

=====
Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700
Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: September 1996 archive - one BIG message

This is the USC Listproc archive of AAPORNET messages for this entire month. It is one big message, in chronological order, just the way the USC archive stored it. You can search within this month with your browser's search function (usually Ctrl-F).

Turning this into individual messages that ASU's Listserv software can index and sort means a lot of reformatting. We will do this as time permits.

New messages are of course automatically formatted correctly, and I have converted November 1994 through January 1995 and June 2002 to the present.

Shap Wolf
Survey Research Laboratory
Arizona State University
shap.wolf@asu.edu
AAPORNET volunteer host

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9609.
Part 1/1, total size 156936 bytes:

----- Cut here -----
>From mcouper@survey.umd.edu Mon Sep 2 08:22:37 1996
Return-Path: mcouper@survey.umd.edu
Received: from umail.umd.edu (umail.umd.edu [128.8.10.28])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA27447 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Mon, 2 Sep 1996 08:22:35 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from survey.umd.edu (survey.umd.edu [129.2.24.103]) by
umail.umd.edu (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id LAA23727 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>;
Mon, 2 Sep 1996 11:21:21 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from SURVEY/MAILQUEUE1 by survey.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);
Mon, 2 Sep 96 11:22:17 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by SURVEY (Mercury 1.13); Mon, 2 Sep 96 11:21:48
+1100
From: "Mick Couper" <mcouper@survey.umd.edu>
Organization: Joint Program In Survey Methodology
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu
Date: Mon, 2 Sep 1996 11:21:47 EST
Subject: InterCASIC '96 registration materials
Priority: normal
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.23)
Message-ID: <4985DB350A8@survey.umd.edu>

Dear AAPOR colleagues:

Registration materials are now available for the International Conference on Computer-Assisted Information Collection (InterCASIC) to be held December 11-14 in San Antonio. To get a copy of the brochure and registration form, send an e-mail with your snail-mail address to Lee Decker (lee@amstat.org)

or myself (mcouper@survey.umd.edu). If you want to see more information on the conference, visit our web page at:

<http://www.bsos.umd.edu/jpsm/casic.html>

We have a very interesting program, and this conference is likely to be oversubscribed, so register early.

Hope to see many of you in San Antonio.

Mick Couper

```
>From DMMerkle@aol.com Tue Sep 3 10:23:56 1996
Return-Path: DMMerkle@aol.com
Received: from emout07.mail.aol.com (emout07.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.22])
    by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id KAA26287 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Sep 1996 10:23:53 -0700
(PDT)
From: DMMerkle@aol.com
Received: by emout07.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id NAA15058 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 3 Sep 1996 13:22:08 -0400
Date: Tue, 3 Sep 1996 13:22:08 -0400
Message-ID: <960903132208_515057616@emout07.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Job Announcement
```

EDK Associates, a strategic public opinion research firm based in New York, is conducting a national search to fill the following position:

Title: RESEARCH ASSISTANT/RESEARCH ANALYST

Date Available: September, 1996

Location: New York City

Responsibilities: Build and manage data sets, do data runs, schedule and manage polls and focus groups. Assist president of the company and other staffers in development of questionnaires and report writing. Draft client memos and proposals.

Qualifications: High-energy individual with competence in SPSS and SPSS for Windows, strong computer and communications skills. Able to work efficiently and creatively under tight deadlines. Some public opinion or marketing research experience preferable, but not required.

EDK Associates was founded in 1991 by Ethel Klein, PhD. The firm specializes in public education campaigns, strategic planning and public affairs strategy. Clients include the Ford Foundation, Family Violence Prevention Fund, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Home Box Office, Ziff-Davis, the California Wellness Foundation, the New York Community Trust, Public Media Center, and Merck.

Interested candidates should send or fax their resume and salary history to:

Ethel Klein
President
EDK Associates
101 Fifth Avenue, 6th Floor
New York, NY 10003

Fax: 212-367-7517

>From tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu Wed Sep 4 09:22:25 1996
Return-Path: tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu
Received: from mhub2.tc.umn.edu (mhub2.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.52])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA11196 for <Aapornet@vm.usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Sep 1996 09:22:24 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub2.tc.umn.edu; Wed, 4 Sep 96 10:49:46
-0500
Received: by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Wed, 4 Sep 96 10:49:46 -0500
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 1996 10:49:45 -0500 (CDT)
From: Phillip J Tichenor <tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
To: networklist Aapor <Aapornet@vm.usc.edu>
Subject: age x gender tracking data?
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.960904104633.20332A-100000@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Can anyone send me some tracking data with age and gender breakdowns on support for Clinton v. Dole? Have they been published somewhere recently? Data that show changes for the past couple of months or so? Phil Tichenor

>From Usapolls@aol.com Wed Sep 4 13:02:27 1996
Return-Path: Usapolls@aol.com
Received: from emout15.mail.aol.com (emout15.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.41])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA12027 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Sep 1996 13:02:25 -0700
(PDT)
From: Usapolls@aol.com
Received: by emout15.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id QAA09858 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 4 Sep 1996 16:01:53 -0400
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 1996 16:01:53 -0400
Message-ID: <960904155654_277213437@emout15.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: OPSCAN Software/Hardware for Surveys

I would be interested in any information anyone has on experiences with and knowledge of software/hardware that would permit self-administered questionnaires to be read in by an op scan machine.

I have seen such packages advertised, though I cannot remember where. I would be particularly interested in a package that would permit us to design the answer forms ourselves, either outputting the form directly or else outputting something that might require custom printing.

I recall getting a Gallup form like this in a study they did for the Post Office.

Obviously, the use of such a system is most justified in high volume surveys where the set up cost is amortized over a large number of surveys.

We are embarking on a large-scale project with a long survey and large sample of highly motivated respondents (who WILL follow directions carefully). All of these features make me comfortable about this method. We are on a very tight timeframe, however, and thus I would appreciate a quick response from anyone knowing of such a product.

Thanks,

Mike O'Neil
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, AZ 85282
(602) 967-4441

>From David_Moore@internet.gallup.com Wed Sep 4 13:40:17 1996
Return-Path: David_Moore@internet.gallup.com
Received: from gateway.gallup.com (firewall-user@gateway.gallup.com [206.158.235.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA16818 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Sep 1996 13:40:15 -0700 (PDT)
From: David_Moore@internet.gallup.com
Received: (from uucp@localhost) by gateway.gallup.com (8.7.4/8.6.11) id PAA27093 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Sep 1996 15:39:45 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from unknown(198.247.195.190) by gateway.gallup.com via smap (T3.2)
id xma027085; Wed, 4 Sep 96 15:39:39 -0500
Received: from ccMail by internet.gallup.com (SMTPLINK V2.11 PreRelease 4)
id AA841876836; Wed, 04 Sep 96 16:37:58 CST
Date: Wed, 04 Sep 96 16:37:58 CST
Message-Id: <9608048418.AA841876836@internet.gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: age x gender tracking data?

I can fax an SPSS printout of age by gender for Gallup surveys, but contact me directly with your fax number

David W. Moore
The Gallup Organization
47 Hulfish Street
Princeton, NJ 08542
david_moore@internet.gallup.com

Reply Separator

Subject: age x gender tracking data?
Author: aapornet@usc.edu at Internet
Date: 9/4/96 11:37 AM

Can anyone send me some tracking data with age and gender breakdowns on support for Clinton v. Dole? Have they been published somewhere recently? Data that show changes for the past couple of months or so? Phil Tichenor

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Sep 5 10:04:13 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA26439 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Sep 1996 10:04:11 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA07560 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Sep 1996 10:04:10 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Thu, 5 Sep 1996 10:04:10 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
Reply-To: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Two Straws in the Wind
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960905095833.6548B-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

TWO STRAWS IN THE WIND

COMPUTERS ASKED TO IDENTIFY SUSPICIOUS BAGGAGE

Officials working on an aviation commission headed by Vice President Gore and formed after the TWA Flight 800 crash are recommending that computerized background checks of passengers should be made to determine which customer luggage to search. Names, addresses, phone numbers, travel histories and billing records of passengers would be examined to look for irregularities that would suggest the possibility of terrorist activity. Civil libertarians are expected to object to the plan as an invasion of privacy. (New York Times 1 Sep 96 p17)

SPORTS LEAGUES VS. ONLINE MEDIA

The National Basketball Association's lawsuit against America Online for its practice of reporting real-time game developments online is testing the proposition that sports news is proprietary data owned by the professional league involved, and aims to set a new precedent for a new medium. "The effort to protect the facts so you can sell them is anathema to First Amendment principles," says a New York attorney who filed a friend-of-the-court brief on behalf of AOL. "This is part of the mad scramble to redefine intellectual property," says the VP for NFL Enterprises, the NFL's new media unit. "Just as we control the rights for the game in television and in radio, we intend to control the way the game appears on the Internet." (Wall Street Journal 30 Aug 96 B1)

Selected from Edupage (9/3/96), edited by John Gehl and Suzanne Douglas.

>From lees@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu Fri Sep 6 07:47:03 1996
Return-Path: lees@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu
Received: from tiberium.circ.gwu.edu (tiberium.circ.gwu.edu
[128.164.127.251])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id HAA12329 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Sep 1996 07:46:59 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from gwis2.circ.gwu.edu (gwis2 [128.164.127.252]) by tiberium.circ.gwu.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) with ESMTTP id KAA28212 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Sep 1996 10:42:44 -0400
Received: (from lees@localhost) by gwis2.circ.gwu.edu (8.7.5/8.6.12) id KAA29238; Fri, 6 Sep 1996 10:46:53 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Fri, 6 Sep 1996 10:46:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: Lee Sigelman <lees@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu>
Subject: Russian election surveys
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: <199608240822.BAA15957@usc.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.3.89.9609061001.A9024-0100000@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

A few months ago, a results of a series of surveys on the first and second rounds of the Russian election were posted to this list. I either saved these and lost them or failed to save them in the first place. In any event, if any kind soul did retain them and would forward them to me (not to the whole list!), I'd really appreciate it. Thanks.

Lee Sigelman	VOICE: (202) 994-6290
Department of Political Science	FAX: (202) 994-7743
The George Washington University	E-MAIL: lees@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu
Washington, DC 20052	

>From kcbreese@christa.unh.edu Fri Sep 6 12:18:15 1996
Return-Path: kcbreese@christa.unh.edu
Received: from unh.edu (unh.edu [132.177.132.50])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA21411 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Sep 1996 12:13:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from christa.unh.edu by unh.edu with SMTP id AA18813
(5.67b+/IDA-1.5 for <aapornet@usc.edu>); Fri, 6 Sep 1996 15:13:25 -0400
Received: from unhsc10.unh.edu (unhsc10.unh.edu [132.177.130.73]) by christa.unh.edu (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id PAA16779 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Sep 1996 15:13:24 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Fri, 6 Sep 1996 15:13:24 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199609061913.PAA16779@christa.unh.edu>
X-Sender: kcbreese@christa.unh.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: kcbreese@christa.unh.edu (Kara Breese)
Subject: survey design product
X-Mailer: <PC Eudora Version 1.4>

Is anyone aware of a software product (windows or DOS based) that:

- 1) is designed to teach the small business person how to conduct market research? or,
- 2) outlines "how to conduct a survey" for someone with very little experience.

Please respond directly to: kcbreese@christa.unh.edu

Thank you!

Kara Breese
Assistant Director/Information Specialist
UNH Survey Center
(603) 862-2983 Phone
(603) 862-1488 Fax
kcbreese@christa.unh.edu

>From weggdg@sncac.snc.edu Fri Sep 6 12:59:47 1996
Return-Path: weggdg@sncac.snc.edu
Received: from sncac.snc.edu (sncac.snc.edu [138.74.0.6])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA26833 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Sep 1996 12:59:44 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by sncac.snc.edu; id AA21704; Fri, 6 Sep 96 14:57:34 -0500
From: weggdg@sncac.snc.edu (David G. Wegge)
Message-Id: <9609061957.AA21704@sncac.snc.edu>
Subject: pro football & values survey
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Fri, 6 Sep 1996 14:57:33 -0500 (CDT)
Cc: weggdg@sncac.snc.edu
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL21]
Content-Type: text

We are planning to conduct a national survey in late october or early November on the topic of professional football and values. I would be interested in receiving samples of questions that others have asked on this topic. We are checking with some of the polling archives around the country as well. Please send question items or citations to:

David G. Wegge, Director
St. Norbert College Survey Center
F. K. Bemis International Center
100 Grant Street
De Pere, WI 54115
Voice: (414) 403-3080
FAX: (414) 403-4036
e-mail : weggdg@sncac.snc.edu

Thank you so much .

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Sep 7 11:35:43 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP
id LAA25602 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Sep 1996 11:35:41 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA27066 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Sep 1996 11:35:37 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Sat, 7 Sep 1996 11:35:36 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: For Government Wonks
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960907112930.26424E-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Government wonks on AAPORNET might come to cherish (or at least bookmark) the following spanking-new home page. Thanks again to all the fine people in Ann Arbor for yet another selfless contribution to global scholarship.

Government Resources on the Web

<http://www.lib.umich.edu/libhome/Documents.center/federal.html>
Contains 142 pages of annotated links to federal, state, foreign, and international governments, as well as political science and statistical data. Browse special sections like Documents in the News, Congressional Research and Census data.

>From RFunk787@aol.com Sun Sep 8 09:29:30 1996
Return-Path: RFunk787@aol.com
Received: from emout07.mail.aol.com (emout07.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.22])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA08623 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 8 Sep 1996 09:29:29 -0700
(PDT)
From: RFunk787@aol.com
Received: by emout07.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id MAA05502 for
aapornet@usc.edu; Sun, 8 Sep 1996 12:28:57 -0400
Date: Sun, 8 Sep 1996 12:28:57 -0400
Message-ID: <960908122856_1377074241@emout07.mail.aol.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Another Straw in the Wind ?

Last week the Wall Street Journal ran an article, "Math Ph.D.s Add to Anti-Foreigner Wave." -- "A group of young U.S. mathematicians, with doctorates from such schools as Princeton University and MIT, are lobbying Congress to repeal laws that now make it especially easy for universities to import foreign professors." It seems that last year immigrants won 40% of the 720 mathematics jobs available. For the past two years, recent U.S. math Ph.D.s have experienced unemployment rates of 10+%, a sharp rise since 1990, when the "Einstein Exemption" was passed.

"'We remain a fiercely merit-oriented, antixenophobic community, but the current situation knows no precedent,' wrote Harvard-trained mathematician Eric Weinstein and 20 other scholars in a recent plea to Capitol Hill. . . . 'Since 1976 universities have been using the immigration exemptions to import a labor force of foreign scientists at greatly decreased cost'."

It would seem that the operative phrase here is "knows no precedent." Sure, let 'em in, no problem, as long as it happens to somebody else. This suggests a working definition of "xenophobia": When somebody you don't know objects to losing his livelihood to a foreigner.

Government, survey research and academic social science jobs at present seem fairly immune to migration overseas, or to wholesale usurpation by immigrants. Nevertheless, this article suggests we might do well to think a

bit before slapping labels like "xenophobia", "redneck" and "racism" on concerns abroad in the U.S. and gaining momentum. It seems this is primarily an economic issue, and it is creeping closer to home. Not everyone, even in the academic community, enjoys tenure or civil service job protection.

The article closes with a quote from a Harvard labor economist:
"Immigration is income redistribution, and the people who are 100% for immigration often downplay that aspect." Indeed.

Ray Funkhouser

>From rbezilla@ix.netcom.com Sun Sep 8 10:33:55 1996
Return-Path: rbezilla@ix5.ix.netcom.com
Received: from dfw-ix5.ix.netcom.com (dfw-ix5.ix.netcom.com [206.214.98.5])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA13031 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 8 Sep 1996 10:33:53 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [199.183.207.56] (prn-nj1-24.ix.netcom.com [199.183.207.56])
by dfw-ix5.ix.netcom.com (8.6.13/8.6.12) with SMTP id KAA15212 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 8 Sep 1996 10:33:16 -0700
Message-Id: <199609081733.KAA15212@dfw-ix5.ix.netcom.com>
Subject: Re: Another Straw in the Wind ?
Date: Sun, 8 Sep 96 13:31:23 -0400
x-sender: rbezilla@popd.ix.netcom.com
x-mailer: Claris EMailer 1.1
From: Robert Bezilla <rbezilla@ix.netcom.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

>Government, survey research and academic social science jobs at present
>seem fairly immune to migration overseas, or to wholesale usurpation by
>immigrants.

I think it is highly likely that off-shore telephone/internet interviewers will begin to compete with the current Midwestern phone shops, both to take advantage of lower-priced labor and because non-U.S. based survey organizations will want to tap the U.S. market directly. It seems just as likely that low-cost statistical services from places such as India and Russia will become commonplace.

Robert Bezilla
rbezilla@ix.netcom.com

>From Fred.Solop@nau.edu Mon Sep 9 11:43:10 1996
Return-Path: Fred.Solop@nau.edu
Received: from logjam.ucc.nau.edu (mailgate.nau.edu [134.114.96.14])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA15191 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 9 Sep 1996 11:43:04 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU by NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU (PMDF V5.0-6 #2384)
id <01I99UXQWF408X600F@NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU>; Mon, 09 Sep 1996 11:42:46 -0700
(MST)
Date: Mon, 09 Sep 1996 11:42:46 -0700 (MST)
From: Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@nau.edu>

Subject: Updated Web Site
To: por@unc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01I99UXQX81U8X600F@NAUVAX.UCC.NAU.EDU>
X-VMS-To: IN%"por@unc.edu" IN%"aapornet@usc.edu"
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The Social Research Laboratory at Northern Arizona University has updated its world wide web site. Please take a look at what we're doing and forward me any suggestions for improving the site. Also take a look at our new Arizona Election site. We are just in the process of pulling this together.

The SRL address is:

<http://www.nau.edu/~srl>

and the election site can be reached at:

<http://www.nau.edu/azelection>

Please add our sites to your bookmark and send us your URL addresses to include in our listing of on-line resources.

Thanks,

Fred Solop

```
*****
*   Fred Solop                               *** Northern Arizona University   *
*   Associate Professor,                     *** P.O. BOX 15036                       *
*   Dept. of Political Science                *** Flagstaff, AZ 86011                 *
*   Associate Director,                      *** E-mail: Fred.Solop@nau.edu          *
*   The Social Research Lab                  *** Web Address: http://www.nau.edu/~srl *
*   *****                                  *** Phone: (520) 523-3135; FAX: (520) 523-6777 *
*****
```

```
>From murray1@nyc.pipeline.com Mon Sep 9 11:57:02 1996
Return-Path: murray1@pipeline.com
Received: from mailout1.h1.usa.pipeline.com (data1.h1.usa.pipeline.com
[38.8.56.2])
    by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
    id LAA17209 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Mon, 9 Sep 1996 11:56:57 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from pipel.ny3.usa.pipeline.com by mailout1.h1.usa.pipeline.com
(8.6.9/2.1-PSINet/Pipeline)
    id SAA26142; Mon, 9 Sep 1996 18:56:25 GMT
Received: by pipel.ny3.usa.pipeline.com (SMI-8.6/SMI-5.4-PSI)
    id SAA20826; Mon, 9 Sep 1996 18:56:20 GMT
Date: Mon, 9 Sep 1996 18:56:20 GMT
Message-Id: <199609091856.SAA20826@pipel.ny3.usa.pipeline.com>
To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU
Subject: New York Chapter's Fall Season
From: murray1@nyc.pipeline.com (Murray Edelman)
X-PipeUser: murray1
X-PipeHub: nyc.pipeline.com
```

X-PipeGCOS: (Murray Edelman)
X-Mailer: Pipeline v3.5.0

AAPORNETer's

The New York Chapter has an exciting program this year. If you work in the New York area and haven't received our membership mailing, send a request to Roni Rosner (rrosner@aol.com).

Also if you know someone that might be interested, we can send them information. Don't worry we won't hound them.

Below is our fall program: Dan Merkle, our program chair, will be putting details over the net as we approach the dates.

September 19th, Self-Administered Questionnaires --workshop with Don Dillman

October 9th, Surveying the Internet

November 14th, Polling and the 1996 Elections -- A Post Mortem

December 13th (Holiday Party): The Relationship Between Presidents and their Pollsters with Robert Shapiro.

Murray Edelman, President

NYAAPOR

>From binddav@statcan.ca Tue Sep 10 12:26:30 1996

Return-Path: binddav@statcan.ca

Received: from stcgate.statcan.ca (stcgate.statcan.ca [142.206.192.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA09063 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Tue, 10 Sep 1996 12:26:17 -0700
(PDT)

Received: (from root@localhost) by stcgate.statcan.ca (8.6.11/8.6.9) id
PAA22631; Tue, 10 Sep 1996 15:27:09 -0400

Received: from stcnet.statcan.ca (142.206.128.146) by stcgate via smap
(V1.3)

id sma022488; Tue Sep 10 19:26:18 1996

Received: from statcan.ca by statcan.ca (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
id PAA01658; Tue, 10 Sep 1996 15:29:13 -0400

Date: Tue, 10 Sep 1996 15:29:13 -0400

Message-Id: <199609101929.PAA01658@statcan.ca>

X-Sender: binddav@142.206.128.146

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: "AAPORNET" <AAPORNET@usc.edu>, "allstat" <allstat@mailbase.ac.uk>,
"SSC List" <d-ssc@mcmail.CIS.McMaster.CA>, "sso-1"
<sso-1@ehd.hwc.ca>,

"Stats-discuss" <stats-discuss@mcc.ac.uk>,

"SURVEY" <SURVEY@ftc.gov.pe.ca>

From: binddav@statcan.ca (David A. Binder)

Subject: Re: CORTAID - new information

Cc: "Tom Jabine" <tjabine@nas.edu>

I believe I previously sent the exchange of letters between Tom Jabine and

Pharmacia & Upjohn. Since new information has been received, I felt it was fitting that I should send you the most recent update.

First, I repeat the original message from Tom Jabine. I follow this with the most recent correspondence.

+++++=====

Return-Path: <owner-srmsnet@UMDD.UMD.EDU>
Received: from statcan.ca by statcan.ca (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
id WAA06719; Tue, 20 Aug 1996 22:45:47 -0400
Received: (from root@localhost) by stcgate.statcan.ca (8.6.11/8.6.9) id
WAA11938; Tue, 20 Aug 1996 22:42:31 -0400
Received: from wnt.dc.lsoft.com(206.241.12.7) by stcgate via smap (V1.3)
id sma011925; Wed Aug 21 02:42:15 1996
Received: from PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM (206.241.12.4) by wnt.dc.lsoft.com
(LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1a) with SMTP id <0.F329C0D0@wnt.dc.lsoft.com>;
Tue, 20 Aug 1996 22:35:55 -0400
Received: from UMDD.UMD.EDU by UMDD.UMD.EDU (LISTSERV release 1.8b) with NJE
id
6237 for SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU; Tue, 20 Aug 1996 22:35:27 -0400
Received: from UMDD.UMD.EDU by UMDD.UMD.EDU (Mailer R2.10 ptf000) with BSMT
id
6935; Tue, 20 Aug 96 22:33:45 EDT
Received: from darius.nas.edu by UMDD.UMD.EDU ; 20 Aug 96 22:33:44 EDT
Received: from nas.edu (chariot.nas.edu [144.171.1.14]) by darius.nas.edu
(8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id WAA13704 for <srmsnet@umdd.umd.edu>;
Tue,
20 Aug 1996 22:35:42 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from cc:Mail by nas.edu id AA840605633; Tue, 20 Aug 96 22:25:23
EST
Encoding: 69 Text
Message-ID: <9607208406.AA840605633@nas.edu>
Date: Tue, 20 Aug 1996 22:25:23 EST
Reply-To: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>
Sender: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>
From: Tom Jabine <tjabine@NAS.EDU>
Subject: Use of surveys in advertising
To: Multiple recipients of list SRMSNET <SRMSNET@UMDD.UMD.EDU>
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 2453

There follows a letter, which is self-explanatory, from me to the CEO of Pharmacia and Upjohn:

3231 Worthington St. NW
Washington DC 20015-2362
July 14, 1996

Mr. John L. Zabriskie, CEO
Pharmacia and Upjohn, Inc.
7000 Portage Road
Kalamazoo MI 99001

Dear Mr. Zabriskie:

In the July 14, 1996 issue of the Washington Post Parade magazine, an advertisement for Cortaid contained the following statement:

Only Cortaid is recommended most by doctors. That's because Cortaid stops the persistent itching, then goes beyond to help heal the blotchy, allergic skin rash. Trust the brand doctors prefer over all other brands.

I assume the statements about doctors' preferences and recommendations were based on one or more surveys of doctors. I would be obliged if you could send me information about the survey(s) on which these statements were based, including the specific questions that were asked about preferences and recommendations for Cortaid, the statistical results for those questions, and details of the survey design(s), including sample sizes, method of data collection, and survey response rates. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Jabine

Following is a transcription of a reply that I received, dated 8/14/96:

Dear Mr. Jabine:

Your letter dated July 14, 1996 to Dr. John L. Zabriskie requesting certain information about a CORTAID[symbol for registered trade name] advertisement has been referred to me for reply.

While the statement you cited from the advertisement is correct and we have substantiation for the claims made in the statement, it is not our practice to publicly disclose the information you have requested absent a compelling business need to do so.

I regret that we could not be more responsive to your inquiry.

Very truly yours,

Ian D. Thorburn [CONSUMER HEALTHCARE, Brand Group Director]

I am considering making an inquiry to the National Advertising Division of the Council of Better Business Bureaus. Does anyone have other suggestions for pursuing this issue, or am I wasting my time?

Tom Jabine

++++++=====++++++

Return-Path: <tjabine@nas.edu>
Received: from statcan.ca by statcan.ca (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
id LAA25319; Tue, 10 Sep 1996 11:54:50 -0400
Received: (from root@localhost) by stcgate.statcan.ca (8.6.11/8.6.9) id
LAA19079 for <binddav@statcan.ca>; Tue, 10 Sep 1996 11:51:44 -0400
Received: from darius.nas.edu(144.171.1.12) by stcgate via smap (V1.3)
id sma019036; Tue Sep 10 15:51:33 1996
Received: from nas.edu (chariot.nas.edu [144.171.1.14]) by darius.nas.edu
(8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id LAA01080 for <binddav@statcan.ca>; Tue, 10 Sep
1996 11:37:51 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from cc:Mail by nas.edu
id AA842380209; Tue, 10 Sep 96 10:43:16 EST
Date: Tue, 10 Sep 96 10:43:16 EST
From: "Tom Jabine" <tjabine@nas.edu>
Encoding: 101 Text
Message-Id: <9608108423.AA842380209@nas.edu>
To: binddav@statcan.ca (David A. Binder)
Subject: Re: CORTAID - new information
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 3877

September 9, 1996

Progress Report on CORTAID Advertising

You may recall that my first letter from Mr. Ian D. Thorburn of Pharmacia & Upjohn failed to provide any of the information I had requested about the nature of surveys and survey data used to support their advertising claim that "Only CORTAID is recommended by most doctors." Much to my surprise, without my attempting any further contact with the company, I have just received a second letter from Mr. Thorburn. A transcript follows:

Dear Mr. Jabine:

Thank you for your recent letter requesting information on CORTAID [followed by registered trademark sign] market research. You asked for information supporting the advertised statement "Only CORTAID is recommended most by doctors." This statement is supported by data purchased from a company called IMS America located in Plymouth Meeting Pennsylvania. IMS gathers this information by auditing a panel of doctors. Thousands of doctors are sampled in a study called NDTI (National Disease Therapeutic Index) where they cooperate in reporting the products they recommend for various types of ailments.

The brands recommended by doctors were all brands (including store brands) sold in retail stores without a prescription used for the same results as CORTAID. Other brands included Cortizone 10, Cortizone 5, Cortizone Kids, Caladryl, topical Benadryl and Lanacane. The results came from a continuing physician survey of office-based doctors.

The physician sample consists of at least 980 reporting physicians per month and 2,940 per quarter. Doctors are selected from 69 different specialties

according to the total number of doctors in each specialty. Doctors are selected at random to be on the NDTI panel. The total physician universe represented numbered almost 400,000 physicians.

For more information about how the data are collected, you should contact IMS America Ltd.

Sincerely

Ian D. Thorburn
Director, U.S. Marketing

A bit of research revealed that IMS America is a division of Dun & Bradstreet. Its parent company, IMS International, is active in several countries. It is one of the largest suppliers of marketing information to pharmaceutical manufacturers. It might be characterized as a data warehouse, with one of its major activities being the purchase of data on prescriptions, an activity that has brought it to the attention of medical privacy advocates. Apparently the National Disease Therapeutic Index (strange name for a survey) supplements the prescription data with information about doctors' recommendations for non-prescription drugs.

Thomas B. Jabine
Statistical Consultant
3231 Worthington St. NW
Washington DC 20015-2362

Tel:202/244-4179
Email:tjabine@nas.edu

+++=====+++

David A. Binder	binddav@statcan.ca
Director	az004@freenet.carleton.ca
Business Survey Methods Division	TEL: (613) 951-0980 (Office)
11-A R.H. Coats Building	(613) 226-7292 (Home)
Statistics Canada	FAX: (613) 951-1462
Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA K1A 0T6	

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Wed Sep 11 10:57:40 1996
Return-Path: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (garnet.acns.fsu.edu [128.186.195.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA09114 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 11 Sep 1996 10:57:35 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from slosh.coss.fsu.edu (slosh.coss.fsu.edu [128.186.39.165]) by
garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.7.4/8.7.3) with SMTP id NAA61017; Wed, 11 Sep 1996
13:56:58 -0400

Message-Id: <1.5.4.32.19960911174936.0067d8a4@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (32)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 11 Sep 1996 13:49:36 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: work attitudes scales?
Cc: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu, kwang@ui.urban.org

Does anyone know where these items came from, reliability estimates and the like? Please respond directly to Dr. Wang below.

Thanks!
Susan Losh
FSU-Soc

>From: "Kevin Wang" <KWANG@UI.URBAN.ORG>
>Organization: Urban Institute
>To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
>Date: Wed, 11 Sep 1996 12:04:56 -0500
>Subject: work attitudes scales?
>Reply-to: KWANG@UI.URBAN.ORG
>Priority: normal
>
>Dr. Losh,
>
>We are working on developing a survey of 25,000 households across the
>U.S. designed to assess the effects of the New Federalism and welfare
>reform. We would like to include some sort of "attitudes toward
>work" scale.
>
>We have one set of questions from another survey but we can't track
>down the origins and reliability of these items. Some of the questions are

>as follows, rated from strongly agree to strongly disagree:
>
>I want to work in order to make more money.
>
>I would be ashamed of myself if I didn't try to work.
>
>I get lonely when I don't have a job.
>
>Work is very satisfying.
>
>My family and friends might think poorly of me if I didn't try to
>work.
>
>I really don't want to work.
>
>It would really bother me if I didn't try to work.
>
>I get bored when I don't have a job.
>
>I want to work because that's what I'm expected to do.
>

>I didn't find much in either Sociological Measurement
>or Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes (ed. by
>Robinson, Shaver and Wrightsman).

>

>At any rate, I would appreciate any help you could provide on either
>tracking down the origins of the items above or in suggestions for
>other "attitudes towards work" scales. Perhaps you could post this
>on AAPORNET?

>

>Thank you.

>

>Kevin

>

>

>

>Kevin Wang

>The Urban Institute

>2100 M Street NW

>Washington, DC 20037

>

>TEL: 202-857-8732

>FAX: 202-223-1149

>

>

>

>From EOBRIEN@nass.usda.gov Thu Sep 12 06:57:33 1996

Return-Path: EOBRIEN@nass.usda.gov

Received: from ag.gov (ag.gov [162.79.3.5])

by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id GAA19860 for <AAPORnet@usc.edu>; Thu, 12 Sep 1996 06:57:32 -0700

(PDT)

From: EOBRIEN@nass.usda.gov

Received: from nass.usda.gov ([199.129.206.11]) by ag.gov (4.1/SMI-4.1)

id AA11514; Thu, 12 Sep 96 07:58:23 MDT

Received: from ccMail by nass.usda.gov (SMTPLINK V2.11 PreRelease 4)

id AA842547386; Thu, 12 Sep 96 09:56:16 EST

Date: Thu, 12 Sep 96 09:56:16 EST

Message-Id: <9608128425.AA842547386@nass.usda.gov>

To: AAPORnet@usc.edu

Subject: Non-response in Business Surveys

Annually, we conduct a large national 2 hour, in-person financial survey of farm businesses. The literature on the ills of and remedies for nonresponse in household surveys is rich. However, winning cooperation from people at their place of business is a different dynamic. For those of you who survey people (who are primarily owner/operators) at their place of work, what are you doing to maximize survey response? What have you written on the topic?

Thank you,
Eileen

eo'brien@nass.usda.gov

Eileen M. O'Brien

USDA-NASS
Survey Methodology Group
Stop 4151
1400 Independence Ave
Washington, D.C. 20250-2000

phone (202)720-5810
fax (202)720-8738

>From DHAYNES@UBmail.ubalt.edu Thu Sep 12 07:55:25 1996
Return-Path: DHAYNES@UBmail.ubalt.edu
Received: from ubmail.ubalt.edu (ubmail.ubalt.edu [198.202.0.25])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA28077 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 12 Sep 1996 07:55:24 -0700
(PDT)
From: DHAYNES@UBmail.ubalt.edu
Received: from UBmail.ubalt.edu by UBmail.ubalt.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #7370) id
<01I9E0G9Y7DC004EYJ@UBmail.ubalt.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 12 Sep
1996 11:01:15 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 12 Sep 1996 11:01:15 -0500 (EST)
Subject: Phone surveys of hearing impaired
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01I9E0G9YZMQ004EYJ@UBmail.ubalt.edu>
X-VMS-To: MX%"aapornet@usc.edu"
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I am seeking advice on conducting phone surveys with respondents who require
a TTY terminal. Does anyone have experience with this?

I would appreciate any advice or suggestions.

Thanks

Don Haynes
University of Baltimore
dhaynes@ubmail.ubalt.edu
>From Kymn_Kochanek@abtassoc.com Thu Sep 12 08:48:33 1996
Return-Path: Kymn_Kochanek@abtassoc.com
Received: from relay5.UU.NET (relay5.UU.NET [192.48.96.15])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA05077; Thu, 12 Sep 1996 08:48:31 -0700 (PDT)
From: Kymn_Kochanek@abtassoc.com
Received: from uucp3.UU.NET by relay5.UU.NET with SMTP
(peer crosschecked as: uucp3.UU.NET [192.48.96.34])
id QQbgwd03217; Thu, 12 Sep 1996 11:48:31 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from uucpgwy.UUCP by uucp3.UU.NET with UUCP/RMAIL
; Thu, 12 Sep 1996 11:48:31 -0400
Received: from cc:Mail by uucpgwy.abtassoc.com
id AA842554408 Thu, 12 Sep 96 11:53:28
Date: Thu, 12 Sep 96 11:53:28
Encoding: 3761 Text
Message-Id: <9608128425.AA842554408@uucpgwy.abtassoc.com>
To: uunet!usc.edu!aapornet@uunet.uu.net
Sender: uunet!usc.edu!owner-aapornet@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Re: Phone surveys of hearing impaired

I am seeking advice on conducting phone surveys with respondents who require a TTY terminal. Does anyone have experience with this?

I would appreciate any advice or suggestions.

Thanks

Don Haynes
University of Baltimore
dhaynes@ubmail.ubalt.edu

I know of two alternatives readily available: 1) lease of a TTD (text telephone device) and 2) AT&T operator services to provide interaction between you and respondents who are deaf, hearing impaired, deaf-blind, or speech disabled.

Two types of devices are available for lease or purchase from AT&T and other sources, the text telephone (TT) or telebraille (TB) telephone. To ensure high quality and efficient interactions, we recruit individuals who have experience in operating the TT machine to man the telephone for all hours of operation.

Abt has a working relationship with several organization that provide capable workers who have disabilities or work with others who have disabilities. Hospitals and other communities services in your area can provide the connection to such a network.

The transaction between the interviewer and respondent requires the interviewer to type the questions into the TTY and the data into the CATI system. The responses are typed into the CATI system in "real time" to ensure the interviewer takes full advantage of the range checks, consistency checks, and automated skip patterns programmed into the on-line questionnaire. To ensure that no answers are lost, the TTY comes equipped with a printer port for external printing. The interaction between the interviewer and respondent is captured on hardcopy to ensure a thorough review before finalizing the completed case.

We use the Advanced TTY 8840, a machine leased from AT&T, which features Voice Carry Over (VCO), which allows both a verbal and written transaction to occur between the interviewer and respondent, helping to ensure clear communication.

An alternative is to use AT&T's Telecommunications Relay Services that allow

interviewers to call the AT&T Communications Assistant (CA) who calls and "translates" for the person who is deaf, deaf-blind, hearing or speech impaired. The CA mans a TT and types the words spoken by the interviewer to the respondent. The respondent types back their response on their own TT or TB machine. The words are read by the CA to the interviewer who data enters the information into the CATI system.

Initial calls to the respondent's telephone number would identify the need for use of the AT&T Telecommunications Relay Services. The second call, placed by trained interviewers, would be made by connecting the AT&T CA and then the respondent. Brief over the telephone "training sessions" are conducted with the CA to prepare them for the interaction with the respondent.

AT&T provides basic materials to supplement your interviewer training for this assignment. Practice sessions are provided, mainly to prepare the interviewers for the slower administration of the questionnaire, but also for the complications and confusion that can occur with a three-way conversation.

Confidentiality and quality are assured by AT&T. Confidentiality pledges are signed by AT&T CA's. On-line monitoring is conducted both by AT&T. Feedback is provided to the CA's by both you and AT&T. You can request particular CA's and remove CA's (by identification number) from providing service to our account.

AT&T has more information at 1-800-682-8706. While we have experience with their Language Line services, we have not yet used their Relay Services for the Deaf.

Hope this helps.

Kymn Kochanek
Director of Operations
Abt Associates Inc.

>From DMMerkle@aol.com Thu Sep 12 12:04:14 1996

Return-Path: DMMerkle@aol.com

Received: from emout09.mail.aol.com (emout09.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.24])

by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id MAA06786 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 12 Sep 1996 12:04:12 -0700

(PDT)

From: DMMerkle@aol.com

Received: by emout09.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id PAA26491 for

aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 12 Sep 1996 15:03:41 -0400

Date: Thu, 12 Sep 1996 15:03:41 -0400

Message-ID: <960912150341_100379128@emout09.mail.aol.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: NYAAPOR Workshop

NYAAPOR kicks off the 1996-97 season with an evening workshop on Self-Administered Questionnaire Design with Don Dillman. All are invited. The details are below.

Daniel Merkle
Program Chair, NYAAPOR

Evening Workshop
Thursday, September 19, 1996
Time: 6:00 p.m. (sharp) -- 8:30 p.m.
Place: CUNY Graduate Center
33 West 42nd Street, Room 1800
New York

SELF-ADMINISTERED QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

Don Dillman, Washington State University

Don Dillman, arguably the expert on self-administered questionnaire design, will discuss numerous ways to enhance the efficacy of this methodology.

Much of Don's presentation will be based on research he has conducted during the last few years, including several experiments done at the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

The workshop will explore:

- The important issues in laying out a self-administered questionnaire
- How the visual layout influence response rates and measurement
- Incentives, appeals and other ways of increasing response rates

Anyone wishing to attend should contact Roni Rosner (212-722-5333 or ronirosner@aol.com) by Sept. 17th.

Pre-paid fees are: \$25 (members), \$35 (nonmembers), and \$12.50 (full-time students, HLMs). Fees at the door are : \$30 (members), \$40 (nonmembers), and \$17.50 (full-time students, HLMs).

Sorry, no refunds, but you can send someone in your place.

>From JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu Thu Sep 12 14:09:52 1996
Return-Path: JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu
Received: from umailsrv1.umd.edu (umailsrv1.umd.edu [128.8.10.53])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA00983 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 12 Sep 1996 14:09:46 -0700
(PDT)
From: JOHNNY@cati.umd.edu
Received: by umailsrv1.umd.edu (5.57/Ultrix3.0-C)

id AA13995; Thu, 12 Sep 96 17:09:33 -0400
Received: from BSOSCATI/MAILQUEUE1 by cati.umd.edu (Mercury 1.13);
Thu, 12 Sep 96 17:09:42 +1100
Received: from MAILQUEUE1 by BSOSCATI (Mercury 1.13); Thu, 12 Sep 96
17:09:18 +1100
Organization: Survey Research Center, UMCP
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Date: Thu, 12 Sep 1996 17:09:12 EDT
Subject: Re: Upcoming Omnibus Surveys
Reply-To: johnny@cati.umd.edu
Priority: normal
X-Mailer: PMail v3.0 (R1)
Message-Id: <12516155BC6@cati.umd.edu>

The due dates for submitting questions for either the Maryland Poll
or National Omnibus have both been extended to Sept 20.

These surveys are conducted by the Survey Research Center,
University of Maryland.

For more information: src@cati.umd.edu or call 301-314-7835

>From cra@fox.nstn.ca Fri Sep 13 04:17:39 1996
Return-Path: cra@fox.nstn.ca
Received: from Fox.nstn.ca (fox.nstn.ca [137.186.128.12])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMT
id EAA16994 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Sep 1996 04:17:37 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from ts7-14.hfx.iSTAR.ca (ts7-14.hfx.iSTAR.ca [198.53.121.154]) by
Fox.nstn.ca (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id IAA27908 for <AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU>;
Fri, 13 Sep 1996 08:17:35 -0300 (ADT)
Date: Fri, 13 Sep 1996 08:17:35 -0300 (ADT)
Message-Id: <199609131117.IAA27908@Fox.nstn.ca>
X-Sender: crainc@fox.nstn.ca
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu
From: cra@fox.nstn.ca (Keith Neuman)
Subject: Measuring Organic Food Purchases
X-Mailer: <PC Eudora Version 1.4>

I am currently designing a study to measure consumer purchases of organic
food products on a telephone survey, and am searching for ideas for how to
develop an efficient yet accurate means of measuring these purchases. Given

that organic/all natural foods may not be clearly labelled as such, and
because there is one standard definition or classification, I have found
that one cannot rely on simply asking respondents whether or not they have
purchased such products.

I would appreciate any input, suggestions, references or comments on this
question.

Keith Neuman, Ph.D.
Corporate Research Associates Inc.
Halifax, Nova Scotia CANADA
e-mail:CRA@fox.nstn.ca

>From Lee.H.Giesbrecht@ccMail.Census.GOV Fri Sep 13 12:04:16 1996
Return-Path: Lee.H.Giesbrecht@ccMail.Census.GOV
Received: from info.census.gov (info.census.gov [148.129.129.10])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA14519 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Sep 1996 12:04:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from gate.census.gov (gate.census.gov [148.129.129.2]) by
info.census.gov (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id PAA11159 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Fri, 13 Sep 1996 15:04:12 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from it-relay1.census.gov by gate.census.gov with SMTP id AA25393
(InterLock SMTP Gateway 3.0 for <aapornet@usc.edu>);
Fri, 13 Sep 1996 15:04:11 -0400
Received: from smtp-gw3.census.gov (smtp-gw3.census.gov [148.129.126.23]) by
it-relay1.census.gov (8.7.5/8.7.3/v1.9) with SMTP id PAA29415 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 13 Sep 1996 15:04:11 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from ccMail by smtp-gw3.census.gov (SMTPLINK V2.10.05)
id AA842652417; Fri, 13 Sep 96 14:58:07 EST
Date: Fri, 13 Sep 96 14:58:07 EST
From: "Lee H Giesbrecht" <Lee.H.Giesbrecht@ccMail.Census.GOV>
Message-Id: <9608138426.AA842652417@smtp-gw3.census.gov>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: Charles.H.Alexander.Jr@it-relay1.census.gov
Subject: Effect of an up-front hhld roster on within-hhld coverage

I am trying to summarize what is known about the effect of using an up-front roster on within-household coverage.

I am interested in any research (by which I include quantitative field studies, qualitative field studies, laboratory work, as well as interpretations of patterns in collected data such as time-in-sample effects) supporting or refuting any of the following hypotheses:

- * collecting a list of names at the start of the questionnaire increases within-household coverage
- * collecting a list of other kinds of units or events (e.g., crimes) at the start of the questionnaire increases the reported number of units
- * respondents frequently break off interviews before completing the entire interview (I know this happens, but how often?)
- * there tends to be less complete reporting of events or whatever later in an interview than at the beginning of an interview.
- * respondents will deliberately give answers to avoid being asked additional questions, such as denying purchases of a particular category of expenditures.
- * within household coverage is lower for burdensome surveys in which all household members are asked questions; especially if the effect is more noticeable for second and later visits

* the length and burden of a questionnaire affects responses

Thanks in advance for your help!

Lee Giesbrecht
Survey Statistician (and student in the Joint Program in Survey
Methodology at the University of Maryland)
U.S. Census Bureau
Federal Building 3, Room 3356
Washington, D.C. 20233
lgiesbre@survey.umd.edu

>From mcohen@inet.ed.gov Sat Sep 14 16:02:45 1996
Return-Path: mcohen@inet.ed.gov
Received: from inet.ed.gov (inet.ed.gov [192.239.34.1])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id QAA26293 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 14 Sep 1996 16:02:43 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <199609142302.QAA26293@usc.edu>
Date: Sat, 14 Sep 1996 19:04:13 -0400
From: mcohen@inet.ed.gov (Michael P. Cohen)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Another Straw in the Wind ?
X-Status: ON 32768

As an AAPOR member with a math Ph.D., I was naturally interested in the post
by
Ray Funkhouser, quoted in part:

> Last week the Wall Street Journal ran an article, "Math Ph.D.s Add to
> Anti-Foreigner Wave." -- "A group of young U.S. mathematicians, with
> doctorates from such schools as Princeton University and MIT, are
> lobbying Congress to repeal laws that now make it especially easy for
> universities to import foreign professors." It seems that last year
> immigrants won 40% of the 720 mathematics jobs available. For the
> past two years, recent U.S. math Ph.D.s have experienced unemployment
> rates of 10+%, a sharp rise since 1990, when the "Einstein Exemption"
> was passed.
>
> "'We remain a fiercely merit-oriented, antixenophobic community, but
> the current situation knows no precedent,' wrote Harvard-trained
> mathematician Eric Weinstein and 20 other scholars in a recent plea to
> Capitol Hill. . . . 'Since 1976 universities have been using the
> immigration exemptions to import a labor force of foreign scientists
> at greatly decreased cost'."
>
> It would seem that the operative phrase here is "knows no precedent."
Sure,
> let 'em in, no problem, as long as it happens to somebody else. This
> suggests a working definition of "xenophobia": When somebody you don't
know
> objects to losing his livelihood to a foreigner. [snip]
>

A friend who subscribes supplied me with the full article (Wall Street
Journal,
Wednesday, September 4, 1996, page A2). This quotation, not supplied

>
>Thank you,
>Eileen
>
>-----
>eo'brien@nass.usda.gov
>
>Eileen M. O'Brien
>USDA-NASS
>Stop 4151
>1400 Independence Ave
>Washington, D.C. 20250-2000
>
>-----
>

Although not much of it treated the face-to-face mode, the proceedings and monograph from the 1993 International Conference on Establishment Surveys had quite a few papers on the topic of response incentives.

In addition to the ICES materials, I recommend a 1994 paper by Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, et al. in Administrative Science Quarterly #39 "Organizational Survey Nonresponse" for its interesting theorizing and references on the organizational response process. They write from the perspective of organizational sociology; a discipline that most survey researchers are unfamiliar with.

These, I think, are some interesting areas of study on the issue of response incentives:

- 1) Mandatory reporting requirements: using them where they exist and creating them where they don't. But what kind of effect might this have on error? Census has been doing some work on this subject.
- 2) Non-financial incentives: (the small cash incentives used for household surveys might be inappropriate for institutional respondents.) Diane Willimack's ICES paper on nonmonetary incentives for your Farm Costs and Returns Survey is obviously an example. Also, I have observed that in some industry surveys, organizational respondents may be more motivated out of interest with the results--a copy of the report, feedback on what their colleagues do, etc.
- 3) Positive auspices of endorsement by some industry or professional association: might legitimize the survey, but how to do it while avoiding bias and co-optation of the research?
- 4) Personalization / better informant selection: Most of the literature refers to mail surveys, but it's always important to find the most appropriate respondent, with the most knowledge/authority to access the information, and for whom the subject is most salient. My own personal interest is in informant selection strategies in organizational surveys.

Good luck.

Carl Ramirez
Senior Social Science Analyst
U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G St, NW, Room 2921
Washington DC 20548
phone: (202) 512-3721
e-mail: ramirezc.ggd@gao.gov

>From tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu Mon Sep 16 12:04:58 1996
Return-Path: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu
Received: from virginia.edu (mars.itc.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id MAA01716 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 16 Sep 1996 12:04:52 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from uva.pcmail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa14626;
16 Sep 96 15:01 EDT
Received: by uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU (8.6.10/1.34)
id PAA08808; Mon, 16 Sep 1996 15:01:16 -0400
Resent-Message-Id: <199609161901.PAA08808@uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU>
Resent-From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu>
Resent-Date: Mon, 16 Sep 96 15:00:49 EDT
X-Mailer: UVa PCMail 1.9.0
Resent-To: aapornet@usc.edu
Received: by uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU (8.6.10/1.34)
id NAA08552; Mon, 16 Sep 1996 13:20:28 -0400
Message-Id: <199609161720.NAA08552@uva.pcmail.Virginia.EDU>
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu>
Date: Mon, 16 Sep 96 13:18:27 EDT
X-Mailer: UVa PCMail 1.9.0
To: aapornet@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu
Subject: Faculty position at UVa
Cc: tmglp@uva.pcmail.virginia.edu

AAPORnetters: I hope you will pass this message on to those in your
circles who might be qualified. The ad will be published in ASocA
Footnotes next month. Hot tips on someone you know
that we might try to recruit are always welcome, by e-mail or by phone to
924-6516.

--Tom

The University of Virginia Department of Sociology seeks a full
professor with a record of distinguished scholarship and an active research
program. We have particular needs for candidates who focus on some
dimension of stratification, broadly defined, and who conduct quantitative
research. Applicants should send a letter detailing research and teaching
interests and a curriculum vitae to: Chair of Search Committee, Sociology
Department, University of Virginia, 539 Cabell Hall, Charlottesville, VA
22903. Applications received by November 1 will be given full
consideration. The University of Virginia is an Equal
Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (804) 924-6516
Sociology/Center for Survey Research FAX: (804) 924-7028
University of Virginia, 539 Cabell Hall

* on the Pursuit of Excellence, 1994

*
*
*

>From kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu Tue Sep 17 08:32:49 1996
Return-Path: kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu
Received: from netop3.harvard.edu (netop3.harvard.edu [128.103.205.103])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id IAA15175 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 08:32:47 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21]) by
netop3.harvard.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) with ESMTTP id LAA00242 for
<AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 11:32:41 -0400
Received: by hsph.harvard.edu (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
id LAA15910; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 11:33:14 -0400
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 1996 11:33:13 -0400 (EDT)
From: Karen Donelan <kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu>
To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@usc.edu>
Subject: surveys on public attitudes about mental retardation
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.960917112527.16649F-100000@hsph.harvard.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I am working on a review paper on public attitudes toward the mentally retarded. We are interested in personal knowledge/experience with issue, policy preferences regarding education and employment and media images. My colleagues and I have found several U.S. studies through the Roper Center and a few other sources. We are especially interested in INTERNATIONAL comparisons--have looked through ISSP and International indices of public opinion data but are coming up short. Is anyone aware of surveys done on this topic outside of the U.S.?

Thanks very much for your help. Please reply to me directly.

Karen Donelan
Dept of Health Policy and Management
Harvard School of Public Health
677 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115

kdonelan@hsph.harvard.edu

voice: (617)432-3829
fax: (617)432-4494

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Sep 17 09:28:08 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA22624 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 09:28:06 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA02816 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 09:28:06 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 1996 09:28:06 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
Reply-To: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Call for Papers: Style Conference
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960917091802.2056A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

***** CALL FOR PAPERS *****
THE STYLE CONFERENCE Bowling Green, Ohio JULY 25-28, 1997

KEYNOTE SPEAKER: Valerie Steele, author of FASHION & EROTICISM, FETISH, &
editor of the new journal FASHION THEORY

SCHEDULED FEATURED SPEAKERS include: Herb Blau, Meaghan Morris, Lynn Spigel,
Robyn Wiegman

Plus: The "ADIOS, BARBIE"/HUES Fashion Show, a performance/critique from
the third wave feminist magazine's multiethnic editorial collective.

We invite a wide variety of material, cultural, and discursive experiences
including academic and nonacademic approaches. Proposals welcomed in any
format; deadline for 250-word proposals: December 1, 1996

The Style Conference
Women's Studies Program
246 Shatzel Hall
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

or: style@listproc.bgsu.edu

For more information:
Visit THE STYLE CONFERENCE's Web site:
<http://www.bgsu.edu/departments/wmst/style/>

or call or email us for a brochure:
Laura Stempel Mumford: (608) 238-3612 <Lsmumford@aol.com>
Ellen Berry: (419) 372-2620 <eberry@bgnet.bgsu.edu>

*

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Sep 17 09:43:17 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA25244 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 09:43:15 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA03549 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 09:43:16 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 1996 09:43:15 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Net Effect on Academic Journals
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960917093700.2777A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

NET EFFECT ON ACADEMIC JOURNALS

>From today's DAILY REPORT of The Chronicle of Higher Education:

MAGAZINES & JOURNALS

A glance at the October issue of "Technology Review":

Although some scientists were using the Internet long before the worldwide network got its name, the "critical mass" now on line is starting to change the way science works, writes Herb Brody in "Wired Science." In interviews with scientists across the country, Mr. Brody, a senior editor for the magazine, teased out examples of how the Internet has sped up intellectual conversations and connected researchers with common interests who otherwise might never have met. He writes about a chemist at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, for example, who happened to be interested in the physics of wood instruments. On the Internet, the Virginia Tech professor found others in Australia, New Zealand, and Canada who shared his interest, and the group recently wrote a paper on the subject using electronic mail. Mr. Brody also shows how scholars who once waited for quarterly journals to report updates in their fields can now peruse new articles within hours, if not minutes, of their release on line. Of course, many are wary of such widely distributed, fast-paced science, particularly if it bypasses peer review, Mr. Brody writes. They wonder: "What good is speed if the material itself is unoriginal or, worse, just plain wrong?" (The magazine may be found on newsstands, and on the Internet at <http://web.mit.edu/techreview/>)

Copyright (c) 1996 The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc.

>From JEBELING@oavax.csuchico.edu Tue Sep 17 11:17:51 1996
Return-Path: JEBELING@oavax.csuchico.edu
Received: from OAVAX.CSUCHICO.EDU (oavax.CSUCHICO.EDU [132.241.80.95])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA14048 for <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 11:17:48 -0700
(PDT)
From: JEBELING@oavax.csuchico.edu
Received: from oavax.csuchico.edu by oavax.csuchico.edu (PMDF V4.2-13 #2) id

<01I9L0IYULG000ABEG@oavax.csuchico.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 11:18:52 PDT
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 1996 11:18:52 -0700 (PDT)
Subject: the GSS on a CD rom
To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU
Message-id: <01I9L0IYVEDU00ABEG@oavax.csuchico.edu>
X-Envelope-to: AAPORNET@USC.EDU
X-VMS-To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU
X-VMS-Cc: JEBELING
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Has anyone out there in AAPornetland seen or heard of the National
Opinion Research Center data sets, GSS, on a CD rom?
If anyone has I'd appreciate knowing how I can get a copy of it.

The data in that series, going back to 1972, excellent.

You can either send it out to the total group on aapornet or to me
personally at:

jebeling@oavax.csuchico.edu

Thanks a lot.

jon ebeling

>From MANNERS@vms.cis.pitt.edu Tue Sep 17 12:29:05 1996
Return-Path: MANNERS@vms.cis.pitt.edu
Received: from myriad.cis.pitt.edu (myriad.cis.pitt.edu [136.142.186.16])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA25100 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 12:29:04 -0700
(PDT)
From: MANNERS@vms.cis.pitt.edu
Received: from vms.cis.pitt.edu by vms.cis.pitt.edu (PMDF V4.3-10 #10002)
id <01I9L95IC5TS95MVL0@vms.cis.pitt.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 15:28:26 -0500
(EST)
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 1996 15:28:26 -0500 (EST)
Subject: sampling teenagers in a rural setting
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01I9L95IDNIQ95MVL0@vms.cis.pitt.edu>
X-Envelope-to: aapornet@usc.edu
X-VMS-To: IN%"aapornet@usc.edu"
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

A proposed research project in western PA requires a sample
of teens from rural areas. School lists are ruled out. Any fresh
ideas about building a frame of rural teens?

Suggestions to:

Steven Manners
UCSUR
University of Pittsburgh
manners@vms.cis.pitt.edu

>From NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU Tue Sep 17 13:13:43 1996
Return-Path: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU
Received: from UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (uchimvs1.uchicago.edu [128.135.19.10])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA01495 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 13:13:41 -0700
(PDT)

Message-Id: <199609172013.NAA01495@usc.edu>
Received: from UCHIMVS1.BITNET by UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU (IBM MVS SMTP V3R1)
with BSMTMP id 0984; Tue, 17 Sep 96 15:12:40 CDT
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 96 15:08 CST
From: NNRTWS1@UCHIMVS1.UCHICAGO.EDU
To: aapornet@USC.EDU
Subject: Re: the GSS on a CD rom

The GSS is not offered on CD-ROM. You can get it on:

1. The Web: <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss>
 2. Nine-track tape: ICPSR and the Roper Center, UCONN
 3. Diskette: The Roper Center (for selected years only)
- tom w smith

>From LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU Tue Sep 17 14:30:37 1996
Return-Path: LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU
Received: from PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU (pacevm.dac.pace.edu [198.105.36.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id OAA13382 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 14:30:32 -0700
(PDT)

Message-Id: <199609172130.OAA13382@usc.edu>
Received: from PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU by PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)
with BSMTMP id 2076; Tue, 17 Sep 96 17:31:33 EDT
Received: from PACEVM (NJE origin LEE@PACEVM) by PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU (LMail
V1.2b/1.8b) with BSMTMP id 2073; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 17:28:38 -0400
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 96 17:23:59 EDT
From: "Robert S. Lee" <LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU>
Subject: Re: the GSS on a CD rom
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: Message of Tue, 17 Sep 1996 11:18:52 -0700 (PDT) from
<JEBELING@oa.vax.csuchico.edu>

GSS on CD-ROM can be obtained from MicroCase Corp., 1301 120th Ave. NE,
Bellvue, WA 98005. Phone: (206) 635-0293, FAX: (206) 635-0953. I believe you
need the MicroCase Analysis System software to use this.

You might also check with NORC in Chicago and the Roper Center at University
of Connecticut.

Bob Lee

ROBERT S. LEE
PACE UNIVERSITY, 1 PACE PLAZA, NEW YORK, NY 10038
VOICE: 212/620-7851 FAX: 212/346-1573
LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU
>From JEBELING@oavax.csuchico.edu Tue Sep 17 16:21:33 1996
Return-Path: JEBELING@oavax.csuchico.edu

Received: from OAVAX.CSUCHICO.EDU (oavax.CSUCHICO.EDU [132.241.80.95])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id QAA01997 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 16:21:28 -0700
(PDT)

From: JEBELING@oavax.csuchico.edu
Received: from oavax.csuchico.edu by oavax.csuchico.edu (PMDF V4.2-13 #2) id
<01I9LB60DVE800AACZ@oavax.csuchico.edu>; Tue, 17 Sep 1996 16:22:35 PDT
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 1996 16:22:35 -0700 (PDT)
Subject: Re: the GSS on a CD rom
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01I9LB60EXZ600AACZ@oavax.csuchico.edu>
X-Envelope-to: aapornet@usc.edu
X-VMS-To: IN%"aapornet@usc.edu"
X-VMS-Cc: JEBELING
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Thanks very much for you reply.

I'll check out the two sites; I've used the microcase stuff and don't
really care for it very much. I'd prefer to use my software for analysis,
STATA.

Thanks again

jon ebeling
jebeling@oavax.csuchico.edu

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Sep 18 11:27:06 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA05056 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Sep 1996 11:27:04 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA18332 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Sep 1996 11:27:05 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 1996 11:27:04 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Sampling Bar for 2000 Census?
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960918112259.18088A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

CONGRESSIONAL PANELS MOVE TO BAR SAMPLING FOR CENSUS

Two congressional panels, expressing concern about
methodology and legality, are moving to bar the U.S.
Census Bureau from using statistical sampling to

supplement the decennial head count in the year 2000, according to reporting by Steven A. Holmes in this morning's New York Times (p. A10 natl. ed.).

The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is scheduled to vote today on a nonbinding report which recommends that the bureau not use sampling methods to complete or adjust the 2000 Census.

"The bureau should strive harder for accuracy and fairness in terms of getting the proportional distribution of the population physically right among geographic and political units," the Times quotes the report as concluding. "The committee believes this can only be achieved by performing an actual enumeration."

Last month, a Senate Appropriations subcommittee approved a similar nonbinding report.

According to Holmes: "The panels' actions appear to be an effort by some congressional Republicans to warn the Census Bureau not to proceed too far with planning to use sampling methods. At the same time, the panels are reluctant to ban the practice, since organizations like the National Academy of Sciences and the American Statistical Association say it is the only viable way to increase the accuracy of the census while reducing the cost of conducting it."

White House officials and congressional Democrats, who favor the use of sampling methods, have charged that Republicans will oppose any changes because they believe that sampling would result in higher counts--and therefore greater representation and resources--for minority groups that traditionally vote Democratic. Republicans have denied that their actions are politically motivated, justifying their opposition to the changes both on constitutional grounds and because sampling introduces other types of errors.

As Holmes reports: "Even though the reports are nonbinding, their approval by Congress makes officials of the Commerce Department, which runs the census, fear that they will become the basis for a cutoff of the funds needed to prepare for sampling, including the testing of different sampling techniques. Those tests are scheduled to take place over the next few months."

According to the Times account, the bureau began exploring the use of sampling techniques after the 1990 census, which was criticized for, among other things, undercounting minority groups. The bureau proposal to supplement traditional counting with statistical sampling was rejected by the Bush

administration, however, which cited constitutional stipulations for an actual enumeration.

As Holmes concludes his report from Washington:
"The Census Bureau's plans for sampling were prompted by what many policy makers and legislators consider to be the debacle of the 1990 Census, the most expensive in the nation's history and one that missed the highest proportion of blacks compared to whites since 1940. The 1990 Census count also touched off a raft of lawsuits when the commerce secretary at the time, Robert Mosbacher, refused--through the use of statistical sampling--the head count to more accurately reflect the presence of minority group members and rural dwellers in the population."

Last March, the Supreme Court ruled that Mosbacher was acting within his authority.

Copyright 1996 The New York Times Company

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Sep 18 11:37:29 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA07622 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Sep 1996 11:37:25 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA18880 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Sep 1996 11:37:24 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 1996 11:37:23 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: DC Job Posting--Senior Level
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960918113249.18088N-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Date: Tue, 17 Sep 1996 11:52:15 -0400 (EDT)
From: Margret Straw 434-6320 <GSTRAW@aarp.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: ACTION: Job Posting

Large DC non-profit membership association seeks a senior level analytical professional to serve as an expert resource to focus our legislative research efforts. This individual will design survey instruments and perform statistical analyses of survey research data as well as direct external research contracts, prepare reports, & communicate findings to diverse audiences. Experience in the area of political polling and legislative issues is a plus. RECRUITMENT FOR THIS POSITION IS RESTRICTED TO THE WASHINGTON, DC, MARYLAND, AND VIRGINIA GEOGRAPHIC AREA.

The ideal candidate will have a Ph.D. in social/behavioral science or gerontological research with emphasis on quantitative and qualitative

research methods. Min. 6 yrs. experience including research design/execution, analysis/synthesis and management required. Familiarity with statistical/analysis software (especially SPSS & MS Office) essential.

The Association values a culturally-diverse workplace and offers an excellent salary and comprehensive benefits package. For immediate consideration, send resume to: American Association of Retired Persons, Human Resources Department, HRD-EW4011-PCM, 601 E Street, NW, Washington, DC 20049. EOE/AA NO PHONE CALLS, PLEASE.

```
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Sep 18 12:04:20 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
        by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
        id MAA13140 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Sep 1996 12:04:14 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
        by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.2/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
        id MAA20444 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 18 Sep 1996 12:04:10 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 1996 12:04:10 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: American Presidential History Sanitized?
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960918115737.18088R-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
```

From today's DAILY REPORT of The Chronicle of Higher Education:

MAGAZINES & JOURNALS

A glance at the September 30 issue of "The Nation":

When the author Gore Vidal wrote and narrated a series about the American Presidency for a British television channel this year, all went well. But as soon as the series was considered for an American audience, Mr. Vidal writes, corporate interests rushed to get their hands on it. Three giant corporations ultimately control the History Channel, a cable network on which Mr. Vidal's program was scheduled: Disney (which owns ABC), General Electric (which owns NBC), and the Hearst Corporation. Before his program passed muster with those three, the author writes in "The End of History," a panel of journalists and historians was hired by G.E. to -- as Mr. Vidal describes it -- sanitize his narration. The panel took pains to reconstruct his interpretation of history -- which was often openly critical of corporations and U.S. foreign policy -- in terms that softened the truth, he writes. "All I wanted to do was tell a story never told before on our television," he concludes. But it is ``never to be told again as long as the

likes of G.E. and Disney are allowed to be media owners and manipulators of public opinion."

Copyright (c) 1996 The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc.

>From rusciano@enigma.rider.edu Thu Sep 19 06:42:30 1996
Return-Path: RUSCIANO@enigma.rider.edu
Received: from enigma (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA20272 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 06:42:29 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from enigma.rider.edu by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.0-4 #15764) id
<01I9NPU7YGPC8WXWYY@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 19 Sep
1996 09:43:21 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 09:43:21 -0400 (EDT)
From: rusciano@enigma.rider.edu
Subject: Debate Commission Report-- see attachment
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <Pine.PMDF.3.91.960919094200.539059498A-110000@enigma.rider.edu>
Content-id: <Pine.PMDF.3.91.960919094200.539059498B@enigma.rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: MULTIPART/MIXED; BOUNDARY="Boundary (ID
t5Stx0mWI1DWbfxhz1bRPw)"

--Boundary (ID t5Stx0mWI1DWbfxhz1bRPw)
Content-id: <Pine.PMDF.3.91.960919094200.539059498C@enigma.rider.edu>
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

--Boundary (ID t5Stx0mWI1DWbfxhz1bRPw)
Content-id: <Pine.PMDF.3.91.960919094200.539059498D@enigma.rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: MESSAGE/RFC822

Received: from genius.rider.edu by genius.rider.edu (PMDF V5.0-4 #15764) id
<01I9MQO31LQS8Y727L@genius.rider.edu> for aaportnet@usc.edu; Wed, 18 Sep
1996 17:08:46 -0500 (EST)
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 1996 17:08:46 -0500 (EST)
From: RUSCIANO@genius.rider.edu
Subject: The debate decision
To: aaportnet@usc.edu
Message-id: <01I9MQO31VDY8Y727L@genius.rider.edu>
X-VMS-To: IN%"aaportnet@usc.edu" "Members of AAPORnet"
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Fellow members of AAPORNET:

I was thinking today that since the debate commission has made its decision to exclude Ross Perot from the debates, our organization might have to confront the ramifications of their criteria. Basically, the decision seems to have relied very heavily upon polling data which indicates that Ross Perot is attracting only about 5% or so of the vote in trial heats for the

1996 election. While we can certainly discuss whether the commission was correct in their decision, I am more concerned here with the position in which survey researchers find themselves due to this decision. Some possible questions that arise for me include:

(1) which survey data are relevant here? While Perot was only polling about 5% of the vote, some 60% or so of respondents felt he should be included in the debates (the same was not true of other candidates such as Ralph Nader and the Libertarian candidate). How do we determine which results will be used in this decision, especially since many voters may have felt that they wanted to hear more before they would consider Perot.

(2) do the polls create a self-fulfilling prophecy? Clearly, this decision leaves one open to the tautological assumption that Perot is being excluded because he cannot win, and he cannot win because he is being excluded. Is this a proper use of trial heat polling data, since this data is just a "snapshot" of a given moment in voter preferences, and cannot predict how voters will choose later.

(3) is the commission putting polls above election results? Consider that Perot won 19% of the vote in 1996. Should such an actual result weigh less in considerations than present polling data?

(4) what is our relationship as researchers to the government's actions in the election? Perot is receiving \$23 million in matching funds from the government to run for the Presidency, and he is on the ballot in fifty states. Do we find ourselves as survey researchers providing evidence that will lead to a confrontation, at some point, with governmental policies which have, in effect, granted Perot's candidacy with some degree of legitimacy (to the tune of \$23 million and space on all states' ballots)?

(5) Finally, when this case goes into court, will survey researchers become co-litigants on one side or the other (or at least witnesses) as the Perot people dispute the commission's recommendation?

I should add that from a political point of view, I believe that Perot's presence in the debates will have little effect on their outcome. However, the basis of the commission's decision could have enormous effects on the role of survey research in future elections. Are there any other opinions on this, and is this subject something about which AAPOR will need to take a stand in the future?

Frank L. Rusciano
Professor, Political Science
Rider University

--Boundary (ID t5Stx0mWI1DWbfxhz1bRPw)--
>From GOLQC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU Thu Sep 19 09:58:36 1996
Return-Path: GOLQC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU
Received: from CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (cunyvm.cuny.edu [128.228.1.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA13659 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 09:58:21 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <199609191658.JAA13659@usc.edu>

Received: from CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU by CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)
with BSMTP id 0903; Thu, 19 Sep 96 12:58:11 EDT
Received: from CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (NJE origin GOLQC@CUNYVM) by CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with RFC822 id 3780; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 12:58:11 -0400
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 96 12:34:14 EDT
From: Al Gollin <GOLQC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU>
Subject: Re: Debate Commission Report-- see attachment
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: Message of Thu, 19 Sep 1996 09:43:21 -0400 (EDT) from
<rusciano@enigma.rider.edu>

This use of polls had a stronger precedent in 1980, when the LWV based its inclusion of John Anderson in debates on poll results--exclusively as I recall. This time the Commission used multiple criteria, and polls seem to have had a secondary role: informing experts about state-level chances of winning by Perot thus affecting electoral college results. But we don't know who these local experts were or what evidence they drew upon. Tad Cantril on behalf of NCPP was very (publically) critical of the LWV reliance on polls in 1980 via op-ed pieces in the Post and Times soon afterward. But this time it seems to me that abuse of polls can't be charged until more is known about their weight in the process at all stages: whose polls were used, by whom, affecting what criteria, etc. If critique is to be based on circular-reciprocal effects of published polls on voting outcomes, as Rusciano implies, I'd like to see evidence for that either way, ie vote lessened by exclusion or enlarged by inclusion. Tough to prove as debates are just one influence among many in the whole process. What about it, Sid Kraus? Al Gollin

>From LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU Thu Sep 19 10:03:28 1996

Return-Path: LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU

Received: from PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU (pacevm.dac.pace.edu [198.105.36.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA14783 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 10:03:26 -0700
(PDT)

Message-Id: <199609191703.KAA14783@usc.edu>

Received: from PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU by PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)
with BSMTP id 3867; Thu, 19 Sep 96 13:04:26 EDT

Received: from PACEVM (NJE origin LEE@PACEVM) by PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU (LMail
V1.2b/1.8b) with BSMTP id 3865; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:04:26 -0400

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 96 12:46:51 EDT

From: LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU

Subject: Re: Debate Commission Report-- see attachment

To: Bob Lee <aapornet@usc.edu>

In-Reply-To: Message of Thu, 19 Sep 1996 09:43:21 -0400 (EDT) from
<rusciano@enigma.rider.edu>

It seems to me that the commission was very much out of line by basing its decision on public opinion polls. Perot is on the ballot in all 50 states and has qualified for government funds for his campaign. His strategy has clearly been to lay low and to go all out in the last weeks of the campaign. Isn't he entitled to determine his own strategy? Does the commission have the right to force a candidate to have a good *early* showing? This commission consists of representatives of the two major parties. Should this be the proper composition of a commission that can, in effect, kick a candidate out of the race? In my opinion, this is grossly unfair to a legitimate national candidate. The poll standing of a candidate at a particular stage in the campaign should have nothing to do with eligibility to be in the debates. We should, I believe, come out

against this misuse of poll data by a commission which is clearly taking on power to itself that it is not entitled to.

P.S. I am not a Perot supporter and will not vote for him.

ROBERT S. LEE

PACE UNIVERSITY, 1 PACE PLAZA, NEW YORK, NY 10038

VOICE: 212/620-7851 FAX: 212/346-1573

LEE@PACEVM.DAC.PACE.EDU

>From DMMerkle@aol.com Thu Sep 19 10:23:20 1996

Return-Path: DMMerkle@aol.com

Received: from emout03.mail.aol.com (emout03.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.94])

by usc.edu (8.7.5/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id KAA18031 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 10:23:17 -0700

(PDT)

From: DMMerkle@aol.com

Received: by emout03.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id NAA14582 for

aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:22:47 -0400

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:22:47 -0400

Message-ID: <960919132246_288503382@emout03.mail.aol.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: NYAAPOR - Surveying the Internet

Below is information about NYAAPOR's October 9th meeting -- "Surveying the Internet."

Daniel Merkle

Program Chair, NYAAPOR

NYAAPOR CHAPTER EVENING MEETING

SURVEYING THE INTERNET

Date: Wednesday, 9 October 1996

Time: 5:30 - 8:00 p.m.

Place: NOTE LOCATION CHANGE

NBC, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, Mezzanine

MUST USE STUDIO ELEVATORS!!!

ONLY ACCESS TO MEZZANINE

(in center of lobby, follow signs)

Admission: Free to NYAAPOR members & students; all others \$7

SURVEYING THE INTERNET

As Internet usage has increased, so has the amount of survey data on Internet usage patterns. This session explores some of this research in an attempt to answer such questions as:

How many people are on the Internet?

Who are they?

How and why do they use it?
What are the broader implications of this technology?
What are some of the methodological issues that survey researchers face when
measuring Internet usage?

Presenters:

Prof. David Birdsell, Baruch College
Peter Coy, BusinessWeek
Charles D'Oyly, Yankelovich Partners
Brad Fay, Roper Starch Worldwide

NOTE: NBC SECURITY CANNOT ADMIT ANYONE WHOSE NAME IS NOT ON OUR LIST!

Anyone planning to attend must phone in his/her name. Just call 722-5333 or
e-mail ronirosner@aol.com by Tuesday, 8 October.

>From GOLQC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU Fri Sep 20 13:20:27 1996
Return-Path: GOLQC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU
Received: from CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (cunyvm.cuny.edu [128.228.1.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id NAA00989 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Fri, 20 Sep 1996 13:20:23 -0700
(PDT)
Resent-Message-Id: <199609202020.NAA00989@usc.edu>
Received: from CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU by CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)
with BSMTP id 4543; Fri, 20 Sep 96 16:20:23 EDT
Received: from CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (NJE origin GOLQC@CUNYVM) by CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with RFC822 id 5757; Fri, 20 Sep 1996 16:20:24 -0400
Resent-Date: Fri, 20 Sep 96 16:20:00 EDT
Resent-From: Al Gollin <GOLQC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU>
Resent-To: aapornet@usc.edu
Received: from CUNYVM (NJE origin SMTP5@CUNYVM) by CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (LMail
V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 4861; Fri, 20 Sep 1996 09:45:12 -0400
Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu by CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)
with TCP; Fri, 20 Sep 96 09:45:05 EDT
Received: from portc02.async.csuohio.edu (137.148.59.12) by
mail.asic.csuohio.edu with SMTP (MailShare 1.0fc6); Fri, 20 Sep 1996
09:44:46 -0400
X-Sender: s.kraus@bones.asic.csuohio.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: Golqc@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU
From: "Dr. Sidney Kraus" <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>
Subject: Re: Debate Commission Report-- see attachment
Date: Fri, 20 Sep 1996 09:44:46 -0400
Message-ID: <1368909810-505084@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

-----Original message-----

Al: I've obtained a new email address, but still have the old one. AApornet has to clear my name...some sort of gatekeeping. In the meantime would you be kind enough to forward my response to your question (herewith attached) over the net? Thanks, Sid.

>Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 15:54:56

>To: aapornet@USC.EDU

>From: "Dr. Sidney Kraus" <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

>Subject: Re: Debate Commission Report-- see attachment

>

>I will try to respond to Al Gollin's comments about the relative

>influence

of poll data on candidate inclusion/exclusion in debates. Incidentally, I got his message as I was re-writing a section to that topic for my second edition of TELEVISED PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES AND PUBLIC POLICY, which I humbly suggest that those interested in the topic, consult. Basically, Al's comments are to the point, but they don't go far enough to cover the problem. Third and minor party candidates have been a thorn in the side of debate sponsors. They cost money, since sponsors are forced to go to court to defend the legal actions of debate-rejected bona fide presidential candidates. Beware the wrath of a jilted candidate! Moreover, there is a sense of outrage when in our democracy bonafide candidates are not allowed to debate. (Polls show that even though some 60 percent of the electorate say they will not vote for Perot, 70 percent believe he should be included in the debates.) Both the League of Women Voters and the Commission on Presidential Debates have wrestled with the problem. In 1976, the League would not allow Senator Eugene McCarthy to debate Ford and Carter. In 1977, I said that I regretted that decision, but that I would rather see only the two major party candidates debate than not to have debates at all. In 1988 I have taken the following positions:

>

> 1) The notion of a relationship between public opinion polling and presidential debates can be in keeping with democratic theory, providing for voter involvement in the conduct of the presidential campaign and the election process. But, its use as debate gatekeeper for minor party participation is questionable.

>

> 2) MP participation could be decided by a formula not based on probability estimates but similar to that which qualifies presidential candidates to receive public funds under the Campaign Financing Act.

>

> To its credit, the Commission did devise a rather elaborate "formula" for making its recent decision. I still believe that debates should be mandated by federal legislation and a "new" commission should be established without the political parties formal inclusion. The current problem is not the use of polls, but the perceived lack of fairness and credibility associated with the Commission.

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

either
>>>way, ie vote lessened by exclusion or enlarged by inclusion. Tough to
prove as
>>>debates are just one influence among many in the whole process. What
about it,
>>>Sid Kraus? Al Gollin
>>>
>
Dr. Sidney Kraus
Dept. of Communication
College of Arts & Sciences
Cleveland State University
email: s.kraus@csuohio.edu
>From paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua Sat Sep 21 14:54:11 1996
Return-Path: kmis.kiev.ua!paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua
Received: from shiva.adam.kiev.ua (root@shiva.adam.kiev.ua [194.44.10.35])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA20492 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 21 Sep 1996 14:53:38 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from kmisua.UUCP (uukmis@localhost) by shiva.adam.kiev.ua
(8.7.5/8.7.3) with UUCP id AAA00454; Sun, 22 Sep 1996 00:54:40 +0300
X-Authentication-Warning: shiva.adam.kiev.ua: uukmis set sender to
<kmisua!kmis.kiev.ua!paniotto> using -f
Received: by kmis.kiev.ua (UUPC/@ v5.09gamma, 14Mar93);
Sun, 22 Sep 1996 00:35:59 +0200
To: wapor/net@umich.edu
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-Id: <AAft6HoaZ8@kmis.kiev.ua>
Organization: KIIS
From: "Vladimir I. Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>
Date: Sun, 22 Sep 96 00:35:59 +0200
X-Mailer: BML [MS/DOS Beauty Mail v.1.36]
Subject: Suggestion for cooperation
Lines: 132

Suggestion for collaboration

Dear Colleagues,

Our firm - KIIS - seeks for partner.

KIIS (The Kiev International Institute of Sociology) is a private Ukrainian-American joint research venture which conducts full-service survey research, representative for Ukraine and its regions, and qualitative research (focus-groups and in-depth interviews) .

We would like to establish next kind of co-operation:

- your firm finds clients who are interested in surveys in Ukraine (may be you may ask your clients if they are interested in Ukraine);
- your firm creates the questionnaire for that survey;
- KIIS conducts the survey (does all necessary work such as translating the questionnaires into Russian and Ukrainian, pre-testing and printing the questionnaire; constructing the survey sample; managing the fieldwork, including the training of field supervisors and interviewers, supervision of fieldwork, quality control, coding the responses; entering and cleaning the data; ascertaining representativeness of the sample and weighting the data, if necessary) and sends the data as SPSS-file (or another format) along with technical report to your firm;
- your firm analyse data and prepare report to the client.

KIIS UKRAINE OMNIBUS
SURVEY

The Kiev International Institute of Sociology informs that between October 16 and November 10, 1996 it will conduct an omnibus survey of the adult population of Ukraine.

Sample. 1600 respondents aged 16 years and older, living in Ukraine. Sample is based on random selection of 200 sampling points (post-office districts) all over the Ukraine. The sampling process consists of random selection of streets, buildings and apartments inside each post-office district. The last stage - random selection of respondents from families. The sample is representative not only for Ukraine as a whole but for separate regions and groups of regions.

Closing Date for Questions: October 15, 1996

Results Available: November 11, 1996 (Marginals and the data in SPSS-file)

Costs:

Entry fee \$380 plus \$260 per closed (pre-coded) question, \$370 for open-ended question (receiving the information without including your own questions - \$19 per question).

Discount:

- for clients who will purchase more than 10 questions - 10% discount;

- for clients who purchased data of one previous omnibus - \$200 per closed question and \$330 per open-ended question.

Questions already included in questionnaire:

Demography: sex, age, education, ethnicity of respondent and his parents, marital status, occupational status, socio-economic status, language, religion, place of residence - oblast, city or village, size.

Political questions: view on general situation in Ukraine, social problems, attitudes toward economic reforms, private property, free market, opinion about the Black Sea fleet, Crimea, relations with Russia, independence of Ukraine nuclear weapons, language problems, rating of political parties and leaders.

The full list of questions (with exact wording) will be send on your request.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Sep 23 09:47:05 1996

Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP

id JAA04448 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Sep 1996 09:47:01 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.3/usc) with SMTP
id JAA03641 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Sep 1996 09:46:59 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Mon, 23 Sep 1996 09:46:58 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Overly-Cautious Poll Reporting?
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960923094119.3113B-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

OVERLY-CAUTIOUS POLL REPORTING?

Ironic though it might be, considering the hard work by many AAPOR members over the past two decades to improve the statistical reporting of public opinion polls in the popular media, such coverage might now actually be too conservative. Does anyone besides me find overly cautious the following item in the "Political Briefing" section of last Thursday's New York Times (Sept. 19, p. A15 natl ed)?

B a t t l e G r o u n d s

T O S S - U P I N 2 S T A T E S ;
C L I N T O N F A L T E R S I N 3 d

Two new polls show that Florida and Virginia, ordinarily part of the Republican base, are very much up for grabs. On the other hand, President Clinton could be paying a price for his tough tobacco policy in the battle ground state of North Carolina.

The polls, conducted by the firm of Mason-Dixon Political/Media Research, showed Mr. Clinton with a statistically negligible lead in Florida: 47 percent to Bob Dole's 42 percent, with the margin of sampling error plus or minus 4 percentage points...

Reckless though I might be, I cannot see a five-point spread with a four-point margin of error as "statistically negligible." Might not readers at least be informed--in some way--that these percentages are the best unbiased point estimates of the actual percentages of support ("best" in the sense of maximum likelihood or MLE)? Couldn't the report indicate that although there is an appreciable chance that Dole in fact led Clinton in Florida at the time the poll was conducted, there is the same chance (roughly) that Clinton actually led Dole by as much as nine or ten points?

Lacking the space to say anything like this, wouldn't the Times have better served its readers by merely reporting the two point estimates and the sampling error without further editorial comment? What do you all think?

-- Jim Beniger

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Sep 23 10:07:51 1996
Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA09141 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Sep 1996 10:07:50 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.3/usc) with SMTP
id KAA04790 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Sep 1996 10:07:49 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Mon, 23 Sep 1996 10:07:48 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: JOB: Associate Director, Soc Sci Res Lab
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960923100042.3113D-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

NOTE: The posting date suggests that the "deadlines" have been extended, but
you might wish to check before applying. -- JRB

Date: Fri, 20 Sep 1996 11:14:23 -0500
From: "Jennie M. Davis" <jennie@SUNSET.BACKBONE.OLEMISS.EDU>
Subject: POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT
The University of Mississippi
University, MS 38677

Associate Director -- Social Science Research Laboratory

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Oversee and coordinate externally-funded research projects in the social sciences. Supervise data collection and manage daily activities of Social Science Research Laboratory. Coordinate and supervise telephone research projects: survey questionnaire construction; schedule lab staff an hours of operation; set and enforce lab use policies; interview and hire employees; supervise employees participating in the survey process; program and operate computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system; monitor progress of data collection; train subordinates to operate statistical, spreadsheet, and word processing software. Prepare and maintain all fiscal documents (balance of departmental expenditures; budget proposals for prospective clients, payroll and accounting records).

QUALIFICATIONS:

Bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university in a political science or related field. Master's degree preferred. Experience with survey research questionnaire construction and methodology. Must demonstrate professional level skills in budgeting, accounting, office management, and supervising and training subordinates. One year experience managing computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system preferred.

SALARY:

Competitive

DEADLINE FOR APPLICATIONS:
September 20, 1996

CONTACT:

Dr. Robert Brown
Dr. L. Marvin Overby
Directors, Social Science Research Laboratory (601) 232-5417
E-mail: psrbrown@cypress.mcsr.olemiss.edu
The University of Mississippi
Deupree Hall 105
University, MS 38677

STARTING DATE:
October 1, 1996

The University of Mississippi is an Affirmative Action/Americans with Disabilities/ Equal Employment Opportunity Employer.

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Mon Sep 23 10:46:27 1996
Return-Path: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
Received: from shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (root@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.128.96])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id KAA17345 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Sep 1996 10:46:22 -0700
(PDT)
From: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
Received: from labsoc17.hunter.cuny.edu (labsoc17.hunter.cuny.edu
[146.95.21.117]) by shiva.hunter.cuny.edu (8.6.12/george) with SMTP id
NAA07298 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Sep 1996 13:49:41 -0400
Date: Mon, 23 Sep 1996 13:49:41 -0400
Message-Id: <199609231749.NAA07298@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Overly-Cautious Poll Reporting?

Jim, please

1. Not all publications are as good as the NYT in reporting "how the survey was done". 2. I am sure that you know (but how can you leave this out of your consideration), the sampling error is just one part of the "total survey error" as people like Seymour Sudman, Don Dillman, and many others have reminded us since long (no offense to anybody not mentioned by name, but I just attended D.D.'s presentation at the NYAAPOR last week). The error reported by the NYT and other news organizations is the only one that can be quantified rather easily, but more often than not it may represent a minor part of the total survey error.

So, don't open this can and let's hope for the best that nobody in the media actually saw Jim's posting.

>From mikemokr@ap.org Mon Sep 23 11:04:48 1996
Return-Path: mikemokr@ap.org

Received: from hermes.ap.org (hermes.ap.org [165.1.6.7])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA21418 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Sep 1996 11:04:42 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by hermes./home/mikemokr (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
id OAA01414; Mon, 23 Sep 1996 14:01:13 -0400
Date: Mon, 23 Sep 1996 14:01:12 -0400 (EDT)
From: Mike Mokrzycki <mikemokr@ap.org>
X-Sender: mikemokr@hermes
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Overly-Cautious Poll Reporting?
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960923094119.3113B-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.960923131822.243A-100000@hermes>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

If it had been me, I would have called 47-42 with +/-4 "statistically slight," or an "apparent" or "narrow" lead, to acknowledge the chance Dole actually could have been ahead while recognizing that it's more likely Clinton led. I'd have saved statistically "negligible" (or a description to that effect) for a difference of less than the error margin, while a difference of greater than twice the error margin would be a clear lead -- at least that's the formula we use at AP.

As for simply reporting results and error margins without "editorial comment," I tend to prefer spelling out for the reader what is, what isn't, and what might or might not be. I suspect many would look at 47-42 with +/-4, not understand that the error margin should be applied to each result and not the difference, and therefore not see there's some chance Dole actually led.

In my role as a poll-reporting coach, I'm very interested in hearing others' opinions about this issue. (btw, I followed the recent discussion here of how sampling error is just one potential source of error in polls; I remind reporters of that and mention it in my stories whenever I can.)

Mike Mokrzycki
political polling editor, Associated Press
mikemokr@ap.org

On Mon, 23 Sep 1996, James Beniger wrote:

>
> OVERLY-CAUTIOUS POLL REPORTING?
>
> Ironic though it might be, considering the hard work by many AAPOR
> members over the past two decades to improve the statistical reporting
> of public opinion polls in the popular media, such coverage might now
> actually be too conservative. Does anyone besides me find overly
> cautious the following item in the "Political Briefing" section of
> last Thursday's New York Times (Sept. 19, p. A15 natl ed)?

>
>
> B a t t l e G r o u n d s
> -----
> T O S S - U P I N 2 S T A T E S ;
> C L I N T O N F A L T E R S I N 3 d

>
>
> Two new polls show that Florida and
> Virginia, ordinarily part of the Republi-
> can base, are very much up for grabs. On
> the other hand, President Clinton could
> be paying a price for his tough tobacco
> policy in the battle ground state of
> North Carolina.
> The polls, conducted by the firm of
> Mason-Dixon Political/Media Research,
> showed Mr. Clinton with a statistically
> negligible lead in Florida: 47 percent to
> Bob Dole's 42 percent, with the margin of
> sampling error plus or minus 4 percentage
> points...
>
>
> Reckless though I might be, I cannot see a five-point spread with a
> four-point margin of error as "statistically negligible." Might not
> readers at least be informed--in some way--that these percentages are
> the best unbiased point estimates of the actual percentages of support
> ("best" in the sense of maximum likelihood or MLE)? Couldn't the
> report indicate that although there is an appreciable chance that Dole
> in fact led Clinton in Florida at the time the poll was conducted,
> there is the same chance (roughly) that Clinton actually led Dole by
> as much as nine or ten points?
>
> Lacking the space to say anything like this, wouldn't the Times have
> better served its readers by merely reporting the two point estimates
> and the sampling error without further editorial comment? What do you
> all think?
>
> -- Jim Beniger
>
>

>From mikemokr@ap.org Mon Sep 23 11:06:18 1996
Return-Path: mikemokr@ap.org
Received: from hermes.ap.org (hermes.ap.org [165.1.6.7])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA21893 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 23 Sep 1996 11:06:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by hermes./home/mikemokr (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
id OAA01636; Mon, 23 Sep 1996 14:02:44 -0400
Date: Mon, 23 Sep 1996 14:02:44 -0400 (EDT)
From: Mike Mokrzycki <mikemokr@ap.org>
X-Sender: mikemokr@hermes
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Overly-Cautious Poll Reporting?
In-Reply-To: <199609231749.NAA07298@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.960923140203.243B-100000@hermes>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Mon, 23 Sep 1996 mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu wrote:

> So, don't open this can and let's hope for the best that nobody in the

I sort of agree with Jim, but not entirely. If I were making an even money bet I would bet on Clinton in these states. A 5 point lead is not insignificant even though the sampling error on the difference (2 sigma) is about 8 percentage points. For the Times to say the lead is insignificant is misleading. ("Insignificant" is not a statistical term.) The lead is not a statistical certainty, which is what we imply when we say the difference between the candidates is significant. Nonetheless, the odds are pretty good that Clinton is really ahead of Dole. They are just not at the 95% level.

The part I disagree with Jim about is this sentence: Couldn't the report indicate that although there is an appreciable chance that Dole in fact led Clinton in Florida at the time the poll was conducted, there is the same chance (roughly) that Clinton actually led Dole by as much as nine or ten points?" For it to be correct it assumes that the sample estimate is really the parameter.

What I would prefer in the way of reporting is for the story to say: "Bill Clinton leads Bob Dole by 5 percentage points. This lead is too small, given the margin of error, for us to be sure that his lead will hold up in other polls conducted at about the same time."

I prefer the reporter tell the story that fits the facts (above) and not just report that the difference is 5 points and the margin of error is 4 points. That kind of reporting puts the burden on the reader, a burden that most readers are not prepared to deal with.

warren mitofsky

In a message dated 96-09-23 13:17:48 EDT, you write:

<< The polls, conducted by the firm of
Mason-Dixon Political/Media Research,
showed Mr. Clinton with a statistically
negligible lead in Florida: 47 percent to
Bob Dole's 42 percent, with the margin of
sampling error plus or minus 4 percentage
points...

Reckless though I might be, I cannot see a five-point spread with a four-point margin of error as "statistically negligible." Might not readers at least be informed--in some way--that these percentages are the best unbiased point estimates of the actual percentages of support ("best" in the sense of maximum likelihood or MLE)? Couldn't the report indicate that although there is an appreciable chance that Dole in fact led Clinton in Florida at the time the poll was conducted, there is the same chance (roughly) that Clinton actually led Dole by as much as nine or ten points?

Lacking the space to say anything like this, wouldn't the Times have better served its readers by merely reporting the two point estimates and the sampling error without further editorial comment? What do you all think?

-- Jim Beniger

>>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Sep 24 07:02:28 1996

Return-Path: beniger@almaak.usc.edu
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.135])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA29381 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Sep 1996 07:02:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.3/usc) with SMTP
id HAA09463 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Sep 1996 07:02:27 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Tue, 24 Sep 1996 07:02:26 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Post-Doc: Work/Family Research
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960924065740.9316A-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Date: Mon, 23 Sep 1996 12:58:26 -0400
From: Ramona K Heck <rkh2@cornell.edu>
Subject: NEW INTERDISCIPLINARY POSTDOCTORAL TRAINING PROGRAM AT CORNELL

The Cornell Employment and Family Careers Institute invites applications for an interdisciplinary postdoctoral training program in work/family careers research. Training applies a life course approach to the study of the work/family interface and will begin as early as January 1997. Training periods are for 12 months, with a possibility of renewal. There is a stipend of \$32,000 per year. For additional information contact: Phyllis Moen, Director, Cornell Employment and Family Careers Institute, G58 MVR Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853; Phone: (607) 255-0838; Fax: (607) 255-9856; pem3@cornell.edu.

=====
Ramona K. Z. Heck
Director
Family Business Research Institute
103 Martha Van Rensselaer Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-4401

WWW home page=> <http://nmq.com/Cornell>
email=> rkh2@cornell.edu
facsimile=> 607-255-0799
voice=> 607-255-2591
=====

>From SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU Tue Sep 24 09:39:18 1996
Return-Path: SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU
Received: from LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU (lsuvm.sncc.lsu.edu [130.39.128.22])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id JAA24415 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Tue, 24 Sep 1996 09:39:16 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU by LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTP id 2560; Tue, 24 Sep 96 11:38:17 CDT
Received: from LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU (NJE origin SOWEIL@LSUVM) by

LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTTP id 9697; Tue, 24 Sep 1996 11:38:17 -0500

Date: Tue, 24 Sep 96 11:33:39 CDT
From: Rick Weil <SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Overly-Cautious Poll Reporting?
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SUN.3.92.960923094119.3113B-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT
X-Mailer: MailBook 95.01.263
Message-Id: <960924.113816.CDT.SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU>

On Beniger's question about the margin of error on several surveys in Florida.

I'm not a sampling methodologist, but what I remember from my methodology course in graduate school was this: if you have more than one survey of the same population with the same question at the same time (of course, all these can be violated), then you basically have a bigger sample, and your margin of error should be reduced.

The real methodologists out there can probably think of a bunch of other caveats, but this was the simple point I remembered that I always think of when I see multiple survey results all pointing in the same direction.

Rick Weil

Rick Weil	504-388-1140 Phone	
Department of Sociology	504-388-5102 FAX	
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	EMAIL:	
Baton Rouge, LA 70803	SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU	

>From rusciano@enigma.rider.edu Tue Sep 24 10:59:54 1996
Return-Path: RUSCIANO@enigma.rider.edu
Received: from enigma (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA10935 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 24 Sep 1996 10:59:52 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from enigma.rider.edu by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.0-4 #15764) id
<01I9UYAU3KR48WYJFH@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 24 Sep
1996 14:00:35 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 24 Sep 1996 14:00:35 -0400 (EDT)
From: rusciano@enigma.rider.edu
Subject: The Poll Regarding Teenage Drug Use
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <Pine.PMDF.3.91.960924135815.539088605B-100000@enigma.rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Fellow AAPORneters:

I have a question that arose when I was watching a news broadcast on the recent study regarding teenage drug use. Since this study has been the

subject of so much political attention in this presidential election, I felt that we should have the opportunity to examine its results more closely. In particular, I heard some interpretations which disturbed me if they were, indeed, the basis for the survey's conclusions. Perhaps someone with more knowledge of the survey can clear up a few questions for me:

- (1) Was the N for the survey about 4300 teenagers?
- (2) Was the increase in heroin and cocaine use really based upon an increase of 17 to 34 users over six years? That hardly seems significant in a survey of 4300.
- (3) Indeed, was the increase in marijuana use significant with that N? I understand that usage went from about 277 users to about 377 users? Are those numbers correct? Even if the other figure quoted was correct (an increase from 5.5% to 11%), how significant is that result when one considers that the percentages who DID NOT use marijuana went from 94.5% to 89%, respectively?

I guess what I wish to request, if anyone has the information, is a more formal presentation and evaluation of these results. What I have seen so far does not justify calling teenage drug use an "epidemic"-- in fact, it might not even justify the claim that we can be sure teenage drug use has even increased with an acceptable degree of confidence. Any further information on this survey would be appreciated. It seems to me that since this survey has been used for political effect so vehemently lately, we should have the opportunity to scrutinize the results and discuss whether they justify the claims being made.

Frank L. Rusciano
Rider University

>From EOBRIEN@nass.usda.gov Wed Sep 25 05:07:06 1996
Return-Path: EOBRIEN@nass.usda.gov
Received: from ag.gov (ag.gov [162.79.3.5])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id FAA28930 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 25 Sep 1996 05:07:02 -0700
(PDT)
From: EOBRIEN@nass.usda.gov
Received: from nass.usda.gov ([199.129.206.11]) by ag.gov (4.1/SMI-4.1)
id AA21561; Wed, 25 Sep 96 06:07:11 MDT
Received: from ccMail by nass.usda.gov (SMTPLINK V2.11 PreRelease 4)
id AA843663893; Wed, 25 Sep 96 07:58:10 EST
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 96 07:58:10 EST
Message-Id: <9608258436.AA843663893@nass.usda.gov>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: The Poll Regarding Teenage Drug Use

Frank,

I'll let others answer the design issues you mention but I have one more question.

Much progress has been made in reducing social desirability bias in questions about topics such as drug abuse. Newer methods which afford

the respondent more privacy should be expected to increase the reported frequency of sensitive behaviors-- and may have been applied in this study of 4,300. Who knows if interviewing mode/method has changed? How much of the increase in reported drug abuse can be attributed to better interviewing methods (if they were used)?

--Eileen

_____ Reply Separator

Subject: The Poll Regarding Teenage Drug Use
Author: aapornet@usc.edu at INTERNET
Date: 9/24/96 2:28 PM

Fellow AAPORneters:

I have a question that arose when I was watching a news broadcast on the recent study regarding teenage drug use. Since this study has been the subject of so much political attention in this presidential election, I felt that we should have the opportunity to examine its results more closely. In particular, I heard some interpretations which disturbed me if they were, indeed, the basis for the survey's conclusions. Perhaps someone with more knowledge of the survey can clear up a few questions for me:

- (1) Was the N for the survey about 4300 teenagers?
- (2) Was the increase in heroin and cocaine use really based upon an increase of 17 to 34 users over six years? That hardly seems significant in a survey of 4300.
- (3) Indeed, was the increase in marijuana use significant with that N? I understand that usage went from about 277 users to about 377 users? Are those numbers correct? Even if the other figure quoted was correct (an increase from 5.5% to 11%), how significant is that result when one considers that the percentages who DID NOT use marijuana went from 94.5% to 89%, respectively?

I guess what I wish to request, if anyone has the information, is a more formal presentation and evaluation of these results. What I have seen so far does not justify calling teenage drug use an "epidemic"-- in fact, it might not even justify the claim that we can be sure teenage drug use has even increased with an acceptable degree of confidence. Any further information on this survey would be appreciated. It seems to me that since this survey has been used for political effect so vehemently lately, we should have the opportunity to scrutinize the results and discuss whether they justify the claims being made.

Frank L. Rusciano
Rider University

>From mikemokr@ap.org Wed Sep 25 08:37:10 1996

Return-Path: mikemokr@ap.org
Received: from hermes.ap.org (hermes.ap.org [165.1.6.7])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id IAA26597 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 25 Sep 1996 08:37:08 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by hermes./home/mikemokr (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
id LAA10853; Wed, 25 Sep 1996 11:33:38 -0400
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 1996 11:33:37 -0400 (EDT)
From: Mike Mokrzycki <mikemokr@ap.org>
X-Sender: mikemokr@hermes
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Overly-Cautious Poll Reporting?
In-Reply-To: <960924.113816.CDT.SOWEIL@LSUVM.SNCC.LSU.EDU>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.960925112112.10269B-100000@hermes>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Tue, 24 Sep 1996, Rick Weil wrote:

> I'm not a sampling methodologist, but what I remember from my
> methodology course in graduate school was this: if you have more than
> one survey of the same population with the same question at the same
> time (of course, all these can be violated), then you basically have a
> bigger sample, and your margin of error should be reduced.

I'm no methodologist either, but the national polls rarely have exactly the same field periods (though there's considerable overlap), often use different question wording, may or may not precede trial-heat questions with a variety of other questions, employ varying sampling methods, etc., etc., etc. (see POQ spring '95 for a thorough comparison of methodologies). I wouldn't think of in effect combining them. Considering all those differences, though, I'm impressed by how much the national polls generally have agreed with each other this year.

Mike Mokrzycki Associated Press mikemokr@ap.org

>From piresrc@hopf.dnai.com Wed Sep 25 10:59:40 1996
Return-Path: piresrc@hopf.dnai.com
Received: from dnai.com (dnai.com [140.174.162.28])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA28431 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 25 Sep 1996 10:59:35 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from d-48.dnai.com (d-48.dnai.com [140.174.162.48]) by dnai.com
(8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id KAA29135 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 25 Sep 1996
10:59:03 -0700 (PDT)
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 1996 10:59:03 -0700 (PDT)
Message-Id: <199609251759.KAA29135@dnai.com>
X-Sender: piresrc@hopf.dnai.com (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.3
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: piresrc@hopf.dnai.com (P.I.R.E./S.R.C.)
Subject: piggy backing

I'm interested in piggy backing a boating questionnaire onto a national telephone survey that is conducted either annually or bi-annually. If you

know of a survey that might be an appropriate vehicle, please let me know.
Thanks, Alan Bernstein

e-mail
piresrc@dnai.com

>From ABIDER@american.edu Wed Sep 25 11:12:47 1996
Return-Path: ABIDER@AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (smtp@auvm.american.edu [147.9.1.2])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id LAA01897 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 25 Sep 1996 11:12:45 -0700
(PDT)
Message-Id: <199609251812.LAA01897@usc.edu>
Received: from AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTP id 1217; Wed, 25 Sep 96 14:11:58 EDT
Received: from american.edu (NJE origin ABIDER@AUVM) by AUVM.AMERICAN.EDU
(LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 2449; Wed, 25 Sep 1996 14:11:58 -0400
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 96 13:56:20 EDT
From: Albert Biderman <ABIDER@american.edu>
Organization: The American University
Subject: Re: The Poll Regarding Teenage Drug Use
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: Message of Tue, 24 Sep 1996 14:00:35 -0400 (EDT) from
<rusciano@enigma.rider.edu>

I had started to write the following on the "teen-age drug use crisis"
surveys, but quit when I failed at my tries at down-loading the report from
the ADAMSHA wbsite. I did have access to stuff on the surveys in the 1994
Crim Just Stat Handbook. For what it's worth, here it is.

The Christian Coalition kicked off last week's doleful campaign to make the
most of the teenager drug use issue. The irony of it is that the the
coalition wouldn't have been able to make much of the issue had they had
more of their way in the recent past. The irony of it is that they wouldn't
have been able to make much of it had they had more of their way in the
recent past. The Coalition prayers must have been powerful because it
received a godsend in the form of the recent report of the federally
sponsored National Household Survey of Drug Abuse-- NHSDA--that portrayed
drug using teenagers on the rise since 1992. (The drug use monitoring
surveys in schools that the National Institute on Substance Abuse and Mental
Health Services also sponsors shows a similar pattern for youngsters with
regard to increased marijuana use, but not for other drugs.) The Coalition
helped make part of the Republican Congressional "Contract with America" a
"Family Reinforcement Act" that would have required federally sponsored
researchers to get written parental consent before interviewing minors on
such topics as drugs or sex (USA Today, Jan 22, 1996). Since that
requirement would have been the death knell for these surveys, a storm of
protests made this provision one of the "Contract's" abandoned objectives.

Religious conservatives, and the Republican right, have been enemies not
only of such government surveys but also of the government programs that
sponsor them, since these are programs that place drug abuse in a medical
and mental health context. The speeches of Robert Dole that take these
SAMHSA survey results as springboard dwell on moral suasion, law
enforcement, and the more war-like features of the War on Drugs.

Although I have great respect for the power of the religious right, I doubt that its anti-government, anti-survey efforts have had enough influence to bias the drug surveys' samples. The averages presumably are not greatly biased by the systematic exclusion of kids from right-wing households who, presumably, would be either less likely to be into drugs or, if they were, would be less inclined than less square brats to brag about it on a questionnaire.

Regardless of any such bias, there are reasons to be skeptical of the sensational conclusions being drawn from these surveys. My experience with such surveys taught me long ago that obscure differences of survey method and implementation can make for huge apparent changes in their results. An obviously aberrant drop in the survey's data for drug use by blacks in 1992 lead to a peer committee review of the household survey which failed to pin down the reasons for the drop. It urged caution in any use of the 1992 data in measuring change. (1992 is the base year used for the most alarming claims of increasing use.) I would also be particularly curious about how the 1994 urban undercount Census revisions were introduced into the survey weights.

I am also skeptical about some of the non-sensational conclusions being drawn from these surveys. Among the latter is the sociologically appealing theory of the hippie parent generation's kids reaching their teens. These demographic changes spread out too much in time to account for very much of the precipitous rate changes in question.

Obviously, the prominence these data are receiving involves the clutching at straws by a floundering political campaign--an attempt at poll pole-vaulting with a slender reed of survey data as the poll-pole. I have heard no one questioning the survey, however. President Clinton in speaking to the FOP, for instance, took at face value the purported increase of drug use among young teenagers and then noted that drug use had gone down among adults. His briefers didn't think to put two and two together. Most of the 12-18 year-old kids who would have been the additional new users during the past five years are now in the next age group, 18-25. That group showed no increase in drug users, however. Maybe Clinton should claim that increasing numbers of young people are giving up drugs.

Caution is in order, however, in making a longitudinal sow out of a cross-sectional pig's ear.

Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu

>From MPRNJ!JHH@mprnj.com Thu Sep 26 06:23:28 1996
Return-Path: mprnj!MPRNJ!JHH@mprnj.com
Received: from tigger.jvnc.net (tigger.jvnc.net [128.121.50.145])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id GAA25344 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Sep 1996 06:23:27 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mprnj.com by tigger.jvnc.net with UUCP id AA25974
(5.65c/IDA-1.4.4 for aapornet@usc.edu); Thu, 26 Sep 1996 09:23:21 -0400
From: MPRNJ!JHH@mprnj.com (John Hall)
Date: 26-Sep-96 09:26:34
Received: by mprnj.com (UUCP-MHS-XtcN) Thu Sep 26 09:26:41 1996
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: AAPORNET digest 380
Message-Id: A448A33A01B4ACD1

In-Reply-To: A048A33A01B4ACD1
Importance: Normal
Encoding: 35 TEXT

I'm sure some other sampler has replied by now, but I felt compelled to add my two cents, since there seems to be an interest in the "significance" of differences in recently published estimates of drug use by teens.

Before discussing statistical significance, let me say that Eileen's (EOBRIEN) comments are well taken. The statistical significance of a difference is meaningful only if the concepts being measured are the same; also survey bias can result in both false positives and false negatives when it comes to tests of significance; to use Eileen's example, if question wording and/or other nonsampling factors contributed to (biased) under reporting four years ago, but new and improved techniques eliminated this bias, the estimated difference between then and now would be biased, and an interpretation of a "statistically significant" difference being real could be wrong.

Another thing to remember is that even if a difference is real, it may not be big enough to be important. How much of a tax increase would you put up with or how much reduction in your favorite government service (be it the Navy, education or the Food Stamp program) would you accept to reduce teen cocaine use to 1992 levels??? Would you accept more restrictions on your personal freedoms, or those of your children (who most likely don't use cocaine and never will)?

All that being said, if the differences noted are based on two samples each with observations on 4300 teens, it is likely that the cited differences are statistically significant. Of course the two samples are not simple random samples, so there will be "design effects" that increase the sampling error of both surveys and also of any estimated difference. Even with a design effect of 6.0 (a very large design effect), the differences in estimated marijuana use cited by Rusciano would be significant. With the estimates on cocaine use, the call is a bit closer, but my guess is that the estimated difference is statistically significant. (I'd need more details to be more confident.)

>From MPRNJ!JHH@mprnj.com Thu Sep 26 06:57:00 1996
Return-Path: mprnj!MPRNJ!JHH@mprnj.com
Received: from tigger.jvnc.net (tigger.jvnc.net [128.121.50.145])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id GAA00740 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Sep 1996 06:56:58 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from mprnj.com by tigger.jvnc.net with UUCP id AA00222
(5.65c/IDA-1.4.4 for aapornet@usc.edu); Thu, 26 Sep 1996 09:56:57 -0400
From: MPRNJ!JHH@mprnj.com (John Hall)
Date: 26-Sep-96 09:55:57
Received: by mprnj.com (UUCP-MHS-XtcN) Thu Sep 26 10:00:17 1996
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: AAPORNET digest 380
Message-Id: A948A33A01B4ACD1
Importance: Normal
Encoding: 42 TEXT

If you get this twice, my apologies, but,

1. I got a message indicating that the original may have not gone through.

2. I forgot to sign the original

John Hall

jhh @mprnj.com

I'm sure some other sampler has replied by now, but I felt compelled to add my two cents, since there seems to be an interest in the "significance" of differences in recently published estimates of drug use by teens.

Before discussing statistical significance, let me say that Eileen's (EOBRIEN) comments are well taken. The statistical significance of a difference is meaningful only if the concepts being measured are the same; also survey bias can result in both false positives and false negatives when it comes to tests of significance; to use Eileen's example, if question wording and/or other nonsampling factors contributed to (biased) under reporting four years ago, but new and improved techniques eliminated this bias, the estimated difference between then and now would be biased, and an interpretation of a "statistically significant" difference being real could be wrong.

Another thing to remember is that even if a difference is real, it may not be big enough to be important. How much of a tax increase would you put up with or how much reduction in your favorite government service (be it the Navy, education or the Food Stamp program) would you accept to reduce teen cocaine use to 1992 levels??? Would you accept more restrictions on your personal freedoms, or those of your children (who most likely don't use cocaine and never will)?

All that being said, if the differences noted are based on two samples each with observations on 4300 teens, it is likely that the cited differences are statistically significant. Of course the two samples are not simple random samples, so there will be "design effects" that increase the sampling error of both surveys and also of any estimated difference. Even with a design effect of 6.0 (a very large design effect), the differences in estimated marijuana use cited by Rusciano would be significant. With the estimates on cocaine use, the call is a bit closer, but my guess is that the estimated difference is statistically significant. (I'd need more details to be more confident.)

>From tgv@rti.org Thu Sep 26 13:46:36 1996

Return-Path: tgv@rti.org

Received: from cscnts3.rti.org (cscnts3.rti.org [152.5.128.49])

by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP

id NAA14267 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 26 Sep 1996 13:46:33 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by cscnts3.rti.org with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.993.5)

id <01BBABCA.33D71DE0@cscnts3.rti.org>; Thu, 26 Sep 1996 16:46:02

-0400

Message-ID:

<c=US%a=_p=Research_Triangl%l=CSCNTS3-960926204559Z-43082@cscnts3.rti.org>

From: "Virag, Thomas G." <tgv@rti.org>

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

Cc: "'Gfroerer, Joe'" <JGfroere@SAMHSA.gov>,
"Virag, Thomas G."
<tgvr@rti.org>
Subject: FW: Recent teenage drug abuse data -Forwarded
Date: Thu, 26 Sep 1996 16:45:59 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version
4.0.993.5
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

AAPOR Colleagues:

I am forwarding to you the e-mail shown below as requested by Joe Gfroerer, Branch Chief of the Prevalence Branch of the Office of Applied Studies at the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA).

Tom Virag	
Research Triangle Institute	Office Tel:
919-541-6011	
3040 Cornwallis Road (222 Hill Building)	Office Fax:
919-541-1261	
P.O. Box 12194	Home
Tel: 919-467-8053	
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194	Home Fax: 919-467-7052
Website: http://www.rti.org	Internet:
tgvr@rti.org	

>-----
>From:
>
>JGFROERE%gw2mhs@ngmsmtp.samhsa.gov [SMTP:JGFROERE%gw2mhs@ngmsmtp.samhsa.gov]
>Sent: Thursday, September 26, 1996 4:17 PM
>To: Virag, Thomas G.
>Subject: Recent teenage drug abuse data -Forwarded
>
>Tom, please forward this message to AAPOR. Thanks.
>--\$----Novell--Attachment----\$
>
>X-NVL-Content-Type: TEXT
>X-NVL-Content-Charset: X-IBM-437
>X-NVL-Content-Filename: MESSAGE
>
>Having read some of the comments on the recently released survey, I
>wanted to provide some information on it. There are several national
>surveys of teenage drug use. The one released by DHHS a couple weeks
>ago was the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, which
>covers the population age 12 and older. Conducted annually, it is the
>Federal Government's primary source of statistical information on the
>prevalence of drug use in the U.S. My office, the Prevalence Branch of
>the Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health
>Services Administration (SAMHSA), is responsible for directing the
>survey. Currently, the Research Triangle Institute conducts the survey
>for us under contract. I invite you to read the report of the survey
>(OAS Advance Report 18), which is available on the SAMHSA web site
>(www.samhsa.gov) or can be obtained by calling 301-443-7980.

>
>I hope that researchers in AAPOR will take the time to read the report
>and find out about how it is conducted before making judgements based
>on news reports that may or may not be accurate. Thank you.
>
>--\$----Novell--Attachment----\$--
>
>
>From boser@utkux.utcc.utk.edu Fri Sep 27 07:32:22 1996
Return-Path: boser@utkux.utcc.utk.edu
Received: from utkux.utcc.utk.edu (UTKUX1.UTK.EDU [128.169.76.67])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with SMTP
id HAA05187 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 27 Sep 1996 07:32:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [128.169.240.98] (COE168.COE.UTK.EDU) by utkux.utcc.utk.edu
(5.x/2.8s-UTK.UTCC)
id AA14902; Fri, 27 Sep 1996 10:30:48 -0400
Date: Fri, 27 Sep 1996 10:30:47 -0400
Message-Id: <v01540b01ae717435a31f@[128.169.240.98]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: boser@utkux.utcc.utk.edu (Judy Boser)
Subject: science interest inventory

I know this is not strictly in the field of interest for aapornet members,
but hopefully there is someone on the listserv that may have some
information.

I am trying to find instruments to measure interest in science for students
in grades 5 and below. This may involve pictorial representation or having
someone mark responses for younger students. Journal articles typically do
not contain the instruments or items, although sometimes a sample item(s)
may be included. We have found references to two instruments that appear to
be out of print at this time: "A Picture Choice" by IOX (Instructional
Objectives Exchange) and "What I Like to do" by SRA.

I would appreciate any help in the way of references, etc.

Judy Boser
University of Tennessee
215 Claxton Addition
Knoxville, TN 37996-3400
Phone 423 974-2137
FAX 423 974-8718
E-Mail BOSER@UTK.EDU

>From rys4@columbia.edu Fri Sep 27 11:31:33 1996
Return-Path: rys4@columbia.edu
Received: from labdien.cc.columbia.edu (labdien.cc.columbia.edu
[128.59.35.20])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTMP
id LAA19712 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 27 Sep 1996 11:31:30 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (rys4@localhost) by labdien.cc.columbia.edu
(8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id OAA24781 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 27 Sep 1996

14:31:27 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Fri, 27 Sep 1996 14:31:23 -0400 (EDT)
From: Robert Yale Shapiro <rys4@columbia.edu>
Sender: rys4@columbia.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Public Agenda Foundation--Opening
In-Reply-To: <v01540b01ae717435a31f@[128.169.240.98]>
Message-ID:
<Pine.SUN.3.95L.960927142915.23829D-100000@labdien.cc.columbia.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I am forwarding this from Steve Farkas, Public Agenda Foundation. Please direct all inquiries to him.

>From Paresearch@aol.com Fri Sep 27 14:28:26 1996
Date: Fri, 27 Sep 1996 14:22:24 -0400
From: Paresearch@aol.com
To: rys4@columbia.edu
Subject: Job opening at Public Agenda

Here is Steve Farkas's description of the opening at Public Agenda

--

September 27, 1996

PUBLIC OPINION ANALYST IMMEDIATE OPENING

Public Agenda - a nonpartisan, not-for-profit, research organization - has an opening for an issue- oriented public opinion analyst. We are searching for someone who can conduct qualitative research - especially focus groups - and who can help design surveys as well. This is a wonderful opportunity to do challenging, high-quality work in a very collegial atmosphere.

Responsibilities will include:

- conducting focus groups and in-depth interviews with leaders
- helping to design survey questionnaires
- report-writing and editing
- preparing and making presentations
- negotiating prices and study specifications with suppliers
- arranging travel and logistical details
- using on-line data bases

Applicants should:

- be highly organized and detail-oriented
- have a graduate degree
- be computer-literate
- be able to work independently
- be able to work on several different projects simultaneously
- be able to work under pressure
- be willing to travel frequently
- be able to write quickly and crisply

Founded in 1975 by public opinion analyst Daniel Yankelovich and former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, Public Agenda works to help citizens better understand critical policy issues and to help the nation's leaders better

understand the public's point of view. It is widely respected for the quality and depth of its nonpartisan opinion research.

Respond to:

Steve Farkas, Vice President and Director of Research
The Public Agenda Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, NY 10016
fax (212) 889-3461, e-mail paresearch@aol.com

>From Lee.H.Giesbrecht@ccMail.Census.GOV Fri Sep 27 12:06:52 1996
Return-Path: Lee.H.Giesbrecht@ccMail.Census.GOV
Received: from info.census.gov (info.census.gov [148.129.129.10])
by usc.edu (8.7.6/8.7.2/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA27708 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 27 Sep 1996 12:06:47 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from gate.census.gov (gate.census.gov [148.129.129.2]) by
info.census.gov (8.7.6/8.7.3) with SMTP id PAA19971 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Fri, 27 Sep 1996 15:06:40 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from it-relay1.census.gov by gate.census.gov with SMTP id AA07579
(InterLock SMTP Gateway 3.0 for <aapornet@usc.edu>);
Fri, 27 Sep 1996 15:06:40 -0400
Received: from smtp-gw3.census.gov (smtp-gw3.census.gov [148.129.126.23]) by
it-relay1.census.gov (8.7.6/8.7.3/v1.9) with SMTP id PAA11882 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 27 Sep 1996 15:06:39 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from ccMail by smtp-gw3.census.gov (SMTPLINK V2.10.05)
id AA843862112; Fri, 27 Sep 96 15:03:00 EST
Date: Fri, 27 Sep 96 15:03:00 EST
From: "Lee H Giesbrecht" <Lee.H.Giesbrecht@ccMail.Census.GOV>
Message-Id: <9608278438.AA843862112@smtp-gw3.census.gov>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Coverage Bias in List-Assisted RDD Samples?

I am working on a research project on coverage bias in list-assisted RDD sample designs. Does anyone know of any unpublished work on this subject that might be helpful? I am familiar with the fairly recent work (within the last few years) by Brick, et. al. and Keeter. Any other references would be greatly appreciated!

Thanks in advance,

Lee Giesbrecht
U.S. Census Bureau
FOB #3, Rm. 3357
Washington, D.C. 20233
(301) 457-3801
lgiesbre@survey.umd.edu