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

I am looking for a standard AAPOR article approximately 4-5 years old on response rates and computing incidence. any assistance would be appreciated.

>From abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu Tue Sep  1 11:33:00 1998

I am looking for a standard AAPOR article approximately 4-5 years old on response rates and computing incidence. any assistance would be appreciated.
You should look at the Standard Definitions report on defining outcome rates that's on the AAPOR Website: aapor@umich.edu

 response rates

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

Could you direct me to any research that would help me to understand the consumer affairs issues of most concern to older Americans? I am on a
local consumer affairs commission and am interested to know what senior citizens are most worried about or about which they feel they most need information and assistance.

Thanks very much.

>From M.SCHULMAN@srbicom Wed Sep  2 15:05:11 1998
Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
   id PAA02065 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 2 Sep 1998 15:05:03 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from SRBI_NEW_YORK-Message_Server by srbi.com
   with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 02 Sep 1998 18:02:00 -0400
Message-Id: <s5ed8818.043@srbi.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Wed, 02 Sep 1998 18:02:15 -0400
From: "MARK SCHULMAN " <M.SCHULMAN@srbicom>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Operations Center Director Position
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

Position Available: Survey Operations Center Director

Central New Jersey

Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc. (SRBI) is a leading international market research company with four offices and two large Survey Operations Centers. We will be opening a third Operations and Interviewing Center in Central New Jersey (Monmouth County) in November 1998.

We are seeking an outstanding Operations Center Director to guide the start-up of that center, then manage it on a day-to-day basis. The center will eventually contain 100 - 125 CATI interviewing positions plus some operations departments. This outstanding career opportunity is open immediately.

The start-up includes recruiting and retaining high quality interviewers, selecting a supervisory and support staff, overseeing the installation of systems, and being responsible for maintaining SRBI's high standards.

Candidates should be highly motivated, have an understanding of the research process, have successful administrative expertise, and have knowledge of CATI and data processing systems and technology. Candidates should also have superior ability to train and motivate people. Successful management experience is a prerequisite. Experience in market research operations is a plus.

We are committed to providing thorough training and support to the Center Director. Senior operations staff from SRBI's New York City office will work closely with the Operations Center Director during the start-up.
COMPENSATION: The starting salary will depend on qualifications. There is a good benefit package, including health benefits and 401K, and the opportunity to live in New Jersey's Monmouth County, just a few miles from the NJ shore. The area often appears on lists of "most desirable places to live." Monmouth County is about an hour from New York City. NJ Transit's Jersey Coast line provides frequent commuter train service into Penn Station, New York.

ABOUT SRBI: SRBI is a leading market and opinion research firm. The company specializes in public opinion, public policy, telecommunications, media, health care, financial services, utilities, automotive and transportation research. The firm conducts large-scale policy evaluation and strategy surveys for government, foundations, and major corporations. SRBI is an American affiliate of Global Market Research, an international consortium of research companies in 24 countries.

Visit our web page at: www.srbi.com

APPLICATIONS: Send resume and cover letter to: Al Ronca, Senior Partner, Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc., 145 E. 32nd St., Suite 500, New York, NY 10016

E-mail: a.ronca@srbi.com

SRBI is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Does anyone know of a book or other publication on how to conduct executive interviews?

Please reply to Ctalkov@opiniondynamics.com
I'm posting the following as a favor... pls do not reply to me, but rather to the address listed at the bottom of this msg. Thanx.

************
Research Associate

Progressive polling firm seeks responsible individual for analytical position. The qualified candidate must be hardworking, possess qualitative and quantitative research skills, be an experienced writer, detail oriented, and have working knowledge of statistics and the political process. The position's duties are wide ranging and include: doing background research, questionnaire development, creating graphic presentations, report and proposal writing, proofing and client support. Time management skills, organizational ability and interpersonal skills a must.

Fax (202) 776-9074 resume and cover letter to Exec. Dir., Lake Snell Perry & Assoc., 1730 Rhode Island Ave., #400, Wash DC 20036.
No calls.
by mail.gwi.net (8.8.5/8.8.7) with SMTP id SAA04596
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Sep 1998 18:03:03 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 8 Sep 1998 18:03:03 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199809082203.SAA04596@mail.gwi.net>
X-Sender: bnash@mail.gwi.net (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Barbara Nash <Bnash@marketdecisions.com>
Subject: Job Posting

Senior Marketing Research Manager

Market Decisions, Inc., an established full-service marketing research firm in Portland, Maine, is seeking an experienced project manager who can develop and manage projects independently. Project managers are supported by a capable in-house, CATI-equipped field service and data services staff. The firm stresses research integrity with solid methodological processes. Project managers must have experience in questionnaire design, analysis, report writing and making presentations as well as focus group moderating. The firm provides services to a variety of private and public sector clients throughout Northern New England.

Candidates should have a minimum of 5 years of relevant industry experience. Work for an independent marketing research consulting firm is a plus. MBA or masters degree in relevant field preferred. A comprehensive benefits package includes a competitive salary and a 401 K plan with company match. Position is open until filled. For additional information, visit our web site at www.marketdecisions.com. Send resume and letter of introduction to President, Market Decisions, Inc. P.O. Box, 2890, South Portland, ME 04116-2890.

>From JEBELING@oavax.csuchico.edu Tue Sep  8 19:33:05 1998
Received: from OAVAX.CSUCHICO.EDU (oavax.CSUChico.EDU [132.241.80.95])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id TAA06953 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Sep 1998 19:33:04 -0700
(PDT)
From: JEBELING@oavax.csuchico.edu
Received: from oavax.csuchico.edu by oavax.csuchico.edu (PMDF V4.2-13 #2) id
    <01J1KPY7VJ400006D4@oavax.csuchico.edu>; Tue, 8 Sep 1998 19:32:51 PDT
Date: Tue, 08 Sep 1998 19:32:51 -0700 (PDT)
Subject: Re: Job Posting
To: jbeling@usc.edu
Message-id: <01J1KPY7WC1U0006D4@oavax.csuchico.edu>
X-Envelope-to: jbeling@usc.edu
X-VMS-To: IN"%aapornet@usc.edu"
X-VMS-Cc: JEBELING
MIME-version: 1.0
A Research Conference on
the 1995 National Survey of Family Growth

The National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) and the Office of
Behavioral and Social Science Research (OBSSR) of NIH announce the first
research conference on the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG), to be
held at NCHS in Hyattsville, Maryland, on October 13 and 14, 1998.

The 1995 NSFG (Cycle 5) is a national survey of 10,847 women 15-44 years of
age, interviewed between January and October of 1995. The data set includes
detailed event histories of living arrangements during childhood; education;
work; marriage and divorce; cohabitation; sexual partners; contraception;
and pregnancy. There is in-depth information on the intendedness of
pregnancies; religious background; attitudes toward family and gender roles;
use of family planning services and other medical care; and many other
topics. While increasing the analytic potential of the survey, the time
series of
key fertility-related indicators have been maintained. In short, the
1995 NSFG is a very rich data set, useful for more in-depth research than
was possible with its predecessors conducted in 1973, 1976, 1982, and 1988.

The purpose of this conference is to present some original research using
the new NSFG data from Cycle 5, and to allow the researchers to meet and
discuss the data set and the issues it raises. The 2-day conference
includes over 20 papers on a wide range of NSFG topics. (A list of papers to
be presented is available from Anjani Chandra upon request.)
More information about the NSFG can be obtained from the NSFG homepage at:

http://www.cdc.gov/nchswww/about/major/nsfg/nsfg.htm

(In early September, further details about the Research Conference will also be posted on this website.)

Registration

There is no registration cost for the NSFG Research Conference, however space in the NCHS Auditorium is limited, and people are encouraged to register early. All those who are interested in attending are asked to register no later than October 6, 1998 by contacting either:

Anjani Chandra or Linda Peterson
301-436-8731, ext. 128 or 301-436-8731, ext. 126
ayc3@cdc.gov or lsp2@cdc.gov

******
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NOTE: When using material from this release please cite the Hartford Courant /UCconn CONNECTICUT POLL.

QUICK REACTION POLL ON STARR REPORT
by G. Donald Ferree, Jr.

The release of the Starr report seems to have begun to erode the evaluation of President Clinton, even as attitudes to Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr remain far from positive. This conclusion is based on results of a special "quick turnaround" survey conducted by the Hartford Courant/UConn Connecticut Poll intended to gauge first reactions to the publication of the report. Some 555 persons, drawn from lists of previously indentified registered voters were interviewed Friday evening, September 11, and the morning and afternoon of Saturday, September 12.

To be sure, ratings of Clinton's performance as President remain strong. Two thirds of the state's registered voters give either "excellent" (19%) or "good" (45%) ratings on the "job Bill Clinton is doing as President". One in three choose "fair" (19%) or poor (15%). These are on a rough par with the ratings he was receiving earlier this year, and so far show little sign of substantial fall off.

But this rosy assessment does NOT persist across all the questions on the survey. For example, when respondents were asked to recall how they had voted in 1996, Clinton "wins" by a more impressive margin than he actually received (Clinton 47%, Dole 23%, Perot 9%). However, this is common as voters tend to "overrecall" voting for the winner.

But "if you had it to do all over again", there is slippage. On the recall, Clinton's "margin" over Dole, Perot, and "someone else", was 9%. If the election were repeated, he still garners more support than any other individual, but falls 5% short of the combined total of Dole, Perot, and that unnamed "someone else".

Clinton, along with two other prominent figures in the recent controversy, was also rated in terms of "favorability". Here there is a clear sign of bad news for the Chief Executive. Now, on balance, voters regard him UNFAVORABLY by about a three to two margin (53%-37%). This is in clear contrast with perceptions of the First Lady. She was viewed FAVORABLY by two residents for every one who had an unfavorable sense of her (57%-28%). Men and women did not differ very strongly in their overall view of the President, but women tended to be more positive about the First Lady.

Kenneth Starr is now on a rough par with his antagonist. Overall, 46% of all voters see him unfavorably, and 28% favorably. (There are more people who are not willing to rate Starr than is the case for Clinton, but the balance of opinion is similar). Men are somewhat less critical of the Independent Counsel than are women. The latter group was markedly more favorably disposed to Hillary Clinton than were their male counterparts.

Earlier this year, as may be seen in the accompanying chart, Starr was much more negatively viewed than Clinton, but while Starr has not moved up much, Clinton seems to have fallen.

Two thirds of all respondents ventured an opinion of both men. Roughly equal numbers liked Clinton and disliked Starr as fit the opposite pattern, and together these groups accounted for half of all respondents. One in six disliked (more precisely had an unfavorable impression) of BOTH men. Only a
handful (4%) were favorable to both.

Going along with the continuing doubts about Starr, the public's evaluation of HIS job is less than stellar. On the same scale used to rate the President, four in ten call Starr's performance either excellent (15%) or good (25%), while half think that fair (25%) or poor (26%) is more like it. Women were rather more critical of Starr's performance than men were.

It should be pointed out that, compared to last Spring, while Starr's numbers remain unimpressive in the abstract, they have moved UP somewhat. Opinion in April was even more anti-Starr than is now the case, and his job ratings have moved up from the point when one in four gave him an excellent or good rating.

Voters on balance show some sympathy for the argument that Starr has gone too far. Thus, after being reminded that Starr began with Whitewater and expanded his investigation (with permission), six in ten (58%) believe he has gone too far, while four in ten (38%) think it is appropriate. This has changed little since April.

The argument that Starr's is a politically motivated effort finds some resonance. Half believe that he is "mostly out to get Clinton personally" as opposed to being "mostly out to find the truth". Still, if one counts in those who think that he is looking for the truth even if he is ALSO motivated to "get" Clinton, opinion is more evenly divided. Again, the balance is about what it was in April. Of course, the motivation of a prosecutor is not necessarily related to the truth of his accusations.

Awareness of Starr's report is high. Two thirds (68%) say they have heard or read about the contents of the report. This is extraordinary when one realizes that it had scarcely been open to the public for twenty-four hours when the last interview was completed about 4:45 on Saturday. Awareness is high among all age, gender, and partisan groups, save for the very youngest.

But the impact is what is really telling. To be sure, "what you have heard about this case recently" (a conservative measure of impact of the report and rebuttal), has not affected the views of about half (53%) of all those interviewed, or so they claim. But what impact there has been is clearly onesided. Almost half (44%) say their view of the President has worsened, only a handful (2%) say that recent developments have made them feel more positive.

While the spectre of impeachment has been raised, and while there is clear evidence of erosion of positive feeling towards Clinton, the public has surely not yet given up on him. But there are danger signs.

Asked to consider the situation from the perspective of "what you know now", one in three 35% say he has done something so serious that he should resign or be impeached by Congress if he does not leave office voluntarily. While half (54%) say he should not, a further 5% volunteered that they felt he should resign but did not support forcing him out. This leaves, however, four voters in every ten who, based on what they now know, think the
President should leave office.

Men are a bit more likely to take this stand than women, and there is a clear partisan cast, with 58% of Republicans favoring forcing him out if he does not resign, three times as many as self-described Democrats who take this position. The public, that is on balance has not yet favored impeachment (if Clinton should not voluntarily leave office) but there is substantial sentiment that things have come to such a pass that the Clinton presidency should come to an end.

The question on the most recent survey about resignation or impeachment was not directly asked on earlier polls. On our April survey, however, respondents were asked to support that the evidence ultimately "shows that he lied under oath about his sexual relationships with women while he was President". Assuming that hypothetical situation some 37% said that Congress should "start impeachment proceedings against him", while 56% did not.

The present question poses more problems for Clinton than that did for three reasons. First, the Starr report clearly alleges exactly this situation (and others), and Clinton now has admitted to sexual conduct he previously steadfastly denied -- although the degree to which he "lied under oath" is in dispute. Second, it is often easier to agree to a course of action when it is hypothetical than when, as now, it approaches much more closely to reality. Thirdly, the proportion who now say that Clinton should actually leave office now is at least as high as that which endorsed just the START of impeachment proceedings earlier.

The association of the report's publication with changes in perception of Clinton is not just temporal. There are differences between those who have heard or seen reports of the referral's content and those who have not. (Of course, it is hard to separate the extent to which awareness of the report causes shifts as opposed to which differences of views makes one more or less likely to pay attention).

The two groups are similar in terms of Clinton job rating. Those who have seen it are more likely to claim to have voted in 1996, but less likely (if they cast ballots) to have supported the President, and more likely to shift away from Clinton if they had it to do all over. They are less favorable to Clinton, relatively more favorable to Starr, and tend to rate the latter's job performance higher than those who were not aware of the referral's contents.

The groups were similar in thinking, on balance, that Starr's investigation had gone too far, but those who knew of the report were more likely to believe the Independent Counsel was seeking the truth as opposed to on a partisan adventure. Not surprisingly they were more likely to say recent events (presumably including the report) had worsened their view of Clinton, and correspondingly, to call for his resignation or removal.

It should be emphasized that this survey can only reflect immediate reactions, which could shift as arguments and counter arguments continue to be advanced. And Clinton's specific ratings as PRESIDENT remain a strong chip in his corner, as to doubts about Starr. But there are distinct storm
clouds, and publication of the Starr report and related events have clearly been associated with what could be the start of a major reassessment of Bill Clinton's fitness for his office.

Comparison of September and Earlier Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Clinton Rating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Bill Clinton** |           |       |          |
| Favorable        | 37%       | 58%   | 56%      |
| Unfavorable      | 53        | 33    | 33       |
| Don't know enough| 7         | 7     | 8        |
| DK, etc.         | 3         | 2     | 2        |

| **Kenneth Starr** |           |       |          |
| Favorable        | 28%       | 21%   | 19%      |
| Unfavorable      | 46        | 47    | 38       |
| Don't know enough| 24        | 29    | 40       |
| DK, etc.         | 2         | 3     | 4        |

| **Overall rating of Starr** |           |       |          |
| Excellent              | 15%       | 3%    | 5%       |
| Good                   | 25        | 22    | 23       |
| Fair                   | 25        | 29    | 25       |
| Poor                   | 26        | 30    | 25       |
| DK, etc.               | 9         | 16    | 21       |

| **Scope of Investigation** |           |       |          |
| Allowed to go too far  | 58%       | 54%   | 54%      |
| Investigation OK       | 38        | 35    | 35       |
| DK, etc.               | 5         | 10    | 11       |

| **Starr's motivation** |           |       |          |
| Mostly for truth      | 37%       | 34%   | 30%      |
| Mostly out for Clinton| 50        | 44    | 46       |
| Mixture (vol.)        | 5         | 6     | 8        |
| DK, etc.              | 7         | 16    | 16       |

Statewide Marginals and Percentages for Key Groups

What follows is the exact question wording for each of the items referred to in the release. The first column is the percentage of the entire sample
giving each response. The second and third reports the percentages for men and women separately. The fourth, fifth, and sixth columns show self-described Democrats, Independents, and Republicans. Columns seven through ten report the results for those in each of four age groups (calculated from year of birth): 18-29; 30-44; 45-59; older. The next two columns separate those who reported having a child living in their household from those who said they did not. Finally, results are shown in column thirteen for voters who said they had seen or heard some of the content of Starr's report, and in fourteen for those who had not.

Q01. (Interviewer note, but DO NOT ASK) Respondent's gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>PARTISANSHIP</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>KIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>TOT M F DEM IND REP &lt;30 &lt;45 &lt;60 60+ YES NO HRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45% 100% --% 39% 51% 45% 51% 46% 46% 40% 48% 43% 45% 45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55 -- 100 61 49 55 49 54 54 60 52 57 55 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q02. How would you rate the job Bill Clinton is doing as President? Excellent, good, fair or poor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>PARTISANSHIP</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>KIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>TOT M F DEM IND REP &lt;30 &lt;45 &lt;60 60+ YES NO HRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>19% 18% 19% 32% 15% 8% 9% 17% 21% 22% 20% 18% 20% 17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>45 45 45 52 44 37 53 46 47 41 41 48 43 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>19 17 21 12 20 30 23 22 17 18 25 16 20 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>15 19 11 3 19 25 12 15 14 16 13 16 15 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK, etc.</td>
<td>2 2 3 1 3 1 4 -- 2 3 2 2 1 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q03. In the 1996 presidential election, did you vote for Clinton, Dole, Perot, someone else, or didn't you happen to vote in that election?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>PARTISANSHIP</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>KIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>TOT M F DEM IND REP &lt;30 &lt;45 &lt;60 60+ YES NO HRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>47% 44% 49% 76% 40% 17% 28% 46% 51% 49% 44% 48% 47% 46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Perot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>41%/40%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>42%/46%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP</td>
<td>67%/35%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>35%/14%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIDS</td>
<td>14%/39%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q04. If you had it to do all over again, would you vote for Clinton, Dole, Perot, someone else, or wouldn't you vote?

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

RPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Dole</th>
<th>Perot</th>
<th>Someone else</th>
<th>Wouldn't vote</th>
<th>Ineligible (vol.)</th>
<th>DK, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>34%/32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>35%/25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP</td>
<td>61%/25%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>21%/9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIDS</td>
<td>3%/2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q21. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM: RECONSIDERED VOTE)

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

RPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stick with Clinton</th>
<th>Newly to Clinton</th>
<th>No longer Clinton</th>
<th>Stick other</th>
<th>Other pattern/DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>34%/32%</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>13/12</td>
<td>34/37</td>
<td>12/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>35%/25%</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>31/36</td>
<td>13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP</td>
<td>61%/25%</td>
<td>10/5</td>
<td>15/8</td>
<td>66/36</td>
<td>13/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>21%/9%</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>42/35</td>
<td>7/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIDS</td>
<td>3%/2%</td>
<td>8/5</td>
<td>11/8</td>
<td>34/35</td>
<td>12/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q05. For each of the following people, please tell me if you have a favorable impression of them, an unfavorable impression, or don't know enough to make up your mind. Bill Clinton

GENDER  PARTISANSHIP  AGE IN YEARS  KIDS
RPT

TOT  M  F  DEM  IND  REP  <30  <45  <60  60+  YES  NO  HRD
NOT

---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---

---
Favorable 37% 37% 37% 54% 36% 13% 38% 36% 40% 34% 36% 37% 33% 44%
Unfavorable 53 55 52 35 58 77 40 57 54 55 57 51 59 43
Don't know enough 7 7 7 8 4 7 23 3 4 7 5 8 5 11
DK, etc. 3 1 4 3 2 3 -- 4 2 4 3 3 3 2

Q06. Kenneth Starr

GENDER  PARTISANSHIP  AGE IN YEARS  KIDS
RPT

TOT  M  F  DEM  IND  REP  <30  <45  <60  60+  YES  NO  HRD
NOT

---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---

---
Favorable 28% 33% 24% 15% 28% 48% 19% 35% 25% 29% 30% 27% 31% 22%
Unfavorable 46 40 51 68 40 26 21 43 51 52 44 47 48 43
Don't know enough 24 25 23 16 29 23 55 19 22 17 24 23 20 32
DK, etc. 2 3 2 2 3 4 5 3 2 2 2 3 2 3

Q07. Hillary Clinton

GENDER  PARTISANSHIP  AGE IN YEARS  KIDS
RPT

TOT  M  F  DEM  IND  REP  <30  <45  <60  60+  YES  NO  HRD
NOT

---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---  ---

---
Favorable 57% 47% 65% 75% 54% 39% 63% 51% 59% 59% 50% 61% 58% 56%
Unfavorable 28 35 23 15 30 48 14 33 29 29 32 26 31 22
Don't know enough 12 16 9 8 15 11 23 13 10 10 15 11 8 20
DK, etc. 2 2 2 3 2 2 -- 3 3 2 3 2 3 1

Q22. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM: COMPARISON OF CLINTON-STARR)

GENDER  PARTISANSHIP  AGE IN YEARS  KIDS
RPT

TOT  M  F  DEM  IND  REP  <30  <45  <60  60+  YES  NO  HRD
<p>| Q08. How would you rate the job Kenneth Starr has been doing as special counsel? Excellent, good, fair, or poor? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>PARTISANSHIP</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>KIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DK, etc.</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Q09. Originally, Starr was only investigating Whitewater, but with the approval of the justice department, he has been looking into many other matters as well. Do you think he has been allowed to go too far, or is his investigation appropriate? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>PARTISANSHIP</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>KIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allowed to go too far</strong></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigation appropriate</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DK, etc.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Q10. Do you think Starr is mostly out to find the truth, or is he mostly out to get Clinton personally? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>PARTISANSHIP</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>KIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allowed to go too far</strong></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigation appropriate</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DK, etc.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11. The House of Representatives released part of the report Starr sent them. Have you seen or heard anything about the contents of this report?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>PARTISANSHIP</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>KIDS</th>
<th>RPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly for truth</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly get Clinton</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture (vol.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK, etc.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Q12. Has what you've heard about this case recently improved your opinion of President Clinton, made it worse, or not made much difference one way or the other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>PARTISANSHIP</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>KIDS</th>
<th>RPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved opinion</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made it worse</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much diff.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Q13. From what you now know, do you think President Clinton has done anything so serious that he should either resign or be impeached by Congress if he doesn't resign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>PARTISANSHIP</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>KIDS</th>
<th>RPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35% 31% 17% 39% 58% 33% 39% 32% 36% 37% 34% 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54 51 57 73 48 37 62 55 54 51 51 56 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resign/don't force(vol)</td>
<td>5 5 5 6 4 -- 2 6 7 4 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK, etc.</td>
<td>6 4 8 5 8 2 6 5 7 6 8 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes less than .5%
-- denotes 0%

**HOW THE POLL WAS DONE**

This Hartford Courant/UCONN Connecticut Poll was conducted at the Center for Survey Research and Analysis at the University of Connecticut, under the direction of G. Donald Ferree, Jr., who has directed the Poll since its founding in 1979.

A total of 555 randomly selected registered voters were interviewed over the telephone on September 11 and 12, 1988. Telephone numbers were selected at random from lists of previously identified registered voters. Theoretically, results from this survey have a "margin of error" of about +/- 5%. This means that, had we asked every registered voter in Connecticut exactly these questions at the time the survey was conducted, there is only a one in twenty chance that the answers would differ by more than that in either direction from what we report here. There could be differences because of changes in question wording, events occurring in the meantime, or any of the practical difficulties involved in taking a scientific survey. Results based on subgroups are subject to a larger "margin of error".
APDU'98: 23rd Annual Conference of the Association of Public Data Users, will be held October 25-28, 1998. The location is the Holiday Inn Hotel & Suites, Historic District Alexandria, 625 First Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. This year's theme is "Looking into the Crystal Ball: What is the Future of Public Data?"

A preliminary program, accommodations, and registration information is available via the APDU homepage (http://www.apdu.org). Note that the cutoff for hotel reservations at the conference rate is Friday September 25 and the cutoff for receiving a reduced conference registration fee is Tuesday October 6. Individuals who normally receive a printed conference brochure should receive those materials this week.

APDU was founded in 1976 to serve the users, producers and disseminators of government statistical data by assisting users in the identification and application of public data; establishing communication linkages between data producers and users; and bringing the perspectives and concerns of public data users to bear on issues of government information and statistical policy. APDU consists of representatives from many academic, governmental, commercial and private sectors.

Some APDU'98 conference highlights include keynote speaker Katherine Wallman, Chief, Statistical Policy Office of OMB; Monday luncheon speaker Larry Brandt, Director of the Digital Government Initiative at NSF; Tom Hofeller, Staff Director, Subcommittee on the Census; Two Insiders' Views from the Outside: Reports from Former Census Bureau Directors, Barbara Everitt Bryant and Martha Farnsworth Riche; and presentations on the future of data preservation, the National Spatial Data Infrastructure, plans for Census 2000, the 1997 Economic Census and NAICS, and the impact of welfare reform legislation on states. A new feature at APDU'98 are intensive hands-on roundtable sessions on the American Community Survey, combining socio-demographic data with GIS applications, PDQ-Explore, and Delivering Data on the Web: Planning, Execution, and Evaluation.

This year's conference co-chairs are Lisa Neidert of the University of Michigan (lisan@umich.edu) and Ted Hull of the National Archives and Records Administration (theodore.hull@arch2.nara.gov). We look forward to seeing you at APDU'98!
SENIOR SURVEY RESEARCH DIRECTOR

Response Analysis Corporation, a survey research company in Princeton, NJ, seeks a senior-level project director and proposal writer for social survey research projects in the areas of health and social welfare, among others.

The successful candidate will have: excellent writing skills; experience writing survey research proposals and leading proposal teams; knowledge of and experience with social survey research methodology and design; minimum 5 years experience managing project teams; an advanced degree in one of the social sciences; interest in and experience with business development activities is desirable.

We offer a suburban, college-town setting within commuting distance to Philadelphia and NYC, a collegial and supportive work environment, and full operational capabilities (national in-person interviewing staff, in-house phone interviewing center, coding, data processing, etc.). Send resume with salary requirement to Response Analysis Corporation, attention: Human Resources, P.O. Box 158, Princeton, NJ 08542. Fax (609) 921-2611. EOE M/F/D/V.
I am forwarding the following message to AAPORites. I am certain that we can help out this researcher. Please respond directly to Dr. Moskowitz. Hal Kassarjian

************
American Association of Public Opinion Research Washington/Baltimore Chapter

Topic: Changing Values and Attitudes in America and Western Europe

Speaker: Seymour Martin Lipset, George Mason University

Date: Thursday, September 24, 1998

Time: 12-2 p.m. Buffet lunch at noon. Speaker at 12:30.

Cost: $10, including tax and tip, but not dessert. Dessert costs extra.

Location: Montpelier Dining Room C
Madison Building, 6th Floor
Library of Congress
101 Independence Ave., SE
Washington, DC

Metro: Capitol South, Blue or Orange Line

RSVP: Either mail a check for $10 (per person), payable to DC/AAPOR, to:
Carolyn Shettle
5504 Uppingham St.
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

or

call Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 to make
a reservation by the close of business September 21 (Rosh Hashanah), and pay
Rob Simmons or Audrey Kindlon at the door.

Please note: We must give the Library of Congress a head count 48 hours
before the meeting, so it's important for attendees to reserve a place in
advance.

******************************************************************************
******************************************************************************

Mark your calendar:
On October 21, David Binder from Statistics Canada will speak on longitudinal surveys in a session co-sponsored by the Methodology Section of the Washington Statistical Society.

******************************************************************************
*******************************
If you would like to stay on our mailing list through next summer, please send the following form and your check for $10 (or $6 for students), payable to DC/AAPOR, to:

Carolyn Shettle
5504 Uppingham Street
Chevy Chase, MD 20815


I. Personal Information

Name (First Last):
Organization:
Job Title:

II. Directory Information:

Address line 1:
Address line 2:
City, State, Zip Code:
Telephone Number:
E-mail Address:

III. Mailing Address (If different than Directory Information above)

Mailing Address line 1:
Mailing Address line 2:
City, State, Zip Code:

If you are attending the Lipset luncheon as well as joining the Chapter, you may send Carolyn Shettle one check for the luncheon and the membership dues combined ($20, or $16 for students).
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Has anyone seen a reasonably credible estimate of the number of businesses in this country on the net?

I would appreciate any help that could be provided.

thank you

Mike O'Neil
Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, Arizona 85282
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surveys@primenet.com O'Neil Associates email
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Received: from post.mail.demon.net (post-11.mail.demon.net [194.217.242.40])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
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Dear Colleagues

Has anybody run a cross-tab on recent Clinton data filtered by '96 recall voters? Would be useful to know if there is a difference between voters (recalled) and non-voters, even if the data is a bit fuzzy. I'd use it in a speech tomorrow if anybody can send it to me. Thanks, and ...

Grateful!

Bob Worcester, MORI/LSE

-----Original Message-----
From: Frank_Newport@gallup.com <Frank_Newport@gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: 27 August 1998 14:41
Subject: FW: Change in question text on Clinton

> >
> >
> >-------
> > From: Newport, Frank
> > Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 1998 5:56 PM
> > To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> > Subject: RE: Change in question text on Clinton
> >
> > Here are the details of the situation involving the Bill Clinton
> favorability rating measures early last week, for AAPORNET users'
> background information.
> >
> > Monday night's snapshot CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll (August 17),
> conducted immediately after President Clinton's address to the
> nation, contained - in addition to the usual job approval and other
> questions
> > - a "favorability" measure. This question is usually asked about a
> list of people using the following format: "Next, I'd like to get
your overall opinion of some people in the news. As I read each name,
please say if you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of this
person... if you have never heard of him or her. First...
Monday
night's polling constituted an unusual situation in that the decision
was made to ask the favorability question only about one person, Bill
Clinton. Therefore, in order to make the introductory wording fit the
new context, the question was reduced to the following: "Now,
thinking about Bill Clinton as a person, do you have a favorable or
unfavorable opinion of him?"

The results Monday night:

Favorable: 40%
Unfavorable: 48%
No Opinion: 12%

This "favorable" percent was 20% points lower than the favorable
percent for Bill Clinton measured in the previous week's poll. By
Tuesday, however, the possibility became apparent that the small
wording change itself may have been responsible for some of the
difference between the two poll's results. Therefore, within Tuesday
night's poll, we included a split sample experiment to provide
empirical data on the possible impact of the wording change. We also
added Hillary Clinton's name in the experiment, to see if the wording
change would have an impact on her rating as well as on President
Clinton's.

A random split half of the sample received the same wording as Monday
night. The other half received wording which was the same as the
"usual" Gallup wording.

The results Tuesday night:

Evaluations of Bill Clinton

"Thinking about Bill Clinton as a person, do you have a favorable or
unfavorable opinion of him?" 44% favorable 48% unfavorable 8% no
opinion

"As I read each name, please say if you have a favorable or
unfavorable opinion of this person" 55% favorable 42% unfavorable 3%
no opinion

Evaluations of Hillary Clinton

"Thinking about Hillary Clinton as a person, do you have a favorable
or unfavorable opinion of her?" 64% favorable 24% unfavorable 12% no
opinion

"As I read each name, please say if you have a favorable or
unfavorable opinion of this person" 64% favorable 29% unfavorable 7%
no opinion
These findings suggest that the change in wording may have been responsible for up to an 11% point difference in the "favorable" ratings of Bill Clinton. The impact of the wording change on the favorable ratings of Hillary Clinton, however, was negligible.

These findings suggest, among other things, that respondents may be highly sensitive to nuances when asked to rate Bill Clinton in the current political environment. The slight wording changes may have provided a cue to respondents that they were being asked to discuss Bill Clinton's character explicitly, a cue that was not as apparent in the "traditional" Gallup wording.

This same wording change made no difference in the ratings of Hillary Clinton, presumably because her image is not bifurcated into the same professional/personal dimensions as is the President's.

As noted, poll releases that used the Monday night figure placed it in a trend context with the previous, "traditional" wording. This trend comparison was inappropriate without further explanation. We estimate that the traditional wording would have yielded a 51% favorable rating Monday night, a 9-point drop rather than the 20-point drop reported.

Based on the results of Tuesday night's experiment, revised findings were published in USA Today, were included in two different AP dispatches, were discussed in an article in Thursday's New York Times, and were immediately posted on the Gallup.com website in order to correct any misperceptions that may have been created when the original Monday night finding was compared to previous trends.

Additional Data Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton Handling Job/President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> Opinion of "This Person" (BC)  
> Favorable 60 - 55 53 55  
> Unfavorable 38 - 42 43 43  
> No Opinion 2 - 3 4 2

> Opinion "As a Person" (BC)  
> Favorable - 40 44 - -  
> Unfavorable - 48 48 - -  
> No Opinion - 2 8 - -

Frank Newport  
The Gallup Poll, Princeton  
newpf@gallup.com
Most of the responses I have received both on and off the list have confirmed my suspicion that the "as a person" form appears to give people the opportunity to concentrate on the person of Bill Clinton as they perceive him as separate from his role as president.

It appears to me that this means that there is a continuum of questions that range from the classic approve or disapprove of job as a president, through the list of people in the news to this "as a person" question. The first of these concentrates the respondent's attention on the role while the latter focuses attention on the person.

Perhaps this "as a person" question is actually a better measure of what we are trying to measure when we try to separate the person from the role?

--
Leo G. Simonetta  
leos@christa.unh.edu
UNH Survey Center

Last spring I asked AAPORNET to discuss the value of reporting public opinion about Pres. Clinton's difficulties by party I.D. rather than simply reporting an aggregate number for the entire U.S. citizenry.

Thus, I'd like to complement the NY Times (98/09/16, p. A24 National Edition) in their reporting of Jan-98 and Sept-98 opinions ***not just as
simple univariate findings*** but also showing us bivariate statistics including partisanship.

I find it especially informative to see the remarkable consistency in patterns of responses to Clinton's job approval ratings between January and now for Republicans, Democrats and Independents. It also is very informative to see the clear erosion of positive sentiment towards Clinton's moral values across each category of party affiliation.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.  
Professor of Journalism & Communication  
Professor of Public Policy & Management  
Director, Survey Research Unit  
College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University  
Derby Hall [Room 0126], 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210  
Voice: 614-292-3468  Fax: 614-292-6673  E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

If anyone is interested in reporting polls about Clinton by party ID, the TIME/CNN poll always reports findings this way. The Polling Report usually publishes these results.

>From Kramerypi@aol.com Thu Sep 17 10:45:25 1998
Received: from imo13.mx.aol.com (imo13.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.3])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA14999 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Sep 1998 10:45:23 -0700 (PDT)
From: Kramerypi@aol.com
Received: from Kramerypi@aol.com
  by imo13.mx.aol.com (IMOv16.10) id FMYSa13872
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Sep 1998 13:44:08 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <6ffc0723.36014a68@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 17 Sep 1998 13:44:08 EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Reporting opinions by party affiliation
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 18

If anyone is interested in reporting polls about Clinton by party ID, the TIME/CNN poll always reports findings this way. The Polling Report usually publishes these results.

>From wlester@ap.org Thu Sep 17 11:28:34 1998
Received: from charon.ap.org (charon.ap.org [165.1.60.10])
  by usc.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5/usc) with ESMTP
   id LAA01389 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Sep 1998 14:27:33 -0700 (PDT)
From: Will Lester <wlester@ap.org>
The Polling Report is online? on the aapor site?

will lester

Kramerypi@aol.com wrote:

> If anyone is interested in reporting of polls about Clinton by party
> ID, the TIME/CNN poll always reports findings this way. The Polling
> Report usually publishes these results.

The Polling Report is at http://www.pollingreport.com/

--
Leo G. Simonetta  leos@christa.unh.edu
My opinions. Mine! All Mine!

--
S. Kraus  s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu
Once again, national public opinion results, by reputable polls using reliable methods, are being viewed as not valid. Today, ABC's Cokey Roberts (usually an objective commentator), said that the reason why Republicans on the Hill aren't paying attention to polls -- showing the President with about 2/3rds favorable job rating, and majority opinion against impeachment or resignation -- is because the polls are skewed by New York and California responses. The Midwest and the South would show not show such majority opinions as those on the two coasts.

It serves our interests to promote the use of bivariate statistics -- in the present case, the inclusion of region as well as other dependant variables -- as Paul Lavarkas as urged.

>From RoniRosner@aol.com Sun Sep 20 10:44:34 1998
Received: from imo22.mx.aol.com (imo22.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.66])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA07930 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 10:44:33 -0700
(PDT)
From: RoniRosner@aol.com
Received: from RoniRosner@aol.com
   by imo22.mx.aol.com (IMVo16.10) id FHTFa03120
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 13:43:45 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <e6789f25.36053ed1@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 20 Sep 1998 13:43:45 EDT
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: "PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS" -- 10/1 MEETING
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 2.5 for Windows

AAPOR/New York Chapter and the MSC present an Evening Meeting

Date: THURSDAY, 1 OCTOBER 1998

Refreshments: 5:30 p.m.
Presentation: 6:00 -- 8:00 p.m.

Place: The Media Studies Center
580 Madison Ave. (56-57th Sts.)/Mezzanine Level
Admission: NYAAPOR members, student members, HLMs, MSC, free; other students, $5; all others, $10

**PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS:**
Case Studies of How Politicians Try to Tar the Messenger

* Have you done any polling and then drew the ire and public finger wagging from politicians?

* Have you ever conducted research and then were blamed or chided for unpopular results?

Join NYAAPOR and feel right at home. Several of our colleagues who poll around the country detail case studies that show how politicians attempt to disparage the messenger when confronted by unpleasant news.

Introducing our Panelists:

Robert Daves, The Minnesota Poll (Panel Chair)
"The Case of the Push Poll Accusations"

Janice Ballou, The Eagleton Poll
"The Case of the Methodological Malcontents"

Kathleen Frankovic, CBS News
"The Cases of the Presidents and the Pols"

David Moore, The Gallup Organization
"The Cases of the Unfair Poll Accusations"

------------------------------------------------------------------------

BUILDING SECURITY CANNOT ADMIT ANYONE WHOSE NAME IS NOT ON OUR LIST!! If you are planning to attend, respond by TUES., 29 SEPT. E-MAIL RoniRosner@AOL.COM Or, if you must, call 722-5333.

------------------------------------------------------------------------

Save the date!! Afternoon workshop on 21 Oct.1998
"DISCOVERING DATA MINING"

>From fweil@lsu.edu Sun Sep 20 13:41:54 1998
Received: from mail081.lsu.edu (sp115.ocs.lsu.edu [130.39.174.48])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
   id NAA01650 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 13:41:47 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from weber ([204.252.235.71]) by mail081.lsu.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.1 (569.2 2-6-1998)) with SMTP id 86256685.0071A1B8; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 15:41:10 -0500
Message-ID: <007101bde4d6$f2a955c0$47ebfccc@weber>
From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@lsu.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Public Opinion on the Dock
Dr. Sidney Kraus wrote:

> It serves our interests to promote the use of bivariate statistics -- in the present case, the inclusion of region as well as other dependant variables
> -- as Paul Lavarkas as urged.

I'm probably typical of a number of people on aapornet - I am very interested in the current situation but don't have current data coming in all the time. (I mostly do secondary analysis of time trends cross-nationally, but I like to use current polls in a political sociology class I teach).

It's not too hard to find the overall trends in the press or on the web, but analyses are much harder to find. It would be great to see breakdowns and analyses of current trends on aapornet. Since we're all very busy, you don't necessarily have to write something extra for the list - simply post breakdowns and/or reports you have already produced (if non-proprietary) or post links to places on the web where one can find such analyses. This would be tremendously informative for those of us who do survey analysis but don't specialize in current developments.

Frederick Weil, Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
504-388-1140
504-388-5102 fax
fweil@lsu.edu

> From jwerner@jwdp.com Sun Sep 20 16:45:11 1998
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id QAA28394 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 16:45:09 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from jwdp.com (plp27.vgernet.net [205.219.186.127])
   by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id WAA13526
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 22:35:06 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <36059378.AF9B25E2@jwdp.com>
Date: Sun, 20 Sep 1998 19:44:56 -0400

I will attend the October 1 meeting. Please put Laurie on the list too, since she will probably meet me there afterwards.

With respect to the subject of the meeting, here is an extract from the speech to the House of Representatives by Dick Gephardt on Sept. 11 concerning the nature of the impeachment process:

This is a sacred process. This goes to the heart of our democracy. This is not a second election. This is not politics. This is not spinning. This is not polling. This is not a lynch mob. This is not a witch hunt. This is not trying to find facts to support our already-reached conclusions. This is a constitutional test. . . .

Note where polling shows up in the hierarchy of things.

I would have liked to go to the Data Mining session too, but I have another commitment on October 21st.

Jan

RoniRosner@aol.com wrote:
> AAPOR/New York Chapter and the MSC present an Evening Meeting
> Date: THURSDAY, 1 OCTOBER 1998
> Refreshments: 5:30 p.m.
> Presentation: 6:00 -- 8:00 p.m.
> Place: The Media Studies Center
> 580 Madison Ave. (56-57th Sts.)/Mezzanine Level
> Admission: NYAAPOR members, student members, HLMs, MSC, free;
> other students, $5; all others, $10
> PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS:
> Case Studies of How Politicians Try to Tar the Messenger
> * Have you done any polling and then drew the ire and public finger wagging from politicians?
Have you ever conducted research and then were blamed or chided for unpopular results?

Join NYAAPOR and feel right at home. Several of our colleagues who poll around the country detail case studies that show how politicians attempt to disparage the messenger when confronted by unpleasant news.

Introducing our Panelists:

Robert Daves, The Minnesota Poll (Panel Chair)
"The Case of the Push Poll Accusations"

Janice Ballou, The Eagleton Poll
"The Case of the Methodological Malcontents"

Kathleen Frankovic, CBS News
"The Cases of the Presidents and the Pols"

David Moore, The Gallup Organization
"The Cases of the Unfair Poll Accusations"

-----------------------------
BUILDING SECURITY CANNOT ADMIT ANYONE WHOSE NAME IS NOT ON OUR LIST!! If you are planning to attend, respond by TUES., 29 SEPT. E-MAIL RoniRosner@AOL.COM Or, if you must, call 722-5333.

Save the date!! Afternoon workshop on 21 Oct.1998 "DISCOVERING DATA MINING"

From mtrau@umich.edu Sun Sep 20 17:53:04 1998
Received: from relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (relic.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.11]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id RAA09453 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 17:52:50 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from umich.edu (pm465-21.dialip.mich.net [207.75.177.79]) by relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (relic.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.11])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id UAA11463 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 20:52:24 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <3605A432.8F091FE9@umich.edu>
Date: Sun, 20 Sep 1998 20:56:18 -0400
From: Mike Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Public Opinion on the Dock
References: <199809201552.IAA26023@usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
We also know that people discount polls when the measured opinion does not coincide with their own view. The bivariate analysis would help to understand what's going on and check the claim, but I doubt it would convince Republican leaders.

Dr. Sidney Kraus wrote:

> Once again, national public opinion results, by reputable polls using reliable methods, are being viewed as not valid. Today, ABC's Cokey Roberts (usually an objective commentator), said that the reason why Republicans on the Hill aren't paying attention to polls -- showing the President with about 2/3rds favorable job rating, and majority opinion against impeachment or resignation -- is because the polls are skewed by New York and California responses. The Midwest and the South would show not show such majority opinions as those on the two coasts.
>
> It serves our interests to promote the use of bivariate statistics -- in the present case, the inclusion of region as well as other dependant variables
>
> -- as Paul Lavarkas as urged.

---

> From: RoniRosner@aol.com
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: "PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS" -- 10/1 MEETING
> Date: Sunday, September 20, 1998 1:43 PM

Roni, Please put Agnes and me on the reservation list. Thanks. Leo Bogart

----------
AAPOR/New York Chapter and the MSC present an Evening Meeting

Date:              THURSDAY, 1 OCTOBER 1998

Refreshments:  5:30 p.m.
Presentation:    6:00 -- 8:00 p.m.

Place:             The Media Studies Center
                     580 Madison Ave. (56-57th Sts.)/Mezzanine Level

Admission:      NYAAPOR members, student members, HLMs, MSC, free;
                     other students, $5; all others, $10

PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS:
Case Studies of How Politicians Try to Tar the Messenger

* Have you done any polling and then drew the ire and public finger
  wagging from politicians?

* Have you ever conducted research and then were blamed or chided for unpopular results?

Join NYAAPOR and feel right at home. Several of our colleagues who poll around the country detail case studies that show how politicians attempt to disparage the messenger when confronted by unpleasant news.

Introducing our Panelists:

Robert Daves, The Minnesota Poll (Panel Chair)
"The Case of the Push Poll Accusations"

Janice Ballou, The Eagleton Poll
"The Case of the Methodological Malcontents"

Kathleen Frankovic, CBS News
"The Cases of the Presidents and the Pols"

David Moore, The Gallup Organization
"The Cases of the Unfair Poll Accusations"

BUILDING SECURITY CANNOT ADMIT ANYONE WHOSE NAME IS NOT ON OUR LIST!! If you are planning to attend, respond by TUES., 29 SEPT.
E-MAIL RoniRosner@AOL.COM  Or, if you must, call 722-5333.
> Save the date!!  Afternoon workshop on 21 Oct.1998
> "DISCOVERING DATA MINING"
> From mitofsky@mindspring.com Sun Sep 20 19:29:32 1998
Received: from camel7.mindspring.com (camel7.mindspring.com [207.69.200.57])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/us) with ESMTP
    id TAA21406 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 19:29:14 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from warrenmi (user-38ld03t.dialup.mindspring.com
[209.86.128.125])
    by camel7.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id WAA29334
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 22:28:35 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199809210228.WAA29334@camel7.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Sun, 20 Sep 1998 22:27:55 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: "PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS" -- 10/1 MEETING
In-Reply-To: <e6789f25.36053ed1@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Roni,
If my name is not on the list please add it.
Warren Mitofsky

At 01:43 PM 9/20/98 -0400, you wrote:
> AAPOR/New York Chapter and the MSC present an Evening Meeting
> 
> Date: THURSDAY, 1 OCTOBER 1998
> 
> Refreshments: 5:30 p.m.
> Presentation: 6:00 -- 8:00 p.m.
> 
> Place: The Media Studies Center
> 580 Madison Ave. (56-57th Sts.)/Mezzanine Level
> 
> Admission: NYAAPOR members, student members, HLMs, MSC, free;
> other students, $5; all others, $10
> 
> PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS:
> Case Studies of How Politicians Try to Tar the Messenger
> 
> * Have you done any polling and then drew the ire and public finger
wagging from politicians?
> 
> * Have you ever conducted research and then were blamed or chided
for unpopular results?
> Join NYAAPOR and feel right at home. Several of our colleagues who poll
> around the country detail case studies that show how politicians
> attempt to disparage the messenger when confronted by unpleasant news.
> 
> Introducing our Panelists:
> 
> Robert Daves, The Minnesota Poll (Panel Chair)
> "The Case of the Push Poll Accusations"
> 
> Janice Ballou, The Eagleton Poll
> "The Case of the Methodological Malcontents"
> 
> Kathleen Frankovic, CBS News
> "The Cases of the Presidents and the Pols"
> 
> David Moore, The Gallup Organization
> "The Cases of the Unfair Poll Accusations"
> 
> ----------------------------------
> ----
> 
> Save the date!! Afternoon workshop on 21 Oct. 1998
> "DISCOVERING DATA MINING"
> 
> From JHall@mathematica-mpr.com Mon Sep 21 05:54:43 1998
> Received: from relay1.smtp.psi.net (relay1.smtp.psi.net [38.8.14.2])
> by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/uscd) with ESMTP
> id FAA26146 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 05:54:42 -0700
> (PDT)
> Received: from [38.233.146.17] (helo=mpr5.MATHINC)
> by relay1.smtp.psi.net with smtp (Exim 1.90 #1)
> for aapornet@usc.edu
> id 0zL5UG-00006B-00; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 08:54:40 -0400
> Received: by mpr5.MATHINC with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail
> Connector Version 4.0.994.63)
> id <01BDE53E.1D1943D0@mpr5.MATHINC>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 08:59:17 -0400
> Message-ID: <c=US%a=%p=MATHINC%l=MPR5-980921125906Z-2645@mpr5.MATHINC>
> From: John Hall <JHall@mathematica-mpr.com>
> To: "<aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Subject: RE: Public Opinion on the Dock
> Date: Mon, 21 Sep 1998 08:59:06 -0400
> X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version
> 4.0.994.63

Doing some rough calculations (NY and CA combined account for 20% of the US population), it would appear that for Clinton to have a 65% approval rating,
he would have to have a fairly strong majority outside of CA and NY. At the extreme, if Clinton's approval rating were 100% in both CA and NY, he would still have to get a 55% rating in the rest of the country to get an overall 65% rating. (It is Monday morning, so I hope someone checks my demographics and my arithmetic.)

John
John Hall
Senior Sampling Statistician
Mathematica Policy Research
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543
phone (609) 275-2357
fax (609) 799-0005
email jhall@mathematica-mpr.com

--------------
>From: Dr. Sidney Kraus[SMTP:s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu]
>Sent: Sunday, September 20, 1998 11:52 AM
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Public Opinion on the Dock
>
>Once again, national public opinion results, by reputable polls using
>reliable methods, are being viewed as not valid. Today, ABC’s Cokey
>Roberts (usually an objective commentator), said that the reason why
>Republicans on the Hill aren't paying attention to polls -- showing the
>President with about 2/3rds favorable job rating, and majority opinion
>against impeachment or resignation -- is because the polls are skewed
>by New York and California responses. The Midwest and the South would
>show not show such majority opinions as those on the two coasts.
>
>It serves our interests to promote the use of bivariate statistics --
in the present case, the inclusion of region as well as other dependant
>variables
>-- as Paul Lavarkas as urged.
>
>From poja@fhsuvm.fhsu.edu Mon Sep 21 07:00:59 1998
Received: from FHSUVM.FHSU.EDU (fhsuvm.fhsu.edu [198.22.249.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id HAA05050 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 07:00:56 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from fhsuvm.fhsu.edu by FHSUVM.FHSU.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R3) with
TCP;
   Mon, 21 Sep 98 09:01:57 CST
Message-ID: <36066573.FFF5E8BD@fhsuvm.fhsu.edu>
Date: Mon, 21 Sep 1998 09:40:51 -0500
From: jaistrup <poja@fhsuvm.fhsu.edu>
Reply-To: poja@fhsuvm.fhsu.edu
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Public Opinion on the Dock

Dr. Sidney Kraus wrote:

> Once again, national public opinion results, by reputable polls using
> reliable methods, are being viewed as not valid. Today, ABC's Cokey
> Roberts (usually an objective commentator), said that the reason why
> Republicans on the Hill aren't paying attention to polls -- showing
> the President with about 2/3rds favorable job rating, and majority
> opinion against impeachment or resignation -- is because the polls are
> skewed by New York and California responses. The Midwest and the
> South would show not show such majority opinions as those on the two
> coasts.
> >
> It serves our interests to promote the use of bivariate statistics --
> in the present case, the inclusion of region as well as other
> dependant variables
> -- as Paul Lavarkas as urged.

Joe Aistrup, Ph.D.
Docking Institute of Public Affairs
Given Robert's obvious misinterpretation, does anyone know if AAPOR plans on contacting the network or issuing a statement about it?

> ---------
> From:    jaistrup[SMTP:poja@fhsuvm.fhsu.edu]
> Reply To: poja@fhsuvm.fhsu.edu
> Sent:    Monday, September 21, 1998 10:40 AM
> To:      aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Public Opinion on the Dock
> 
> Last Friday's USA Today had the poll numbers for Clinton's approval
> broken down by region. The East tended to have the highest level of
> approval, while the West (which obviously includes CA) had the lowest.
> In addition, numerous web sites have more detailed analysis.
> 
> When I heard Cokey Roberts's statement this morning, I had a very
> similar reaction as Sidney Kraus. I also was upset by Robert's lack
> of understanding
> of national polls. Unfortunately, this demonstrates that despite this
> Association's best efforts, we still need to work harder educating our
> reporters
> and most importantly, the general public regarding surveys and survey
> methodology.
> 
> Joe Aistrup, Ph.D.
> Docking Institute of Public Affairs
> 
> Dr. Sidney Kraus wrote:
> 
> > Once again, national public opinion results, by reputable polls
> > using
> > reliable methods, are being viewed as not valid. Today, ABC's Cokey
> > Roberts
> > (usually an objective commentator), said that the reason why
> > Republicans on
> > the Hill aren't paying attention to polls -- showing the President
> > with
> > about 2/3rds favorable job rating, and majority opinion against
> > impeachment
> > or resignation -- is because the polls are skewed by New York and
> > California
> > responses. The Midwest and the South would show not show such
> > majority
> > opinions as those on the two coasts.
> > >
> > > It serves our interests to promote the use of bivariate statistics
> > -- in the
> > > present case, the inclusion of region as well as other dependant
> > variables
> > > -- as Paul Lavarkas as urged.
I'm sending these along for those interested, in case you didn't see these numbers in Friday's (New York) edition of the NY Times in an article by Marjorie Connelly:

Based on combined national RDD samples, NYT & CBS News, 9/12-9/14, n=1813, and CBS News, 9/15, n=429.

I don't think these are not the actual item-wording. They are taken from the news article graphic.

The House of Representatives did the right thing in releasing to the public the full report from the independent counsel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% AGREE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRATS</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENTS</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICANS</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the details should not have been released to the public:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% AGREE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRATS</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENTS</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICANS</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not necessary to release the videotape:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% AGREE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRATS</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEPENDENTS  72%
REPUBLICANS      58%
ALL             70%

My own comment: To me, what is informative about "where" public opinion is on these matters is that Independents still look more like Democrats than they do like Republicans. It would be when, if ever, Independents start looking more like Republicans that the tide has turned. To me, this is a clear value in reporting these types of data by party affidavit and not merely relegating bivariate results to websites and professional publications....

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
* Professor of Journalism & Communication *
* Professor of Public Policy & Management *
* Director, Survey Research Unit *
* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University *
* Derby Hall [Room 0126], 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210 *
* Voice: 614-292-3468  Fax: 614-292-6673  E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

On Mon, 21 Sep 1998 13:08:46 -0400 Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. wrote:

> My own comment: To me, what is informative about "where" public
> opinion is on these matters is that Independents still look more like
> Democrats than they do like Republicans.
What I find most striking is how close independents are to "all"--I can't recall ever seeing it this close on so many variables (see below).

-- Jim Beniger

The House of Representatives did the right thing in releasing to the public the full report from the independent counsel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% AGREE</th>
<th>INDEPENDENTS</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the details should not have been released to the public:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% AGREE</th>
<th>INDEPENDENTS</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not necessary to release the videotape:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% AGREE</th>
<th>INDEPENDENTS</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roni,
Any chance that transcripts or detailed notes will be made available from the proceedings? Should be a fascinating session but being that I live in Atlanta, attendance would be difficult. I'm sure that many AAPORites would be equally interested. Comment frequently heard in my neighborhood (very, very politically conservative) by those who don't like poll findings is "where in the world do they get these people" (referring to the sample, of course).

Thanks,

Dick Halpern

<smaller>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121
E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com
</smaller>

Has anyone conducted or come across any recent poll findings relating to attitudes, listening habits, audience size and characteristics, etc. with regard to various talk show hosts such as Rush Limbaugh, Neal Boritz, Howard Stern, and the like? We know they have an influence and loyal audiences. Be grateful for any leads.

Dick Halpern
Re all the discussion about crosstabulations and presidential ratings. =
Given the nature of the issue surrounding the President, I think = focusing
on gender is much more interesting than the rather predictable =
relationships showing that Democrats are more supportive and forgiving = of
the President than are Republicans and that the President fares less = well
in conservative areas of the country. =20

Much as been made of the gender gap in recent presidential elections. = One
could speculate that women, who are more disposed to the Democratic = party,
might also be more intolerant of infidelity than men, creating an =
interesting conflict for them. The only national poll whose data I had =
access to (LA TIMES Aug 18-19) showed women still rated Clinton's job =
performance more highly than men (68% vs.56% favorable) but that this 12 =
percentage point differential was cut in half for the favorability =
rating (52% favorable for women, 46% for men, a 6 percentage point difference), which is more influenced (we presume) by personal behavior. (I don't remember how much better Clinton did among women than men in = the '96 election; I seem to recall it was a bit more than 12 percentage points, but I am not sure). All of this suggests that the scandal may have diminished the gender gap, but this is only one poll. I'd love to see more.

I found Frank Newport's report fascinating, it should become a textbook example in question wording, since the wording change was so subtle and the impact so strong. I'd love to see THOSE figures (for all 3 questions) broken down by gender.

Mike O'Neil

------------------------
Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, Arizona 85282
602.967.4441 Voice
602.967.6171 Personal Fax
602.966.6122 O'Neil Associates Fax
oneil@speedchoice.com personal email
surveys@primenet.com O'Neil Associates email
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One could speculate that women, who are more disposed to the Democratic party, = might also = be more intolerant of infidelity than men, creating an interesting = conflict for = them.&amp;nbsp; The only national poll
whose data I had access to (LA TIMES = Aug=20
18-19) showed women still rated Clinton's job performance more highly than
men=20 (68% vs.56% favorable) but that this 12 percentage point differential
was cut in=20 half for the favorability;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbs
JOHN: I agree completely that there is most certainly a solid correlation between voting and views towards what is happening and should be happening to Clinton. I don't have the data myself, but we all know that Republicans and especially the most partisan of them, as a group, are generally most likely to vote and similarly hold the most negative views towards Clinton.

The issue of what population's (the entire adult public? registered voters? etc.) views should be presented is an interesting one. I'm for presenting more information than less -- thus I'd like to see more bivariate results reported by the media including, as you suggest, how past voting history and future voting likelihood play out on views towards Clinton.

Personally, and although I have voted in every election available to me since I turned 21 (30 yrs ago), I considered it somewhat elitist and inconsistent with our "American spirit" when I hear suggestions to *only* have the views of voters considered when reporting opinion polls results. I'm not suggesting that is what you would like, but we do on occasion hear calls for that, as some Republicans are doing now. Elections allow those of us, like you and me who always vote, to help choose our representatives. But those elected officials are supposed to represent all Americans, not just those who voted, and certainly not just those who voted for their elected official's candidacy. That is why I so value well conducted opinion polls that are accurately reported by the media that allow the opinions of a more representative set of Americans to be known than simply those who have recently voted or will vote in the next election.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
*                       Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.                      *
*                  Professor of Journalism & Communication          *
*                  Professor of Public Policy & Management            *
*                      Director, Survey Research Unit                 *
*       College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University *
*        Derby Hall [Room 0126], 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210 *
*  Voice: 614-292-3468  Fax: 614-292-6673  E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Tue Sep 22 07:31:59 1998
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.EDU [128.218.6.65])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id HAA15906 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 07:31:54 -0700
(PDT)
Received: by psg.ucsf.EDU with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)
  id <RY4H2PMQ>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 07:36:02 -0700
Message-ID: <1E164712D2DBD11832A00A0C921A2130419A5@psg.ucsf.EDU>
From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Party breakdowns
Date: Tue, 22 Sep 1998 07:36:01 -0700
I agree with Dr. Lavrakas, and I would like to add a note of caution about restricting analyses to voters, especially in this case. I consider any question about "whether you would vote for Clinton now" problematic in terms of validity because no one can ignore the fact = that it's a total hypothetical, i.e., Clinton cannot run again. One must = also remember that such questions are not really about elections because there is no opponent. It would only produce another index of current feelings about the man but has no real political reality to it.

I have not seen much work on whether the Clinton issue affects people's judgements of House, Senate, and Gubernatorial candidates. If it does, we need to ask the how and why of it. Does endorsing a person's = policies and/or approach to government mean endorsing the person as well? Are people taking a closer look at the private lives of the candidates, or is there a backlash and are trying to stay away from it. If a candidate spends all their time saying what a great person they are and skimps on proposed policies/programs/approaches/solutions, does that help or hurt the candidate? There is opportunity here to get entr=E9e into decision-making by voters and non-voters alike.

Lance M. Pollack

-----Original Message-----
From: Paul  J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. [SMTP:lavrakas.1@osu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 1998 5:22 AM
To:   Competitive Edge, John
Cc:   aapornet@usc.edu
Subject:    Re: Party breakdowns

JOHN: I agree completely that there is most certainly a solid correlation between voting and views towards what is happening and should be happening to Clinton. I don't have the data myself, but we all know that Republicans and especially the most partisan of them, as a group, are generally most likely to vote and similarly hold the most negative views towards Clinton.

The issue of what population's (the entire adult public? registered voters? etc.) views should be presented is an interesting one. I'm for presenting more information than less -- thus I'd like to see more bivariate results reported by the media including, as you suggest, how past voting
history and
future voting likelihood play out on views towards Clinton. =20

Personally, and although I have voted in every election available to me
since I turned 21 (30 yrs ago), I considered it somewhat elitist and inconsistent with our "American spirit" when I hear suggestions to
*only*
have the views of voters considered when reporting opinion polls results.
I'm not suggesting that is what you would like, but we do on occasion hear
calls for that, as some Republicans are doing now. Elections allow those of
us, like you and me who always vote, to help choose our representatives.
But those elected officials are supposed to represent all Americans, not
just those who voted, and certainly not just those who voted for their elected official's candidacy. That is why I so value well conducted opinion
polls that are accurately reported by the media that allow the opinions of a more representative set of Americans to be known than simply those who have
recently voted or will vote in the next election. =20

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

* * *
Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
*
* Professor of Journalism & Communication
*
* Professor of Public Policy & Management
*
* Director, Survey Research Unit
*
* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University *
* Derby Hall [Room 0126], 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210 *
* Voice: 614-292-3468 Fax: 614-292-6673 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
* From bwiggins@irss.unc.edu Tue Sep 22 07:39:45 1998
Received: from frosty.irss.unc.edu (frosty.irss.unc.edu [152.2.32.82]) by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id HAA19433 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 07:39:44 -0700 (PDT)
The annual meeting of the Southern Association for Public Opinion Research will be held October 1-2, 1998, in Raleigh, NC. A preliminary agenda and conference registration form can be found on the SAPOR website: www.irss.unc.edu/sapor

If you have questions, contact me at bwiggins@irss.unc.edu, or Allen Duffer, conference chair, at apd@rti.org.

Beverly B. Wiggins
SAPOR President
Associate Director for Research Development
Institute for Research in Social Science
Manning Hall, CB#3355
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3355
phone: 919-966-2350
fax: 919-962-4777
e-mail: bwiggins@irss.unc.edu
Roni,

Consider this a second to Dick's message--I'm even "deeper South" than Atlanta and I would be interested too. Sounds like maybe a posting to AAPOR-net if possible would hit the spot.

Thanks.
Susan Losh

At 10:42 PM 9/20/98 -0400, you wrote:
>Roni,
>
>Any chance that transcripts or detailed notes will be made available
>from
>the proceedings? Should be a fascinating session but being that I live in Atlanta, attendance would be difficult. I'm sure that many AAPORites would be equally interested. Comment frequently heard in my neighborhood (very, very politically conservative) by those who don't like poll findings is "where in the world do they get these people" (referring to the sample, of course).
>
>Thanks,
>
>Dick Halpern

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121
E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

If time were money, I'd be in debtor's prison.

Susan Losh
Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-644-1753 Office
850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
FAX 850-644-6208

>From M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com Tue Sep 22 12:49:04 1998
Dear Colleagues,

Given the profound impact that our polls are likely to have on the course of the House Judiciary Committee's Clinton impeachment inquiry, the public opinion profession should be reviewing and relearning the lessons of Watergate.

Few active pollsters today were involved in those polls. Unlike elections, wars, and presidential job ratings, we have faced impeachment and removal issues only once before in our lifetimes, in the 1970s. In the 25 years or so since Watergate, we may have only a weak professional memory of these polls and the issues that arose. Frankly, Watergate polling revealed profound gaps and weaknesses in our approach.

I am urging that we check our historical record in the hope that our profession does not repeat these errors. Perhaps the best place to start is with the thoughtful scholarship of Gladys and Kurt Lang, particularly, The Battle for Public Opinion: The President, The Press, and the Polls During Watergate.

A major problematic aspect of Watergate polling was the question wording. Pollsters were inconsistent in their question wordings involving "impeachment" and "removal from office." A president can be "removed" from office by the Senate only after being "impeached" by the House. Watergate polls show confusion by the public (and by pollsters as well) on the distinction between impeachment and removal. Questions asking about whether the president should be "impeached" were interpreted as meaning that the president should be "removed." The Langs document this confusion in the Watergate polls and the continuing attempts by pollsters to modify these key questions. Importantly, even today, questions asking if the President should be "impeached" will confuse the public unless "impeachment" and "removal" are clearly defined in the question.

Some surveys today ask about whether the President "should consider resigning." Others ask if the President "should resign." These are very different questions and should not be compared. The question about "consider resigning" is very soft and imprecise. "Yes, he should consider =
resigning, but reject it for now..." In short, we don't want the press to be comparing apples and oranges.

During Watergate, some polls, such as Roper, tracked the job ratings not just of the president, but also of the fairness and objectivity of the key people deliberating the impeachment, then removal. For the most part, the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Watergate Committee received high marks. (Lang and Lang) Judge Starr's job approval rating, by contrast, remains low. We do not yet have a rating of the Chairman Hyde and House Judiciary Committee's efforts. Future polls need to track public confidence in the fairness of the current inquiry.

Given the barrage of polling data and the critical role that we may play, let us both relearn the lessons of the past and be ever vigilant in critically monitoring our efforts. AAPORNET is an appropriate forum for this review. The stakes are very high.

Mark A. Schulman, Ph.D.
Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc.
and Baruch College
m.schulman@srbi.com

>From abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu Wed Sep 23 05:22:07 1998
Received: from smtp.spc.uchicago.edu (root@smtp.spc.uchicago.edu [128.135.252.7])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id FAA21261 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 05:21:46 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from nittany.uchicago.edu (abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.8])
  by smtp.spc.uchicago.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id HAA24766
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 07:22:47 -0500
Received:  by nittany.uchicago.edu (16.8/UofC3.0)
  id AA26117; Wed, 23 Sep 98 07:20:29 -0500
Date: Wed, 23 Sep 98 07:20:29 -0500
From: "Tom W. Smith" <abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu>
Message-Id: <9809231220.AA26117@nittany.uchicago.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu

General Social Survey Student Paper Competition

The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago announces the fifth annual General Social Survey (GSS) Student Paper Competition. To be eligible papers must:
1) be based on data from the 1972-1998 GSSs or from the GSS's cross-national component, the International Social Survey Program (any year or combination of years may be used), 2) represent original and unpublished work, and 3) be written by a student or students at an accredited college or university. Both undergraduates and graduate students may enter and college graduates are eligible for one year after receiving their degree.

The papers will be judged on the basis of their: a) contribution to expanding understanding of contemporary American society, b) development and testing of social science models and theories, c) statistical and
methodological sophistication, and d) clarity of writing and organization. Papers should be less than 40 pages in length (including tables, references, appendices, etc.) and should be double spaced.

Paper will be judged by the principal investigators of the GSS (James A. Davis and Tom W. Smith) with assistance from a group of leading scholars. Separate prizes will be awarded to the best undergraduate and best graduate-level entries. Entrants should indicate in which group they are competing. Winners will receive a cash prize of $250, a commemorative plaque, and the MicroCase Analysis System, including data from the 1972-1998 GSSs (a $1,395 value). The MicroCase software is donated by the MicroCase Corporation of Bellevue, Washington. Honorable mentions may also be awarded by the judges.

Two copies of each paper must be received by February 15, 1999. The winner will be announced in late April, 1999. Send entries to:

Tom W. Smith
General Social Survey
National Opinion Research Center
1155 East 60th St.
Chicago, Il 60637

For further information:

Phone: 773-256-6288
Fax: 773-753-7886
Email: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu

Yet another new technology that those of us who do telephone surveys will have to worry about. I've attached Ameritech's press release below.
Tired Of Telemarketing Calls? Ameritech Launches Breakthrough Service, Privacy Manager

New Service Screens Out Unwanted Calls - Gives Customers Choice and Control

CHICAGO - Ameritech today introduced a new breakthrough service to help customers manage a frequent personal intrusion - unwanted calls that interrupt precious free time. Ameritech Privacy Manager (tm) gives customers choice and control over the calls coming into their homes and enables them to reject unwanted callers.

For customers, the ability to protect their privacy is a priority: nearly eight in 10 Americans nationwide think that sales calls can be intrusive, according to a poll by Lou Harris Associates completed earlier this summer.

Ameritech Privacy Manager helps customers enhance their privacy. In fact, the service actually reduces how often the phone rings. In testing Privacy Manager, Ameritech found that approximately seven out of every 10 unidentified callers simply hung up when their call was intercepted by the service - meaning far fewer interruptions for Privacy Manager subscribers.

Privacy Manager represents a significant advance in helping customers gain control over incoming calls and ranks as the most significant new consumer communications feature since the introduction of voice mail. Ameritech developed the new service and has applied for a patent. Ameritech customers in Chicago and Detroit will be the first in the nation to enjoy this new breakthrough service.

The company has established a special number, 1-800-PRIVACY, for customers interested in signing up for Ameritech Privacy Manager. In addition, an area within the Ameritech Web site - www.ameritech.com/privacy - offers information on the new service and tips on how to protect your personal privacy. "For many Americans, quality time at home has become a scarce resource," said Richard C. Notebaert, chairman and chief executive officer of Ameritech. "This innovative new product, Ameritech Privacy Manager, enables customers to take back their free time by gaining choice and control over every incoming call."

Ameritech Privacy Manager: A First-Ever Solution

Privacy Manager intercepts calls that show up as "private," "blocked," "out of area," "unavailable" or "unknown" on a Caller ID display. For these often frustrating calls, Privacy Manager gives customers the peace of mind of knowing who is calling and enables the customer to choose how to handle each call. Yet important calls from friends and family can always get through.

After intercepting unidentified calls, Privacy Manager then:

1. asks the caller to record his/her name before attempting to connect the call;
2. tells the subscriber who is calling;

3. gives the subscriber the choice to 1) take the call, 2) ignore/reject the call, or 3) play a recorded message informing the caller that telemarketing calls are not accepted and asking that the customer's name be added to the telemarketer's "do not call" list - a legally binding request.

4. Disconnects the call if the caller does not say his/her name.

The result: fewer rings, fewer annoying calls and fewer times you have to ask telemarketers not to call back. Ameritech Privacy Manager stops most sales calls before your phone even rings and gives you a range of options to control the calls that do.

Privacy Manager currently is available to most people in Chicago and Detroit for $3.95 a month. The service operates in conjunction with Caller ID with Name.

Privacy Manager is the newest addition to Ameritech's range of privacy-enhancing services, such as Caller ID, Call Screening (enables customers to block up to 10 numbers), *69 ID service and private listings.

Ameritech (NYSE: AIT) serves millions of customers in 50 states and 40 countries. Ameritech provides a full range of communications service, including local and long distance telephone, cellular, paging, security, cable TV, Internet and more. One of the world's 100 largest companies, Ameritech (www.ameritech.com) has 72,000 employees, 1 million shareowners and more than $29 billion in assets.

### AMERITECH PRIVACY MANAGER PRODUCT FACT SHEET

**WHAT:** Ameritech Privacy Manager (tm) with SalesScreener, a new breakthrough addressing an important customer issue - how to stop unidentified telemarketing and other unwanted calls from coming into the home.

Ameritech Privacy Manager gives customers greater privacy by giving them choice and control over the calls coming into their homes, and reduces how often the phone rings with unidentified, often sales-related, calls. Yet important calls can always get through.

**HOW:**

Privacy Manager intercepts calls that show up as "private," "blocked," "out of area," "unavailable" or "unknown" on a Caller ID display. After intercepting these unidentified calls, Privacy Manager then:

1. asks the caller to record his/her name before attempting to connect the call;

2. tells the subscriber who is calling;
3. gives the subscriber the choice to 1) take the call, 2) ignore/reject the call, or 3) play a recorded message informing the caller that telemarketing calls are not accepted and asking that the customer's name be added to the telemarketer's "do not call" list - a legally binding request.

4. Disconnects the call if the caller does not say his/her name.

BENEFITS:

1. Fewer calls - in tests, approximately seven out of every 10 unidentified callers hung up when Privacy Manager intercepted their calls.

2. An end to "unknown name/unknown number" or "name/number blocked" calls

3. Fewer interruptions of customers' free time

REQUIREMENTS:

1. TouchTone Service

2. Ameritech Caller ID with Name

PRICING:

$3.95 per month (plus Caller ID with Name)

AVAILABLE:

Currently available in Chicago and Detroit. Customers can call 1-800-PRIVACY or visit www.ameritech.com/privacy to learn more.

DEVELOPED BY:

Ameritech (patent pending)

To hear an audio demonstration of Ameritech Privacy Manager, call 1-800-492-4511, or visit the Ameritech Web site at www.ameritech.com/privacy

News Media Contact: Bill Pendergast, (847) 248-2779

Customer Contact: 1-800-PRIVACY

---

Trevor Tompson (tompson.1@osu.edu)
Research Associate
Survey Research Unit, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences The Ohio State University 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus, Ohio 43210-1330
(614) 292-6672

>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Wed Sep 23 09:15:30 1998
Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu (bones.asic.csuohio.edu
I concur with Schulman's analysis. I believe the issue of such import that AAPOR should consider sponsoring a one or two day forum in Washington, D. C. within the next three or four months. I would be willing to be part of a committee that would organize such a forum. I believe that there are a few foundations that would provide some money for such an effort. There is also the possibility of AAPOR contacting other organizations for joint-sponsorship, though my preference is for AAPOR to go alone on this issue. We would need to discuss the specific nature of the forum, determine topics and presenters or panels, find a venue, etc.

I am not sure of the procedure to follow in order for AAPOR to sponsor the event, but I guess it would start with the council.

For now, responses to Schulman's statements and this idea may suggest where we go from here.

At 03:47 PM 9/22/98 -0400, you wrote:
>Dear Colleagues,
>
>Given the profound impact that our polls are likely to have on the course of the House Judiciary Committee's Clinton impeachment inquiry, the public opinion profession should be reviewing and relearning the lessons of Watergate.
>
>Few active pollsters today were involved in those polls. Unlike elections, wars, and presidential job ratings, we have faced impeachment and removal issues only once before in our lifetimes, in the 1970s. In the 25 years or so since Watergate, we may have only a weak professional memory of these polls and the issues that arose. Frankly, Watergate polling revealed profound gaps and weaknesses in our approach.
>
>I am urging that we check our historical record in the hope that our profession does not repeat these errors. Perhaps the best place to start is with the thoughtful scholarship of Gladys and Kurt Lang, particularly, The

A major problematic aspect of Watergate polling was the question wording. Pollsters were inconsistent in their question wordings involving "impeachment" and "removal from office." A president can be "removed" from office by the Senate only after being "impeached" by the House. Watergate polls show confusion by the public (and by pollsters as well) on the distinction between impeachment and removal. Questions asking about whether the president should be "impeached" were interpreted as meaning that the president should be "removed." The Langs document this confusion in the Watergate polls and the continuing attempts by pollsters to modify these key questions. Importantly, even today, questions asking if the President should be "impeached" will confuse the public unless "impeachment" and "removal" are clearly defined in the question.

Some surveys today ask about whether the President "should consider resigning." Others ask if the President "should resign." These are very different questions and should not be compared. The question about "consider resigning" is very soft and imprecise. "Yes, he should consider resigning, but reject it for now..." In short, we don't want the press to be comparing apples and oranges.

During Watergate, some polls, such as Roper, tracked the job ratings not just of the president, but also of the fairness and objectivity of the key people deliberating the impeachment, then removal. For the most part, the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Watergate Committee received high marks. (Lang and Lang) Judge Starr's job approval rating, by contrast, remains low. We do not yet have a rating of the Chairman Hyde and House Judiciary Committee's efforts. Future polls need to track public confidence in the fairness of the current inquiry.

Given the barrage of polling data and the critical role that we may play, let us both relearn the lessons of the past and be ever vigilant in critically monitoring our efforts. AAPORNET is an appropriate forum for this review. The stakes are very high.

Mark A. Schulman, Ph.D.
Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc.
and Baruch College
m.schulman@srbi.com

From Chun_Y@BLS.GOV Wed Sep 23 09:38:01 1998
Received: from blsmail.bls.gov (dcgate.bls.gov [146.142.4.13])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
  id JAA25295 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 09:38:00 -0700
  (PDT)
Received: from psbmailhub.psb.bls.gov ([146.142.42.8]) by mailgate.bls.gov
  (5.x/SMI-SVR4)
So do I concur with Schulman and Kraus. The public opinion takes a pivotal role in the process. I suggest AAPOR's Washington-Baltimore Chapter to be part of a one-day forum organization in Washington, D.C. under the national AAPOR's leadership. I would be willing to help develop the committee and timely forum.

Young Chun, Behavioral Scientist

"Young Chun's opinion is of his own plus or minus 3 percent of the public's, and does not represent the Bureau of Labor Statistics's."

--------
From: Sidney Kraus[SMTP:s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 1998 12:19 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Watergate and Professional Memory

I concur with Schulman's analysis. I believe the issue of such import that AAPOR should consider sponsoring a one or two day forum in Washington, D.C. within the next three or four months. I would be willing to be part of a committee that would organize such a forum. I believe that there are a few foundations that would provide some money for such an effort. There is also the possibility of AAPOR contacting other organizations for joint-sponsorship, though my preference is for AAPOR to go alone on this issue. We would need to discuss the specific nature of the forum, determine topics and presenters or panels, find a venue, etc.

I am not sure of the procedure to follow in order for AAPOR to sponsor the event, but I guess it would start with the council.

For now, responses to Schulman's statements and this idea may suggest
At 03:47 PM 9/22/98 -0400, you wrote:

> Dear Colleagues,
>
> Given the profound impact that our polls are likely to have on the course of the House Judiciary Committee's Clinton impeachment inquiry, the public opinion profession should be reviewing and relearning the lessons of Watergate.
>
> Few active pollsters today were involved in those polls. Unlike elections, wars, and presidential job ratings, we have faced impeachment and removal issues only once before in our lifetimes, in the 1970s. In the 25 years or so since Watergate, we may have only a weak professional memory of these polls and the issues that arose. Frankly, Watergate polling revealed profound gaps and weaknesses in our approach.
>
> I am urging that we check our historical record in the hope that our profession does not repeat these errors. Perhaps the best place to start is with the thoughtful scholarship of Gladys and Kurt Lang, particularly, The Battle for Public Opinion: The President, The Press, and the Polls During Watergate.
>
> A major problematic aspect of Watergate polling was the question wording. Pollsters were inconsistent in their question wordings involving "impeachment" and "removal from office." A president can be "removed" from office by the Senate only after being "impeached" by the House. Watergate polls show confusion by the public (and by pollsters as well) on the distinction between impeachment and removal. Questions asking about whether the president should be "impeached" were intrepreted as meaning that the president should be "removed." The Langs document this confusion in the Watergate polls and the continuing attempts by pollsters to modify these key questions. Importantly, even today, questions asking if the President should be "impeached" will confuse the public unless "impeachment" and "removal" are clearly defined in the question.
>
> Some surveys today ask about whether the President "should consider resigning." Others ask if the President "should resign." These are very different questions and should not be compared. The question about "consider resigning" is very soft and imprecise. "Yes, he should
consider resigning, but reject it for now...” In short, we don't want the press to be comparing apples and oranges.

During Watergate, some polls, such as Roper, tracked the job ratings not just of the president, but also of the fairness and objectivity of the key people deliberating the impeachment, then removal. For the most part, the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Watergate Committee received high marks. (Lang and Lang) Judge Starr's job approval rating, by contrast, remains low. We do not yet have a rating of the Chairman Hyde and House Judiciary Committee's efforts. Future polls need to track public confidence in the fairness of the current inquiry.

Given the barrage of polling data and the critical role that we may play, let us both relearn the lessons of the past and be ever vigilant in critically monitoring our efforts. AAPORNET is an appropriate forum for this review. The stakes are very high.

Mark A. Schulman, Ph.D.
Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc.
and Baruch College
m.schulman@srbi.com

From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Wed Sep 23 10:57:34 1998
Received: from mail-lax-1.pilot.net (mail-lax-1.pilot.net [205.139.40.18])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id KAA27992 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 10:57:30 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from mailgw.latimes.com (unknown-c-23-147.latimes.com [204.48.23.147] (may be forged))
    by mail-lax-1.pilot.net (Pilot/) with ESMTP id KAA17163 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 10:57:28 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from latimes.com (bierce.latimes.com [192.187.72.9]) by mailgw.latimes.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA22816 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 10:57:10 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from news.latimes.com (fowler.news.latimes.com [192.187.72.7]) by latimes.com (8.6.10/8.6.9) with ESMTP id KAA09452 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 10:57:08 -0700
Received: (from pinkus@localhost) by news.latimes.com (8.6.9/8.6.9) id KAA38534; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 10:59:01 -0700
Date: Wed, 23 Sep 1998 10:59:00 -0700
From: Susan Pinkus <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Reporting opinions by party affiliation
The Los Angeles Times Poll also reported its Clinton’s findings by dems, inds and reps. The website is latimes.com/timespoll

Susan Pinkus
LA Times Poll

*******************************************************************************
*******************************************************************************
Susan H. Pinkus
Los Angeles Times Poll
Internet:susan.pinkus@latimes.com
American Online: spinkus@aol.com
FAX: 213-237-2505
*******************************************************************************
*******************************************************************************

For customers, the ability to protect their privacy is a priority: nearly eight in 10 Americans nationwide think that sales calls can be intrusive, according to a poll by Lou Harris Associates completed earlier this summer.

Was this a telephone survey? Imagine the non-response bias on this subject!

After reading the material sent, this is only a problem if the survey organization blocks the name of the organization from caller ID. How are survey organizations dealing with Caller ID?

>From Competitivedge@compuserve.com Wed Sep 23 16:49:21 1998
Received: from hil-img-10.compuserve.com (hil-img-10.compuserve.com [149.174.177.140])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
Regarding Trevor Tompson's press release from Ameritech:

If someone wants to spend $4 per month to block unwanted calls, they're probably already refusing to do surveys with us right now. Such a service may actually reduce refusal rates. (Along these lines, has anyone else out there experienced a significant reduction in refusal rates in the past year? We have. I'm wondering if this is something others are seeing as well?)

As long as we can get a handle on the usage demographics, widespread use of telephone privacy equipment may actually reduce labor and toll costs.

John Nienstedt
Competitive Edge Research
Competitivedge@compuserve.com
In response to John Nienstedt's optimistic spin on the new call blocking technology, if he is correct we are of course only replacing one problem with another: while the technology might lower our refusal rates (because we can't get far enough in the screening process to identify the number as an eligible household), great damage is being done to the representativeness of our samples (thereby undermining the conclusions we reach in a study).

We have been closely tracking the call screening problem for the last several years here in South Carolina and have thus far concluded the following:
(1) 18-20% of the population have Caller-ID services AND use the service to "screen unwanted calls" all or some of the time;
(2) About 30% have a telephone answering machine that they use all or some of the time to screen unwanted calls;
(3) Just under 40% have either or both of these and use them to screen unwanted calls;
(4) Age is the primary correlate of screening behavior in both instances with younger folks being the most likely to say they screen their calls;

***HOWEVER***
(1) Of those with Caller-ID, about one in four could not tell us what the unit displayed as our listing because they were not in the room where the unit was located -- in other words, they couldn't and didn't use the technology to screen our call;
(2) Among those who did see the listing (which was usually displayed as "University of SC" or "SC Gov't"), just under 70% said it made them neither more hesitant nor more willing to answer the telephone --- in other words, the listing made little difference;
(3) Finally, using a multivariate approach (with demographics and screening behavior as predictor variables), we found NO relationship between self-reported screening behavior and # of attempts to get a completion, # of days to complete the interview, or likelihood of getting a refusal before obtaining a completion at a given number.

Our conclusion (to this point at least) is that as long as proper follow-up procedures are used (we make at least 6 follow-up calls and one refusal conversion attempt), then call screening does not appear to be that big a problem. Yes, I'm sure that there is a small segment of society who are in Peter Tuckel's words "cocooners" -- those who always screen their calls -- but our ability to maintain consistent response rates for the past several years gives me confidence that call screening is not reeking the level of havoc that we might expect.

Michael

Michael W. Link, Ph.D.
Assistant Director, Survey Research Laboratory
On Wednesday, September 23, 1998 3:47 PM, Kathleen & Ward Rakestraw Kay [SMTP:rakekay@erols.com] wrote:
> >For customers, the ability to protect their privacy is a priority: nearly eight in 10 Americans nationwide think that sales calls can be intrusive,
> >according to a poll by Lou Harris Associates completed earlier this summer.
> >Was this a telephone survey? Imagine the non-response bias on this subject!
> >After reading the material sent, this is only a problem if the survey organization blocks the name of the organization from caller ID. How are survey organizations dealing with Caller ID?
> >From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Sep 24 06:07:22 1998
> >Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
> >by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP id GAA28031 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 06:07:20 -0700 (PDT)
> >Received: from jwdp.com (plpm3-12.vgernet.net [207.51.117.12])
> >by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id MAA09807 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 12:01:56 -0400 (EDT)
> >Message-ID: <360A4406.5EB34BFC@jwdp.com>
> >Date: Thu, 24 Sep 1998 09:07:18 -0400
> >From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
> >Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
> >X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win95; U)
> >MIME-Version: 1.0
> >To: aapornet@usc.edu
> >Subject: Re: Ameritech "Privacy Manager"
> >References: <199809231948_MC2-5A5B-5DFB@compuserve.com>
> >Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
> >Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Why stop there?

Why bother with costly and complicated random samples that only a few smarty-pants eggheads understand if most respondents selected aren't going to answer your survey anyway?

Just interview over a few beers at the local sports bar and cut the refusal rates _WAY_ down.
Competitive Edge Research wrote:
>
> Regarding Trevor Tompson's press release from Ameritech:
> >
> > If someone wants to spend $4 per month to block unwanted calls, they're
> > probably already refusing to do surveys with us right now. Such a service
> > may actually reduce refusal rates. (Along these lines, has anyone else
> > out
> > there experienced a significant reduction in refusal rates in the past
> > year? We have. I'm wondering if this is something others are seeing as
> > well?)
> >
> > As long as we can get a handle on the usage demographics, widespread use
> > of
> > telephone privacy equipment may actually reduce labor and toll costs.
> >
> > John Nienstedt
> > Competitive Edge Research
> > Competitivedge@compuserve.com
>
> From lvoigt@fhcrc.org Thu Sep 24 08:15:38 1998
> Received: from fhcrc.org (bug1.fhcrc.org [140.107.10.110])
> by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
> id IAA04966 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 08:15:32 -0700
> (PDT)
> Received: from moe.fhcrc.org (moe [140.107.10.42])
> by fhcrc.org (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id IAA07511
> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 08:15:30 -0700 (PDT)
> Received: by moe.fhcrc.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
> id <RJS1T0FY>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 08:14:40 -0700
> Message-ID: <21C98F2C5C8AD1118AD200805FEACAF07B1248@moe.fhcrc.org>
> From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@fhcrc.org>
> To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Subject: RE: Ameritech "Privacy Manager"
> Date: Thu, 24 Sep 1998 08:14:39 -0700
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)
> Content-Type: text/plain

I don't see how call screening could reduce refusal rates -- by
definition a blocked call is a "refusal to screen" in our organization.

We have not had too much of a problem with "blocked calls" as a
final response so far -- (less than 10 in the last year). We do attempt
these again at a later time just like we do refusals to interview,
refusals to screen, and answering machine all nine attempts (at least 3
calls during the day, 3 in the evening and 3 on the weekend over a
3-week period).

We have had a slow increase in our "refusal/unable to screen"
over the past five years, but we still are able to screen 90% or more of
the calls. We think one of the reasons our response rate is staying so
high is that our cancer center is well known and respected in our area, and we generally only do RDD in our area. The Northwest is also a little quirky -- characteristics of our populations often defies the national averages. I suspect that we will have more problems with response rates in the coming years.

Michael Link -- thanks for posting the interesting statistics on South Carolina's experiences.

Lynda Voigt
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle, WA

> ----Original Message-----
> From: Competitive Edge Research [SMTP:Competitivedge@compuserve.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 1998 4:49 PM
> To: AAPORNet
> Subject: Re: Ameritech "Privacy Manager"
> 
> > Regarding Trevor Tompson's press release from Ameritech:
> > If someone wants to spend $4 per month to block unwanted calls,
> > they're
> > probably already refusing to do surveys with us right now. Such a
> > service
> > may actually reduce refusal rates. (Along these lines, has anyone
> > else out
> > there experienced a significant reduction in refusal rates in the past
> > year? We have. I'm wondering if this is something others are seeing
> > as
> > well?)
> > 
> > As long as we can get a handle on the usage demographics, widespread
> > use of
> > telephone privacy equipment may actually reduce labor and toll costs.
> > 
> > John Nienstedt
> > Competitive Edge Research
> > Competitivedge@compuserve.com
> > From joholz@mindspring.com Thu Sep 24 08:43:15 1998
> Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])
> by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
> id IAA14672 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 08:43:11 -0700 (PDT)
> Received: from default (user-38ld0gg.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.130.16])
> by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id LAA05285
> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 11:42:48 -0400 (EDT)
> Message-Id: <1.5.4.32.19980924155210.0068cf58@pop.mindspring.com>
> X-Sender: joholz@pop.mindspring.com
> X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (32)
> Mime-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
> Date: Thu, 24 Sep 1998 11:52:10 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jo Holz <joholz@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Watergate and Professional Memory

I think Sydney Kraus has made an excellent proposal in response to Mark Schulman's perceptive admonition to the polling community, and I suggest that we on the AAPOR council discuss this idea via e-mail or phone ASAP.

Jo

At 12:19 PM 9/23/98 -0400, you wrote:
>I concur with Schulman's analysis. I believe the issue of such import
>that AAPOR should consider sponsoring a one or two day forum in Washington,
>D. C. within the next three or four months. I would be willing to be part
>of a committee that would organize such a forum. I believe that there are
>a few foundations that would provide some money for such an effort. There
>is also the possibility of AAPOR contacting other organizations for
>joint-sponsorship, though my preference is for AAPOR to go alone on this
>issue. We would need to discuss the specific nature of the forum,
determine topics and presenters or panels, find a venue, etc.
>
> I am not sure of the procedure to follow in order for AAPOR to sponsor the
>event, but I guess it would start with the council.
>
> For now, responses to Schulman's statements and this idea may suggest where
>we go from here.
>
>
>----------------------------
>Jo Holz                          Phone: (718) 499-3212
>Holz Research & Consulting      Fax: (718) 499-3606
>434 Fifth Street
>Brooklyn, NY 11215

>From mdbenson@compuserve.com Thu Sep 24 11:50:26 1998
Received: from arl-img-5.compuserve.com (arl-img-5.compuserve.com
[149.174.217.135])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id LAA09147 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 11:50:21 -0700
(PDT)
Received: (from root@localhost)
  by arl-img-5.compuserve.com (8.8.6/8.8.6/2.14) id OAA13318
  for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 14:49:42 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Thu, 24 Sep 1998 14:49:14 -0400
From: Mark Benson <mdbenson@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: Ameritech "Privacy Manager"
Sender: Mark Benson <mdbenson@compuserve.com>
To: "INTERNET:aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-ID: <199809241449_MC2-5A92-B8B1@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
John:

I agree that privacy equipment on phones may reduce refusals, but I can't help but wonder about an incremental increase in non-response bias just because the option is readily accessible to respondents where it wasn't before.

Call blocking may get worse and possibly more of a problem as time goes on but speaking from personal experience, we have caller ID, call block, an answering machine and to date it hasn't stopped any Tom, Dick, Harry or stock broker, financial services advisor, real estate salesman or solicitors for various charities from getting through....and we do speak to them. There are ways to get through and the telemarketing types seem to have figured it out.

Besides, after reading over the details of Ameritech's proposed service it doesn't seem to pose an insurmountable obstacle for getting through-unless I've missed something vital.
With respect, it's not either/or. Having now done 16 TV and radio broadcasts on this thing, mostly for the BBC, I've had every dumb question in the book, from 'how can a sample of 1,000...' to 'why do the Americans pay so much attention to the polls when we treat them as a joke...'. As to the point, I've used a dozen times the stat that 45% of Republicans want him impeached, but only 12% of Democrats, and the independents are more like Democrats than Republicans. BUT, when some of the 45% find out that the Republican Party doesn't want him impeached, but left to dangle in the wind right up to the next Presidential election, it's possible that the percentage of Republicans supporting impeachment will go down, and the journos will be writing and broadcasting that, looking only at the top lines, that he's growing in popular support, with calls for his impeachment going down...

Bob Worcester

--------

From: Michael O'Neil <oneil@speedchoice.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Presidential Ratings - gender
Date: 22 September 1998 08:43

Re all the discussion about crosstabulations and presidential ratings. Given the nature of the issue surrounding the President, I think focusing on gender is much more interesting than the rather predictable relationships showing that Democrats are more supportive and forgiving of the President than are Republicans and that the President fares less well in conservative areas of the country.

Much as been made of the gender gap in recent presidential elections. One could speculate that women, who are more disposed to the Democratic party, might also be more intolerant of infidelity than men, creating an interesting conflict for them. The only national poll whose data I had access to (LA TIMES Aug 18-19) showed women still rated Clinton's job performance more highly than men (68% vs.56% favorable) but that this 12 percentage point differential was cut in half for the favorability rating (52% favorable for women, 46% for men, a 6 percentage point difference), which is more influenced (we presume) by personal behavior. (I don't remember how much better Clinton did among women than men in the '96 election; I seem to recall it was a bit more than 12 percentage points, but I am not sure). All of this suggests that the scandal may have diminished the gender gap, but this is only one poll. I'd love to see more.
I found Frank Newport's report fascinating, it should become a textbook example in question wording, since the wording change was so subtle and the impact so strong. I'd love to see THOSE figures (for all 3 questions) broken down by gender.

Mike O'Neil

---------------------------------------------
Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, Arizona 85282

602.967.4441 Voice
602.967.6171 Personal Fax
602.967.6122 O'Neil Associates Fax

oneil@speedchoice.com personal email
surveys@primenet.com O'Neil Associates email

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Fri Sep 25 07:07:04 1998
Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id HAA25670 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 07:07:03 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])
   by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA27892
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 10:07:02 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19980925140704.00c9a454@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@pop.service.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Fri, 25 Sep 1998 10:07:04 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Paul  J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Today's NY Times Page 1 poll article

In case you might not know to look for it, the New York Times has run it's top Page 1 story today about the latest Times/CBS News poll on the current Clinton/Starr/et al political events. Not only is the long story chock full of detailed and illuminating "multivariate" survey results about the public opinion towards Clinton and Congress, but the Burke and Elder story helps frame the importance of this information by speculating on how the November congressional elections look to play out despite these otherwise quite favorable poll findings for Clinton's.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
* Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. *
* Professor of Journalism & Communication *
* Professor of Public Policy & Management *
* Director, Survey Research Unit *
* College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University *
Telephone Center Manager

The National Opinion Research Center (NORC), a leading social science research organization, seeks an experienced manager to oversee the production and quality of telephone data collection activities at its Downer's Grove facility. The manager will be responsible for hiring, and managing resources to effectively complete survey data collection tasks. The manager will take the lead in developing standard operating procedures for telephone data collection activities and will assist with proposal development, survey cost estimates, and project planning. The manager may also serve as data collection task leader on large and complex telephone surveys. This position has significant supervisory responsibility, including administrative responsibility for all telephone center staff (12 direct reports and 100-150 indirect reports). Minimum requirements include a bachelor's degree or higher, strong management, team building and leadership skills as demonstrated by at least 5 years of experience in positions of increasing supervisory responsibility. Knowledge of the principles, processes and methods of survey research, especially telephone data collection methodology is preferred.

Fax cover letter, resume and salary history to Michael Biladeau, Assistant Director of Human Resources, 773.753.7808 or send via mail to NORC, 1155 E. 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60637. NORC is an Equal Opportunity Employer who values diversity in its workforce. M/F/D/V.
The National Institute of Health is reorganizing their grant application review procedure after a review by a panel of 60 social and behavioral researchers. They are soliciting comments from interested researchers on these proposals, which are due by October 9.

There are 3 relevant sources of information about the proposals:

1. The Web site of the American Psychological Association (APA), where there is an article in their Monitor (a good precis of the proposals):


2. An NIH site that describes the reorganization briefly:

   http://www.drg.nih.gov/review/bssintro.html

3. A detailed description of the proposal:

   http://www.drg.nih.gov/review/rhss.html
Is there any literature out there that addresses the difference between asking a question at the household level compared to asking the same question about every person in the household? For example, suppose you ask "Is anyone in the household born outside the U.S.?” followed by "Who?". Is there any literature that supports the finding that the number of persons born outside the U.S. using this form of question will be significantly less than if you ask, for each person in the household, "Was NAME born outside the U.S.?” or even "Where was NAME born?”. Does asking a question at the household level with follow up items lead to underreporting as compared to asking the same item of each person in the household? Does the nature of the question play a role in this? Does household size matter? What about the degree to which the characteristic of interest is predominant within the household? Any thoughts on these questions or references to look at would be very much appreciated.

Kevin Wang
The Urban Institute
2100 M. St. NW
Washington, DC 20037

TEL: 202-261-5732
FAX: 202-293-1918

The UJA Federations of North America is searching for a researcher to help conduct the National Jewish Population Survey. This will be the definitive study of American Jewry for the coming decade. A national probability sample of 5000 respondents will be interviewed in 2000. Well over 100,000 households will be screened, providing a large database on religious identification.

The following ad appeared in a recent Sunday New York Times. Please
feel free to share this announcement with appropriate candidates.

Jim Schwartz, Ph.D.
Research Director
UJA Federations of North America
jim_schwartz@cjfny.org

__________________________

Survey Research

National survey of U.S. Jews needs detail-oriented self-starter. Involved in questionnaire preparation, communicating with academics and other interested groups, monitoring field work, multivariate analysis, writing reports. Also other projects.

Requires: PhD or ABD in a social science; strong capabilities with research methods, multivariate statistics (SPSS), writing skills; substantial knowledge about Jewish community.

Fax resume and salary requirements to: Research Director, (212) 284-6805

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Fri Sep 25 11:48:36 1998
Received: from camel14.mindspring.com (camel14.mindspring.com [207.69.200.64])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id LAA15144 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 11:48:33 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from warrenmi (user-38ld2l5.dialup.mindspring.com
  [209.86.138.165])
  by camel14.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id OAA17046
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 14:48:32 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199809251848.OAA17046@camel14.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Fri, 25 Sep 1998 14:47:47 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Today's NY Times Page 1 poll article-what's wrong
In-Reply-To: <2.2.32.19980925140704.00c9a454@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

As Paul Lavrakas points out, the story in the New York Times is quite illuminating and generally a very good story, BUT... the value of the multivariate statistics he lauds is questionable. One of those multivariate tables they printed has statistics with enormous sampling errors. The "Most
likely voters' data has a margin of error of +/- 8% on each statistic and the "more likely voters" is +/- 5% per statistic. To put it more to the point, there are no significant difference to the numbers they took the trouble to print. Ordinarily I would not care, but that means the point they were trying to make in the text and with the table does not stand up to scrutiny. This is hardly something to congratulate the NY Times for doing. That table will give the Republicans the only good news they will get out of that survey.

At 10:07 AM 9/25/98 -0400, you wrote:
> In case you might not know to look for it, the New York Times has run it's
> top Page 1 story today about the latest Times/CBS News poll on the current
> Clinton/Starr/et al political events. Not only is the long story chock full
> of detailed and illuminating "multivariate" survey results about the public
> opinion towards Clinton and Congress, but the Burke and Elder story helps
> frame the importance of this information by speculating on how the November
> congressional elections look to play out despite these otherwise quite
> favorable poll findings for Clinton's.

> ***********************
>$ Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.  
>$ Professor of Journalism & Communication  
>$ Professor of Public Policy & Management  
>$ Director, Survey Research Unit  
>College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University  
>$ Derby Hall [Room 0126], 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210  
>$ Voice: 614-292-3468 Fax: 614-292-6673 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu  
>********************
>
>From adam.safir@arbitron.com Sat Sep 26 00:03:30 1998
Received: from vulcan.arbitron.com (vulcan.arbitron.com [208.232.40.3])
 by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
 id AAA29745 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 26 Sep 1998 00:03:28 -0700
 (PDT)
Received: by vulcan.arbitron.com; id CAA03745; Sat, 26 Sep 1998 02:49:31
 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from mercury.arbitron.com(198.40.5.145) by vulcan.arbitron.com via
 smap (4.1)
 id xma003741; Sat, 26 Sep 98 02:48:43 -0400
Received: from ARBITRON-Message_Server by arbitron.com
 with Novell_GroupWise; Sat, 26 Sep 1998 03:01:38 -0400
Message-Id: <s60c5912.077@arbitron.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Sat, 26 Sep 1998 02:56:37 -0400
From: Adam Safir <adam.safir@arbitron.com>
Sender: Postmaster@arbitron.com
Reply-To: adam.safir@arbitron.com
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Comments on NIH Reorganization of Review Panels -Reply
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Disposition: inline
I will be out of the office from Monday, September 28 through Friday, October 2. Your message will not be read until Monday, October 5.

I will be checking my voice mail on a daily basis. If you have an immediate concern, please leave a message at (410) 312-8481.

thanks, Adam.

--
From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sat Sep 26 06:25:16 1998
Received: from okeefe.bestweb.net (okeefe.bestweb.net [209.94.100.110])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA26522 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 26 Sep 1998 06:25:15 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-4.tuckahoe.bestweb.net [209.94.107.213])
    by okeefe.bestweb.net (8.9.0/8.9.0) with ESMTP id JAA01091;
    Sat, 26 Sep 1998 09:25:13 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <360CEA89.615D2DC2@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Date: Sat, 26 Sep 1998 09:22:17 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.05 [en] (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Comments on NIH Reorganization of Review Panels
References: <360BDC6E.D921E945@umich.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mike Traugott wrote:

> Mike Traugott wrote:
> > The National Institute of Health is reorganizing their grant
> > application review procedure after a review by a panel of 60 social and
> > behavioral reserachers. They are soliciting comments from interested
> > researchers on these proposals, whcih are due by October 9.
> > There are 3 relevant sources of information about the proposals:
> > 1. The Web site of the American Psychological Association (APA), where
> > there is an article in their Monitor (a good precis of the proposals):
> > 2. An NIH site that describes the reorganization briefly:
> The site listed failed, but this one worked
http://www.drg.nih.gov/review/bssmain.htm
> 3. A detailed description of the proposal:
> http://www.drg.nih.gov/review/rhss.html
Warren is technically accurate, as I believe he always is, on the strict statistical point he makes.

However, I suggest there is much more to this than observing whether or not the table presents statistically significant differences that hold up to the <.05 level criterion.

On the one hand, the linear trend in this table (which one would hypothesize a priori and thus be testing) is likely to be significant beyond the .05 level -- although I haven't taken the time to run a chi-square test, for example, on the percentages shown.

More important is the issue of whether the .05 significance level should have guided (constrained?) the Times' reporters and their editors in this instance.

Unlike traditional social science and statistical tradition that typically (and in my mind too often blindly) concerns itself disproportionatetely with Type 1 Error (avoiding False Positives; i.e., which for the journalist means, don't run a poll finding/story unless you have certainty beyond .05 significance, because you may be wrong), the practice of good and reasonable journalism -- that balances many considerations simultaneously -- manifests a great concern for Type II Error (avoiding False Negatives; i.e., don't miss running an important poll finding/story that is very likely to be accurate just because you don't reach the .05 level of statistical significance).
In the case of the Times' poll findings on Friday, the likely voter trends presented have been found consistently in past research. This in itself serves as a second and independent "source" on which to base the news judgment on whether or not to run the findings.

To me, deciding to hold back on presenting these findings would have been both bad journalism and bad social science.

At 02:47 PM 9/25/98 -0400, you wrote:
> As Paul Lavrakas points out, the story in the New York Times is quite
> illuminating and generally a very good story, BUT.... the value of the
> multivariate statistics he lauds is questionable. One of those multivariate
> tables they printed has statistics with enormous sampling errors. The "Most
> likely voters" data has a margin of error of +/- 8% on each statistic and
> the "more likely voters" is +/- 5% per statistic. To put it more to the
> point, there are no significant difference to the numbers they took the
> trouble to print. Ordinarily I would not care, but that means the point
> they were trying to make in the text and with the table does not stand up
> to scrutiny. This is hardly something to congratulate the NY Times for
> doing. That table will give the Republicans the only good news they will
> get out of that survey.
>
> * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
> * *
> * Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
> * 
> * Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy & Management
> * 
> * Director, OSU/SBS Survey Research Unit
> * 
> * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
> * *
> * College of Social & Behavioral Sciences; Derby Hall, Room 0126
> * 
> * 154 North Oval Mall, Ohio State University; Columbus OH 43210
> * 
> * Voice: (614)-292-6672 Fax: (614)-292-6673 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu
> *
> * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
> *
> > From MILTGOLD@aol.com Sun Sep 27 14:53:57 1998
> Received: from imo16.mx.aol.com (imo16.mx.aol.com [198.8.8.8/usce] with ESMTP
> id OAA02698; Sun, 27 Sep 1998 14:53:56 -0700 (PDT)
> From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
> Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
> by imo16.mx.aol.com (IMOv16.10) id MCJEa07908;
> Sun, 27 Sep 1998 17:53:08 -0400 (EDT)
> Message-ID: <828fe84e.360eb3c4@aol.com>
In a message dated 9/26/98 3:02:37 AM, kwang@ui.urban.org wrote:

<<s there any literature out there that addresses the difference between asking a question at the household level compared to asking the same question about every person in the household? For example, suppose you ask "Is anyone in the household born outside the U.S.?" followed by "Who". Is there any literature that supports the finding that the number of persons born outside the U.S. using this form of question will be significantly less than if you ask, for each person in the household, "Was NAME born outside the U.S." or even "Where was NAME born". >>

I believe the general principle here is that the more specific the wording of a question--- the clearer the frame of reference, as perceived by respondents, and the more accurate the information they supply. That's probably why the long form of the Census asks for info on a person by person basis, substituting each person's name in the general form of the question: "Did ____ . . . ?" You'd certainly not want to introduce memory recall errors, as someone forgets to include a member of the "household" (especially in a large family, or an extended family) in their count of how many were born outside the US, etc. Also, what is a "household"? Would it be mentally defined and recalled the same way to all, if you only once stated it was all those living in the same housing unit?

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.
Research Statistician
Former member of the Questionnaire Design Section,
National Agricultural Statistics Service, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture
miltgold@aol.com

>From kosicki.1@osu.edu Sun Sep 27 17:45:27 1998
Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.32])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA26072 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 27 Sep 1998 17:45:06 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from [204.210.234.19] (dub234019.columbus.rr.com [204.210.234.19])
by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id UAA10650
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 27 Sep 1998 20:42:34 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: gkosicki@pop.service.ohio-state.edu
Paul,
It occurs to me that I do not know who followed Vince as chair at the comm
department at Michigan. Do you? Is it Traugott? If you don't know, could
you remember to ask him at some point and let me know? Thanks. Best. --

jerry

Gerald Kosicki, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Journalism and Communication
The Ohio State University
3036 Derby Hall
Columbus, OH 43210

Office Voice: 614-292-9237
FAX: 614-292-3809
Home tel: 614-873-3718
E-mail: kosicki.1@osu.edu

Check out the new web site of the Annual Surveys
of Journalism and Mass Communication enrollments
and graduates:

http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Sun Sep 27 21:17:12 1998
Received: from camel7.mindspring.com (camel7.mindspring.com [207.69.200.57])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id VAA28877 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 27 Sep 1998 21:17:10 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from warrenmi (user-38ld19k.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.133.52])
   by camel7.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id AAA26185;
   Mon, 28 Sep 1998 00:17:08 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <199809280417.AAA26185@camel7.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Mon, 28 Sep 1998 00:16:24 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Today's NY Times Page 1 poll article-what's wrong
Cc: lavrakas.1@osu.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Paul,
The NYTimes article you praised is not a ringing endorsement for publishing multivariate statistics. It is not the data in the table that is so objectionable. It is the conclusions they draw from the data. Shouldn't there be some criterion before they start talking about differences? Where do you draw the line? And if you do not like the .05 level what do you like? After you get done picking some other arbitrary level you will still have a type II risk.

My advice: If you want multivariate statistics read a report or a journal article, not a news story.

warren

> Warren is technically accurate, as I believe he always is, on the strict statistical point he makes.
>
> However, I suggest there is much more to this than observing whether or not the table presents statistically significant differences that hold up to the <.05 level criterion.
>
> On the one hand, the linear trend in this table (which one would hypothesize a priori and thus be testing) is likely to be significant beyond the .05 level -- although I haven't taken the time to run a chi-square test, for example, on the percentages shown.
> More important is the issue of whether the .05 significance level should have guided (constrained?) the Times' reporters and their editors in this instance.
>
> Unlike traditional social science and statistical tradition that typically (and in my mind too often blindly) concerns itself disproportionately with Type I Error (avoiding False Positives; i.e., which for the journalist means, don't run a poll finding/story unless you have certainty beyond .05 significance, because you may be wrong), the practice of good and reasonable journalism -- that balances many considerations simultaneously -- manifests a great concern for Type II Error (avoiding False Negatives; i.e., don't miss running an important poll finding/story that is very likely to be accurate just because you don't reach the .05 level of statistical significance).
>
> In the case of the Times' poll findings on Friday, the likely voter trends presented have been found consistently in past research. This in itself serves as a second and independent "source" on which to base the news judgment on whether or not to run the findings.
>
> To me, deciding to hold back on presenting these findings would have been both bad journalism and bad social science.

At 02:47 PM 9/25/98 -0400, you wrote:
>> As Paul Lavrakas points out, the story in the New York Times is quite
illuminating and generally a very good story, BUT.... the value of the
multivariate statistics he lauds is questionable. One of those
multivariate
tables they printed has statistics with enormous sampling errors. The
"Most
likely voters" data has a margin of error of +/- 8% on each statistic and
the "more likely voters" is +/- 5% per statistic. To put it more to the
point, there are no significant difference to the numbers they took the
trouble to print. Ordinarily I would not care, but that means the point
they were trying to make in the text and with the table does not stand up
to scrutiny. This is hardly something to congratulate the NY Times for
doing. That table will give the Republicans the only good news they will
get out of that survey.

Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
Professor of Journalism & Communication and of Public Policy &
Management
Director, OSU/SBS Survey Research Unit

College of Social & Behavioral Sciences; Derby Hall, Room 0126
154 North Oval Mall, Ohio State University; Columbus OH 43210
Voice: (614)-292-6672    Fax: (614)-292-6673    E-mail:
lavrakas.1@osu.edu

From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Mon Sep 28 04:44:39 1998
Received: from okeefe.bestweb.net (okeefe.bestweb.net [209.94.100.110])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id EAA09444 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 04:44:38 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-6.tuckahoe.bestweb.net
[209.94.107.215])
by okeefe.bestweb.net (8.9.0/8.9.0) with ESMTP id HAA18440;
Mon, 28 Sep 1998 07:44:36 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <360F764F.C6B0CF35@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Date: Mon, 28 Sep 1998 07:43:11 -0400
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.05 [en] (Win95; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
CC: lavrakas.1@osu.edu
Subject: Re: Today's NY Times Page 1 poll article--what's wrong
References: <19980928040417.AAA26185@camel7.mindspring.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> Paul,
> The NYTimes article you praised is not a ringing endorsement for publishing
> multivariate statistics. It is not the data in the table that is so objectionable. It is the conclusions they draw from the data. Shouldn't there be some criterion before they start talking about differences? Where do you draw the line? And if you do not like the .05 level what do you like? After you get done picking some other arbitrary level you will still have a type II risk.
>
> My advice: If you want multivariate statistics read a report or a journal article, not a news story.
> warren

Dear All:

I think Warren makes a pretty good point here. If we are not supposed to use reasonable statistical inferential techniques, what are we supposed to do?

Furthermore, it seems to me that a variety of other multivariate crosstabs could have been run, if the data were available.

For instance, it may be the one is picking up views from those who are more "moralistic" than others. Those who voted for Bush, etc. But all of these subgroups would have the same problem.

Actually, something that looks like a logit would be a more appropriate technique. But for a Newspaper. . . .?

Andy Beveridge

>>> Warren is technically accurate, as I believe he always is, on the strict statistical point he makes.
>>>
>> However, I suggest there is much more to this than observing whether or not the table presents statistically significant differences that hold up to the .05 level criterion.
>>>
I think there is a point being missed here. Newspapers are never going to replace journals in their level of detailed description of how the world works. But news organizations can do a better job of portraying the fact that the world is a complex rather than a simple place.

Sometimes this can be done by suggesting a "result" is just what was expected, while other times it was not - in relation to what we think we know. Furthermore, it is better to employ multivariate analyses than to drop a series of marginals on readers and viewers because this demonstrates that there are important differences among significant subgroups in the population. No one expects to regressions (linear or probit) in the NY Times or any other newspaper. But it is useful to say that "The survey suggests that the Republican advantage in the fall election is likely to increase as the size of the electorate shrinks..." or "Among a number of factors that explain Clinton's approval (A, B, and C), people's financial well-being seems to be the most important..."
Jerry - I am the person who replaced Vince. What was it you wanted to know? Mike

Gerald Kosicki wrote:
>
> Paul,
> It occurs to me that I do not know who followed Vince as chair at the comm
department at Michigan. Do you? Is it Traugott? If you don't know, could
you remember to ask him at some point and let me know? Thanks. Best. --
jerry
>
> Gerald Kosicki, Ph.D.
> Associate Professor
> School of Journalism and Communication
> The Ohio State University
> 3036 Derby Hall
> Columbus, OH  43210
>
> Office Voice: 614-292-9237
> FAX: 614-292-3809
> Home tel: 614-873-3718
> E-mail: kosicki.1@osu.edu
>
> Check out the new web site of the Annual Surveys
> of Journalism and Mass Communication enrollments
> and graduates:
>
> http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/

It's Mike. I didn't think to mention it when I heard a while back. He's
just swamped with things he'd rather not be doing, but...
At 08:50 PM 9/27/98 -0400, you wrote:
>
Paul,
>
It occurs to me that I do not know who followed Vince as chair at the comm
>department at Michigan. Do you? Is it Traugott? If you don't know, could
>you remember to ask him at some point and let me know? Thanks. Best. --
>jerry
>
Gerald Kosicki, Ph.D.
>Associate Professor
>School of Journalism and Communication
>The Ohio State University
>3036 Derby Hall
>Columbus, OH 43210
>
Office Voice: 614-292-9237
>FAX: 614-292-3809
>Home tel: 614-873-3718
>E-mail: kosicki.1@osu.edu
>
Check out the new web site of the Annual Surveys
>of Journalism and Mass Communication enrollments
>and graduates:
>
http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/
>
>***************
>Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
>Professor of Journalism & Communication
>Professor of Public Policy & Management
>Director, Survey Research Unit
>College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University
>Derby Hall [Room 0126], 154 N. Oval Mall, Columbus OH 43210
>Voice: 614-292-3468 Fax: 614-292-6673 E-mail: lavrakas.1@osu.edu
>***************

>From monikamcd@erols.com Mon Sep 28 08:00:18 1998
Received: from smtp2.erols.com (smtp2.erols.com [207.172.3.235])
   by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
   id HAA07893 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 07:59:59 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from feld3man (207-172-203-132.s5.as2.nwk.erols.com
[207.172.203.132])
   by smtp2.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA01265
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 10:59:58 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <360FA476.5264@erols.com>
Date: Mon, 28 Sep 1998 11:00:06 -0400
While it is difficult for media polls to employ multivariate analysis, it's not impossible. At the LAT Poll we did (1995) a large story on party coalitions that made use, successfully, of OLS regression analysis of the data. The result was an insightful piece that was able to sort out spurious correlations in the data and get down to some really important factors in determining party support (for Dems, Reps, and Reform Party).

There are, however, two very real constraints on doing this:
1. Time -- the deadline pressures involved in getting polling data out in the media are unbelievable. There seems to be a belief that these data lose their cache if they're more than a day or two old, which makes in-depth (and scientifically rigorous) analysis difficult.
2. Explaining the method -- rather than just dumping multivariate conclusions on the public, these methods need some explanation. Results need to be supported for the public to have faith in them, but no one wants to publish regression coefficients in the paper (and rightfully so). We used a brief paragraph that attempted to describe regression in layman's terms, but any such attempt has to be overly simplistic and is probably therefore not ideal.

Monika McDermott
UCLA
Department of Political Science

Michael Traugott wrote:

> I think there is a point being missed here. Newspapers are never going
> to replace journals in their level of detailed description of how the
> world works. But news organizations can do a better job of portraying
> the fact that the world is a complex rather than a simple place.
>
> Sometimes this can be done by suggesting a "result" is just what was
> expected, while other times it was not - in relation to what we think we
> know. Furthermore, it is better to employ multivariate analyses than to
> drop a series of marginals on readers and viewers because it
> demonstrates that there are important differences among significant
> subgroups in the population. No one expects to regressions (linear or
> probit) in the NY Times or any other newspaper. But it is useful to say
> that "The survey suggests that the Republican advantage in the fall
> election is likely to increase as the size of the electorate
> shrinks...." or "Among a number of factors that explain Clinton's
> approval (A, B, and C), people's financial well-being seems to be the
> most important...
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Sep 28 10:39:59 1998
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA27547 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 10:39:58 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
    id KAA21980 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 10:39:57 -0700
(PDT)
Date: Mon, 28 Sep 1998 10:39:56 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: COPAFS Review of Sampling Litigation (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9809281039110.19443-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Mon, 28 Sep 1998 11:31:50 EDT
From: COPAFS@aol.com
Subject: COPAFS Review of Sampling Litigation

Please find "A Brief History of the Litigation on Sampling in the 2000
Decennial Census" on our web site under What's New.
http://members.aol.com/copafs

*******

>From joholz@mindspring.com Mon Sep 28 13:25:01 1998
Received: from camel7.mindspring.com (camel7.mindspring.com [207.69.200.57])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA02149 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 13:24:59 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from default (user-38ld0tl.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.131.181])
    by camel7.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA16031
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 16:24:57 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <1.5.4.32.19980928203426.0068bef4@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: joholz@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (32)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Mon, 28 Sep 1998 16:34:26 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jo Holz <joholz@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Watergate and Professional Memory

Sydney,

As one of AAPOR's current council members (I'm Publications and Information
Chair), I'm very interested in your proposal, as are several other Council
members I've heard from. It would be helpful at this point if you could
expand a bit on your ideas. What do you see as the purpose and focus of the forum? Could you give some examples of possible topics that might be covered? Of course, the details would be worked out later, by whatever committee is formed to get this going, but I think it would help to move this proposal along and get other Council members on board if you could flesh the proposal out a bit more for us.

Thanks,
Jo

At 12:19 PM 9/23/98 -0400, you wrote:
>I concurr with Schulman's analysis. I believe the issue of such import
>that AAPOR should consider sponsoring a one or two day forum in Washington,
>D. C. within the next three or four months. I would be willing to be part
>of a committee that would organize such a forum. I believe that there are
>a few foundations that would provide some money for such an effort. There
>is also the possibility of AAPOR contacting other organizations for
>joint-sponsorship, though my preference is for AAPOR to go alone on this
>issue. We would need to discuss the specific nature of the forum,
determine topics and presenters or panels, find a venue, etc.
>
>I am not sure of the procedure to follow in order for AAPOR to sponsor the
event, but I guess it would start with the council.
>
>For now, responses to Schulman's statements and this idea may suggest where
>we go from here.
>
>-------------------------------
>Jo Holz                          Phone: (718) 499-3212
>Holz Research & Consulting       Fax: (718) 499-3606
>434 Fifth Street
>Brooklyn, NY 11215

>From rusciano@enigma.rider.edu Tue Sep 29 08:31:16 1998
Received: from enigma.RIDER.EDU (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA06614 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 29 Sep 1998 08:31:13 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from enigma.rider.edu by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.1-10 #29692)
    id <01J2DL9RD9P8K8WXA0B@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue,
29 Sep 1998 11:31:26 EDT
Date: Tue, 29 Sep 1998 11:31:25 -0400 (EDT)
From: rusciano@enigma.rider.edu
Subject: CNN resources for analysis
In-reply-to: <3.0.5.32.19980920224239.00800100@pop.mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <Pine.PMDF.3.95.980929112554.539029739B-100000@enigma.rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear fellow AAPORneters:
I was searching through the CNN archives yesterday, and I found that they still have the exit polls and questions for the 1996 election. I seem to recall, however, that they used to have a special feature where one could ask for a basic cross-tabulation of the variables-- for instance, the vote by gender-- and it would provide a pie chart for you. I was thinking of using this for my students, and I was wondering if the feature still existed, and what the web address might be. It might be useful to post the answer to the entire AAPORnet, as others might be able to use it.

As a sidenote, the address for the exit polls and questions for 1996 is http://allpolitics.com/1996/elections/natl.exit.poll. (One might have to use cnn.com as the first part of the address, but I think either will get you into the file.

Thanks for the help.

Frank Louis Rusciano, Professor
Political Science Department
Rider University
email at rusciano@rider.edu

>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Tue Sep 29 10:47:53 1998
Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu (bones.asic.csuohio.edu [137.148.16.17])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA24463 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 29 Sep 1998 10:47:51 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from myhost.csuohio.edu (137.148.18.39) by mail.asic.csuohio.edu
    with SMTP (MailShare 1.0fc6); Tue, 29 Sep 1998 13:48:29 -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: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Dr. Sidney Kraus" <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>
Subject: Forum Plan Suggestions
Date: Tue, 29 Sep 1998 13:48:29 -0400
Message-ID: <1305045587-21184719@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

Jo:

Here are some ideas that come to mind. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss these and others with the Council or with a forum planning committee.

1. We should organize a two-day forum on political public opinion polling (polls). The purpose is twofold: 1) to explain to the public, press and politicians -- using non-academic terms with as little jargon as possible -- how polls are conducted, analyzed, and disseminated; 2) discuss and analyze polls (from January, 1998 to present) about President Clinton and the current political crisis.

2. The format of the two-day forum could be divided each day by a
presentation by four individuals in the a.m. and two 6-member + chairperson panel discussions in the afternoon.

3. Topics and individuals could be determined by the organizing committee.

4. A forum chair could introduce the forum and all sessions.

5. Forum should be telecast on C-Span, online q and a involving our web site, recorded for subsequent edited videotape, culminating in an edited paperback edition.


Hope this is helpful.
Best,
Sid

>From evans.witt@mindspring.com Wed Sep 30 10:39:58 1998
Received: from camel14.mindspring.com (camel14.mindspring.com [207.69.200.64])
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
  id KAA11396 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Sep 1998 10:39:45 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from evanslaptop (ip43.washington11.dc.pub-ip.psi.net [38.30.47.43])
  by camel14.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id NAA13739
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 30 Sep 1998 13:39:10 -0400 (EDT)
Reply-To: <evans.witt@mindspring.com>
From: "Evans Witt" <evans.witt@mindspring.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: A column about online polls
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 13:38:19 -0400
Message-ID: <000501bdec99$2060ad00$2b2f1e26@evanslaptop>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

One of the most seasoned observers of the online news business has done a good column on the use of online polls on the Internet:

> A new "Stop The Presses!" column by Steve Outing has been posted on the MediaInfo.com (Editor & Publisher Interactive) Web site:

> ONLINE POLLS: BASICALLY WORTHLESS
> [Wednesday, September 30, 1998]
>Some recent Web site user polls about the Clinton sex scandal
> demonstrate that such spot online-only polls are often wildly wrong.
> Are news sites that run them doing the public a disservice?
>
>For complete column, see

It's worth reading...

_________________________________
Evans Witt
Princeton Survey Research Associates
Princeton, NJ
Washington, DC
evans.witt@psra.com