. So is our duty to do our job right.
Particularly so because we can be especially aware of how crowded the last refuge of scoundrels can become when a nation is at war.

My hope is that there will be a bit of balance in opinion survey construction; favoring keeping the objects of our questions phrased in keeping with how they are framed by identifiably legitimate political contenders, but also, where we think something vital out there is being missed, by following our own lights as independent, objective and skeptical experts, trained and equipped for objective, theoretically sound understanding of social phenomena. That's how I see the citizenship role as researcher or pollster. That's above and beyond my duty as citizen to respect the actions of legitimate authority, salute the flag, preserve protect and defend. Oh, yes, and to cheer for my team in the World Series.

Albert D. Biderman

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Nick Panagakis
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2001 10:43 AM
Subject: Re: NYT/CBS NEWS POLL: Survey Shows Doubts Stirring on Terror War (NYTimes)

I didn't think of the word "progress" as a bias because the answer choices do include very/somewhat dissatisfied. Isn't "Not making progress" a common term? I think it appears on grade school report cards. I could be wrong about that. As for the more commonly used "U.S." (I think Jim =
implying that) the war against terrorism is being waged by state and local governments and by the private sector so I used nation...

The top box "very satisfied" is the score to watch - now 36%. In light of the very tragic events, "somewhat satisfied" falls far short. Note that this is the plurality of opinion - 45%.

Nonetheless, there is room for improvement.

RE: Don's comments below. The question could read: "Thinking about the nation's campaign against terrorism, how much HEADWAY, IF ANY, do you think we are making...a lot, some, etc." Or "Thinking about the nation's campaign against terrorism, how satisfied are you with the HEADWAY we are making...very satisfied, etc."

Thanks for the comments. But I do believe you agree that some "global" measure would be useful.

Nick

rom: Don Ferree &lt;gferree@ssc.wisc.edu&gt;

"I am personally less troubled by the second "progress" which seems to me to be close to asking about "how well we are doing" than the first, which COULD imply there is progress, in contrast to "Thinking about the campaign against terrorism, how satisfied". Still, I would tend to avoid the word "progress", or add "if any", to increase the "face neutrality" of the question."

James Beniger wrote:

Nick, Does't using the word "progress"--two times, in a single, = two-line sentence--bias the responses? Isn't it rather difficult for any one of us to be "dissatisfied" with anything we are told is "progress," as made by anyone (not to mention our own "nation"--and against "terrorism" yet)?

On Wed, 31 Oct 2001, Nick Panagakis wrote:

For a Tribune Poll in Illinois that ran last Sunday, I tried more of a "global" question which could be used over time to measure the progress the nation is making regardless of the form of =
terrorist=20
activity now or in the future.=20

&lt;P&gt;Thinking about the progress the nation is making in its =
campaign=20
against &lt;BR&gt;terrorism, how satisfied are you with the progress =
we are=20
making...?=20
&lt;P&gt;&nbsp;&nbsp;********=20
&lt;P&gt;&gt; Satisfied=20
(Net)&nbsp;&nbs
Americans for the first time are raising doubts about whether the nation can accomplish its objectives in fighting terrorism at home and abroad, including capturing or killing Osama bin Laden, saving the international alliance from unraveling and protecting people from future attacks, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows. Despite threats about anthrax unfolding virtually every day and little discernible progress in the air campaign against the Taliban, Americans are still offering President Bush their overwhelming approval. Mr. Bush's job approval rating, which soared after Sept. 11, stands firm at 87 percent. And Congress has an approval rating of 67 percent, the highest since the Times/CBS News Poll began asking about it in the 1970's. Even after six weeks in which people were not inclined to critique aspects of the government's response, there are stirrings of discontent that extend both to how the nation is responding to domestic terrorism and to how it is handling the war. The public is questioning whether the government is doing enough to forestall what it increasingly expects to be another terrorist attack in this country within months.
Fifty-three percent say another attack is very likely, up from 46 percent two weeks ago and 36 percent two weeks before that. Most people say they expect the attack to be in the form of bioterrorism. These responses came before Attorney General John Ashcroft announced yesterday that new terrorist attacks were expected as soon as this week. Yet more than half the public says the government in Washington has not done enough to prepare for a biological attack, and nor have state and local governments. Nearly half of Americans say the government is withholding information; they need to know about the recent anthrax cases. More than a quarter say public health officials are wrong in advising people not to ask their own doctors for Cipro, an antibiotic used in treating anthrax.

While security has been tightened at airports, leading to the now-common sight of long lines, Americans are still jumpy about flying. They want the federal government to take complete control of hiring and supervising all airport security personnel. The nationwide telephone poll of 1,024 adults was conducted Thursday through Sunday. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points. Tom Cale, a poll respondent who sells cars in Fairmont, W.Va., is among those who support the nation's leaders but have nagging concerns. "It's not that we don't have competent people in positions of authority," Mr. Cale, 50, said in a follow-up.
interview. "They just haven't written the book yet about the potential dangers that are out there." Bracing for more terror, Mr. Cale said: "The next attack would be what you least suspect. It's going to be something that few people would see, or that would affect the most people, like sabotaging gas supply lines, or taking out two or three main power stations." Joan Kautz, 49, a clerk for a rental car agency in Linden, N.J., said: "With the added security at the airport, bioterrorism is the only way to get in here. That's why they've used the mail, and even now the government is not protecting our postal workers." In one of the most striking shifts, only 18 percent of Americans said they had a great deal of confidence that the government could protect them from terrorism; a month ago, 35 percent had such confidence. A majority, 58 percent, said they had a fair amount of confidence. The rest had little or no confidence. Similarly, people feel that the government can protect them from anthrax and smallpox, but the degree of confidence is another matter. Only 15 percent have a great deal of confidence that the government can protect them from anthrax; 19 percent say the same about smallpox. Beyond the efforts at home, Americans are not entirely satisfied with the military action in Afghanistan and seem less hopeful than they were before the bombing began. Although most respondents said the war was going well for the United States, the largest proportion--58 percent--said it...
was going only somewhat well. Twenty-five percent said it was going very well, and 13 percent said the war was going badly. Only 28 percent are very confident that the United States will capture or kill Mr. bin Laden, who is believed to be the mastermind behind the Sept. 11 attacks. In a CBS News poll two weeks earlier, 38 percent said they were very confident. Eleanor Roth, 67, a retired receptionist from Dayton, Ohio, said, "I would rather him be captured than killed to avoid him being labeled a martyr. Maybe they will find him, but..."

James Oleszcsuk, 57, a longshoreman from Baltimore, was even less optimistic. "It won't be easy getting bin Laden," Mr. Oleszcsuk said. "First it was weeks, then months, now years to get this guy. It makes me wonder what kind of reports the government is getting. You hear so many things, you don't know what to believe. The political implications of capturing him would be problematic with many of the Middle Eastern countries. I don't think it's going to happen." In another sign of mounting uneasiness about the war, only 29 percent said they were very confident in the ability of the United States government to maintain the international alliance of countries that support the military campaign; two weeks ago, 46 percent were very confident.
The public is prepared for a long and bloody conflict in Afghanistan; a majority of Americans say they are willing to accept the deaths of several thousand American troops there. Eight out of 10 respondents said they thought the conflict would extend beyond Afghanistan into neighboring countries and other parts of the world. "I wouldn't be surprised if this war took three to five years," said Judy Adams, 48, a homemaker from Jonesville, La. "We have fought for our country for over 200 years to keep our land and our families safe. If we don't stand behind our president and pull together as a nation, we're not going to see our land stand." Americans continue to view Israel favorably while they back the establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. About half the public views Saudi Arabia as a friend of the United States but not an ally. There were signs of anxiety in the poll perhaps because it was conducted at a time when developments have made people feel more vulnerable. In recent days, the Bush administration and leaders on Capitol Hill appeared to lack a coordinated message in responding to the anthrax threat. Most Americans say they have been closely following the news about anthrax sent through the mail, and many have begun handling their own mail more cautiously. The poll turned up mixed messages about the extent to which people are panicky. While they are concerned about whether the government can
protect them, Americans are calm at home. Only a quarter say they are worried about terrorism in their communities. While 20 percent of Americans say they are more on edge now than they were before the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, few say they are having trouble sleeping or are experiencing a loss of income. For all their misgivings about the government's capacity to protect them, the public remains steadfast behind its leaders. Most people say that Mr. Bush has clearly explained the goals of both the military action in Afghanistan and the war against terrorism in general. Nearly 8 in 10 respondents approve of the way Mr. Bush is handling the war on terrorism; more than 6 in 10 approve his handling of the economy. Six in 10 Americans now say the country is moving in the right direction. Last June, well before the attacks, only 4 in 10 said the same thing.

The public's support for its leaders and government extends far beyond the White House. Over almost the last three decades, the job approval rating for Congress has never approached 67 percent, where it stands today. The Watergate scandals first eroded the public's trust in government. For more than 27 years, people said they were more distrustful of government than trusting. But in the aftermath of Sept. 11, people hold a different view. Now, more than half of Americans said they trusted the government to do what was right just about always or most of the time.
time. In 1998, when the Times/CBS News Poll asked the question, only 26 percent said they trusted the government. Still, the poll found that the public was not prepared for a more activist government. Despite the high profile of many government agencies since Sept. 11, people still favored a smaller government with fewer services over a bigger government with more services, 52 percent to 43 percent.

Julie Hartfield, 22, a nursing assistant in Rochester, N.Y., said she did not know what to expect now. "I feel like America was a little too sure of itself, thinking that no one could touch us," Ms. Hartfield said. "After the first anthrax outbreak, they should have made sure security was tight. Now there are outbreaks all over the place, and you wonder, 'What's next?'
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