

---

Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700  
Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>  
Subject: September 1998 archive - one BIG message

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

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

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

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

Begin archive:

-----  
Archive aapornet, file log9809.  
Part 1/1, total size 215780 bytes:

----- Cut here -----  
>From feinberg@surveys.com Tue Sep 1 11:18:28 1998  
Received: from webhp1.surveys.com (mta@webhp1.surveys.com [204.217.98.6])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id LAA09010 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Sep 1998 11:18:27 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from kdurkin.surveys.com ([38.209.106.188]) by webhp1.surveys.com  
(Netscape Messaging Server 3.52) with SMTP id AAA120C  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Sep 1998 14:12:01 -0400  
From: "Barry Feinberg" <feinberg@surveys.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Date: Tue, 1 Sep 1998 14:20:52 +0000  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
Subject: response rates  
X-pmrqc: 1  
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.52)  
Message-ID: <77186F864B1.AAA120C@webhp1.surveys.com>

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

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 SMTP  
id LAA16105 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Sep 1998 11:32:59 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from nittany.uchicago.edu (abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu  
[128.135.45.8]) by smtp.spc.uchicago.edu (8.6.9/8.6.4) with SMTP id NAA25820  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Sep 1998 13:34:55 -0500

Received: by nittany.uchicago.edu (16.8/UofC3.0)  
id AA21924; Tue, 1 Sep 98 13:32:57 -0500

Date: Tue, 1 Sep 98 13:32:57 -0500

From: "Tom\_W. Smith" <abcgss1@nittany.uchicago.edu>

Message-Id: <9809011832.AA21924@nittany.uchicago.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: response rates

You should look at the Standard Definitions report on defining outcome rates  
that's on the AAPOR Website: aapor@umich.edu

>From mbednarz@umich.edu Tue Sep 1 12:45:43 1998

Received: from donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.19])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id MAA21540 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Sep 1998 12:45:30 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moonpatrol.rs.itd.umich.edu (smtp@moonpatrol.rs.itd.umich.edu  
[141.211.63.97])

by donkeykong.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/4.3-mailhub) with ESMTP id

PAA01004

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Sep 1998 15:45:26 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from localhost (mbednarz@localhost)

by moonpatrol.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/5.1-client) with SMTP id

PAA01873

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 1 Sep 1998 15:45:25 -0400 (EDT)

Precedence: first-class

Date: Tue, 1 Sep 1998 15:45:25 -0400 (EDT)

From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>

X-Sender: mbednarz@moonpatrol.rs.itd.umich.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: forwarding a request

Message-ID:

<Pine.SOL.3.95.980901154343.1137A-100000@moonpatrol.rs.itd.umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Should you wish to respond, please do so to: mchmelrose@aol.com

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

Date: Tue, 1 Sep 1998 14:38:58 EDT

From: MCHmelrose@aol.com

To: aapor@umich.edu

Subject: Consumer Affairs

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@srbi.com 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@srbi.com>  
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. =20

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. =20

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. =20

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. =20

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 =

phase. =20

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.=20

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.=20

Visit our web page at: [www.srbi.com](http://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](mailto:a.ronca@srbi.com)

SRBI is an Equal Opportunity Employer.=20

>From CTalkov@aol.com Fri Sep 4 12:20:08 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 MAA29869 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Sep 1998 12:20:01 -0700 (PDT)  
From: CTalkov@aol.com  
Received: from CTalkov@aol.com  
by imo13.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.1) id FHYZa25245  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 4 Sep 1998 15:19:05 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <e84e42f7.35f03d29@aol.com>  
Date: Fri, 4 Sep 1998 15:19:05 EDT  
To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Subject: request info on executive interviewing  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 18

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

Please reply to [Ctalkov@opiniondynamics.com](mailto:Ctalkov@opiniondynamics.com)

Thanks.

Cynthia Talkov

>From hillcrai@norcmail.uchicago.edu Tue Sep 8 10:03:05 1998

Received: from genesis0s.norc.uchicago.edu (genesis0s.norc.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.68])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id KAA00340 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Sep 1998 10:03:04 -0700

(PDT)

From: hillcrai@norcmail.uchicago.edu

Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])

by genesis0s.norc.uchicago.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id LAA02132

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Sep 1998 11:24:45 -0500

Received: from ccMail by norcmail.uchicago.edu (ccMail Link to SMTP

R6.01.01)

id AA905274200; Tue, 08 Sep 98 12:03:22 -0600

Message-Id: <9809089052.AA905274200@norcmail.uchicago.edu>

X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R6.01.01

Date: Tue, 08 Sep 98 11:59:28 -0600

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: job posting

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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.

>From Bnash@marketdecisions.com Tue Sep 8 15:03:11 1998

Received: from mail.gwi.net (root@mail.gwi.net [204.120.68.142])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id PAA15412 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 8 Sep 1998 15:03:07 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from NASH (d-208-3-76-233.gwi.net [208.3.76.233])

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](http://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: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <01J1KPY7WC1U0006D4@oavax.csuchico.edu>  
X-Envelope-to: aapornet@usc.edu  
X-VMS-To: IN%"aapornet@usc.edu"  
X-VMS-Cc: JEBELING  
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Sep 11 10:54:23 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 KAA29874 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Sep 1998 10:54:19 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id KAA16693 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 11 Sep 1998 10:54:18 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Fri, 11 Sep 1998 10:54:18 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: NSFG Research Conference (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9809111046130.3969-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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

Date: Fri, 11 Sep 1998 15:32:11 +1000

From: Diana Crow <diana@coombs.anu.edu.au>

Subject: NSFG Research Conference on October 13-14, 1998

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        301-436-8731, ext. 126  
ayc3@cdc.gov                lsp2@cdc.gov

\*\*\*\*\*

>From SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu Sun Sep 13 19:44:18 1998  
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (uconnvm.uconn.edu [137.99.26.3])  
  by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
  id TAA29166 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Sun, 13 Sep 1998 19:44:12 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: by UConnVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id  
2403 ; Sun, 13 Sep 1998 22:43:35 EDT  
Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UConnVM) by  
UConnVM.UConn.EDU (LMail V1.2c/1.8c) with BSMTP id 4293; Sun, 13 Sep 1998  
22:43:35 -0400  
Date:     Sun, 13 Sep 98 22:42:26 EDT  
From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>  
Subject:   FYI: Quick Reaction Survey in CT  
To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
X-Mailer:   MailBook 98.01.000  
Message-Id: <980913.224334.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Connecticut Poll #189, Release 1  
University of Connecticut  
September 12, 1998

NOTE: When using material from this release please cite the Hartford  
Courant /UConn 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 identified 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 suppose 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

	SEPTEMBER	APRIL	FEBRUARY
<b>Overall Clinton Rating</b>			
Excellent	19%	17%	17%
Good	45	48	48
Fair	19	24	23
Poor	15	11	11
DK, etc.	2	1	1
<b>Bill Clinton</b>			
Favorable	37%	58%	56%
Unfavorable	53	33	33
Don't know enough	7	7	8
DK, etc.	3	2	2
<b>Kenneth Starr</b>			
Favorable	28%	21%	19%
Unfavorable	46	47	38
Don't know enough	24	29	40
DK, etc.	2	3	4
<b>Overall rating of Starr</b>			
Excellent	15%	3%	5%
Good	25	22	23
Fair	25	29	25
Poor	26	30	25
DK, etc.	9	16	21
<b>Scope of Investigation</b>			
Allowed to go too far	58%	54%	54%
Investigation OK	38	35	35
DK, etc.	5	10	11
<b>Starr's motivation</b>			
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

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

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

-----

---  
 Male 45% 100% --% 39% 51% 45% 51% 46% 46% 40% 48% 43% 45%  
 45%  
 Female 55 -- 100 61 49 55 49 54 54 60 52 57 55  
 55

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

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

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

-----

---  
 Excellent 19% 18% 19% 32% 15% 8% 9% 17% 21% 22% 20% 18% 20%  
 17%  
 Good 45 45 45 52 44 37 53 46 47 41 41 48 43  
 49  
 Fair 19 17 21 12 20 30 23 22 17 18 25 16 20  
 17  
 Poor 15 19 11 3 19 25 12 15 14 16 13 16 15  
 13  
 DK, etc. 2 2 3 1 3 1 4 -- 2 3 2 2 1  
 4

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?

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

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

-----

---  
 Clinton 47% 44% 49% 76% 40% 17% 28% 46% 51% 49% 44% 48% 47%  
 46%

Dole	23	25	21	3	22	56	8	29	23	24	23	23	26
16													
Perot	9	11	8	7	14	6	3	10	10	10	10	8	10
6													
Someone else	6	6	5	3	6	8	6	5	6	6	3	7	5
6													
Didn't happen to vote	12	9	14	9	13	11	46	8	9	6	15	10	8
19													
Ineligible (vol.)	1	1	1	1	1	--	8	1	--	--	1	1	*
3													
DK, etc.	3	4	2	1	4	2	--	2	2	5	3	3	2
4													

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

---																		
Clinton	41%	40%	42%	67%	35%	14%	46%	41%	46%	35%	39%	42%	39%					
46%																		
Dole	25	28	23	5	26	58	15	32	22	28	29	23	29					
19																		
Perot	7	10	5	5	11	6	6	9	9	4	8	6	8					
5																		
Someone else	14	11	16	11	18	11	14	10	15	16	12	15	14					
14																		
Would not vote	5	6	4	5	5	4	13	2	3	6	5	5	4					
8																		
Ineligible (vol.)	1	1	2	1	--	2	7	1	--	1	2	1	1					
2																		
DK, etc.	6	5	7	7	6	6	--	5	5	10	4	7	6					
7																		

Q21. (CONSTRUCTED ITEM: RECONSIDERED VOTE)

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

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

---																		
Stick with Clinton	34%	32%	35%	61%	25%	9%	21%	36%	40%	31%	32%	35%	34%					
34%																		
Newly to Clinton	7	8	7	7	10	5	25	5	6	4	8	7	5					
12																		
No longer Clinton	13	12	14	16	15	8	8	10	11	19	13	13	14					
12																		
Stick other	34	37	31	11	36	66	13	42	35	34	35	33	38					
24																		
Other pattern/DK	12	11	13	7	14	12	34	7	9	12	13	12	9					
18																		

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

NOT

-----

---

Fav. to both	4%	5%	3%	4%	4%	1%	4%	6%	3%	3%	5%	3%	3%
6%													
Fav. Clinton	24	22	26	39	21	8	4	24	31	25	24	25	25
22													
Fav. Starr	24	28	21	10	24	46	15	28	22	26	24	24	28
17													
Unfav. both	16	13	19	23	15	11	8	16	17	19	17	16	17
15													
DK on one/both	32	33	31	24	36	33	69	26	27	27	30	33	28
41													

Q08. How would you rate the job Kenneth Starr has been doing as special counsel? Excellent, good, fair, or poor?

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

RPT  
TOT M F DEM IND REP <30 <45 <60 60+ YES NO HRD

NOT

-----

---

Excellent	15%	18%	13%	7%	16%	26%	8%	17%	14%	17%	14%	15%	16%
12%													
Good	25	27	24	21	26	31	30	27	24	22	28	23	25
25													
Fair	25	26	24	23	26	26	39	26	27	17	27	24	26
21													
Poor	26	23	29	42	21	10	3	23	30	33	21	30	27
26													
DK, etc.	9	7	11	7	11	7	19	7	6	11	10	8	5
17													

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?

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

RPT  
TOT M F DEM IND REP <30 <45 <60 60+ YES NO HRD

NOT

-----

---

Allowed to go to far	58%	53%	62%	80%	52%	35%	36%	58%	63%	59%	53%	60%	58%
58%													
Investigation appropri	38	45	32	15	44	62	54	39	34	36	43	35	40
35													
DK, etc.	5	3	6	4	4	10	3	3	5	4	5	3	
7													

Q10. Do you think Starr is mostly out to find the truth, or is he mostly out to get Clinton personally?

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

RPT



TOT M F DEM IND REP <30 <45 <60 60+ YES NO HRD

NOT

-----

---  
 Mostly for truth 37% 44% 32% 16% 44% 60% 36% 41% 36% 36% 39% 36% 42%  
 29%  
 Mostly get Clinton 50 45 55 75 43 25 43 48 52 53 49 51 49  
 54  
 Mixture (vol.) 5 6 5 3 7 7 8 6 5 4 5 6 5  
 7  
 DK, etc. 7 6 8 6 7 8 13 4 6 7 6 7 5  
 11

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?

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

RPT  
 TOT M F DEM IND REP <30 <45 <60 60+ YES NO HRD

NOT

-----

---  
 Yes 68% 68% 68% 68% 69% 68% 43% 76% 70% 67% 69% 67% 100%  
 --%  
 No 32 33 32 31 31 32 58 23 30 33 31 33 --  
 100  
 DK, etc. \* -- \* 1 -- -- -- 1 -- -- 1 -- --  
 --

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?

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

RPT  
 TOT M F DEM IND REP <30 <45 <60 60+ YES NO HRD

NOT

-----

---  
 Improved opinion 2% 2% 2% 3% 2% \*% --% 1% 2% 3% 2% 2% 2%  
 2%  
 Made it worse 44 45 43 35 44 58 48 47 38 46 45 44 50  
 33  
 Not much diff. 53 52 54 61 54 41 52 51 60 49 54 53 48  
 64  
 DK, etc. 1 1 1 2 1 -- -- \* \* 2 -- 1 1  
 2

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?

GENDER PARTISANSHIP AGE IN YEARS KIDS

RPT  
 TOT M F DEM IND REP <30 <45 <60 60+ YES NO HRD

NOT

-----

---																				
Yes	35%	40%	31%	17%	39%	58%	33%	39%	32%	36%	37%	34%	40%							
25%																				
No	54	51	57	73	48	37	62	55	54	51	51	56	51							
60																				
Resign/don't force(vol)	5	5	5	5	6	4	--	2	6	7	4	5	5							
5																				
DK, etc.	6	4	8	5	8	2	6	5	7	6	8	5	5							
9																				

\* 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".

----- 30 -----

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Sep 14 11:18:32 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 LAA18241 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Sep 1998 11:18:31 -0700 (PDT)  
 Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)  
 by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
 id LAA23678 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Sep 1998 11:18:30 -0700 (PDT)  
 Date: Mon, 14 Sep 1998 11:18:30 -0700 (PDT)  
 From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
 To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
 Subject: APDU'98 Conference (fwd)  
 Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9809141114200.26398-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
 MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Mon, 14 Sep 1998 11:49:12 -0400  
From: Theodore J. Hull <theodore.hull@arch2.nara.gov>  
Subject: APDU'98 Conference

This announcement is being distributed to a number of listservs. Please forgive duplication through cross-postings.

---

## APDU'98 Annual Meeting

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](mailto:lisan@umich.edu)) and Ted Hull of the National Archives and Records Administration ([theodore.hull@arch2.nara.gov](mailto:theodore.hull@arch2.nara.gov)). We look forward to seeing you at APDU'98!

\*\*\*\*\*

>From gwen.miller@response-analysis.com Mon Sep 14 13:42:38 1998  
Received: from mail2 (mail2.response-analysis.com [206.6.4.2])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id NAA05331 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Sep 1998 13:42:22 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: gwen.miller@response-analysis.com  
Message-Id: <TFSNEBPJ@response-analysis.com>  
Date: Mon, 14 Sep 1998 16:42:00 -0500  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Job Opportunity  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
X-Mailer: TFS Gateway /220050028/220000139/220110031/221140449/

## 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=2E

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=2E Interest in and experience with business development activities is desirable=2E

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=2E)=2E Send resume with salary requirement to Response Analysis Corporation, attention: Human Resources, P=2EO=2E Box 158, Princeton, NJ 08542=2E Fax (609) 921-2611=2E EOE M/F/D/V

>From hkassarj@ucla.edu Mon Sep 14 15:05:00 1998  
Received: from theta2.ben2.ucla.edu (theta2.ben2.ucla.edu [164.67.131.36])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id PAA13567 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Sep 1998 15:04:59 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from kassarjian-dell  
(pool0046-max4.ucla-ca-us.dialup.earthlink.net [207.217.13.238])  
by theta2.ben2.ucla.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id PAA18172;  
Mon, 14 Sep 1998 15:04:58 -0700

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19980914220609.006ed77c@pop.ben2.ucla.edu>  
X-Sender: hkassarj@pop.ben2.ucla.edu  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Mon, 14 Sep 1998 15:06:09 -0700  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "H. H. Kassarian" <hkassarj@ucla.edu>  
Subject: CAPI programs  
Cc: jmoskowitz@psg.ucsf.edu

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 Kassarian  
\*\*\*\*\*

>Return-Path: <owner-spsp-discuss@stolaf.edu>  
>X-Sender: huff@stolaf.edu  
>Date: Fri, 11 Sep 1998 08:12:23 -0500  
>To: spsp-discuss@stolaf.edu  
>From: "Moskowitz, Judith" <JMoskowitz@psg.ucsf.edu>  
>Subject: CAPI programs  
>X-List-Info: LN=spsp-discuss WHOM=JMoskowitz@psg.ucsf.edu  
>  
>Hi All,  
>  
>I'm about to purchase a CAPI program for a large study we will be  
>starting early next year. We are currently considering "Sensus Q & A."  
>Does anyone have any experience using this program or recommendations  
>for other programs?

>Thanks,

>Judy Moskowitz

>=====

>Judy Moskowitz, Ph.D., MPH  
>Center for AIDS Prevention Studies  
>University of California San Francisco  
>74 New Montgomery, Suite 502  
>San Francisco, CA 94105  
>415-597-9197 (tel)  
>415-597-9125 (fax)  
>jmoskowitz@psg.ucsf.edu

>=====

>  
>  
\*\*\*\*\*

Hal Kassarian  
hkassarj@ucla.edu  
Phone 1-818 784-5669  
FAX 1-818 784-3325

>From SIMMONRO@osd.pentagon.mil Mon Sep 14 15:17:25 1998  
Received: from ddmfitayz003.osd.mil (ddmfitayz003.osd.mil [134.152.184.5])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id PAA17999 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Sep 1998 15:17:22 -0700  
(PDT)

Message-Id: <199809142217.PAA17999@usc.edu>  
Received: by ddmfitayz003 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)  
id <S8J3JVRA>; Mon, 14 Sep 1998 18:11:35 -0400  
From: "Simmons, Robert O.,DMDCEAST" <SIMMONRO@osd.pentagon.mil>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: DC/AAPOR's First Meeting of 1998-99  
Date: Mon, 14 Sep 1998 19:15:25 -0400  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

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

American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) Washington, D.C./Baltimore Chapter 1998-99 Registration Form

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).

>From oneil@speedchoice.com Mon Sep 14 20:28:06 1998  
Received: from mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com (mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com [207.240.197.31])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id UAA22045 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Sep 1998 20:28:05 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from phx35035 (hybrid-217-120.phoenix.speedchoice.com [207.240.217.120]) by mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com (8.8.8/) with SMTP id UAA21016 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 14 Sep 1998 20:28:55 -0700 (MST)  
Message-ID: <005f01bde057\$cd09f3c0\$78d9f0cf@phx35035>





in this country on the = net?&nbsp;=20 </FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT  
color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;;</DIV> <DIV><FONT size=3D2>I would  
appreciate any help that could be=20 provided.</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT  
size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;;</DIV> <DIV><FONT size=3D2>thank you</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;;</DIV> <DIV><FONT size=3D2>Mike  
O'Neil</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000=20  
size=3D2>=3D=  
=3D<BR>=  
Michael O'Neil,=20  
Ph.D.<BR>O'Neil Associates, Inc.<BR>412 East Southern Avenue<BR>Tempe, =  
Arizona=20 85282</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000  
size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;;</DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000  
size=3D2>602.967.4441 Voice<BR>602.967.6171 = Personal=20  
Fax<BR>602.967.6122 O'Neil Associates Fax</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT  
color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;;</DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000  
size=3D2><A=20  
href=3D"mailto:oneil@speedchoice.com">oneil@speedchoice.com</A>&nbsp;; =  
personal=20 email<BR><A =  
href=3D"mailto:surveys@primenet.com">surveys@primenet.com</A> O'Neil=20  
Associates email</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_005C\_01BDE01D.201BAD00--

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Tue Sep 15 07:42:28 1998  
Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com  
[207.69.200.82])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id HAA19463 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Sep 1998 07:42:27 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from default (user-37kb5tj.dialup.mindspring.com [207.69.151.179])  
by dewdrop2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id KAA00374  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 15 Sep 1998 10:42:24 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19980915091643.007fe440@pop.mindspring.com>  
X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)  
Date: Tue, 15 Sep 1998 09:16:43 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Re: How many businesses are on the net  
In-Reply-To: <005f01bde057\$cd09f3c0\$78d9f0cf@phx35035>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

Jupiter communication is a pretty good source for industry statistics re net  
usage:

Try <http://www.jup.com/>

Another possible source is <http://www.nua.ie/surveys/>

At 08:20 PM 9/14/1998 -0700, you wrote:

>>>>

<excerpt> Has anyone seen a reasonably credible estimate of the number of businesses in this country on the net?

<color><param>8080,0000,0000</param>

I would appreciate any help that could be provided.

thank you

Mike O'Neil

</color>=====

Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.

O'Neil Associates, Inc.

412 East Southern Avenue

Tempe, Arizona 85282

<color><param>8080,0000,0000</param>

</color>602.967.4441 Voice

602.967.6171 Personal Fax

602.967.6122 O'Neil Associates Fax

<color><param>8080,0000,0000</param>

</color><<mailto:oneil@speedchoice.com>oneil@speedchoice.com personal email

<<mailto:surveys@primenet.com>surveys@primenet.com O'Neil Associates email

<color><param>8080,0000,0000</param>

</color></excerpt><color><param>8080,0000,0000</param><<<<<<<

</color>

>From worc@mori.com Wed Sep 16 10:13:03 1998

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

id KAA03830 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 16 Sep 1998 10:13:01 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [194.222.4.107] (helo=worc.demon.co.uk)  
by post.mail.demon.net with smtp (Exim 2.03 #1)  
id 0zJL8K-0001xg-00; Wed, 16 Sep 1998 17:12:49 +0000  
From: "Robert M Worcester" <worc@mori.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Change in question text on Clinton  
Date: Wed, 16 Sep 1998 18:06:46 +0100  
Message-ID: <01bde194\$628d9fe0\$6b04dec2@worc.demon.co.uk>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.71.1712.3  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3

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...of 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:

>>  
>>     Aug 10-12 Aug 17 Aug 18 Aug 20 Aug 21-23  
>> Bill Clinton Handling Job/President  
>> Approve 65 62 66 61 62  
>> Disapprove 30 32 29 34 35  
>> No Opinion 5 6 5 5 3

>>  
>> 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

>>  
>> -----

>> From: Leo G Simonetta[SMTP:leos@christa.unh.edu]  
>> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu  
>> Sent: Friday, August 21, 1998 9:58 AM  
>> To: Members of AAPORNET  
>> Subject: Re: Change in question text on Clinton

>>  
>>  
>> Most of the response 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

>>  
>>

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Thu Sep 17 05:11:17 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 FAA11795 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Sep 1998 05:11:12 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])  
by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id IAA07539  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Sep 1998 08:10:03 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19980917121003.00cc3834@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: Thu, 17 Sep 1998 08:10:03 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>  
Subject: Reporting opinions by party affiliation

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 \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

>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 of 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 (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id LAA01389 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Sep 1998 11:28:33 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: (from smap@localhost)  
by charon.ap.org (8.8.5/8.8.6) id OAA12398  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Sep 1998 14:27:56 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from ben.ap.org(165.1.3.86) by charon via smap (V2.0)  
id xma012393; Thu, 17 Sep 98 14:27:33 -0400  
Received: from ap.org ([165.1.7.176]) by apmail.ap.org (PMDF V5.1-10 #24485)  
with ESMTP id <01J1WZX01P3499DKMV@apmail.ap.org> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu,  
17 Sep 1998 14:27:33 EST  
Date: Thu, 17 Sep 1998 14:27:32 -0400  
From: Will Lester <wlester@ap.org>

Subject: Re: Reporting opinions by party affiliation  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <36015493.7B33DD82@ap.org>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; I)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
References: <6ffc0723.36014a68@aol.com>

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.

>From leos@christa.unh.edu Thu Sep 17 12:16:04 1998  
Received: from hopper.unh.edu (root@hopper.unh.edu [132.177.137.8])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id MAA19922 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Sep 1998 12:16:02 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from christa.unh.edu (unhsc2.unh.edu [132.177.129.81])  
by hopper.unh.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id PAA16710  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 17 Sep 1998 15:15:55 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <36015F1F.CCDB407A@christa.unh.edu>  
Date: Thu, 17 Sep 1998 15:12:32 -0400  
From: Leo Simonetta <leos@christa.unh.edu>  
Reply-To: leos@christa.unh.edu  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.03 [en] (Win95; I)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Reporting opinions by party affiliation  
References: <6ffc0723.36014a68@aol.com> <36015493.7B33DD82@ap.org>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

--

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

>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Sun Sep 20 08:52:59 1998  
Received: from notesmail2.csuohio.edu (notesmail2.csuohio.edu  
[137.148.49.17])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id IAA26023 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 08:52:53 -0700  
(PDT)



Date: Sun, 20 Sep 1998 08:52:53 -0700 (PDT)  
Message-Id: <199809201552.IAA26023@usc.edu>  
Received: from myhost.csuohio.edu ([137.148.59.14]) by  
notesmail2.csuohio.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2 (651.2  
6-10-1998)) with SMTP id 85256685.00577C72; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 11:55:35 -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: 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 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 (IMOV16.10) 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

Date: Sun, 20 Sep 1998 15:40:40 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3155.0  
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3155.0

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

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: "PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS" -- 10/1 MEETING  
References: <e6789f25.36053ed1@aol.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 committment 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 (8.8.8/2.5) 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 leobogart@worldnet.att.net Sun Sep 20 18:15:52 1998  
Received: from mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net  
[204.127.131.38])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id SAA11892 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 20 Sep 1998 18:15:51 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from worldnet.worldnet.att.net ([12.79.5.133])  
by mtiwmhc03.worldnet.att.net (InterMail v03.02.03 118 118 102)  
with ESMTP  
id <19980921011520.FWLU18708@worldnet.worldnet.att.net>  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 01:15:20 +0000  
From: "Leo Bogart" <leobogart@worldnet.att.net>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: "PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS" -- 10/1 MEETING  
Date: Sun, 20 Sep 1998 21:11:48 -0400  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Priority: 3  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1155  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Message-Id: <19980921011520.FWLU18708@worldnet.worldnet.att.net>

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

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

>  
> 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](mailto: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/usc) 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"

>-----

>----

---

>-----

>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 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/usc) 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  
References: <199809201552.IAA26023@usc.edu>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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.

>From bthompso@bsmg.com Mon Sep 21 08:36:19 1998  
Received: from bjke.com (firewall-user@ganymede.bjke.com [144.210.8.38])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id IAA22812 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 08:36:18 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: bthompso@bsmg.com  
Received: by bjke.com; id KAA00542; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 10:36:13 -0500 (CDT)  
Received: from eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com(144.210.140.12) by gauntlet.bjke.com via  
smap (4.1)  
id xmaa29596; Mon, 21 Sep 98 10:35:26 -0500  
Received: by eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
id <T1AR93X6>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 11:35:01 -0400  
Message-ID: <24C3CEDAD424D11191BD00805F0D6C4DD70662@eastx01bsmg.bsmg.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Public Opinion on the Dock  
Date: Mon, 21 Sep 1998 11:35:00 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
Content-Type: text/plain

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.

>

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Mon Sep 21 10:08:49 1998  
Received: from mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu  
[128.146.214.31])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id KAA09700 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 10:08:47 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])  
by mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id NAA02746  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 13:08:45 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19980921170846.009ee668@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: Mon, 21 Sep 1998 13:08:46 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>  
Subject: Recent NYT/CBS News poll data by party affiliation

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:

% AGREE	
DEMOCRATS	24%
INDEPENDENTS	36%
REPUBLICANS	55%
ALL	37%

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

% AGREE	
DEMOCRATS	73%
INDEPENDENTS	59%
REPUBLICANS	40%
ALL	59%

It is not necessary to release the videotape:

% AGREE	
DEMOCRATS	80%

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 affiliation 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 \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Sep 21 14:31:51 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 OAA01678 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 14:31:50 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)  
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id OAA01557 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 14:31:50 -0700  
(PDT)  
Date: Mon, 21 Sep 1998 14:31:50 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Recent NYT/CBS News poll data by party  
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9809211420450.4274-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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:

	% AGREE
INDEPENDENTS	36%
ALL	37%

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

	% AGREE
INDEPENDENTS	59%
ALL	59%

It is not necessary to release the videotape:

	% AGREE
INDEPENDENTS	72%
ALL	70%

\*\*\*\*\*

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Mon Sep 21 19:05:13 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 TAA11020 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 19:04:56 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from default (user-38lconq.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.98.250])  
by camel14.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id WAA03168;  
Mon, 21 Sep 1998 22:04:51 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19980920224239.00800100@pop.mindspring.com>  
X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)  
Date: Sun, 20 Sep 1998 22:42:39 -0400  
To: RoniRosner@aol.com  
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Re: "PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS" -- 10/1 MEETING  
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu  
In-Reply-To: <e6789f25.36053ed1@aol.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/enriched; charset="us-ascii"

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>

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Mon Sep 21 21:25:12 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 VAA24198 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 21 Sep 1998 21:25:10 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from default (user-37kb0bn.dialup.mindspring.com [207.69.129.119])  
by camel14.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id AAA22562  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 00:25:08 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19980922002445.00804c50@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Tue, 22 Sep 1998 00:24:45 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: Any Research re Talk Show hosts?

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

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



rshalpern@mindspring.com

<smaller>Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Phone/Fax: 770 434 4121

E-Mail: rshalpern@mindspring.com

</smaller>

>From oneil@speedchoice.com Tue Sep 22 00:51:23 1998

Received: from mail.speedchoice.com (mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com [207.240.197.31])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id AAA25882 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 00:51:21 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from phx35035 (hybrid-217-120.phoenix.speedchoice.com

[207.240.217.120]) by mail.speedchoice.com (8.8.8/) with SMTP id AAA19427

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 00:52:14 -0700 (MST)

Message-ID: <005701bde5fc\$bc5ef160\$78d9f0cf@phx35035>

From: "Michael O'Neil" <oneil@speedchoice.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Presidential Ratings - gender

Date: Tue, 22 Sep 1998 00:43:48 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0054\_01BDE5C2.0F690980"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2120.0

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2120.0

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0054\_01BDE5C2.0F690980

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

=3D=  
=3D=

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

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0054\_01BDE5C2.0F690980  
Content-Type: text/html;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">  
<HTML>  
<HEAD>

<META content=3Dtext/html;charset=3Diso-8859-1 = http-equiv=3DContent-Type>  
<META content=3D"MSHTML 4.72.2106.6" name=3DGENERATOR> </HEAD> <BODY  
bgColor=3D#ffffff> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Re all the discussion  
about = crosstabulations and=20 presidential ratings.&nbsp; Given the nature  
of the issue surrounding = the=20 President, I think focusing on gender is  
much more interesting than the = rather=20 predictable relationships showing  
that Democrats are more supportive and =

forgiving of the President than are Republicans and that the President =  
fares=20 less well in conservative areas of the country.&nbsp; </FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV> <DIV><FONT  
size=3D2></FONT><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Much as been = made of the=20  
gender gap in recent presidential elections.&nbsp; </FONT><FONT =  
size=3D2>One could=20 speculate that women, who are more disposed to the  
Democratic party, = might also=20 be more intolerant of infidelity than men,  
creating an interesting = conflict for=20 them.&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; rating (52% favorable  
for women, = 46% for=20 men, a 6 percentage point difference), which is more  
influenced (we =  
presume) by=20  
personal behavior.&nbsp;   ( I don't remember how much better Clinton did =  
among=20 women than men in the '96 election; I seem to recall it was a bit  
more = than 12=20 percentage points, but I am not sure).&nbsp;   All of this  
suggests that = the=20 scandal may have diminished the gender gap, but this  
is only one = poll.&nbsp;   I'd=20 love to see more.</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT  
size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;  </DIV> <DIV><FONT size=3D2>I found Frank Newport's  
report fascinating, it = should become a=20 textbook example in question  
wording, since the wording change was so = subtle and=20 the impact so  
strong.&nbsp;   I'd love to see THOSE figures (for all 3 = questions)=20  
broken down by gender.</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;  </DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Mike O'Neil</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV>&nbsp;  </DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000=20  
size=3D2>=3D=  
=3D<BR>=  
Michael O'Neil,=20  
Ph.D.<BR>O'Neil Associates, Inc.<BR>412 East Southern Avenue<BR>Tempe, =  
Arizona=20 85282</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000  
size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;  </DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000  
size=3D2>602.967.4441 Voice<BR>602.967.6171 = Personal=20  
Fax<BR>602.967.6122 O'Neil Associates Fax</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT  
color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;  </DIV> <DIV><FONT color=3D#000000  
size=3D2><A=20  
href=3D"mailto:oneil@speedchoice.com">oneil@speedchoice.com</A>&nbsp;   =  
personal=20 email<BR><A =  
href=3D"mailto:surveys@primenet.com">surveys@primenet.com</A> O'Neil=20  
Associates email</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0054\_01BDE5C2.0F690980--

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Tue Sep 22 05:21:49 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 FAA19827 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 05:21:48 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu ([128.146.93.45])  
by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id IAA26930;  
Tue, 22 Sep 1998 08:21:45 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19980922122146.009f2978@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: Tue, 22 Sep 1998 08:21:46 -0400  
To: "Competitive Edge, John" <Competitivedge@compuserve.com>  
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>  
Subject: Re: Party breakdowns

Cc: aapornet@usc.edu

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 ESMTTP  
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: <1E164712D2DBD111832A00A0C921A2130419A5@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

X-Priority: 3  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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 bwiggin@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)

Received: from bwiggin.irss.unc.edu by frosty.irss.unc.edu (5.x/SMI-SVR4)  
id AA06975; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 10:39:50 -0400  
Message-Id: <9809221439.AA06975@frosty.irss.unc.edu>  
Date: Tue, 22 Sep 1998 10:37:46 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)  
From: bwiggin@irss.unc.edu (Bev Wiggins)  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: SAPOR meeting  
In-Reply-To: <363A185194EDD111889C0000F81E597F46D118@cscnts3.rti.org>; from  
"bwiggins" at Tue Sep 22 10:37:46 1998  
X-Mailer: Siren Mail (Windows Version 4.0.2 (Windows 95/NT))  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET="US-ASCII"

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](http://www.irss.unc.edu/sapor)

If you have questions, contact me at [bwiggins@irss.unc.edu](mailto:bwiggins@irss.unc.edu), or Allen Duffer,  
conference chair, at [apd@rti.org](mailto: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  
email: [bwiggins@irss.unc.edu](mailto:bwiggins@irss.unc.edu)

>From [slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu) Tue Sep 22 08:41:11 1998  
Received: from [garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:garnet.acns.fsu.edu) ([gmhub.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:gmhub.acns.fsu.edu) [128.186.195.10])  
by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id IAA09007 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 08:41:08 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from [garnet1.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:garnet1.acns.fsu.edu) ([garnet1.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:garnet1.acns.fsu.edu) [128.186.195.2])  
by [garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:garnet.acns.fsu.edu) (8.8.6/8.8.6) with ESMTP id LAA26488  
for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 11:40:43 -0400  
Received: from [fsu.edu](mailto:fsu.edu) ([xyp06-14.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:xyp06-14.acns.fsu.edu) [146.201.2.139])  
by [garnet1.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:garnet1.acns.fsu.edu) (8.8.6/8.8.6) with SMTP id LAA80802  
for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 11:40:38 -0400  
Date: Tue, 22 Sep 1998 11:40:38 -0400  
Message-Id: <199809221540.LAA80802@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>  
X-Sender: [slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)  
From: Susan Losh <[slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)>  
Subject: Re: "PUMMELING THE POLLSTERS" -- 10/1 MEETING

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



Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id MAA15003 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 12:48:57 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from SRBI\_NEW\_YORK-Message\_Server by srbi.com  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Tue, 22 Sep 1998 15:45:44 -0400  
Message-Id: <s607c628.077@srbi.com>  
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2  
Date: Tue, 22 Sep 1998 15:47:05 -0400  
From: "MARK SCHULMAN " <M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Watergate and Professional Memory  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Disposition: inline

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. =20

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. =20

A major problematic aspect of Watergate polling was the question wording. =  
Pollsters were inconsistent in their question wordings involving "impeachme=  
nt" 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. =20

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. =20

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 =20

>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](mailto:smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu)

>From [tompson.1@osu.edu](mailto:tompson.1@osu.edu) Wed Sep 23 07:32:53 1998  
Received: from [mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu](mailto:mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu) ([root@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu](mailto:root@mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu))  
[128.146.214.31])  
by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id HAA15622 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 07:32:51 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from [kunovich.2.acs.ohio-state.edu](mailto:kunovich.2.acs.ohio-state.edu) ([128.146.93.47])  
by [mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu](mailto:mail2.uts.ohio-state.edu) (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA06877  
for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 10:32:49 -0400 (EDT)  
Reply-To: <[tompson.1@osu.edu](mailto:tompson.1@osu.edu)>  
From: "Trevor Tompson" <[tompson.1@osu.edu](mailto:tompson.1@osu.edu)>  
To: "AAPORnet" <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Subject: More bad news for telephone surveys  
Date: Wed, 23 Sep 1998 10:32:45 -0400  
Message-ID: <000401bde6ff\$087cfda0\$2f5d9280@kunovich.2.acs.ohio-state.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2232.26  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

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](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.ameritech.com/privacy)

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

Customer Contact: 1-800-PRIVACY

---

Trevor Tompson ([tompson.1@osu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu) Wed Sep 23 09:15:30 1998

Received: from [mail.asic.csuohio.edu](mailto:mail.asic.csuohio.edu) ([bones.asic.csuohio.edu](mailto:bones.asic.csuohio.edu))

[137.148.16.17])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id JAA16168 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 09:15:26 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from s.kraus.csuohio.edu (137.148.207.15) by mail.asic.csuohio.edu with SMTP (MailShare 1.0fc6); Wed, 23 Sep 1998 12:16:09 -0400

Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19980923121946.006bda90@bones.asic.csuohio.edu>

X-Sender: s.kraus@bones.asic.csuohio.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)

Date: Wed, 23 Sep 1998 12:19:46 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

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

Subject: Re: Watergate and Professional Memory

In-Reply-To: <s607c628.077@srbi.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

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 sstements 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

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 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)



id AA27774; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 12:37:42 -0400  
Received: by psbmailhub with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
id <T34VQ5G6>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 12:39:09 -0400  
Message-Id: <705AF639142AD211BCE500104B6A398916D665@PSBMAIL4>  
From: Chun\_Y <Chun\_Y@BLS.GOV>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Watergate and Professional Memory  
Date: Wed, 23 Sep 1998 12:37:31 -0400  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

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  
U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"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 sstements 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 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 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 (PDT)  
From: Susan Pinkus <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
cc: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Reporting opinions by party affiliation

In-Reply-To: <6ffc0723.36014a68@aol.com>  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.A32.3.91.980923105800.85142B-100000@fowler.news.latimes.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*

>From rakekay@erols.com Wed Sep 23 12:47:40 1998  
Received: from smtp3.erols.com (smtp3.erols.com [207.172.3.236])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id MAA16770 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 12:47:28 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from [207.172.182.83] (207-172-182-83.s83.tnt19.brd.erols.com  
[207.172.182.83])  
by smtp3.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA18450  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 15:46:44 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <199809231946.PAA18450@smtp3.erols.com>  
Subject: Re: More bad news for telephone surveys  
Date: Wed, 23 Sep 98 15:47:21 -0400  
From: Kathleen & Ward Rakestraw Kay <rakekay@erols.com>  
To: "AAPORnet" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

>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

id QAA12043 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 16:49:19 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: (from root@localhost)  
by hil-img-10.compuserve.com (8.8.6/8.8.6/2.14) id TAA22015  
for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 23 Sep 1998 19:48:46 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Wed, 23 Sep 1998 19:48:32 -0400  
From: Competitive Edge Research <Competitivedge@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Re: Ameritech "Privacy Manager"  
Sender: Competitive Edge Research <Competitivedge@compuserve.com>  
To: AAPORNet <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-ID: <199809231948\_MC2-5A5B-5DFB@compuserve.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Disposition: inline

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 or not 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 link@iopa.sc.edu Thu Sep 24 05:26:01 1998  
Received: from iopa.iopa.sc.edu (iopa.iopa.sc.edu [129.252.145.50])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id FAA22409 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 05:25:59 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from link.iopa.sc.edu (unverified [129.252.145.12]) by  
iopa.iopa.sc.edu  
(Rockliffe SMTPRA 2.1.6) with SMTP id <B0000041051@iopa.iopa.sc.edu> for  
<aapornet@usc.edu>;  
Thu, 24 Sep 1998 08:26:23 -0400  
Received: by localhost with Microsoft MAPI; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 08:26:11 -0400  
Message-ID: <01BDE794.FCB469E0@link@iopa.sc.edu>  
From: Michael Link <link@iopa.sc.edu>  
Reply-To: "link@iopa.sc.edu" <link@iopa.sc.edu>  
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: More bad news for telephone surveys  
Date: Thu, 24 Sep 1998 08:26:10 -0400  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet E-mail/MAPI - 8.0.0.4008  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

Institute of Public Affairs  
Carolina Plaza, 15th Floor  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208

Office: (803) 777-0351  
Fax: (803) 777-4575  
email: Link@iopa.sc.edu

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.fhrc.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.fhrc.org (moe [140.107.10.42])  
by fhrc.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.fhrc.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.1960.3)  
id <RJS1T0FY>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 08:14:40 -0700

Message-ID: <21C98F2C5C8AD1118AD200805FEACAF07B1248@moe.fhrc.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 sstements 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

Content-Disposition: inline

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. =

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Thu Sep 24 12:39:36 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 MAA11168 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 12:39:34 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from default (user-38lc8po.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.35.56])  
by camel14.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA10490  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 15:39:32 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19980924153239.007cb3e0@pop.mindspring.com>  
X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)  
Date: Thu, 24 Sep 1998 15:32:39 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Re: Ameritech "Privacy Manager"  
In-Reply-To: <199809231948\_MC2-5A5B-5DFB@compuserve.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

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.

>From worc@mori.com Thu Sep 24 12:47:25 1998  
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  
id MAA16635 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 12:47:10 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from [194.222.4.107] (helo=worc.demon.co.uk)  
by post.mail.demon.net with esmtp (Exim 2.03 #1)  
id 0zMHL0-0002oM-00  
for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 24 Sep 1998 19:46:52 +0000

From: "Robert M Worcester" <worc@mori.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Presidential Ratings - gender  
Date: Thu, 24 Sep 1998 20:13:48 +0100  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Priority: 3  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1155  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Message-Id: <E0zMHL0-0002oM-00@post.mail.demon.net>

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 \*

\* 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 rasinski@norcmail.uchicago.edu Fri Sep 25 08:35:41 1998  
Received: from genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu  
[128.135.45.28])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id IAA12599 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 08:35:40 -0700  
(PDT)  
From: rasinski@norcmail.uchicago.edu  
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])  
by genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id FAA21393  
for <aapornet@usc.edu >; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 05:39:25 -0500  
Received: from ccMail by norcmail.uchicago.edu (ccMail Link to SMTP  
R6.01.01)  
id AA906737767; Fri, 25 Sep 98 10:36:10 -0600  
Message-Id: <9809259067.AA906737767@norcmail.uchicago.edu>  
X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R6.01.01  
Date: Fri, 25 Sep 98 10:35:10 -0600  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Telephone Center Manager Job Posting  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

## 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.

>From mtrau@umich.edu Fri Sep 25 10:09:56 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 KAA16805 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 10:09:54 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from umich.edu (isr-126-46.isr.umich.edu [141.211.126.55])  
by relic.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.8/2.5) with ESMTP id NAA28274  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 13:09:25 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <360BDC6E.D921E945@umich.edu>  
Date: Fri, 25 Sep 1998 13:09:50 -0500  
From: Mike Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (WinNT; U)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapor <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Comments on NIH Reorganization of Review Panels  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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):

<http://www.apa.org/ppo/nih2.html>

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>

>From kwang@ui.urban.org Fri Sep 25 11:02:10 1998  
Received: from ABACUS.URBAN.ORG (ABACUS.URBAN.ORG [192.188.252.9])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id LAA01330 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 11:02:08 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from ui.urban.org by ABACUS.URBAN.ORG with SMTP;  
Fri, 25 Sep 1998 12:55:31 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from UINET2/SpoolDir by ui.urban.org (Mercury 1.31);  
25 Sep 98 12:52:25 -0500  
Received: from SpoolDir by UINET2 (Mercury 1.31); 25 Sep 98 12:52:13 -0500  
Received: from abacus.urban.org by ui.urban.org (Mercury 1.31);  
25 Sep 98 12:52:04 -0500

From: "Kevin Wang" <kwang@ui.urban.org>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Date: Fri, 25 Sep 1998 12:57:34 -0500  
Subject: household vs. person items  
Reply-to: KWANG@ui.urban.org  
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v2.54)  
Message-ID: <70542BB763F@ui.urban.org>

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

>From JIM\_SCHWARTZ@CJFNY.ORG Fri Sep 25 11:38:43 1998  
Received: from jon.cjfny.org (jon.cjfny.org [206.88.148.10])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
id LAA10552 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 11:38:31 -0700  
(PDT)

X-ROUTED: Fri, 25 Sep 1998 14:36:18 -0500  
Received: from NEWYORK.CJFNY.ORG [206.88.136.66] by jon.cjfny.org with smtp  
id AOCDDADF ; Fri, 25 Sep 1998 14:35:48 -0500  
Received: from cc:Mail by NEWYORK.CJFNY.ORG  
id AA906759298; Fri, 25 Sep 98 14:38:41 EST  
Date: Fri, 25 Sep 98 14:38:41 EST  
From: "JIM SCHWARTZ" <JIM\_SCHWARTZ@CJFNY.ORG>  
Message-Id: <9808259067.AA906759298@NEWYORK.CJFNY.ORG>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Survey Researcher - Job Opening

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-38ld215.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  
smtp (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:

>

> 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):

>

> <http://www.apa.org/ppo/nih2.html>

>

> 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>

>

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

>

> 3. A detailed description of the proposal:

>

> <http://www.drg.nih.gov/review/rhss.html>

--

Andrew A. Beveridge            Home Office  
209 Kissena Hall                50 Merriam Avenue  
Department of Sociology        Bronxville, NY 10708  
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237  
Flushing, NY 11367-1597        Fax: 914-337-8210  
Phone: 718-997-2837            E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu  
Fax: 718-997-2820              Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps  
>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Sun Sep 27 07:51:24 1998  
Received: from mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu  
[128.146.214.30])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id HAA29313 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 27 Sep 1998 07:51:23 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from lavrakas.1.acs.ohio-state.edu (ts6-5.homenet.ohio-state.edu  
[140.254.112.108])  
by mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA09761  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 27 Sep 1998 10:51:19 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Sun, 27 Sep 1998 10:51:19 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-Id: <199809271451.KAA09761@mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu>  
X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu (Unverified)  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.1.2  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>  
Subject: Re: Today's NY Times Page 1 poll article-what's wrong

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 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 [198.81.17.6])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) 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>

Date: Sun, 27 Sep 1998 17:53:08 EDT  
To: kwang@ui.urban.org, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Subject: Re: household vs. person items  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

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

Message-Id: <v04003a02b2348d9b9cef@[204.210.234.19]>  
In-Reply-To: <199809271451.KAA09761@mail1.uts.ohio-state.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Sun, 27 Sep 1998 20:50:58 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Gerald Kosicki <kosicki.1@osu.edu>  
Subject: Michigan

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 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 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: <199809280417.AAA26185@camel7.mindspring.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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.  
>>

>From mtrau@umich.edu Mon Sep 28 05:15:32 1998  
Received: from redheat.rs.itd.umich.edu (redheat.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.36])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id FAA12344 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 05:15:31 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from umich.edu (comm551755.comm.lsa.umich.edu [141.211.28.25])  
by redheat.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.5/2.5) with ESMTP id IAA12897; Mon,  
28 Sep 1998 08:15:29 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <360F7DE0.14D8998C@umich.edu>  
Date: Mon, 28 Sep 1998 08:15:28 -0400  
From: Michael Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (WinNT; 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: <199809280417.AAA26185@camel7.mindspring.com>  
<360F764F.C6B0CF35@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 mtrau@umich.edu Mon Sep 28 05:25:42 1998  
Received: from twins.rs.itd.umich.edu (twins.rs.itd.umich.edu [141.211.83.39])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id FAA13087 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 05:25:41 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from umich.edu (comm551755.comm.lsa.umich.edu [141.211.28.25])  
by twins.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.6/2.5) with ESMTP id IAA13938  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 08:25:40 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <360F8042.C06B66A@umich.edu>  
Date: Mon, 28 Sep 1998 08:25:38 -0400  
From: Michael Traugott <mtrau@umich.edu>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (WinNT; U)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Michigan  
References: <v04003a02b2348d9b9cef@[204.210.234.19]>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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/>  
> From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Mon Sep 28 05:40:09 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 FAA14318 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 05:40:07 -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 IAA18317  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 28 Sep 1998 08:40:01 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19980928124001.00c9cbb8@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: Mon, 28 Sep 1998 08:40:01 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: Michigan

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

From: Monika McDermott <monikamcd@erols.com>  
Reply-To: monikamcd@erols.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-KC032698 (Win95; I)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Today's NY Times Page 1 poll article-what's wrong  
References: <199809280417.AAA26185@camel7.mindspring.com>  
<360F764F.C6B0CF35@troll.soc.qc.edu> <360F7DE0.14D8998C@umich.edu>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 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 sstatements 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 <01J2DL9RDP9K8WXA0B@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](http://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](mailto:rusciano@rider.edu)

>From [s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu](mailto:s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu) Tue Sep 29 10:47:53 1998  
Received: from [mail.asic.csuohio.edu](mailto:mail.asic.csuohio.edu) ([bones.asic.csuohio.edu](mailto:bones.asic.csuohio.edu) [137.148.16.17])  
by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id KAA24463 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Tue, 29 Sep 1998 10:47:51 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from [myhost.csuohio.edu](mailto:myhost.csuohio.edu) (137.148.18.39) by [mail.asic.csuohio.edu](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)  
From: "Dr. Sidney Kraus" <[s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu](mailto: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](mailto: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.

6. Two sources of funding come to mind: 20th Century Fund and the John and Mary Markle Foundation. Estimated budget: \$50,000.

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  
<http://www.mediainfo.com/ephome/news/newshtm/stop/stop.htm>

It's worth reading...

---

Evans Witt  
Princeton Survey Research Associates  
Princeton, NJ  
Washington, DC  
[evans.witt@psra.com](mailto:evans.witt@psra.com)