

---

Date: Tue, 01 Oct 2002 07:03:15 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: LA TIMES POLL: Calif. Gov. Davis Outpaces Repub. Rival Bill Simon Jr.  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210010655160.13421-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

[www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-me-poll10oct01.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-me-poll10oct01.story)

October 1 2002

Davis Builds Big Lead in Race

Times Poll: Governor outpaces rival Simon 45% to 35% among likely voters. Many consider him the better of two unsatisfying choices.

By MARK Z. BARABAK  
TIMES STAFF WRITER

Gray Davis has opened a substantial lead over Bill Simon Jr. in the race for California governor, as disenchanted voters turn to the incumbent Democrat as the better of two unsatisfying choices, according to the Los Angeles Times Poll.

The survey, completed Sunday night, suggests that Davis' attack strategy against Republican Simon has paid off: After a multimillion-dollar barrage of critical TV ads, the Los Angeles businessman is now viewed negatively by about half of those likely to vote. Davis' image, in turn, has improved slightly over the last few months.

More significantly, although Davis receives poor marks on issues such as handling the state budget, energy and his personal ethics, likely voters said the governor would still do a better job in those areas than Simon.

Overall, Davis was leading his Republican rival 45% to 35% among likely voters, with 7% supporting other candidates and 13% undecided. When a lower turnout scenario was factored in--with fewer than half of registered voters casting ballots--Davis extended his lead over Simon to 46% to 34%.

The poll found a strong Democratic tide running through California, with the party's nominees leading all seven down-ballot contests for offices such as lieutenant governor, treasurer and attorney

general--often by substantial margins.

Two of the higher-profile measures on the Nov. 5 ballot were getting mixed receptions. Proposition 49, the Arnold Schwarzenegger-backed measure to promote after-school programs, was supported by 55% of those surveyed and opposed by 31%. Proposition 52, which would allow same-day voter registration, was trailing with 39% in favor and 51% opposed.

As the campaign heads into its final five weeks, Californians are plainly discontented with both the direction of the state and their choices of who will occupy the governor's seat for the next four years. Though that can cause a certain amount of volatility among voters, in this case Democrats appear to be benefiting.

More than half, 51% of registered voters, believe that the state is heading in the wrong direction, up from 40% in February. And 65% of those likely to turn out next month said they wished there were other candidates running, besides Davis and Simon, with a plausible shot at winning the governorship.

"It's like choosing between two bad apples," said Chris DeLong, a 32-year-old government worker and registered independent from Sacramento, who considers Simon too conservative but questions Davis' trustworthiness. In a follow-up interview, DeLong said he is leaning toward a vote to reelect the governor only because he worries that his support for a third-party candidate would be wasted.

The dissatisfaction transcends party lines, although Democrats are somewhat more contented with their gubernatorial nominee than Republicans. Only about a third of Simon supporters were satisfied with their choice, compared to more than four in 10 Davis supporters who were satisfied with their candidate.

"Frankly, I'll do anything to keep Gray Davis from being elected again," said Barbara Pouliot, 41, a Republican from Fullerton. "I can't think of a single thing that he's done right." That said, Pouliot suggested that Simon "just doesn't have the experience to be governor. It's the best of a bad choice."

Conversely, Dolores Halden, a 70-year-old Republican and retired nurse in Sunnyvale, used words like "opportunist" to describe Davis. Still, she finds him more honest than Simon, who "seems pretty sleazy" in his business dealings. Above all, Halden said, she wishes that she had other choices at the top of the Democratic and Republican tickets.

Davis' lukewarm standing with Californians would normally signal trouble for an incumbent, particularly since he has spent millions of dollars to plead his case over the television airwaves.

Overall, likely voters are divided in their impressions of the governor, with 48% having a favorable view of Davis and 51% an unfavorable impression.

The biggest reason for unhappiness with the incumbent was his performance during last year's energy crisis, cited by nearly half of likely voters with an unfavorable opinion of Davis.

In recent months evidence has emerged that major energy companies gamed the deregulated California electricity market, contributing to the state's energy problems. But Elizabeth Carlton, apparently speaking for many, said Davis is still somewhat to blame. "He should have been able to detect what was going on and do something about it," said Carlton, 84, a retired Oakland homemaker who is a registered Democrat. "That's his job."

On another major issue facing California, more than half--52%--of likely voters disapproved of Davis' handling of the state budget. He received better marks for his record on education--the governor's stated No. 1 priority--but still only 49% approved. Thirty-nine percent disapproved.

On the broader leadership question, Davis boosted his standing somewhat since the last Times Poll in February. At that stage, fewer than half of registered voters described Davis as a decisive leader. In the latest survey, 51% said he fit that description. (The figure was 50% among likely voters.)

But despite the political danger usually posed by such middling ratings, most of the likely voters surveyed still believe that Davis would do a better job on most issues than Simon. On education, crime, domestic security, the economy and general leadership abilities Davis was favored over Simon by seven percentage points or more among likely voters. Even on energy, likely voters were evenly split over which candidate would do a better job, with Simon favored only slightly, 39% to 37%.

The contest for governor is Simon's first run for political office. He was the surprise winner in the March GOP primary and enjoyed a burst of favorable publicity after upsetting former Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan. But months of daily pounding by negative Davis TV spots have badly hurt Simon's image, with 51% now having a negative impression of the Republican nominee.

Indeed, the challenge facing Simon over the next five weeks is stark. Davis was leading his opponent among likely voters of all age groups, education and income levels. The governor was predictably ahead in the Democratic-leaning Los Angeles region and the San Francisco Bay Area. But he was virtually tied with Simon in Republican-tilting areas outside California's two biggest metropolitan centers.

Many of Davis' TV spots have focused on Simon's business record, and the criticism has clearly taken hold. Of those with a negative impression of Simon, close to half said their feelings stemmed from doubts about his honesty and integrity.

"I don't like Simon," said Republican Wesley Wolfe, 59, of Westchester, who developed his negative view "primarily from Davis' ads." He doesn't much care for the governor either, Wolfe said, but would probably back him as "the lesser of two evils."

Throughout the campaign, Simon has attacked Davis' prodigious fund-raising, calling him a "coin-operated" governor who runs a "pay-to-play administration" that favors big campaign donors. Davis has repeatedly denied any connection between the money he raises and the policies he pursues.

But the poll found little evidence that Simon's assault has dented Davis: By 44% to 27%, likely voters said they believed that the incumbent has more honesty and integrity to serve as governor than his challenger.

"That's the way politics is," Maxine Bracy, 67, a Los Angeles teacher, Democrat and Davis supporter, said of the governor's fundraising. "I don't think anyone can win unless they're extremely rich. So they have to raise money."

Two contentious issues--abortion and gun control--have so far played little role in the race, as Simon has sought to downplay his stance and Davis has focused instead on his opponent's business record and personal integrity.

Simon opposes abortion in most instances and is against the adoption of more gun controls. Davis, in contrast, has signed legislation broadening abortion rights and extending curbs on firearms.

Asked about abortion, 57% of likely voters said it should be legal most of the time. Of those, nearly six in 10 were backing Davis. Of the 38% who said abortion should be illegal save for a few exceptions, just over half supported Simon.

On gun control, just about half of likely voters, 48%, said they favored a further crackdown on firearms. Of those, six in 10 were backing Davis.

Of the 16% who favored fewer restrictions on guns, Simon was supported by just about seven in 10 likely voters. The GOP nominee was also outpolling Davis among those who believe that the current restrictions are just about right, leading 44% to 34%.

The Times Poll, under the direction of Susan Pinkus, interviewed 1,171 registered voters Sept. 25-29. There were 679 likely voters. The margin of sampling error for registered voters is plus or minus 3 percentage points. For likely voters it is 4 points.

-----

Claudia Vaughn, data management supervisor for The Times Poll, also contributed to this report

[www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-me-poll1oct01.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-me-poll1oct01.story)

-----  
Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2002 11:56:57 -0400  
Subject: RE: Page length and response rates  
Message-ID: <F078EEE4D799064E95F003CFD9B4C7FC01276E25@UMBE2K1>

X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Patricia Gallagher" <Patricia.Gallagher@umb.edu>  
To: <kristin.j.stettler@census.gov>  
Cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 01 Oct 2002 15:56:57.0896 (UTC)  
FILETIME=[2BE5E280:01C26963]  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g91FuxI09054

Hi Kristin,

In working on the development of the CAHPS instrument for the Medicaid population, we did an experiment in 1998 on the effect of instrument length on mail returns. The bottom line is that Medicaid enrollees were about as likely to complete a relatively long questionnaire as a shorter one. The results of the instrument length test also demonstrate that a short questionnaire alone is not enough to achieve high response rate in this population.

I hope that none of the PIs that I work with see this. I'm always trying to talk them into the most parsimonious instruments possible. In dual mode studies, long questionnaires make for long telephone interviews. Beyond response rates, there are the issues of respondent burden and cost considerations.

There were three contacts for the instrument length experiments: The first data collection step was to mail all selected individuals a questionnaire and a fact sheet containing answers to frequently asked questions. Seven to 10 days later a reminder/thank you post card was sent to the entire sample. About two weeks after the initial mailing, a replacement questionnaire packet was sent to all those who had not yet responded. Parents/guardians were proxy respondents for minors.

An outline of the instruments used and response rates (AAPOR RR1) follows.

Hope this is useful to you.

Trish

Patricia M. Gallagher, PhD  
Center for Survey Research  
University of Massachusetts Boston  
100 Morrissey Blvd, Boston MA 02125  
617-287-7200; fax: 617-287-7210

Instrument Length Test: Response rates and Instruments

? Massachusetts Medicaid Experience  
Adults

38%RR - Abbreviated MSS (23 items)

35%RR - CAHPS Core plus Medicaid Supplemental Questions (54 items)

37%RR - CAHPS Core plus Medicaid and Chronic Conditions Supplemental Questions (76 items)

Children

38% RR - Abbreviated MSS (23 items)

35% RR - CAHPS Core plus Medicaid Supplemental Questions (54 items)

34% RR - CAHPS Core plus Medicaid and Chronic Conditions Supplemental Questions (76 items)

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

From: kristin.j.stettler@census.gov  
[mailto:kristin.j.stettler@census.gov]  
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2002 6:29 PM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Page length and response rates

For self-administered mail surveys, is anyone out there familiar with any empirical research on the effect of page length on response rates? Also, the trade-offs between response rates and data quality.

It seems like this is an issue that arises over and over, but I've not seen much published on the topic.

Thanks for any input.

Kristin Stettler  
ESMS, US Census Bureau  
301-457-8426  
kristin.j.stettler@census.gov

=====  
Date: Tue, 01 Oct 2002 12:33:48 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Vacancy announcements for NCHS's Survey Design Staff  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210011216400.11910-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Date: Tue, 01 Oct 2002 14:54:53 -0400  
From: Shimizu, Iris M. <ims1@CDC.GOV>  
Subject: Vacancy announcements for NCHS's Survey Design Staff

Several vacancies have been announced for positions in the Survey Design Staff of National Center for Health Statistics, Office of Research and Methodology.

The announcements close on 12/24/02. U.S. citizenship is required.

MOVING EXPENSES ARE AUTHORIZED. The announcements are located on the web.

For position of Chief, Survey Design Staff:

<http://vaps.hrmo.cdc.gov/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=4-02-023>

For GS13 position:

<http://vaps.hrmo.cdc.gov/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=4-02-024>

For GS14 position:

<http://vaps.hrmo.cdc.gov/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=4-02-025>

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2002 23:10:12 +0300  
From: "Vladimir I. Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>  
X-Mailer: The Bat! (v1.61)  
Reply-To: "Vladimir I. Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
Message-ID: <285186494.20021001231012@kmis.kiev.ua>  
To: "AAPOR Network" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Omnibus in Ukraine  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues,

Between October 15 and 28 Kiev International Institute of Sociology will conduct an omnibus-survey of the adult population of Ukraine.

The deadline to provide questions is October, 7, 2002

Results Available: November 5, 2002

Sample:

2,000 respondents aged 18 years and older, living in Ukraine. Sample is based on random selection of 200 sampling points (post-office districts) all over Ukraine (in all 24 oblasts of Ukraine and Crimea).

Costs per one question - \$260

Discounts and other details are in our WEB site:  
<http://www.kiis.com.ua>

We are inviting you to take part in this survey. We would be glad to cooperate with you.

Sincerely yours,

Vladimir Paniotto

For more information you may also write or call

Natalya Kharchenko, Deputy Director of KIIS  
Office phone / fax: (380-44)-463-5868, 238-2567, 238-2568

E-mail: nkh@kiis.com.ua  
Copy to: office@kiis.com.ua  
          khemelko@kiis-1.kiev.ua  
          omnlist@kiis.com.ua

\*\*\*\*\*  
Volodimir Paniotto, Director of KIIS  
(Kiev International Institute of Sociology)  
Milchakova 1/18, kv.11, Kiev-02002, UKRAINE  
Phone (380-44)-463-5868,238-2567,238-2568 (office)  
Phone (380-44)-517-3949 (home)  
Fax (380-44)-263-3458, phone-fax 463-5868  
E-mail: paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua  
<http://www.kiis.com.ua>  
\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2002 16:33:30 -0400  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Do Not Call list practices  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

About a week ago I sent a message to the AAPORnet membership asking if people would share information about their practices concerning Do Not Call lists, in particular how long numbers were kept on the list. I received very few responses (n=3) but all that did respond, plus my own organization, currently have a policy to leave the number of the list indefinitely. If others would be willing to respond, I'd be glad to post another notice back to AAPORnet.

=====  
Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2002 17:25:57 -0400  
Subject: Stupidity Watch  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F961856CE@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>



Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g91LR5I14779

Stupidity Watch

Los Angeles Times columnist Steve Lopez

<<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-lopez29sep29,0,4292035.column>>,

like Thomas Friedman, doesn't understand how to gauge public opinion.

"Forget what you've heard," he writes: National polls, some of which suggest 70% of Americans support a war against Iraq, are not to be trusted. Roughly 75% of the readers of this column are opposed, and that many people can't be wrong. Twice now I've raised questions about the wisdom of such an undertaking, and several hundred people have backed me up. Lopez apparently doesn't know what a "representative sample is."

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) [hfienberg@stats.org](mailto:hfienberg@stats.org)  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2002 14:29:20 -0700  
From: John Huffman <[jhuffman@netratings.com](mailto:jhuffman@netratings.com)>  
To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Cc: John Huffman <[jhuffman@netratings.com](mailto:jhuffman@netratings.com)>  
Subject: Research Analyst Position Open  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Postion Posting:

Panel Management Research Analyst, Measurement Sciences

NetRatings, Inc, (NTRT) has an opening for a Panel Management Research Analyst at our offices in the heart of the Silicon Valley in Milpitas, California. The Panel Management Research Analyst takes responsibility for providing analytic and technical support for the Nielsen//NetRatings Internet Audience Ratings panels. This key research position assists in the maintenance of our industry accepted, representative research panels ensuring that the highest quality research standards are maintained throughout the panel recruitment, measurement, maintenance and audience ratings reporting cycle.

JOB DESCRIPTION:

The Research Analyst takes responsibility for providing analytic support for the Measurement Science department. In addition, this position will supervise a technical/customer support group.

Types of Responsibilities:

- Produce, analyze and report key metrics to support panel management, maintenance and data quality;
- Maintain relationships with outside vendors;
- Manage panelist incentive program;
- Supervise technical/customer support group and coordinate staffing and phone coverage schedules;
- Maintain phone scripts, interviewer training materials, etc.

This position requires someone:

- who can take complete ownership of tasks;
- who has at minimum a BA/BS in behavioral sciences, statistics, mathematics or other quantitative or research field plus 1-3 years related work experience (advanced degree can substitute)
- Survey/behavioral research, Call Center, or Supervisory experience is a plus;
- Familiar with data analysis tools such as SPSS, SAS, Minitab, LIMDEP or database tools such as Access or SQL.

Compensation is dependent upon experience: Base Salary, semi-annual bonus plan, stock options, Employee Stock Purchase Plan, and benefits are highly competitive.

TO APPLY: For consideration, e-mail or mail a cover letter and resume to the below address. The cover letter should address your experience/expertise in the following categories: statistics, data analysis (including software or tools used), survey or behavioral research, market/media research, analytical ability and communication skills. Reviews will begin immediately and continue until position is filled.

About NetRatings, Inc. Through strategic partnerships between NetRatings (NASDAQ: NTRT), Nielsen Media Research and ACNielsen, the Nielsen//NetRatings services include worldwide Internet audience measurement, AdRelevance tracking of online advertising creatives, impressions and expenditures, and the @plan Internet user lifestyle, demographic, and product brand preferences measurement. Nielsen//NetRatings uses patented technology capable of measuring both Internet use and advertising to provide the most timely, accurate and comprehensive information in the global marketplace. For more information, please visit [www.nielsen-netratings.com](http://www.nielsen-netratings.com)

For more information, please visit [www.netratings.com](http://www.netratings.com) or [www.nielsen-netratings.com](http://www.nielsen-netratings.com) or contact John Huffman at (408) 586-7525 or [jhuffman@netratings.com](mailto:jhuffman@netratings.com)

John Huffman  
Research Manager  
NetRatings, Inc  
[www.NetRatings.com](http://www.NetRatings.com)  
890 Hillview Court, Suite 300  
Milpitas, CA 95035  
(408) 586-7525 Office

jhuffman@netratings.com

---

Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2002 17:32:30 -0400  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>  
Subject: Re: Stupidity Watch  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

Howard Fienberg wrote:

>Stupidity Watch  
>Los Angeles Times columnist Steve Lopez  
><<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-lopez29sep29,0,4292035.column>>,  
>like Thomas Friedman, doesn't understand how to gauge public  
>opinion. "Forget what you've heard," he writes:  
> National polls, some of which suggest 70% of Americans  
>support a war against Iraq, are not to be trusted. Roughly 75% of  
>the readers of this column are opposed, and that many people can't  
>be wrong.  
> Twice now I've raised questions about the wisdom of such an  
>undertaking, and several hundred people have backed me up.  
>Lopez apparently doesn't know what a "representative sample is."

It's this kind of arrogance that gives pollsters a bad name.

All the statistical precision in the world won't help if the questions you ask aren't sufficient to capture ambiguity, ambivalence, or complexity. People are being told that attacking Iraq is the "patriotic" thing to do, so given a forced choice, it's very likely they'll chose "yes" as the right answer. But probe and you find a lot of reservations. Kohut noted this, and he's not as stupid as a newspaper columnist, is he?

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
Village Station - PO Box 953  
New York NY 10014-0704 USA  
voice +1-212-741-9852  
fax +1-212-807-9152  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>  
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

---

Date: Tue, 01 Oct 2002 14:33:57 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <[beniger@almaak.usc.edu](mailto:beniger@almaak.usc.edu)>  
Subject: Re: Vacancy announcements for NCHS's Survey Design Staff (fwd)  
To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Message-id: <[Pine.GSO.4.33.0210011429360.19538-100000@almaak.usc.edu](mailto:Pine.GSO.4.33.0210011429360.19538-100000@almaak.usc.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Kudos to John Fries for solving every mystery of the [www2.cdc.gov/hrmo](http://www2.cdc.gov/hrmo)

Many thanks, John!

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Date: Tue, 01 Oct 2002 17:06:49 -0400  
From: John C. Fries <JCF@SIRresearch.com>  
To: beniger@almaak.usc.edu  
Cc: John C. Fries <JCF@SIRresearch.com>  
Subject: Re: Vacancy announcements for NCHS's Survey Design Staff

Jim,

I was not able to view the postings using the URLs you listed, but found them using the base URL: <http://www2.cdc.gov/hrmo/>

If I added the "viewdetails" text after the above, it successfully opened the position listing. I figured I'd pass this along in case you hear from others having the same problem, though it could very well be something specific to my IP.

Best,

John

-----  
John C. Fries..... JCF@SIRresearch.com  
Senior Project Director.....Voice: 804.358.8981  
Southeastern Institute of Research.....FAX: 804.358.9761  
Marketing and Public Opinion Research...Richmond, Virginia  
-----

James Beniger wrote:

>  
>  
> Date: Tue, 01 Oct 2002 14:54:53 -0400  
> From: Shimizu, Iris M. <ims1@CDC.GOV>  
> Subject: Vacancy announcements for NCHS's Survey Design Staff  
>  
>  
> Several vacancies have been announced for positions in the Survey  
> Design Staff of National Center for Health Statistics, Office of  
> Research and Methodology.  
>  
> The announcements close on 12/24/02. U.S. citizenship is required.  
>  
> MOVING EXPENSES ARE AUTHORIZED. The announcements are located  
> on the web.  
>  
> For position of Chief, Survey Design Staff:  
>  
> <http://vaps.hrmo.cdc.gov/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=4-02-023>  
>

> For GS13 position:  
>  
> <http://vaps.hrmo.cdc.gov/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=4-02-024>  
>  
> For GS14 position:  
>  
> <http://vaps.hrmo.cdc.gov/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=4-02-025>  
>  
>  
> \*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Tue, 01 Oct 2002 18:30:54 -0400  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
Subject: Stupidly Reporting Poll Results  
In-reply-to: <p05100331b9bfc465f9c8@[192.168.1.107]>  
To: dhenwood@panix.com, "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <KLEOLNOOPCIGAOADMGOHCEFDDKAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

Gallup has a very interesting assessment of US attitudes towards the Iraq invasion.

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr021001.asp>

Though the public doesn't like Saddam . . . you know the drill.

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of  
> Doug Henwood  
> Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2002 5:33 PM  
> To: AAPORNET (E-mail)  
> Subject: Re: Stupidity Watch  
>  
>  
> Howard Fienberg wrote:  
>  
> >Stupidity Watch  
> >Los Angeles Times columnist Steve Lopez  
> ><<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-lopez29sep29,0,4292035.column>>,  
> >like Thomas Friedman, doesn't understand how to gauge public  
> >opinion. "Forget what you've heard," he writes:  
> > National polls, some of which suggest 70% of Americans  
> >support a war against Iraq, are not to be trusted. Roughly 75% of  
> >the readers of this column are opposed, and that many people can't  
> >be wrong.  
> > Twice now I've raised questions about the wisdom of such an  
> >undertaking, and several hundred people have backed me up.

> >Lopez apparently doesn't know what a "representative sample is.  
>  
> It's this kind of arrogance that gives pollsters a bad name.  
>  
> All the statistical precision in the world won't help if the  
> questions you ask aren't sufficient to capture ambiguity,  
> ambivalence, or complexity. People are being told that attacking Iraq  
> is the "patriotic" thing to do, so given a forced choice, it's very  
> likely they'll chose "yes" as the right answer. But probe and you  
> find a lot of reservations. Kohut noted this, and he's not as stupid  
> as a newspaper columnist, is he?  
> --  
>  
> Doug Henwood  
> Left Business Observer  
> Village Station - PO Box 953  
> New York NY 10014-0704 USA  
> voice +1-212-741-9852  
> fax +1-212-807-9152  
> cell +1-917-865-2813  
> email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
> web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>  
>

---

Date: Tue, 01 Oct 2002 21:17:35 -0400  
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>  
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD {TLC;RETAIL} (Win95; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: HFienberg@stats.org  
CC: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Stupidity Watch  
References:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F961856CE@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'ved read Friedman and the messages on AAPORNET about this, and I think this is a situation where the sampling procedure is not the main issue.

Opinion researchers are not at liberty to suggest, in questionnaires/interviews, alternatives to the courses of action that are proposed by presidents. Yet the leaders or legislators who see things differently from President Bush have not proposed alternative courses of action. If foreign leaders have alternative scenarios in mind, those don't seem to have reached the American media.

The opinion research focusing on the Iraqi situation that I've heard about would not be truly authentic if one of the questions had to do with whether the objective should be "unseating Saddam" vs. "disarming him" (approximate wording). There has been no open discussion of these alternatives in the media (am I correct?) I've not see any questions about whether people think we "should try to prevent Saddam from obtaining materials that would help him develop nuclear arms" or they think "it is not possible to deter

Saddam by blocking the supply of materials to him" (again, approximate wording).

There should have been much more open discussion -- reported in the media so the public has at least the option of following it -- but since there hasn't, the questions that can be asked sound stilted to me, and don't quite pick up the flavor of the conversations that I have had with friends and colleagues because privately we go way beyond what we read about in terms of what was announced from the White House, in what sequence, for what stated motives, with what prospects of winning support domestically and internationally, winning militarily at what cost, etc.

Jeanne L. Anderson  
(formerly) Principal  
Jeanne Anderson Research

Howard Fienberg wrote:

> Stupidity Watch  
> Los Angeles Times columnist Steve Lopez  
<<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-lopez29sep29,0,4292035.column>>, like Thomas Friedman, doesn't understand how to gauge public opinion. "Forget what you've heard," he writes:  
> National polls, some of which suggest 70% of Americans support a war against Iraq, are not to be trusted. Roughly 75% of the readers of this column are opposed, and that many people can't be wrong.  
> Twice now I've raised questions about the wisdom of such an undertaking, and several hundred people have backed me up.  
> Lopez apparently doesn't know what a "representative sample is."  
>  
> -----  
> Howard Fienberg  
> Senior Analyst  
> The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
> 2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
> Washington, DC 20037  
> (ph) 202-223-3193  
> (fax) 202-872-4014  
> (e) [hfienberg@stats.org](mailto:hfienberg@stats.org)  
> <http://www.stats.org>

---

Date: Tue, 01 Oct 2002 21:49:04 -0400  
To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)  
From: Dick Halpern <[dhalpern@bellsouth.net](mailto:dhalpern@bellsouth.net)>  
Subject: Gallup Poll Analyses - Nine Key Questions About Public Opinion on Iraq  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g921q0I27568

Click on:

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr021001.asp?Version=p>

POLL ANALYSES  
October 1, 2002

Nine Key Questions About Public Opinion on Iraq  
Support for invading Iraq remains high -- but with conditions

by Editors of the Gallup Poll

GALLUP NEWS SERVICE

PRINCETON, NJ --

1. Do Americans favor the idea of military intervention in Iraq?

Basic support for the use of American ground troops to remove Saddam Hussein from power has remained steady throughout the month of September. The Sept. 20-22 CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll found that 57% of Americans said they favored such action, while 38% opposed it.

Source: Gallup.com

Date Released:10/1/2002

Location: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr021001.asp>

etc. etc. etc,

-----  
Copyright © 2002 The Gallup Organization, Princeton, NJ. All rights reserved. These materials are provided for noncommercial, personal use only. Reproduction prohibited without the express permission of The Gallup Organization.  
-----

=====  
Date: Wed, 02 Oct 2002 07:15:10 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: China's Leader Campaigning for Cult Status (Henry Chu, LATimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210020703080.23199-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

PUBLIC OPINION AND POLLING ABSTRACT

China's No. 1 leader, President Jiang Zemin, has learned, despite a media offensive by his handlers that would put many U.S. politicians to shame,



that it's hard to create a cult of personality when so many people think you don't have one. He kisses babies, sings at state banquets and hires pollsters to tell him how he's doing. His face is plastered on billboards and book covers. Like his two iconic predecessors, Mao Tse-tung and Deng Xiaoping, he goes swimming for the cameras to demonstrate his vigor. Whatever his intentions, there is no question that Jiang and his supporters have been trying for years to burnish his image through an aggressive public-relations campaign, including frequent photo ops with world leaders such as the one he will no doubt participate in with President Bush at the American leader's Texas ranch this month. "I think it's a new situation," said Victor Yuan, the founder of an independent polling firm in Beijing that has researched popular attitudes about government. "In the U.S., politicians, at least on the face of it, say they try to please the public. Here, people are not voters; they still [can only] listen to their leaders. But those leaders are starting to think about public opinion." Such opinion still has extremely limited impact on a system that eschews public accountability. Power in China continues to flow mainly from back-room deals, tight political control and other undemocratic practices by the Communist Party. But the current regime has staked its legitimacy on its ability to deliver prosperity to the nation's 1.3 billion people and to turn China into a major player on the world stage. Popular opinion can no longer be written off, even if it's not yet the direct key to power.

#####

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

[www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-fg-jiangloct01.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-fg-jiangloct01.story)

October 1 2002

#### China's Leader Campaigning for Cult Status

Politics: The president wants people to say 'Jiang' with the same reverence as 'Mao' and 'Deng.' The trouble is, he's just not exciting.

By HENRY CHU  
TIMES STAFF WRITER

BEIJING -- It's hard to create a cult of personality when so many people think you don't have one.

That's the tough lesson China's No. 1 leader, President Jiang Zemin, has learned, despite a media offensive by his handlers that would put many U.S. politicians to shame.

He kisses babies, sings at state banquets and hires pollsters to tell him how he's doing. His face is plastered on billboards and book covers. Like his two iconic predecessors, Mao Tse-tung and Deng Xiaoping, he goes swimming for the cameras to demonstrate his vigor.

But to many Chinese, Jiang, 76, still cuts a colorless figure.

"Jiang Zemin is like an old lady," one veteran Communist Party member in Beijing said disdainfully.

By all accounts, the bespectacled, bookish-looking Jiang is desperate to be elevated into the Chinese pantheon alongside Mao, the founder of the People's Republic, and Deng, the mentor who plucked Jiang almost out of nowhere to be his successor.

Yet despite holding all the most important titles in China--president, party secretary and head of the military--Jiang is far less powerful than the two men before him, who ruled with absolute authority based on their status as heroes of the Communist revolution.

These days, Jiang's leadership is under the microscope as China gears up for its 16th Communist Party Congress, a crucial political gathering held every five years and due to begin Nov. 8. All eyes are fixed on the Chinese president to see whether he will step down from his post of party chief, as widely expected, or hang on to power.

Whatever his intentions, there is no question that Jiang and his supporters have been trying for years to burnish his image through an aggressive public-relations campaign, including frequent photo ops with world leaders such as the one he will no doubt participate in with President Bush at the American leader's Texas ranch this month.

Jiang's concern--some call it an obsession--about his public persona is not simply a function of vanity, although those who have met him say there seems no shortage of that. It is also, analysts say, a political ploy, part of a wider effort over the last decade to strengthen his position and ensure that his influence endures even if he steps down in November.

#### New Skepticism in Air

Jiang doesn't boast the pedigree of Mao or Deng. At the same time, 20 years of breakneck social and economic change have given rise to a better-educated, more sophisticated and more skeptical Chinese populace than ever before, open to outside influences and information--some of it highly unflattering to its unelected leaders.

Hence Jiang's unrelenting media blitz, which aims to establish him firmly in the public's eyes as the rightful heir to the throne.

Jiang, observers say, has spent more time and effort cultivating his image than other Chinese leaders, going so far as to discreetly hire a PR firm back in 1997 to find out how people rated his performance in presiding over Hong Kong's return to Beijing's control.

"I think it's a new situation," said Victor Yuan, the founder of an independent polling firm in Beijing that has researched popular attitudes about government. "In the U.S., politicians, at least on the face of it, say they try to please the public. Here, people are not voters; they still [can only] listen to their leaders. But those leaders are starting to think about public opinion."

Such opinion still has extremely limited impact on a system that eschews public accountability. Power in China continues to flow mainly from back-room deals, tight political control and other undemocratic practices by the Communist Party.

But the current regime has staked its legitimacy on its ability to deliver prosperity to the nation's 1.3 billion people and to turn China into a major player on the world stage. Popular opinion can no longer be written off, even if it's not yet the direct key to power.

Gone are the days when Mao or Deng could remain the unquestioned ruler of China whatever the results of his policies.

Mao was revered as the Great Helmsman despite disastrous mistakes such as the Great Leap Forward of the 1950s--a collectivization program in which a staggering 30 million people died of starvation--and the anarchic 1966-76 Cultural Revolution.

Deng, too, remained "paramount leader" through and after the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre, although he held no formal titles by the time of his death except honorary president of a charity and of China's Bridge Assn.

Jiang is a cautious technocrat, not an inspirational revolutionary or visionary. His political credentials come from a Shanghai university and a Soviet car factory, not the legendary Long March of the 1930s, the crucible that yielded the early leaders of the People's Republic.

He has had to rely instead on astute political maneuvering to knock off his rivals ever since Deng anointed him party chief right after the Tiananmen Square massacre.

His handlers have striven to portray Jiang as a modernizer in tune with the times, a progressive thinker who wants to broaden the Communist Party to include not just its traditional base of peasants and workers but China's new elites: its small but increasingly influential middle class, its professionals and intellectuals, and its entrepreneurs.

Jiang's awkwardly named and somewhat confusing political philosophy, the "Three Represents," is widely seen as an attempt to co-opt these growing elites by inviting them to join the party.

"He tries to please everybody," said one public-relations consultant who has advised the government and asked not to be identified. Some of Jiang's attempts to drive home his right of succession have been embarrassingly ham-handed. One newspaper article a few years ago featured photos of Mao and Deng reading the People's Daily, the party mouthpiece. A third picture showed Jiang mimicking them almost down to the pose.

His emphasis on image even dictates his choice of clothes. When the country celebrated 50 years of Communist rule in 1999 with a massive parade through downtown Beijing, Jiang was the only one of China's leaders up on the viewing platform wearing a Mao suit. The others wore Western dress and clapped stonily as marchers went by hoisting huge pictures of Mao, Deng and Jiang.

Perhaps more than any other of his duties, Jiang relishes his role as a world statesman--and plays it up as much as possible. The national evening newscast, seen by hundreds of millions of viewers, airs almost nightly footage of Jiang trotting the globe or receiving tribute in Beijing from small, poor countries that most Chinese have never heard of.

The cameras also track him on highly staged walkabouts among ordinary Chinese, whose flesh he presses and infants he dandles on his knee to show himself a beneficent leader in touch with the average Zhou.

But the results aren't always encouraging.

#### Ridicule and Apathy

Many Chinese think Jiang looks ridiculous and sycophantic bursting into English for foreign dignitaries or indulging his habit, which he apparently thinks charming, of serenading them with snatches of Chinese opera.

Others find it hard to care even enough to poke fun at the "Three Represents," which he is lobbying hard to have written into the Communist Party charter at the party congress. This would guarantee that his influence on China's direction would continue.

A survey of young people found that only 11% could name even one of the "represents." Scoffers say the philosophy should be enshrined in the party charter, alongside "Mao Tse-tung Thought" and "Deng Xiaoping Theory," under the heading "Jiang Zemin's Opinions."

"I don't see Jiang as a particularly popular leader," said Joseph Fewsmith, an expert on Chinese politics at Boston University. "I think there is a real disconnect between the public, which is more interested in making a living, and the leadership, where party mechanisms and control over ideology remain important."

But Jiang lacks the charisma of Mao. And despite the best efforts of his spin doctors, many still do not see him as path-breaking like Deng, who instituted the market-oriented reforms he continued.

"Unless he has been sure of his next move, he has generally not moved. This has given his administration a lackluster character because he is not associated with forceful or visionary leadership," Fewsmith said. "But it has helped him stay in power."

[www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-fg-jiangloct01.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-fg-jiangloct01.story)

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

---

Date: Wed, 2 Oct 2002 09:57:03 -0400  
From: "Allen Barton" <allenbarton@mindspring.com>  
To: <HFienberg@stats.org>, "AAPORNET \ (E-mail\)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F961856CE@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
Subject: Re: Stupidity Watch  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Any poll which simply reported that "70% of Americans support a war against Iraq" would be just as stupid as a columnist who argued that his letters from his readers are a good sample. The same applies to reporting that "57% of Americans support invading Iraq."

Note that the Gallup release of Sept. 24 was entitled: "Americans' View: US should not go it alone in Iraq" and the subtitle of their October 1 release was "Support for invading Iraq remains high - but with conditions." Gallup polls show that only about 37% support an American invasion of Iraq if the UN does not support us, but 79% support invasion if the UN does support an invasion. The Gallup "trend" question obviously produces its 57% support because a considerable number of those people are assuming UN support; conversely it produces 38% opposition because roughly half of those people are assuming that the question means "going it alone" without UN support.

As the Gallup Oct. 1 release puts it (unfortunately on page 9 while p. 1 reports the 57% "support invasion" figure): "Americans are consistent about the need for UN support as a prerequisite for an American attack on Iraq. ...Only about one-third of Americans would favor US military action against Iraq in the face of UN opposition."

The Gallup poll (p. 10 of Oct 1 release) asked "If the United Nations does impose a deadline and Iraq fails to meet it, what should the United Nations do: authorize military action against Iraq, or engage in further diplomatic efforts with Iraq?" 61% favored a UN sponsored military action under this condition. This suggests that "regime change" as such is not the basic public demand; rather it is inspection and removal of Hussein's weapons of mass destruction, with regime change only as a means to that end if Hussein does not permit an effective weapons inspection system. Thus the 57% figure for "invading Iraq with US ground troops to remove Saddam Hussein from power" should not be taken as endorsement of the right-wing Bush advisors' position that "regime change" has to be the unalterable policy of the US. A considerable number within this 57% would clearly be satisfied with an effective inspection and weapons destruction system without "regime change."

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

From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2002 5:25 PM  
Subject: Stupidity Watch

> Stupidity Watch  
> Los Angeles Times columnist Steve Lopez  
<<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-lopez29sep29,0,4292035.column>>,  
like Thomas Friedman, doesn't understand how to gauge public opinion.  
"Forget what you've heard," he writes:  
> National polls, some of which suggest 70% of Americans support a war  
against Iraq, are not to be trusted. Roughly 75% of the readers of this  
column are opposed, and that many people can't be wrong.  
> Twice now I've raised questions about the wisdom of such an undertaking,  
and several hundred people have backed me up.  
> Lopez apparently doesn't know what a "representative sample is."  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Howard Fienberg  
> Senior Analyst  
> The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
> 2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
> Washington, DC 20037  
> (ph) 202-223-3193  
> (fax) 202-872-4014  
> (e) hfienberg@stats.org  
> <http://www.stats.org>  
>  
>  
>

=====  
Date: Wed, 2 Oct 2002 10:24:00 -0500  
From: "Andrew Rojecki" <arojecki@uic.edu>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "Andrew Rojecki" <arojecki@uic.edu>  
Subject: Brazilian public opinion  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0076\_01C269FD.D2CDCBE0"  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0076\_01C269FD.D2CDCBE0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

One of our graduate students is studying the Landless Rural Workers' =  
Movement (MST), a movement fighting for land reform in Brazil. She is =  
particularly interested in the impact media coverage has had on =  
Brazilian public opinion and welcomes any data you might have on mass =

attitudes related to the MST, land reform in general, violence in the countryside, or any related topic. Her study sample includes media coverage of the movement in the years 1981, 1986, 1991, 1997, and 2002, but any poll data collected in Brazil in the last 25 years or so on these issues would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks very much,

Andrew Rojecki  
Department of Communication  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
312-996-4460

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0076\_01C269FD.D2CDCBE0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0076\_01C269FD.D2CDCBE0--

=====  
Date: Wed, 02 Oct 2002 10:44:32 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: New PIPA/Knowledge Networks Poll: Americans on the Conflict with Iraq  
(fwd)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210021035470.17910-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

-----  
New PIPA/Knowledge Networks Poll: Americans on the Conflict with Iraq  
-----

[www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/ConflictIraq/ConflictIraq.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/ConflictIraq/ConflictIraq.pdf)

October 2, 2002

New PIPA/Knowledge Networks Poll: Americans on the Conflict with Iraq

A new poll on public attitudes toward the conflict with Iraq has just been released by the Program on International Policy Attitudes. The poll of 709 Americans was fielded by the research firm Knowledge Networks September 26-30.

A report of findings is available on the website (<http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/ConflictIraq/ConflictIraq.pdf>). To see the press release, go to [<http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/ConflictIraq/pressrelease.pdf>].

Key findings include:

- A majority opposes Congress granting the President's request to give him the power to decide whether to go to war with Iraq, but a majority would support Congress doing so on the condition that the UN first approves the military action.
- A majority favors the goal of disarmament of Iraq through the process of UN inspections over the goal of overthrowing the Iraqi regime. This is true even though most Americans have doubts about whether UN inspectors will succeed in discovering all of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.
- Most Americans believe that Saddam Hussein already has the capability to attack targets in the US with weapons of mass destruction. If disarmament through inspections is not an option, given the choice between dealing with this threat through deterrence or military preemption, a majority chooses the latter.
- The problem of Iraq is seen as a high priority, but not as high as the problem of al-Qaeda.

Please Note: PIPA will notify you by e-mail whenever new reports are being released. If you do not wish to receive these notifications, please let us know.

[www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/ConflictIraq/ConflictIraq.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/ConflictIraq/ConflictIraq.pdf)

---

New PIPA/Knowledge Networks Poll: Americans on the Conflict with Iraq

---

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Wed, 02 Oct 2002 16:10:14 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>  
Subject: Polls and the Cuomo and Torricelli decisions to drop out  
In-Reply-To: <200210020707.g9277PI05412@listproc.usc.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed



An Op-Ed in today's Newsday on polls and the Cuomo and Torricelli decisions to drop out:

Copyright 2002 Newsday, Inc.  
Newsday (New York, NY)  
October 2, 2002 Wednesday ALL EDITIONS  
SECTION: VIEWPOINTS, Pg. A29  
LENGTH: 846 words  
HEADLINE: Campaign Drop-Outs Show Parties at Work

BYLINE: By David Karol. David Karol is a visiting fellow at the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics, Princeton University.

BODY:

The recent last-minute campaign withdrawals by Andrew Cuomo and New Jersey Sen. Robert Torricelli have raised concerns.

Since both candidates dropped out of their respective races after polls showed them trailing their opponents, some observers have been disturbed by the role that polling numbers seem to be playing in the political process. Have polls gone from the background of campaigns to a substitute for them? Have the voters been bypassed?

Not at all. What really links these cases is not so much polls as the revived role of political parties.

The fact that polls can influence the outcomes they are meant to predict is not new. Politicians frequently use polls to test arguments before unveiling them. Candidates, potential and actual, who poll badly have trouble raising funds, since donors don't want to waste money. To that extent, polls can be a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Yet smart politicians realize that polls are at best a snapshot of public sentiment. Sometimes voters' reaction to an issue or a candidate is superficial and can change when they learn more. In those cases, parties and politicians may be undeterred by unfavorable early polls. But as the elections approach, they become more meaningful.

The continued candidacies of Cuomo and Torricelli would have hurt their parties. Having lost his early lead in the Democratic primary for governor, Cuomo would have had to run attack ads, which might have split his party racially - as occurred in the last New York mayoral contest. This would not only have helped Gov. George Pataki, it could have created longer-term problems for New York Democrats. As for Torricelli, not only was he risking Democrats' chances in New Jersey, but his continued campaign would have diverted funds that his party needs for other close races in a year when control of the Senate is at stake.

Both candidates were pressured by their party to withdraw. Undoubtedly much of this was done in private. But some signals were devastatingly public. Most of the Democratic establishment in New York backed H. Carl McCall. Eventually, even Sen. Hillary Clinton, who had been officially neutral, marched with McCall in a parade. Similarly, stories about Democrats' anger at Torricelli had been published in recent days.

Both Cuomo and Torricelli are pragmatists who are playing for the long term. By sparing his party a divisive contest, Cuomo can hope to fight another day. The fact that he was an underdog against McCall and Pataki undoubtedly made Cuomo's decision easier. Torricelli, on the other hand, probably realizes that his campaigning days are over. Yet he, too, can hope to salvage something by withdrawing now, even if it is only the private-sector success and backroom influence that other ethically challenged yet politically adept individuals like former U.S. Rep. Tony Coelho and former Sen. Al D'Amato have enjoyed.

Why then don't we see more of these last-minute withdrawals? After all, there are many hopeless candidates every year. There are a few reasons. Parties may be deterred by the legal and logistical complications already evident in New Jersey.

In addition, there are two key factors present in the cases of Cuomo and Torricelli but often absent elsewhere. First, the party needs to have a better alternative. In many cases, the trailing candidate is still the party's best hope. That's why he or she was nominated in the first place. Second, the underdog needs to be willing to "take one for the team." Understandably, many underdogs will hope they can beat the odds.

Moreover, not all candidates are equally subject to pressure. For example, some have suggested that California GOP gubernatorial candidate Bill Simon should withdraw. He has had legal trouble, lacks experience and is to the right of most California voters. A replacement might have given his party a better chance against Gov. Gray Davis. But unlike Torricelli and Cuomo, Simon, a multi-millionaire and political rookie, is largely immune to party pressures.

Of course even if parties are important, that doesn't mean they're omniscient. Democrats might have miscalculated in New York and New Jersey. McCall has come under attack for misuse of his office to pressure firms to hire his relatives. In retrospect, Andrew Cuomo might have been the stronger candidate. And in New Jersey, the courts may block Democrats' efforts to replace Torricelli. But miscalculation is nothing new in politics. The relevant point is who is doing the calculating.

Elections are supposed to be about giving people a voice in the political process. At their best, parties offer voters a "brand name," which gives voters a signal as to where candidates stand on issues. And by giving competing groups of politicians a stake in their party's overall success, they create an accountability that would otherwise be absent in a political system based on separation of powers.

Polls help parties do their job by letting them know what the public wants. It's not always pretty and it's not always inspiring, but the system is working.

=====  
Date: Thu, 3 Oct 2002 09:34:39 -0400  
Subject: BBC News: Poll on US ties rocks Iran  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F96185709@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:

X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>

To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g93DZjJ13425

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/2294509.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2294509.stm)

Media heads face prosecution in Iran over a ground-breaking opinion poll on mending relations with the United States. It showed a large majority of the population in favour of dialogue with the "Great Satan" and nearly half showing sympathy with US policy on Iran.

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Thu, 03 Oct 2002 09:55:23 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Carolyn L. Funk" <clfunk@vcu.edu>  
Subject: New VCU Life Sciences Survey  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="===== \_5664502==\_.ALT"

----- \_5664502==\_.ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

This may be of interest to list members.

Cary Funk  
VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY  
VCU Life Sciences Survey

PUBLIC VALUES SCIENCE BUT WARY OF CLONING, STEM CELL RESEARCH

RICHMOND, Va. Americans clearly value the contributions of science to society but are wary of cloning and other new scientific technologies, according to a new nationwide survey conducted by Virginia Commonwealth University. Survey results show that ambivalence toward scientific developments is evident in a number of areas including a clear drop in support for medical research using embryonic stem cells compared to just one year ago. This underlying ambivalence is poised to continue as new scientific technologies bring new business opportunities for private

industry.

The VCU Life Sciences Survey was conducted by telephone with 1000 adults nationwide, September 4-16, 2002. The margin of error for the poll is plus or minus 3 percentage points. This is the second annual VCU Life Sciences survey conducted for VCU Life Sciences by the VCU Center for Public Policy.

#### Survey highlights:

##### Strong Objections to Human Cloning

The idea of human cloning elicits strong opposition among the American public. 81 percent are either somewhat or strongly opposed to cloning and most of these are strongly opposed to it. Just 16 percent favor human cloning. Seven in ten consider it morally wrong for businesses to use human cloning technology in developing new products while just 19 percent think this is morally acceptable. Even those who consider themselves clear about the differences between therapeutic and reproductive cloning expressed strong opposition to cloning. Less opposition is found for cloning if it is limited to research for the treatment of disease. Under these conditions, 45 percent are in favor while 51 percent are opposed.

##### Support for Stem Cell Research Drops

When federal funding for stem cell research from human embryos was discussed a year ago, it looked like public support was behind the research. A year later, only 35 percent favor stem cell research whereas 51 percent are opposed. Opinion on this issue tracks closely with views about abortion.

##### Positive and Negative Contributions of Science

Overwhelming majorities believe that developments in science have helped make society better (85 percent) and agree that scientific research is essential for improving the quality of human lives (90 percent). When asked to name the most positive contribution of science, the most frequently mentioned areas were health and medical advances (27 percent) and computer technology (24 percent).

At the same time, clear majorities have reservations about the role of science in society. 69 percent agree that scientific research these days doesn't pay enough attention to the moral values of society and six in ten agree that scientific research has created as many problems for society as it has solutions. When asked to name the most negative contribution of science, no single area stood out. More frequently mentioned areas included nuclear and other weapons, mass communications technology such as cell phones, computer technology and cloning.

##### Do Business and Science Mix?

Americans endorse a more skeptical view of scientists when

thinking=20  
about the temptations to make money from new medical and scientific=20  
discoveries. 66 percent agree with a statement indicating that the new=20  
business opportunities encourage scientists to cut corners on research=20  
quality. Similarly, 69 percent agree that the temptation to make money from=  
=20  
new technologies puts pressure on scientists to pursue ideas that violate=20  
ethical principles.

=B7           Recent restrictions on medical research have often applied only  
to=  
=20  
research supported by federal funds while leaving research sponsored by=20  
private businesses untouched. When asked about this issue, 58 percent felt=  
=20  
that the rules governing medical research should be the same for both=20  
federally-funded and private business research while 36 percent felt it was=  
=20  
okay to have different rules in place. When making those rules, a=20  
majority-- at 53 percent -- feel that restrictions on medical research=20  
should take into account research practices in other countries while 41=20  
percent feel U.S. laws should not take this into account.

Public Reactions to Disagreements in Science  
=B7           While scientific and medical disagreements over recommendations=  
and=20  
explanations for events and conditions are often in the news, the public=20  
appears to take these in with a fair amount of support and understanding.=20  
86 percent agree that when scientists disagree it helps scientific experts=  
=20  
weed out weak theories and evidence.  
A complete report on the findings of the survey can be found at=20  
<http://www.vcu.edu/lifesci/overview/polls.html>.

CONTACT:  
Cary Funk, Survey Director  
VCU Center for Public Policy  
Phone: 804 827-1430  
E-mail [clfunk@vcu.edu](mailto:clfunk@vcu.edu)

Thomas F. Huff, Vice Provost for Life Sciences  
Phone: 804 827 5600

====\_5664502==\_.ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\*           ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---           \*  
\*       This post contains a forbidden message format       \*  
\*   (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting)   \*  
\*       This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT   \*  
\*   If your postings display this message your mail program   \*  
\*   is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting   \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

====\_5664502==\_.ALT--

---

Date: Thu, 03 Oct 2002 10:22:54 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Employment Opportunity: Director  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210031017570.25781-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Date: Thu, 03 Oct 2002 11:51:57 -0500  
From: Kirk M Wolter <wolter@IASTATE.EDU>  
Subject: Employment Opportunities 1(4)

I am pleased to bring to your attention and invite applications for several very attractive employment opportunities:

1. Director of one of the component units of the Interdisciplinary Research Institute for Survey Science (IRISS)
2. Faculty in survey statistics and methodology
3. Survey directors/senior survey directors
4. Postdocs.

This message describes the first of these opportunities.

-----

Director

Institute for Social & Behavioral Research

Iowa State University invites applications for Director, Institute for Social & Behavioral Research. ISBR is affiliated with IRISS (see ad on left) and conducts NIMH and NIDA-funded research on social and behavioral issues related to families and physical and emotional health. It has a strong national reputation for basic research, the translation of research into prevention interventions, and the diffusion of empirically-supported prevention programs. ISBR has over 40 faculty and professional staff members and nearly 200 full and part-time employees. Candidates for Director must have an established record of scholarly activity appropriate to hold the tenured rank of Professor in a department relevant to the work of ISBR; must be nationally recognized through sustained scholarly activity and grant support; and must have demonstrated ability to compete successfully for extramural funding and to network with funding and other relevant agencies. Candidates must possess strong interpersonal, communication, and organizational skills.

Applicants should send a letter describing their qualifications and professional goals, a curriculum vita, and the names of 3 references to: Dr. Fred Lorenz, Search Committee Chair (Att: Betty Davis), Institute for Social & Behavioral Research, 2625 North Loop Drive, Suite 500, Ames IA 50010-8296. Review of applications will begin December 1 and continue

until the position is filled.

Kirk Wolter  
218 Snedecor Hall  
IRISS  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50011

---

=====  
Date: Thu, 3 Oct 2002 12:51:32 -0700  
From: "Steve Johnson" <stevej@nsdssurvey.org>  
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210031017570.25781-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: GIS for residential sampling  
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 6.00.2600.0000  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

Is anyone familiar with the use of GIS to sample a residential population. The method, as it was briefly described to me, is to use GIS to locate residential addresses, sample from those addresses, hand deliver a questionnaire, and then hand pick up the completed survey. Several issues/problems come to mind with this approach, but I wondered what the collective AAPOR knowledge about this is, particularly as it relates to sample bias, and costs.  
Thanks in advance

Stephen Johnson, PhD  
President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

---

Date: Thu, 03 Oct 2002 14:43:15 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: TV to Decide Brazilian Elections (Michael Astor, AP)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210031427380.7492-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from QUOTED-PRINTABLE to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g93LhUJ16909

PUBLIC OPINION AND POLLING ABSTRACT

Television will decide Brazil's presidential race, government candidate

Jose Serra predicts. Advertising time provided free by the government is a vital source of political information in Brazil, a country where 80 percent of the 115 million people have only an eighth-grade education. Opposition candidate Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva, with his warm, intensely personal TV spots, has struck a nerve with voters that has placed him on the brink of victory. Polls show that Lula has 45 percent of the votes for Sunday's election, compared to 21 percent for Serra. He can win outright and avoid a runoff in late October if he gets more than 50 percent. The government gives all major candidates free air time on 50-minute radio and TV programs that all stations must broadcast twice daily. Studies show that most Brazilians watch the programs at least once. But this year, thanks to a hotly disputed campaign, the programs are more popular than ever. Serra was running behind Lula but expected to close the gap when the TV campaigning began last month. Air time is allotted according to the congressional representation of the parties that back a candidate, and Serra's ruling coalition gave him more than all other candidates. Although his ratings initially improved, Serra soon stalled in the polls.

-- Jim

---

Copyright (c) 2002, NEWSDAY, Inc. <www.newsday.com>

---

[www.newsday.com/news/nationworld/wire/sns-ap-brazil-elections-tv1003oct03,0,600344.story](http://www.newsday.com/news/nationworld/wire/sns-ap-brazil-elections-tv1003oct03,0,600344.story)

October 3, 2002, 4:43 PM EDT

TV to Decide Brazilian Elections

By MICHAEL ASTOR

Associated Press Writer

RIO DE JANEIRO, Brazil -- Television will decide Brazil's presidential race, government candidate Jose Serra predicted. He may be right -- but experts say his adversary's ads are the best on the air.

The advertising time provided free by the government is a vital source of political information in Brazil, a country where 80 percent of the 115 million people have only an eighth grade education.

And opposition candidate Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva, with his warm, intensely personal TV spots, has struck a nerve with voters that has placed him on the brink of victory.

Polls show that Lula has 45 percent of the votes for Sunday's election, compared with 21 percent for Serra. He can win outright and avoid a runoff in late October if he gets more than 50 percent.

Lula, a former union boss who lost his last three bids for the presidency, drew on his own background to produce TV spots with the drama of Brazil's beloved soap operas.

He told of losing his first wife and son in childbirth, and of his



imprisonment by a 1964-85 military dictatorship.

Media analysts say that while Serra discusses his platform for improving Brazil, Lula speaks to the country's heart.

It didn't help that the large, dark bags under Serra's eyes give him the look of an undertaker. Even his supporters describe him as "anti-charismatic."

Then there's Serra's rhetoric, which is more profound and dense than Lula's and doesn't appeal to the average voter, said Alberto Dines, editor of the media-watching Web site and TV show Observatoria da Imprensa.

In Brazil, he said, "It's easier to make an emotional appeal than a rational appeal"

The government gives all major candidates free air time on 50-minute radio and TV programs that all stations must broadcast twice daily. Studies show that most Brazilians watch the programs at least once. But this year, thanks to a hotly disputed campaign, the programs are more popular than ever.

Brazilian political history shows that television can make a politician's career, or quickly destroy it.

Fernando Collor de Mello was a master, exploiting his aquiline profile and deep baritone to rise from obscure state governor to president in 1989.

In the same election, a right-wing candidate with a bushy black beard used his few seconds of TV time to shout "My name is Eneas!" The slogan caught on, and five years later Eneas Carneiro polled 7 percent of the votes for president.

Serra was running behind Lula but expected to close the gap when the TV campaigning began last month. Air time is allotted according to the congressional representation of the parties that back a candidate, and Serra's ruling coalition gave him more than all other candidates. It didn't happen. Although his ratings initially improved, Serra soon stalled in the polls.

Serra did effectively use television to detonate rival Ciro Gomes, a center-left candidate who only weeks ago was neck-and-neck with Lula.

Serra ran tapes showing Gomes in a radio interview calling a listener "stupid," and Gomes began a freefall to fourth place, with barely 10 percent of the vote.

"The big news in this year's TV campaign was how it practically destroyed the candidacy of Ciro Gomes," said Haroldo de Britto, a political analyst with Goes e Consultores Associados. "In this case the negative campaigning worked, because Gomes supplied all the material against himself."

-----  
Copyright (c) 2002, NEWSDAY, Inc. <www.newsday.com>  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Thu, 03 Oct 2002 16:56:30 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: New Virus Warning!  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210031655290.12739-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

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

Date: Thu, 03 Oct 2002 16:11:10 -0700  
From: Bureau of Public Secrets <knabb@slip.net>  
To: Bureau of Public Secrets <knabb@slip.net>  
Subject: New Virus Information

Dear friends,

A new virus has appeared the last few days and seems to be spreading very rapidly. It is apparently a variation of the "Klez" viruses that started circulating last spring. I personally have received over 30 messages containing this virus in the past four days. That quantity no doubt reflects the fact that I have a pretty high public presence on the Net and am in lots of people's address lists; but it suggests that the virus is widespread and that many of you are also likely to receive it.

Like the previous Klez viruses, this virus can take advantage of a glitch in old Windows systems to automatically open itself onto your computer. So if you haven't updated your Windows 98, the usual advice -- "Do not open strange email attachments" -- is not sufficient.

I recommend that you subscribe to some anti-virus program. I subscribe to McAfee's "VirusScan Online." It costs \$30/year and is quite convenient since it updates itself automatically every few days (which is essential: an anti-virus program that is even a week out of date will not catch this current virus, for example, because it was just discovered a few days ago). I don't subscribe to McAfee's other programs (firewall, anti-spam, etc.), but the virus risk is a serious one. Without an anti-virus program you're almost bound to get a virus sooner or later. At best it's a hassle (you have to debug your computer and then send out warnings and apologies to everyone on your list); at worst, it could damage or destroy your files.

As most of you are aware, two of the telltale signs of a virus hoax are that it is not dated (and hence can continue circulating indefinitely) and

that it contains no reliable references to verify it. For verification of this message, please see the notice below, sent to me today (Oct. 3) by McAfee. You can go to their site for information on the virus. And you can subscribe to VirusScan Online by clicking the link at the bottom.

Two additional notes: I've noticed that the virus-containing messages are almost invariably exactly 70K in size. So if you use a web-based email system that shows the size, you can delete such messages before downloading them.

Note also: Among other deviousnesses, the virus tends to falsify the return address. So do not assume that a virus message seemingly sent from a certain address means that the computer at that address is infected. That address may simply have been gleaned from a computer that is infected.

Cheers,

Ken Knabb

\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
\*\* VIRUS ALERT - W32/Bugbear@MM \*\*  
\*\* HIGH RISK \*\*  
-----

Dear Ken,

McAfee.com has seen a large and growing number of computers infected with W32/Bugbear@MM virus. The risk assessment has been UPDATED TO HIGH for home and corporate users. Users should update their anti-virus software as soon as possible.

#### DESCRIPTION

W32/Bugbear@MM is a mass-mailing worm that attempts to send itself to email addresses found on an infected system. It also spreads through open network shares and has the ability to send print jobs to printers found on an infected network.

The "from" field, subject line, message body, and attachment all vary widely and may appear to be legitimate email.

The virus will attempt to disable various security products, including anti-virus and personal firewall software.

It will also try to install a backdoor trojan that can capture what the user types, including sensitive information such as passwords. The trojan will also allow a hacker to upload files from the infected system, download files onto the system, run executable files and stop processes from running.

#### HOW TO GET MORE INFORMATION

McAfee.com will continue to update you on the latest details of the W32/Bugbear@MM virus, click here for more information:  
==> <http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=4035>

Sincerely,  
McAfee.com

---

Date: Thu, 3 Oct 2002 16:57:17 -0700  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCR.C.ORG>  
To: "'AAPORNET'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Zip code prefix link?  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Does anyone know of files that list zip code for area code-prefix combinations?

thanks,

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

---

Date: Thu, 03 Oct 2002 20:26:07 -0700  
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>  
Subject: RE: Zip code prefix link?  
To: "'Voigt, Lynda '" <lvoigt@fhcrc.org>, "'AAPORNET' '" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <3BAE9A3E52E8234BB392CB924B8060DB528FAE@mainex2.asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_XL/Qy/nYWZFvEQJ4zrZ7tQ)"

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\_XL/Qy/nYWZFvEQJ4zrZ7tQ)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Yes. We use Genesys, it will report the zip codes for listed numbers for each area-exchange. It lists up to six zip codes; I frequently find significant overlap of zip codes.

In fact, to draw a sample defined by zip codes, you have to examine the distribution and decide what proportion of listed numbers have to in a zip code for Genesys to draw sample from that area-exchange.

I'm sure other sampling systems have similar capabilities. Don't know of any other sources; by its nature this is expensive data to compile and report.

Shap Wolf  
Arizona State University  
Survey Research Laboratory

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

From: Voigt, Lynda  
To: 'AAPORNET'  
Sent: 10/3/02 4:57 PM  
Subject: Zip code prefix link?

Does anyone know of files that list zip code for area code-prefix combinations?

thanks,

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_XL/Qy/nYWZFvEQJ4zrZ7tQ)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\*           ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---           \*  
\*       This post contains a forbidden message format       \*  
\*   (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting)   \*  
\*       This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT   \*  
\*   If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\*   is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

--Boundary\_(ID\_XL/Qy/nYWZFvEQJ4zrZ7tQ)--  
--Boundary\_(ID\_XL/Qy/nYWZFvEQJ4zrZ7tQ)--  
--Boundary\_(ID\_XL/Qy/nYWZFvEQJ4zrZ7tQ)--

=====  
Date: Fri, 4 Oct 2002 10:10:04 -0400  
From: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@grizzard.com>  
To: "'lvoigt@fhcrc.org'" <lvoigt@fhcrc.org>, "'AAPORNET'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Zip code prefix link?  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

You can obtain a dataset with this information from [www.melissadata.com](http://www.melissadata.com).  
They are relatively inexpensive as well.

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias

---

Statistical Consultant  
Grizzard  
229 Peachtree Street - 12th Floor  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
(404) 935-7481

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

From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org]  
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2002 7:57 PM  
To: 'AAPORNET'  
Subject: Zip code prefix link?

Does anyone know of files that list zip code for area code-prefix combinations?

thanks,

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

---

Date: Fri, 4 Oct 2002 10:21:30 -0400  
From: "Commiskey, Patricia" <PCommiskey@som.umaryland.edu>  
To: "AAPORnet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Question regarding CATI literature...  
X-Priority: 1  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Can anyone suggest one or a couple of basic, but thorough, articles on using different technologies in survey research, particularly CATI but also scannable surveys, web-based, etc.? I was looking for information on methodology but also for comparisons to each other (benefits, disadvantages).

Thanks in advance! 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

---

Date: Fri, 4 Oct 2002 10:22:27 -0400  
From: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@grizzard.com>  
To: "'PCommiskey@som.umaryland.edu'" <PCommiskey@som.umaryland.edu>,  
"AAPORnet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Question regarding CATI literature...  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

I'd see the following for a broad range of articles on the subject:

Computer Assisted Survey Information Collection by Mick P. Couper.  
It is published by Wiley, John and Sons, Incorporated in 1998 ( ISBN: 0471178489).

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias

---

Statistical Consultant  
Grizzard  
229 Peachtree Street - 12th Floor  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
(404) 935-7481

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

From: Commiskey, Patricia [mailto:PCommiskey@som.umaryland.edu]  
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2002 10:22 AM  
To: AAPORnet (E-mail)  
Subject: Question regarding CATI literature...  
Importance: High

Can anyone suggest one or a couple of basic, but thorough, articles on using different technologies in survey research, particularly CATI but also scannable surveys, web-based, etc.? I was looking for information on methodology but also for comparisons to each other (benefits, disadvantages).

Thanks in advance! 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

---

Date: Fri, 04 Oct 2002 13:12:41 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Dick Halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>  
Subject: Question regarding CATI literature...  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Take a look at Quirks, a market research magazine. The theme of their July/August Issue is on On line Research. They list a number of on line research companies and review three of them. They also have a web site, [www.quirks.com](http://www.quirks.com), which has a good archive of market research articles on all sorts of topics. Worth a look.

Dick Halpern

Can anyone suggest one or a couple of basic, but thorough, articles on using different technologies in survey research, particularly CATI but also scannable surveys, web-based, etc.? I was looking for information on methodology but also for comparisons to each other (benefits, disadvantages).

Thanks in advance! 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](mailto:pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 04 Oct 2002 19:29:44 -0400  
From: "Richard Clark" <[clark@cviog.uga.edu](mailto:clark@cviog.uga.edu)>  
X-Accept-Language: en-us, en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)  
CC: [JLMcCrary@bcps.k12.md.us](mailto:JLMcCrary@bcps.k12.md.us)  
Subject: Surveying children  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Can anyone suggest some literature on surveying children for a colleague of mine? We'd be interested in some methodological considerations as well as any case studies AAPORites could recommend.

-- Rich

---

Rich Clark, Ph.D.  
Manager, Survey Research and Data Services Unit  
Director of Peach State Poll  
Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
University of Georgia  
(706) 542-2736

---

Date: Sun, 06 Oct 2002 10:42:54 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto: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: IL Poll  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Our latest poll on Illinois races appears here:

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-0210060409oct06,0,7336095.story?coll=chi%2Dnews%2Dhed>

---

Date: Sun, 06 Oct 2002 20:02:42 -0400  
From: "Linda Young" <young@pire.org>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "Bernard E. Murphy" <MURPHY@pire.org>  
Subject: Questions re: Web survey of military personnel  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-7  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g9702tJ19823

Colleagues,

One of our research scientists has asked me to post the following questions to AAPOR members regarding web-based surveys. We would very much appreciate any thoughts, references, etc. that you could pass along. Please send your responses to me and I will forward them to Dr. Murphy. Thanks very much for your help.

---

We are conducting a web-based survey of Navy commanders in order to learn their opinions about a course that we provide for their sailors. All commands on a particular base were requested to complete the 5-10 minute web-based survey. This, then, is a "list-based sample of high-coverage populations" (Couper's Type 5 in his article "Web Surveys: A Review of Issues and Approaches," Public Opinion Quarterly, 2000).

We are seeking articles or experiences with populations similar to military commands where an e-mail request to complete a web based survey is made. Based on previous experiences, what is a reasonable response rate? What strategies have been found to increase the rate? What level of effort is required for each strategy?

Bernard Murphy, Ph.D.  
Senior Program Director  
Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation  
11710 Beltsville Drive, Suite 300  
Calverton, Maryland 20705

Linda Young  
Center Director  
Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation  
(502) 634-3694, ext. 11

FAX: (502) 634-5690  
Email: Young@PIRE.org

---

Date: Mon, 07 Oct 2002 06:13:37 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Public Says Bush Needs to Pay Heed to Weak Economy (NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210070612350.28104-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/07/politics/07POLL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/07/politics/07POLL.html)

October 7, 2002

Public Says Bush Needs to Pay Heed to Weak Economy

By ADAM NAGOURNEY and JANET ELDER

A majority of Americans say that the nation's economy is in its worst shape in nearly a decade and that President Bush and Congressional leaders are spending too much time talking about Iraq while neglecting problems at home, according to the latest New York Times/CBS News poll.

The poll found signs of economic distress that cut across party and geographic lines. Nearly half of all Americans are worried that they or someone in their household will be out of a job within a year.

The number of Americans who said they believe the economy is worse than it was just two years ago has increased markedly since the summer. The number of Americans who approved of the way Mr. Bush has handled the economy -- 41 percent -- was the lowest it has been in his presidency. Many people said they worried that a war in Iraq -- which most Americans view as inevitable -- would disrupt an already unsettled economy.

The poll found that despite the emphasis by Mr. Bush since Labor Day on the need to move against Saddam Hussein, support for such a policy has not changed appreciably since the summer. While most Americans said they backed Mr. Bush's campaign against Iraq, the sentiment was expressed with reservations and signs of apprehension about its potential repercussions.

Americans said they feared a long and costly war that could spread across the Middle East and encourage more terrorist attacks in the United States. They said they did not want the United States to act without support from allies and did not want the United States to act

before United Nations weapons inspectors had an opportunity to enter Iraq.

As Congress prepares to resume debate on a resolution supporting the use of force in Iraq, Americans said they thought members of both parties were trying to manipulate the issue for their political advantage.

"Bush is spending way too much time focusing on Iraq instead of the economy, and he's doing it as a political move," said Gladys Steele, 42, a homemaker from Seattle who is a political independent, in a follow-up interview yesterday. "He thinks keeping us fearful about going to war will distract us from how bad the economy is."

The poll was conducted a month before what Democrats and Republicans view as an extraordinarily competitive round of midterm Congressional elections.

In recent days many Democrats have grown glum about the upcoming election, arguing that Mr. Bush and the White House have successfully drowned out domestic issues that the Democrats had hoped to capitalize on with his talk of war. Many Democrats had even feared that the debate over war had undermined their chances of winning the House and holding on to their one-seat margin in the Senate.

Mr. Bush is to deliver a national address on the subject tonight.

But the Times/CBS News poll suggests that no matter what is happening in Washington, voters are more concerned with the economy and domestic issues than with what is happening with Saddam Hussein, presenting the Democrats a glimmer of hope as Congress prepares to vote on the Iraq resolution and adjourn to campaign.

Whether any of this makes a difference in an election that will most likely be decided in a handful of Senate and House races is an entirely different matter. A nationwide poll, while revealing of broad sentiments in the American electorate, cannot be used to predict results accurately in the relatively small number of Congressional races that are considered competitive.

This poll, conducted by telephone Thursday through Saturday, was taken of 668 adults nationwide. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus four percentage points.

By every indication, the subject of Iraq should dominate the news out of Washington for at least the next week. There is Mr. Bush's speech tonight, and then the debate in Congress is expected to last at least through Friday.

In addition, in a handful of competitive races, Republican candidates are seeking to use the issue of acting against Iraq as a way to undercut Democratic opponents.

Two-thirds of Americans say they approve of the United States using military power to oust Mr. Hussein. A majority of Americans say that Mr. Bush has a clear plan to deal with Iraq; by contrast, a majority say the White House does not have a clear plan to deal with terrorism

at home.

But there are signs of ambivalence.

With Mr. Bush pushing for quick action against Baghdad, nearly two-thirds of respondents said they wanted to give the United Nations more time to try to send weapons inspectors into Iraq.

Similarly, most Americans said Mr. Bush should not act until he wins approval from Congress -- and they applauded Congress's pushing the administration for details on its Iraqi plans.

There were also clear suggestions that some Americans suspected that Mr. Bush's intentions went beyond simply disarming Iraq. More than half said that Mr. Bush was more interested in removing Mr. Hussein than in removing potentially lethal weapons.

Fully 7 in 10 respondents said they expected that war with Iraq was inevitable. More than half said they believed that Iraq poses a greater threat to the United States today than it did two years ago.

On a number of measures, the poll suggested that politicians in Washington were out of step with the concern of Americans. Again and again, in questions and in follow-up interviews, respondents talked more about the economy than Baghdad and expressed concern that leaders in Washington were not paying enough attention to the issues that mattered to them.

"There is no balance right now between finding solutions to our domestic problems and our foreign affairs," said Michael Chen, 30, an independent who works as a sales manager in Beaverton, Ore. "No one is talking about how to solve the economic downfall."

Geoff Crooks, 44, an independent who lives in Lincoln, Neb., said: "We are paying way too much attention to Iraq."

"Meanwhile, the stock market has fallen 25 percent and tons of people are unemployed -- including myself," said Mr. Crooks, who had worked as a travel consultant.

Democrats have hoped that concern about the economy would allow them to turn this election into a referendum on Republican fiscal policies, in a way that would sweep out of office a large number of Republicans -- what politicians refer to as a nationalization of the election. So far, there is no evidence that that has begun.

But the concern about the economy would seem to be a matter of concern for Mr. Bush, who is two years away from his own re-election campaign. More than two-thirds said the president should be paying more attention to the economy than he is.

"I hate to say this because I'm a Republican, but the economy was better when Clinton was in office," said Donna Doolittle, 42, a benefits coordinator who works at a hospital in Holiday, Fla. "Maybe interest rates are low now, but health insurance is going up; there are layoffs."

Mrs. Doolittle said she thought that Mr. Bush was trying to make the country "feel safe after what happened" but added, "We need to feel safe about the economy, too."

There were other findings that could prove important over the final weeks of the campaign. Over the summer, Democrats had hoped that the turmoil on Wall Street and reports of corporate malfeasance would give them an issue to use against Republicans. The poll found that nearly half the respondents thought that Mr. Bush was more interested in protecting corporations than in protecting ordinary Americans.

There was unhappiness as well among Americans about Congress. Nearly half of the respondents said they disapproved of the way Congress was doing its job, and 70 percent said they thought it was time to throw out some incumbents and bring in some new members. In 1994, when Republicans, lead by Newt Gingrich, swept Democrats out of control of the House, that figure was 84 percent.

But at the same time, in a not-unusual bit of discordance often found by poll takers measuring the view of Congress, more than half of registered voters said they would vote to re-elect their own local representative.

Not unusually, among all respondents, Republicans were seen as stronger on the military and in dealing with terror -- the issues that have largely dominated the news out of Washington over the past month. Democrats are seen as the stronger party in dealing with domestic issues; in particular, Social Security and prescription drugs. Those are the issues that party leaders said they were planning to try once more to emphasize once Congress leaves Washington and the campaigns move into their final days.

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/07/politics/07POLL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/07/politics/07POLL.html)

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Mon, 07 Oct 2002 06:36:46 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: NYTimes/CBSNews Poll Results on Bush on US economy (NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210070636090.2449-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

Do you think George W. Bush is paying enough attention to the economy,  
or should he be paying more attention?

	Enough Attention	Should Be Paying More	No Opinion
TOTAL	27 %	69	5
Republicans	44 %	51	4
Independents	29 %	65	6
Democrats	13 %	83	4

Numbers may not add to  
100 because of rounding.

The New York Times/CBS News Poll

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Mon, 7 Oct 2002 11:16:59 -0400  
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Zogby: What Arabs Think: Values, Beliefs and Concerns  
Message-ID: <000001c26e14\$95a58850\$6901a8c0@mark>  
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, Build 10.0.3416  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

FYI: Article in today's Washington Post.

---

Poll Finds Arabs Dislike U.S. Based on Policies It Pursues  
American Freedoms, Values Viewed Favorably, Survey Says

By Karen DeYoung

Washington Post Staff Writer  
Monday, October 7, 2002; Page A13

A comprehensive survey of attitudes and opinions in the Arab world has found that Arabs look favorably on American freedoms and political values, but have a strongly negative overall view of the United States based largely on their disapproval of U.S. policy toward the region.

The survey's author, U.S. public opinion firm Zogby International, said that Arab views do not reflect "an anti-Western sentiment at work," and noted that France, Canada, Germany and Japan were among countries with highly favorable ratings.

The United States, Britain and Israel were viewed unfavorably in all eight countries surveyed, including Kuwait, where a U.S.-led international coalition drove out Iraqi occupiers during the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

The results appeared contrary to the basic thrust of stepped-up "public diplomacy" outreach programs that the Bush administration and Congress have promoted in the wake of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks. The programs rest on the premise that anti-American views in the region stem largely from lack of knowledge about U.S. values.

Although the Arab world has been the subject of numerous marketing surveys, there have been few, if any, widespread inquiries into values and beliefs. Pollsters conducted face-to-face interviews last spring with 3,800 adults in Lebanon, Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Morocco, Egypt and among Israeli Arabs. Each was asked 92 questions covering their values, political concerns, mood and outlook, self-definition and how they viewed the world. Results of the survey, sponsored by the Saudi-backed Arab Thought Foundation, were released over the weekend.

Overall, Arabs reflected positively on their own situations and the future. Asked Ronald Reagan's campaign question: "Are you better off now than you were four years ago?" a strong plurality in most countries said yes, and believed that their children would fare better still.

Asked what matters most to them, Arabs reflected the views of those in similar surveys throughout the world, focusing principally on personal matters, including quality of life and economic opportunity, family and faith. On the relative importance of values to be taught to children, they gave highest marks to self-respect, good health and hygiene and responsibility, followed by respect for elders, achievement of a better life and self-reliance.

The importance of religious faith, as a personal value and in teaching children, was number one in both Saudi Arabia and Egypt. But in other Arab countries, including Lebanon, the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait, it was of significantly less concern.

Arab Americans, who were also surveyed for purposes of comparison, rated responsibility as the most important value for parents to teach their children, placing religion at the bottom of the list.

Survey responses indicated little substantive difference when broken down by age, gender and education. In a region where national borders were largely drawn by colonial powers, respondents chose "being Arab" as a self-identifier far more often than nationality or religion in every country but Lebanon.

A plurality of respondents, asked to rate 10 issues in order of political importance to them, put civil and personal rights at the top of the list. Health care was second, followed by the "rights of the Palestinian people."

Interpreting these results, Zogby notes that the Palestinian issue, rather than being seen as a matter of foreign policy, "appears to have become a personal matter . . . ahead of more general concerns like moral standards or the state of their country's economy."

These views appeared to play a major role in determining Arab attitudes toward the United States. A majority of respondents in Egypt, Kuwait, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia, for example, looked favorably on what the survey described as "American freedom and democracy." Assessments of American technological abilities and culture received similarly high marks. In all four countries, however, less than 10 percent viewed U.S.-Arab policy favorably.

Asked what the United States could do "to improve its relations with the Arab world," respondents focused largely on what they saw as a general unfairness toward and lack of understanding of the region, and a particular bias toward Israel in the Israeli-Arab conflict.

C 2002 The Washington Post Company

-----  
New Book: What Arabs Think  
Landmark Study of Arab Values  
and Political Concerns

<http://www.zogby.com>  
<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=627>  
<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=629>

=====  
Date: Mon, 07 Oct 2002 11:49:01 -0700  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
From: Douglas Strand <dstrand@csm.Berkeley.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Zogby: What Arabs Think: Values, Beliefs and Concerns  
In-Reply-To: <000001c26e14\$95a58850\$6901a8c0@mark>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="=====\_3380202==\_ .ALT"



-----\_3380202==\_.ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Can we get a response to this Zogby poll from somebody at Gallup?

The findings in a number of ways sound contrary to the findings of the Gallup poll of Muslim countries, presented at the last AAPOR conference. Particularly noteworthy to me were the findings that respondents were more likely to be optimistic about the changes in their personal well-being, and (allegedly) likely to support American values. Maybe my memory is off here, but didn't Gallup report finding the opposite on both counts, in general?

It seems to have been rather poor judgment on the part of the Washington Post to do this story without including any mention of the recent Gallup results for many of these same countries, on many of these same issues.

-Doug Strand  
-----

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Project Director  
Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
Survey Research Center  
Univ. of California, Berkeley  
510-642-0508

At 11:16 AM Monday 10/7/02 -0400, you wrote:

>FYI: Article in today's Washington Post.

>-----

>

>Poll Finds Arabs Dislike U.S. Based on Policies It Pursues

>American Freedoms, Values Viewed Favorably, Survey Says

>

>By Karen DeYoung

>Washington Post Staff Writer

>Monday, October 7, 2002; Page A13

>

>

>A comprehensive survey of attitudes and opinions in the Arab world has

>found that Arabs look favorably on American freedoms and political

>values, but have a strongly negative overall view of the United States

>based largely on their disapproval of U.S. policy toward the region.

>

>The survey's author, U.S. public opinion firm Zogby International, said

>that Arab views do not reflect "an anti-Western sentiment at work," and

>noted that France, Canada, Germany and Japan were among countries with

>highly favorable ratings.

>

>The United States, Britain and Israel were viewed unfavorably in all

>eight countries surveyed, including Kuwait, where a U.S.-led

>international coalition drove out Iraqi occupiers during the 1991

>Persian Gulf War.

>

>The results appeared contrary to the basic thrust of stepped-up "public

>diplomacy" outreach programs that the Bush administration and Congress  
>have promoted in the wake of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks. The  
>programs rest on the premise that anti-American views in the region stem  
>largely from lack of knowledge about U.S. values.

>

>Although the Arab world has been the subject of numerous marketing  
>surveys, there have been few, if any, widespread inquiries into values  
>and beliefs. Pollsters conducted face-to-face interviews last spring  
>with 3,800 adults in Lebanon, Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the United  
>Arab Emirates, Morocco, Egypt and among Israeli Arabs. Each was asked 92  
>questions covering their values, political concerns, mood and outlook,  
>self-definition and how they viewed the world. Results of the survey,  
>sponsored by the Saudi-backed Arab Thought Foundation, were released  
>over the weekend.

>

>Overall, Arabs reflected positively on their own situations and the  
>future. Asked Ronald Reagan's campaign question: "Are you better off now  
>than you were four years ago?" a strong plurality in most countries said  
>yes, and believed that their children would fare better still.

>

>Asked what matters most to them, Arabs reflected the views of those in  
>similar surveys throughout the world, focusing principally on personal  
>matters, including quality of life and economic opportunity, family and  
>faith. On the relative importance of values to be taught to children,  
>they gave highest marks to self-respect, good health and hygiene and  
>responsibility, followed by respect for elders, achievement of a better  
>life and self-reliance.

>

>The importance of religious faith, as a personal value and in teaching  
>children, was number one in both Saudi Arabia and Egypt. But in other  
>Arab countries, including Lebanon, the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait,  
>it was of significantly less concern.

>

>Arab Americans, who were also surveyed for purposes of comparison, rated  
>responsibility as the most important value for parents to teach their  
>children, placing religion at the bottom of the list.

>

>Survey responses indicated little substantive difference when broken  
>down by age, gender and education. In a region where national borders  
>were largely drawn by colonial powers, respondents chose "being Arab" as  
>a self-identifier far more often than nationality or religion in every  
>country but Lebanon.

>

>A plurality of respondents, asked to rate 10 issues in order of  
>political importance to them, put civil and personal rights at the top  
>of the list. Health care was second, followed by the "rights of the  
>Palestinian people."

>

>Interpreting these results, Zogby notes that the Palestinian issue,  
>rather than being seen as a matter of foreign policy, "appears to have  
>become a personal matter . . . ahead of more general concerns like moral  
>standards or the state of their country's economy."

>

>These views appeared to play a major role in determining Arab attitudes  
>toward the United States. A majority of respondents in Egypt, Kuwait,  
>Lebanon and Saudi Arabia, for example, looked favorably on what the  
>survey described as "American freedom and democracy." Assessments of

>American technological abilities and culture received similarly high  
>marks. In all four countries, however, less than 10 percent viewed  
>U.S.-Arab policy favorably.

>  
>Asked what the United States could do "to improve its relations with the  
>Arab world," respondents focused largely on what they saw as a general  
>unfairness toward and lack of understanding of the region, and a  
>particular bias toward Israel in the Israeli-Arab conflict.

>  
>  
>  
>  
>C 2002 The Washington Post Company

>  
>-----

>  
>New Book: What Arabs Think  
>Landmark Study of Arab Values  
>and Political Concerns  
>  
><http://www.zogby.com>  
><http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=627>  
><http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=629>

-----\_3380202==\_.ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----\_3380202==\_.ALT--

=====

Date: Mon, 7 Oct 2002 14:55:43 -0400  
From: "Raghavan Mayur" <mayur@technometrica.com>  
To: <dstrand@csm.Berkeley.EDU>, "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <5.1.0.14.2.20021007114758.00acdec0@csm.berkeley.edu>  
Subject: Re: Zogby: What Arabs Think: Values, Beliefs and Concerns  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Hope this note from Warren Mitofsky helps...  
~mayur

NCPP on Gallup Muslim poll

The following is a comment on the reporting about the Gallup poll of Muslims. Gallup published a methodological statement about how the poll was conducted. The description made the work seem reasonable. It was a poll of all people in the selected countries, not just Muslims. The criticism was over Gallup's aggregating of the results from the various countries. Each country was treated equally. The Zogby poll, if my understanding is correct, was conducted in more Muslim countries, but in only one city per country. This should be verified with Zogby. If so, the Gallup and Zogby polls are not comparable.

warren mitofsky

A statement by the National Council on Public Polls'  
Polling Review Board  
MEDIA COVERAGE OF THE GALLUP POLL OF "THE ISLAMIC WORLD"  
March 6, 2002  
Gallup did an important and fascinating study of reaction to the terrorist attacks on the United States on 9/11. The study drew such wide attention President Bush, according to USA Today, said we "must do more to improve [our] image in the Islamic world." A State Department spokesman also commented on the study. Given this study's prominent attention the National Council on Public Polls feels some comments are in order.  
News stories based on the Gallup poll reported results in the aggregate without regard to the population of the countries they represent. Kuwait, with less than 2 million Muslims, was treated the same as Indonesia, which has over 200 million Muslims. The "aggregate" quoted in the media was actually the average for the countries surveyed regardless of the size of their populations.

The nine countries in the Gallup study do not represent the Muslim world. Gallup never claimed it had a representative sample of Muslim countries. However its findings, as reported by USA Today, claims to be a study of the Muslim world. CNN also reported a single number

that represented Muslims.  
The aggregate figures do not even represent the results across the nine countries. The nine countries in the Gallup study comprise only about 40% of the world's Muslim population. Four of the excluded countries had larger populations of Muslims than many of those that were included. Excluded were India, Bangladesh, Egypt and Nigeria. On the other hand almost two thirds of the Muslims in the nine countries Gallup studied live in Indonesia and Pakistan. (Note: both CNN and USA Today did report results for the nine countries in addition to the aggregate data.)

The surveys were samples of all residents of the countries surveyed, not only Muslims.

We must rely on the news organizations that have reported the study, and our comments relate to the ways in which the research results have been reported in the media. Nothing in this statement is intended to be critical of this important research. For more information about this and other polling issues, contact the NCPP Polling Review Board. [www.ncpp.org](http://www.ncpp.org)

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

212 980-3031 Phone  
212 980-3107 FAX  
[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)  
<http://www.MitofskyInternational.com>

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

From: "Douglas Strand" <[dstrand@csm.Berkeley.EDU](mailto:dstrand@csm.Berkeley.EDU)>  
To: "AAPORNET" <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Sent: Monday, October 07, 2002 2:49 PM  
Subject: Re: Zogby: What Arabs Think: Values, Beliefs and Concerns

> Can we get a response to this Zogby poll from somebody at Gallup?  
>  
> The findings in a number of ways sound contrary

to the findings of the  
> Gallup poll of Muslim countries, presented at  
the last AAPOR  
> conference. Particularly noteworthy to me were  
the findings that  
> respondents were more likely to be optimistic  
about the changes in their  
> personal well-being, and (allegedly) likely to  
support American  
> values. Maybe my memory is off here, but didn't  
Gallup report finding the  
> opposite on both counts, in general?  
>  
> It seems to have been rather poor judgment on  
the part of the Washington  
> Post to do this story without including any  
mention of the recent Gallup  
> results for many of these same countries, on  
many of these same issues.  
>  
> -Doug Strand  
> -----  
>  
> Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
> Project Director  
> Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey  
(PACES)  
> Survey Research Center  
> Univ. of California, Berkeley  
> 510-642-0508  
>  
>  
> At 11:16 AM Monday 10/7/02 -0400, you wrote:  
> >FYI: Article in today's Washington Post.  
> >-----  
> >  
> >Poll Finds Arabs Dislike U.S. Based on Policies  
It Pursues  
> >American Freedoms, Values Viewed Favorably,  
Survey Says  
> >  
> >By Karen DeYoung  
> >Washington Post Staff Writer  
> >Monday, October 7, 2002; Page A13  
> >  
> >  
> >A comprehensive survey of attitudes and  
opinions in the Arab world has  
> >found that Arabs look favorably on American  
freedoms and political  
> >values, but have a strongly negative overall  
view of the United States  
> >based largely on their disapproval of U.S.  
policy toward the region.  
> >  
> >The survey's author, U.S. public opinion firm  
Zogby International, said

> >that Arab views do not reflect "an anti-Western sentiment at work," and  
> >noted that France, Canada, Germany and Japan were among countries with  
> >highly favorable ratings.  
> >  
> >The United States, Britain and Israel were viewed unfavorably in all  
> >eight countries surveyed, including Kuwait, where a U.S.-led  
> >international coalition drove out Iraqi occupiers during the 1991  
> >Persian Gulf War.  
> >  
> >The results appeared contrary to the basic thrust of stepped-up "public  
> >diplomacy" outreach programs that the Bush administration and Congress  
> >have promoted in the wake of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks. The  
> >programs rest on the premise that anti-American views in the region stem  
> >largely from lack of knowledge about U.S. values.  
> >  
> >Although the Arab world has been the subject of numerous marketing  
> >surveys, there have been few, if any, widespread inquiries into values  
> >and beliefs. Pollsters conducted face-to-face interviews last spring  
> >with 3,800 adults in Lebanon, Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the United  
> >Arab Emirates, Morocco, Egypt and among Israeli Arabs. Each was asked 92  
> >questions covering their values, political concerns, mood and outlook,  
> >self-definition and how they viewed the world. Results of the survey,  
> >sponsored by the Saudi-backed Arab Thought Foundation, were released  
> >over the weekend.  
> >  
> >Overall, Arabs reflected positively on their own situations and the  
> >future. Asked Ronald Reagan's campaign question: "Are you better off now  
> >than you were four years ago?" a strong plurality in most countries said  
> >yes, and believed that their children would fare better still.  
> >  
> >Asked what matters most to them, Arabs reflected the views of those in  
> >similar surveys throughout the world, focusing principally on personal  
> >matters, including quality of life and economic

opportunity, family and  
> >faith. On the relative importance of values to  
be taught to children,  
> >they gave highest marks to self-respect, good  
health and hygiene and  
> >responsibility, followed by respect for elders,  
achievement of a better  
> >life and self-reliance.  
> >  
> >The importance of religious faith, as a  
personal value and in teaching  
> >children, was number one in both Saudi Arabia  
and Egypt. But in other  
> >Arab countries, including Lebanon, the United  
Arab Emirates and Kuwait,  
> >it was of significantly less concern.  
> >  
> >Arab Americans, who were also surveyed for  
purposes of comparison, rated  
> >responsibility as the most important value for  
parents to teach their  
> >children, placing religion at the bottom of the  
list.  
> >  
> >Survey responses indicated little substantive  
difference when broken  
> >down by age, gender and education. In a region  
where national borders  
> >were largely drawn by colonial powers,  
respondents chose "being Arab" as  
> >a self-identifier far more often than  
nationality or religion in every  
> >country but Lebanon.  
> >  
> >A plurality of respondents, asked to rate 10  
issues in order of  
> >political importance to them, put civil and  
personal rights at the top  
> >of the list. Health care was second, followed  
by the "rights of the  
> >Palestinian people."  
> >  
> >Interpreting these results, Zogby notes that  
the Palestinian issue,  
> >rather than being seen as a matter of foreign  
policy, "appears to have  
> >become a personal matter . . . ahead of more  
general concerns like moral  
> >standards or the state of their country's  
economy."  
> >  
> >These views appeared to play a major role in  
determining Arab attitudes  
> >toward the United States. A majority of  
respondents in Egypt, Kuwait,  
> >Lebanon and Saudi Arabia, for example, looked  
favorably on what the



> >survey described as "American freedom and  
democracy." Assessments of  
> >American technological abilities and culture  
received similarly high  
> >marks. In all four countries, however, less  
than 10 percent viewed  
> >U.S.-Arab policy favorably.  
> >  
> >Asked what the United States could do "to  
improve its relations with the  
> >Arab world," respondents focused largely on  
what they saw as a general  
> >unfairness toward and lack of understanding of  
the region, and a  
> >particular bias toward Israel in the  
Israeli-Arab conflict.

> >

> >

> >

> >C 2002 The Washington Post Company

> >

>

>-----

---

> >

> >New Book: What Arabs Think

> >Landmark Study of Arab Values

> >and Political Concerns

> >

> ><http://www.zogby.com>

> ><http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=627>

> ><http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=629>

>

=====  
Date: Mon, 7 Oct 2002 15:45:52 -0400

From: Dave Howell <dahowell@isr.umich.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: NES: Request for Applications - 2003-2004 NES Pre-Doctoral Fellows

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2656.59)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

The Center for Political Studies at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research, in cooperation with the National Election Studies, seeks to appoint up to four pre-doctoral National Election Studies Fellows for the 2003-2004 academic year. We are interested in scholars who will take advantage of Michigan's tradition of creative interdisciplinary work and its strength across the social sciences. We are especially interested in applications from scholars whose research combines institutional analysis with the analysis of individual judgment, choice, and behavior.

NES Fellows will use the year to finish their dissertations in residence at the Center. Fellows will also be involved in the National Election Studies. While NES Fellows will devote most of their time to their

dissertation work, during their tenure, each of the Fellows will be involved in one special project featuring NES data. Fellows will participate in the NES Seminar on Behavior and Institutions and may contribute to the intellectual life of the Center and the Institute by participating in the range of other activities there (for example, the Seminar on Political Economy, the Seminar on Group Dynamics, the Seminar on Complex Systems, the Seminar on American Political Development and American Political Institutions).

Fellows will receive a \$27,000 stipend, health insurance, and a \$5,000 research fund. Fellows may receive up to \$10,000 to defray the costs of tuition at the University of Michigan or at their home institution; applicants should specify whether and how much tuition support they will need for the year.

Applicants should submit a c.v., one or two letters of recommendation, a transcript, a cover letter sketching their plans for the year, and a copy of their dissertation prospectus to Nancy Burns and Donald Kinder, National Election Studies Fellows Program, 4246 ISR, 426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106-1248. We will begin reviewing applications on Thursday, October 31, 2002, and continue until positions are filled. The University of Michigan is an AA/EO employer and strongly encourages applications from women and minority candidates.

=====  
Date: Mon, 7 Oct 2002 17:04:39 -0400  
Subject: New physical activity opinion survey demonstrates perceptions do not meet reality  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F96185749@cmpa01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g97L5rJ12200

New physical activity opinion survey demonstrates perceptions do not meet reality Research News Release : 3-Oct-2002 <  
[http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2002-10/sc-npa100302.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2002-10/sc-npa100302.php) >

How accurate is self-assessment? That's the question the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) is asking itself after recently commissioning an opinion survey of adults and teenagers about their perceptions of physical activity and physical education.

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193

(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
http://www.stats.org

=====  
Date: Mon, 07 Oct 2002 14:12:44 -0700  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
From: Douglas Strand <dstrand@csm.Berkeley.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Zogby: What Arabs Think: Values, Beliefs and Concerns  
In-Reply-To: <002801c26e33\$285769c0\$8210adc7@com>  
References: <5.1.0.14.2.20021007114758.00acdec0@csm.berkeley.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="=====\_12004757==\_ .ALT"

-----\_12004757==\_ .ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

If the comment about Zogby below is on target about the methodology, then not only are Gallup and Zogby not comparable, but the Zogby poll appears to be misleading. Without rural Arabs, how can one claim to characterize what "Arabs" in these countries think? Also, if only urban Arabs are counted, I would suspect that the results would underestimate the dislike of American culture in those countries.

My attempt to find any methodological information at the Zogby.com site failed. The electronic book of the results will be available for viewing on 10/10. So maybe my negative impressions are just the result of the Wash. Post's failures to disclose the methodology suspected below.

This poll appears to be different from the one whose results were released by Zogby last April.

I wonder if further inspection of the methodology will invite any critique by the Polling Review Board?

May Zogby disabuse me of any misunderstandings.

-Doug Strand  
-----

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Project Director  
Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
Survey Research Center  
Univ. of California, Berkeley  
510-642-0508

At 02:55 PM Monday 10/7/02 -0400, mayur@technometrica.com (quoting Warren Mitofsky) wrote:  
>The Zogby poll, if my  
>understanding is  
>correct, was conducted in more Muslim countries,  
>but in only one city per

>country. This should be verified with Zogby. If  
>so, the Gallup and Zogby  
>polls are not comparable.  
>warren mitofsky

====\_12004757==\_ .ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\*           ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---           \*  
\*       This post contains a forbidden message format           \*  
\*    (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting)       \*  
\*       This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT       \*  
\*    If your postings display this message your mail program    \*  
\*    is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting    \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

====\_12004757==\_ .ALT--

=====  
Date: Tue, 08 Oct 2002 06:53:28 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Bush Cites Iraqi Threat Posed to US and Allies (D Sanger, NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210080644390.28333-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

PUBLIC OPINION AND POLLING ABSTRACT

President Bush declared last night in Cincinnati that Saddam Hussein could attack the United States or its allies "on any given day" with chemical or biological weapons. In an argument for disarming Iraq or going to war with that country, he argued that "we have an urgent duty to prevent the worst from occurring." As one White House official said in recent days, "The strategy is to use the Congress as leverage, leverage to bring around the public, and leverage to make it clear to the U.N. that it's not only George Bush who is prepared to draw a line in the sand, it's the whole country." This second audience, the American public, has been more problematic. A New York Times/CBS News poll published today showed strong support for confronting Iraq. But Americans indicated that they wanted allies and wanted the United Nations inspection process to proceed before military action was taken.

-- Jim

-----  
Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company  
-----

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/08/politics/08BUSH.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/08/politics/08BUSH.html)

October 8, 2002

## Bush Cites Iraqi Threat Posed to U.S. and Allies

By DAVID E. SANGER

CINCINNATI, Oct. 7 -- President Bush declared tonight that Saddam Hussein could attack the United States or its allies "on any given day" with chemical or biological weapons. In a forceful argument for disarming Iraq or going to war with that country, he argued that "we have an urgent duty to prevent the worst from occurring."

Mr. Bush, in a half-hour indictment of Mr. Hussein delivered before an audience of 400 here and millions around the country and the world, insisted that leading a campaign to disarm the Iraqi leader would not detract from the war against terrorism. "To the contrary," he said, "confronting the threat posed by Iraq is crucial to winning the war on terror."

The president likened the threat the country faces today from Iraq to the Cuban missile crisis, which unfolded exactly 40 years ago this month. The comparison was intended, his aides acknowledged, to give the confrontation a sense of urgency and to explain why the United States could wait only weeks or months to disarm the Iraqi leader.

Building his case, the president charged for the first time that Iraq's fleet of unmanned aerial vehicles was ultimately intended to deliver chemical and biological weapons to cities in the United States. The president also built a lengthy, if circumstantial, case that Mr. Hussein had extensive ties to the Al Qaeda terrorist organization and that Iraq trained members of the terrorist group in "bomb-making, poisons and deadly gases." Although other members of his administration had cited evidence tying Al Qaeda to Iraq, Mr. Bush spoke about this in detail for the first time tonight.

He called Mr. Hussein a dictator, "a student of Stalin" and a murderer, and most important described no solution other than Mr. Hussein's permanent removal from office that would end the confrontation.

"I hope that this will not require military action, but it may," he said, warning America that Mr. Hussein could attempt "cruel and desperate measures" in response. He warned Iraq's generals to ignore any orders to use weapons of mass destruction or be treated as war criminals.

Mr. Bush did not declare war tonight, but he was clearly preparing the country for the likelihood that war would be the only course left if Iraq refused to disarm. He insisted that doing nothing "is the riskiest of all options," and quoted John F. Kennedy's words during the missile crisis at length to underscore his point that it would be foolish to wait for a determined American enemy to strike first.

"Facing clear evidence or peril, we cannot wait for the final proof -- the smoking gun -- that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud." He continued, "Understanding the threats of our time, knowing the designs and deceptions of the Iraqi regime, we have every reason to assume the

worst, and we have an urgent duty to prevent the worst from occurring."

Tonight, after Mr. Bush spoke, the White House released spy satellite photographs showing how extensively a crucial Iraqi nuclear facility had been rebuilt since the United States bombed it in 1998. The pictures were reminiscent of President Kennedy's decision to show photographs of Soviet missiles in Cuba, though Mr. Bush's pictures revealed only buildings, not weapons.

The White House carefully chose the site of tonight's speech: the restored Union Terminal here. The hall was filled with a cheering crowd that interrupted Mr. Bush twice, and the president described the decisions ahead in the stark terms of the terminal's heyday in World War II.

While the arguments he offered tonight were largely familiar, he gathered those arguments into one speech, seeking to answer those who argue that the threat is not that urgent and that a war now will destabilize the Middle East and distract from the war on terrorism. Methodically, he rejected those contentions. But the heart of his argument was that "the threat from Iraq stands alone because it gathers the most serious dangers of our age in one place."

He spoke at a critical moment in the national debate over Iraq, just as Congress is poised to vote this week on a resolution authorizing military action, and as the United Nations Security Council is entering the final throes of an intense internal struggle over how to confront Baghdad. Once again Mr. Bush described this as a struggle for the true identity of the United Nations, and made it clear that if it failed to disarm Iraq, he would, with the help of a coalition of nations that he never named.

Mr. Bush said, as he has often in recent times, that his argument is with Mr. Hussein and his supporters, but not with the Iraqi people. "America is a friend to the people of Iraq," he said. "Our demands are directed only at the regime that enslaves them and threatens us." He drew a picture of a free Iraq, in which "the oppression of Kurds, Assyrians, Turkomans, Shiites, Sunnis and others will be lifted."

He never described how long the United States would be willing to occupy Iraq or hold together a country that has long been divided by rival tribes and rival religions, and where the riches will go to those who sit atop Iraq's oilfields. But he spoke of maintaining a "unified Iraq," and said "if military action is necessary, the United States and our allies will help the Iraqi people rebuild their economy and create the institutions of liberty."

In what appeared to be an effort to end the debate over the administration's real goals of disarming Iraq or removing Mr. Hussein from power, Mr. Bush said one could not come without the other. And he answered critics who believe, he said, that removing Mr. Hussein could "make the situation worse."

"The situation could hardly get worse," he said simply.

In some respects, the speech was notable for what it did not say. There was no warning to Israel to stay out of the conflict with Iraq, even if

it is attacked. There was no explanation of why Mr. Hussein has not used his biological and chemical weapons against the United States or its allies, even though it has possessed them for years. There were no comparisons to the other nations Mr. Bush has called members of an "axis of evil," North Korea and Iran, both of which are believed to be pursuing nuclear weapons programs.

He also added a new demand to Iraq, one he never mentioned in his speech to the United Nations on Sept. 12. In addition to inspections and disarmament, he said, Mr. Hussein must allow "witnesses to its illegal activities to be interviewed outside of the country," and to take their families with them, so that Mr. Hussein cannot hold them hostage.

He argued that it was impossible to know with any certainty how close Mr. Hussein was to developing a nuclear weapon. But it did not matter, he said, because American intelligence shows that Mr. Hussein is reconstituting his nuclear weapons program with "a group he calls his nuclear mujahideen, his nuclear holy warriors." He said that a softball-sized amount of fissile material would be sufficient to make Iraq a nuclear power in less than a year, and "if we allow that to happen, a terrible line would be crossed."

Mr. Bush's speech caps a week-long effort to sell his case against Saddam Hussein. His first audience, Congress, requires the least persuasion. Both houses of Congress are expected to give the president discretion to attack Iraq when they vote, probably by the end of the week.

Over the weekend, even the Senate majority leader, Tom Daschle, an early skeptic of granting Mr. Bush so much latitude to decide when and how to commit the military, conceded that Mr. Bush would get the broad authority he has sought.

Just a month ago, it seemed highly doubtful Mr. Bush would get that kind of backing. In August the critics of committing the military to disarming and dislodging Mr. Hussein seemed to dominate the debate, led by prominent Republicans and generals who conducted the war in the Persian Gulf. But starting with his speech to the United Nations on Sept. 12, Mr. Bush began to win converts, and the White House quite skillfully used a 1998 Congressional vote calling for regime change in Iraq to make the case that Mr. Hussein has only grown more threatening.

"The strategy," one White House official said in recent days, "is to use the Congress as leverage, leverage to bring around the public, and leverage to make it clear to the U.N. that it's not only George Bush who is prepared to draw a line in the sand, it's the whole country."

His second audience, the American public, has been more problematic. A New York Times/CBS News poll published today showed strong support for confronting Iraq. But Americans indicated that they wanted allies and wanted the United Nations inspection process to proceed before military action was taken.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Tue, 08 Oct 2002 09:57:03 -0400  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Dick Morris Accuses the NYTimes of "push polling"  
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <005301c26ed2\$94fd2200\$0d0a010a@leo>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

THE TIMES' PUSH POLL

<http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm>  
(with three pop under ads)

October 8, 2002 -- 'PUBLIC Says Bush Needs To Pay Heed To Weak Economy,' blared yesterday's New York Times. Based on a telephone survey last week of 564 registered voters, the article claimed a majority of American voters believed that the president is spending too much time talking about Iraq while neglecting domestic problems.

But take a close look at the poll: The phrasing of the questions is so slanted and biased that it amounts to journalistic "push polling" - the use of "objective" polling to generate a predetermined result, and so vindicate a specific point of view.

It was just such polling that led the Democratic Party astray over the summer and played an important role in catalyzing their (politically suicidal) criticism of Bush over Iraq. Now the Times returns with another poll, on the verge of Congress' vote on a use-of-force resolution, to suggest that voters see the economy as a bigger issue than Iraq.

Slant No. 1: The Times poll asks voters if they would "be more likely to vote for a congressional candidate because of their positions on the economy or foreign policy."

The use of "foreign policy" throws the results way off and allows the Times to report that voters want more focus on the economy by 57 percent to 25 percent. But on Sept. 8-9 Fox News asked 900 voters a similar question - comparing not economy vs. foreign policy, but economy vs. national security. The results: an even split, with the economy pulling 32 percent and national security 31 percent. What a difference a word makes!

Slant No. 2: The Times then asked what voters would "like to hear the candidates talk more about, the possibility of war with Iraq or improving



the economy." It got the expected outcome: 70 percent for the economy, 17 percent for Iraq. But that phrasing surely masks the impatience of voters who favor war with Iraq but are tired of the endless talk about it. Those who favor action and oppose more debate would register on the "economy" side of this biased question.

Slant No. 3: The poll found voters approving of military action against Iraq by 67 percent to 27 percent. But the Times then tried to undermine this finding by asking if voters would still back military action if there were "substantial American military casualties" (support drops to 54 percent) or "substantial Iraqi civilian casualties" (support drops to 49 percent).

So where is the question on how support would change if military action is quick and painless, as in the 1991 war? Or if (again as in 1991) postwar examination of Iraqi sites revealed that substantial work on weapons of mass destruction had been going on?

Slant No. 4: Having run doomsday, high-casualty scenarios by the voters, the poll then asked if Congress is "asking enough questions about President Bush's policy toward Iraq?" Invited to criticize Congress, voters do - 51% say that Congress is not asking enough questions, implying an indecision among Americans that is clearly not really there.

A truly impartial poll would have included a number of questions the Times omits, such as:

\* If France or Russia vetoes a resolution in the U.N. calling for an invasion of Iraq, should America and Britain still attack Iraq, or should they refrain from attacking Iraq?

\* Do you think that U.N. inspections will be effective in stopping Saddam Hussein from developing weapons of mass destruction?

\* Do you approve or disapprove of the attitude of the Democratic Party toward a possible invasion of Iraq?

For decades, responsible journalists refused even to cover public-opinion polls. Then, in a turnaround, they began to conduct them and treat their findings as hard news. Now the process has come full circle: Journalists appear to be using polls to generate the conclusions they want and to validate their own pre-existing theses and hypotheses.

When politicians use polling to produce a political outcome, not to probe what the public genuinely thinks, newspapers condemn it as "push polling." Is push polling any better done by a liberal newspaper universally respected for its integrity?

--

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

---

Date: Tue, 08 Oct 2002 10:55:16 -0400  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Subject: Gallup: Top Ten Findings About Public Opinion and Iraq  
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <005801c26eda\$b7657240\$0d0a010a@leo>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

Highly recommended reading

<Since there aren't any popup ads, I'll just list the first two paragraphs and the URL:>

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr021008.asp#rm>

Top Ten Findings About Public Opinion and Iraq  
Public still supportive of Iraq invasion, but with reservations

by Lydia Saad  
GALLUP NEWS SERVICE

PRINCETON, NJ -- President Bush's Monday night address on Iraq was delivered to an American audience that has thus far been highly supportive of him personally, and in general agreement with the possibility of invading Iraq and removing Saddam Hussein from power. But the same public tuned in with important doubts about whether the United States has done all it can to resolve the Iraq situation diplomatically, and with reservations about the advisability of taking on Iraq unilaterally, without the support of America's allies or the United Nations. Despite Bush's popularity, Americans continue to say that Congress, not Bush, should have the ultimate say over whether the United States invades Iraq. And despite Americans' support for the invasion, particularly under the right conditions, only a third of likely voters indicate they will be more likely to vote for their congressional incumbents if they vote in favor of sending U.S. troops to Iraq.

Recent Gallup polling also shows that Americans have a fairly high tolerance for U.S. casualties in a potential war with Iraq -- to a certain point. If the estimated number of casualties reaches 5,000, a majority of Americans would oppose invading Iraq with U.S. ground troops.

-- Leo G. Simonetta Art & Science Group, LLC [simonetta@artsci.com](mailto:simonetta@artsci.com)

=====  
Date: Tue, 08 Oct 2002 10:16:14 -0500  
From: Don Ferree <[gferree@ssc.wisc.edu](mailto:gferree@ssc.wisc.edu)>  
Subject: A quick point on response categories  
In-reply-to: <005801c26eda\$b7657240\$0d0a010a@leo>  
X-Sender: [gferree@ssc.wisc.edu](mailto:gferree@ssc.wisc.edu)  
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <4.1.20021008100212.01cb6580@ssc.wisc.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Fellow AAPORNETers,

One wrinkle suggested by some of the recent postings on Iraq-related polling is that it seems to me, when the question arises whether A is paying too much attention to B, I think it is almost always best to phrase the questions something like, Do you think A is paying too much attention, too little attention, or about right amount of attention to X.

My point is that including BOTH "too much" and "too little" has the advantage of avoiding even the appearance of pushing respondents to a conclusion, since it doesn't assume from the structure of the question that the alternatives are either things are OK or more needs to be done. Secondly, and perhaps even more importantly, it allows good cross-time comparison even if the issue may change. Thus even if one thinks a priori that sentiment is divided between do more and do what you are doing NOW, it could well be that sentiment in the future would divide between doing LESS and doing what is then being done. If one allows all three alternatives at both times, one can compare opinion. If one offers only the dichotomy, this comparison becomes impossible. (And allowing a volunteered response doesn't address the basic problem). So, even if you are sure (which assumption might be questoined) that virtually no one thinks too little attention is being paid to something today, not including that as an option in the question can create difficulty later, as well as leaving one open to charges of "biasing" results, whether well-founded or not. This generalizes to all sorts of issues, so for example, if the issue is Bush's readiness to use force, I would urge questions of the sort (not necessarily the wording) is he too quick/ready/eager to use force, too slow/reluctant/cautious with some middle category, NOT is he too quick to use force, with an implied yes/no dichotomy.

Don

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.  
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
1800 University Avenue  
Madison WI 53705  
608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)  
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

=====  
Date: Tue, 08 Oct 2002 08:27:50 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: NY POST'S DICK MORRIS: NYTimes Conducted a "Push Poll"  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210080753300.28333-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Fellow AAPORNETers,

Here's how I posted (see way below) to my own personal email list--with all thanks to Leo Simonetta--the New York Post column by Dick Morris accusing the New York Times of push polling. While I'm at it, I'd like to conduct a very modest survey of my own, with your own cooperation, if you please...

How do you feel, personally, about the charge by New York Post columnist Dick Morris that the most recent New York Times Poll was, in essence, a push poll? (Please check the \*one\* category which best captures your own opinion).

- \_\_\_ 1. Dick Morris is absolutely correct, 100 percent!
- 2. Dick Morris has a modest point, but he's overblown it.
- 3. Dick Morris's columns are always out-to-lunch, without exception.
- 4. Dick Morris will do anything--anything--to attract attention to his miserable column.
- 5. Dick Morris has his head wedged way, way up in a very dark place where I would never, ever wish to go looking for it.

Please check the \*one\* category which best expresses your own personal opinion and return this message to beniger@rcf.usc.edu

Results will be tabulated and posted here on AAPORNET.

Thank you.

-- Jim

P.S. If you should think that my survey here is itself a push poll, I don't wish to hear about it--please send your opinions to Dick Morris, New York Post.

=====

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

Date: Tue, 08 Oct 2002 07:39:33 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: Triumph-of-Content-1@usc.edu

Subject: <toc>--NY POST'S DICK MORRIS: NYTimes Conducted a "Push Poll"

The New York Post has challenged the integrity of the most recent New York Times Poll, which is conducted by several of the world's most respected survey researchers? I don't expect we'll see the end of this particular crosstown brawl anytime soon.

-- Jim

---

Copyright 2002 NYP Holdings, Inc -- NEW YORK POST <nypost.com>

---

[www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm](http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm)

POST OPINION -- Columnists

THE NEW YORK TIMES' PUSH POLL

By DICK MORRIS

October 8, 2002 -- "PUBLIC Says Bush Needs To Pay Heed To Weak Economy," blared yesterday's New York Times. Based on a telephone survey last week of 564 registered voters, the article claimed a majority of American voters believed that the president is spending too much time talking about Iraq while neglecting domestic problems.

But take a close look at the poll: The phrasing of the questions is so slanted and biased that it amounts to journalistic "push polling" - the use of "objective" polling to generate a predetermined result, and so vindicate a specific point of view.

It was just such polling that led the Democratic Party astray over the summer and played an important role in catalyzing their (politically suicidal) criticism of Bush over Iraq. Now the Times returns with another poll, on the verge of Congress' vote on a use-of-force resolution, to suggest that voters see the economy as a bigger issue than Iraq.

Slant No. 1: The Times poll asks voters if they would "be more likely to vote for a congressional candidate because of their positions on the economy or foreign policy."

The use of "foreign policy" throws the results way off and allows the Times to report that voters want more focus on the economy by 57 percent to 25 percent. But on Sept. 8-9 Fox News asked 900 voters a similar question - comparing not economy vs. foreign policy, but economy vs. national security. The results: an even split, with the economy pulling 32 percent and national security 31 percent. What a difference a word makes!

Slant No. 2: The Times then asked what voters would "like to hear the candidates talk more about, the possibility of war with Iraq or improving the economy." It got the expected outcome: 70 percent for the economy, 17 percent for Iraq. But that phrasing surely masks the impatience of voters who favor war with Iraq but are tired of the endless talk about it. Those who favor action and oppose more debate would register on the "economy" side of this biased question.

Slant No. 3: The poll found voters approving of military action against Iraq by 67 percent to 27 percent. But the Times then tried to undermine this finding by asking if voters would still back military action if there were "substantial American military casualties" (support drops to

54 percent) or "substantial Iraqi civilian casualties" (support drops to 49 percent).

So where is the question on how support would change if military action is quick and painless, as in the 1991 war? Or if (again as in 1991) postwar examination of Iraqi sites revealed that substantial work on weapons of mass destruction had been going on?

Slant No. 4: Having run doomsday, high-casualty scenarios by the voters, the poll then asked if Congress is "asking enough questions about President Bush's policy toward Iraq?" Invited to criticize Congress, voters do - 51% say that Congress is not asking enough questions, implying an indecision among Americans that is clearly not really there.

A truly impartial poll would have included a number of questions the Times omits, such as:

\* If France or Russia vetoes a resolution in the U.N. calling for an invasion of Iraq, should America and Britain still attack Iraq, or should they refrain from attacking Iraq?

\* Do you think that U.N. inspections will be effective in stopping Saddam Hussein from developing weapons of mass destruction?

\* Do you approve or disapprove of the attitude of the Democratic Party toward a possible invasion of Iraq?

For decades, responsible journalists refused even to cover public-opinion polls. Then, in a turnaround, they began to conduct them and treat their findings as hard news. Now the process has come full circle: Journalists appear to be using polls to generate the conclusions they want and to validate their own pre-existing theses and hypotheses.

When politicians use polling to produce a political outcome, not to probe what the public genuinely thinks, newspapers condemn it as "push polling." Is push polling any better done by a liberal newspaper universally respected for its integrity?

[www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm](http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm)

---

Copyright 2002 NYP Holdings, Inc -- NEW YORK POST <nypost.com>

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Thu, 3 Oct 2002 11:38:05 -0400  
From: "Raghavan Mayur" <mayur@technometrica.com>  
To: <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>, "ape" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <4.1.20021008100212.01cb6580@ssc.wisc.edu>

Subject: Re: A quick point on response categories  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Another take on "war on terrorism" vs. boosting  
the economy

Investor's Business Daily/Christian Science  
Monitor/TIPP poll  
September 3 through September 8, 2002,  
n=914 interviews using RDD sample

Q: To what extent do you agree or disagree with  
the following statement: The Bush administration  
is spending too much time on the war on terrorism  
and needs to give more attention to boosting the  
economy.

Would you say that you...  
14% Completely agree  
41% Somewhat agree  
27% Somewhat disagree  
16% Completely disagree  
1% (Don't read: Not sure)

Raghavan Mayur  
President  
TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence/TIPP

----- Original Message -----  
From: "Don Ferree" <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>  
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2002 11:16 AM  
Subject: A quick point on response categories

> Fellow AAPORNETers,  
>  
> One wrinkle suggested by some of the recent  
> postings on Iraq-related  
> polling is that it seems to me, when the  
> question arises whether A is  
> paying too much attention to B, I think it is  
> almost always best to phrase  
> the questions something like, Do you think A is  
> paying too much attention,  
> too little attention, or about right amount of  
> attention to X.  
>  
> My point is that including BOTH "too much" and  
> "too little" has the

> advantage of avoiding even the appearance of  
> pushing respondents to a  
> conclusion, since it doesn't assume from the  
> structure of the question that  
> the alternatives are either things are OK or  
> more needs to be done.  
> Secondly, and perhaps even more importantly, it  
> allows good cross-time  
> comparison even if the issue may change. Thus  
> even if one thinks a priori  
> that sentiment is divided between do more and do  
> what you are doing NOW, it  
> could well be that sentiment in the future would  
> divide between doing LESS  
> and doing what is then being done. If one  
> allows all three alternatives at  
> both times, one can compare opinion. If one  
> offers only the dichotomy,  
> this comparison becomes impossible. (And  
> allowing a volunteered response  
> doesn't address the basic problem). So, even if  
> you are sure (which  
> assumption might be questioned) that virtually  
> no one thinks too little  
> attention is being paid to something today, not  
> including that as an option  
> in the question can create difficulty later, as  
> well as leaving one open to  
> charges of "biasing" results, whether  
> well-founded or not. This  
> generalizes to all sorts of issues, so for  
> example, if the issue is Bush's  
> readiness to use force, I would urge questions  
> of the sort (not necessarily  
> the wording) is he too quick/ready/eager to use  
> force, too  
> slow/reluctant/cautious with some middle  
> category, NOT is he too quick to  
> use force, with an implied yes/no dichotomy.  
>  
> Don  
>  
>  
> G. Donald Ferree, Jr.  
> Associate Director for Public Opinion Research  
> University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
> 1800 University Avenue  
> Madison WI 53705  
> 608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)  
> gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

---

Date: Tue, 08 Oct 2002 12:12:15 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Bryan Denham <bdenham@CLEMSON.EDU>  
Subject: Push Poll



Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

James,

I believe it is important to note that Mr. Morris may be using the term "push poll" a bit differently than AAPOR does in its statement on push polling. Having written about the subject, I would mention first that push pollers do not gather data; they only purport to do so, usually through carefully crafted language courtesy of a "communications" firm. Push polls generally are conducted near election day, lending some credence to Mr. Morris' article, and they use the word "if" to avoid legal actions taken by those who have been the subject of a question such as this: "If I told you that the candidate you plan to vote for has been linked to organized crime and has a history of drug abuse, would you be more or less inclined to vote for him?"

Again, no data is actually gathered in these "polls" that reach thousands of potential voters. Push pollers merely plant seeds in voters' minds and move on to the next phone call.

It sounds as if Mr. Morris was referring to a biased poll, perhaps saturated with demand characteristics.

Best,

Bryan Denham

=====  
Date: Tue, 8 Oct 2002 14:06:17 -0400  
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
To: "'beniger@almaak.usc.edu'" <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>,  
AAPORNET  
Subject: RE: NY POST'S DICK MORRIS: NYTimes Conducted a "Push Poll"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2656.59)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Good morning, James

In the long run, all closed-ended questions can be called push-polling, and the longer and more complicated [not to mention double-barreled [The Times poll asks voters if they would "be more likely to vote for a congressional candidate because of their positions on the economy or foreign policy."]] the more open to post hoc interpretation they become.

The initials AAPOR stand for the American Association for Public Opinion RESEARCH. No one, not you, not Dick Morris, should be offended or outraged by the efforts of organizations to conduct a poll in order to provide material for today's newspaper, which will become tomorrow's garbage wrap.

I'm seriously thinking about starting NOMOR - The National Organization of Media Opinion-poll Refusniks.

Finally, I hope that you noted that I did not give a numerical answer to

your poll. I do, in fact, think that Morris has a point, he has NOT overblown it, he will do almost anything to attract attention to his column, and on more than one occasion has had his head firmly wedged in a hazmat area. But that's not something you can fit into the categories you provided.

Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Associate  
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research  
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248  
Phone: 734-222-8660  
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@almaak.usc.edu]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2002 11:28 AM  
To: AAPORNET  
Subject: NY POST'S DICK MORRIS: NYTimes Conducted a "Push Poll"

Fellow AAPORNETers,

Here's how I posted (see way below) to my own personal email list--with all thanks to Leo Simonetta--the New York Post column by Dick Morris accusing the New York Times of push polling. While I'm at it, I'd like to conduct a very modest survey of my own, with your own cooperation, if you please...

How do you feel, personally, about the charge by New York Post columnist Dick Morris that the most recent New York Times Poll was, in essence, a push poll? (Please check the \*one\* category which best captures your own opinion).

- \_\_\_ 1. Dick Morris is absolutely correct, 100 percent!
- 2. Dick Morris has a modest point, but he's overblown it.
- 3. Dick Morris's columns are always out-to-lunch, without exception.
- 4. Dick Morris will do anything--anything--to attract attention to his miserable column.
- 5. Dick Morris has his head wedged way, way up in a very dark place where I would never, ever wish to go looking for it.

Please check the \*one\* category which best expresses your own personal opinion and return this message to beniger@rcf.usc.edu

Results will be tabulated and posted here on AAPORNET.

Thank you.

-- Jim

P.S. If you should think that my survey here is itself a push poll, I don't wish to hear about it--please send your opinions to Dick Morris, New York Post.

=====

----- Forwarded message -----  
Date: Tue, 08 Oct 2002 07:39:33 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: Triumph-of-Content-1@usc.edu  
Subject: <toc>--NY POST'S DICK MORRIS: NYTimes Conducted a "Push Poll"

The New York Post has challenged the integrity of the most recent New York Times Poll, which is conducted by several of the world's most respected survey researchers? I don't expect we'll see the end of this particular crosstown brawl anytime soon.

-- Jim

---

Copyright 2002 NYP Holdings, Inc -- NEW YORK POST <nypost.com>

---

[www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm](http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm)

POST OPINION -- Columnists

THE NEW YORK TIMES' PUSH POLL

By DICK MORRIS

October 8, 2002 -- "PUBLIC Says Bush Needs To Pay Heed To Weak Economy," blared yesterday's New York Times. Based on a telephone survey last week of 564 registered voters, the article claimed a majority of American voters believed that the president is spending too much time talking about Iraq while neglecting domestic problems.

But take a close look at the poll: The phrasing of the questions is so slanted and biased that it amounts to journalistic "push polling" - the use of "objective" polling to generate a predetermined result, and so vindicate a specific point of view.

It was just such polling that led the Democratic Party astray over the summer and played an important role in catalyzing their (politically suicidal) criticism of Bush over Iraq. Now the Times returns with another poll, on the verge of Congress' vote on a use-of-force resolution, to suggest that voters see the economy as a bigger issue than Iraq.

Slant No. 1: The Times poll asks voters if they would "be more likely to vote for a congressional candidate because of their positions on the economy or foreign policy."

The use of "foreign policy" throws the results way off and allows the Times to report that voters want more focus on the economy by 57 percent to 25 percent. But on Sept. 8-9 Fox News asked 900 voters a similar question - comparing not economy vs. foreign policy, but economy vs. national security. The results: an even split, with the economy pulling 32 percent and national security 31 percent. What a difference a word makes!

Slant No. 2: The Times then asked what voters would "like to hear the candidates talk more about, the possibility of war with Iraq or improving the economy." It got the expected outcome: 70 percent for the economy, 17 percent for Iraq. But that phrasing surely masks the impatience of voters who favor war with Iraq but are tired of the endless talk about it. Those who favor action and oppose more debate would register on the "economy" side of this biased question.

Slant No. 3: The poll found voters approving of military action against Iraq by 67 percent to 27 percent. But the Times then tried to undermine this finding by asking if voters would still back military action if there were "substantial American military casualties" (support drops to 54 percent) or "substantial Iraqi civilian casualties" (support drops to 49 percent).

So where is the question on how support would change if military action is quick and painless, as in the 1991 war? Or if (again as in 1991) postwar examination of Iraqi sites revealed that substantial work on weapons of mass destruction had been going on?

Slant No. 4: Having run doomsday, high-casualty scenarios by the voters, the poll then asked if Congress is "asking enough questions about President Bush's policy toward Iraq?" Invited to criticize Congress, voters do - 51% say that Congress is not asking enough questions, implying an indecision among Americans that is clearly not really there.

A truly impartial poll would have included a number of questions the Times omits, such as:

\* If France or Russia vetoes a resolution in the U.N. calling for an invasion of Iraq, should America and Britain still attack Iraq, or should they refrain from attacking Iraq?

\* Do you think that U.N. inspections will be effective in stopping Saddam Hussein from developing weapons of mass destruction?

\* Do you approve or disapprove of the attitude of the Democratic Party toward a possible invasion of Iraq?

For decades, responsible journalists refused even to cover public-opinion polls. Then, in a turnaround, they began to conduct them and treat their findings as hard news. Now the process has come full circle: Journalists appear to be using polls to generate the conclusions they want and to validate their own pre-existing theses and

hypotheses.

When politicians use polling to produce a political outcome, not to probe what the public genuinely thinks, newspapers condemn it as "push polling." Is push polling any better done by a liberal newspaper universally respected for its integrity?

[www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm](http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm)

-----  
Copyright 2002 NYP Holdings, Inc -- NEW YORK POST <nypost.com>  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Tue, 8 Oct 2002 15:23:51 -0400  
From: "Sid Groeneman" <sid.grc@verizon.net>  
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: The latest products for blocking telemarketers  
Message-ID: <000001c26f00\$3f6741d0\$6401a8c0@dell14300>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0001\_01C26EDE.B855A1D0"  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.2627  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106  
X-Authentication-Info: Submitted using SMTP AUTH LOGIN at out001.verizon.net  
from [138.88.41.237] at Tue, 8 Oct 2002 14:23:49 -0500

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0001\_01C26EDE.B855A1D0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Some members might be interested in this review of products designed to block telemarketers (and survey interviewers as well). Note: If simply clicking on the link below doesn't take you to the article, try holding down the Ctrl key and clicking on the link.

"Black boxes help consumers zap telemarketers"  
[http://biz.yahoo.com/rc/021008/column\\_pluggedin\\_1.html](http://biz.yahoo.com/rc/021008/column_pluggedin_1.html)

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting  
Bethesda, Maryland  
sid.grc@verizon.net  
301 469-0813  
[www.groeneman.com](http://www.groeneman.com)

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0001\_01C26EDE.B855A1D0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0001\_01C26EDE.B855A1D0--

=====  
Date: Tue, 8 Oct 2002 15:37:52 -0400  
Subject: Military polling  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F96185767@cmpa01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g98JcwJ05518

...a poll conducted to gauge what military members think has interesting findings on "support among the military" for the war. But the article <<http://www.navytimes.com/story.php?f=1-292236-1155988.php>> itself reveals that the poll is a random sample of Military Times readers, and not of military members generally. To its credit, the cited article points this out, though perhaps not as prominently as it might have (the paragraph comes after various assertions about what "The nation's military" thinks): The poll may not reflect the thinking of service members as a whole, because subscribers to Army Times, Navy Times, Air Force Times and Marine Corps Times tend to be career-oriented and do not typically include the most junior enlisted and officer ranks. Senior noncommissioned officers and field-grade officers made up a higher proportion of our sample than they do the general military population.

Pollsters taking the pulse of the general population use publicly available lists of phone numbers or addresses and randomly sample the nation. But no publicly available, comprehensive lists exist for service members. The Military Times subscriber base is arguably the best available independent list from which to conduct a survey of military men and women. Thus, we really don't know what military members generally think; we just know what the Military Times readers think, and this may be skewed both by the bias that the Military Times describes, and whatever political slant (if any) the Military Times publications might have. If, for instance, the various publications are generally known as fairly hawkish (sheer speculation, but something we'd need to investigate before generalizing from the publications' readership to the military at large), then the less hawkish

military members might just not read them as much.

Now it may well be that the military generally is more pro-war than the public at large (not much relevant to the policy debate, I think, but relevant to the tangent related to the "chicken-hawk" allegation). And this poll is not chopped liver; it may well be worth reporting, as one data point on what one chunk of the military thinks. But it seems to me quite important to make sure that the poll results are reported with suitable warnings, and not just as findings about what "military members" think. -- Eugene Volokh  
<[http://volokh.blogspot.com/2002\\_10\\_06\\_volokh\\_archive.html#85536321](http://volokh.blogspot.com/2002_10_06_volokh_archive.html#85536321)>

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) [hfienberg@stats.org](mailto:hfienberg@stats.org)  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Tue, 8 Oct 2002 15:41:35 -0400  
Subject: NYT polls one thing, reports another  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F96185768@cmpa01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <[HFienberg@stats.org](mailto:HFienberg@stats.org)>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g98JgaJ05973

[http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/001/748tgpjp.a  
sp](http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/001/748tgpjp.asp)

THE NEW YORK TIMES has lately come under a barrage of media criticism, not all of it from "the right," about the extent to which editorial bias has infected the paper's hard news columns. And already some of that criticism has been directed specifically against the paper's A-section reporting on its own, proprietary public opinion research (commissioned in partnership with CBS News). So what I'm about to offer isn't exactly without precedent. The bias in question, however, may well be without precedent; I can't remember anything quite like it, at least. "Poll Says Bush Needs to Pay Heed to Weak Economy," written up by Times correspondents Adam Nagourney and Janet Elder, and awarded pride of place--the front-page lede--in yesterday morning's edition, isn't just slanted (or misleading or imbalanced or overstated or any other word commonly applied to such things). The story is an outright fraud, a falsehood, a work of fiction.

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Oct 2002 10:33:21 +0200  
Subject: Interviewer notes regarding interview quality  
Message-ID: <6174FEC3C617614187CCA750C922A36103240B@exs03.scb.intra>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Lyberg Lars VL-S" <lars.lyberg@scb.se>  
To: "Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA" <SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU>,  
<aapornet@usc.edu>  
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 09 Oct 2002 08:33:21.0821 (UTC)  
FILETIME=[86C924D0:01C26F6E]  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g998XPJ04064

I was wondering if anyone has tried to ask interviewers about their perceptions of the data quality of survey interviews they have conducted. What survey? Wording of such questions to the interviewers? Results? How results have been used? References to your own work on this kind of assessment or to work by others?

Best regards,

Lars

-

=====  
Date: Wed, 09 Oct 2002 06:11:58 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: BOOK REVIEW: Democracy Imperiled; The Vanishing Voter,  
by TE Patterson (LATimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210090558410.7652-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT



---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

[www.calendarlive.com/books/bookreview/cl-bk-sifry6oct06,story](http://www.calendarlive.com/books/bookreview/cl-bk-sifry6oct06,story)

October 6, 2002

### Democracy Imperiled

THE VANISHING VOTER: Public Involvement in an Age of Uncertainty,  
By Thomas E. Patterson, Alfred A. Knopf: 256 pp., \$25

By MICAH L. SIFRY, Micah L. Sifry is senior analyst for Public Campaign, a nonpartisan campaign finance reform group. He is the author of "Spoiling for a Fight: Third-Party Politics in America."

Does your vote matter? After the intensely close presidential election of 2000, some people might be inclined to say yes. Others, noting how the conservative majority on the Supreme Court aborted Florida's vote-counting process, would argue otherwise.

Does your vote matter in the presidential primaries? The candidate who wins the wealth primary--the invisible money chase that takes place before any voting occurs--has gone on to win his party's nomination every year since 1984. So unless you live in Iowa or New Hampshire, the states where the first two votes are held, your franchise means little during the nomination process.

Should we keep our archaic winner-take-all method of doling out representation, which disenfranchises tens of millions of voters consigned by gerrymandering to live in districts where their parties can never win? Should we keep forcing voters to choose between the lesser of two evils, or should we experiment with preference voting and instant runoffs, which are prevalent in Ireland, France, Australia and elsewhere overseas, and which eliminate the spoiler problem? Why are younger, less educated and working-class people more likely to believe that there are no significant differences between the two major parties, and thus less reason to bother voting? Who benefits from the system now in place, and what will it take to force them to change it?

Alas, Thomas E. Patterson's thought-provoking "The Vanishing Voter" doesn't wrestle with any of these issues. Instead, he confines himself to a much narrower question about the presidential selection process surrounding the 2000 election: "What draws people to the campaign and what keeps them away?"

Patterson's research, which involved weekly polls from November 1999 through the post-election mess, confirms what we already know: Voters are turned off by "too much money, too much theater, too much fighting and too much deception." The process, he writes, "starts way too early and lasts far too long ... provides too many dull stretches and too few high points, and ... holds out opportunities that often turn out empty."

To fix it, Patterson calls on the parties to shorten the campaign and

give voters of every state a more meaningful vote, ideally by holding a series of single-state primaries in the late spring and concluding the process with a giant "Ultimate Tuesday" national primary a month later. He also calls on the networks to increase their prime-time coverage of the candidates and admonishes the political press to spend less time hyping minor gaffes, the horse race and their own pontifications. Finally, he urges elected officials to adopt some useful reforms, like election day voter registration (which has significantly boosted turnout in the six states that have it, and which Californians will vote on in November).

Patterson's findings, however, suggest that even some well-intentioned rejiggering of the process will not be enough to bridge the chasm between average voters and the electoral industrial complex.

Consider these nuggets from his book:

\* At the start of 2000, two-thirds of the public had no idea which candidates they supported, contrary to the drumbeat of media polls claiming this or that candidate was the front-runner (this is because the media polls forced people to choose between named candidates, while Patterson's polls allowed voters to say they hadn't made a firm choice).

\* Despite heavy news coverage, half the public didn't know that Arizona Sen. John McCain beat George W. Bush in New Hampshire. People were so turned off by the race that "by the first convention in 2000 ... 80% had no idea it was about to begin," Patterson reports.

\* More people watched the Nixon-Kennedy debates of 1960 than watched the Bush-Gore debates of 2000, even though there were 100 million fewer people then.

\* By election day, after more than a year of campaigning and nearly a billion dollars spent, a majority of those surveyed by Patterson flunked a series of 12 questions seeking to ascertain whether they knew the candidates' positions on prime issues like gun registration, defense spending, tax cuts, abortion, school vouchers, prescription drug coverage, offshore oil drilling and affirmative action.

"The gap between the practitioner and the citizen--despite the intimacy of television and the immediacy of polling--has arguably never been greater," Patterson writes. "The world occupied by the hundreds at the top and the world populated by the millions at the bottom still overlap at points, but they do so less satisfactorily than before. The juice has been squeezed out of elections."

But it's not just the juice that's gone; the essence of self-government has been eliminated. We the people don't rule ourselves. Big campaign contributors, big-foot journalists, political incumbents and party leaders set the terms by which the rest of us live. And so people ask themselves why they should bother voting. Today, thanks to the Voting Rights Act and the motor-voter law, most of the legal barriers to individual voter participation have been cleared away. (Though, Patterson reports, America still disenfranchises a stunning 10% of its population, compared with just 2% in the United Kingdom, by taking away ex-felons' voting rights and prohibiting legal aliens from voting). Education levels, another predictor of citizen involvement, are up, and

beginning with the 1960s, women have been turning out at the same pace as men.

But despite all this, voting--the basic act of citizenship--is slowly dying in America. Despite the closeness of the race, only 55% of all eligible adults voted in the presidential election of 2000, compared to 70% in 1960. In off-year elections, only about one-third vote. Voting rates of 10% or less are commonplace in many congressional primaries, and single-digit percentages are no longer a rarity. Most ominous for the future are turnout rates among people younger than 30, which barely hit 30% in 2000.

Would politics be any different if more people voted? Yes, because the active electorate tilts toward older, wealthier and more Republican. Patterson points out that Democrats would be in charge in the White House and on Capitol Hill if all eligible adults voted in 2000. Of course, if politicians expected more people to vote, they would adjust their campaigns accordingly. Still, we could expect somewhat different policy outcomes. Patterson's Vanishing Voter Project found that likely voters in 2000 were more inclined than nonvoters to spend the federal budget surplus on a tax cut, debt reduction or strengthening Social Security. Nonvoters were more likely to want it spent on health, education and welfare.

Patterson observes that today's minimum wage (adjusted for inflation) is lower than it was in 1979, that median income has stagnated and that top-dog wealth has soared. Yet these core economic issues, which would undoubtedly motivate millions of disaffected voters, are not pursued with any vigor by the major parties. Why? Start with the fact that business interests give 15 times as much in campaign contributions than labor interests. National Democrats are more beholden to their donors than to their voters.

Then add in the amazing lack of political competition for most offices: Three-quarters of the U.S. House wins re-election by a landslide, one out of seven don't even have a major party challenger, while more than 40% of state legislative candidates run without major opposition. Why should these political and economic interests stir up more voter engagement when things are so cozy for them now? (To get a better answer than Patterson supplies, turn to Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward's invaluable "Why Americans Still Don't Vote: And Why Politicians Want It That Way.")

It's striking that, in a book focused on vanishing voters, Patterson omits any consideration of Jesse Ventura's shocking win in Minnesota, where turnout soared thanks in great part to his working-class appeal (along with his inclusion in televised debates, his ability to get significant public financing and election-day voter registration). Patterson also gives scarce mention to other outside-the-box political challenges, like Ross Perot's in 1992 and Ralph Nader's in 2000, that demonstrably increased voter interest and participation. He does recognize how real political competition upped turnout during the Bush-McCain battle and in some of the Bush-Gore battleground states in the fall. But his prescriptions fall far short of his diagnosis.

Democracy in America is dying because the incumbent class of both major parties, working in tandem with each other and their funders,

consultants and a complaisant press, have figured out how to snuff out real competition. Patterson's book suggests that, if we want to revive it, we're going to have to create a truly level playing field for all parties and their candidates with fair treatment by the media, equal access to the ballot, an end to partisan gerrymandering, public funding to free politicians from their dependence on big money, more inclusive debates and more representative ways of counting votes. In a word, we need to apply antitrust thinking to electoral politics. Otherwise, the political market will stay closed, leaving more and more voters little choice but to stay home on election day.

[www.calendarlive.com/books/bookreview/cl-bk-sifry6oct06,story](http://www.calendarlive.com/books/bookreview/cl-bk-sifry6oct06,story)

-----  
Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Oct 2002 09:21:09 -0400  
Subject: More on the slanted Times poll coverage  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F9618576F@cempa01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g99DMAJ13037

Dick Morris also weighs in  
<<http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm>> this morning on the Times poll. In his words: "The phrasing of the questions is so slanted and biased that it amounts to journalistic "push polling" - the use of polling to generate pre-determined answers to vindicate a specific point of view. It was just such polling that led the Democratic Party astray over the summer and played an important role in catalyzing their criticism of Bush over Iraq."

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) [hfienberg@stats.org](mailto:hfienberg@stats.org)  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Wed, 09 Oct 2002 09:39:06 -0400  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
Subject: Slanted Polls  
In-reply-to:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F9618576F@cmpa01.smallbusiness.local>  
To: HFienberg@stats.org, "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHGEOADKAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

Dear All:

Regardless of Howard and Dick Morris's views on the Times Poll, it seems obvious by now that a majority of the public does not support a unilateral invasion of Iraq, and is quite concerned by the economy. As during Monica, it maybe that the Chattering Classes have a different view of public opinion than do the public.

I once again strongly recommend the Gallup work (previously cited on this list), as well as the PIPA poll (also cited).

It seems that both generally confirm the Times results.

Now it is true I do consult with the Times, but only on demographic issues.

Andrew A. Beveridge Home office  
Professor of Sociology  
Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY 50 Merriam Avenue  
209 Kissena Hall Bronxville, NY 10708-2743  
64-19 Kissena Blvd Phone: 914-337-6237  
Flushing, NY 11367 FAX: 914-337-8210  
Phone: 718-997-2837 email [beveridg@optonline.net](mailto:beveridg@optonline.net)  
FAX: 718-997-2820  
email [andy@troll.soc.qc.edu](mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu) web: <http://histmaps.research.cuny.edu>

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of  
> Howard Fienberg  
> Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 9:21 AM  
> To: AAPORNET (E-mail)  
> Subject: more on the slanted Times poll coverage  
>  
>  
> Dick Morris also weighs in  
> <<http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm>> this  
> morning on the Times poll. In his words: "The phrasing of the  
> questions is so slanted and biased that it amounts to

> journalistic "push polling" - the use of polling to generate  
> pre-determined answers to vindicate a specific point of view. It  
> was just such polling that led the Democratic Party astray over  
> the summer and played an important role in catalyzing their  
> criticism of Bush over Iraq."

>  
>  
> -----  
> Howard Fienberg  
> Senior Analyst  
> The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
> 2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
> Washington, DC 20037  
> (ph) 202-223-3193  
> (fax) 202-872-4014  
> (e) hfienberg@stats.org  
> http://www.stats.org  
>  
>  
>  
>

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Oct 2002 09:47:26 -0400  
Subject: Survey: Israel is number 2 threat to world peace, just after Iraq  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F96185770@cmpa01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g99DmQJ14621

from Ha'aretz:  
<<http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=217563&contrassID=1&subContrassID=8&sbSubContrassID=0&listSrc=Y>>  
Israel was ranked number two, just after Iraq, on a list of countries that threaten world peace, according to a recent survey conducted by French newspapers. Syria, Iran and Libya also appear on the list, albeit after Israel. The survey was conducted jointly by five local dailies in northwest France, which have a combined readership of about 175,000.

The list includes a total of 15 countries. Following Iraq and Israel were Afghanistan, the United States, Palestine, Iran, Pakistan, Algiers and Libya in that order. Syria appears number 12 on the list.

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)

2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

>From HFienberg@stats.org Wed Oct 9 06:53:10 2002  
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 g99Dr9J15249 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Oct 2002 06:53:09  
-0700 (PDT)  
Received: from CMPA01.smallbusiness.local  
(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 GAA12015 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Oct 2002 06:53:06 -0700 (PDT)  
content-class: urn:content-classes:message  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Subject: RE: Slanted Polls  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Date: Wed, 9 Oct 2002 09:52:07 -0400  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F96185771@cmpa01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "Andrew A Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>,  
"AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g99Dr9J15250

"My" views on the Times poll are immaterial. I posted those of David Tell  
and Dick Morris.

And no matter what any of us thinks we know about the state of public  
opinion regarding Iraq, it does not justify what the Times appears to have  
done.

Howard F.

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

From: Andrew A Beveridge [mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 9:39 AM  
To: Howard Fienberg; AAPORNET (E-mail)  
Subject: Slanted Polls

Dear All:

Regardless of Howard and Dick Morris's views on the Times Poll, it seems  
obvious by now that a majority of the public does not support a unilateral  
invasion of Iraq, and is quite concerned by the economy. As during Monica,

it maybe that the Chattering Classes have a different view of public opinion than do the public.

I once again strongly recommend the Gallup work (previously cited on this list), as well as the PIPA poll (also cited).

It seems that both generally confirm the Times results.

Now it is true I do consult with the Times, but only on demographic issues.

Andrew A. Beveridge Home office  
Professor of Sociology  
Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY 50 Merriam Avenue  
209 Kissena Hall Bronxville, NY 10708-2743  
64-19 Kissena Blvd Phone: 914-337-6237  
Flushing, NY 11367 FAX: 914-337-8210  
Phone: 718-997-2837 email [beveridg@optonline.net](mailto:beveridg@optonline.net)  
FAX: 718-997-2820  
email [andy@troll.soc.qc.edu](mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu) web: <http://histmaps.research.cuny.edu>

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of  
> Howard Fienberg  
> Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 9:21 AM  
> To: AAPORNET (E-mail)  
> Subject: more on the slanted Times poll coverage  
>  
>  
> Dick Morris also weighs in  
> <<http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm>> this  
> morning on the Times poll. In his words: "The phrasing of the  
> questions is so slanted and biased that it amounts to  
> journalistic "push polling" - the use of polling to generate  
> pre-determined answers to vindicate a specific point of view. It  
> was just such polling that led the Democratic Party astray over  
> the summer and played an important role in catalyzing their  
> criticism of Bush over Iraq."  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Howard Fienberg  
> Senior Analyst  
> The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
> 2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
> Washington, DC 20037  
> (ph) 202-223-3193  
> (fax) 202-872-4014  
> (e) [hfienberg@stats.org](mailto:hfienberg@stats.org)  
> <http://www.stats.org>  
>  
>  
>  
>



---

Date: Wed, 09 Oct 2002 11:33:07 -0400  
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
X-Accept-Language: en-us, en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Futile debates over question wording  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

When polls/surveys were first being developed, George Gallup and others thought they could be used as unofficial referenda to allow the public to vote on important issues facing the country. This would provide, for good or ill, a kind of true democracy.

However, it was soon discovered that almost any issue worth asking about allowed innumerable ways of writing questions. True, some seemed more loaded than others, but even a writer who strives for objectivity finds that there is no single way to ask a question that does not lean in one direction or another or still another. A reductio ad absurdum of this occurred during the 1982 conflict between Argentina and Great Britain over the Falkland/Malvinas Islands: one could not even ask a relevant question without using a name favored by one of the two parties to the dispute.

What surveys can do well is to hold question wording constant and to make comparisons across categories like education or, with more difficulty (because of changing circumstances), over time. In such cases one hopes that the wording does not interact with the set of categories and this is usually the case, as summarized in the principle of form-resistant correlations.

What surveys do not do well is to summarize public opinion on the basis of univariate percentages at a given point in time. It helps to ask a number of different questions, but in the end drawing a conclusion from the answers involves difficult and uncertain judgments, the more so when the issue itself is constantly changing, and there are question order effects and other facts and artifacts in play. Too bad, but something that we all need to face.

Howard

---

Date: Wed, 9 Oct 2002 11:37:23 EDT  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
Received: from <JAnnSelzer@aol.com>  
by imo-m10.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v34.13.) id 5.31.2e47112d (4238)  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 9 Oct 2002 11:37:23 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <31.2e47112d.2ad5a733@aol.com>  
Subject: Re: The latest products for blocking telemarketers  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="part1\_31.2e47112d.2ad5a733\_boundary"

X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 10638

--part1\_31.2e47112d.2ad5a733\_boundary  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I don't know if there's any zap for the recorded messages that telemarketers leave--but that is in fact more annoying to me than a live person from whom I can request to be removed from their list.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company  
Des Moines

In a message dated 10/8/2002 2:25:26 PM Central Daylight Time, sid.grc@verizon.net writes:

>  
> Some members might be interested in this review of products designed to  
> block telemarketers (and survey interviewers as well). Note: If simply  
> clicking on the link below doesn't take you to the article, try holding  
> down the Ctrl key and clicking on the link.  
>  
> "Black boxes help consumers zap telemarketers"  
>

--part1\_31.2e47112d.2ad5a733\_boundary  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
* * * * *
*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *
*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *
*      (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
*      This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT      *
*      If your postings display this message your mail program *
*      is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *
```

--part1\_31.2e47112d.2ad5a733\_boundary--

=====  
Date: Wed, 09 Oct 2002 09:52:31 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: 2 Americans Awarded Nobel Prize for Economics (D Altman, NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210090929420.29526-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Because AAPORNET seems at the moment to be fixed on the topic of question wording, I find it interesting that question formulation, construction and wording played a key role in the awarding of this year's Nobel Prize in Economics. I'm especially interested because one of the two awards went to Daniel Kahneman, an Israeli citizen and professor of psychology at Princeton, where he was when I was an assistant professor of sociology in the same small building, Green Hall, on the second floor--immediately above psychology. I also met my wife Kay in Green Hall, when she was on the psychology staff. That established, does anyone besides me think that survey design just might pick up a few useful tips from the psychology and economics literature on decision making and choice? I know that a few survey researchers have looked at this literature, but it's hardly a groundswell.

-- Jim

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/09/business/09CND-NOBEL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/09/business/09CND-NOBEL.html)

October 9, 2002

2 Americans Awarded Nobel for Economics

By DANIEL ALTMAN

Two Americans have won this year's Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences for trying to explain idiosyncrasies in people's ways of making decisions -- research that occupies the nexus of psychology and economics.

Daniel Kahneman, a professor of psychology at Princeton University who is also a citizen of Israel, and Vernon L. Smith, a professor of economics and law at George Mason University, shared the prize, which is worth approximately \$1.07 million before taxes.

The standard theory of choice propounded by economists assumes that individuals make decisions systematically, based on their preferences and available information, in a way that changes little with time or context. Yet by the early 1980's, Professor Kahneman and his longtime collaborator, Amos Tversky, who died in 1996, had begun to perform experiments with human subjects to suggest seemingly irrational wrinkles in behavior.

In an article published in Science in 1981, they reported results of a study in which 152 students were given hypothetical choices for trying to save 600 people from a disease. Using one strategy, exactly 200 people could be saved. Using another, there would be a one-third chance that everyone would die, and a two-thirds chance that no one would be saved. Seventy-two percent of the subjects, preferring the less risky strategy, chose the first option.

But when the researchers presented the same choice with different

wording -- either 400 people would die for sure or there would be a one-third chance of saving everyone -- only 22 percent chose the first option.

Professor Smith's work formalized laboratory techniques for studying economic decision-making, with a focus on bargaining and auctions. The Nobel committee cited him for demonstrating how market institutions, such as the type of auction used in a sale, could affect participants' behavior.

The prize committee cited Mr. Tversky in its statement, but Nobel prizes are not awarded posthumously. This award represents the second time in recent years that a deceased researcher in economics has been mentioned by the committee. In 1997, Fischer Black, one of the architects of a renowned model for pricing options, received recognition when Robert C. Merton and Myron S. Scholes, with whom he collaborated, won the prize.

Unlike the other five Nobel Prizes, the prize in economics was not set up by the will of Alfred Nobel, the Swedish inventor of dynamite who died in 1896. It has been awarded by the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences with sponsorship from the Sweden's central bank since 1968.

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/09/business/09CND-NOBEL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/09/business/09CND-NOBEL.html)

-----  
Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Oct 2002 10:20:37 -0700  
From: "Dr. Judy Calder" <calder@SCS.UNR.EDU>  
To: <lars.lyberg@scb.se>,  
"Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA" <SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU>,  
References: <6174FEC3C617614187CCA750C922A36103240B@exs03.scb.intra>  
Subject: Re: Interviewer notes regarding interview quality  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_00C4\_01C26F7D.82B43B00"  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_00C4\_01C26F7D.82B43B00  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Funny that you should bring this topic up as one of my former students and I are writing a paper on this very topic & are close to submitting it. We

look at data that interviewers rated for quality using typical data quality variables from the interviewer's point of view. At the Center for Applied Research, interviews with overall ratings of less than "excellent" were asked a series of follow-up questions (see Table 1, attached). We found differential responding patterns to be associated with the interviewer ratings of the interchange between interviewer and respondent. Supervisors review the interviewer ratings, and if interviewer notes plus the existence of any of the "negative" conditions in shown Table 1 exist, a decision is made whether to retain the interview data or delete it. This has been a qualitative process rather than a strict numerical counting, much less an algorithm. Hope this will help somewhat.

judy calder

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

From: "Lyberg Lars VL-S" <lars.lyberg@scb.se>

To: "Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA" <SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU>; <aapornet@usc.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 1:33 AM

Subject: Interviewer notes regarding interview quality

>

> I was wondering if anyone has tried to ask interviewers about their perceptions of the data quality of survey interviews they have conducted. What survey? Wording of such questions to the interviewers? Results? How results have been used? References to your own work on this kind of assessment or to work by others?

>

> Best regards,

>

> Lars

> -

>

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_00C4\_01C26F7D.82B43B00

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_00C4\_01C26F7D.82B43B00--

=====  
Date: Wed, 09 Oct 2002 13:31:28 -0400

From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>

Subject: Re: Slanted Polls

To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu

Cc: HFienberg@stats.org, "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Message-id: <3DA467EF.341F1EF7@rider.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.78 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win98; U)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
X-Accept-Language: en  
References: <KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHGEOADKAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

In defense of the Times polling questions, please indulge me for a moment while I tell a brief story about the 1988 Presidential election.

During the '88 election, I was teaching Introduction to American Politics to two sections of about 45 students apiece. One of their assignments was to write a position paper on some controversial, national political issue.

I spent a great deal of time going over the presidential election, assigning students to watch the debates, etc., in anticipation of receiving a deluge of position papers supporting either Bush or Dukakis (students were allowed to pick their own topic for the paper, but I encouraged them to write about the election).

I received exactly two papers out of 90 on the election.

Rather than fall into despair, I just wrote it off to students' lack of interest in politics, or a lack of knowledge about the basic issues (I generally avoided the possibility that the teaching was uninspired...). However, after the election, I gave my students another exercise-- if you were to advise President-elect Bush about the first issue he should take up, what would you say?

When I collected the answers and wrote them on the board, I made an amazing discovery. The answers included "relations with the Soviet Union", "the environment", "the deficit", "unemployment and underemployment", "education", and so on-- in short, my students defined the major issues on the political agenda in 1988. Also, notable was the absence of any issues like "prison furloughs", "the pledge of allegiance", or "flags" that had taken up so much time in the general election.

In short, my students knew what the issues were, and were concerned about them, but the candidates preferred to talk about other things; was it therefore any surprise that none of them wrote about the election?

My point is: what would have happened during the election if someone had asked in a poll "do you think the candidates are spending too much time on issues like prison furloughs and the pledge of allegiance and not enough time on the economy"? Of course, that would have interfered with one side or the other wanting to make the campaign about "their" issues. On the other hand, I think we suspect what the results would have been, and maybe, just maybe, the candidates would have been goaded into talking about the issues the public wanted discussed.

In short, I don't find anything wrong with what the Times did. Too often, we allow political elites or others (yes, we social scientists are guilty of this too) to dictate what issues will be discussed, without asking the American people what they think is important.

Oh, and as a sidenote to the writer of that column in the Weekly Standard-- an individual can believe an issue is the most important one on the political agenda, and still believe politicians spend too much time on

it...

Frank Rusciano

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

> Dear All:

>

> Regardless of Howard and Dick Morris's views on the Times Poll, it seems  
> obvious by now that a majority of the public does not support a unilateral  
> invasion of Iraq, and is quite concerned by the economy. As during  
Monica,

> it maybe that the Chattering Classes have a different view of public  
opinion

> than do the public.

>

> I once again strongly recommend the Gallup work (previously cited on this  
> list), as well as the PIPA poll (also cited).

>

> It seems that both generally confirm the Times results.

>

> Now it is true I do consult with the Times, but only on demographic  
issues.

>

> Andrew A. Beveridge Home  
office

> Professor of Sociology  
> Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY 50 Merriam  
Avenue

> 209 Kissena Hall  
Bronxville, NY 10708-2743

> 64-19 Kissena Blvd Phone:  
914-337-6237

> Flushing, NY 11367 FAX:  
914-337-8210

> Phone: 718-997-2837 email  
beveridg@optonline.net

> FAX: 718-997-2820

> email andy@troll.soc.qc.edu web:  
http://histmaps.research.cuny.edu

>

> > -----Original Message-----  
> > From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of  
> > Howard Fienberg

> > Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 9:21 AM

> > To: AAPORNET (E-mail)

> > Subject: more on the slanted Times poll coverage

> >

> >

> >

> >

> > Dick Morris also weighs in

> > <<http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/59155.htm>> this

> > morning on the Times poll. In his words: "The phrasing of the

> > questions is so slanted and biased that it amounts to

> > journalistic "push polling" - the use of polling to generate

> > pre-determined answers to vindicate a specific point of view. It

> > was just such polling that led the Democratic Party astray over

> > the summer and played an important role in catalyzing their

> > criticism of Bush over Iraq."  
> >  
> >  
> > -----  
> > Howard Fienberg  
> > Senior Analyst  
> > The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
> > 2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
> > Washington, DC 20037  
> > (ph) 202-223-3193  
> > (fax) 202-872-4014  
> > (e) hfienberg@stats.org  
> > http://www.stats.org  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >

---

Date: Wed, 9 Oct 2002 14:19:57 -0400  
From: "Kemper, Mark" <MKemper@bridgew.edu>  
To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Multiple questions  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Howard is correct. No matter how much time and energy we devote to writing questions and designing survey instruments, measurement error will persist. But using multiple questions and developing multi-item-based scales greatly improves our ability to accurately measure what individuals think. The downside is that the findings from such approaches are not easily communicated--especially on television--to an audience of non-experts.

Mark

Mark Kemper, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor  
Political Science Department  
Summer Street House  
Bridgewater State College  
Bridgewater, MA 02325

(508) 531-2796  
mkemper@bridgew.edu

---

Date: Wed, 09 Oct 2002 14:35:12 -0400  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: RE: Multiple questions



In-reply-to: <9F5E83E17008D31193DD0090274E75050E217F88@mailhost.bridgew.edu>  
To: "'aapor'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <00ba01c26fc2\$9aec2120\$0d0a010a@leo>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

Which is why I think things like the Gallup report that Andrew A. Beveridge and I referred to are so important.

They used multiple questions and variations to try to triangulate public opinion. One can always argue that they should have used a question worded this way or why didn't they use this response option.

Unless the questioner has proof that they were intentionally trying to slant the results the most likely reasons (IMHO) in no particular order are:

They wanted to know what people thought about this particular way of wording the question. They did not think to ask it (that particular way). They thought this way was better. They didn't have the resources for another version. They made a mistake.

I am sure I am not the only one who has regretted the wording of a particular question after fielding a survey. -- Leo G. Simonetta Art & Science Group, LLC [simonetta@artsci.com](mailto:simonetta@artsci.com)

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

> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu  
> [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of  
> Kemper, Mark  
> Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 2:20 PM  
> To: aapor  
> Subject: multiple questions

>

>

> Howard is correct. No matter how much time and energy we  
> devote to writing  
> questions and designing survey instruments, measurement error  
> will persist.  
> But using multiple questions and developing multi-item-based  
> scales greatly  
> improves our ability to accurately measure what individuals  
> think. The  
> downside is that the findings from such approaches are not easily  
> communicated--especially on television--to an audience of non-experts.

>

> Mark

>

>

>

>

> Mark Kemper, Ph.D.

> Assistant Professor  
> Political Science Department  
> Summer Street House  
> Bridgewater State College  
> Bridgewater, MA 02325  
>  
> (508) 531-2796  
> mkemper@bridgew.edu  
>  
>  
>

=====  
Date: Wed, 09 Oct 2002 16:02:01 -0400  
From: "Mark Schulman" <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Cc: kraymond@nsf.gov  
Subject: NSF Minority Postdoctoral Research Fellowships  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g99K2BJ20923

The National Science Foundation's Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences (SBE) offers Minority Postdoctoral Research Fellowships and related supporting activities in an effort to increase the participation of underrepresented groups in selected areas of science in the U.S. These fellowships support training and research at the postdoctoral level in a host institution in the areas of social, behavioral, and economic sciences (including history and philosophy of science) supported by NSF. Applicants must be U.S. citizens, nationals, or lawfully admitted permanent residents and recipients of the doctoral degree within the past 4 years.

The Post-Doc award size is \$50,000/year for 2 years, payable as \$36,000 in stipend (paid directly to the Fellow), \$9,000 as a research allowance, and \$5,000 as an institutional allowance for fringe benefits (including health insurance).

Additionally, travel awards (up to \$4,000) are available for graduate students who plan to apply for the postdoctoral fellowship to visit potential sponsors. At the conclusion of the Fellowship, Fellows are eligible to apply for a research start-up grant (up to \$50,000).

The deadline for applications is Monday, December 2, 2002 (annually the first Monday in December).

For more information, consult the program announcement at <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2001/nsf00139/nsf00139.html>, or contact John Perhonis at 703-292-7279 or [jperhoni@nsf.gov](mailto:jperhoni@nsf.gov).

Kristin Raymond

Science Assistant  
Cross-Directorate Activities  
Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences  
National Science Foundation  
4201 Wilson Blvd, Suite 995.21  
Arlington, Virginia 22230

Phone: 703-292-7323  
Fax: 703-292-9068  
URL: <http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/ses/cda>

=====  
Date: Wed, 09 Oct 2002 19:50:47 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Dick Halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>  
Subject: Jealous? Maybe It's Genetic. Maybe Not.  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/related;  
type="text/plain";  
boundary="====\_36529361==.REL"

-----\_36529361==.REL  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Well...differences in question wording and overall approach do produce=20  
different responses.....

Dick

New York Times, October 8, 2002

Jealous? Maybe It's Genetic. Maybe Not.

By ERICA GOODE

J22aba33.jpgealousy, according to evolutionary psychologists, evolved a=20  
million or so years ago on the African plain, where life was no picnic.

Out there on the savanna, a man had to constantly guard against cuckoldry,=  
=20  
lest he squander his resources, unwittingly feeding that hard-earned leg of=  
=20  
mastodon to some other guy's progeny.

Women had other things to worry about, like keeping the meat coming in.=20  
Sure, it bothered them if their men indulged in a little hanky-panky by the=

=20  
watering hole. But the real threat was if a man became emotionally attached=  
=20  
to another woman: who would bring home the mastodon then?

At least, that's the theory advanced by evolutionary psychologists, who in=  
=20  
the last decade have ushered Darwinian theory into new and provocative=  
=20  
areas, including the relationship between the sexes. As a result of such=  
=20  
differing survival pressures long ago, they maintain, the brains of modern=  
=20  
men and women are programmed to respond differently to the infidelity of a=  
=20  
romantic partner. Men become more jealous over sexual infidelity, a=  
=20  
strategy that worked pretty well in the Stone Age, promoting reproductive=  
=20  
success. Women are more distressed by emotional betrayal, which could leave=  
=20  
them without resources.

It is an appealing argument in a society where men are considered to be=  
=20  
from Mars and women from Venus, and one that has gained substantial=  
=20  
purchase among evolutionary scientists and in popular literature. It is=  
=20  
also supported by a variety of studies finding evidence for such a sex=  
=20  
difference, many of them carried out by Dr. David M. Buss, an evolutionary=  
=20  
psychologist at the University of Texas, and his colleagues.

"Men and women may be equally jealous, but the events that trigger jealousy=  
=20  
differ," Dr. Buss wrote in "The Dangerous Passion: Why Jealousy Is as=  
=20  
Necessary as Love and Hate."

Other scholars have not been so convinced. They have argued that it is more=  
=20  
likely that differences between men and women that evolutionary=  
=20  
psychologists attribute to natural selection =97 like the tendency of men  
to=  
=20  
be polygamous and women, monogamous =97 are the product of cultures, not=  
=20  
evolution. Jealousy is probably no exception.

So the nature-nurture debate has continued over the years.

But two new research papers take a different tack. They do not dispute that=  
=20  
evolution plays a role in shaping human behavior. But they question the=  
=20  
evidence assembled by Dr. Buss and others for the notion that jealousy=  
=20  
evolved differently in men and in women.

In one paper, to appear in the November issue of The Journal of Personality=  
=20  
and Social Psychology, researchers led by Dr. David DeSteno, a psychologist=  
=20  
at Northeastern University, assert that the sex difference revealed in many=  
=20  
studies of jealousy by evolutionary psychologists is spurious, an artifact=  
=20

of the particular method used in those studies.

They suggest that, rather than representing a hard-wired psychological mechanism for promoting reproduction, jealousy could have evolved in each sex for some more general purpose—for example, protecting social bonds in a very social species.

"I'm very sympathetic to the evolutionary view," Dr. DeSteno said. "It's ridiculous to assume that the human mind was not subject to the evolutionary chisel. But I think there can be numerous evolutionary arguments for how specific social behaviors develop."

Dr. DeSteno and his colleagues—Monica Y. Bartlett and Julia Braverman of Northeastern and Dr. Peter Salovey of Yale—say the problem with many of the studies conducted by Dr. Buss and other investigators is that they all use the same technique: the subjects are asked to call to mind a serious committed relationship that they had, that they now have or that they would like to have.

They are then presented with two forms of infidelity—one sexual, one emotional—and asked which they would find most distressing. (Dr. Buss calls this method "Sophie's Choice," referring to the book and movie in which the title character must choose which of her children will be killed. Other psychologists call it "forced choice.")

Using this method, virtually every study has found a difference between the sexes, with women being more likely to pick emotional infidelity as the most upsetting choice.

But Dr. DeSteno and his colleagues conducted their own studies, adding other ways of measuring jealousy, for instance, asking the 111 subjects, undergraduates at Northeastern, to rate on a seven-point scale how upset they would be about each form of infidelity in turn, rather than having them choose between the two forms presented together.

When such other methods were used, the researchers found, the gap between men and women disappeared; both sexes said they were more disturbed by sexual infidelity.

They then investigated further, to determine the reason for the discrepancy between the techniques.

"It's very strange from an evolutionary perspective why the sex difference would only occur" in the forced-choice situation and not in others, Dr. DeSteno said.

One possibility, the researchers reasoned, was that instead of eliciting an automatic, preprogrammed response to infidelity the kind one would expect from a mechanism designed by evolution the forced-choice method sent subjects into a more complex intellectual decision-making process, in which they weighed the trade-offs between the two unpleasant alternatives.

To test this hypothesis, the researchers conducted another study, in which half the subjects filled out a questionnaire asking, among other things, whether they would be more upset if a romantic partner "had passionate sex with someone else" or "formed a deep emotional bond to someone else." The other subjects were given the same task, but they were asked to simultaneously remember a string of numbers while answering the questions a twist the researchers hoped would eliminate the possibility of complicated reasoning, forcing an automatic response.

The researchers found that among the subjects who completed the questionnaire free from distraction, the usual sex difference appeared with more women choosing emotional infidelity. But among the subjects who had to remember the numbers, there was no sex difference; women, as well as men, identified sexual infidelity as the most upsetting.

"The fact that women's responses on the forced-choice measure mirrored those of men argues forcefully against the existence of innate sex differences," the researchers wrote.

Dr. Buss, however, said he failed to find the new research convincing. Dr. DeSteno and his colleagues, Dr. Buss said, had distorted the claims of evolutionary psychology.

"These authors take a kind of rigid, robotic, stereotypic and false depiction of the evolutionary hypothesis and then show that those robotic depictions are wrong," Dr. Buss said. "I could develop any number of contexts in which you could make the sex differences in jealousy disappear; the fact that you could create a laboratory experiment in which you do so is, in my view, a meaningless and trivial demonstration."

Besides, he added, a smaller study, published this year, found sex differences even when methods other than forced-choice were used to determine preferences. Dr. Todd Shackelford, an associate professor of psychology at Florida Atlantic University and a former student of Dr. Buss, also had objections.

"I guess, to state it plainly, I think the paper is in large part ludicrous," he said. "It's clear to me that they have an agenda they're pushing."

Yet in an extensive critique, to be published next year in the journal Personality and Social Psychology Review, Dr. Christine R. Harris, a psychologist and research scientist at the University of California at San Diego, says Dr. DeSteno and his colleagues have identified only one of many serious flaws in the case for evolved sex differences in jealousy.

"The evidence supporting this theory is far less conclusive than is often maintained," Dr. Harris said.

For example, she pointed out that the forced-choice studies of jealousy have found differences between American and European men as large as those between American men and women. And in some Asian cultures, the disparity is even larger: only 25 percent of Chinese men, for example, chose sexual infidelity as more distressing in one study; 75 percent picked emotional infidelity.

Such findings, Dr. Harris wrote, seem "quite problematic" to a theory that posits an evolutionarily evolved mechanism operative in most, if not all, humans, while the results are compatible with the idea that culture influences the jealous responses of men and women.

Another difficulty, she continued, is that some studies examining real instances of unfaithfulness as opposed to the imagined infidelity of college students and other laboratory subjects found very different patterns of results.

In one study, involving adults living in sexually open marriages, for example, more women than men reported being bothered by the thought of their mate's engaging in sexual intercourse with another person, Dr. Harris said. Another study found that both men and women dwelled more on the sexual side of a mate's infidelity than the emotional aspects.

Dr. Harris also takes on the finding, reported in the 1980's by evolutionary psychologists like Dr. Martin Daly and Dr. Margo Wilson at McMaster's University in Ontario, that men are far more likely than women to kill their spouses out of sexual jealousy. Men, Dr. Harris pointed out, are more likely to be the perpetrators in all forms of violent crime. When the proportion of homicides involving jealousy is considered, rather than the absolute number of such acts, women are just as likely to kill out of jealousy as men are.

Perhaps predictably, such arguments are unlikely to put an end to the continuing debate over evolution's role in shaping jealous passion.

Dr. Shackelford waved away Dr. Harris's critique and the criticisms made by other researchers as misguided forays intended "to cater to the muddled masses of mainstream psychology."





---

Date: Fri, 11 Oct 2002 09:22:37 -0400  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.79 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: E.J.Dionne on election polls (Washington Post)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

This column by E.J.Dionne in today's Washington Post presents a number of interesting comments and observations about political polls and the difficulties politicians face in interpreting and acting on their results.

The column may be read online at:  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A10066-2002Oct10.html>

Jan Werner  
jwerner@jwdp.com

---

What Matters on Election Day

By E. J. Dionne Jr.

Friday, October 11, 2002; Page A37

Is there a disconnect between Washington and the rest of the country over what's at stake in the November elections? Is there a difference between the news agenda and the voters' agenda? Consider the conventional take on what's happening: By moving Iraq to political center stage, Republicans have derailed Democratic efforts to make the campaign about the economy, the falling stock market and corporate irresponsibility. Democrats are split and unhappy. Republicans are joyous in the knowledge that when elections are about foreign policy, Democrats usually lose.

I've been testing this theory in interviews with strategists in both parties and against the findings of public opinion polls. What has emerged is a compelling alternative view: that Iraq and foreign policy are, indeed, important to many voters, but that these voters are for the most part loyal Republicans who would have voted with their party, war or no war.

Among Democrats, on the other hand, the war is less salient -- and the Democrats who do care about the war are against it. Crucially, political independents seem more inclined to vote on the economy or domestic issues such as health care. In other words, the war issue matters least to the voters most likely to determine the outcome of the election. The war matters most to the voters whose minds couldn't be changed anyway. The Iraq effect is likely to be limited to whether it increases the relative turnout among faithful Republicans.

The findings of the public polls, according to strategists in both parties, mirror the findings of private campaign polls. According to the recent Washington Post/ABC News survey, 45 percent of Republicans listed Iraq as an issue crucial to their voting decision this year, compared with 33 percent of Democrats and 28 percent of independents.

And while the New York Times/CBS News Poll this week found that Americans ranked terrorism ahead of the economy as a "priority for the nation," voters had a different view when it came to what they wanted their congressional candidates to discuss. Asked if they wanted to hear more about the war in Iraq or about the economy, 56 percent of Republicans picked the economy, as did 64 percent of independents and 83 percent of Democrats.

>From such numbers Democrats have constructed a dream scenario: The relentless focus on war by Washington, the media and, especially, the president will steadily increase the electorate's frustration. "The more Bush talks about Iraq, the more it seems that he's not paying attention to the economy," says Geoff Garin, a veteran Democratic pollster. "This may end up falling under the law of unintended consequences, just as impeachment did in 1998."

In the 1998 elections, Republicans were certain they would be pushed to victory by a wave of protest voting against Bill Clinton. What happened was the opposite: Democrats went to the polls to oppose the impeachment effort, while many independents saw the impeachment talk as too partisan and unrelated to their concerns. Garin's conclusion: "What the voters said is, 'You're off topic.' "

Republican strategists agree that war alone will not carry them to victory. The word in Republican circles is that Bush will turn more to economic questions as the election nears. If he does, he will only underscore the Democrats' point that the economy is what matters. Still, says Bill McInturff, a Republican pollster, the Iraq debate has done Republicans a world of good. "The discussion about Iraq," he says, "has prevented the Democrats from coalescing the economic sentiment against Bush and the Republicans."

David Winston, another Republican pollster, insists on a truth often lost because of his profession's habit of breaking all of us down into little groups: Most voters care about both the economy and the war on terrorism. Pollsters, he said, still don't know how the two concerns will balance out on Election Day. The GOP could win some close races if concerns about terrorism nudge even a modest number of moderate Democrats and independents the Republicans' way.

But Republicans face a dilemma. Because so many Democrats from competitive districts fell into line behind Bush's war resolution this week, the war will be a distinguishing issue in only a handful of contests. And because most Democrats, along with many independents, are uneasy over the prospect of war, the issue's power to move voters is limited and efforts to push it into the campaign could backfire. "No party," says Winston, "can be perceived as using this issue politically."

Thus the paradox of 2002: American voters take the conflict with Iraq

so seriously that most of them will not allow it to decide the election.

© 2002 The Washington Post Company

=====  
Date: Fri, 11 Oct 2002 09:23:43 -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: Undervote Campaign  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

[/www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/chi-0210110322oct11,0,2602690.story?coll=chi%2Dnews%2Dhed](http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/chi-0210110322oct11,0,2602690.story?coll=chi%2Dnews%2Dhed)

Ballot boo-boos targeted by county  
By Shia Kapos and Dan Mihalopoulos  
Tribune staff reporters

October 11, 2002

Mindful that election chaos in Florida two years ago threw the nation into a constitutional crisis, local election officials have drafted a sophisticated new strategy to avoid a repeat in Illinois.

Meet Chad and Dimples.

Cook County Clerk David Orr has decided the antidote to all those hanging, dangling, flopping and drooping chads that so vexed voters in Florida and Chicago during Election 2000 is a public awareness campaign for those of voting age that seems geared to the Cartoon Network set.

The centerpieces of the campaign are Chad and Dimples, animated characters who represent pieces of partially punched ballots but also bear a striking resemblance to SpongeBob SquarePants, the underwater star of a cartoon series on the Nickelodeon cable network.

Scott Burnham, a spokesman for Orr, acknowledged that the voter education campaign was geared to the lowest common denominator. "It's completely silly, but that's what it will take to catch on," he said.

In the campaign, which will feature TV and radio spots, Chad and Dimples remind voters about what to do before leaving the polling booth.

"Remember Florida. If we don't break free, this vote won't count," the characters plead while they hang precariously from a ballot that risks not being counted. "Don't leave us hanging," they continue.

=====  
Date: Fri, 11 Oct 2002 09:34:14 -0700 (PDT)

From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: New Announcement: Chief for NCHS's Survey Design Staff  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210110929520.3610-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

-----  
Announcement for position of Chief for NCHS's Survey Design Staff  
-----

Several vacancies have been announced for positions in the Survey Design Staff of National Center for Health Statistics, Office of Research and Methodology.

The announcements close on 12/24/02. MOVING EXPENSES ARE AUTHORIZED.  
The announcements are located on the web.

For position of Chief, Survey Design Staff, click on:

<http://www2.cdc.gov/hrmo/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=4-02-023>  
and  
<http://www2.cdc.gov/hrmo/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=10-03-001>

For GS13 position: click on:

<http://www2.cdc.gov/hrmo/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=4-02-024>

For GS14 position, click on:

<http://www2.cdc.gov/hrmo/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=4-02-025>

-----  
Announcement for position of Chief for NCHS's Survey Design Staff  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Fri, 11 Oct 2002 23:55:00 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Dick Halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>  
Subject: Palestinian poll: A husband may beat his wife if she hurts his manhood  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g9C41JJ28612

Interesting....translated from the Arabic by the Palestinian Media Watch, an Israeli group. They're pretty reliable....but I have no details about the validity/reliability/representativeness of the findings since I don't read Arabic.

Dick

Palestinian Media Watch Bulletin  
October 9, 2002

Palestinian poll: A husband may beat his wife if she hurts his manhood  
By Itamar Marcus

Introduction:

A poll conducted in the Palestinian Authority by a Palestinian public opinion company shows that a majority of Palestinians are of the opinion that a husband may prevent his wife from working, that a woman should strive to devote herself to her husband and that a husband is entitled to beat his wife if he thinks that she "hurt his manhood". Nearly half the Palestinians believe that neither law enforcement nor social welfare agencies' intervention in husbands' violence towards the wife is warranted, while at the same time a the majority calls for tough punitive legislation for violence towards women. These two attitudes are, it seems, not viewed as contradictory. One possible explanation is that the support for punitive measures expressed by a majority of Palestinians does not apply to a husband's violence towards his wife.

The text:

"The Society for the Advancement of the Palestinian Working Woman, in conjunction with The Palestinian Center for Public Opinion Polls, conducted a poll under the supervision of Dr. Nabil Kokali, on the topic of violence against women..."

"56.9% of Palestinians feel that it is a husband's right to hit his wife if he thinks she hurt his manhood..."

"59.1% of Palestinians feel that it is a husband's right to prevent his wife from working outside the home..."

"66.4% of Palestinians declare that the crown of success of the Palestinian Woman is devoting herself to the care of her children and her husband above devotion to herself."

"47.1% feel that there is no need for intervention of social or law enforcement agencies in instances of husbands attacking wives, because that is a family problem..."

"73.9% feel that a woman must think of how to become a mother and wife rather than engage in her economic and social freedom..."

"86% of Palestinians feel that the [Islamic] traditions and customs retard advancement of women..."

"68.5% of Palestinians feel that the [Palestinian] Authority should legislate firm punitive legislation for violence against women..."

[Al-Ayyam women's supplement 'The Woman's Voice', October 3, 2002]

PALESTINIAN MEDIA WATCH

phone: 972- 2- 625-4140 fax: 972-2- 624-2803

visit our website, click here: <http://www.pmw.org.il>

for further information, contact PMW Director, Itamar Marcus

material may be quoted, citing PMW as the source  
subscribe free to PMW reports, details below

```
=====
Date: Sat, 12 Oct 2002 15:23:48 -0500
To: "Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA" <SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU>,
    aapornet@usc.edu, lars.lyberg@scb.se
From: "Colm O'Muircheartaigh" <caomuirc@midway.uchicago.edu>
Subject: Re: Interviewer notes regarding interview quality
In-Reply-To: <00c701c26fb8$2f88df40$6339c586@sabcar.unr.edu>
References: <6174FEC3C617614187CCA750C922A36103240B@exs03.scb.intra>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed
```

In the World Fertility Survey (WFS) there were two evaluation questions in the interview schedule itself for the interviewer to complete. The first came after the birth history section and asked the interviewer to evaluate the quality of the dates reported in that section. The second came at the end of the schedule and asked the interviewer to categorize the overall level of cooperation of the respondent in the interview.

I used both in an analysis of the simple response variance of the responses (using reinterviews in a small number of countries). There was a strong association between the interviewer's classification and the simple response variance. There was also a strong association between the answers to the two questions.

The results are reported in two Scientific Reports published by WFS in 1984.

Colm O'Muircheartaigh

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

>From: "Lyberg Lars VL-S" <lars.lyberg@scb.se>

>To: "Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA"  
<SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU>;

><aapornet@usc.edu>

>Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 1:33 AM

>Subject: Interviewer notes regarding interview quality

>

>

> >

> > I was wondering if anyone has tried to ask interviewers about their  
>perceptions of the data quality of survey interviews they have conducted.  
>What survey? Wording of such questions to the interviewers? Results? How

>results have been used? References to your own work on this kind of  
>assessment or to work by others?

> >

> > Best regards,

> >

> > Lars

> > -

> >

```
>* * * * *  
>*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *  
>*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *  
>* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *  
>*      This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT *  
>* If your postings display this message your mail program *  
>* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *  
>* * * * *
```

```
=====
Date: Tue, 15 Oct 2002 06:48:22 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>
Subject: CONFERENCE - Impact of Technology on the Survey Process - Call for
Papers
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210150638440.25056-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
```

```
*****
      an announcement from The Association for Survey Computing.
      Apologies for any cross-postings
*****
```

SURVEY AND STATISTICAL COMPUTING IV  
THE IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY ON THE SURVEY PROCESS

The ASC's 4th International Conference  
17-19 September 2003, Warwick University

FIRST ANNOUNCEMENT AND CALL FOR CONTRIBUTED PAPERS

The Association for Survey Computing is pleased to announce that it will be hosting its fourth International Conference on Survey and Statistical Computing at Warwick University between Sept 17 and 19, 2003 and is now seeking proposals for contributed papers.

The central theme of the conference will be the Impact of Technology on the Survey Process, and we will be seeking contributions from producers, consumers and commissioners of survey research alike. The conference will, inter alia, explore the often-complex relationship between the push and pull of technological changes and the

expectations and demands created by them. We will also be seeking to examine how outcomes feed back to affect the processes which initially gave rise to them. Although a conference about technology, the topics to be discussed will appeal to everyone with an interest in survey design, data collection, analysis, reporting, or statistical computing.

The conference will consist of papers presented to both plenary and parallel sessions, as well as poster sessions.

All papers will be published prior to the conference in a bound set of proceedings to be distributed to delegates.

#### PLENARY SESSIONS AND INVITED SPEAKERS

Plenary sessions of the Conference will be addressed by five invited speakers, including our keynote and endnote speakers:

NORMAN GLASS

Chief Executive, National Centre for Social Research

DENISE LIEVESLEY

Director, UNESCO Institute for Statistics

#### PARALLEL SESSIONS AND CONTRIBUTING SPEAKERS

Contributing speakers will address themed sessions taking place in one of four, parallel streams. Thematic and organisational details will be finalised at the end of the selection process, but the Scientific Program Committee is particularly seeking proposals addressing the impact of technology in the following areas:

- \* The role of the survey professional
- \* Sampling and respondent recruitment
- \* Data capture
- \* Data analysis
- \* Information dissemination and discovery
- \* Software support for the survey process
- \* Quality and quality assurance
- \* Ethical issues
- \* Qualitative research

(These topic areas should be seen as indicative and not prescriptive).

Proposals for contributed papers should be between 250 and 500 words in length, and sent, preferably by e-mail, to the ASC Administrator (admin@asc.org.uk) to arrive no later than Friday, Dec 6, 2002.

For complete conference details, please visit our web site at:  
<http://www.asc.org.uk>

-----

Please reply to:

Diana Elder, Administrator (admin@asc.org.uk)



ASC, PO Box 60, Chesham, Bucks, UK HP5 3QH  
tel/fax: +44 (0)1494 793033  
<http://www.asc.org.uk>

This message has been sent on behalf of the ASC by:

Randy Banks (randy@essex.ac.uk)  
Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER)  
University of Essex, Colchester, UK CO4 3SQ

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Tue, 15 Oct 2002 07:08:22 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Job Opening Survey Research Associate in DC  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210150702270.29725-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Job Title: Survey Research Associate

The American Chemical Society is the largest scientific society in the world with more than 163,000 individual members. We are seeking an exceptional individual who has an interest in employment issues affecting the scientific workforce and survey research. Responsibilities include: conduct and analyze 2 national employment surveys and special studies each year; write about and present findings based on original and secondary data. Please visit our website at [www.chemistry.org](http://www.chemistry.org) <<http://www.chemistry.org>> for information on the Society. Candidate's work experience should include at least 3 years and a college degree in sociology, economics, or demography is preferred. Must have knowledge of basic statistics and quantitative research methods as well as experience with SPSS or SAS. Ability to plan, organize, and carry out survey and analysis projects and associated administrative tasks. Excellent writing and communication skills, ability to work within a team environment, and attention to detail required. About 10 days travel required per year. ACS offers an excellent, comprehensive benefits package. ACS is a drug-free, smoke free, equal opportunity employer. Position located in downtown Washington, D.C. Qualified candidates may send your cover letter and resume to [employment@acs.org](mailto:employment@acs.org) <<mailto:employment@acs.org>> referencing AML 02-54 or mail to American Chemical Society, HR Department, 1155 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

Robie Sangster  
Bureau of Labor Statistics

Office of Survey Methods Research  
2 Mass. Ave., N.E., Rm. 1950  
Washington, DC 20212  
Telephone 202-691-7517  
FAX 202-691-7426

Sit with a pretty girl for an hour, and it seems like a minute; sit on a hot stove for a minute, and it seems like an hour----that's relativity.  
Albert Einstein

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Tue, 15 Oct 2002 16:47:36 -0400  
From: "Raghavan Mayur" <mayur@technometrica.com>  
To: "ape" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Sentiment Takes Dive, Back At Recession Low As Outlook Turns Dark  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
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  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by  
mail.technometrica.com id g9FFpWf22178  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g9FKlWJ09654

-----  
-----  
Copyright © Investor's Business  
Daily, Inc. 2002.  
-----  
-----

Feature Story  
Tuesday, October 15, 2002

Sentiment Takes Dive, Back At Recession Low As  
Outlook Turns Dark  
.....  
Optimism Lowest Since 4-01  
.....  
Fall in confidence raises concerns for consumers,  
new double-dip worries

BY IBD STAFF  
INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

Americans' faith in the economy has taken another  
hit, with confidence

falling to its lowest level since the recession took hold last year and optimism for the next six months turning negative for the first time in nearly a year.

These are the main findings of the latest IBD/TIPP Poll that ended Sunday and surveyed 912 adults.

The loss of confidence cuts across a wide swath of demographic groups, spills over into the public's view of President Bush's economic stewardship and raises questions about a recovery that, until recently at least, has been propped up by consumers who have kept spending in the face of sluggish conditions.

Confidence, in other words, is back to a point where a double-dip recession can't be ruled out.

"Risks are weighted more heavily toward a recession than a recovery," concluded Raghavan Mayur, president of TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence, IBD's polling partner.

"The support from consumers is pretty much drying up. Unless new business investment and easing of monetary policy kick in, a persistent erosion of consumer confidence may potentially trigger a reversal."

Undercutting

The IBD/TIPP Economic Confidence Index slipped 1.5 points to 53.4 in October - above the 52.4 level where it bottomed in April 2001. March 2001 has been considered the official start of the recession that many analysts believe likely ended in November of last year.

An index score above 50 shows optimism, below 50 shows pessimism and 50 is neutral.

"As they are ailing from the barrage of corporate scandals, Americans' confidence in the economy is waning due to pressure from multiple fronts: an imminent war with Iraq, a tight job market and a roller-coaster stock market," said Mayur.

Compared with March 2002, when confidence stood at 62.9 amid signs of a robust economic recovery, the latest reading of 53.4 is "day and night," he said.

"At present, it's fair to describe U.S. consumer confidence as weak, with 17 of the 21 key demographic groups slipping in the October poll," said Mayur.

By Age, Politics

Even Republicans, who are typically bullish, dropped their optimism from a score of 66.3 to 63.2. Those in the age group 18 to 24 posted the biggest losses - 12 points, sliding from 65.0 to 53.1.

Investors moderated their optimism, with their score dropping by 3.9 points from 56.6 to 52.7.

Consumer spending accounts for two-thirds of U.S. economic activity, and a high level of consumer confidence is essential to keep the recovery on track, Mayur noted.

Most of this month's drop in the overall index was due to the component that measures how consumers feel about the economy's prospects six months from now. It sliced through the neutral level of 50, to 48.3 from 50.5 in September, a loss of 4.4%.

"This is an important marker," said Mayur, "because a movement of this component could be sending a signal about a turning point in the economic future. Fifteen of 21 demographic subgroups fell through that threshold." Of the remaining two components, one that gauges how Americans feel about their personal finances dropped to 58.3 in October from 59.9 in September.

The third component, measuring how government economic policies are working, slipped to 53.6 from 54.2.

These anxieties are echoed in a "quality of life" measurement that's taken as part of a National Outlook Index that TIPP and

IBD also compile.

"The quality of life index normally stays in a tight band around 60," said Mayur. "But it has softened to 56.1, indicating that Americans' economic concerns are spilling into broader issues."

Mayur noted, however, that a stable stock market can give confidence a shot in the arm. In its last three sessions, the market has shown signs of rallying. But it is still too early, most agree, to tell if the downtrend in force for so long has reversed.

The lower economic confidence ratings do not seem to be seriously hurting Bush's overall rating. The Presidential Leadership Index that IBD and TIPP compile stands at 62.3 vs. 63.2 in September.

But the share of Americans who give Bush an A or B on handling the economy has fallen steadily, from 55% in January to 38% this month, down from 39% in September and similar to the pre-Sept. 11 rating of 37% posted a year ago.

"Republicans place a high degree of confidence with Bush on the economy," said Mayur. "But Democrats and independents are not too happy."

Independent voters showed the biggest decline in giving high grades to Bush. While 51% gave an A or B in January, only 27% do so now.

Democrats giving him high grades on handling the economy have sunk to 24% from 34% in January. Republicans have slipped to 68% from 79%.

© Investor's Business Daily, Inc. 2002. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction or redistribution is prohibited without prior authorized permission from Investor's Business Daily. For information on reprints, webprints, permissions or back issue orders, go to [www.investors.com/terms/reprints.asp](http://www.investors.com/terms/reprints.asp).

=====  
Date: Wed, 16 Oct 2002 11:40:29 -0700  
From: "Kurt Lang" <lang@u.washington.edu>  
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210031427380.7492-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Best-Kept Washington secret since Deep-Throat  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="Windows-1252"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

We call this the best kept Watergate secret after deep-throat because....

Many times during the long months that Bill Clinton was defending his presidency, we regretted that our BATTLE FOR PUBLIC OPINION: THE PRESIDENT, THE PRESS, AND POLLS DURING WATERGATE - so newly relevant - had been allowed to go out of print. Just recently and quite out of the blue, Columbia University Press informed us of that, within weeks, they would divest themselves of over 200 hard-cover copies still in their possession so as to free storage space. Rather than seeing these books trashed, or whatever, we had them shipped here, hoping to find more welcoming homes for them among new cohorts of readers - FOR A VERY NOMINAL PRICE! (See offer below.)

Why should anyone be interested in this analytic study of the political maneuvering, the media coverage, and the changing public perception of Nixon and his role in the break-in?

At the time of publication in 1983, the book earned uniformly high praise from both academics and journalists and not one bad review. Later it made the list of the fifty most influential books on public opinion put together by the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

W. Phillips Davison (Professor Emeritus, Columbia University) described it as "a thoroughly engrossing synthesis of history, politics, and public opinion theory.... A beautifully-written latter-day classic." Nicholas von Hoffman (former Washington Post columnist with a ringside seat at the battle) called it "valuable, original, and a powerful corrective to a number of ideas people have."

The book , "a good read" with appeal to anyone who still is, or ready to be, fascinated by this scandal, is also suitable for courses - graduate and undergraduate -- on such topics as public opinion, political communication, and recent American history. Faculty who once assigned it told us of highly positive feedback from students.

To cover our own expenses, please send checks in the amount of \$7.50/copy made out to either one of us. Regrettably, you can't pay by credit card but orders will be filled immediately upon receipt. Be sure to attach your preferred shipping address.

Gladys Engel Lang or Kurt Lang

1249 20th Ave E.  
Seattle, WA 98112-3530

P.S. The dust jacket indicates that we are professors of sociology and political science at the State University of New York at Stony Brook but we have since we moved to and ended our teaching careers at the University of Washington.

=====  
Date: Wed, 16 Oct 2002 15:13:51 -0400  
From: "Hembroff, Larry" <Larry.Hembroff@ssc.msu.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: New Survey Position Available  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.10)  
Content-Type: text/plain

The Office for Survey Research at Michigan State University is pleased to announce a new position and seeks qualified applicants interested in joining our research team. Information about OSR and its survey activity is available from our website ([www.ippsr.msu.edu/OSR](http://www.ippsr.msu.edu/OSR)) <<http://www.ippsr.msu.edu/OSR>> .

RESEARCH SPECIALIST  
Office for Survey Research  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
Michigan State University

This position involves writing research proposals, developing interviews/questionnaires, designing samples and research plans, analyzing data, and writing research reports for clients and publication. The position will work closely with the Director of the Office of Survey Research to coordinate project activities, assist in cost estimation, planning and correspondence, assist in the development and implementation of policies and procedures, and help make decisions regarding projects to pursue. A special focus of this position is marketing and developing new clients for OSR and responding to requests for proposals as a prime or sub-contractor for services involving survey research.

Required Qualifications:

1. Completed Ph.D. in Sociology, Political Science, or another social science discipline that uses survey research methods.
2. Training in survey methodologies, sampling techniques, and computer technology.

Preferred Qualifications:

1. Experience with CATI software and project leadership in survey research.
2. Record of research and publications.
3. Experience in survey field operations.
4. Experience conducting focus groups or internet surveys.

The position reports to the Senior Survey Methodologist and Director of the Office of Survey Research. It is classified as an academic specialist position.

MSU is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity institution.

This is a 12-month, fixed term appointment subject to renewal based on availability of funds.

Application due date: November 11, 2002

Contact: Iris Taylor  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
517-355-6672

---

Date: Wed, 16 Oct 2002 16:53:55 -0400  
From: "Cralley, Marla" <Marla.Cralley@arbitron.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Demographic/Socio-economic Characteristics of Cell Phone Users  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="windows-1252"

We are interested in finding information on cell phone users.

Has anyone done any studies of the demographic and/or socio-economic characteristics of users of cell phones?

Thanks,

Marla

Marla Cralley  
Sr. Project Leader  
Research Methods  
Arbitron Inc  
Marla.cralley@arbitron.com  
410-312-8449

---

Date: Wed, 16 Oct 2002 17:33:46 -0400  
From: "Mike Donatello" <Mike.Donatello@MarketDataAnalysis.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Demographic/Socio-economic Characteristics of Cell Phone Users  
Message-ID:



<DDEEKKMOJPLLPKOLPFCNMEEGDFAA.Mike.Donatello@MarketDataAnalysis.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="Windows-1252"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106  
In-Reply-To: <411EA40BC162D211B92B0008C7B1D2B305CD80D5@arbmex.arbitron.com>

Marla,

Try the CTIA (Cellular Telecommunications & Internet Association) Web site. There's a section on research ([http://www.wow-com.com/market\\_research/](http://www.wow-com.com/market_research/)) that may have what you need.

--

Mike Donatello  
Senior Partner, Vice President of Research  
Borrell Associates Inc.  
Digital Direction for Media Companies  
2902 Mother Well Ct., Oak Hill, VA 20171-4065  
V 703.582.5680 F 703.832.8630  
MDonatello@borrellassociates.com

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of  
Cralley, Marla  
Sent: 16 October, 2002 16:54  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Demographic/Socio-economic Characteristics of Cell Phone Users

We are interested in finding information on cell phone users.

Has anyone done any studies of the demographic and/or socio-economic characteristics of users of cell phones?

Thanks,

Marla

Marla Cralley  
Sr. Project Leader  
Research Methods  
Arbitron Inc  
Marla.cralley@arbitron.com  
410-312-8449

=====  
Date: Thu, 17 Oct 2002 10:26:41 -0400  
From: "Raghavan Mayur" <mayur@technometrica.com>  
To: "ape" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Results of the latest Investor's Business Daily/Christian Science  
Monitor/TIPP Poll -- Iraq  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Investor's Business Daily/Christian Science  
Monitor/TIPP poll was conducted between October 7  
through October 13, 2002, using a  
computer-generated sample to cover both listed and  
unlisted households. A total of 912 telephone  
interviews were conducted with adult Americans  
nationwide. The margin of error for the poll is  
3.3 percentage points at the 95% confidence level.

35: H1  
Do you believe Saddam Hussein is an IMMEDIATE  
THREAT to the US or not?

October, 2002  
63% He is an immediate threat  
31% He is not an immediate threat  
5% (Don't read: Not sure)  
0% (Don't read: Refused)

September, 2002  
60% He is an immediate threat  
33% He is not an immediate threat  
7% (Don't read: Not sure)  
0% (Don't read: Refused)

36: H2  
How important do you think it is for the United  
States to take military action within the next 6  
months in order to remove Saddam Hussein from  
power in Iraq? Would you say...

October  
46% Very important  
29% Somewhat important  
13% Not very important  
9% Not at all important  
3% (Don't read: Not sure/ Refused)

September

37% Very important  
35% Somewhat important  
15% Not very important  
9% Not at all important  
3% (Don't read: Not sure/ Refused)

37: H3

In the event that UN weapons inspections begin, do you think an Iraqi regime change would still be necessary or not?

October

70% Necessary  
20% Not necessary  
9% (Don't read: Not sure)  
1% (Don't read: Refused)

September

68% Necessary  
21% Not necessary  
10% (Don't read: Not sure)  
1% (Don't read: Refused)

38: H4

In your mind, is there enough of a link between Iraq and TERRORISM to justify a US military campaign to try to topple the regime of Iraqi president Saddam Hussein OR does the US need to offer more evidence?

October

50% There is enough of a link  
45% Need more evidence  
5% (Don't read: Not sure)  
0% (Don't read: Refused)

September

48% There is enough of a link  
45% Need more evidence  
6% (Don't read: Not sure)  
1% (Don't read: Refused)

39: H5

If the US went to war with Iraq, would you, yourself, volunteer to serve, OR encourage an immediate family member such as a brother, sister, spouse, child or grandchild, to serve in the armed services?

49% Yes  
46% No  
6% Not sure

40: H6

If the United States finds itself at war and

needing many more active-duty personnel in the  
armed forces, would you prefer...

Rotation => 2

N= 100%

26% the re-establishment of the draft {or}

69% only voluntary recruitment for the military  
{or}

4% (Don't read: Not sure)

0% (Don't read: Refused)

41: H7

Now I'm going to read a few different scenarios,  
and for each one, please tell me if you would  
support a US attempt at regime change. Okay...

Press "1" to continue... 1

42: H7A

Rotation => H7E

How about: When a country directly attacks the  
United States?

Would you support a US attempt at regime change?

91% Yes

6% No

3% (Don't read: Not sure)

0% (Don't read: Refused)

43: H7B

How about: When a country attacks a US ally?

Would you support a US attempt at regime change?

74% Yes

16% No

3% (Don't read: Not sure)

0% (Don't read: Refused)

44: H7C

How about: When a country is known to support  
terrorism?

Would you support a US attempt at regime change?

70% Yes

24% No

6% (Don't read: Not sure)

0% (Don't read: Refused)

45: H7D

How about: When a country has the capability and  
apparent intent to harm the US?

Would you support a US attempt at regime change?

78% Yes

15% No

6% (Don't read: Not sure)

1% (Don't read: Refused)

46: H7E

How about: When a country is led by a dictator?  
Would you support a US attempt at regime change?

N= 100%

Yes 1 35%

No 2 56%

(Don't read: Not sure) 3 8%

(Don't read: Refused) 4 1%

47: H8

In your opinion, when it comes to the current  
administration's policy of regime change in Iraq,  
would you describe each of the following as a  
MAJOR factor, a MINOR factor, or NOT A FACTOR  
behind that policy? How about...

48: H8A

Rotation => H8F

How about: Defending the WORLD from the Iraqi  
regime that possesses weapons of mass destruction  
HOW MUCH OF A FACTOR IS IT IN THE ADMIN'S  
REGIME-CHANGE POLICY?

75% Major factor

16% Minor factor

5% Not a factor

4% (Do not read: Not sure)

0% (Do not read: Refused)

49: H8B

How about: Defending the US from the Iraqi regime  
that possesses weapons of mass destruction  
HOW MUCH OF A FACTOR IS IT IN THE ADMIN'S  
REGIME-CHANGE POLICY?

80% Major factor

11% Minor factor

4% Not a factor

4% (Do not read: Not sure)

0% (Do not read: Refused)

50: H8C

How about: Diverting attention from the domestic  
economic situation  
HOW MUCH OF A FACTOR IS IT IN THE ADMIN'S  
REGIME-CHANGE POLICY?

39% Major factor

31% Minor factor

23% Not a factor

6% (Do not read: Not sure)

0% (Do not read: Refused)

51: H8D

How about: The fact that Saddam Hussein attempted to assassinate the first President Bush  
HOW MUCH OF A FACTOR IS IT IN THE ADMIN'S REGIME-CHANGE POLICY?

55% Major factor  
25% Minor factor  
15% Not a factor  
5% (Do not read: Not sure)  
0% (Do not read: Refused)

52: H8E

How about: The regime change is a critical part of the US-led "war on terrorism."  
HOW MUCH OF A FACTOR IS IT IN THE ADMIN'S REGIME-CHANGE POLICY?

67% Major factor  
20% Minor factor  
8% Not a factor  
6% (Do not read: Not sure)  
0% (Do not read: Refused)

53: H8F

How about: The concern that the Iraqi regime is supporting the Al Qaeda (AL-KAYDA) network  
HOW MUCH OF A FACTOR IS IT IN THE ADMIN'S REGIME-CHANGE POLICY?

73% Major factor  
15% Minor factor  
6% Not a factor  
6% (Do not read: Not sure)  
0% (Do not read: Refused)

=====  
Date: Thu, 17 Oct 2002 13:10:09 -0400  
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: FYI--French public opinion on Iraq, terrorism, role of the U.S.  
Message-ID: <001001c27600\$0fe245c0\$6901a8c0@mark>  
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, Build 10.0.3416  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Following are some recent questions asked in France. This is my rough translation--I have put links so you can read actual wording. Mark

Richards

-----

I'Institut BVA poll of 985 adults interviewed by telephone Sept. 6-7, 2002

[http://www.bva.fr/new/actualitepm3702\\_1.html](http://www.bva.fr/new/actualitepm3702_1.html)

Q. Do you have the impression that the United States is using the war against terrorism to strengthen its influence in the world?

Yes - 73%

No - 22%

Not sure - 5%

Q. At this time, we are commemorating [the victims of] the terrorist attacks of 11 September on the United States. Do you fear more terrorist actions in the future?

Yes - 80%

No - 17%

Not sure - 3%

Q. The United States envisions military intervention in Iraq. Would such military intervention, in your opinion, be completely justified, somewhat justified, not too justified, or not at all justified?

Justified - 27%

Completely justified - 9%

Somewhat justified - 18%

Not justified - 63%

Not too justified - 26%

Not at all justified - 37%

Not sure - 10%

Q. If the United States intervenes militarily in Iraq, do you think France should...

--Politically support the U.S. - 19%

--Participate in military operations against Iraq - 8%

--Remain completely neutral - 46%

--Politically oppose the U.S. - 21%

--Not sure - 6%

Ifop - Le Journal du Dimanche poll of 985 adults interviewed by telephone Sept.12-13, 2002

<http://www.ifop.com/europe/sondages/opiionf/guerreirak.asp>

Q. Do you have confidence in ... to make good decisions regarding the fight against terrorism?

...France - 76% yes, 23% no

...United Nations - 69% yes, 28% no

...European Union - 66% yes, 33% no

...The United States - 45% yes, 53% no

Q. Over the long term, choosing from among the following factors, which one do you think is most important for winning the war against terrorism?

--Dismantling terrorist camps, such as Al-Qaida - 33%  
--Peace in the Middle East - 31%  
--Reduction of poverty in the Third World - 30%  
--An American military intervention in Iraq - 5%  
--No sure - 1%

Q. In the case that the UN Security Council decides in favor of a military intervention in Iraq, would you be completely favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or completely unfavorable to French military intervention in Iraq?

Favorable - 34%  
--completely - 8%  
--somewhat - 26%  
Unfavorable - 65%  
--completely - 41%  
--somewhat - 24%  
Not sure - 1%

Q. Some say that the United States has a position that is too dominating in International affairs when it comes to the fight against terrorism. Others say that the United States is playing their normal role as the number one world power. Which of these opinions is closest to your opinion?

--The U.S. has a role that is too dominating - 68%  
--The U.S. is playing an appropriate role - 29%  
--[Both] - 2%  
--Not sure - 1%

Ipsos-France 2-Le Point poll of 935 adults interviewed by telephone  
Sept. 20-21, 2002  
<http://www.ipsos.fr/index.asp>

Q. Are you completely, somewhat, not too, or not at all favorable to the principle of a military intervention in Iraq?

Favorable - 17%  
Unfavorable - 76%

Istitut BVA poll of 950 adults interviewed in-person Oct. 7-9, 2002  
<http://www.bva.fr/new/lacroix141002.html>

Q. Do you think that a war in Iraq will reduce, increase, or have no impact on International terrorism:

Reduce - 7%  
Increase - 45%  
Have no impact - 40%  
Not sure - 8%



Q. Do you think that a war in Iraq will reduce, increase, or have no impact on the risk of biological, chemical, or nuclear conflicts?

Reduce - 6%  
Increase - 44%  
Have no impact - 38%  
Not sure - 12%

Q. Do you think that a war in Iraq will reduce, increase, or have no impact on tensions in the Middle East?

Reduce - 5%  
Increase - 49%  
Have no impact - 37%  
Not sure - 9%

-----  
Mark David Richards, PhD  
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.  
2610 Woodley Place NW  
Washington, District of Columbia 20008  
Tel. 202. 347. 8822  
Fax. 202. 347. 8825  
mark@bisconti.com

=====  
Date: Thu, 17 Oct 2002 13:25:08 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
Subject: The Devil in the Data: All Poll Numbers Are Not Created Equal  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Stuart Rothenberg

<[http://www.rollcall.com/pages/columns/rothenberg/sr\\_images/roth2\\_top.gif](http://www.rollcall.com/pages/columns/rothenberg/sr_images/roth2_top.gif)>  
Campaigning  
<[http://www.rollcall.com/pages/columns/rothenberg/sr\\_images/roth2\\_bot.gif](http://www.rollcall.com/pages/columns/rothenberg/sr_images/roth2_bot.gif)>  
October 17, 2002

The Devil in the Data: All Poll Numbers Are Not Created Equal

I'm rather glad that MSNBC has hired John Zogby to conduct polls in a number of Senate races, but it's not because I always love his numbers. Picking apart his polls can often be more enlightening than the findings themselves.

I'm not making a blanket statement about Zogby's polls or anyone else's. But it certainly is true that recent polls by the University of New

Hampshire, Lake Snell Perry and Associates, and Zogby International have raised more than a few eyebrows.

Let's take a look at some of the more striking Zogby data. In mid-September, Zogby found Sen. Paul Wellstone (D-Minn.) trailing challenger Norm Coleman (R) by 6 points, 47 percent to 41 percent. But now, in polling conducted last week, Wellstone has a 9-point lead, 46 percent to 37 percent.

Wellstone's decision to take a stand against a war in Iraq may have reminded some voters why they liked the incumbent and bolstered his support, but that race reversal - and especially Coleman's 10-point drop in support - is difficult to accept.

Similarly unbelievable is Zogby polling in Missouri. Between mid-September and mid-October, Republican nominee Jim Talent's showing in the ballot test jumped 7 points (from 40 percent to 47 percent), while Sen. Jean Carnahan's (D) dropped by an equal amount (from 48 percent to 41 percent).

Reversals of this magnitude would represent a cataclysm for a candidate and almost certainly be associated with dramatic events that would receive heavy media coverage. That doesn't seem to be the case in either Minnesota or Missouri.

The sub-samples in some of Zogby's findings are even more odd. Zogby's September poll in Tennessee found Lamar Alexander (R) leading Bob Clement (D), a reasonable conclusion. What wasn't reasonable was Zogby's finding that Clement was leading by 9 points among men, while Alexander was leading by 25 points among women.

In his release, Zogby referred to the "reverse gender gap" and asked, "What's going on in Tennessee?" I know the problem, and it had nothing to do with the electorate in the Volunteer State. It was the data. Zogby's October data were more reasonable, showing Alexander with a big lead among men and running even with Clement among women. The September cross-tabs were simply wrong.

Want another example? Zogby's Sept. 16-17 New Jersey poll showed Sen. Robert Torricelli (D) leading Doug Forrester (R) 39 percent to 34 percent. Whatever you think about those numbers, it's awfully hard to swallow Zogby's finding that twice as many Republicans were planning to vote for Torricelli as were Democrats for Forrester.

Sure, once you take into account the margin of error in each of these cells, the opposite result could be (and certainly was) true. But these dopey, small-sample, sub-sample results only demonstrate that cross-tabs are of limited utility when trying to monitor Senate races.

Another example of poor polling showed up in the New Hampshire Senate race. An August University of New Hampshire poll of 344 likely GOP primary voters for WMUR showed Rep. John Sununu leading Sen. Bob Smith 56 percent to 34 percent in the party contest - a 22-point lead. When the results were in, Sununu had a 54 percent to 45 percent victory. Smith's actual vote was 11 points better than his showing in that poll.

If you want to let the UNH poll off of the hook, you can do so by arguing that the race changed in the final week, after the poll was conducted. Or

you can focus on Sununu's numbers in the poll and the election, which were virtually the same. But the message from the UNH survey ("it's a blowout") simply was very different from the actual results.

Finally, I can't end this column without referring to Lake Snell Perry and Associates polling in Maine for Senate hopeful Chellie Pingree (D). That firm's numbers in the Maine Senate race were so far out of whack with other surveys conducted in the state that more than a few people have commented about it to me.

In a May 15-19 survey, Lake Snell Perry found Pingree trailing Sen. Susan Collins (R) by just 12 points, 45 percent to 33 percent. At virtually the same time, a Moore Information poll for Collins found the Senator up 61 percent to 25 percent, RKM Research for WCSH-TV had Collins leading 63 percent to 25 percent, and Strategic Marketing had the race at 53 percent to 21 percent.

In other words, everyone but Pingree's pollster had it a blowout. Three months later, Pingree's polling showed her down by only 9 points, 47 percent to 38 percent. Everyone else still had a blowout, generally in the 30-point range. Moore Information's July poll had Collins ahead 57 percent to 28 percent, while the firm's mid-September survey put the race at 60 percent to 26 percent.

Trying to pin down a pollster is a little like trying to catch a greased pig. Pollsters always have an explanation for why their numbers may differ from everyone else's, and they are hesitant to admit that even an obviously silly number is wrong.

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

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com  
www.mitofskyinternational.com

---

Date: Thu, 17 Oct 2002 13:42:13 -0400  
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: FYI: World public opinion on U.S. foreign policy, most important problem  
Message-ID: <001601c27604\$8a35bec0\$6901a8c0@mark>  
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, Build 10.0.3416

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

This might be of interest ... mark

--Gallup International - Voice of the People conducted interviews with 28,218 adults in 36 countries in July and August 2002 on U.S. foreign policy. See this link for English summary report.

[http://www.voice-of-the-people.net/ContentFiles/docs/Terrorism\\_and\\_US\\_foreign\\_policy.pdf](http://www.voice-of-the-people.net/ContentFiles/docs/Terrorism_and_US_foreign_policy.pdf)

French summary of U.S. foreign policy study:  
[http://www.sofres.com/etudes/pol/110902\\_poletrangere.htm](http://www.sofres.com/etudes/pol/110902_poletrangere.htm)

--They also conducted interviews with 35,433 people in 46 countries on the most important problem facing the world today. See:

[http://www.voice-of-the-people.net/ContentFiles/docs/VoP\\_Poverty\\_Results.pdf](http://www.voice-of-the-people.net/ContentFiles/docs/VoP_Poverty_Results.pdf)

-----  
Gallup International:  
<http://www.gallup-international.com/surveys.htm>

Voice of the People  
<http://www.voice-of-the-people.net/>

=====  
Date: Thu, 17 Oct 2002 15:47:14 -0400  
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
To: <mitofsky@mindspring.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: The Devil in the Data: All Poll Numbers Are Not Created Equal  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This rant only reminds me of the deafening silence that followed the posting by Jay Leve -- more than two weeks ago (September 30) -- of a very responsive reply to criticisms of SurveyUSA.

It's easy to criticize. (I know; I do it all the time.) But it's amazing that, after the bricks that were thrown, nothing has been offered in response.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

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

Date: Thursday, October 17, 2002 1:27 PM

Subject: The Devil in the Data: All Poll Numbers Are Not Created Equal

>Stuart Rothenberg

>

><[http://www.rollcall.com/pages/columns/rothenberg/sr\\_images/roth2\\_top.gif](http://www.rollcall.com/pages/columns/rothenberg/sr_images/roth2_top.gif)>

>Campaigning

><[http://www.rollcall.com/pages/columns/rothenberg/sr\\_images/roth2\\_bot.gif](http://www.rollcall.com/pages/columns/rothenberg/sr_images/roth2_bot.gif)>

>October 17, 2002

>

>The Devil in the Data: All Poll Numbers Are Not Created Equal

>

>I'm rather glad that MSNBC has hired John Zogby to conduct polls in a number

>of Senate races, but it's not because I always love his numbers. Picking apart his polls can often be more enlightening than the findings themselves.

>

>I'm not making a blanket statement about Zogby's polls or anyone else's. But

>it certainly is true that recent polls by the University of New Hampshire, >Lake Snell Perry and Associates, and Zogby International have raised more >than a few eyebrows.

>

>Let's take a look at some of the more striking Zogby data.

>In mid-September, Zogby found Sen. Paul Wellstone (D-Minn.) trailing >challenger Norm Coleman (R) by 6 points, 47 percent to 41 percent. But now, >in polling conducted last week, Wellstone has a 9-point lead, 46 percent to >37 percent.

>

>Wellstone's decision to take a stand against a war in Iraq may have reminded

>some voters why they liked the incumbent and bolstered his support, but that

>race reversal - and especially Coleman's 10-point drop in support - is >difficult to accept.

>

>Similarly unbelievable is Zogby polling in Missouri. Between mid-September >and mid-October, Republican nominee Jim Talent's showing in the ballot test >jumped 7 points (from 40 percent to 47 percent), while Sen. Jean Carnahan's >(D) dropped by an equal amount (from 48 percent to 41 percent).

>

>Reversals of this magnitude would represent a cataclysm for a candidate and >almost certainly be associated with dramatic events that would receive heavy

>media coverage. That doesn't seem to be the case in either Minnesota or  
>Missouri.  
>  
>The sub-samples in some of Zogby's findings are even more odd.  
>Zogby's September poll in Tennessee found Lamar Alexander (R) leading Bob  
>Clement (D), a reasonable conclusion. What wasn't reasonable was Zogby's  
>finding that Clement was leading by 9 points among men, while Alexander was  
>leading by 25 points among women.  
>  
>In his release, Zogby referred to the "reverse gender gap" and asked,  
>"What's going on in Tennessee?" I know the problem, and it had nothing to  
do  
>with the electorate in the Volunteer State. It was the data. Zogby's  
October  
>data were more reasonable, showing Alexander with a big lead among men and  
>running even with Clement among women. The September cross-tabs were simply  
>wrong.  
>  
>Want another example? Zogby's Sept. 16-17 New Jersey poll showed Sen.  
Robert  
>Torricelli (D) leading Doug Forrester (R) 39 percent to 34 percent.  
Whatever  
>you think about those numbers, it's awfully hard to swallow Zogby's finding  
>that twice as many Republicans were planning to vote for Torricelli as were  
>Democrats for Forrester.  
>  
>Sure, once you take into account the margin of error in each of these  
cells,  
>the opposite result could be (and certainly was) true. But these dopey,  
>small-sample, sub-sample results only demonstrate that cross-tabs are of  
>limited utility when trying to monitor Senate races.  
>  
>Another example of poor polling showed up in the New Hampshire Senate race.  
>An August University of New Hampshire poll of 344 likely GOP primary voters  
>for WMUR showed Rep. John Sununu leading Sen. Bob Smith 56 percent to 34  
>percent in the party contest - a 22-point lead. When the results were in,  
>Sununu had a 54 percent to 45 percent victory. Smith's actual vote was 11  
>points better than his showing in that poll.  
>  
>If you want to let the UNH poll off of the hook, you can do so by arguing  
>that the race changed in the final week, after the poll was conducted. Or  
>you can focus on Sununu's numbers in the poll and the election, which were  
>virtually the same. But the message from the UNH survey ("it's a blowout")  
>simply was very different from the actual results.  
>  
>Finally, I can't end this column without referring to Lake Snell Perry and  
>Associates polling in Maine for Senate hopeful Chellie Pingree (D). That  
>firm's numbers in the Maine Senate race were so far out of whack with other  
>surveys conducted in the state that more than a few people have commented  
>about it to me.  
>  
>In a May 15-19 survey, Lake Snell Perry found Pingree trailing Sen. Susan  
>Collins (R) by just 12 points, 45 percent to 33 percent. At virtually the  
>same time, a Moore Information poll for Collins found the Senator up 61  
>percent to 25 percent, RKM Research for WCSH-TV had Collins leading 63  
>percent to 25 percent, and Strategic Marketing had the race at 53 percent  
to

>21 percent.  
>  
>In other words, everyone but Pingree's pollster had it a blowout.  
>Three months later, Pingree's polling showed her down by only 9 points, 47  
>percent to 38 percent. Everyone else still had a blowout, generally in the  
>30-point range. Moore Information's July poll had Collins ahead 57 percent  
>to 28 percent, while the firm's mid-September survey put the race at 60  
>percent to 26 percent.  
>  
>Trying to pin down a pollster is a little like trying to catch a greased  
>pig. Pollsters always have an explanation for why their numbers may differ  
>from everyone else's, and they are hesitant to admit that even an obviously  
>silly number is wrong.  
>  
>  
>Mitofsky International  
>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor  
>New York, NY 10022  
>  
>212 980-3031  
>212 980-3107 FAX  
>  
>mitofsky@mindspring.com  
>www.mitofskyinternational.com  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

=====  
Date: Thu, 17 Oct 2002 16:21:04 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Poll Finds New Yorkers Give High Marks to Pataki (NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210171614050.9257-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

-----  
Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company  
-----

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/17/nyregion/17CND-POLL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/17/nyregion/17CND-POLL.html)

October 17, 2002

Poll Finds New Yorkers Give High Marks to Pataki

By MARJORIE CONNELLY

While New Yorkers have growing concerns about the state's economy, and criticize the Governor's handling of it, George E. Pataki continues to receive high marks for his performance as governor, according to the latest statewide New York Times poll. He is seen as having made some progress in improving public schools, protecting environment and reducing taxes.

H. Carl McCall, the Democratic candidate, remains in a struggle against his opponent's high name recognition and strong job approval ratings. At this point in the campaign, Mr. McCall has been unable to offer voters a reason to change from the popular Republican incumbent, who is seeking a third term. Tom Golisano, the Independence Party candidate who has financed much of his campaign from his personal fortune, is attracting more voters than in his previous runs for this office.

The Times poll was conducted throughout the state Saturday through Wednesday with 860 registered voters, of whom 454 are considered likely to vote on Nov. 5. The margin of sampling error for all voters is plus or minus three percentage points, for likely voters it is plus or minus five percentage points.

Mr. Pataki is viewed favorably by 52 percent of voters, and 62 percent of New Yorkers say he has done a good job while in office. He is rated particularly well on his management following the terrorists attacks last year. About three-quarters of New Yorkers approve of Mr. Pataki's response to the attacks and almost as many praise his participation in the ongoing recovery efforts.

There is much less enthusiasm for his stewardship of New York State's economy. Less than half, 48 percent, approve of his handling of the economic development of the state and 34 percent disapprove.

Mr. Pataki has an 11-point lead among likely voters over his opponent, with 39 percent to Mr. McCall's 28 percent. Mr. Golisano has 16 percent, and 15 percent are undecided.

When undecided voters who lean toward one candidate or another are included in the totals, Mr. Pataki leads Mr. McCall by 42 percent to 31 percent. Mr. Golisano is supported by 17 percent and 8 percent remain undecided.

New Yorkers' perception of the state's economy has deteriorated enormously in the last two years. In a Times/CBS News poll taken four years ago, 76 percent said the state's economy was good, now only 42 percent see in positive terms. The percent of voters in the state who view the economy negatively has grown from 23 percent in 1998 to 55 percent in the latest poll.

But this economic decline has not translated into a decrease in positive attitudes toward Mr. Pataki's tenure in office. His overall job approval has remained virtually unchanged. In fact, more than half of his supporters offer the good job he has been doing in Albany as the main reason for voting to keep him there.

The most prevalent reason voters give for backing Mr. McCall is his



political party, mentioned by 28 percent. Although Mr. McCall has been state comptroller for nine years, he remains fairly unknown. A third of the voter have a favorable opinion of him, and 15 percent have an unfavorable opinion. But half are undecided or do not know enough about him. Fifty-one percent of New Yorkers approve of how he's handling his job as comptroller, and only 14 percent disapprove, but 35 percent were unable to offer an assessment of his job performance.

Mr. McCall's candidacy is further hampered a lack of support from constituencies that might be expected to support him more strongly. For example, only 51 percent of Democrats support their party's nominee. Mr. Pataki has the backing of 18 percent of the Democrats, and 12 percent prefer Mr. Golisano. In addition, less than half of voters in New York City prefer Mr. McCall, and less than three-quarters of black voters support him.

Mr. Pataki has the support of 67 percent of Republicans and 38 percent of independent voters. The rest of the independents divide 24 percent for Mr. Golisano and 19 percent for Mr. McCall.

For all the advantage Mr. Pataki enjoys, for several issues, voters are not distinguishing between the candidates. The candidates are both seen as caring. They also believe that taxes will go up regardless of who wins in November and the economy is not likely to improve regardless of who occupies the governor's seat in Albany. Both candidates are seen as caring about the voters' needs and problems.

Mr. Golisano's third attempt at the governor's mansion appears to be more promising than the previous undertakings, with his support strongest among independents and conservatives and outside New York City.

The economy is a major concern of New Yorkers, particularly upstate.

Education is the issue most on voters' minds in New York City and the surrounding suburban counties. But unemployment, taxes and the overall economy are the top concerns for voters in the rest of the state.

Overall there is support for the idea of shifting funds from wealthier school districts to poorer ones in urban and rural areas, with the strongest support coming from New York City voters 73 percent of them favor shifting funds, compared with 56 percent in the rest of the state.

Most New Yorkers do not favor the reinstatement of a commuter tax on people who work in New York City but live outside the five boroughs. Not surprisingly, voters who live in the city have a different view than the rest. Forty-eight percent of New York City voters favor a commuter tax, compared with only 21 percent of the rest of the state. Voters in far-off counties were no less inclined to favor such a tax than were those living in the counties surrounding the city.

But the upstate voters are more likely to argue that the city is receiving too much aid from Albany. While two-thirds of voters in New York City say Albany provides too little aid, as do 40 percent of voters in Westchester, Rockland, Nassau and Suffolk, but only 11 percent of voters upstate agree.

Mr. Pataki is seen as the candidate who cares more about the needs and problems of suburbs and the rest of the state. The voters are divided over which candidate cares more about New York City. Forty percent said Mr. McCall and 35 percent said Mr. Pataki cares more about the city.

After his eight years in office, Mr. Pataki is seen as having made at least some progress on improving public education and protecting the environment. While only, five percent say he has made a lot of progress and 56 percent say he has made some progress improving public school education in the state, 32 percent say he has not made much progress or none at all.

Similarly, about half of the state's voters say Mr. Pataki has made at least some progress made in improving the economy and reducing taxes. But most voters do not think Mr. Pataki has made much progress in creating jobs or reducing the state's debt. While 35 percent say he has made at least some progress in reducing the state's debt, 29 percent say he has not made much progress and another 15 percent don't think he has made any progress at all. Twenty percent has no opinion on this subject.

This year's gubernatorial campaign has not generated much excitement. Only 40 percent describe the campaign as interesting, 54 percent call it dull. These attitudes are similar to those seen in 1998, when Mr. Pataki defeated challenger Peter Vallone by more than 20 points.

There is some feeling of inevitability in this year's race for Governor. A majority of both Mr. McCall's and Mr. Golisano's supporters expect Mr. Pataki to be reelected.

In the race to replace Mr. McCall as comptroller, Alan Hevesi, the Democratic candidate, leads Republican John Faso by 12 points 38 percent to 26 percent, with 34 percent undecided. When the undecided voters who lean toward a candidate are included, Mr. Hevesi is supported by 43 percent and Mr. Faso has the backing of 31 percent, while 24 percent remain undecided.

Neither candidate in this race is very familiar to the voters. Mr. Hevesi, who was comptroller in New York City and ran for mayor last year, is viewed favorably by 25 percent, unfavorably by 6 percent with 66 percent of voters unable to offer an opinion. Mr. Faso is even less well known. Thirteen percent of the voters have a favorable opinion of him, 4 percent are unfavorable and 81 percent are undecided or don't enough about him.

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/17/nyregion/17CND-POLL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/17/nyregion/17CND-POLL.html)

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

---

Date: Thu, 17 Oct 2002 17:01:32 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: State of the List Report  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210171656130.9257-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

STATE OF THE LIST REPORT: AAPORNET

At this moment, there are exactly 930 individual  
email accounts subscribed to AAPORNET.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Fri, 18 Oct 2002 06:57:55 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: JOB ADVERT - 2 Research Officers - University of Essex (fwd)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210180656460.2817-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from QUOTED-PRINTABLE to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g9IDvuJ03538

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

Date: Fri, 18 Oct 2002 10:11:28 +0100  
From: Randy Banks <randy@essex.ac.uk>  
Reply-To: helen@essex.ac.uk  
Subject: JOB ADVERT - 2 Research Officers - University of Essex

\*\*\* aploogies in advance for any x-posting \*\*\*

All -

Please feel free to pass the following on to anyone who you think might  
benefit.

Many thanks.

randy

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

TWO SENIOR RESEARCH OFFICERS

Institute for Social and Economic Research

The Institute for Social and Economic Research wishes to appoint two Senior Research Officers to support its programme of longitudinal surveys. These posts provide an opportunity to work in a friendly and stimulating research environment that brings together high quality survey data collection with leading edge academic research. The candidates appointed will assist in the design and implementation of surveys managed by ISER and participate in its programme of substantive and methodological research.

Candidates should have a background in a social science discipline, and quantitative analysis skills. Ideally they have some experience of large scale surveys and/or have a working knowledge of designing and conducting surveys. One post will contribute to a new project funded under the ESRC Research Methods Programme, and an interest in undertaking methodological research is highly desirable. The appointment will be for two years in the first instance, on Grade 1A within the salary range £18,265 to £27,339.

Further particulars and applications may be obtained from the web at <http://www.essex.ac.uk/personnel/Jobs/ads/R214.htm>, by telephoning Colchester (01206) 872462 quoting reference number R/214 by email to [staffing@essex.ac.uk](mailto:staffing@essex.ac.uk) or by writing to the Personnel Section, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, CO4 3SQ. Closing date: 15 November 2002. Interviews will be held on Thursday 5 December 2002.

-----  
Randy Banks (randy@essex.ac.uk)  
ISER, University of Essex  
Colchester, Essex, UK  
CO4 3SQ

tel: +44 (0)1206 873067  
fax: +44 (0)1206 873151

<http://iserwww.essex.ac.uk>

=====  
Date: Fri, 18 Oct 2002 08:06:34 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <[beniger@almaak.usc.edu](mailto:beniger@almaak.usc.edu)>  
Subject: Call for papers "telecommunications + education" feb 23 - march 1  
2003 Tahiti (fwd)  
To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Message-id: <[Pine.GSO.4.33.0210180802390.2817-100000@almaak.usc.edu](mailto:Pine.GSO.4.33.0210180802390.2817-100000@almaak.usc.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

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

Date: Fri, 18 Oct 2002 08:22:26 +0200

From: c.almansi@bluewin.ch

To: beniger@almaak.usc.edu

Subject: Call for papers "telecommunications + education" feb 23 - march 1  
2003 Tahiti

Deadline Oct 24, I'm afraid (sorry: partly my travelling, but mainly the  
\*#\$+' push engine Swisscast, which spewed out the notice only yesterday):  
<http://iutsun1.colmar.uha.fr/Education.html>

cheers

Claudia

10th International Conference on Telecommunications

ICT'2003

February 23 - March 1, 2003

Tahiti, Papeete ? French Polynesia

?Telecommunications + Education? Workshop

(supported by the IEEE Learning Technology Task Force)

March 1, 2003

Chair: Dr. Vladimir Uskov, Bradley University, U.S.A.

<http://iutsun1.colmar.uha.fr/Education.html>

#### ICT?2003 GENERAL INFORMATION

The 10th International Conference on Telecommunications will be held in Tahiti, Papeete, French Polynesia. The ICT 2003 conference will offer tutorials, plenary sessions, poster sessions, panels, workshops and exhibition opportunities. It will cover a variety of challenging telecommunication topics ranging from background fields like signals, traffic, coding, communication basics up to large communication systems and networks, fixed, mobile and integrated, etc. Applications, services, system and network management issues will also receive significant attention. Conference Web page is available at <http://conf.uha.fr/ICT2003.html>

#### THE ?TELECOMMUNICATIONS + EDUCATION? WORKSHOP TOPICS

The ?Telecommunications + Education? Workshop will be held on March 1, 2003 as a part of the ICT-2003 conference. The Workshop web site is available

at <http://iutsun1.colmar.uha.fr/Education.html> . The Workshop is planned to cover various aspects of the following 5 main topics:

Topic

Presenter/Moderator

Applications of Telecommunications in Education and Training

Dr. Kinshuk, Chair, IEEE Learning Technology Task Force

Professor, Information Systems, Massey University

New Zealand

?Academia-Industry? Collaboration in ?Telecommunications + Education? Area

Dr. Vladimir Uskov, Member of the Executive Committee, IEEE Learning Technology

Task Force

Professor, Computer Science and Information Systems, Bradley University

U.S.A.

Design and Development of Telecommunications Curricula

Dr. Melvyn Muchnik, Chair of Advisory Board, National Telecommunication Network (NUTN)

Professor, Communications, Governors State University

U.S.A.

National and International Projects in ?Telecommunications + Education? Area

Dr. Alexander Ivannikov, First Deputy Director

State Research Institute on Telecommunications and Information Technology

Russia

Teaching of Telecommunications Courses in Colleges and Universities: Best Practices

Dr. Alexandra Cristea

Associate Professor, Technical University of Eindhoven

The Netherlands

The submitted paper are expected to cover concepts, state-of-the-art technologies, standards, implementations, best practices, ongoing projects, study, running experiments or innovative applications/utilization of telecommunication technologies in education area.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS

1) Initially you must submit electronically an abstract of 500 words (about 1 page) or less. Your abstract must contain author's name, abstract title, author's affiliation, phone number, fax number, and email address. An electronic copy of abstract in DOC format should be sent to uskov@bradley.edu . The deadline for workshop abstract's electronic submission is October 24, 2002.

2) Abstracts will be judged for the Workshop appropriateness by the Workshop international program committee.

3) Authors of abstracts will be notified of acceptance or rejection by November 4, 2002.

4) Authors of accepted papers must complete the ICT-2003 Conference Registration Form by November 15, 2002. This Form is available at <http://iutsun1.uha.fr/RegisICT03.html>

5) If your abstract is accepted, then visit <http://conf.uha.fr/manuscript.html> for ICT-2003 Manuscript Preparation Instructions. A complete camera-ready final paper is due by November 15, 2002. An electronic copy of complete camera-ready final paper in DOC format should be sent to uskov@bradley.edu

6) Accepted papers will be published in the ICT-2003 conference proceedings under the condition that author(s) entirely paid ICT-2003 Registration Fee by November 15, 2002.

#### WORKSHOP BEST PAPERS

About 8-10 best Workshop papers will be considered for publication in a special issue of the "Learning Technology & Society" online international journal (ISSN 1436-4522).

#### IMPORTANT DATES FOR THE "TELECOMMUNICATIONS + EDUCATION" WORKSHOP

October 24, 2002 - Submission of abstracts

November 4, 2002 - Notification of acceptance

November 15, 2002 - Deadline for full-length camera-ready versions of accepted papers

November 15, 2002 - Deadline for conference registration (conference registration includes workshop registration).

March 1, 2003 - "Telecommunications + Education" Workshop as a part of the ICT-2003

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Fri, 18 Oct 2002 10:40:52 -0500  
From: Mary Losch <mary.losch@UNI.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Web Survey Hosting Vendors  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <3DAFE534.11289.1293AF20@localhost>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Colleagues,

We are interested in your experiences (both positive and negative) with web survey hosting services/vendors. We have used "in-house" ITS assistance which yielded limited capabilities and we have also used one national vendor which also yielded several technical challenges and problems during administration.

If you have used web hosting services, please let me know about your experiences and recommendations. We are especially interested in vendors that can provide programming of comprehensive instruments (participants can stop and return later, skip patterns, random ordering, password protection, etc) and can provide assurances of data security and confidentiality.

Please respond directly to me and I will post a summary to AAPORNET. Thanks. Mary

\*\*\*\*\*

Mary E. Losch, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor and Assistant Director  
Department of Psychology/Center for Social and Behavioral Research  
221 Sabin Hall  
Cedar Falls, IA 50614  
(319) 273-2105  
mary.losch@uni.edu

---

Date: Fri, 18 Oct 2002 16:45:13 -0400  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Jewish Sample  
To: "'Aapornet'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <000001c276e7\$45418540\$130a010a@LEO>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.4024  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g9IKoiJ11907

I once again seek the collective wisdom of aapornet.



We are considering conducting a national telephone opinion study for a Jewish institution and we would like to know if there are any good publicly available sources for Jewish sample. I have been told that there are some samples available that use last name as an indicator but that these are only accurate about 20% of the time.

Is anyone aware of a better sample?

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road Suite 101  
Baltimore, MD 21209  
410-377-7880  
410-377-7955 fax

---

Date: Sat, 19 Oct 2002 12:35:47 -0500  
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>  
To: <aeikensdp@aol.com>, <Pixy412@aol.com>, <rmayland@aol.com>, <sschier@carleton.edu>, <75227.173@compuserve.com>, <reide@email.usps.gov>  
Subject: Minnesota Poll news  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

Pollwatchers,

Many of you have expressed an interest in the Minnesota Poll or Minnesota politics. You can find the latest poll results dealing with the gubernatorial and U.S. Senate race at

<http://www.startribune.com/poll>

Of course, if this e-mail is an intrusion, please accept my apology and hit your delete button.

All best wishes...

Rob Daves, director  
The Minnesota Poll

---

Date: Sat, 19 Oct 2002 14:43:50 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Sharp rise in favour of war on Iraq (Alan Travis, TheGuardian)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210191441270.4426-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from QUOTED-PRINTABLE to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g9JLhqJ16459

---

Guardian Unlimited © Guardian Newspapers Limited 2002

---

[www.guardian.co.uk/uk\\_news/story/0,3604,812632,00.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,3604,812632,00.html)

Wednesday October 16, 2002

Sharp rise in favour of war on Iraq

Alan Travis, home affairs editor  
The Guardian

There has been a spectacular surge in support among British voters for military action against Iraq in the immediate aftermath of the terror attack in Bali, according to the latest Guardian/ICM poll.

The survey, which was carried out on Monday, shows that support for a military attack on Iraq has risen 10 points in the last week from 32% to 42% of voters.

The ICM poll also shows that more voters agree with Tony Blair that it is necessary to fight on two fronts against both al-Qaida and Iraq. Only one in three voters agree that the United States and Britain "took their eye off the ball" by concentrating on Iraq.

Mr Blair yesterday told the Commons in an emergency statement that the Bali attack was "an act of pure wickedness" which he said would be met "with defiance and determination".

He told MPs that he entirely rejected the contention that terrorism should be fought alone and that dealing with Iraq's weapons of mass destruction was a distraction.

"Some say that we should fight terrorism alone and that the issues to do with weapons of mass destruction are a distraction. I reject that entirely," he said. "Both, though different in means, are the same in nature. Both are the new threats facing the post-cold war world. Both are threats from people of states who do not care about human life, who have no compunction about killing the innocent. Both represent the extreme replacing the rational, the fanatic driving out moderation."

The Guardian/ICM poll shows that 41% of voters agree with the prime minister that it is not a choice between fighting either Iraq or al-Qaida. Fewer - 35% - disagreed and said they believed the United States had "taken its eye off the ball".

The level of support for a military attack on Iraq is now at its highest level since the Guardian started a weekly tracker poll on the question in August. Opposition to a war against Iraq reached a peak in the last week of August when it touched 50% and has now fallen to its lowest level at 37%.

Support for a war against Iraq is strongest amongst men - 51% approve as opposed to only 34% of women - and among 25- 34-year-olds who approve by 52% to 25%. Opposition to war is strongest among women - 41% of whom disapprove compared with 33% of men.

The poll results also show that the belief that a new UN mandate is needed before British troops are committed remains overwhelming with 85% of voters saying this must be a precondition.

A similar proportion - 81% - also says there needs to be a Commons vote before there is British participation in an attack on Iraq. Mistrust of Saddam Hussein also remains at a very high level in Britain.

Three-quarters say they do not believe he would honour his commitment to allow UN weapons inspectors into Iraq without any conditions. Only 13% are prepared to give him the benefit of the doubt.

ICM interviewed a random sample of 1,008 adults aged 18 and over by telephone on Monday 14 October. Interviews were conducted across the country and the results have been weighted to the profile of all adults.

[www.guardian.co.uk/uk\\_news/story/0,3604,812632,00.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,3604,812632,00.html)

---

Guardian Unlimited © Guardian Newspapers Limited 2002

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Sun, 20 Oct 2002 07:20:03 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: LA TIMES POLL: Most Priests Say Bishops Mishandled Abuse Issue  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210200718530.1364-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

[www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priest20oct20.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priest20oct20.story)

October 20 2002

LA TIMES POLL

Most Priests Say Bishops Mishandled Abuse Issue

Many believe that the U.S. church's charter, though protective of children, is unfair to clerics, and many are angry at prelates.

By Larry B. Stammer  
Times Staff Writer

Two-thirds of the nation's Roman Catholic priests disapprove of the way that U.S. bishops have handled sexual abuse allegations against members of the clergy, a nationwide Los Angeles Times poll of the priesthood has found.

The findings of the poll, the most extensive nationwide opinion survey of American priests since 1994, point to a pervasive and deep-seated anger among many priests. Many are upset at the nation's bishops. They are also, in many cases, angry at the news media.

In written comments that many priests submitted with the poll responses, they said bishops delayed dealing with the crisis in the first place, then compounded the problem by adopting a "zero-tolerance" policy, the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People, that denies accused clerics their rights to due process.

But the poll also found a bedrock of faith among priests, happiness in their chosen vocation and a belief that the church will come out of the crisis stronger.

Nonetheless, in their comments on the sexual abuse policy, which the U.S. bishops approved in June, priests expressed many of the same objections raised by Vatican officials. On Friday the Vatican released a letter to the U.S. bishops saying some aspects of the policy conflict with church law and need to be changed.

Seventy-five percent of poll respondents said the charter has done a "good" or "excellent" job of protecting minors from sexual abuse by priests.

"Probably at this point the safest place for any kid to be is in the church," said Father Frank Jasper, a Franciscan priest and psychotherapist in Indianapolis who agreed to a follow-up interview.

Fifty-five percent said the charter would restore confidence in the church.

But only 34% rated the charter's fairness to priests accused of abuse as "good" or "excellent," with 45% calling it "fair" or "poor" in that regard.

Like many other priests, Jasper, 56, who has been ordained for 29 years, said the charter was hastily put together under intense media

pressure and undermined the due-process rights of priests guaranteed by the church's canon law.

The sexual abuse scandal has resulted in an estimated 300 priests nationwide being removed from ministry and an unprecedented official apology from the church. The furor has taken a toll on the morale of priests who have never been accused of sexual abuse, the survey found.

"I feel so badly for the innocent victims, but in a way, I feel victimized by these sexual monsters because they, in a way, stole from me some of the pride and joy I had as a priest," said one California cleric.

More than three out of five of those surveyed said they believed that most or many of the allegations of sexual abuse of minors by priests were true. More than half, 53%, said they think the church has been too lenient in disciplining those accused of misconduct.

Yet in addition to disappointment with the bishops, many priests expressed anger at how the news media have covered cases of abuse. Seventy-three percent of priests responding to the survey said the news media had been "negative" in their treatment of the church.

"I'm terribly disappointed," Father Eugene Burns of Chicago said in a follow-up telephone interview.

"I never saw anything about us who have borne the heat of the day and have been good, faithful priests," said Burns, 74, who has been a priest 47 years. "They threw mud at all of us. I used to enjoy our national news, as well as local, but it was getting nauseating. So I just shut it off."

Many said they were outraged by the publication of unproven allegations, particularly in cases involving alleged molestations that occurred decades ago and in which there had been no indication of further offenses.

"Faithful laity seems to forgive our sins. The press seems to delight in our sins," a priest from New Jersey wrote.

Although there have been polls of rank-and-file Catholics and Americans in general since the sexual abuse scandal erupted in January in Boston and spread across the U.S., this poll marks the first attempt to survey the views of priests.

Catholic institutions have done some polls of the nation's roughly 45,000 active and retired priests in recent years, but the current survey, conducted by the Los Angeles Times Poll, is the most extensive opinion survey of U.S. priests since a similar Times poll of priests and nuns conducted in 1993 and 1994.

The latest poll surveyed 1,854 priests nationwide and has a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points. Priests were given an opportunity to add written comments along with their answers. Some also agreed to follow-up interviews with Times reporters.

The poll found that overwhelmingly priests are happy with their

vocations (70% say they are "very satisfied" with their lives as priests), approve of the way their local bishops manage their own dioceses (76%), and expect that in the long run the church will emerge from the crisis stronger and healthier.

"At 85 years of age, I see the ship listing greatly but not ready to sink," commented one person who responded to the poll. "God's promises are too convincing for that. I'll stay on board with God's help."

Another said: "I believe the church will survive this scandal, as it has for the last 2,000 years. Hopefully, it will emerge more pure, more refined and more holy. I pray for that every day."

But the priests also agreed that the current crisis is a serious one. Asked if the sex abuse scandal was the worst crisis the church in America has faced in a century, more than two-thirds said yes.

None of the priests in their written comments sought to excuse or minimize child abuse. As have U.S. bishops and Pope John Paul II, they expressed agreement that there is no room in the priesthood for those who would sexually abuse minors.

"They should be removed from ministry, but not publicly," Burns said. "They must know that nobody's above the law. It's their fault. They're stupid. They must have known it was wrong. Certainly, God wouldn't look the other way. They had to know what a horrible disgrace. But the power of passion!"

Others faulted the bishops for waiting so long to address the issue of sexual abuse, which they began discussing at their national meetings at least as early as 1985.

"I'm very angry that no charges have been brought against" bishops who failed to protect children from molesters, "and at the present time it seems that no charges will ever be brought against them," wrote one Pennsylvania priest.

"Heads have to roll in the episcopacy [bishops] before people are going to be satisfied," commented a cleric from the northern Great Plains.

Wrote one Southern California priest: "I can't wait for a bishop or cardinal to go to jail."

About one-third of priests identified themselves as liberals in matters of doctrine; roughly another third identified themselves as conservatives. Both groups expressed criticisms of the bishops, but liberals were more likely to criticize them than conservatives, 76% versus 59%.

Many of the same priests also said the rights of the accused, as well as victims, must be honored. Many asked if Christian forgiveness had also become a victim of the scandal, particularly in cases in which a priest may have abused once decades ago and led an abuse-free life with an effective ministry ever since.

"The Dallas charter is so broad that it places most priests at risk of an unjust accusation," wrote a cleric from upstate New York. "An

allegation is regarded as proved if it is merely credible."

Some came to the defense of the bishops. "The church is taking aggressive action to end these scandals. Please don't make its task more difficult by trying to dictate how it should do its duty," wrote one priest, adding that the church's "leaders, wisely, are looking to, and praying to, God for help."

Others, however, commented angrily on the fact that bishops are not subject to the rule requiring abusers' removal from ministry and the priesthood. Sixty-five percent said the charter did a fair to poor job in providing for the discipline of bishops who cover up for abusive priests.

According to church law, only the pope can discipline a bishop. Nonetheless, the anger of some priests was palpable.

"In the end, the bishops have absolved themselves and will walk away unscathed," wrote a priest from the New York City area. "Perhaps corporate America is following the bishops' lead."

[www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priest20oct20.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priest20oct20.story)

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Sun, 20 Oct 2002 07:41:11 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: LA TIMES POLL: 15% of Priests Identify as Gay or `on Homosexual Side'  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210200740200.2997-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

[www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-gaypriest20oct20014425.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-gaypriest20oct20014425.story)

October 20 2002

THE TIMES POLL

## 15% Identify as Gay or 'on Homosexual Side'

By Larry B. Stammer  
Times Staff Writer

The subject of gays in the priesthood has been hotly debated throughout the sexual abuse scandal that has rocked the Catholic Church in the U.S.

Many Catholic traditionalists, including some bishops and Vatican officials, have sought to blame gay priests for the scandal. On the other side, many have said the church has increasingly come to depend on gay men who have entered the priesthood in larger numbers in recent years.

Despite the debate, there has been little data on how many priests actually are gay.

The Times poll of priests asked respondents to characterize their sexual orientation. A combined 15% identified themselves as homosexual (9%) or "somewhere in between, but more on the homosexual side" (6%).

But among younger priests -- those ordained for 20 years or less -- the figure was 23%.

The figures, particularly for the younger priests, are higher than most estimates of the percentage of U.S. gay men, but lower than some estimates of the percentage of homosexuals in the priesthood, which have ranged up to 50%.

The figures bolster the idea that more gay men have entered the priesthood in recent decades or at least that gay priests are now more open about their sexuality.

Five percent of respondents placed themselves "completely in the middle" between heterosexuality and homosexuality, while 67% identified themselves as exclusively heterosexual in orientation. Eight percent referred to themselves as "mostly" heterosexual, and 5% declined to answer the question.

Asked whether a "homosexual subculture" -- defined as "a definite group of persons that has its own friendships, social gatherings and vocabulary" -- exists in their diocese or religious order, 44% said "definitely" (17%) or "probably" (27%) yes, while 52% said no. Asked if such a subculture existed at the seminary they attended, 26% said "definitely" (12%) or "probably" (14%) yes, while 71% said no. But 53% of priests who were ordained in the last 20 years said such a subculture existed in the seminary when they attended.

Just as many traditionalists have blamed the sexual abuse scandal on homosexuals in the priesthood, many liberals have blamed the church's requirement that priests be celibate.

The poll also asked priests about "the role that celibacy plays in your life." One-third of those surveyed said they "do not waver" from their vow of celibacy, while 47% described celibacy as "an ongoing journey"



and 14% said they "do not always succeed in following" it. Two percent said they are not celibate, and 5% declined to answer the question.

Psychologists and other experts on sexuality generally say sexual abuse of children is not connected to sexual orientation or celibacy. Most offenders suffer from arrested psychosexual development and are heterosexual, those experts say. But such views have done little to discourage arguments in the church and the secular media about celibacy or the renewed efforts by the Vatican to discourage the ordination of homosexuals.

The poll respondents were guaranteed anonymity, but results on the sexuality questions could have been influenced by wariness of the media and fears among gay priests that disclosing their sexual orientation amid the current crisis would be ill-advised.

Catholic research groups periodically survey priests' views on many subjects, but the church has never polled its priests about their sexual orientation. Catholic researchers have said members of the church hierarchy did not want the question asked.

[www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-gaypriest20oct20014425.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-gaypriest20oct20014425.story)

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Sun, 20 Oct 2002 07:55:25 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: How the LA Times Survey of Priests Was Taken (LATimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210200754300.2997-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

[www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priestmethod20oct20.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priestmethod20oct20.story)

October 20 2002

How the National Survey Was Taken

Response rate among the 5,000 priests who were mailed the questionnaire was 37%, considered statistically representative.

This is the most extensive opinion survey of the nation's Catholic priests since a Los Angeles Times poll of priests and nuns conducted over several months in 1993 and 1994.

Opinion surveys of the general population usually are conducted by telephone, using random-digit dialing. For a small population such as priests, however, that method is impractical.

Instead, The Times Poll chose a sample of 5,000 active and retired priests across the country in 80 dioceses and mailed surveys to them. The packet included a cover letter promising that all results would remain anonymous.

The sample was designed to be geographically distributed in the same way as the 45,382 priests who make up the total U.S. priest population. Diocesan priests and those in religious orders were included in proportion to their overall share of the total priest population in each geographic area.

Addresses and population counts were taken from directories of dioceses and religious orders and from the Official Catholic Directory published by P.J. Kennedy & Sons.

To achieve the largest possible return rate, the poll contacted respondents four times, mailing questionnaires June 27 and July 25, a reminder postcard Aug. 5, and a final set of questionnaire packets Sept. 4. The end date of the survey was Oct. 11, giving it a 16-week field period.

The poll was criticized by some Catholic organizations that said it asked inappropriate questions. Nonetheless, it achieved a response rate of 37%, for a total of 1,854 respondents nationwide, which is considered statistically representative.

Response rates were acceptable in all the dioceses surveyed, and ranged from 30% in some dioceses in the South to 44% in some parts of the Midwest. The margin of error for the sample is plus or minus 3 percentage points.

The sample of priests who responded to the survey slightly over-represents active diocesan priests as compared with those who belong to religious orders. It also slightly over-represents priests in the South as compared with those in the East and Midwest. The final results were adjusted slightly to account for the differences.

Besides the survey questions, the poll invited respondents to submit additional written comments. Some priests also agreed to speak with reporters for follow-up interviews.

In the written comments, some priests praised the survey. Others criticized the wording of some of the 67 questions.

The most common complaint was that some questions required a more complicated answer than simply yes or no.

Others suggested that certain items were designed to produce responses that would embarrass the church.

The survey was supervised by Los Angeles Times Poll Director Susan Pinkus along with Associate Director Jill Darling Richardson and Field Director Roger Richardson. Claudia Vaughn was the data management supervisor, and Ray Enslow was the publications coordinator.

-----  
Further information on this study is available by writing to Los Angeles Times Poll, 202 W. 1st St., Los Angeles, CA 90012-4105. In addition, Times Poll data and question wording may be found online at <http://www.latimes.com/home/news/polls>.

[www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priestmethod20oct20.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priestmethod20oct20.story)

-----  
Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Sun, 20 Oct 2002 08:57:50 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: LA TIMES POLL ANALYSIS: Priests Say Catholic Church Facing Biggest Crisis of Century  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210200855470.2997-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

-----  
Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times  
-----

[www.latimes.com/news/local/la-timespollpriests-471palan,0,5008625.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-timespollpriests-471palan,0,5008625.story)

October 20 2002

TIMES POLL

Poll Analysis: Priests Say Catholic Church  
Facing Biggest Crisis of the Century

But most are satisfied with the way their lives are going.

By JILL DARLING RICHARDSON

Times Poll Assoc. Director

Most priests and members of religious orders believe the Catholic Church is currently facing the biggest crisis of this century, according to the latest Los Angeles Times poll. The survey of 1,854 priests and religious in 80 dioceses across the United States and Puerto Rico reveals a clergy who are happy in their chosen life, but who feel embattled by a barrage of negative media attention. Many also expressed concern over the Church hierarchy's handling of the crisis, and some fear loss of credibility and possible witch-hunts as more allegations -- some decades old -- come to light.

The survey uncovered a religious community whose members are satisfied with their own lives and ministries, but who are at the same time concerned over internal and external stresses on the Church itself. Even though about seven in 10 agreed with the statement "The Catholic Church in America is now facing its biggest crisis in the last century" priests in the survey were generally upbeat about their lives. Nine in 10 said they are very (70%) or somewhat (21%) satisfied with the way their life as a priest is going these days. Six in 10 said their life in the priesthood has turned out better than they thought it would and more than seven in 10 said they would definitely make the same choice again, along with another two in 10 who would probably do so.

#### Allegations of Abuse and The Bishops' Conference

The survey contacted priests in the weeks following the yearly conference of Roman Catholic Bishops in the United States. During this conference in June 2002, which took place in a heightened atmosphere of crisis and was extensively covered by the media, the bishops drafted a set of guidelines for dealing with priests who are accused of sexual misconduct. The zero tolerance guidelines set forth in the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People require bishops to report allegations of child sexual abuse to civil authorities and remove accused priests from public ministry. Because bishops are heads of their local dioceses and cannot be sanctioned by other bishops, the guidelines do not address the issues of discipline of bishops who are involved in misconduct themselves or who cover up for priests who are accused of misconduct.

Generally speaking, while priests approve of and trust the bishops who head their own dioceses -- three out of four said they approved (39% approved strongly and 37% somewhat) of the way the bishop in their own diocese is handling his duties overall -- two-thirds disapprove of the way bishops in general have handled the allegations of child sexual abuse against priests.

There is also a sense among priests that the problems are happening elsewhere, outside their home dioceses. Eight in 10 overall said they were satisfied that adequate procedures had already been established in their own diocese for dealing with the issue of child sexual abuse by priests even before the Bishop's conference last June.

When asked to name what bothered them the most about the crisis, priests mentioned the bishops' response to the crisis most often at

21%. (Next highest mention was concern about unsubstantiated claims of abuse at 16%, followed by the media response to the crisis at 14%.)

While this shows that some are clearly worried about unsubstantiated claims, a majority (60%) indicated they believe that most (19%) or many (42%) of the allegations of sexual misconduct that have been leveled at priests are true, and over half (53%) said they think the Church has been too lenient in disciplining priests who are accused of misconduct. (Thirteen percent feel the Church has been too harsh, and 26% say the level of discipline has been just right.)

Not surprisingly, a priest's religious leanings play a role in his perception of how the crisis is being handled. Generally speaking, priests who identify as liberal (i.e. non-orthodox) on the religious ideological spectrum tend to feel more strongly about the lack of protection of accused priests by their bishops, but also to be more inclined to believe that the bulk of the allegations against priests are true. Also, they are less satisfied with the guidelines set forth in the Bishops conference last June, and more willing to advocate that bishops resign if they are found to have covered up for abusing priests than are their more conservative brethren.

When priests were asked about the greatest challenges they face in their life and work, issues surrounding the scandal were not immediately foremost in their minds, but that is not to say that concerns are not there. Priests most often mentioned the need to combat secularism and materialism in the laity (12%), the problems of burnout from excessive demands on their time (15%), and the issues of effective ministry (10%). However, aggregating mentions of related issues -- media attacks on the Church, the problems laity and clergy are having in the wake of the abuse scandals, and concern over lost credibility -- reveals that just under two in 10 priests expressed concern about one or more of those issues.

Many priests indicated in their written comments at the end of the survey that they feel that the Church and especially the clergy have been portrayed unfairly by the media, who they feel do not understand the life that priests lead. Nearly three in four said they think the news media's treatment of the Church is too negative.

#### Satisfaction With the Bishop's Charter

When priests were asked to rate the guidelines set forth in the Charter, two-thirds said they were at least somewhat satisfied that it adequately addresses the issues dealing with sexual abuse by priests but 25% said they were not. Six percent said they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. The largest proportion said they were "mostly" (33%) or "somewhat" (26%) satisfied that it addressed the issues.

When asked to rate the Charter on a variety of specifics, priests expressed the greatest satisfaction with the way the compact set about protecting minors. Three out of four priests said it does at least a good job of protecting minors from sexual abuse. Over half (55%) gave the Charter an excellent or good rating for its ability to help restore confidence in the Catholic Church. However, when it comes to being fair

to those who are accused of abuse, only 34% of priests said it did a good job and 65% said it did only a fair or poor job when it comes to providing for the discipline of bishops who cover up for abusive priests.

Priests rate how well the Bishop's compact will:

	Excellent/ Good	Neutral	Fair/ Poor
Protect minors from sex abuse	75%	8	12
Restore confidence in the Church	55%	17	24
Treat accused priests fairly	34%	16	45
Provide discipline for bishops who cover up for abusive priests	15%	13	65

When asked what outcome they would most like to see if a bishop is found to have protected a priest who has sexually abused a minor, only 11% said they thought that the bishop should be arrested, and hardly anyone suggested the bishop should not apologize (1%). Most (75%) agreed that a bishop in that position should apologize and impose new safeguards. That group includes 34% who said that the bishop should take those steps and then continue to serve, and 41% who said the bishop should take those steps and then resign. Thirteen percent did not answer the question.

## Bishops

Generally speaking, priests reported good relations with their diocesan bishops. Along with the majority who approve of the job their bishop is doing, nearly three out of four (73%) consider their bishop's view on moral issues to be just about right. Nearly two out of five liberal religious priests find the views of their diocesan bishops to be too conservative and 55% find his views on par with theirs. Conversely, more than four out of five each of moderate and conservative religious priests find their bishops' views in line with their own thinking. More than two-thirds also feel comfortable in going to their superiors for guidance and comfort. But, 37% of liberal religious say they feel uncomfortable, as do 37% of priests who came of age in the Vatican II era. (This result is comparable to Catholics' in a survey sponsored by ABC News/Washington Post in March 2002. More than three-quarters of Catholic Americans are satisfied with leadership provided by their bishop and 86% are satisfied with their parish priests.)

On another matter that may have more to do with the problems now confronting the Church, priests are divided as to whether they favor or oppose direct democratic election of diocesan bishops by the diocesan clergy and laity. However, priests who are liberal in their religious ideology overwhelmingly approve of this issue (73%), while virtually a similar group of religious conservative priests are as adamantly opposed to the idea. Those saying they are religious moderates are more prone to be against this idea (52% oppose to 44% in favor). Not surprisingly, priests who came of age after Vatican II are strongly opposed to direct elections (67%), while the priests in other

generational categories are evenly divided in their opinion.

### Gay Priests

Sociologists and researchers who survey the priest population have provided estimates of the proportion of priests who are gay ranging from about 35% to as high as 50%. This survey asked priests to rate their sexual orientation on a five point scale with heterosexual on one end of the scale and homosexual on the other. Sixty-seven percent identified as heterosexual, 8% said they lean toward heterosexual, 5% say they are completely in the middle, 6% lean toward homosexual and 9% say they are gay.

Allegations have been made by conservative members of the Church hierarchy that problems of abuse stem from the high proportion of gay priests and the existence of a homosexual subculture in the Church. The survey asked two questions about this, first defining a subculture as "a definite group of persons that has its own friendships, social gatherings, and vocabulary."

Under half of the priests (44%) said that such a group definitely (17%) or probably (27%) exists in their diocese. In a survey conducted by Dean Hoge for Catholic University of America in 2001, 19% of priests said "clearly there is a subculture", 36% said their probably is and 17% said there is not.

In this survey more priests who came of age after Vatican II, along with those who have spent 20 years or less in the priesthood, say there is a homosexual subculture in the seminary they attended. Priests who have been ordained the shortest time are more apt to say that the gay subculture exists in their diocese as well. Only 26% said they thought there was a homosexual subculture in the seminary when they attended (including 12% who said definitely and 14% who said probably.) In Hoge's study, 15% said there clearly was a subculture in their seminary, 26% said probably and 44% said no subculture.

The survey did not ask any specific questions about a link between homosexuality and child abuse, and psychologists and other experts on human sexuality generally say that sexual abuse of children is not connected to either sexual orientation or celibacy.

### Celibacy

About a third of priests say that celibacy is not a problem for them, while 47% say it's something that takes times to achieve and is an ongoing journey. Fourteen percent said it is a discipline they try to follow, and 2% say celibacy is not relevant to their priesthood and they do not observe it. They also think the practice of celibacy is the same whether the priest is gay or not. But more than a fifth believe it is easier for straight priests to practice celibacy than for gay priests and 2% think it is easier for homosexual priests to practice celibacy than heterosexual priests.

Most priests are also satisfied with their intimacy with others, that is non-sexual intimacy, they have with their friends.

## How the Poll Was Conducted

### Overview

This survey is the 471st in a series of Los Angeles Times opinion studies designed to measure public attitudes on a number of critical issues. It is the second Los Angeles Times survey of Roman Catholic priests in the United States. The study takes a look at the attitudes of priests in the Roman Catholic Church in America today, in a period when the Church is undergoing public and private scrutiny. Although Catholic-affiliated surveys of the attitudes of priests have been done recently, no independent survey of this population has been taken since the Times Poll surveyed priests and nuns over a period of months in 1993 and 1994 (LAT surveys 321 and 323).

For this survey, 1,854 active and retired priests in 80 dioceses across the U.S and in Puerto Rico returned mail-ballot questionnaires over the period June 27-Oct. 11. Diocesan and religious priests were included in the sample. Spanish language questionnaires were provided for priests in Puerto Rico.

### Sample Design and Coverage

The Times Poll selected 5,000 priests from a total population of 45,382 in the United States and Puerto Rico using a two-stage procedure. First, the Official Catholic Directory (OFCD), published by P.J. Kennedy & Sons, was used to compile a complete list of all the dioceses in the country as well as the total priest population in each diocese. The list was pre-stratified by regional geography. Eighty dioceses were randomly selected, proportional to priest population in each region.

For the second-stage sample selection, Times Poll researchers obtained directories for each of the sample dioceses wherever possible. When such directories were either unavailable or actively withheld, the OFCD was substituted as a source. In this way, a sample of 5,000 active and retired priests was drawn in proportion to priest population in each diocesan area.

At this point, two Tribune newspapers -- the Morning Call in Allentown, Pa., and the South Florida Sun-Sentinel in Ft. Lauderdale, Fl. -- expressed an interest in oversampling dioceses in their areas for national comparison. In order to provide enough data for separate analysis of the three southern Pa. dioceses of interest to the Morning Call (Scranton, Allentown and Philadelphia, of which only Scranton and Philadelphia were in the first-stage sample pick) and the two dioceses of interest to the South Florida Sun-Sentinel (Miami and Palm Beach, neither of which was in the original first-stage sample pick), every priest in those five dioceses was contacted. Note that the data set under analysis here includes only the Times Poll's original selected priests in the Scranton and Philadelphia dioceses.(fn1)

The survey questionnaires were first mailed on June 27. This was after the Bishop's conference. Seven thousand two hundred and twenty-two questionnaires, cover letters and pre-paid return envelopes were sent.



A second mailing of the same packet was sent to 5,878 non-responding priests on July 25. A reminder postcard was mailed to 5,707 non-responding priests on Aug. 5, and a final third set of 4,924 questionnaire packets was mailed to continuing non-responders on Sept. 4.(fn2) The end date of the survey was Oct. 11, making it a 16-week field period. In creating its design, the Times Poll followed the general guidelines for mail surveys found in Dillman's Mail and Internet Surveys.(fn3)

Research and field work for the 78 dioceses outside southern Pa. were completed by Los Angeles Times field staff(fn4) under the supervision of Times Poll Field Director Roger Richardson and Times Poll Director Susan Pinkus. Data collection in the dioceses of Philadelphia and Scranton, Pa., was overseen for the Morning Call newspaper by Chris Borick, assistant professor of political science at Muhlenberg College.

#### Return Rates and Margins of Error

By the standard calculation for true random sample of a population of this size, one can say with 95% certainty that the margin of error for this sample is +/-3 percentage points. All population surveys, including this one, are subject to errors of many kinds. Bias may be introduced through coverage errors, survey non-response, question wording issues and other types of human error. Every attempt was made to reduce all of these through preliminary research and follow-ups on non-responders. Four attempts were made to convince priests to return their questionnaires.

Using a response-rate calculation that removes deceased, unqualified and reassigned priests from the sample, resulting in a total sample size of 4,965, the survey has a type A response rate of 37%. Additional removal of unavailable priests results in a sample size of 4,887 and a type B response rate of 38%. Type A response rates ranged from 30% among dioceses in the South to 44% in the Midwest.

Response rate on this survey may have been affected by a variety of issues. First, the Roman Catholic priest population has been subject to intense media scrutiny over the last few months. Many non-responding priests indicated that their refusal to cooperate was due to a concern that their answers would be sensationalized by the press. There were various negative publications about this survey in the Catholic community. Despite the negative publicity, response rates were acceptable in all dioceses and outstanding in some.

In addition to response rate issues, undetected flaws in the way the sampling and interviewing procedure were carried out could have a significant effect on findings. Changing the wording of questions and the sequence in which they are asked can produce different results. Sometimes questions are inadvertently biased or misleading and people who respond to surveys may not necessarily replicate the views of those who refuse to participate. Moreover, while every precaution has been taken to make these findings completely accurate, other errors may have resulted from the various practical difficulties associated with taking any survey of public opinion.

Some of the best data available for comparison on this survey are

surveys of priest populations conducted by Georgetown University's Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA). Comparing numbers of active and retired priests nationwide(fn5) to those in our survey, one can see that this survey slightly overrepresents active diocesan priests and underrepresents religious priests.

All US(fn5) Priests	LA Times Priests Poll 2002		
Diocesan, Active	48%	54%	
Diocesan, Retired	15	14	
Religious, Active	31	28	
Religious, Retired	6	4	

Comparing sample population to the figures taken from the Official Catholic Directory, the sample slightly underrepresents priests in the East and Midwest and overrepresents those in the South. The sample figures have been adjusted slightly to account for this difference.

#### Unweighted

	All US Priests*	LA Times Priests Poll 2002
East	38%	36%
Midwest	17	13
South	30	35
West	15	16

\* Figures calculated from population totals in Official Catholic Directory 2001.

The Los Angeles Times Poll is directed by Susan Pinkus under the general supervision of Los Angeles Times Managing Editor Dean Baquet. Jill Darling Richardson is Associate Director, Roger Richardson is Field Director, Claudia Vaughn is Data Management Supervisor, and Ray Enslow is Publications Coordinator.

Further information regarding this study is available by writing to the Los Angeles Times Poll, 202 West 1st Street, Los Angeles, California 90012-4105, by calling (213) 237-2027 or by e-mailing [timespoll@latimes.com](mailto:timespoll@latimes.com).

This report conforms to the standards of disclosure of the National Council on Public Polls and the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

#### Footnotes

1. Only the dioceses originally selected in the first stage and priests originally selected in the second stage of the sampling process are included in this data set. No interviews conducted in the dioceses of Allentown, Miami or Palm Beach have been included and the interviews with non-sampled priests are excluded as well.

2. Fifty-five percent of the total completed and refused questionnaires

had been returned by the date of the second mailing, 68% by the date of the reminder postcard mailing, and 88% by the date of the third and final mailing.

3. Mail and Internet Surveys, The Tailored Design Method, by Dillman, Don A., John Wiley & Sons, 2000 (2nd ed.)

4. The Times Poll would like to acknowledge supervisor Art Dodd and editors Walter Boxer, Debra Birgen and Cynthia Kirk for their diligence and hard work on this survey.

5. National study of priests conducted by CARA in 1999 for the Committee for Priestly Life and Ministry of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

[www.latimes.com/news/local/la-timespollpriests-471palan,0,5008625.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-timespollpriests-471palan,0,5008625.story)

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Sun, 20 Oct 2002 12:16:24 -0400  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.79 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: How the LA Times Survey of Priests Was Taken (LATimes)  
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210200754300.2997-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> [www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priestmethod20oct20.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priestmethod20oct20.story)  
>  
> October 20 2002  
>  
> How the National Survey Was Taken  
>  
> Response rate among the 5,000 priests who were mailed the questionnaire  
> was 37%, considered statistically representative.

Huh????

"Statistically representative" sounds very scientific and gives an aura of authority to the poll results, but is utterly meaningless as applied to a response rate.

Those who actually read through the next half dozen paragraphs will find out that:

> The poll was criticized by some Catholic organizations that said it  
> asked inappropriate questions. Nonetheless, it achieved a response rate  
> of 37%, for a total of 1,854 respondents nationwide, which is  
> considered statistically representative.

Readers who are already knowledgeable about polling will understand that it is the number of respondents rather than the response rate that is "statistically representative," but this wording still fudges the issue for the less informed. Since we are never told that the sample was randomly selected, even that is not justified.

More important, in polls on sensitive subjects, one cannot assume that non-response is uncorrelated to the subject of the questions, which means that one must be even more cautious than usual when projecting sample results to the overall population.

Regardless of the theoretical accuracy of the results, this is a fascinating survey and the LA Times is to be commended for undertaking it.

It really is too bad that they have tried to promote the credibility of their results by cloaking them with this kind of pseudo-scientific mumbo jumbo.

Jan Werner  
jwerner@jwdp.com

=====  
Date: Sun, 20 Oct 2002 14:10:32 -0400  
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
To: <jwerner@jwdp.com>, "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: How the LA Times Survey of Priests Was Taken (LATimes)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

I agree that they are to be commended for attempting a national survey on this important issue. However, there are problems evident in only a quick review.

While positioned as a survey among all Catholic priests, there is no explanation of the method of contact and success in reaching non-diocesan members of religious orders (Jesuits, Augustinians, etc.) many of whom have contact with youth via high schools, colleges and other organizations. They represent a substantial proportion of the total priest population. (I grant that the write up claims that "religious" priests were included but how they were reached is not at all clear.)

Apart from how you characterize it, 37 percent response seems low for a study on a topic of such importance that was in the field 4 months and was,

presumably, among a population that opens and reads its mail.

Some of the questions (e.g. "Would you say that you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the way your life as a priest is going these days?") are completely out of touch with the concept of religious vocation as understood by most Catholic clergy. Another, Q.56 on celibacy, is poorly constructed (to be kind). It seems inconceivable that any priest or other person knowledgeable about Catholic clergy was consulted on these questions.

There is an undercurrent of hostility towards the subject population when the reader is told that directories were "actively withheld" and "Every attempt was made. . . to convince priests to return their questionnaires.") Hey, maybe the diocese has a policy of not releasing directories to newspapers; maybe some priests felt the instrument didn't pass the smell test. Too bad!

Describing the Scranton, Allentown and Philadelphia dioceses as "southern Pennsylvania" (twice) in the methodology write-up suggests a lack of attention to accuracy that is evident in other places, as well.

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

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

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Date: Sunday, October 20, 2002 12:16 PM  
Subject: Re: How the LA Times Survey of Priests Was Taken (LATimes)

>> [www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priestmethod20oct20.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-priestmethod20oct20.story)  
>>  
>> October 20 2002  
>>  
>> How the National Survey Was Taken  
>>  
>> Response rate among the 5,000 priests who were mailed the questionnaire  
>> was 37%, considered statistically representative.  
>  
>  
>Huh????  
>  
>"Statistically representative" sounds very scientific and gives an aura  
>of authority to the poll results, but is utterly meaningless as applied  
>to a response rate.  
>  
>Those who actually read through the next half dozen paragraphs will find  
>out that:  
>  
>> The poll was criticized by some Catholic organizations that said it  
>> asked inappropriate questions. Nonetheless, it achieved a response rate  
>> of 37%, for a total of 1,854 respondents nationwide, which is  
>> considered statistically representative.  
>  
>Readers who are already knowledgeable about polling will understand that  
>it is the number of respondents rather than the response rate that is

>"statistically representative," but this wording still fudges the issue  
>for the less informed. Since we are never told that the sample was  
>randomly selected, even that is not justified.  
>  
>More important, in polls on sensitive subjects, one cannot assume that  
>non-response is uncorrelated to the subject of the questions, which  
>means that one must be even more cautious than usual when projecting  
>sample results to the overall population.  
>  
>Regardless of the theoretical accuracy of the results, this is a  
>fascinating survey and the LA Times is to be commended for undertaking  
>it.  
>  
>It really is too bad that they have tried to promote the credibility of  
>their results by cloaking them with this kind of pseudo-scientific mumbo  
>jumbo.  
>  
>Jan Werner  
>jwerner@jwdp.com  
>  
>  
>  
>

---

Date: Sun, 20 Oct 2002 16:15:09 -0700  
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>  
Subject: RE: How the LA Times Survey of Priests Was Taken (LATimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <3BAE9A3E52E8234BB392CB924B8060DB529019@mainex2.asu.edu>  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

If the study was anonymous:

"The packet included a cover letter promising that all results would remain anonymous."

Then how were the follow-ups controlled?

"To achieve the largest possible return rate, the poll contacted respondents four times, mailing questionnaires June 27 and July 25, a reminder postcard Aug. 5, and a final set of questionnaire packets Sept. 4. The end date of the survey was Oct. 11, giving it a 16-week field period."

-Did they use the separate reply postcard technique?

-Was it instead confidential, with tracking numbers that were removed upon receipt?

-Or were the follow-ups sent to the full sample each time--in which case, was there any attempt to discover multiple responses from the same sampled person?

-Or some other method?

This is a fascinating study, and a wonderful opportunity to learn how any of the above techniques worked out.

Shap Wolf  
Arizona State University

=====  
Date: Sun, 20 Oct 2002 17:45:16 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Drilling for Freedom (op ed, TL Friedman, NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210201740430.26832-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

PUBLIC OPINION AND POLLING ABSTRACT

A funny thing happened in Iran the other day. The official Iranian news agency, IRNA, published a poll on Iranian attitudes toward America, conducted by Iran's National Institute for Research Studies and Opinion Polls. The poll asked 1,500 Iranians whether they favored opening talks with America, and 75 percent said "yes." More interesting, 46 percent said U.S. policies on Iran -- which include an economic boycott and labeling Iran part of an "axis of evil" -- were "to some extent correct." You can imagine what happened next. Iran's hard-liners shut down the polling institute and threatened the IRNA official who published the results. Never mind. The fact that the hard-liners had to do such a thing shows how out of touch they are with Iran's courageous mainstream.

-----  
Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company  
-----

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/20/opinion/20FRIE.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/20/opinion/20FRIE.html)

October 20, 2002

Drilling for Freedom

By THOMAS L. FRIEDMAN

A funny thing happened in Iran the other day. The official Iranian news agency, IRNA, published a poll on Iranian attitudes toward America, conducted by Iran's National Institute for Research Studies and Opinion Polls. The poll asked 1,500 Iranians whether they favored opening talks with America, and 75 percent said "yes." More interesting, 46 percent said U.S. policies on Iran -- which include an economic boycott and labeling Iran part of an "axis of evil" -- were "to some extent correct."

Oops!

You can imagine what happened next. Iran's hard-liners shut down the

polling institute and threatened the IRNA official who published the results. Never mind. The fact that the hard-liners had to do such a thing shows how out of touch they are with Iran's courageous mainstream.

I relate this incident because it is very useful in thinking about the task of democratic transition in the Middle East. The Arab and Muslim worlds today are largely dominated by autocratic regimes. If you want to know what it would look like for them to move from autocracy to democracy, check out Iran. In many countries it will involve an Iranian-like mixture of theocracy and democracy, in which the Islamists initially win power by the ballot box, but then can't deliver the jobs and rising living standards that their young people desire, so they come under popular pressure and can only hold on to power by force.

But eventually they will lose, because the young generation in Iran today knows two things: (1) They've had enough democracy to know they want more of it. (2) They've had enough theocracy crammed down their throats to know they want less of it. Eventually, they will force a new balance in Iran, involving real democracy and an honored place for Islam, but not an imposed one.

But why is it taking so long? Why isn't Iran like Poland or Hungary after the fall of the Berlin Wall? And why might Iraq not be like them after the fall of Saddam? The answer is spelled O-I-L.

The transition from autocracy to real democracy in Iran is dragged out much longer than in Europe for many reasons, but the most important is because the hard-line mullahs control Iran's oil wealth. What that means is that they have a pool of money that they can use to monopolize all the instruments of coercion -- the army, police and intelligence services. And their pool of money is not dependent on their opening Iran's economy or political system or being truly responsive to their people's aspirations.

Think of it like this: There are two ways for a government to get rich in the Middle East. One is by drilling a sand dune and the other is by drilling the talents, intelligence, creativity and energy of its men and women. As long as the autocratic leaders of Iran, Iraq or Saudi Arabia can get rich by drilling their natural resources, they can stay in power a long, long time. All they have to do is capture control of the oil tap. Only when a government has to drill its human resources will it organize itself in a way that enables it to extract those talents -- with modern education, open trade, and freedom of thought, of scientific enquiry and of the press.

For all these reasons, if we really want to hasten the transition from autocracy to something more democratic in places like Iraq or Iran, the most important thing we can do is gradually, but steadily, bring down the price of oil -- through conservation and alternative energies.

I know that Dick Cheney thinks conservation is for sissies. Real men send B-52's. But he's dead wrong. In the Middle East, conservation and alternative energies are strategic tools. Ronald Reagan helped bring down the Soviet Union by using two tactics: he delegitimized the Soviets and he defueled them. He delegitimized them by branding the Soviet Union an "Evil Empire," and by exposing its youth to what was going on elsewhere in the world, and he defueled them by so outspending



them on Star Wars that the Soviet Union went bankrupt. In the Middle East today, the Bush team is delegitimizing the worst regimes as an "axis of evil," but it is doing nothing to defuel them. Just the opposite. We refuel them with our big cars.

Which was the first and only real Arab democracy? Lebanon. Which Arab country had no oil? Lebanon. Which is the first Arab oil state to turn itself into a constitutional monarchy? Bahrain. Which is the first Arab oil state to run out of oil? Bahrain.

Ousting Saddam is necessary for promoting the spread of democracy in the Middle East, but it won't be sufficient, it won't stick, without the Mideast states kicking their oil dependency and without us kicking ours.

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/20/opinion/20FRIE.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/20/opinion/20FRIE.html)

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Sun, 20 Oct 2002 18:07:47 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: The Wrong War at the Wrong Time (Tony Judt, NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210201755230.26832-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

PUBLIC OPINION ABSTRACT

The Wrong War at the Wrong Time

By TONY JUDT

The Bush administration cannot combat terrorism without the cooperation and collaboration of the rest of the world. For this reason if no other it needs to start taking into account the fears and opinions of other nations. Yet its strategy toward recalcitrant allies resembles Lyndon Johnson's way of managing unruly members of Congress: "If you've got them by the balls, their hearts and minds will follow." But our international allies are not members of Congress, and their hearts and minds are decidedly elsewhere. The administration is now more distrusted abroad than any American government in the past half-century. By his words and his insistence on a unilateral approach toward Iraq, President Bush has squandered much of the post-Sept. 11 good will that is crucial for an effective global campaign against terrorism. But all is not yet

lost. In the eyes of America's European allies, who still yearn for American leadership and thus prefer to give Washington the benefit of the doubt, President Bush's curious obsession with Iraq illustrates not so much renascent American imperialism as Washington's chronic attention deficit disorder. An American-led war on terrorism, intelligently conceived and relentlessly pursued as part of a strategy of multilateral engagement, would have strong, widespread backing. That is because, though the causes of terrorism are many and varied, we are all potential victims. What happened in Bali could happen in many other places, and it surely will.

Tony Judt is director of the Remarque Institute at New York University.

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/20/opinion/20.JUDT.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/20/opinion/20.JUDT.html)

October 20, 2002

The Wrong War at the Wrong Time

By TONY JUDT

The atrocity in Bali last Saturday is a grim reminder that we are in a long war. It is a war that pits a few thousand unidentified individuals against most of humankind, from the beaches of Bali to lower Manhattan. A year ago President Bush named this conflict the "war on terror" and committed the United States to fighting it. Today many people outside America believe that Washington has lost interest in this war, except as rhetorical cover for a retreat to more familiar territory: an old-fashioned battle against an old-fashioned kind of enemy -- Iraq. We are seeking a fight we can win instead of concentrating on the war that we must win.

For former Sovietologists like Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser, Iraq is a ready substitute for the conventional foes (Russia, China, Cuba) of the cold war years. There is no clear link between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda (and certainly no evidence linking Saddam Hussein to the Bali terrorism); so advocates of a war with Iraq have taken to claiming that such a link can't be excluded, and therefore it should be "pre-empted." Few would deny that Saddam Hussein is evil. And he surely has evil means at his disposal -- as America well knows, since it supplied him with anthrax strains and much else when we backed him in the 1980's. But this is the wrong war at the wrong time.

The Bush administration's goals far exceed the internationally acknowledged need to dismantle Saddam Hussein's arsenal. The domino theory is back, this time in reverse. First we remake Iraq in our own image, then others will follow: Damascus, Beirut, Riyadh, perhaps even Cairo. An administration that came into office disdainful of "nation-building" is gearing up to refashion a whole region. Perhaps more than anything else, it is this that has solidified allied opposition to the administration's war plans.

The worst thing about Mr. Bush's pre-announced war with Iraq is that it is not just a substitute for the war against terrorism; it actively impedes it. Mr. Bush has scolded President Megawati Sukarnoputri of Indonesia for not cracking down on Islamic terrorists. But thanks to the war talk spilling out of Washington, heads of states with Islamic majorities are in an impossible position.

If they line up with the Bush administration against Saddam Hussein, they risk alienating a large and volatile domestic constituency, with unpredictable consequences. (Witness this month's elections in Pakistan, where two provinces adjacent to Afghanistan are now controlled by a coalition of religious parties sympathetic to Osama bin Laden.) But if they acknowledge popular opposition to a war with Iraq, they will incur Mr. Bush's wrath. Either way the war on terror suffers.

We need to return our attention to terrorism in all its many forms. Territorial terrorists like E.T.A., the Basque separatist group in Spain, the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland or Hamas in the Middle East would desist if all their demands were met. Ideological terrorists, like the Baader-Meinhof group in West Germany in the 1970's or the Italian Red Brigades, have no specific demands. Their aim is to destabilize the state and make it "reveal" its true and oppressive nature. And then there are stateless terrorists like the operatives of Al Qaeda for whom high-profile, destabilizing acts of terror are as much the end as the means. They claim a doctrinal basis in Islam; but unlike the would-be revolutionaries of an earlier generation, they are indifferent to borders and governments.

In the 1970's, terrorist groups with very different goals, from Breton nationalists to Andean Maoists, liked to claim affiliation to a nebulous international radical network. Association with global causes boosted their significance and their access to weapons. Today's terrorists have a similar interest in inflating their transnational impact by hinting at connections with Osama bin Laden and the international "anti-imperialist" struggle with America. We should not be too quick to oblige them.

If we blame every terrorist attack on Al Qaeda, if we universalize what are often local animosities and assign every explosive charge and petrol bomb to America's particular enemies, we shall miss our target. Conversely, repressive regimes of every shade are today quick to identify with an international war on terror, hoping to get American support for local conflicts. Washington welcomes such recruits to its cause. But these allies of convenience are fueling widespread suspicion that the war on terror is being used as a new cover for old repression.

The difficulty in distinguishing among terrorists show how hard a war this is going to be. There are no historical precedents, no flattering parallels with Churchill or J. F. K. that can be readily appropriated now. We have to figure this one out for ourselves, and it is the very nature of the terrorist threat -- sub-state, small-scale, informal, international -- that makes it impossible for the United States to face it alone.

The Bush administration cannot combat terrorism without the cooperation and collaboration of the rest of the world. For this reason if no other it needs to start taking into account the fears and opinions of other

nations. Yet its strategy toward recalcitrant allies resembles Lyndon Johnson's way of managing unruly members of Congress: "If you've got them by the balls, their hearts and minds will follow."

But our international allies are not members of Congress, and their hearts and minds are decidedly elsewhere. The administration is now more distrusted abroad than any American government in the past half-century. By his words and his insistence on a unilateral approach toward Iraq, President Bush has squandered much of the post-Sept. 11 good will that is crucial for an effective global campaign against terrorism.

But all is not yet lost. In the eyes of America's European allies, who still yearn for American leadership and thus prefer to give Washington the benefit of the doubt, President Bush's curious obsession with Iraq illustrates not so much renascent American imperialism as Washington's chronic attention deficit disorder. An American-led war on terrorism, intelligently conceived and relentlessly pursued as part of a strategy of multilateral engagement, would have strong, widespread backing. That is because, though the causes of terrorism are many and varied, we are all potential victims. What happened in Bali could happen in many other places, and it surely will.

-----

Tony Judt is director of the Remarque Institute at New York University.

[www.nytimes.com/2002/10/20/opinion/20.JUDT.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/20/opinion/20.JUDT.html)

-----  
Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 05:56:09 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: LA TIMES POLL: Young Priests Hold Old Values (T Watanabe, LATimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210210554530.28424-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

-----  
Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times  
-----

[www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-me-priest21oct21.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-me-priest21oct21.story)

October 21 2002

THE TIMES POLL

Young Priests Hold Old Values

Their views often are at odds with liberal reform of Vatican II in the 1960s.

By Teresa Watanabe  
Times Staff Writer

Second of two parts

Younger Roman Catholic priests in the United States are markedly more conservative than their elders, a Los Angeles Times poll has found, reflecting a global trend toward Christian orthodoxy that is reshaping the world's largest church.

Clerics under age 41 expressed more allegiance to the clerical hierarchy, less dissent against traditional church teachings, and more certainty about the sinfulness of homosexuality, abortion, artificial birth control and other moral issues than did their elders, the poll found.

Those attitudes place the younger priests at odds with many priests who were shaped by the liberal reforms of the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s and who tend to support further changes in the church -- including women priests, optional celibacy, more lay empowerment and the direct election of bishops.

The poll found that overall, 30% of priests described themselves as liberal on religious and moral issues, while 28% described themselves as conservative and 37% as moderate. Among younger priests, however, nearly four in 10 described themselves as conservative, and three-fourths said they were more religiously orthodox than their older counterparts.

The shift to orthodoxy has been actively promoted by Pope John Paul II during his 24-year pontificate. In addition to their predominance among the younger generation of American priests, orthodox views are in the ascendancy worldwide as Catholicism's center of gravity shifts from liberal Europe and North America to the more conservative regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America, according to scholars of the church.

As the influence of those regions grows in the American church -- in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, for example, Latinos and Asians already constitute more than 80% of the faithful -- disagreements over the U.S. institution's future are certain to deepen, many experts say.

"The church has developed a fissure whose size most people do not fully appreciate," said Philip Jenkins, a Pennsylvania State University professor and author of "The Next Christendom."

The Times Poll surveyed a nationwide sample of 1,854 priests in 80 U.S. dioceses. The survey is the most extensive independent nationwide poll of Catholic priests since a similar Times poll conducted in 1993 and

1994. The margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points.

The poll paints a portrait of a gradually diversifying and aging priesthood. Eighty-eight percent of priests are non-Latino whites -- a figure that is down a few percentage points from the last Times poll but remains higher than the white percentage among lay Catholics. Younger priests are also considerably more likely to identify themselves as gay than are those who were ordained in earlier decades.

As the number of new priests graduating from seminaries fails to keep pace with the number reaching retirement age, the average age of a Catholic priest has risen to nearly 61; in the 1994 survey it was 54.

### Great Expectations

The survey shows the vast majority of priests to be happy with their vocations, but the shortage of priests causes many to struggle with burnout. Some talk of feeling caught between what one poll respondent referred to as "a bishop who expects everything and a people who expect everything."

Throughout the poll, the clearest divide was the one between the younger and older generation.

That gap is reflected in men like Father Vincent Inghilterra, a 60-year-old Army chaplain based in the Diocese of Trenton, N.J., and Father Matthew O'Donnell, a 39-year-old pastor from San Andreas, which is east of Stockton.

Inghilterra came of age during Vatican II. The Second Vatican Council was launched by Pope John XXIII in 1962 as a way to "bring the church up to date." The council launched a revolutionary effort to bring the church closer to the people by emphasizing a greater role for the laity, declaring the primacy of individual conscience and abandoning centuries of traditional practices, such as Latin Masses. Particularly in the United States, the reform ideas associated with Vatican II strongly influenced a generation of priests.

Influenced by such dissident theologians as Hans Kung and Charles Curran, who were both subsequently investigated by John Paul II's more orthodox Vatican, Inghilterra said he was encouraged to open all subjects to examination and to think for himself.

### A Careful Approach

"I was taught to be very respectful of the conscience of people and not denounce everything as a sin," he said. "The Catholic people will do what they feel is right in their hearts -- with or without the blessing of the local priest."

O'Donnell was raised in West Covina with such traditional Catholic practices as nightly family rosaries and frequent attendance at daily Mass. But he said that he, like many younger Catholics, longed for stability and certainty amid a climate of moral relativism, sexual permissiveness, social degeneration and a sense that the experiments of

Vatican II had created more confusion than success.

In his seven years as a priest, O'Donnell said, he has gently but firmly laid down church teachings -- telling one couple who had wed in a civil ceremony, for instance, that they could not receive Communion unless they married within the church.

"The beauty and liberty comes in accepting church teachings, not making your own theology," O'Donnell said.

Many younger priests, like O'Donnell, see themselves as carrying out the mission of the pope. Indeed, the poll found that younger priests who came of age after Vatican II and during John Paul's papacy were the most positive toward him, with 79% ranking him outstanding. That compared with 60% of Vatican II-generation priests, and 64% of pre-Vatican II priests 60 years of age and older.

Three-fourths of younger priests ranked the pope's moral views as "about right," compared with 60% of Vatican II-era priests and 61% of pre-Vatican II clerics. About one-third of the older two groups found John Paul's views "too conservative."

To priests such as O'Donnell, the pope represents "a guiding light and a strength." Amid social and religious confusion, he said, "Pope John Paul II speaks with certainty, love and compassion. This is what young people need."

In addition to their admiration for the pope, the younger priests surveyed were more upbeat about the church in general, with 69% ranking conditions "excellent" or "good" compared with 56% among priests of the Vatican II generation, defined by Catholic officials as those ages 42 to 59.

#### 'Empower the Laity'

The younger priests were more apt to believe that no reform is needed in the church, compared with priests of the Vatican II generation, who most frequently chose "democratization" and "empower the laity" from a list of possible reforms.

Younger priests were also far more likely to fully embrace traditional church teachings -- and expect the same from their fellow Catholics.

While 72% of Vatican II priests said Roman Catholics could disagree with some church teachings and remain faithful, only 48% of younger priests agreed with that proposition. The younger priests were the most likely to regard as "always a sin" such acts as premarital sex, abortion, artificial birth control, cloning, using fetal stem cells for research, gay sex, masturbation and wearing condoms as protection against AIDS.

About two-thirds of younger priests opposed the ordination of women as deacons or priests, although a narrow majority favored ordination of married men as priests in the Latin, or Western, rite.

By contrast, among the older priests, large majorities favored women

deacons and ordination of married men as priests; among the Vatican II-era priests, 51% also supported the ordination of women as priests.

### Shortage of Priests

The differences between liberal and conservative priests color views on everything from the cause of sex scandals that have rocked the church to the solution for shortages of priests -- a problem named as the church's most pressing issue by the largest number of respondents across the ideological spectrum.

Liberals argue that the church must open the priesthood to women and married men. But many conservatives assert that the dioceses and religious orders headed by orthodox leaders are brimming with people eager to devote themselves to the religious life.

An example frequently cited by conservatives is the Diocese of Lincoln, Neb., home to 90,000 Catholics.

According to Msgr. Timothy J. Thorburn, the diocesan vicar-general, the number of candidates for the priesthood or religious orders is growing at both seminaries in the area, and within three orders of nuns -- including a new Carmelite monastery of cloistered women established last December.

One of the seminaries, Thorburn said, recently had to expand its quarters to accommodate the surge of young men -- more than 60 -- attracted to the Latin liturgies and other traditional practices of the Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter.

Thorburn called the priest shortage "a short-term problem" that would be solved in a few decades by the return to orthodoxy. "Young people with ideals are not looking for the easy path," he said. "A 'Catholic lite' is not attractive to them."

Some critics fear that younger, conservative clerics will alienate a more liberal Catholic lay population. But conservatives argue that orthodoxy is growing among the laity as well.

According to Father Joseph Fessio, editor of the conservative Ignatius Press in San Francisco, about 20 new Catholic magazines have been launched in the last two decades -- all of them orthodox.

Conservative Catholics, he added, have started a host of new organizations, such as St. Joseph Communications, which holds an annual family conference in Long Beach that has grown from 300 participants when it began a decade or so ago to 7,000 today. In addition, he and others assert that younger families are having more children and increasingly choosing to home-school them.

As the Catholic population continues to change complexion, with increasing numbers of the faithful coming from immigrant communities, Jenkins and other experts say, ideological conflict between younger traditionalists and an older generation of reformers is bound to increase.



In Southern California, for instance, conflict frequently occurs over the role of the laity, said Father Thomas Rausch of Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles. Discomfort "comes out all the time" from younger priests over the issue of treating lay pastoral associates as equal, professional partners, he said.

"It's very important that these younger Catholics not become so enamored with tradition that they lose sight of the need for greater inclusion of the laity or a more collective style of decision making," Rausch said. "Laypeople are claiming their ministry and won't have it taken away from them by some conservative cleric."

In a recent essay in the national Catholic magazine America, however, Rausch wrote that he had also become more sympathetic to some of the concerns of the younger, more conservative theologians.

"After all the confusion and 'Cafeteria Catholicism' in the post-Vatican II climate," he said, referring to the practice of selective adherence to church teachings, "there is a real desire for a greater sense of Catholic identity, more Jesus-centered piety and a rediscovery of the purity of the tradition."

He called on the church and its theologians to bridge the growing divide.

To many Catholics, however, diverse opinion is as old as the church itself.

"We've never been a community that thought the same way," Inghilterra said. "We're richer for the diversity."

[www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-me-priest21oct21.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-me-priest21oct21.story)

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 06:45:00 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Three Years of LA Times Polls (LATimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210210607510.28424-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

www.latimes.com/tools/more.jsp?section=%2Fnews%2Fcustom%2Ftimespoll

Monday, October 21, 2002

TIMES POLLS (Jan. 18, 2000 - Oct. 21, 2002)

Monday, October 21, 2002

---

THE TIMES POLL

Young Priests Hold Old Values

Their views often are at odds with liberal reform of Vatican II in 1960s.

TIMES POLL

Poll Analysis: Priests Satisfied With Their Lives

There is a serious shortage of men entering the priesthood. The newly ordained are more conservative than their older counterparts.

Sunday, October 20, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

Most Priests Say Bishops Mishandled Abuse Issue

Many believe that the U.S. church's charter, though protective of children, is unfair to clerics, and many are angry at prelates.

TIMES POLL

Poll Analysis: Priests Say Catholic Church Facing Biggest Crisis of the Century

But most are satisfied with the way their lives are going.

15% Identify as Gay or 'on Homosexual Side'

The subject of gays in the priesthood has been hotly debated throughout the sexual abuse scandal that has rocked the Catholic Church in the U.S.

How the National Survey Was Taken

Response rate among the 5,000 priests who were mailed the questionnaire was 37%, considered statistically representative.

Friday, October 18, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

LOS ANGELES

Survey Finds Support for School Bond

Measure K, which would provide \$3.3billion to build and renovate L.A. Unified campuses, is backed by 64% in Times poll.

Wednesday, October 16, 2002

---

THE TIMES POLL

Secession Trails in the Valley for First Time

Across the city, the breakaway movements, including the one in Hollywood, are overwhelmingly opposed by voters.

TIMES POLL

Hahn's Approval Rating Is Up

Picking Bratton as the new police chief helps boost mayor's support, a Times poll finds.

TIMES POLL

Poll Analysis: Secession Fever Waning

Mayor Hahn's job approval rises; majority approve of Bratton for LAPD chief.

Excerpts from the polling data: L.A. Secession (PDF)

Tuesday, October 1, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

Davis Builds Big Lead in Race

Governor outpaces rival Simon 45% to 35% among likely voters. Many consider him the better of two unsatisfying choices.

Friday, September 27, 2002

---

Frustrated U.S. Muslims Feel Marginalized Again

A year after the Sept. 11 attacks, American Muslim leaders increasingly fear their community is being pushed to the margins of the American political system.

Monday, September 2, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

Public Still Backs Military Move on Iraq

Foreign affairs: But that majority support by Americans will hold only if the U.S. first gets the support of resistant allies, survey finds.

Sunday, September 1, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

Public's Mood on Priorities Changes

Politics: The war on terror is losing ground to economic woes, which could benefit Democrats in congressional races. Bush's ratings remain generally strong.

Monday, July 8, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

Schools Still an Issue in City Votes

Secession: Poll shows many are unaware ballot measures won't affect L.A. Unified, and both sides may benefit from that confusion.

Sunday, July 7, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

All Told, Angelenos Content

Despite traffic, crime and scandal, most say things are going well in the city. Ratio is twice what it was at times in the mid-'90s.

Friday, July 5, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

Mayor Rebuilds Black Support

Los Angeles Mayor James K. Hahn has begun to regain the support among African Americans that he lost after he opposed a second term for former Police Chief Bernard C. Parks, but overall approval of his job performance remains middling, a Los Angeles Times poll shows.

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

East Doesn't Meet West on Valley Split

Secession: Attitudes follow geographic lines. Approval runs deepest among area's old guard.

Tuesday, July 2, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

Voters Oppose Breaking Up Los Angeles

Times poll: The margin is wide on Hollywood secession. Independence is popular in the Valley, but not enough to carry the citywide vote.

#### THE SECESSION QUESTION

Hollywood Not Ready to Split

Times poll: About 60% of voters in the area don't want to break from L.A., saying they are generally pleased with city services.

Monday, April 29, 2002

---

#### TIMES POLL

A Decade Later, Residents More Upbeat

One in a series about the 1992 riots

Wednesday, April 24, 2002

---

#### TIMES POLL

Residents Back City's Ousting of Parks

Survey: Half agree with the decision while 34% do not. Battle between the chief and mayor does not damage either's approval rating.

Friday, March 15, 2002

---

#### TIMES POLL

Support for a Valley City Is Growing

A majority of San Fernando Valley voters believes the region should secede from Los Angeles, as does nearly half the electorate citywide, a new Los Angeles Times poll shows.

Thursday, March 14, 2002

---

#### TIMES POLL

Hahn's Rating Slips Over Bid to Oust Parks

Times Poll: The mayor's standing drops among city residents, especially blacks. Approval of the police chief is up.

Friday, March 8, 2002

---

Exit Poll Voter Demographics: More GOP Gov. & Down-ballot Races (PDF)

Thursday, March 7, 2002

---

Exit Poll Voter Demographics: GOP Gubernatorial Primary (PDF)

Exit Poll Voter Demographics: Props 40 & 45 (PDF)

Wednesday, March 6, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

RACE FOR GOVERNOR

Simon Trounces Riordan, Storms to GOP Nomination

Primary: The political newcomer badly trailed former L.A. mayor until recently. He'll take on Gov. Davis in November.

Graphic: What Voters Liked (PDF)

Tuesday, February 26, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

Riordan, Simon Tied in Volatile GOP Primary

Poll: Ex-mayor's big lead vanishes in barrage of negative ads by Gov. Davis. Low turnout could favor Simon, the clear choice of conservatives.

Tuesday, February 5, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

Don't Tap Into Social Security

Nation: Four-fifths favor tax cut deferment over using the fund's revenue to pay for other programs.

Tuesday, January 29, 2002

---

TIMES POLL

Davis and Foe Close in Poll

Richard Riordan is neck and neck in a matchup with governor, a Times survey finds. Incumbent's image has taken a beating from energy crisis, economy.

Friday, December 21, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Poll Analysis: Psychological Effects of Sept. 11

Americans are coming to grips with the events of Sept. 11 and their aftermath.

TIMES POLL

Poll Analysis: Concern Growing Over Loss of Civil Liberties

Americans split over ethnic profiling but support broader powers to monitor phone and Internet communications.

Friday, November 16, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

More See a Nation in Recession, but Most Feel Financially Secure  
More Americans have grown pessimistic about the U.S. economy since the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, but most express confidence in their own finances and in the nation's long-term economic health, according to a Los Angeles Times Poll.

Thursday, November 15, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Americans Unified in Support for Bush, War

Two months into the war against terrorism, Americans continue to display a level of unity, optimism and confidence in the nation's leadership rarely seen in the last 40 years, a Times Poll has found.

Sunday, September 16, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

U.S. Keen to Avenge Attacks

Americans say way of life has changed forever. To fight terrorism, many would pay higher taxes, sacrifice some freedoms.

Saturday, June 30, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

California: Davis Favored Despite Energy Woes and Riordan

Despite widespread unhappiness about the state's electricity crisis, California voters still favor Gov. Davis over three potential GOP rivals, according to a Los Angeles Times poll.

Thursday, June 28, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Power Shortage Not Real, Most Californians Say

The energy market was manipulated to boost sellers' profits, 86% say. Davis gets low marks but Bush fares even worse.

Thursday, June 7, 2001

---

Exit Poll Voter Demographics: L.A. Mayoral Runoff Election

Wednesday, June 6, 2001

---

TIMES EXIT POLL

L.A. Takes a Turn to the Left With Democrat in Charge

Los Angeles: After eight years of Republican mayoral leadership, voters hand Hahn a mandate to chart a more liberal course.

Excerpts from the exit poll questionnaire: L.A. Mayoral Runoff Election

Tuesday, May 29, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Hahn Overtakes Villaraigosa in Race for Mayor

Los Angeles: The city attorney runs strongly among moderates and conservatives and is favored in the vote-rich Valley and South L.A.

TIMES POLL

Feuer Has Lead Over Delgadillo in City Attorney's Race

Los Angeles: Almost one-third of voters are undecided, but the councilman holds a 40%-31% edge.

Monday, April 30, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Bush Criticized as Fear for Environment Grows

Nation: Majority say pollution is worsening, and fighting it is more important than creating jobs.

Sunday, April 29, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Bush Rates Fairly Well, Except on Environment

Presidency: At 100-day mark, he gets a 57% approval rating nationwide. That's comparable to evaluations of his father and predecessor Clinton. But the economy could take a toll.

Thursday, April 12, 2001

---

Excerpts from the exit poll questionnaire: L.A. Mayoral Primary Election

Exit Poll Voter Demographics: Mayor

Exit Poll Voter Demographics: City Atty. & Controller

Wednesday, April 11, 2001

---

TIMES EXIT POLL

New Coalitions Forged in an Upbeat L.A.

Los Angeles Election: Antonio Villaraigosa and James K. Hahn faced a difficult task of trying to cobble together a majority at a time when the electorate has shifted dramatically.

Tuesday, April 3, 2001



---

TIMES POLL

Hahn Leads but Soboroff, Villaraigosa Narrow Gap  
Los Angeles: The three candidates have pulled ahead of the rest of the pack running for mayor. Narrow margins between the three leaders promise a close election.

TIMES POLL

Feuer Leads in Contentious Race for L.A. City Attorney  
Times poll finds 20% of likely voters back the councilman, with Delgadillo and D'Agostino not far behind. Councilwoman Chick leads opponents for city controller.

Sunday, March 11, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Latinos Recover Optimism Lost in '90s  
Los Angeles: More than 40% say the quality of life in L.A. has improved in the last five years. However, a majority gave the city's race relations poor marks.

Thursday, March 8, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Public Supports Bush, Is Divided on His Tax Cut Plan  
Nation: Majorities back the president on such issues as defense and education, and most like him personally. But 55% prefer how the Democrats would use the surplus.

Monday, March 5, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Many in L.A. Feel Upbeat; Most Still Oppose Secession  
Los Angeles: Ratings of Riordan and Parks fall significantly after controversial 12 months. Crime is a top concern.

Sunday, March 4, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Hahn Takes Solid Lead in Race to Be Next L.A. Mayor  
Los Angeles: The city attorney secures his base with blacks and runs strongly elsewhere. The other five major candidates are fighting to get Angelenos' attention.

Sunday, February 18, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Residents Favor Building More Power Plants

Californians also want environmental protections. Davis gets high marks for handling the crisis, but respondents are displeased with others, including Bush.

Sunday, January 7, 2001

---

TIMES POLL

Most Californians Think Electricity Crunch Is Artificial

They see shortage as greed-driven, and a majority back re-regulation of the power industry. Davis, PUC and private utilities get poor marks in the crisis.

Thursday, October 26, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Few Aware of Proposal for Drug Treatment

With election day less than two weeks away, most likely voters in California have never heard of Proposition 36, which would treat nonviolent drug offenders rather than imprison them, or are undecided about the measure, a Los Angeles Times poll shows.

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Gore Maintains Solid Lead Among California Voters

Although the survey finds Bush more likable, the vice president gets the nod on most other characteristics and issues for an overall 7-point advantage.

Wednesday, September 27, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Men's Backing Helps Power Bush Past Gore

Nation: Survey shows the GOP nominee is ahead, 48% to 42%. Women prefer the vice president by 7 points, but the Texas governor has a 22-point lead among males.

Tuesday, August 15, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Gore Still Lags on Leadership Issue

Nation: Despite growing public optimism about the nation's direction, Al Gore heads toward the Democratic National Convention burdened by voter doubts about his leadership.

Monday, August 7, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Genome Map Success: Much Yet to Discover

Nation: More than six in 10 oppose the right of private companies to patent human genes.

Monday, July 31, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Bush Holds Slim Lead as Nomination Is at Hand

Nation: Voters favor the Texas governor, 44% to 39%, over Gore, due to strong Republican backing and an edge among independents. Tight race will remain so through the fall, findings indicate.

Sunday, June 18, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Americans Narrowing Support for Abortion

Nation: Results reveal a conflicted stance--they think it's murder yet lean toward leaving the choice to women. Still, support increases for limiting the procedure's availability.

TIMES POLL

Public More Accepting of Gays, Poll Finds

Nation: Just 34% support allowing gay men and lesbians to marry, compared to 58% who oppose it.

Friday, June 16, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Bush Leads, but Abortion Issue Could Mean Trouble

Nation: George W. Bush has solidified his lead in the presidential race but could face turbulence in his political base if he selects a vice presidential nominee who supports abortion rights.

Wednesday, May 10, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Bush Leading Gore as Democratic Base Falters

Nation: Texas governor is rebuilding pre-1992 GOP coalition. Vice president is particularly weak among married voters.

Tuesday, May 9, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Most Optimistic Despite Swings in Stock Market

Nation: Many Americans foresee a greater shake-up, but they don't plan

to curb their investments or spending.

Thursday, April 13, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Few Minds Are Made Up for 2001 Mayoral Election

Los Angeles: Voters haven't yet focused much on the race, but James K. Hahn, Joel Wachs are early leaders.

Tuesday, April 11, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

L.A. Unified Gets Dismal Ratings From Public

Los Angeles: Though most residents believe change is possible, majority also back breakup of district. School quality is ranked as No. 1 issue.

Monday, April 10, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Garcetti Trailing Badly in Race for 3rd Term

Los Angeles: Apparently venting anger over Rampart on the D.A., voters give Steve Cooley a big early edge.

Sunday, April 9, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Rampart Revelations Upset City Residents, Undercut Confidence

LAPD: The ongoing police scandal is sowing doubts about L.A.'s direction despite a strong economy. A majority backs creating an independent panel to investigate.

Monday, April 3, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Retirees Reinvent the Concept

Nation: Times poll finds that many seniors, feeling ever healthier and younger, want to continue to work.

Sunday, April 2, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Few Plan for the Hard Realities of Infirm Parents' Care

Nation: Most families haven't even discussed the issue, Times poll finds. Limited availability of aid can be a shock.

Thursday, March 9, 2000

---

TIMES EXIT POLL

California Election Issues Brought Out Conservatives

California Primary: Convinced 2 to 1 that California is on the right track, most voters cast their lot with the status quo.

Exit Poll Voter Demographics: California Primary (President, U.S. Senate, Props.)

Wednesday, March 8, 2000

---

TIMES EXIT POLL

Amid All the Good News, Some Ominous Signs for Bush

California Primary: Overwhelming support from core Republicans and conservatives allowed George W. Bush to push John McCain toward the edge of elimination Tuesday night in the GOP presidential race.

Friday, March 3, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Feinstein Has Big Lead Over GOP Foes

California: Likely voters also strongly back initiatives allowing gaming on Indian lands and barring same-sex marriage.

Wednesday, March 1, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Big Leads for Bush, Gore in Calif. Primary

Al Gore and George W. Bush have established commanding leads to win the delegates at stake in next week's California presidential primaries.

Monday, February 14, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

McCain, Bush Tied in Pivotal S.C. Race

South Carolina: As Saturday contest nears, conservatives back Texas governor, but the state's moderates, independents and Democrats lean toward senator from Arizona.

Thursday, February 3, 2000

---

Exit Poll Voter Demographics: N.H. Presidential Primary

Wednesday, February 2, 2000

---

TIMES EXIT POLL

Satisfied Voters Are No Guarantee for Favorites

New Hampshire Primary: Contentment among voters doesn't translate into support for front-runners, Times exit poll shows.

Sunday, January 23, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Gore Takes Lead in N.H.; McCain and Bush Tied

New Hampshire: Vice president consolidates his hold on traditional Democrats and cuts into Bradley's support. Iowa caucuses could influence GOP primary here.

Tuesday, January 18, 2000

---

TIMES POLL

Bush, Gore Hold Edge as Iowa Caucuses Near  
Politics: A week before inaugural presidential contest, support seems solid for the front-runners of each party.

[www.latimes.com/tools/more.jsp?section=%2Fnews%2Fcustom%2Ftimespoll](http://www.latimes.com/tools/more.jsp?section=%2Fnews%2Fcustom%2Ftimespoll)

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 12:55:07 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
X-X-Sender: pmeyer@login8.isis.unc.edu  
To: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: The Dillman dollar and emotional distress  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0210211241350.28530-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Has anyone who deals with human subjects review boards had a situation like this?

I have several mail surveys in the field, using a full Dillman method, with a dollar incentive. Some respondents send the dollar back and a few of these say they were offended by it. (I respond with a thank-you and assurance that I am not offended to get it back.)

One respondent in the offended group copied his letter to me to

the human subjects review chair, who has decided that the emotional distress caused by the Dillman dollar is a potential protection-of-human-subjects issue. We are now asked to keep copies of all letters from persons who find the dollar offensive and write a report.

Has it happened to you, or am I on the cutting edge here? I'd like to know how it plays out. Heck, maybe it's routine and I just now noticed.

=====  
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer  
=====

=====  
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 13:01:51 -0400  
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
To: "'pmeyer@email.unc.edu'" <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>,  
"Aapornet@Usc. Edu"  
Subject: RE: The Dillman dollar and emotional distress  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2656.59)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
=====

In my limited experience it's highly unusual. I have had one telephone respondent refuse the cash incentive, stating that the topic was important and he didn't want to take money away from the research effort.

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

From: Philip Meyer [mailto:pmeyer@email.unc.edu]  
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2002 12:55 PM  
To: Aapornet@Usc. Edu  
Subject: The Dillman dollar and emotional distress

Has anyone who deals with human subjects review boards had a situation like this?

I have several mail surveys in the field, using a full Dillman method, with a dollar incentive. Some respondents send the dollar back and a few of these say they were offended by it. (I respond with a thank-you and assurance that I am not offended to get it back.)

One respondent in the offended group copied his letter to me to the human subjects review chair, who has decided that the emotional distress caused by the Dillman dollar is a potential protection-of-human-subjects issue. We are now asked to keep copies of all letters from persons who find the dollar offensive and write a report.

Has it happened to you, or am I on the cutting edge here? I'd like to

know how it plays out. Heck, maybe it's routine and I just now noticed.

```
=====
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085    Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425    URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
=====
```

```
=====
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 10:04:46 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>
Subject: Harvard College Enrolls Fewer Blacks (KL Rakoczy, HarvCrim)
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210211003550.1920-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from QUOTED-PRINTABLE to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id
g9LH4wJ13903
=====
```

-----  
Copyright © 2002, The Harvard Crimson Inc.  
-----

[www.thecrimson.com/printerfriendly.aspx?ref=254723](http://www.thecrimson.com/printerfriendly.aspx?ref=254723)

Originally published on Monday, October 21, 2002

College Enrolls Fewer Blacks

By KATE L. RAKOCZY

CRIMSON STAFF WRITER

For the first time in 20 years, Harvard failed to lead the nation in the percentage of black students who accepted its admissions offers, according to a study published in the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education.

Stanford University surpassed Harvard in black student yield, with 64.4 percent of black candidates accepting admissions offers compared to Harvard's 61.2 percent.

The percentage of black first-year students at the College dropped 4.3 percent for the Class of 2006 compared to the previous class. This year, there are 112 black first-year students, while there were 118



black students in the Class of 2005.

Students and administrators attributed the trend to increased competition for black candidates as other elite schools improve their minority recruitment and offer more diverse student bodies.

And while media reports have suggested last year's clash between University President Lawrence H. Summers and former University Professor Cornel R. West '74 led many prospective black students to go elsewhere, those at Harvard said there is little evidence to support that claim.

Alonzo Sherman '03, who is one of two African-American coordinators for the Undergraduate Minority Recruitment Program and president of the Black Men's Forum, said he spoke with a large number of pre-frosh last spring. The Summers-West conflict was only one of many topics over which those students expressed concern, Sherman said.

"Many students asked about Cornel West, but they asked about a host of other things as well," Sherman said. "It would be unfair and inaccurate to look at it as being strongly connected to the decline in black student yield."

Director of Admissions Marlyn McGrath Lewis '70-'73 said she shared a similar view.

"I have been very reluctant to attribute this somewhat disappointing yield to any one phenomenon," McGrath Lewis said.

"Students have range of interests, and I find it a little condescending to assume one factor by itself could contribute to their decision to not come to Harvard."

McGrath Lewis said she believes this year's drop in black student yield is part of a larger trend of declining black student enrollment at the College over the past 10 years. While 9 percent of first-year students were black in 1993, black students comprise only 6.8 percent of the Class of 2006.

And while the percentage of black students accepting admissions offers from Harvard reached a peak of roughly 74 percent in the mid-1990s, McGrath Lewis said black student yields have been declining fairly steadily ever since.

McGrath Lewis said she attributes this trend to greater competition from Harvard's peers in the recruitment of minority students.

"There's no question this has been an increasingly competed-for group of students," she said. "There's been increased competition and good competition from other colleges, and I'm convinced that's the reason behind most of the effect."

The increased diversity at other schools also makes them more attractive to black students, she said. "I think they're being heavily recruited by a lot of colleges and figuring out--quite accurately--that there may be several comfortable places where they could enroll," McGrath Lewis continued.

McGrath Lewis warned against reading too much into year-to-year fluctuations because the small number of black students at the College makes the group's admissions yield statistics extremely variable.

"A migration of five or 10 people has a relatively dramatic effect," McGrath Lewis said.

Sherman agreed with that interpretation.

"The statistics can be misleading," he said. "If a few students decided to come to Harvard instead of Stanford, Princeton or Yale the black student yield would be up."

-----

Staff writer Kate L. Rakoczy can be reached at rakoczy@fas.harvard.edu.

[www.thecrimson.com/printerfriendly.aspx?ref=254723](http://www.thecrimson.com/printerfriendly.aspx?ref=254723)

-----  
Copyright © 2002, The Harvard Crimson Inc.  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 13:09:17 -0400  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>  
To: "'pmeyer@email.unc.edu'" <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>,  
"Aapornet@Usc. Edu"  
Subject: RE: The Dillman dollar and emotional distress  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Phil,

As you may know, NMR sends non-contingent monetary incentives as part of our mail surveying for the television diary research we conduct. Proportionally, very, very few of the HHs return their money. Of all the HHs that do return the money sent them (the incentive varies from \$1-\$5 depending on several factors), the vast majority comes back from nonresponders without any comments. A smaller proportion of returned-money comes from responding households who return their money with a "positive" comment, (e.g., thanks, but I did it because I wanted to do it, not for the money), and a much smaller proportion of the returned money comes from nonresponders who have something negative to say. We send written apologies whenever it's appropriate.

Your IRB sounds like a typical "tail wagging the dog" situation...

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

From: Philip Meyer [mailto:pmeyer@email.unc.edu]  
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2002 12:55 PM  
To: Aapornet@Usc. Edu  
Subject: The Dillman dollar and emotional distress

Has anyone who deals with human subjects review boards had a situation like this?

I have several mail surveys in the field, using a full Dillman method, with a dollar incentive. Some respondents send the dollar back and a few of these say they were offended by it. (I respond with a thank-you and assurance that I am not offended to get it back.)

One respondent in the offended group copied his letter to me to the human subjects review chair, who has decided that the emotional distress caused by the Dillman dollar is a potential protection-of-human-subjects issue. We are now asked to keep copies of all letters from persons who find the dollar offensive and write a report.

Has it happened to you, or am I on the cutting edge here? I'd like to know how it plays out. Heck, maybe it's routine and I just now noticed.

=====  
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer  
=====

=====  
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 13:27:20 -0400  
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>  
Subject: Re: Harvard College Enrolls Fewer Blacks (KL Rakoczy, HarvCrim)  
To: beniger@almaak.usc.edu  
Cc: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <3DB438F7.CDA84747@rider.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.78 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win98; U)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
X-Accept-Language: en  
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0210211003550.1920-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from QUOTED-PRINTABLE to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g9LHRqJ18002

In connection with discussions of recruitment, did anyone see the 60 Minutes program last night regarding the percentage of males vs. females enrolling in colleges? Basically, the program dealt with an issue that has

become prominent in recent months (I saw a Newsweek or Time article about it)-- namely, that the percentage of females exceeds that of males enrolled in college, and that the gap is increasing. There are similar demographic trends in the professional schools in medicine and law (I don't think Ph.D programs show the same pattern, but I might be wrong). Anyway, a number of "experts" were interviewed regarding the reasons for this trend, including a researcher at the American Enterprise Institute who had written a book called "The War on Boys" and claimed that feminism, preferential treatment by female teachers, and such organizations as the AAUW were responsible for turning males away from a college track.

Does anyone have any hard data on these trends and the reasons why this gap is appearing? It's been known for some time that such a gap existed among African-Americans, but it has only recently been discussed generally about all ethnic and racial groups. This is not an urgent request, but as an interested party in the academy, I'm just wondering what has been happening to create this pattern. (By the way, my institutions is approximately 60% female also).

Frank Rusciano

James Beniger wrote:

>

-----  
> Copyright © 2002, The Harvard Crimson Inc.  
>

-----  
> [www.thecrimson.com/printerfriendly.aspx?ref=254723](http://www.thecrimson.com/printerfriendly.aspx?ref=254723)  
>

> Originally published on Monday, October 21, 2002  
>

> College Enrolls Fewer Blacks  
>

> By KATE L. RAKOCZY  
>

> CRIMSON STAFF WRITER  
>

> For the first time in 20 years, Harvard failed to lead the nation in  
> the percentage of black students who accepted its admissions offers,  
> according to a study published in the Journal of Blacks in Higher  
> Education.

> Stanford University surpassed Harvard in black student yield, with 64.4  
> percent of black candidates accepting admissions offers compared to  
> Harvard's 61.2 percent.

> The percentage of black first-year students at the College dropped 4.3  
> percent for the Class of 2006 compared to the previous class. This  
> year, there are 112 black first-year students, while there were 118  
> black students in the Class of 2005.

> Students and administrators attributed the trend to increased  
> competition for black candidates as other elite schools improve their  
> minority recruitment and offer more diverse student bodies.

> And while media reports have suggested last year's clash between

> University President Lawrence H. Summers and former University  
> Professor Cornel R. West '74 led many prospective black students to go  
> elsewhere, those at Harvard said there is little evidence to support  
> that claim.  
>  
> Alonzo Sherman '03, who is one of two African-American coordinators for  
> the Undergraduate Minority Recruitment Program and president of the  
> Black Men's Forum, said he spoke with a large number of pre-frosh last  
> spring. The Summers-West conflict was only one of many topics over  
> which those students expressed concern, Sherman said.  
>  
> "Many students asked about Cornel West, but they asked about a host of  
> other things as well," Sherman said. "It would be unfair and inaccurate  
> to look at it as being strongly connected to the decline in black  
> student yield."  
>  
> Director of Admissions Marlyn McGrath Lewis '70-'73 said she shared a  
> similar view.  
>  
> "I have been very reluctant to attribute this somewhat disappointing  
> yield to any one phenomenon," McGrath Lewis said.  
>  
> "Students have range of interests, and I find it a little condescending  
> to assume one factor by itself could contribute to their decision to  
> not come to Harvard."  
>  
> McGrath Lewis said she believes this year's drop in black student yield  
> is part of a larger trend of declining black student enrollment at the  
> College over the past 10 years. While 9 percent of first-year students  
> were black in 1993, black students comprise only 6.8 percent of the  
> Class of 2006.  
>  
> And while the percentage of black students accepting admissions offers  
> from Harvard reached a peak of roughly 74 percent in the mid-1990s,  
> McGrath Lewis said black student yields have been declining fairly  
> steadily ever since.  
>  
> McGrath Lewis said she attributes this trend to greater competition  
> from Harvard's peers in the recruitment of minority students.  
>  
> "There's no question this has been an increasingly competed-for group  
> of students," she said. "There's been increased competition and good  
> competition from other colleges, and I'm convinced that's the reason  
> behind most of the effect."  
>  
> The increased diversity at other schools also makes them more  
> attractive to black students, she said. "I think they're being heavily  
> recruited by a lot of colleges and figuring out--quite accurately--that  
> there may be several comfortable places where they could enroll,"  
> McGrath Lewis continued.  
>  
> McGrath Lewis warned against reading too much into year-to-year  
> fluctuations because the small number of black students at the College  
> makes the group's admissions yield statistics extremely variable.  
>  
> "A migration of five or 10 people has a relatively dramatic effect,"  
> McGrath Lewis said.

>  
> Sherman agreed with that interpretation.  
>  
> "The statistics can be misleading," he said. "If a few students decided  
> to come to Harvard instead of Stanford, Princeton or Yale the black  
> student yield would be up."  
>  
> -----  
> Staff writer Kate L. Rakoczy can be reached at rakoczy@fas.harvard.edu.  
>  
> [www.thecrimson.com/printerfriendly.aspx?ref=254723](http://www.thecrimson.com/printerfriendly.aspx?ref=254723)  
>

---

> Copyright © 2002, The Harvard Crimson Inc.  
>

---

>  
> \*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 13:34:52 -0400  
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
To: "'beniger@almaak.usc.edu'" <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>,  
AAPORNET  
Subject: RE: Harvard College Enrolls Fewer Blacks (KL Rakoczy, HarvCrim)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2656.59)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

The discussion of the Summers/West incident and its impact on black interest in Harvard can be investigated, and hopefully terminated, with a look at the figures presented in the article.  
The percentage of black applicants accepting Harvard dropped from 65.5% to 61.2%.  $.612/.615=.995$   
The number of black freshmen last year was 118; this year it will be 112.  $118/.655=180$ , meaning that last year's freshman class had 180 acceptances sent to blacks.  $112/.612=183$ , meaning that Harvard sent out 3 more acceptances to black applicants this year. Assuming no change in rate of acceptance, that means that this year, after the incident, there was an increase in black applicants of just under 2%. Not significant, surely, but if there was less interest in attending Harvard, why would there be an increase in applicants?

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

From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@almaak.usc.edu]  
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2002 1:05 PM  
To: AAPORNET  
Subject: Harvard College Enrolls Fewer Blacks (KL Rakoczy, HarvCrim)

This message uses a character set that is not supported by the Internet Service. To view the original message content, open the attached message. If the text doesn't display correctly, save the attachment to disk, and then open it using a viewer that can display the original character set.

=====  
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 11:52:46 -0700  
From: "Jennifer Franz" <jdfranz@jdfranz.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: CATI  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0200\_01C278F8.5F857700"  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0200\_01C278F8.5F857700  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

We would like to chat with someone who is familiar with programming call sequences into ci3 WinCATI. If you are such a person, I would be grateful if you would reply to me off-network.

Thanks!

Jennifer D. Franz  
JD Franz Research, Inc.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0200\_01C278F8.5F857700  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0200\_01C278F8.5F857700--

=====  
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 14:25:55 -0500  
From: David\_Moore@gallup.com  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Minnesota Poll news  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

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

The results in the Minnesota Poll track what we have been finding in national polls - that people who are most concerned about the economy or a war with Iraq are more likely to be voting for Democrats, and those who are most concerned about terrorism are more likely to be voting for Republicans. (See <http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr021016.asp>.) Apparently, when voters say they are "concerned" about the war with Iraq, they mean that mostly in negative terms (the same dynamic happens when they say they are concerned about the economy) - and they vote for the "out" party. When people say they are concerned about "terrorism," they are reflecting a positive reaction to the Bush administration, and are more likely to vote for Republicans.

Does this mean that the specter of a war with Iraq has actually helped the Democrats, contrary to the conventional wisdom? That seems to be one interpretation...though the national news media suggest that Democrats are pleased that, with the passage of the congressional resolution supporting Bush's Iraq policy, the campaign focus can turn to domestic (economic) issues.

David

David W. Moore  
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll  
[david\\_moore@gallup.com](mailto:david_moore@gallup.com)

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

From: Rob Daves [<mailto:daves@startribune.com>]  
Sent: Saturday, October 19, 2002 1:36 PM  
To: [aeikensdp@aol.com](mailto:aeikensdp@aol.com); [Pixy412@aol.com](mailto:Pixy412@aol.com); [rmayland@aol.com](mailto:rmayland@aol.com); [sschier@carleton.edu](mailto:sschier@carleton.edu); [75227.173@compuserve.com](mailto:75227.173@compuserve.com); [reide@email.usps.gov](mailto:reide@email.usps.gov)  
Subject: Minnesota Poll news

Pollwatchers,

Many of you have expressed an interest in the Minnesota Poll or Minnesota politics. You can find the latest poll results dealing with the gubernatorial and U.S. Senate race at

<http://www.startribune.com/poll>

Of course, if this e-mail is an intrusion, please accept my apology and hit your delete button.

All best wishes...

Rob Daves, director  
The Minnesota Poll



=====  
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 22:16:52 -0400  
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: The Dillman dollar and emotional distress  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

We usually get about 5 back per 1,000 mailed. You can pretend you're JDR or The Rebbe and give them to children -- or just buy Starbucks.

The complaints are almost always, "Take me off your list!" and may or may not include the dollar. I can't remember anyone ever complaining to a third party. Sounds like you went out on university letterhead (not a total plus, we now see) and got someone who likes to write letters. Some people are very calculating in that regard, figuring they might get free products, a box of candy or a gift certificate as a pacifier.

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

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

From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@isr.umich.edu>  
To: 'pmeyer@email.unc.edu' <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>; "Aapornet@Usc. Edu"@listproc.usc.edu <"Aapornet@Usc. Edu"@listproc.usc.edu>  
Date: Monday, October 21, 2002 9:15 PM  
Subject: RE: The Dillman dollar and emotional distress

>In my limited experience it's highly unusual. I have had one telephone  
>respondent refuse the cash incentive, stating that the topic was important  
>and he didn't want to take money away from the research effort.

>

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

>From: Philip Meyer [mailto:pmeyer@email.unc.edu]  
>Sent: Monday, October 21, 2002 12:55 PM  
>To: Aapornet@Usc. Edu  
>Subject: The Dillman dollar and emotional distress

>

>

> Has anyone who deals with human subjects review boards had a situation  
>like this?

>

> I have several mail surveys in the field, using a full Dillman method,  
>with a dollar incentive. Some respondents send the dollar back and a few  
>of these say they were offended by it. (I respond with a thank-you and  
>assurance that I am not offended to get it back.)

>

> One respondent in the offended group copied his letter to me to  
>the human subjects review chair, who has decided that the emotional

distress

>caused by the Dillman dollar is a potential protection-of-human-subjects  
>issue. We are now asked to keep copies of all letters from persons  
>who find the dollar offensive and write a report.

>

> Has it happened to you, or am I on the cutting edge here? I'd like to  
>know how it plays out. Heck, maybe it's routine and I just now noticed.

>

>

>

>=====

>Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
>Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
>Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

>=====

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

=====  
Date: Mon, 21 Oct 2002 19:52:45 -0700  
To: pmeyer@email.unc.edu, "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
From: "H. H. Kassarjian" <hkassarjian@adelphia.net>  
Subject: Re: The Dillman dollar and emotional distress  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0210211241350.28530-100000@login8.isis.u  
nc.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Good grief, another example of Human Subjects Review Boards gone  
bonkers. So many good ideas seem to go sour in time - be it milk, or  
wine, or even Welfare, and especially human subject review boards. Let us  
know how this turns out. Maybe they will become a big puddle of yogurt.  
In fact that might be a good outcome for so many committees.

Hal Kassarjian  
\*\*\*\*\*

At 12:55 PM 10/21/2002 -0400, Philip Meyer wrote:

> Has anyone who deals with human subjects review boards had a situation  
>like this?

>

> I have several mail surveys in the field, using a full Dillman method,  
>with a dollar incentive. Some respondents send the dollar back and a few  
>of these say they were offended by it. (I respond with a thank-you and  
>assurance that I am not offended to get it back.)

>

> One respondent in the offended group copied his letter to me to  
>the human subjects review chair, who has decided that the emotional  
distress

>caused by the Dillman dollar is a potential protection-of-human-subjects  
>issue. We are now asked to keep copies of all letters from persons  
>who find the dollar offensive and write a report.

>

> Has it happened to you, or am I on the cutting edge here? I'd like to  
>know how it plays out. Heck, maybe it's routine and I just now noticed.

>

>

>

>

>=====

>Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
>Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
>Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: [www.unc.edu/~pmeyer](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)  
>=====

=====

Date: Tue, 22 Oct 2002 08:15:02 -0400  
From: "Blumberg, Stephen J." <[swb5@cdc.gov](mailto:swb5@cdc.gov)>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Subject: RE: The Dillman dollar and emotional distress  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain

Let's not criticize human subjects review boards for doing the job that they are set out to do. If unethical research became the norm (or even a widely publicized rare event), response rates for all our research would decline dramatically.

Rather, let's just make sure that human subjects review boards recognize the problems for what they really are. There will always be people who decline to participate in research, and some that do so forcefully. This is not a sign that there is anything wrong with the research.

However, it is worth asking if a person experienced emotional distress as a result of that refusal. Usually, the answer is no. But the Dillman dollar is specifically designed to influence response by, in part, setting up a particular emotional conflict: "I will feel bad if I don't do what I am asked to do, but still keep the dollar." Therefore, it is within the scope of human subjects review to ask if the accompanying materials are written to specifically state that the dollar is not provided in exchange for participation. Assuming that the materials are written as such and you've fully disclosed why the dollar was enclosed, I don't see a protection-of-human-subjects problem. If I were you, this is where I would focus my report to the review board.

--Stephen--

Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D.  
National Center for Health Statistics  
(and co-chair, NCHS IRB)

At 12:55 PM 10/21/2002 -0400, Philip Meyer wrote:

> Has anyone who deals with human subjects review boards had a  
situation  
>like this?  
>  
> I have several mail surveys in the field, using a full Dillman  
method,  
>with a dollar incentive. Some respondents send the dollar back and a  
few  
>of these say they were offended by it. (I respond with a thank-you and  
>assurance that I am not offended to get it back.)  
>  
> One respondent in the offended group copied his letter to me to  
>the human subjects review chair, who has decided that the emotional  
distress  
>caused by the Dillman dollar is a potential  
protection-of-human-subjects  
>issue. We are now asked to keep copies of all letters from persons  
>who find the dollar offensive and write a report.  
>  
> Has it happened to you, or am I on the cutting edge here? I'd like  
to  
>know how it plays out. Heck, maybe it's routine and I just now  
noticed.  
>  
>  
>

>=====

>Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
>Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
>Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: [www.unc.edu/~pmeyer](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)

=====

Date: Wed, 23 Oct 2002 20:47:44 -0500  
Reply-To: "mary.losch@uni.edu" <mary.losch@UNI.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mary Losch <mary.losch@UNI.EDU>  
Subject: Web Survey Hosting Vendors  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: Quoted-printable

I'm reposting to the new address -- please delete if you've already seen =  
it. Mary

Dear Colleagues,

Last week I sent a query to AAPORnet and am happy to report that I  
received a good deal of very helpful information in a short time. I have  
summarized the vendor suggestions below with the top group being those  
suggested by organizations or groups who had used them and the second  
being a list of the vendors who contacted me directly.

Web Survey Hosting Vendors Recommended by previous users:

CCI WebResearch (2)  
Data Recognition Corporation  
Insight Express  
Market Strategies Interactive

Vendors providing information:

Circum Network, Inc.  
Computers for Marketing Corporation  
Sensus Web (Sawtooth Technologies)  
Survey Tracker  
Western Wats Center, Inc

What I have learned through contacts with several of these vendors thus far, is that overall, they seem knowledgeable and able to provide fundamentally sound web survey hosting services =96 we have no direct experience yet to confirm that impression from any of them. Some are clearly oriented toward business applications and market research while others have at least some explicit emphasis on governmental, academic, and policy research. What is most surprising is the wide variation in pricing from \$2,000 to \$24,000 for the same project parameters to program and host a web survey for approximately 7 weeks.

Hope this is helpful. Best, Mary

~~~~~

Mary E. Losch, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director/Associate Professor  
Center for Social and Behavioral Research  
Department of Psychology  
University of Northern Iowa  
221 Sabin Hall  
Cedar Falls, IA 50614  
mary.losch@uni.edu

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read  
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====  
Date: Wed, 23 Oct 2002 20:29:41 -0700  
Reply-To: "Don A. Dillman" <dillman@WSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Don A. Dillman" <dillman@WSU.EDU>  
Subject: On the (Dillman) Dollar  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm not sure whether to be flattered or feel a little chagrined over the discussion about the Dillman Dollar.

But, its been on my mind today, and a couple of comments might be useful.

First, I have no idea who first started using a dollar to encourage response to questionnaires. However, my memory of it is from graduate school in the 1960's when it was explained to me as the Meridith Publishing Company (located in Des Moines, Iowa) crisp new dollar bill technique used in the 1940's. Whatever its origin, it has been used for a long time, and one of the better summaries of effects is Church's 1993 article in the POQ, where he shows about a 19% effect.

In any event, token incentives in advance remain a powerful technique for improving response to mail surveys. I have seen some recent data that shows \$2 (considerably less than the value of the Meridith dollar) in advance improved response to four general public surveys in different states between 19 and 31 percentage points, and had similar positive effects on student surveys. These general public effects occurred in situations for which four contacts were used and other good implementation procedures were used, with final response rates between 60 and 73%. The important point here is that small token incentives in advance are a very powerful means for increasing response rates beyond that achievable by other methods.

I have always thought it important to send the incentives as "small tokens of appreciation" and not suggest they were a payment, even downplaying their importance in letters. And, I don't believe incentives have their large effect because of the monetary value, but rather because they put the survey in a positive light and attract one's attention to what it is about. Although studies I have been associated with often get a few dollars sent back, usually with nice notes, I can't recall getting any complaints about the presence of the incentive causing emotional distress. I hope that any tendency in that direction would be diffused to some degree by including explicit statements about the voluntary nature of the survey in the letter that contains the incentive.

When interacting with human subjects committees I think it's important to be able to talk about the importance of reducing survey error, the strong evidence that such incentives have a strong positive effect on response, and that in comparison to many other ways of trying to improve response are more likely to generate positive as opposed to negative comments from most people. I've been concerned when people have told me about human subjects committees saying it was okay to send payments after people return questionnaires (which have very little effect on response rates), but not okay to send the token incentives in advance.

Certainly, Phil raises issues we need to be concerned with as survey methodologists.

Don

-----  
(original posting from Phil Meyer)

Has anyone who deals with human subjects review boards had a situation like this?

I have several mail surveys in the field, using a full Dillman method, with a dollar incentive. Some respondents send the dollar back and a few of these say they were offended by it. (I respond with a thank-you and assurance that I am not offended to get it back.)

One respondent in the offended group copied his letter to me to the human subjects review chair, who has decided that the emotional distress caused by the Dillman dollar is a potential protection-of-human-subjects issue. We are now asked to keep copies of all letters from persons who find the dollar offensive and write a report.

Has it happened to you, or am I on the cutting edge here? I'd like to

know how it plays out. Heck, maybe it's routine and I just now noticed.

```
=====
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085    Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425    URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
=====
```

```
*****
Don A. Dillman, Professor of Sociology and Rural Sociology
and Deputy Director for Research and Development
of the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164-4014
dillman@wsu.edu
http://survey.sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/
(tele) 509-335-1511 (fax) 509-335-0116
```

```
-----
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:
http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.
```

```
=====
Date:      Wed, 23 Oct 2002 16:55:55 -0400
Reply-To:  Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Sender:    AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:      Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Subject:   Welcome to AAPORNET@ASU.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
```

I wanted to be the first to welcome you to AAPORNET@ASU.edu, effective today. Our new host is Arizona State University.

You will find that our new listserv software has many new features that will make AAPORNET an even more valuable membership benefit.

Importantly, you can now choose to get messages in your regular email, by digest, or not to get them at all--just go to the web site (<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>) and read them. You can also post from the web site. All emails go through a virus checker. The web interface also allows for easy searching of the archives, a rich source of information.

The list will be managed by our AAPOR Secretariat and is open only to current AAPOR members.

Some issues and problems arise in any switchover. Please report any problems to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu.

Many thanks to AAPORNET subscribers who keep our list vital and active. We hope that the new software will enhance further the value of AAPORNET. Let\*s set an even higher standard for quality postings in the future!

Mark Schulman  
02-03 President  
AAPOR

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
=====

Date: Thu, 24 Oct 2002 13:36:20 -0400  
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: On the (Dillman) Dollar  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A recent note on incentives. The Iowa Poll recently conducted a poll of Iowans' attitudes toward the five possible versions for the Iowa Quarter to be issued by the U.S. Mint next year. Because it's a visual question, we opted for a mail survey. Normally, we would include a crisp dollar bill (we've done a substantial amount of work for Meredith and they indeed still use the dollar). But because this was a survey about quarters, we couldn't resist using a quarter instead, in keeping with the theme.

Out of 1887 delivered pieces, we received completed questionnaires from 882, a 47% response rate. Oh, and no one sent back the quarter saying they were offended.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company  
Des Moines, Iowa

In a message dated 10/23/2002 10:23:26 PM Central Daylight Time, dillman@WSU.EDU writes:

> I'm not sure whether to be flattered or feel a little chagrined over the  
> discussion about the Dillman Dollar.  
>  
> But, its been on my mind today, and a couple of comments might be useful.  
>  
> First, I have no idea who first started using a dollar to encourage  
> response  
> to questionnaires. However, my memory of it is from graduate school in the  
> 1960's when it was explained to me as the Meridith Publishing Company



> (located in Des Moines, Iowa) crisp new dollar bill technique used in the  
> 1940's. Whatever its origin, it has been used for a long time, and one of  
> the better summaries of effects is Church's 1993 article in the POQ, where  
> he shows about a 19% effect.

>

> In any event, token incentives in advance remain a powerful technique for  
> improving response to mail surveys. I have seen some recent data that  
shows

> \$2 (considerably less than the value of the Meredith dollar) in advance  
> improved response to four general public surveys in different states  
> between

> 19 and 31 percentage points, and had similar positive effects on student  
> surveys. These general public effects occurred in situations for which  
four

> contacts were used and other good implementation procedures were used,  
with

> final response rates between 60 and 73%. The important point here is that  
> small token incentives in advance are a very powerful means for increasing  
> response rates beyond that achievable by other methods.

>

> I have always thought it important to send the incentives as "small tokens  
> of appreciation" and not suggest they were a payment, even downplaying  
> their

> importance in letters. And, I don't believe incentives have their large  
> effect because of the monetary value, but rather because they put the  
> survey

> in a positive light and attract one's attention to what it is about.

> Although studies I have been associated with often get a few dollars sent  
> back, usually with nice notes, I can't recall getting any complaints about  
> the presence of the incentive causing emotional distress. I hope that any  
> tendency in that direction would be diffused to some degree by including  
> explicit statements about the voluntary nature of the survey in the letter  
> that contains the incentive.

>

> When interacting with human subjects committees I think it's important to  
be

> able to talk about the importance of reducing survey error, the strong  
> evidence that such incentives have a strong positive effect on response,  
> and

> that in comparison to many other ways of trying to improve response are  
> more

> likely to generate positive as opposed to negative comments from most  
> people. I've been concerned when people have told me about human subjects  
> committees saying it was okay to send payments after people return  
> questionnaires (which have very little effect on response rates), but not  
> okay to send the token incentives in advance.

>

> Certainly, Phil raises issues we need to be concerned with as survey  
> methodologists.

>

> Don

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your  
main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

---

Date: Thu, 24 Oct 2002 22:20:10 -0700  
Reply-To: Patricia Gwartney <pattygg@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Patricia Gwartney <pattygg@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>  
Subject: Director of Research, OSRL  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

For the full job description, see: <http://osrl.uoregon.edu/resdir/>

The Oregon Survey Research Laboratory (OSRL) at the University of Oregon intends to appoint a Director of Research during Winter term 2003. In order to locate and hire the best possible candidate, the parameters of this 12-month position are flexible in academic discipline, terminal degree, and the potential for opportunities with an academic department.

We seek candidates with excellent records in survey research methodology and a history of survey-related refereed scholarly publications or the potential for such publications. Essential to the position is a demonstrated history of funded contract survey research; funding in peer-reviewed grants, or potential for such funding; experience in all phases of original survey data collection (instrument development and testing, sampling and sample management, interviewer training, client relationships, and reporting); evidence of effective research leadership; dedication to the highest quality standards of academic survey research; and experience in teaching graduate-level survey research, or ability to do so. Preference will be given to candidates with a developed basic research program related to survey methodology.

Established in 1993, OSRL=92s 240 completed studies contribute to research and public policy in Oregon, the Pacific Northwest, and nationwide with original data collection, analysis, and basic methodological investigations. OSRL reports to UO=92s Vice President for Research and provides survey research expertise to the University community. OSRL annually conducts 25-35 contract studies with revenues of \$700,000 - \$900,000. OSRL emphasizes telephone and mail surveys, but also conducts Internet surveys and qualitative research that underlies and improves surveys. OSRL=92s professional staff comprises 18 full- and part-time benefited staff members.

COMPENSATION: Starting salary depends on qualifications. UO provides a generous benefits package. Although a comprehensive research university, UO=92s campus (a working arboretum) and select faculty and students create the feel of a small liberal arts college. Living in Eugene is, itself, a rare reward - at the confluence of the wild and scenic McKenzie and Willamette Rivers, and one hour from both the Cascade Mountains=92 ancient forest wilderness and the rugged Pacific Coast.

APPLICATION: Applicants should submit their curriculum vitae, two sample publications, at least three references=92 names and contact information (telephone, e-mail), and a cover letter explaining abilities and experience to:

Patty Tout, Project Business Manager



and services.

I pocketed the dollar and promptly mailed back the survey. Instead of filling out the questions, however, I wrote that I charge \$25 for answering [commercial] questionnaires of this length. The only thing that offended me was how cheaply the Journal expected me to give up personal information for their profit.

In retrospect, my price was really too low. The survey would have taken about 15 to 20 minutes to fill out. Next time I get a similar commercial survey, I'll have to raise my price.

--

Michael Margolis  
Department of Political Science  
University of Cincinnati  
P.O. Box 210375  
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375

Tel: 513-556-3310  
Fax: 513-556-2314

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 25 Oct 2002 07:10:06 -0700  
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCR.C.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCR.C.ORG>  
Subject: Source for address files  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

We use the traditional Waksberg-Mitofsky method of RDD and are happy with it (for now). Our screening response has been poor lately and one of our investigators would like to try sending a letter prior to first contact to those addresses we can find. We would need an electronic file so that we could link the phone numbers we select with our usual method to addresses. We can get an electronic Cole's reverse directory to do this, but I'm wondering if more inclusive databases could be purchased at a reasonable cost. We just need a three county area.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
Seattle, WA  
[lvoigt@fhcrc.org](mailto:lvoigt@fhcrc.org)

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 25 Oct 2002 09:44:50 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Source for address files  
Comments: To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCR.C.ORG>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

superpages.com has a reverse look-up feature. Link is on the left.  
<http://wp.superpages.com/people.phtml?SRC=>

Don't know how many numbers you have but the cost is reasonable; i.e., free.

This is only good for listed numbers but so are other databases.

Nick

"Voigt, Lynda" wrote:

>  
> We use the traditional Waksberg-Mitofsky method of RDD and are happy with  
> it  
> (for now). Our screening response has been poor lately and one of our  
> investigators would like to try sending a letter prior to first contact to  
> those addresses we can find. We would need an electronic file so that we  
> could link the phone numbers we select with our usual method to addresses.  
> We can get an electronic Cole's reverse directory to do this, but I'm  
> wondering if more inclusive databases could be purchased at a reasonable  
> cost. We just need a three county area.  
>  
> thanks!  
>  
> Lynda Voigt  
>  
> Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
> Seattle, WA  
> lvoigt@fhcrc.org  
>

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 25 Oct 2002 10:45:33 -0400  
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Source for address files  
Comments: To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCR.C.ORG>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

We have been pleased with the service that we get from Survey Sampling,

Incorporated, and Genesys. Each is easily accessed through the www

Cordially,  
Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Associate  
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research  
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248  
Phone: 734-222-8660  
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: Voigt, Lynda [mailto:lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG]  
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2002 10:10 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Source for address files

We use the traditional Waksberg-Mitofsky method of RDD and are happy with it (for now). Our screening response has been poor lately and one of our investigators would like to try sending a letter prior to first contact to those addresses we can find. We would need an electronic file so that we could link the phone numbers we select with our usual method to addresses. We can get an electronic Cole's reverse directory to do this, but I'm wondering if more inclusive databases could be purchased at a reasonable cost. We just need a three county area.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt

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

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====  
Date: Fri, 25 Oct 2002 10:00:39 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Source for address files  
Comments: cc: "Lynda\", \"Voigt,\" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----  
Subject: Re: Source for address files

Date: Fri, 25 Oct 2002 09:44:50 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRG.ORG>  
CC: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
References: <9667A0D2033CD51195F90002B330A3BF0372F67D@moe.fhcr.org>

superpages.com has a reverse look-up feature. Link is on the left.  
<http://wp.superpages.com/people.phtml?SRC=>

Don't know how many numbers you have but the cost is reasonable; i.e., free.

This is only good for listed numbers but so are other databases.

Nick

"Voigt, Lynda" wrote:

>  
> We use the traditional Waksberg-Mitofsky method of RDD and are happy with  
it  
> (for now). Our screening response has been poor lately and one of our  
> investigators would like to try sending a letter prior to first contact to  
> those addresses we can find. We would need an electronic file so that we  
> could link the phone numbers we select with our usual method to addresses.  
> We can get an electronic Cole's reverse directory to do this, but I'm  
> wondering if more inclusive databases could be purchased at a reasonable  
> cost. We just need a three county area.  
>  
> thanks!  
>  
> Lynda Voigt  
>  
> Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
> Seattle, WA  
> lvoigt@fhcr.org  
>

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 25 Oct 2002 09:20:46 -0700  
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Source for address files  
In-Reply-To: <9667A0D2033CD51195F90002B330A3BF0372F67D@moe.fhcr.org>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Lynda,

There are several firms that sell sample for Waksberg-Mitofsky RDD and other more efficient types of RDD and modified-RDD surveys. These firms compile large databases of phone numbers (including mailing addresses where

available) through a variety of sources and update them frequently. We have used Genesys Sampling Systems several times and have been very happy with them. Another major firm is Survey Sampling, Inc. Below are URL's for these two firms.

Joel

Genesys Sampling Systems  
[http://www.genesys-sampling.com/default\\_2.htm](http://www.genesys-sampling.com/default_2.htm)

Survey Sampling, Inc.  
[http://www.surveysampling.com/ssi\\_home.html](http://www.surveysampling.com/ssi_home.html)

At 10/25/2002 07:10 AM, you wrote:

>We use the traditional Waksberg-Mitofsky method of RDD and are happy with it  
>(for now). Our screening response has been poor lately and one of our  
>investigators would like to try sending a letter prior to first contact to  
>those addresses we can find. We would need an electronic file so that we  
>could link the phone numbers we select with our usual method to addresses.  
>We can get an electronic Cole's reverse directory to do this, but I'm  
>wondering if more inclusive databases could be purchased at a reasonable  
>cost. We just need a three county area.  
>  
>thanks!  
>  
>Lynda Voigt  
>  
>  
>Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
>Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
>Seattle, WA  
>lvoigt@fhcrc.org

=====  
Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.  
Director  
Center for Family and Community Health  
School of Public Health  
University of California, Berkeley  
WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>  
=====

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 25 Oct 2002 09:44:11 -0700  
Reply-To: John Fries <[JCF@SIRRESEARCH.COM](mailto:JCF@SIRRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Fries <[JCF@SIRRESEARCH.COM](mailto:JCF@SIRRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Supervisor to Interviewer Ratio

AAPORnetters,



My company is currently searching for the ideal ratio of supervisors to interviewers. Obviously we want to provide enough supervision to ensure data quality, but we also want to minimize this cost to our clients (at least as much as possible). Currently we are running somewhere in the neighborhood of 1:10 or 1:11. This allows us to be VERY responsive to interviewing needs/issues, but the additional hours (at a higher rate) clearly add to the overall cost of the study.

I would appreciate hearing your experiences and recommendations on this issue. It would certainly be great news to hear that higher ratios prove equally effective in terms of data quality. Also, please pass this message along to others who may have some thoughts about the optimal balance (for example, call center/field service directors).

As always, thanks in advance!

John Fries

--

-----  
John C. Fries..... JCF@SIRresearch.com  
Senior Project Director.....Voice: 804.358.8981  
Southeastern Institute of Research.....FAX: 804.358.9761  
Marketing and Public Opinion Research...Richmond, Virginia  
-----

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 25 Oct 2002 17:00:55 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: More on the (Dillman) Dollar  
In-Reply-To: <[a05100302b9deef8fe7f2@\[10.43.6.29\]](mailto:a05100302b9deef8fe7f2@[10.43.6.29])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I seriously debated whether to reply to this for fear of being too argumentative . . . .

Don't we all profit from the surveys we conduct?

When I worked at a University the profit paid interviewers, supervisors, the university (especially the university) and my salary. If there was any left over it went to grad students, computers, etc. Now that I am out in the commercial world (though still working with Universities) the vast majority of the money we take in goes to the same sort of things (substituting the partnership for the university).

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road Suite 101  
Baltimore, MD 21209  
410-377-7880 ext. 14  
410-377-7955 fax

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mike Margolis  
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2002 9:33 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: More on the (Dillman) Dollar

The Wall Street Journal recently sent me a crisp dollar bill as an incentive to fill out their most recent survey of subscribers. A cursory read-through indicated that , among other things, the Journal was interested in my reading and listening habits, my investments, interests and hobbies, my income and various other socio-economic measures that undoubtedly would enhance their database on subscribers. The information accumulated could be used to entice new advertisers or could be sold directly to marketers of various goods and services.

I pocketed the dollar and promptly mailed back the survey. Instead of filling out the questions, however, I wrote that I charge \$25 for answering [commercial] questionnaires of this length. The only thing that offended me was how cheaply the Journal expected me to give up personal information for their profit.

In retrospect, my price was really too low. The survey would have taken about 15 to 20 minutes to fill out. Next time I get a similar commercial survey, I'll have to raise my price.

--

Michael Margolis  
Department of Political Science  
University of Cincinnati  
P.O. Box 210375  
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375

Tel: 513-556-3310  
Fax: 513-556-2314

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 25 Oct 2002 17:27:13 -0700  
Reply-To: Linda Bourque <lbourque@UCLA.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Linda Bourque <lbourque@UCLA.EDU>  
Subject: Re: More on the (Dillman) Dollar  
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
In-Reply-To: <000001c27c69\$9f3d9a20\$130a010a@LEO>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

It seems to me ironic that persons who want to obtain valid data from representative samples would refuse to respond to a questionnaire and

insist on being paid \$25. Do we consider the Wall Street Journal that egregious an institution? Wouldn't it be better to complete and send the questionnaire and make a request that your name not be included in any lists that were sold for marketing purposes.

I hope this does not mean that my future mailed questionnaires will have to include \$25 in order to obtain a response.

Linda Bourque

At 05:00 PM 10/25/02 -0400, Leo G. Simonetta wrote:

>I seriously debated whether to reply to this for fear of being too  
>argumentative . . . .

>

>Don't we all profit from the surveys we conduct?

>

>When I worked at a University the profit paid interviewers, supervisors,  
>the university (especially the university) and my salary. If there was  
>any left over it went to grad students, computers, etc. Now that I am  
>out in the commercial world (though still working with Universities) the  
>vast majority of the money we take in goes to the same sort of things  
>(substituting the partnership for the university).

>

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta  
>Art & Science Group, LLC  
>6115 Falls Road Suite 101  
>Baltimore, MD 21209  
>410-377-7880 ext. 14  
>410-377-7955 fax

>

>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mike Margolis  
>Sent: Friday, October 25, 2002 9:33 AM  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Subject: More on the (Dillman) Dollar

>

>The Wall Street Journal recently sent me a crisp dollar bill as an  
>incentive to fill out their most recent survey of subscribers. A  
>cursory read-through indicated that , among other things, the Journal  
>was interested in my reading and listening habits, my investments,  
>interests and hobbies, my income and various other socio-economic  
>measures that undoubtedly would enhance their database on  
>subscribers. The information accumulated could be used to entice new  
>advertisers or could be sold directly to marketers of various goods  
>and services.

>

>I pocketed the dollar and promptly mailed back the survey. Instead of  
>filling out the questions, however, I wrote that I charge \$25 for  
>answering [commercial] questionnaires of this length.  
>The only thing that offended me was how cheaply the Journal expected  
>me to give up personal information for their profit.

>

>In retrospect, my price was really too low. The survey would have  
>taken about 15 to 20 minutes to fill out. Next time I get a similar

>commercial survey, I'll have to raise my price.

>--

>Michael Margolis

Tel: 513-556-3310

>Department of Political Science

Fax: 513-556-2314

>University of Cincinnati

>P.O. Box 210375

>Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375

>

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Sat, 26 Oct 2002 23:14:50 -0700  
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <[shap.wolf@ASU.EDU](mailto:shap.wolf@ASU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Shapard Wolf <[shap.wolf@ASU.EDU](mailto:shap.wolf@ASU.EDU)>  
Subject: AAPORNET Archives update

AAPORNET has a great history--we're now in our 97th month. And now on our new host it's easy to search all those messages and retrieve what you're looking for.

Access the search page from the main AAPORNET web site:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

Please write me if you have any questions. There have been many great conversations on AAPORNET over the years--now it is easy to retrieve these.

Shap Wolf

Survey Research Laboratory, Arizona State University

AAPORNET volunteer host

[shap.wolf@asu.edu](mailto:shap.wolf@asu.edu)

Technical details:

Our new Listserv software can index the individual messages from each month, so your search retrieves just the messages you want.

However, the format is different from the USC archives, and it is labor-intensive to convert. I've completed our first three months, plus January 2002 and June-October 2002. More to come!

All but seven months of the USC archives are now uploaded; will finish next week.

You will need to create a password before you can access the archives--just follow the instructions on the main page.

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====  
Date: Sun, 27 Oct 2002 21:50:33 -0500  
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
Subject: The Sniper Case  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Apologies in advance to anyone directly affected by this horrible case, or who otherwise feels the wound is too raw for speculation, but . . .

Check out this story claiming that the apparent killer's car was spotted ten (!) times during the period of the shootings:

<http://www.bayarea.com/mld/mercurynews/news/4374267.htm>

Is there not a simple statistical (probability) principle suggesting that, IF the hundreds, maybe thousands, of vehicles noted to have had any association -- like, they were noted, period -- with the investigation of individual shootings had been dropped into a bucket, then the finger of lady luck would have been pointing at the Chevy Caprice long before the last innocent victim had been shot?

Is it possible that, within the frenzied pursuit of working hypotheses ("profiled" and others), the mindless laws of probability might have saved somebody? Can it be that such a simple tactic was not employed?

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

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Sun, 27 Oct 2002 22:10:17 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: The Sniper Case  
Comments: To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I have seen this account in our local news: " the best opportunity came Oct. 3, immediately after the sniper fatally shot a 72-year-old man waiting for a bus in Washington, near the Montgomery County border. About 10 seconds after the shooting, a witness saw a dark-colored Chevrolet Caprice creep away from the scene with its lights off. The witness later reported the sighting to police." But I did not read about 10 sightings. Only the first one.

On Oct 3, the Caprice was identified as either burgundy or blue. But it

was evening or nighttime - so the color could not be confirmed.

In the next incident, the vehicle became a white box truck or van. And that became the only vehicle eyewitnesses saw leaving subsequent crime scenes. Given the incidence of such vehicles anywhere, that it was witnesses were looked for.. This eyewitness account was repeated again and again and again. Such vehicles are more probable based on my observation since this began

I think this comes down to the unreliability of "eyewitness" accounts or the "herd effect" of seeing what others have said to look for.

Behavioral scientists in this group will have a better take on this.

"James P. Murphy" wrote:

>  
> Apologies in advance to anyone directly affected by this horrible case, or  
> who otherwise feels the wound is too raw for speculation, but . . .  
>  
> Check out this story claiming that the apparent killer's car was spotted  
ten  
> (!) times during the period of the shootings:  
>  
> <http://www.bayarea.com/mld/mercurynews/news/4374267.htm>  
>  
> Is there not a simple statistical (probability) principle suggesting that,  
> IF the hundreds, maybe thousands, of vehicles noted to have had any  
> association -- like, they were noted, period -- with the investigation of  
> individual shootings had been dropped into a bucket, then the finger of  
lady  
> luck would have been pointing at the Chevy Caprice long before the last  
> innocent victim had been shot?  
>  
> Is it possible that, within the frenzied pursuit of working hypotheses  
> ("profiled" and others), the mindless laws of probability might have saved  
> somebody? Can it be that such a simple tactic was not employed?  
>  
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
> Voice (610) 408-8800  
> Fax (610) 408-8802  
> [jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Oct 2002 11:42:13 -0500  
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: The Sniper Case  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

First, let me concur with Dr. Murphy's opening statement, "Apologies in advance to anyone directly affected by this horrible case, or who otherwise feels the wound is too raw for speculation" If that's the case, read no further.

My bias: I'm a psychologist who worked as the director of research for the Michigan Center for Forensic Psychiatry for a year, and worked with police departments in NYC and Flint, Michigan. These experiences were in the years 1967-1980, which is a long time ago, and things might have changed considerably since then. That said, here are a few comments relative to the procedures that we are told were used in apprehending the suspects.

1. Most importantly, what we the public are told and what really occurred are not the same. Usual tip-of-the-iceberg stuff, with what we're told being no more than 10% of the actual activities, and some portion of that being deliberate misinformation designed to put the perpetrator off-guard

2. Unlike TV, most difficult to solve cases occur when law enforcement follows up on informant-provided info. This seems to be the case here.

3. Every law enforcement agency understands that their primary task is to catch the perpetrator, and they will do ANYTHING, including lie to us, to accomplish that goal. Sometimes they even violate consitutional rights, then cover their tracks later to avoid releasing a guilty person because of that violation.

4. Every law-enforcement person I've ever worked with - only a couple of dozen, but without exception - seemed to act as if their first allegiance is to their job and their organization. Family, country, everything else comes lower down on the hierarchy. Dealing with the stuff that they do, on a daily basis, it's the only way they can stay on the job. If they don't adopt that "us against the world" mentality, they get our of the business.

So, my advice is to lay off the second-guessing. We'll never know what really went on here, and efforts to find out are pointless.

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]

Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2002 10:10 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: The Sniper Case

I have seen this account in our local news: " the best opportunity came Oct. 3, immediately after the sniper fatally shot a 72-year-old man waiting for a bus in Washington, near the Montgomery County border. About 10 seconds after the shooting, a witness saw a dark-colored Chevrolet Caprice creep away from the scene with its lights off. The witness later reported the sighting to police." But I did not read about 10 sightings. Only the first one.

On Oct 3, the Caprice was identified as either burgundy or blue. But it was evening or nighttime - so the color could not be confirmed.

In the next incident, the vehicle became a white box truck or van. And that became the only vehicle eyewitnesses saw leaving subsequent crime scenes. Given the incidence of such vehicles anywhere, that it was witnesses were looked for.. This eyewitness account was repeated again and again and again. Such vehicles are more probable based on my observation since this began

I think this comes down to the unreliability of "eyewitness" accounts or the "herd effect" of seeing what others have said to look for.

Behavioral scientists in this group will have a better take on this.

"James P. Murphy" wrote:

>  
> Apologies in advance to anyone directly affected by this horrible case, or  
> who otherwise feels the wound is too raw for speculation, but . . .  
>  
> Check out this story claiming that the apparent killer's car was spotted  
ten  
> (!) times during the period of the shootings:  
>  
> <http://www.bayarea.com/mld/mercurynews/news/4374267.htm>  
>  
> Is there not a simple statistical (probability) principle suggesting that,  
> IF the hundreds, maybe thousands, of vehicles noted to have had any  
> association -- like, they were noted, period -- with the investigation of  
> individual shootings had been dropped into a bucket, then the finger of  
lady  
> luck would have been pointing at the Chevy Caprice long before the last  
> innocent victim had been shot?  
>  
> Is it possible that, within the frenzied pursuit of working hypotheses  
> ("profiled" and others), the mindless laws of probability might have saved  
> somebody? Can it be that such a simple tactic was not employed?  
>  
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
> Voice (610) 408-8800  
> Fax (610) 408-8802  
> [jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)  
>

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Oct 2002 10:52:54 -0600  
Reply-To: Rolando <[rocampo@PRESIDENCIA.GOB.MX](mailto:rocampo@PRESIDENCIA.GOB.MX)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Rolando <[rocampo@PRESIDENCIA.GOB.MX](mailto:rocampo@PRESIDENCIA.GOB.MX)>  
Subject: Survey infotmation about Irak  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

I'm an AAPOR member and I would like to know if anybody have survey information about Irak and the position of President Bush's Irak resolution.

thanks

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

From: "Nathaniel Ehrlich" <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Sent: Lunes, 28 de Octubre de 2002 10:42 a.m.



Subject: Re: The Sniper Case

> First, let me concur with Dr. Murphy's opening statement, "Apologies in  
> advance to anyone directly affected by this horrible case, or who  
otherwise  
> feels the wound is too raw for speculation" If that's the case, read no  
> further.  
> My bias: I'm a psychologist who worked as the director of research for the  
> Michigan Center for Forensic Psychiatry for a year, and worked with police  
> departments in NYC and Flint, Michigan. These experiences were in the  
years  
> 1967-1980, which is a long time ago, and things might have changed  
> considerably since then. That said, here are a few comments relative to  
the  
> procedures that we are told were used in apprehending the suspects.  
> 1. Most importantly, what we the public are told and what really occurred  
> are not the same. Usual tip-of-the-iceberg stuff, with what we're told  
being  
> no more than 10% of the actual activities, and some portion of that being  
> deliberate misinformation designed to put the perpetrator off-guard  
> 2. Unlike TV, most difficult to solve cases occur when law enforcement  
> follows up on informant-provided info. This seems to be the case here.  
> 3. Every law enforcement agency understands that their primary task is to  
> catch the perpetrator, and they will do ANYTHING, including lie to us, to  
> accomplish that goal. Sometimes they even violate consitutional rights,  
then  
> cover their tracks later to avoid releasing a guilty person because of  
that  
> violation.  
> 4. Every law-enforcement person I've ever worked with - only a couple of  
> dozen, but without exception - seemed to act as if their first allegiance  
is  
> to their job and their organization. Family, country, everything else  
comes  
> lower down on the hierarchy. Dealing with the stuff that they do, on a  
daily  
> basis, it's the only way they can stay on the job. If they don't adopt  
that  
> "us against the world" mentality, they get our of the business.  
>  
> So, my advice is to lay off the second-guessing. We'll never know what  
> really went on here, and efforts to find out are pointless.  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]  
> Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2002 10:10 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: The Sniper Case  
>  
>  
> I have seen this account in our local news: " the best opportunity came  
> Oct. 3, immediately after the sniper fatally shot a 72-year-old man  
> waiting for a bus in Washington, near the Montgomery County border.  
> About 10 seconds after the shooting, a witness saw a dark-colored  
> Chevrolet Caprice creep away from the scene with its lights off. The  
> witness later reported the sighting to police." But I did not read about

> 10 sightings. Only the first one.  
>  
> On Oct 3, the Caprice was identified as either burgundy or blue. But it  
> was evening or nighttime - so the color could not be confirmed.  
>  
> In the next incident, the vehicle became a white box truck or van. And  
> that became the only vehicle eyewitnesses saw leaving subsequent crime  
> scenes. Given the incidence of such vehicles anywhere, that it was  
> witnesses were looked for.. This eyewitness account was repeated again  
> and again and again. Such vehicles are more probable based on my  
> observation since this began  
>  
> I think this comes down to the unreliability of "eyewitness" accounts or  
> the "herd effect" of seeing what others have said to look for.  
>  
> Behavioral scientists in this group will have a better take on this.  
>  
>  
> "James P. Murphy" wrote:  
> >  
> > Apologies in advance to anyone directly affected by this horrible case,  
> or  
> > who otherwise feels the wound is too raw for speculation, but . . .  
> >  
> > Check out this story claiming that the apparent killer's car was spotted  
> > ten  
> > (!) times during the period of the shootings:  
> >  
> > <http://www.bayarea.com/mld/mercurynews/news/4374267.htm>  
> >  
> > Is there not a simple statistical (probability) principle suggesting  
> that,  
> > IF the hundreds, maybe thousands, of vehicles noted to have had any  
> > association -- like, they were noted, period -- with the investigation  
> of  
> > individual shootings had been dropped into a bucket, then the finger of  
> > lady  
> > luck would have been pointing at the Chevy Caprice long before the last  
> > innocent victim had been shot?  
> >  
> > Is it possible that, within the frenzied pursuit of working hypotheses  
> > ("profiled" and others), the mindless laws of probability might have  
> saved  
> > somebody? Can it be that such a simple tactic was not employed?  
> >  
> > James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
> > Voice (610) 408-8800  
> > Fax (610) 408-8802  
> > [jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)  
> >

---

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 28 Oct 2002 12:06:55 -0500

Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>  
Subject: Re: The Sniper Case  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

When a vehicle is stopped, the driver questioned, the driver's license checked and found valid, and the vehicle allowed to proceed, do the police record the event in some database that is immediately accessible to local law enforcement? If not, there would be no way to do a statistical analysis, formal or informal, and no basis for even thinking about it.

You would think this would be a good way to pick up (slightly) drunk drivers and others who would be of interest to law enforcement, but it may not be practical.

Jeanne Anderson

Nick Panagakis wrote:

> I have seen this account in our local news: " the best opportunity came  
> Oct. 3, immediately after the sniper fatally shot a 72-year-old man  
> waiting for a bus in Washington, near the Montgomery County border.  
> About 10 seconds after the shooting, a witness saw a dark-colored  
> Chevrolet Caprice creep away from the scene with its lights off. The  
> witness later reported the sighting to police." But I did not read about  
> 10 sightings. Only the first one.  
>  
> On Oct 3, the Caprice was identified as either burgundy or blue. But it  
> was evening or nighttime - so the color could not be confirmed.  
>  
> In the next incident, the vehicle became a white box truck or van. And  
> that became the only vehicle eyewitnesses saw leaving subsequent crime  
> scenes. Given the incidence of such vehicles anywhere, that it was  
> witnesses were looked for.. This eyewitness account was repeated again  
> and again and again. Such vehicles are more probable based on my  
> observation since this began  
>  
> I think this comes down to the unreliability of "eyewitness" accounts or  
> the "herd effect" of seeing what others have said to look for.  
>  
> Behavioral scientists in this group will have a better take on this.  
>  
> "James P. Murphy" wrote:  
> >  
> > Apologies in advance to anyone directly affected by this horrible case,  
> or  
> > who otherwise feels the wound is too raw for speculation, but . . .  
> >

> > Check out this story claiming that the apparent killer's car was spotted  
ten  
> > (!) times during the period of the shootings:  
> >  
> > <http://www.bayarea.com/mld/mercurynews/news/4374267.htm>  
> >  
> > Is there not a simple statistical (probability) principle suggesting  
that,  
> > IF the hundreds, maybe thousands, of vehicles noted to have had any  
> > association -- like, they were noted, period -- with the investigation  
of  
> > individual shootings had been dropped into a bucket, then the finger of  
lady  
> > luck would have been pointing at the Chevy Caprice long before the last  
> > innocent victim had been shot?  
> >  
> > Is it possible that, within the frenzied pursuit of working hypotheses  
> > ("profiled" and others), the mindless laws of probability might have  
saved  
> > somebody? Can it be that such a simple tactic was not employed?  
> >  
> > James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
> > Voice (610) 408-8800  
> > Fax (610) 408-8802  
> > [jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)  
> >

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Oct 2002 14:01:09 -0500  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: More on the (Dillman) Dollar  
In-Reply-To: <[000001c27c69\\$9f3d9a20\\$130a010a@LEO](mailto:000001c27c69$9f3d9a20$130a010a@LEO)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

This all being said I, too, probably would not have filled out the Wall  
Street Journal Survey as described by the original poster - largely out  
of privacy concerns.

--  
Leo G. Simonetta  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road Suite 101  
Baltimore, MD 21209  
410-377-7880 ext. 14  
410-377-7955 fax

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta

Sent: Friday, October 25, 2002 5:01 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: More on the (Dillman )Dollar

I seriously debated whether to reply to this for fear of being too argumentative . . . .

Don't we all profit from the surveys we conduct?

When I worked at a University the profit paid interviewers, supervisors, the university (especially the university) and my salary. If there was any left over it went to grad students, computers, etc. Now that I am out in the commercial world (though still working with Universities) the vast majority of the money we take in goes to the same sort of things (substituting the partnership for the university).

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road Suite 101  
Baltimore, MD 21209  
410-377-7880 ext. 14  
410-377-7955 fax

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mike Margolis  
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2002 9:33 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: More on the (Dillman )Dollar

The Wall Street Journal recently sent me a crisp dollar bill as an incentive to fill out their most recent survey of subscribers. A cursory read-through indicated that , among other things, the Journal was interested in my reading and listening habits, my investments, interests and hobbies, my income and various other socio-economic measures that undoubtedly would enhance their database on subscribers. The information accumulated could be used to entice new advertisers or could be sold directly to marketers of various goods and services.

I pocketed the dollar and promptly mailed back the survey. Instead of filling out the questions, however, I wrote that I charge \$25 for answering [commercial] questionnaires of this length. The only thing that offended me was how cheaply the Journal expected me to give up personal information for their profit.

In retrospect, my price was really too low. The survey would have taken about 15 to 20 minutes to fill out. Next time I get a similar commercial survey, I'll have to raise my price.

--

Michael Margolis  
Department of Political Science  
University of Cincinnati  
P.O. Box 210375  
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375

Tel: 513-556-3310  
Fax: 513-556-2314

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Oct 2002 13:46:34 -0500  
Reply-To: Carl M Ramirez <[RamirezC@GAO.GOV](mailto:RamirezC@GAO.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Carl M Ramirez <[RamirezC@GAO.GOV](mailto:RamirezC@GAO.GOV)>  
Subject: Seeking high response rate omnibus providers  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am posting this on behalf of Stefanie Bzdusek, Survey Project Manager at GAO:

I am looking for firms that conduct nationwide RDD telephone Omnibus surveys of adults in households with an achieved response rate of 60% or greater. Desired frequency of Omnibus surveys is monthly or greater. Please contact Stefanie Bzdusek directly (rather than replying to AAPORNET) at 202-512-6869 or [bzduseks@gao.gov](mailto:bzduseks@gao.gov) if your firm conducts such a survey, or if you know of any such providers.

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Oct 2002 17:47:08 -0500  
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <[M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM](mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Schulman <[M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM](mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM)>  
Subject: FCC Review of Telephone Consumer Protection Act  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

CMOR is a not-for-profit organization that works with the survey research = industry in tracking restrictive legislation that affects survey research. = The organization is supported by major research organizations, (Council of = American Survey Research Organizations, American Marketing Association, = Marketing Research Association, Advertising Research Foundation) and by = many corporations.=20

The AAPOR Council has made a contribution to CMOR in an effort to keep our = members informed of various legislative and regulatory issues that affect = our members. Much of this legislation is directed at the telemarketing = industry, but sometimes spills over into research. One such example is the = FCC's current review of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA).=20 =20

Currently, under the TCPA:

\* Telephone solicitors must comply with consumers do-not-call requests=20

\* Telephone solicitors are prohibited from calling before 8 a.m.

or after 9 p.m.=20

\* Telephone solicitors are prohibited from sending unsolicited  
faxes=20

\* Telephone solicitors are prohibited from using an auto-dialer or  
prerecorded message to call consumers without their=20  
consent (with certain caveats)=20

\* Telephone solicitors that use recorded messages must state the =  
identity of the business and provide its address or telephone number  
(with certain caveats). =20

However, importantly, there are portions of the TCPA that regulate survey =  
research activities. Provisions in the law prohibit any unsolicited calls =  
(both inter-state and intra-state calls) that are made using an "automatic =  
telephone dialing system" or a recorded message to certain numbers or =  
where the called party is charged for the call. A recent CMOR article =  
concerning the provisions of the TCPA impacting survey research can be =  
found at [http://cmor.org/govt\\_affairs\\_news0802.htm](http://cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0802.htm). =20

Since the language in this section of the TCPA is not specific to sales =  
calls, but instead regulates any such calls using an autodialer or =  
recorded message, these provisions regulate survey research calls made =  
with autodialers or made to cell phones. =20  
=20

The FCC is currently reviewing the TCPA Rules, including this section  
that impacts survey research calls. We will keep you informed through =  
CMOR of developments in this review.

Mark Schulman

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 29 Oct 2002 05:19:58 -0500  
Reply-To: Reg\_Baker@MARKETSTRATEGIES.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Reginald Baker <Reg\_Baker@MARKETSTRATEGIES.COM>  
Subject: Re: FCC Review of Telephone Consumer Protection Act  
Comments: To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Mark -- this is an excellent use of AAPOR funds. CMOR has done much of the  
heavy lifting over the past several years to keep the survey research  
industry clear of both federal and state regulations designed to protect  
consumers from teh abuses of telemarketers. And as you point out, they also  
do an excellent job of keeping their members informed about how the morass  
of legislation out there impacts our industry's telephone operations. But  
despite their fine work the telemarketers march on undiscouraged and, as  
well know too well, the threat to legitimate telephone survey research is  
greater than ever. CMOR is going to need all of the help it can get.

Reg Baker  
[www.ms-interactive.com](http://www.ms-interactive.com)

Mark Schulman  
<M.SCHULMAN@SR  
BI.COM>  
Sent by: Telephone Consumer  
AAPORNET  
<AAPORNET@asu.  
edu>

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Subject: FCC Review of  
Protection Act

10/28/02 05:47  
PM  
Please respond  
to Mark  
Schulman

CMOR is a not-for-profit organization that works with the survey research industry in tracking restrictive legislation that affects survey research. The organization is supported by major research organizations, (Council of American Survey Research Organizations, American Marketing Association, Marketing Research Association, Advertising Research Foundation) and by many corporations.

The AAPOR Council has made a contribution to CMOR in an effort to keep our members informed of various legislative and regulatory issues that affect our members. Much of this legislation is directed at the telemarketing industry, but sometimes spills over into research. One such example is the FCC's current review of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA).

Currently, under the TCPA:

- \* Telephone solicitors must comply with consumers do-not-call requests
- \* Telephone solicitors are prohibited from calling before 8 a.m. or after 9 p.m.
- \* Telephone solicitors are prohibited from sending unsolicited faxes
- \* Telephone solicitors are prohibited from using an auto-dialer or prerecorded message to call consumers without their consent (with certain caveats)
- \* Telephone solicitors that use recorded messages must state the identity of the business and provide its address or telephone number (with certain caveats).

However, importantly, there are portions of the TCPA that regulate survey research activities. Provisions in the law prohibit any unsolicited calls (both inter-state and intra-state calls) that are made using an "automatic telephone dialing system" or a recorded message to certain numbers or where the called party is charged for the call. A recent CMOR article concerning the provisions of the TCPA impacting survey research can be found at [http://cmor.org/govt\\_affairs\\_news0802.htm](http://cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0802.htm).



Since the language in this section of the TCPA is not specific to sales calls, but instead regulates any such calls using an autodialer or recorded message, these provisions regulate survey research calls made with autodialers or made to cell phones.

The FCC is currently reviewing the TCPA Rules, including this section that impacts survey research calls. We will keep you informed through CMOR of developments in this review.

Mark Schulman

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read  
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====  
Date: Tue, 29 Oct 2002 21:54:22 -0600  
Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>  
Subject: Study Showing Drop in Consumer Confidence Questioned  
In-Reply-To: <[3DB70AF0.10832.2E80283C@localhost](mailto:3DB70AF0.10832.2E80283C@localhost)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Study Showing Drop in Consumer Confidence Questioned  
As the holiday shopping season approaches, a new study shows consumer confidence plunging to a nine-year low. But some economists question the survey result. NPR's Jack Speer reports. Oct. 29, 2002.  
<http://www.npr.org/ramfiles/atc/20021029.atc.01.ram>

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read  
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 07:22:50 -0600  
Reply-To: Rob Daves <[daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM](mailto:daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Rob Daves <[daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM](mailto:daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM)>  
Subject: Minnesota Poll news  
Comments: To: Gary.E.Langer@abc.com, aeikensdp@aol.com, Pixy412@aol.com, tsilver@capaccess.org, sschier@carleton.edu, 75227.173@compuserve.com, rwickers@dresner-wickers.com, reide@email.usps.gov, jeff.goldblatt@foxnews.com, djleary@iname.com, glen\_cameron@jmail.jour.missouri.edu, bhanley@ktca.org, bhenehan@ktca.org, Pat Kessler <[wcco.mhs.compuserve.com.pkessler@mail.startribune.com](mailto:wcco.mhs.compuserve.com.pkessler@mail.startribune.com)>, dskipper@marketsolutionsgroup.com, b.olson@mn-politics.com, dspacp@msn.com, michelle.jaconi@nbc.com, jgasper@pclink.com, jmiller@polisci.umn.edu, wyspano@politicsinminnesota.com, srg@regen.com, newb0032@tc.umn.edu, txjones@tribune.com, theplayer514@yahoo.com

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Good morning poll watchers.

Many of you have expressed a interest in the Minnesota Poll findings and in Minnesota politics. The results of a news Minnesota Poll about the post-Wellstone Senate race and gubernatorial race are now on [www.startribune.com](http://www.startribune.com), and more about the poll can be found at [www.startribune.com/poll](http://www.startribune.com/poll).

As always, if you find this message to be an intrusion, please accept my apologies, and hit your delete button.

All best wishes,

Rob Daves, director  
The Minnesota Poll

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 13:42:34 +0100  
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Subject: Get paid for your opinions  
Comments: To: [SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU](mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Dear friends,  
Sorry for cross-posting. But I like to share this with you all. This is what gets us a bad name.  
I got a mailing with embedded a webpage from [getpaid4opinions.com](http://getpaid4opinions.com). ([www.getpaid4opinions.com](http://www.getpaid4opinions.com))  
If you go there, you will find out that the only one who gets paid is the firm 'get paid 4 opinions', who want to charge \$ 29.90 from your credit card to give you addresses of market research firms in their data base Market resaerch firms they claim pay up to \$150 an hour. Of course I have not filled it in, but perhaps a AAPOR officer or CMOR officer should do and follow this up. By the way is anyone in the USA paying \$50 to \$125 dollars for 30-60 minutes panel or focus group attendance or \$20-\$75 for filling out a 25 minute survey? these are the amounts mentioned by get paid 4 opinions  
Best regards from Amsterdam

Edith

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Methodika  
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam

tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

-----  
Hope is like a small light in the dark  
It keeps the nightmares away till the dawn of a new world

www.coalitievoorvrede.nl  
www.peoples-peace-campaign.org

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your  
main email address.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 10:32:42 -0500  
Reply-To: [tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Thomas Guterbock <[tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Womans Day: Just say no to phone polls  
Comments: cc: "Wood, Kate" <[kwood@virginia.edu](mailto:kwood@virginia.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE

Last night during interviewer training one of our interviewers brought to=  
=20  
our attention the following item that appeared in the October 8 issue of=20  
Woman's Day magazine:

"4. Just say no to phone surveys. =93Criminals use fake surveys to find out=  
=20  
information about you=97how many kids you have, your daily habits, when=20  
you=92re home from work, where you live,=94 says Neal Rawls, author of Be=  
=20  
Alert, Be Aware, Have a Plan. Keep your personal life your own by=20  
politely declining such offers."

The entire article, "26 ways to be Safer," can be viewed on line at:  
[http://www.womansday.com/xp6/WomansDay/your\\_family.xml/0902/0902be\\_safe1.xml](http://www.womansday.com/xp6/WomansDay/your_family.xml/0902/0902be_safe1.xml)  
1

Is this something to which AAPOR ought to respond? We would encourage =20  
skeptical respondents to seek information on the legitimacy of the call,=20  
which legitimate polling organizations are happy to provide by, for=20  
example, referring the caller to website, FAXing information, giving a=20  
incoming phone number, or just calling back after respondent has time to=20  
consider the call request.  
=09=09=09=09=09=09Tom

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





Nick

Edith de Leeuw wrote:

>  
> Dear friends,  
> Sorry for cross-posting. But I like to share this with you all. This is  
> what gets us a bad name.  
> I got a mailing with embedded a webpage from getpaid4opinions.com.  
> (www.getpaid4opinions.com)  
> If you go there, you will find out that the only one  
> who gets paid is the firm 'get paid 4 opinions', who want to charge \$  
29.90  
> from your  
> credit card to give you addresses of market research firms in their data  
> base Market resaerch firms they claim pay up to \$150 an hour. Of course  
I  
> have not filled it in, but perhaps a AAPOR officer or  
> CMOR officer should do and follow this up. By the way is anyone in the USA  
> paying \$50 to \$125 dollars for 30-60 minutes panel or focus group  
> attendance or \$20-\$75 for filling out a 25 minute survey? these are the  
> amounts mentioned by get paid 4 opinions  
> Best regards from Amsterdam  
>  
> Edith  
>  
> Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Methodika  
> Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam  
> tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
> e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

> -----  
> Hope is like a small light in the dark  
> It keeps the nightmares away till the dawn of a new world  
>  
> www.coalitievoorvrede.nl  
www.peoples-peace-campaign.org  
-----

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your  
main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 11:22:10 -0500  
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Get paid for your opinions  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Thanks for bringing this to my attention, since whenever I see a comeon like  
"get paid for..." anything I delete without reading.  
Any company that's asking potential participants to shell out \$29.50 so that  
they MIGHT get onto a database is preying on the greed and ignorance of the  
population. Which is not a crime, I suppose, unless someone can prove fraud.  
{Do they guarantee that these lists will actually reach market research

houses?}

I spent some years in market research, and I wouldn't ever think of using a "broker" to get survey respondents or focus group participants.  
UGLY!

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2002 9:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Get paid for your opinions

\$50 to \$125 dollars for focus group participation is common. They typically run an hour or longer. The higher amount is being paid here in Chicago for corporate managers; e.g., IT managers.

The lower amount mentioned sounds like shopping mall "intercept" interviews when participants are recruited and interviewed after viewing commercials, examining new appliances, etc.

Field companies that do groups or intercepts typically maintain a database of potential respondents. It sounds like 'get paid 4 opinions' sells prospects to such companies.

They may be acting as a kind of broker putting respondents and field companies together. I am sure they gets prospective respondents who are not convenient to any field location or field location that would buy names from them. The \$29.90 charge seems hard to justify.

Nick

Edith de Leeuw wrote:

>  
> Dear friends,  
> Sorry for cross-posting. But I like to share this with you all. This is  
> what gets us a bad name.  
> I got a mailing with embedded a webpage from getpaid4opinions.com.  
> (www.getpaid4opinions.com)  
> If you go there, you will find out that the only one  
> who gets paid is the firm 'get paid 4 opinions', who want to charge \$  
> 29.90  
> from your  
> credit card to give you addresses of market research firms in their data  
> base Market resaerch firms they claim pay up to \$150 an hour. Of course  
> I  
> have not filled it in, but perhaps a AAPOR officer or  
> CMOR officer should do and follow this up. By the way is anyone in the USA  
> paying \$50 to \$125 dollars for 30-60 minutes panel or focus group  
> attendance or \$20-\$75 for filling out a 25 minute survey? these are the  
> amounts mentioned by get paid 4 opinions  
> Best regards from Amsterdam  
>  
> Edith  
>  
> Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Methodika  
> Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam

> tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
> e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your  
main email address.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your  
main email address.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 11:41:36 -0500  
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Womans Day: Just say no to phone polls  
Comments: To: [tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Abuses occur. An attorney in our area used fake telephone surveys to aid his  
collections work. By having someone pose as a market research interviewer  
doing banking-related surveys, he got creditors to tell which banks they  
used. This allowed him to then freeze the account. That and other unsavory  
practices got him a conviction and jail sentence.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
Voice (610) 408-8800  
Fax (610) 408-8802  
[jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)  
-----Original Message-----

From: Thomas Guterbock <[tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu) <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Date: Wednesday, October 30, 2002 10:43 AM  
Subject: Womans Day: Just say no to phone polls

Last night during interviewer training one of our interviewers brought to  
our attention the following item that appeared in the October 8 issue of  
Woman's Day magazine:

"4. Just say no to phone surveys. "Criminals use fake surveys to find out  
information about you-how many kids you have, your daily habits, when  
you're home from work, where you live," says Neal Rawls, author of Be  
Alert, Be Aware, Have a Plan. Keep your personal life your own by  
politely declining such offers."

The entire article, "26 ways to be Safer," can be viewed on line at:  
[http://www.womansday.com/xp6/WomansDay/your\\_family.xml/0902/0902be\\_safe1.xml](http://www.womansday.com/xp6/WomansDay/your_family.xml/0902/0902be_safe1.xml)

Is this something to which AAPOR ought to respond? We would encourage





represent those of Opinion Access Corp. DO NOT copy, modify, distribute or take any action in reliance on this email if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete this email from your system. Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no responsibility can be accepted for any loss or damage arising from its receipt or use.

---

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2002 6:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Get paid for your opinions

\$50 to \$125 dollars for focus group participation is common. They typically run an hour or longer. The higher amount is being paid here in Chicago for corporate managers; e.g., IT managers.

The lower amount mentioned sounds like shopping mall "intercept" interviews when participants are recruited and interviewed after viewing commercials, examining new appliances, etc.

Field companies that do groups or intercepts typically maintain a database of potential respondents. It sounds like 'get paid 4 opinions' sells prospects to such companies.

They may be acting as a kind of broker putting respondents and field companies together. I am sure they gets prospective respondents who are not convenient to any field location or field location that would buy names from them. The \$29.90 charge seems hard to justify.

Nick

Edith de Leeuw wrote:

>  
> Dear friends,  
> Sorry for cross-posting. But I like to share this with you all. This is  
> what gets us a bad name.  
> I got a mailing with embedded a webpage from [getpaid4opinions.com](http://getpaid4opinions.com).  
> ([www.getpaid4opinions.com](http://www.getpaid4opinions.com))  
> If you go there, you will find out that the only one  
> who gets paid is the firm 'get paid 4 opinions', who want to charge \$  
29.90  
> from your  
> credit card to give you addresses of market research firms in their  
data  
> base Market resaerch firms they claim pay up to \$150 an hour. Of  
course I  
> have not filled it in, but perhaps a AAPOR officer or  
> CMOR officer should do and follow this up. By the way is anyone in the  
USA  
> paying \$50 to \$125 dollars for 30-60 minutes panel or focus group  
> attendance or \$20-\$75 for filling out a 25 minute survey? these are  
the  
> amounts mentioned by get paid 4 opinions

> Best regards from Amsterdam  
>  
> Edith  
>  
> Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Methodika  
> Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam  
> tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
> e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl  
> -----  
> Hope is like a small light in the dark  
> It keeps the nightmares away till the dawn of a new world  
>  
> www.coalitievoorvrede.nl  
www.peoples-peace-campaign.org  
>

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your  
main email address.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 11:54:55 -0800  
Reply-To: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
Organization: Opinion Access Corp.  
Subject: Re: Get paid for your opinions  
Comments: To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E09D19876@isr.umich.edu](mailto:5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E09D19876@isr.umich.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I would be very surprised if this "broker" was actually working on behalf of a marketing research company. What's the phrase, "There's a sucker born every minute?" Probably some person's way of making a buck without actually having to deliver any guarantee to the potential respondent, other than the list of companies that may have a use for panel members.

Lance Hoffman  
Account Executive  
Opinion Access Corp.  
P: 718.729.2622 x.157  
F: 718.729.2444  
C: 646.522.2012

---

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or organization to which it is addressed. Any opinions or advice presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Opinion Access Corp. DO NOT copy, modify, distribute or take any action in reliance on this email if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete this email from your system. Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no responsibility can be

accepted for any loss or damage arising from its receipt or use.

---

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nathaniel Ehrlich  
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2002 8:22 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Get paid for your opinions

Thanks for bringing this to my attention, since whenever I see a comeon like

"get paid for..." anything I delete without reading.

Any company that's asking potential participants to shell out \$29.50 so that

they MIGHT get onto a database is preying on the greed and ignorance of the

population. Which is not a crime, I suppose, unless someone can prove fraud.

{Do they guarantee that these lists will actually reach market research houses?}

I spent some years in market research, and I wouldn't ever think of using a

"broker" to get survey respondents or focus group participants.

UGLY!

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2002 9:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Get paid for your opinions

\$50 to \$125 dollars for focus group participation is common. They typically run an hour or longer. The higher amount is being paid here in Chicago for corporate managers; e.g., IT managers.

The lower amount mentioned sounds like shopping mall "intercept" interviews when participants are recruited and interviewed after viewing commercials, examining new appliances, etc.

Field companies that do groups or intercepts typically maintain a database of potential respondents. It sounds like 'get paid 4 opinions' sells prospects to such companies.

They may be acting as a kind of broker putting respondents and field companies together. I am sure they gets prospective respondents who are not convenient to any field location or field location that would buy names from them. The \$29.90 charge seems hard to justify.

Nick

Edith de Leeuw wrote:

>

> Dear friends,

> Sorry for cross-posting. But I like to share this with you all. This is

> what gets us a bad name.  
> I got a mailing with embedded a webpage from getpaid4opinions.com.  
> (www.getpaid4opinions.com)  
> If you go there, you will find out that the only one  
> who gets paid is the firm 'get paid 4 opinions', who want to charge \$  
29.90  
> from your  
> credit card to give you addresses of market research firms in their  
data  
> base Market resaerch firms they claim pay up to \$150 an hour. Of  
course  
I  
> have not filled it in, but perhaps a AAPOR officer or  
> CMOR officer should do and follow this up. By the way is anyone in the  
USA  
> paying \$50 to \$125 dollars for 30-60 minutes panel or focus group  
> attendance or \$20-\$75 for filling out a 25 minute survey? these are  
the  
> amounts mentioned by get paid 4 opinions  
> Best regards from Amsterdam  
>  
> Edith  
>  
> Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA  
> Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam  
> tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
> e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl  
> -----  
> Hope is like a small light in the dark  
> It keeps the nightmares away till the dawn of a new world  
>  
> www.coalitievoorvrede.nl  
www.peoples-peace-campaign.org  
>

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your  
main email address.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 16:02:07 -0500  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Many Thanks  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I'd like to thanks everyone who responded to my question about possible  
sources of Jewish sample - I responded to some individually but I have  
now officially lost track of those to whom I have responded. So rather  
than possibly sending multiple thank you's individually I will remark  
once again how helpful my fellow AAPORista's are and hope that this  
suffices.

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road Suite 101  
Baltimore, MD 21209  
410-377-7880 ext. 14  
410-377-7955 fax

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your  
main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 19:22:14 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Push polling in South Dakota  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Joshua Micah Marshall's Talking Points Memo weblog  
(<http://talkingpointsmemo.com/>) contains the following description of  
what appears to be genuine push polling in the extremely tight South  
Dakota senate race.

Jan Werner  
[jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)

-----  
-----  
<http://talkingpointsmemo.com/oct0204.html#1029021055pm>

(October 29th, 2002 -- 10:55 PM EST // link)

With one week to go, the South Dakota Senate race remains on a  
razor's edge. The latest information TPM has received has Johnson  
blipping up by a point or two. But is Johnson's opponent,  
Congressman John Thune, trying to even the score with some last  
minute 'push-polls'?

Seems so.

In case you're wondering, 'push-polls' first got attention in the  
early 1990s and they're the specialty of your greasier sort of  
political tele-marketing firm. A 'push-poll' isn't really a poll,  
or at least it's not really an effort to gain public opinion  
information. It's actually a stealth form of negative advertising.  
So for instance, you might have a list of a few questions followed  
by something like: "Would you still vote for candidate X if those  
awful charges about his beating his wife turned out to be true?"  
Click ... phone hangs up.

You get the idea...

Now someone is pulling one of these stunts in South Dakota.

For a week or more there've been rumors around the state that voters were getting classic push-polls tarring Tim Johnson with responsibility for engaging in voter fraud or "rigging the election." The fraud story began to fade about a week ago, fizzling for lack of substance. But it's a close race and the Thune campaign would still like to use it against Johnson.

Push-polling is notoriously difficult to track down and prove. And the financial paper-trail, to the extent there is one, usually only comes to light long after the election is over.

Today I spoke to two South Dakota voters who received such calls.

Ann Boer lives in Lyons, South Dakota, about twenty miles northwest of Sioux Falls. (Her husband, Vern Boer (D), is a candidate for Minnehaha County Commissioner.) Recently, Mrs. Boer received a survey call. The questioner first asked a few generic questions: leaning more toward Republicans or Democrats, more likely to vote for Thune or Johnson, etc. And then he asked: "Have you heard about the investigation going on about fraud in registering voters?"

Boer said yes.

"And if it was told to you tomorrow that it was Johnson's campaign that was responsible for this [fraud] then would that change your vote?"

Here's how Boer described the rest of the call: "I said 'no' and then he said 'why?' and I said 'because I know it's not verified that his campaign is responsible for it.' And then he just kind of hurried up and quit."

"I've gotten numerous calls but I've never gotten one like that," Boer told me Tuesday afternoon. "It was like accusing someone of something that hasn't even been verified."

Then there's Kathy Gustafson.

A bit after 9:00 PM Monday night Gustafson, a graduate student and teaching assistant at South Dakota State University, got a similar call. The caller started out with the standard questions of whether Gustafson leaned more toward the Democrats or the Republicans, whether she supported the NRA, pro-life or pro-choice, etc.

Then came the zinger. "If you knew that Tim Johnson had rigged the election, would you still vote for him?"

Gustafson didn't like the sound of that question and immediately asked the caller who he was working for. He said Central Marketing of New York City. Gustafson told the caller that she would still vote for Johnson since she didn't think there was anything to the charges. She also told him "a question like that had no business on

a survey."

"He thanked me for my time," Gustafson told me on Tuesday. "He did not react or respond to my response to the question ... I asked one more time for him to clarify the company to make sure I got that right. And he said 'Central Marketing, Manhattan, New York City.'" (In yet another call to a South Dakota number, a survey caller identified himself as working for Central Marketing Incorporated (CMI) of Hudson, Florida.)

On Tuesday evening, Gustafson got the same call again from Central Marketing. A lot of these calls, it would seem, are getting made.

The Thune and Johnson campaigns are both now operating under a pledge to run only positive ads through election day. Someone is simultaneously running a pretty slimy negative ad campaign over the state's telephones. One assumes it's not the Johnson campaign.

A late afternoon call to Thune spokesperson Christine Iverson, requesting comment, was not returned.

-- Josh Marshall

Copyright 2002 Joshua Micah Marshall

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 22:04:08 -0600  
Reply-To: "mary.losch@uni.edu" <mary.losch@UNI.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mary Losch <mary.losch@UNI.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Womans Day: Just say no to phone polls  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Regarding Tom G's earlier post --

I would encourage and support a formal response from AAPOR -- perhaps in the form of a Letter to the Editor at Woman's Day. In addition to Tom's points about how to verify the legitimacy of a survey, I would suggest emphasizing the value of gathering input from women on all topics -- their political views, public policy priorities, health experiences and needs, domestic violence, community priorities, and on and on. Without their participation in professional/scientific surveys and interviews, their voices will not be counted. This is a far more serious threat to their well-being than a fake survey.

Mary Losch

Date sent: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 07:47:00 -0800



From: Bill McCready <BMcCready@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.com>  
Subject: Re: Womans Day: Just say no to phone polls  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Send reply to: Bill McCready <BMcCready@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.com>

> One of the approaches we used to take when doing RDD survey work for  
> local communities in Illinois was to alert the village hall and police  
> dispatchers when we were fielding and tell people to check out our  
> legitimacy that way. It requires a bit of coordination and is obviously  
> not appropriate for regional or national surveys.

>

> Bill

>

> =====

> Bill McCready

> Knowledge Networks

> Tel: 708.848.4296

> Cell: 708.203.8941

> Fax: 708.524.1241

> =====

>

>

>

>

>

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

> From: Thomas Guterbock [mailto:tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU]

> Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2002 9:33 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Womans Day: Just say no to phone polls

>

> Last night during interviewer training one of our interviewers brought

> to

> our attention the following item that appeared in the October 8 issue of

>

> Woman's Day magazine:

>

> "4. Just say no to phone surveys. "Criminals use fake surveys to find

> out

> information about you-how many kids you have, your daily habits, when

> you're home from work, where you live," says Neal Rawls, author of Be

> Alert, Be Aware, Have a Plan. Keep your personal life your own by

> politely declining such offers."

>

> The entire article, "26 ways to be Safer," can be viewed on line at:

> [http://www.womansday.com/xp6/WomansDay/your\\_family.xml/0902/0902be\\_safe1](http://www.womansday.com/xp6/WomansDay/your_family.xml/0902/0902be_safe1)

> .xml

>

> Is this something to which AAPOR ought to respond? We would encourage

> skeptical respondents to seek information on the legitimacy of the call,

>

> which legitimate polling organizations are happy to provide by, for

> example, referring the caller to website, FAXing information, giving a

> incoming phone number, or just calling back after respondent has time to

>

> consider the call request.

>

>

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  
>  
----- End of forwarded message -----  
----- End of forwarded message -----

-----  
View the archives and control your settings for AAPORnet at:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your  
main email address.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 31 Oct 2002 08:33:26 -0500  
Reply-To: Eric Plutzer <[exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Eric Plutzer <[exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Push Polling in SD? Not likely  
In-Reply-To: <[200210310437.XAA90264@f05n16.cac.psu.edu](mailto:200210310437.XAA90264@f05n16.cac.psu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

The article about alleged push polling in South Dakota raises a few questions but the evidence cited sounds much more consistent with exploratory polls trying to assess the effectiveness of different types of negative campaign slogans. Not the type of thing to make you proud of how democracy works in the US but well short of push polling.

Consider the fact that there are fewer than 500,000 registered voters in South Dakota, and no more than 200,000 who vote regularly in congressional as well as presidential elections (turnout in 1996 was about 350,000).

Consider also that the race is a dead heat and, as a result, both parties and the mass media are polling more frequently than usual. If call lists are based on habitual, off-year, voters, then virtually all such households could be polled one or more times between Labor Day and the election. So getting a similar call twice isn't too surprising.

Indeed, a typical push-poll with an N of 50,000 or more would mean that within a few days, almost every voter in the state would have received such a call or know someone who had.

The fact that the article reports just a handful of such reports, rather than hundreds, tells me this was a study with a normal N of 1000 or so that was intended to elicit legitimate (if ethically questionable) information.

-- Eric

At 11:01 PM 10/30/2002, you wrote:  
>Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 19:22:14 -0500  
>From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
>Subject: Push polling in South Dakota

>  
>Joshua Micah Marshall's Talking Points Memo weblog  
>(http://talkingpointsmemo.com/) contains the following description of  
>what appears to be genuine push polling in the extremely tight South  
>Dakota senate race.  
>  
>Jan Werner  
>jwerner@jwdp.com

~~~~~  
Eric Plutzer  
Associate Professor of Political Science  
Penn State University  
<http://polisci.la.psu.edu/faculty/plutzer/>

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 31 Oct 2002 09:28:14 -0700  
Reply-To: Michael Newman <[mnewman@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM](mailto:mnewman@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Michael Newman <[mnewman@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM](mailto:mnewman@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM)>  
Subject: Surveys on personal health issues

Dear AAPOR,

I am looking for sources of information that support the validity of data collected through telephone interviews on personal health issues. Specifically, can anyone provide insight (or direct me to research) on respondents' willingness to answer questions on potentially embarrassing medical problems (e.g., impotence)?

Many thanks.

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 31 Oct 2002 12:08:21 -0800  
Reply-To: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
Organization: Opinion Access Corp.  
Subject: Re: Surveys on personal health issues  
Comments: To: Michael Newman <[mnewman@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM](mailto:mnewman@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM)>  
In-Reply-To: <[0H4U00BVRTR2R3@asu.edu](mailto:0H4U00BVRTR2R3@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Believe it or not, we run a tracker on just such a topic. Cooperation is surprisingly good. One of the major keys is obviously running the

study with same-sex interviewers (and we survey women on this topic as well regarding their feelings). If I can be of any further help, please feel free to contact me offline.

Lance Hoffman  
Account Executive  
Opinion Access Corp.  
P: 718.729.2622 x.157  
F: 718.729.2444  
C: 646.522.2012

---

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or organization to which it is addressed. Any opinions or advice presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Opinion Access Corp. DO NOT copy, modify, distribute or take any action in reliance on this email if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete this email from your system. Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no responsibility can be accepted for any loss or damage arising from its receipt or use.

---

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Michael Newman  
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2002 8:28 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Surveys on personal health issues

Dear AAPOR,

I am looking for sources of information that support the validity of data collected through telephone interviews on personal health issues. Specifically, can anyone provide insight (or direct me to research) on respondents' willingness to answer questions on potentially embarrassing medical problems (e.g., impotence)?

Many thanks.

---

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 31 Oct 2002 12:34:10 -0500  
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>

Subject: Creating line graphs  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone have advice on programs good for creating line graphs? I've been using Excel, but it is difficult in several respects. It is hard to fit more than a couple of rows under a chart or to identify the rows on the left (e.g., with the N for bases and other identifications) and have the text aligned properly. It provides just a hyphen for minus, not true minus signs. There are other problems as well. If anyone has experience with programs better than Excel for creating line graphs, recommendations would be appreciated. Howard

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 31 Oct 2002 12:53:23 -0500  
Reply-To: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth\_Steve@TVRATINGS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth\_Steve@TVRATINGS.COM>  
Subject: Re: Creating line graphs  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Howard,

You may find that SPSS is a friendlier application for editing charts and graphs that are data driven. You can also create them from scratch using any number of simple drawing programs. Either way, you'll want to be careful when scaling the Axes. Below is a link to a downloadable drawing program.

<http://www.mayura.com/>

Ken Steve  
Lead Research Analyst  
Nielsen Media Research  
(727) 773-4317

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

From: Howard Schuman [mailto:[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)]  
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2002 12:34 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: creating line graphs

Does anyone have advice on programs good for creating line graphs? I've been using Excel, but it is difficult in several respects. It is hard to fit more than a couple of rows under a chart or to identify the rows on the left (e.g., with the N for bases and other identifications) and have the text aligned properly. It provides just a hyphen for minus, not true minus signs. There are other problems as well. If anyone has

experience with programs better than Excel for creating line graphs, recommendations would be appreciated. Howard

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 31 Oct 2002 10:04:35 -0800  
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Surveys on personal health issues  
In-Reply-To: <002e01c28119\$49e95870\$7301a8c0@LHOFFMAN>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

We did a statewide RDD survey of HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and behaviors in which we asked many sensitive questions. Our cooperation rate was 69% and response rate (AAPOR, RR4) was 35%. We completed up to 40 call attempts to achieve this outcome.

Obviously, the survey introduction, the questions and the transitional statements must be carefully worded, and the interviewers must be well trained in conducting interviews on sensitive subjects.

After completing the introduction which included the informed consent statement, we offered respondents (n=794) who (randomly) drew an interviewer of the opposite sex the option of a same-sex interviewer. Of the male respondents 71% chose to keep their female interviewer and 29% opted for a male interviewer. Of the female respondents 57% chose to keep their male interviewer and 43% opted for a female interviewer. Thus, it may make sense to allow respondents to choose the gender of their interviewer.

At 10/31/2002 12:08 PM, you wrote:

>Believe it or not, we run a tracker on just such a topic. Cooperation  
>is surprisingly good. One of the major keys is obviously running the  
>study with same-sex interviewers (and we survey women on this topic as  
>well regarding their feelings). If I can be of any further help, please  
>feel free to contact me offline.

>  
>Lance Hoffman  
>Account Executive  
>Opinion Access Corp.  
>P: 718.729.2622 x.157  
>F: 718.729.2444  
>C: 646.522.2012

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

>From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Michael Newman  
>Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2002 8:28 AM  
>To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
>Subject: Surveys on personal health issues

>

>Dear AAPOR,  
>  
>I am looking for sources of information that support the validity of  
>data  
>collected through telephone interviews on personal health issues.  
>Specifically, can anyone provide insight (or direct me to research) on  
>respondents' willingness to answer questions on potentially embarrassing  
>medical problems (e.g., impotence)?  
>  
>Many thanks.

=====  
Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.  
Director  
Center for Family and Community Health  
School of Public Health  
University of California, Berkeley  
WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>  
=====

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 31 Oct 2002 13:06:48 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Fwd: War with Iraq - yes or no? \$59 Gift for your opinion  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Here is a new low in the sleazy abuse of polls to fleece the unwary.

I received this email yesterday from "Free Product Samples." While I normally would kill this kind of message sight unseen, I was intrigued after recent abuses documented on AAPORNET, so I opened it.

The original was an HTML document which linked to a form on the sender's server which opened directly within the message, and probably also sent a token back identifying the recipient. Note that while the unidentified "gift" may be free, there is a delivery fee if you choose to answer and accept it.

Jan Werner  
[jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)

-----  
Free Product Samples wrote:

>  
> [Image]  
> Will the United States go to war with Iraq? Yes No  
>

> Does Iraq have weapons of mass destruction? Yes No  
>  
> Does Al Qaeda have training camps in Iraq? Yes No  
>  
> Is President Bush handling the situation with Iraq  
> correctly? Yes No  
>  
> Gifts are free, recipient pays delivery fee.  
> [Image]  
> [Image]  
>  
> Our records indicate you have opted in to receive samples,  
> free offers and money saving tips while visiting one of our  
> marketing partners.  
>  
> If you would no longer like to receive these offers via email,  
> you can unsubscribe by sending a blank email to  
> unsub-86532077-1913@fpsamplesmail.com  
> OR  
> Sending a postal mail to CustomerService  
> 424 E. Central Blvd #118, Orlando, FL 32801  
>  
> This message was sent to address jwerner@jwdp.com

-----  
Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 31 Oct 2002 10:39:10 -0800  
Reply-To: "Dr. Judy Calder" <[calder@SCS.UNR.EDU](mailto:calder@SCS.UNR.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Dr. Judy Calder" <[calder@SCS.UNR.EDU](mailto:calder@SCS.UNR.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Womans Day: Just say no to phone polls  
Comments: To: "mary.losch@uni.edu" <[mary.losch@UNI.EDU](mailto:mary.losch@UNI.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Agree 100% -- thanks to Mary for the insightful comments.

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

From: "mary.losch@uni.edu" <[mary.losch@UNI.EDU](mailto:mary.losch@UNI.EDU)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2002 8:04 PM  
Subject: Re: Womans Day: Just say no to phone polls

> Regarding Tom G's earlier post --

>

> I would encourage and support a formal response from AAPOR --

> perhaps in the form of a Letter to the Editor at Woman's Day.

> In addition to Tom's points about how to verify the legitimacy of a

> survey, I would suggest emphasizing the value of gathering input

> from women on all topics -- their political views, public policy

> priorities, health experiences and needs, domestic violence,

> community priorities, and on and on. Without their participation



> in professional/scientific surveys and interviews, their voices will  
> not be counted. This is a far more serious threat to their well-  
> being than a fake survey.  
>  
> Mary Losch  
>  
> Date sent: Wed, 30 Oct 2002 07:47:00 -0800  
> From: Bill McCready <BMcCready@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.com>  
> Subject: Re: Womans Day: Just say no to phone polls  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Send reply to: Bill McCready <BMcCready@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.com>  
>  
> > One of the approaches we used to take when doing RDD survey work for  
> > local communities in Illinois was to alert the village hall and police  
> > dispatchers when we were fielding and tell people to check out our  
> > legitimacy that way. It requires a bit of coordination and is obviously  
> > not appropriate for regional or national surveys.  
> >  
> > Bill  
> >  
> > =====  
> > Bill McCready  
> > Knowledge Networks  
> > Tel: 708.848.4296  
> > Cell: 708.203.8941  
> > Fax: 708.524.1241  
> > =====  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> > -----Original Message-----  
> > From: Thomas Guterbock [mailto:tmglp@T.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU]  
> > Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2002 9:33 AM  
> > To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> > Subject: Womans Day: Just say no to phone polls  
> >  
> > Last night during interviewer training one of our interviewers brought  
> > to  
> > our attention the following item that appeared in the October 8 issue of  
> >  
> > Woman's Day magazine:  
> >  
> > "4. Just say no to phone surveys. "Criminals use fake surveys to find  
> > out  
> > information about you-how many kids you have, your daily habits, when  
> > you're home from work, where you live," says Neal Rawls, author of Be  
> > Alert, Be Aware, Have a Plan. Keep your personal life your own by  
> > politely declining such offers."  
> >  
> > The entire article, "26 ways to be Safer," can be viewed on line at:  
> > [http://www.womansday.com/xp6/WomansDay/your\\_family.xml/0902/0902be\\_safe1](http://www.womansday.com/xp6/WomansDay/your_family.xml/0902/0902be_safe1)  
> > .xml  
> >  
> > Is this something to which AAPOR ought to respond? We would encourage  
> > skeptical respondents to seek information on the legitimacy of the call,  
> >

> > which legitimate polling organizations are happy to provide by, for  
> > example, referring the caller to website, FAXing information, giving a  
> > incoming phone number, or just calling back after respondent has time to  
> >  
> > consider the call request.

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  
> >

---

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:  
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
then click on 'Join or leave the list'  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)