

=====
Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700

Sender: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>

Subject: September 1999 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 log9909.

Part 1/1, total size 454848 bytes:

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

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Wed Sep 1 13:29:35 1999

Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.74])

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

id NAA29495 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 13:29:29 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from warrenmi (user-2ive0j3.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.2.99])

by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA13860

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 16:29:37 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.1.19990901162053.01c9f820@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Wed, 01 Sep 1999 16:29:32 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

Subject: Re: Calling times

In-Reply-To: <199908311545.IAA02980@web2.tdl.com>

References: <002b01bef3b5\$53bd5620\$c9697acf@diane>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The posting (below) raises a good point. Are response rates different when calls are made at different hours of the night? Perhaps one of more on going survey could tabulate the response rates at different calling times, where time is local time. If it turns out that calls after 9 have lower response rates then it might provide another rationale for cutting off calls at 9.

warren mitofsky

>Subject: Calling times

>

>

>The question really isn't whether it is against the law. The question

>is, is it a good research practice. I think the answer to that

>question is no.

>

>There are norms governing the use of the telephone in American society

>that discourage making routine telephone calls to persons after 9:00

>pm. By calling people after this hour you risk higher non-compliance

>from those who feel you are invading their privacy. Because it is

>considered impolite to call after 9:00 pm for anything other than

>emergencies, calls after this hour will frighten some people. They

>will be asking the question "who could be calling at this hour?" When

>it turns out to be your interviewer, don't be surprised if people are

>bent out of shape. Finally, some people go to bed between 9:00 and

>10:00 and your call may roust them from the early onset of sleep.

>Again, don't be surprised when people react very negatively to this

>eventuality.

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL=20

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor=20

New York, NY 10022=20

212 980-3031=A0=A0=A0=A0=20

212 980-3107 fax

e-mail: mitofsky@mindspring.com =20

>From Smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com Wed Sep 1 13:32:36 1999

Received: from relay3.smtp.psi.net (relay3.smtp.psi.net [38.8.210.2])

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

id NAA02812 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 13:32:15 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [38.176.63.7] (helo=mail.icrsurvey.com)

by relay3.smtp.psi.net with smtp (Exim 1.90 #1)

for aapornet@usc.edu

id 11MH3Q-00074U-00; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 16:32:24 -0400

Received: from media#u#dom-Message_Server by mail.icrsurvey.com

with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 01 Sep 1999 16:32:46 -0400

Message-Id: <s7cd552e.081@mail.icrsurvey.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Wed, 01 Sep 1999 16:32:30 -0400

From: "Steve McFadden" <Smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com>

Sender: Postmaster@mail.icrsurvey.com

Reply-To: Smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Calling times

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I will be out of the office until 9/10, if you need immediate attention =
please contact Jennifer Roach at Jroach@mail.icrsurvey.com.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Sep 1 13:36:23 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id NAA06838 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 13:36:12 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id NAA28377 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 13:35:59 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Wed, 1 Sep 1999 13:35:59 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Position Announcement: Research Analyst (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909011330230.25012-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Position Announcement: Research Analyst (100%)

Reference: #99-490

Social Development Research Group

University of Washington

The Social Development Research Group (SDRG) at the University of Washington is seeking a full-time research analyst for the Seattle Social Development Project (SSDP) and Project Family (PF). SDRG is a multi-disciplinary group of about 60 people led by J. David Hawkins and Richard F. Catalano, working to increase understanding of social development and health risk behavior during childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood, and to use this knowledge to develop effective prevention programs, policies and service

systems. Primary projects at SDRG include SSDP, an eleven-year longitudinal dataset on a multi-ethnic sample of 808 urban public school students followed into young adulthood with multiple indicators from multiple sources, and Project Family a six-year longitudinal study of families in rural Iowa. More information about SDRG is available on our web site under "School Projects" and "Family Projects":

<http://weber.u.washington.edu/~sdrg>

General Duties/Description:

Design and execute longitudinal analyses for etiological studies of delinquency and related health and behavior problems. Analyses will include correlation, regression, ANOVA, logistic regression, and structural equation modeling (SEM), hierarchical linear modeling (HLM), latent growth modeling (LGM), and survival analysis.

Participate in the design of analysis plans, conduct of analyses, interpretation of findings, and testing of theoretical models.

Assist the project team in developing and maintaining analysis datasets.

Conduct scaling analyses and provide documentation of scaling work.

Participate in the development of research grant proposals.

Write scholarly articles and present findings at national conferences.

Requirements:

Ph.D. in social science or related field; or Master's degree in related field and three years relevant experience.

Equivalent experience/education may substitute for stated requirements.

Demonstrated expertise in statistical analysis and research design.

Thorough knowledge of SPSS; research experience in the use of EQS (or Amos, LISREL or M-Plus).

Facility with the following analysis methods: scaling (including reliability analysis), correlation regression, logistic regression, structural equation modeling.

Excellent writing skills

Desirable:

Knowledge of HLM, LGM, or survival analysis.

Experience dealing with missing data analysis techniques.

Experience making scientific presentations on research findings highly desirable.

Knowledge of delinquency and substance use literatures.

Experience in prevention research.

Experience analyzing longitudinal data sets.

Salary Range: To be determined

How to Apply: Send letter and resume by Sept 13, 1999 to:

Administrator, #99-490
Social Development Research Group
9725 3rd Avenue NE, Suite 401
Seattle, WA 98115-2024

For questions, please contact Karl G. Hill: khill@u.washington.edu

THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER.

WOMEN AND MINORITIES ARE ENCOURAGED TO APPLY.

-- End original message --

>From SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu Wed Sep 1 14:04:11 1999

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 OAA28763 for <aapornet@USC.EDU>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 14:03:17 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by UCONNVM.UConn.Edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R4a) via spool with SMTP id 7164 ; Wed, 01 Sep 1999 17:02:41 EDT

Received: from UConnVM.UConn.Edu (NJE origin SSDCF@UCONNVM) by UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU (LMail V1.2c/1.8c) with BSMTP id 5446; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 17:02:41 -0400

Date: Wed, 01 Sep 99 16:51:48 EDT

From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu>

Subject: Re: Calling times

To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

In-Reply-To: <4.1.19990901162053.01c9f820@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Mailer: MailBook 98.01.000

Message-Id: <990901.170241.EDT.SSDCF@UConnVM.UConn.Edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE

Warren makes a good suggestion, but let me broaden it. I would expect that there are area-based differences as well. What is acceptable in New York may not be in Georgia. And, impressionistically, I have the sense that things are different in (at least large areas of) the Midwest and Mountain timezones than in the East and Pacific. It is a pet theory of mine that TV schedules play a role. On the East and West Coast, 9:00 has two hours of primetime television left before the evening news. Typically in Central and Mountain 9:00 local is only one hour before that point, since primetime there runs from 7:00-10:00.

One might argue that area-specific calling times are silly, just pick a time you feel safe with anywhere, but of course =22too early=22 from the

standpoint of productivity varies as well. Five o'clock is too early to catch anyone home in much of the Northeast, but it may well not be so silly in the middle of the country. Of course, any organization keeping records by local time could do so as well within area codes or collections thereof. If anyone has this information but is not easily able to handle it, contact me at the Roper Center, we may be able to help.

Don

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Roper Center for Public Opinion Research
University of Connecticut U-164
341 Mansfield Road Room 421
Storrs CT 06269-1164

E-mail SSDCF=40UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU

On Wed, 01 Sep 1999 16:29:32 -0400 Warren Mitofsky said: =3E(SNIP)? Perhaps one of more on =3Egoing survey could tabulate the response rates at different calling = times, =3Ewhere time is local time. =3E
=3E warren mitofsky
>From fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu Wed Sep 1 14:35:29 1999
Received: from pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu [130.39.64.234])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA15859 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 14:35:25 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from weber (weber.lapop.lsu.edu [130.39.69.59]) by
pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (AIX4.3/UCB 8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id QAA15970 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 16:27:33 -0500

Message-ID: <006e01bef4c1\$7ebd1920\$3b452782@weber.laopo.lsu.edu>

Reply-To: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Calling times

Date: Wed, 1 Sep 1999 16:32:29 -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

Just for fun, let me take this thought a half step further. These time
differentials, on which TV central time is based, were likely started
several generations ago when electronic communications began. It then
became possible to coordinate business activities in real time. The center
of business activity in the U.S. was on the east coast, and the next largest
area was the midwest. In order to do business, people in the central time
zone had to get up an hour earlier, and could quit earlier (I know some of
this from my own Chicago family history). Mountain and Pacific probably
followed suit.

These differentials may now be fading as the weight of the east coast

declines relative to the rest of the country and the rest of the world.

Also, electronic communication must no longer be done in real time - nor can it always be. Markets run round the clock, and email from somewhere in the world is waiting for us when we start work in the morning, no matter how early we get up. The importance of TV schedules may also be gradually fading as we get more of our - global - news and entertainment on-line on-demand. I think the time differentials still exist, but they may be fading.

Rick Weil

Frederick Weil, Associate Professor

Department of Sociology

Louisiana State University

Baton Rouge, LA 70803

225-388-1140 Phone

225-388-5102 FAX

email: fweil@lapop.lsu.edu

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

From: Don Ferree <SSDCF@UCONNVM.UConn.Edu>

To: Members of AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Date: Wednesday, September 01, 1999 3:57 PM

Subject: Re: Calling times

Warren makes a good suggestion, but let me broaden it. I would expect that there are area-based differences as well. What is acceptable in New York may not be in Georgia. And, impressionistically, I have the sense that

things are different in (at least large areas of) the Midwest and Mountain timezones than in the East and Pacific. It is a pet theory of mine that TV schedules play a role. On the East and West Coast, 9:00 has two hours of primetime television left before the evening news. Typically in Central and Mountain 9:00 local is only one hour before that point, since primetime there runs from 7:00-10:00.

One might argue that area-specific calling times are silly, just pick a time you feel safe with anywhere, but of course "too early" from the standpoint of productivity varies as well. Five o'clock is too early to catch anyone home in much of the Northeast, but it may well not be so silly in the middle of the country. Of course, any organization keeping records by local time could do so as well within area codes or collections thereof. If anyone has this information but is not easily able to handle it, contact me at the Roper Center, we may be able to help.

Don

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.

Roper Center for Public Opinion Research

University of Connecticut U-164

341 Mansfield Road Room 421

Storrs CT 06269-1164

E-mail SSDCF@UCONNVM.UCONN.EDU

On Wed, 01 Sep 1999 16:29:32 -0400 Warren Mitofsky said:

>(SNIP)? Perhaps one of more on

>going survey could tabulate the response rates at different calling

>times, where time is local time.

>

> warren mitofsky

>From HOneill536@aol.com Wed Sep 1 14:51:52 1999

Received: from imo12.mx.aol.com (imo12.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.2])

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

id OAA27951 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 14:51:50 -0700

(PDT)

From: HOneill536@aol.com

Received: from HOneill536@aol.com

by imo12.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v22.4.) id 5DAPa05159 (8059)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 17:50:44 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <cfdc5c1e.24fef9b4@aol.com>

Date: Wed, 1 Sep 1999 17:50:44 EDT

Subject: Re: question about calling people who say take me off your list

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 21

Richard - good points --- but:

(1) how do we identify hard-core refusers? Its like trying to have a meeting

of the apathetic only to find out that no one attends.

(2) Yes let's have a marketing campaign re survey participation. Do you hve any idea of the necessary extent of such a campaign and it's cost before any

possible impact would result? CMOR cannot even get all research firms or very many research users to pay the nominal dues to support its efforts on behalf of improving respondent cooperation. And this is not the first such industry effort. It's easy to sit back and say let's mount a marketing or PR

effort. I'd rather see you volunteer your time to what is already going on and offer some money to pay for the effort.

Harrt O'Neill

>From jpearson@stanford.edu Wed Sep 1 15:04:51 1999

Received: from smtp2.Stanford.EDU (smtp2.Stanford.EDU [171.64.14.23])

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

id PAA06377 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 15:04:50 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ..stanford.edu (PC-Pearson-J-a.Stanford.EDU [171.64.152.94])

by smtp2.Stanford.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3/L) with SMTP id PAA29268

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 15:04:49 -0700 (PDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19990901150143.006a3aa4@jpearson.pobox.stanford.edu>

X-Sender: jpearson@jpearson.pobox.stanford.edu

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

Date: Wed, 01 Sep 1999 15:01:43 -0700

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@stanford.edu>

Subject: Calling times

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I've hesitated to add this to the discussion because it seems so obvious, but effective and appropriate calling times also differ by population. Not surprisingly, I've found that when calling Stanford alumni -- most of whom are employed and work long hours -- all I get are answering machines if calling begins much before 6:30pm in any time zone (except for older and retired alumni).

Accordingly, my calling hours vary from study to study (and even within a study) depending on the population. I don't, however, call after 9:15pm in any time zone. This usually gives me fewer hours of calling each evening, but they tend to be more productive hours than simply conforming to some accepted norm.

Jerold Pearson

Director of Market Research

Stanford University

650-723-9186

jpearson@stanford.edu

<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

>From rrand@cfmc.com Wed Sep 1 15:50:05 1999

Received: from mail.cfmc.com (main.cfmc.com [206.15.13.129])

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

id PAA09680 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 15:50:04 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from rrand-w98 (rands-w95.cfmc.com [206.15.13.172])

by mail.cfmc.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id PAA00266

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 1 Sep 1999 15:49:58 -0700

Message-Id: <4.1.19990901152824.00ababd0@cfmc.com>

X-Sender: rrand@cfmc.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Wed, 01 Sep 1999 15:46:08 -0700

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Richard Rands <rands@cfmc.com>

Subject: Re: question about calling people who say take me off your list

In-Reply-To: <cfdc5c1e.24fef9b4@aol.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Harry O'Neill notes....

>Richard - good points --- but:

>

>(1) how do we identify hard-core refusers? Its like trying to have a

>meeting

>of the apathetic only to find out that no one attends.

>

I would establish a database using an email system to which everyone in the industry who is interested can email the names and phone number of people who refuse to participate. This will provide us with a sample of hardcore refusers. It would also allow us to dedupe the list.

With a substantial list, we can then work on a smart campaign to:

- 1) study their demographics,
- 2) convince them that their participation is important, and
- 3) try to understand the psychology of hardcore refusing.

>(2) Yes let's have a marketing campaign re survey participation. Do you

>hve

>any idea of the necessary extent of such a campaign and it's cost before
any

>possible impact would result? CMOR cannot even get all research firms or

>very many research users to pay the nominal dues to support its efforts on

>behalf of improving respondent cooperation. And this is not the first such

>industry effort. It's easy to sit back and say let's mount a marketing or

PR

>effort.

I do know that the MRA is concerned over this problem and the Great Lakes Chapter has developed a pilot program to combat it. The last time I was involved with the discussion at a National MRA meeting, their resolution was to see what kind of impact the GL chapter's program had. That was about a year ago. Perhaps someone here knows what happened with that pilor program.

>I'd rather see you volunteer your time to what is already going on

>and offer some money to pay for the effort.

>

OK. I'll volutneer CfMC to develop a centralized DB where we can accumulate the details of hardcore refusers and help work with a group to get as much information as we can from the resulting list. How is that?

Richard

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Thu Sep 2 07:38:17 1999

Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])

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

id HAA02399 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Sep 1999 07:37:59 -0700

(PDT)

From: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu

Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

id <RWT6PF4T>; Thu, 2 Sep 1999 07:37:06 -0700

Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213CA31E2@psg.ucsf.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: question about calling people who say take me off your list

Date: Thu, 2 Sep 1999 07:37:04 -0700

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

Content-Type: text/plain

Research projects could not participate. Such disclosures violate rules of confidentiality, the protection of which was solemnly promised to each and every respondent.

Lance M. Pollack

University of California, San Francisco

lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

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

From: Richard Rands [SMTP:rrands@cfmc.com]

Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 1999 3:46 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: question about calling people who say take
me off your list

Harry O'Neill notes....

>Richard - good points --- but:

>

>(1) how do we identify hard-core refusers? Its like trying to have a
meeting

>of the apathetic only to find out that no one attends.

>

I would establish a database using an email system to which everyone
in the

industry who is interested can email the names and phone number of
people

who refuse to participate. This will provide us with a sample of
hardcore

refusers. It would also allow us to dedupe the list.

With a substantial list, we can then work on a smart campaign
to:

- 1) study their demographics,
- 2) convince them that their participation is important, and
- 3) try to understand the psychology of hardcore refusing.

>(2) Yes let's have a marketing campaign re survey participation. Do you hve

>any idea of the necessary extent of such a campaign and it's cost before any

>possible impact would result? CMOR cannot even get all research firms or

>very many research users to pay the nominal dues to support its efforts on

>behalf of improving respondent cooperation. And this is not the first such

>industry effort. It's easy to sit back and say let's mount a marketing or PR

>effort.

I do know that the MRA is concerned over this problem and the Great Lakes

Chapter has developed a pilot program to combat it. The last time I was

involved with the discussion at a National MRA meeting, their resolution

was to see what kind of impact the GL chapter's program had. That was about a year ago. Perhaps someone here knows what happened with that

pilor

program.

>I'd rather see you volunteer your time to what is already going on

>and offer some money to pay for the effort.

>

OK. I'll volutneer CfMC to develop a centralized DB where we can

accumulate the details of hardcore refusers and help work with a group
to
get as much information as we can from the resulting list. How is
that?

Richard

>From smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com Thu Sep 2 07:39:57 1999
Received: from relay3.smtp.psi.net (relay3.smtp.psi.net [38.8.210.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA03391 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Sep 1999 07:39:56 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from [38.176.63.7] (helo=mail.icrsurvey.com)
by relay3.smtp.psi.net with smtp (Exim 1.90 #1)
for aapornet@usc.edu
id 11MY2T-0007CO-00; Thu, 2 Sep 1999 10:40:33 -0400
Received: from media#u#dom-Message_Server by mail.icrsurvey.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Thu, 02 Sep 1999 10:41:00 -0400
Message-Id: <s7ce543c.027@mail.icrsurvey.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Thu, 02 Sep 1999 10:40:36 -0400
From: "Steve McFadden" <smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com>
Sender: Postmaster@mail.icrsurvey.com
Reply-To: smcfadde@mail.icrsurvey.com
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: question about calling people who say take me off your
list
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I will be out of the office until 9/10, if you need immediate attention =
please contact Kathleen Martin at kmartin@mail.icrsurvey.com.

>From bwiggin@irss.unc.edu Thu Sep 2 08:04:19 1999

Received: from vance.irss.unc.edu (vance.irss.unc.edu [152.2.32.88])

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

id IAA13655 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Sep 1999 08:04:18 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from bwiggin.irss.unc.edu (bwiggin.irss.unc.edu [152.2.32.128])

by vance.irss.unc.edu (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with SMTP id LAA23767

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 2 Sep 1999 11:02:41 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <199909021502.LAA23767@vance.irss.unc.edu>

Date: Thu, 2 Sep 1999 10:58:16 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)

From: bwiggin@irss.unc.edu (Bev Wiggins)

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: AAPORNET digest 1176

In-Reply-To: <199908250704.AAA29834@usc.edu>; from "bwiggin" at Thu Sep 02
10:58:16 1999

X-Mailer: Siren Mail (Windows Version 4.0.2 (Windows 95/NT))

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET="US-ASCII"

Beverly B. Wiggins

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: bwiggin@irss.unc.edu

-- Begin original message --

> From: aapornet@usc.edu
> Date: Wed, 25 Aug 1999 00:04:23 PDT
> Subject: AAPORNET digest 1176
> To: News and Discussion for members of AAPOR (American Association
> for Public Opinion Research)
> <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
> Message-Id: <199908250704.AAA29834@usc.edu>
> Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> by vance.irss.unc.edu (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id DAA14279
> for <bwiggin@irss.unc.edu>; Wed, 25 Aug 1999 03:03:23 -0400 (EDT)
>
>
> AAPORNET Digest 1176
>
> Topics covered in this issue include:
>
> 1) Re: Market Research Laws
> by "Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D." <lavrakas.1@osu.edu>
> 2) Regional Variations in Sleep
> by Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>

- > 3) Re: Low Points in Survey Research
- > by Richard Day <rday@mcs.net>
- > 4) Re: Market Research Laws
- > by sullivan@fsc-research.com
- > 5) Re: Regional Variations in Sleep
- > by sullivan@fsc-research.com
- > 6) evolution & Kansas
- > by "Roman Czujko" <rczujko@aip.org>
- > 7) Re: evolution & Kansas
- > by "Barry A. Hollander" <barry@arches.uga.edu>
- > 8) Re: evolution & Kansas
- > by Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
- > 9) Re: evolution & Kansas
- > by Ashley Grosse <agrosse@umich.edu>
- >

-- End original message --

>From rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu Fri Sep 3 11:01:12 1999

Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])

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

id LAA08368 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 11:01:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [128.104.48.99] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu

id NAA44296 (8.9.1/50); Fri, 3 Sep 1999 13:01:08 -0500

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Message-Id: <v04011702b3f5b81816cf@[128.104.48.99]>

In-Reply-To: <s7c2c475.012@acpgate.acp.org>

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 1999 13:01:03 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu>

Subject: A study on AAPOR's standards of disclosure

Apologies if this has been posted already. I received recently a yearly abstracts review of dissertations and theses in journalism and mass communication. I thought I would pass on one of the master's abstracts entitled:

"The New York Times' conformity to AAPOR standards of disclosure for the reporting of public opinion polls."

Kriztina Marton, M.A.

University of South Carolina, 1998

Advisor: Lowndes F. Stevens

The paper examines The New York Times' conformity to the guidelines adopted by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) regarding minimal information that should be disclosed about a poll in any report of the poll results.

A random sample of 500 news stories was selected from the articles indexed as "polls and surveys" in the Times during the period between 1989 and 1997. The content analysis of entire articles representing one unit of analysis was based on coding categories developed from the standards of disclosure recommended by AAPOR.

The statistical tests showed that longer articles were more likely to conform to the standards than shorter ones, that election-related stories

were more likely to conform than stories about other issues, and that stories about polls generated by the staff of the Times had a higher rate of conformity than those based on polls sponsored and conducted by other organizations. A composite compliance score created to represent the sum of what was considered the positive score for each standard showed that about half of the articles in the study met five or less of the twelve standards studied, and about half five or more. Compliance was highest in the case of the requirements to disclose information about who was the sponsor, who conducted the poll and the size of the sample. Compliance was lowest in the case of question wording and the requirement to indicate the basis of the results that were based on less than the whole sample.

=====

Robert Godfrey

UW-Madison

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Fri Sep 3 11:32:43 1999

Received: from smtp5.mindspring.com (smtp5.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])

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

id LAA27783 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 11:32:42 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-38ld7av.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.157.95])

by smtp5.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id OAA13819

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 14:32:39 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19990903141859.009df100@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Fri, 03 Sep 1999 14:28:57 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: Warren Beatty for President

In-Reply-To: <199908281612.MAA54702@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="===== _14363507== _ .ALT"

--===== _14363507== _ .ALT

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

For those who are intrigued by the possibility of Warren Beatty as a presidential candidate for president read the Sept 6th issue of The New Yorker magazine where you'll find a very funny piece about him on page 24.

An excerpt:

"When it comes to sex, Beatty makes Bill Clinton look like the guy in the corner with the Hush Puppies and the bad case of dandruff at the junior high school sock hop. Beatty's exploits are legendary in a town where competition is world class and his name has been romantically linked with some the century's greatest beauties.....etc."

Dick Halpern

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology
3837 Courtyard Drive
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248
rshalpern@mindspring.com
phone/fax 770 434 4121

-----_14363507==_.ALT

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

<html>

For those who are intrigued by the possibility of Warren Beatty as a presidential candidate for president read the Sept 6th issue of The New Yorker magazine where you'll find a very funny piece about him on page 24. An excerpt:

 "When it comes to sex, Beatty makes Bill Clinton look like the guy in the corner with the Hush Puppies and the bad case of dandruff at the junior high school sock hop. Beatty's exploits are legendary in a town where competition is world class and his name has been romantically linked with some the century's greatest beauties.....etc."

 Dick Halpern

<hr>

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.
 Consultant,
Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research
 Adjunct Professor, Georgia
Institute of Technology
 3837 Courtyard Drive
 Atlanta, GA

30339-4248
 rshalpern@mindspring.com
 phone/fax 770 434 4121

<hr> </html>

--===== _14363507== _ .ALT--

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Fri Sep 3 11:54:53 1999

Received: from web2 (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])

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

id LAA10367 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 11:54:35 -0700

(PDT)

From: sullivan@fsc-research.com

Received: from michael.tdl.com (tdl-dyn236.tdl.com [205.162.12.236])

by web2 (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA19511

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 11:54:33 -0700

Message-Id: <199909031854.LAA19511@web2>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 1999 11:56:59 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: Re: Warren Beatty for President

In-reply-to: <4.2.0.58.19990903141859.009df100@mail.mindspring.com>

References: <199908281612.MAA54702@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v3.01d)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

How about if we all agree, no more commentary on Warren Beatty
until something actually happens.

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>From jpearson@stanford.edu Fri Sep 3 11:55:08 1999

Received: from smtp2.Stanford.EDU (smtp2.Stanford.EDU [171.64.14.23])

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

id LAA10694 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 11:55:06 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ..stanford.edu (PC-Pearson-J-a.Stanford.EDU [171.64.152.94])

by smtp2.Stanford.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3/L) with SMTP id LAA20288

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 11:55:05 -0700 (PDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19990903115156.006a39f0@jpearson.pobox.stanford.edu>

X-Sender: jpearson@jpearson.pobox.stanford.edu

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

Date: Fri, 03 Sep 1999 11:51:56 -0700

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@stanford.edu>

Subject: Warren Beatty for President

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

<excerpt>"When it comes to sex, Beatty makes Bill Clinton look like the guy in the corner with the Hush Puppies and the bad case of dandruff at the

junior high school sock hop. Beatty's exploits are legendary in a town where competition is world class and his name has been romantically linked with some the century's greatest beauties.....etc."

</excerpt>

There but for the grace of God go I...

Damn.

Jerold Pearson, '75

Director of Market Research

Stanford University

650-723-9186

jpearson@stanford.edu

<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

>From janisrussell@yahoo.com Fri Sep 3 12:13:35 1999

Received: from web805.mail.yahoo.com (web805.mail.yahoo.com [128.11.23.65])

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

id MAA21156 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 12:13:34 -0700

(PDT)

Message-ID: <19990903191333.28025.rocketmail@web805.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [208.233.17.171] by web805.mail.yahoo.com; Fri, 03 Sep 1999

12:13:33 PDT

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 1999 12:13:33 -0700 (PDT)

From: Janis Russell <janisrussell@yahoo.com>

Subject: Job Opening

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

PERT Survey Research

522 Cottage Grove Rd

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Phone: (860) 242-2005

Fax: (860) 242-2708

(send ATTN: Janis Russell)

MARKETING RESEARCH CAREER OPPORTUNITY

Project Director

We invite you to join us at a full-service, custom marketing research supplier located in the Hartford area. Over the past 20 years, PERT Survey Research has established partnerships with well-known national companies in the areas of Consumer Package Goods, Service and HealthCare.

The Project Director leads the project team designing the survey, reviewing the data, analyzing and interpreting the results, preparing the data, and

writing the report or presentation, including recommendations to our clients.

Required:

 A four year degree minimum and experience in Market Research

 Excellent oral and written communication and analytical skills

 Word, Excel and PowerPoint skills

Must be able to work with project team including Account Representative, Project Analyst, Graphics person, and Statistician to understand study objectives and assist in study design. Able to work under deadlines and manage multiple projects. Career growth potential into account management. Excellent company paid benefits. Team environment and casual dress policy.

Please send resume to:

Janis Russell

Director of Project Services

ext. 168

Do You Yahoo!?

Bid and sell for free at <http://auctions.yahoo.com>

>From barry@arches.uga.edu Fri Sep 3 12:14:57 1999

Received: from mailgw.cc.uga.edu (mailgw.cc.uga.edu [128.192.1.101])

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

id MAA22276 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 12:14:55 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from archa8.cc.uga.edu (arch8.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu

(LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.0112B029@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>;

Fri, 3 Sep 1999 15:14:54 -0400

Received: from archa10.cc.uga.edu (arch10.cc.uga.edu [128.192.95.110])
by archa8.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id PAA25412
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 15:13:45 -0400

Received: from Hollander.Grady.uga.edu (bhollander01.grady.uga.edu
[128.192.35.230])

by archa10.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id PAA98142
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 15:13:44 -0400

Message-ID: <003701bef709\$c8f1aac0\$e623c080@Grady.uga.edu>

From: "Barry A. Hollander" <barry@arches.uga.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

References: <199908281612.MAA54702@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>

<199909031854.LAA19511@web2>

Subject: Re: Warren Beatty for President

Date: Sat, 4 Sep 1999 15:15:00 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2014.211

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211

Someone's email included the following:

>The information contained in this communication is
>confidential and is intended only for the use of the
>addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

>If you have received this communication in error,
>please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by
>e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this
>communication and all copies thereof, including
>attachments.

Jeez. I feel I should just kill myself now for reading
the message. Will my computer now self destruct
in 15 seconds?

Barry A. Hollander
Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communication
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Phone: 706.542.5027 | FAX: 706.542.2183

Email: barry@arches.uga.edu

<http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Sep 3 13:28:10 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id NAA01083 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 13:28:09 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id NAA13443 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 13:28:09 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 1999 13:28:09 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Early Web Noise in the Presidential Race

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909031320310.15387-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

PRIVACY POLICY COMES TO THE PRESIDENTIAL RACE...

Copyright 1999 Internet Industry Publishing

EARLY WEB NOISE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL RACE

Reporters are more Net savvy for the 2000 presidential race than they were in 1996, and it looks like some campaigners are catching on, too.

Take for example Lindsey Arent's report on Wired News that the consulting firm that designed Steve Forbes' Web site has registered 19 domain names labeling Florida Gov. Jeb Bush as his running mate. Can the multimillionaire longshot really be serious about courting George W's brother? Or is it just a cheap play for ink? Arent quotes columnist Frank Beacham and George W. Bush spokeswoman Mindy Tucker as saying the registrations are just a publicity stunt. A Forbes spokesman responds blithely, "The statement stands for itself."

And there's another aspect of using the Net that at least two candidates don't quite get. Friday's New York Times includes a report that two campaign Web sites fail to tell volunteers who register online what will happen to the data they submit. Rebecca Fairley Raney reports that while the sites for Gore, Bradley, McCain, Hatch and Forbes supplied a privacy policy, the sites for George W. Bush and Elizabeth Dole did not. Raney found a Dole spokesperson to say the omission was an oversight that would be corrected. In the end, the report comes off like a lesson in netiquette to the sites that overlooked the privacy policy. Publishers have spent years learning to pay attention to privacy fears; now they're having some fun with politicians who have yet to catch up.

Forbes Squats on Bush Name:

<http://www.wired.com/news/news/politics/story/21563html>

Campaign Sites Unclear on Use of Personal Data, Study Says:

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/tech/99/09/cyber/articles/03campaign.html>

Copyright 1999 Internet Industry Publishing

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Fri Sep 3 19:49:21 1999

Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.150])

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

id TAA08988 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 19:49:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149])

by makalu.hp.ufl.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id WAA21426

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 3 Sep 1999 22:55:53 -0400

Received: from K2/SpoolDir by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44);

3 Sep 99 22:49:21 -0500

Received: from SpoolDir by K2 (Mercury 1.44); 3 Sep 99 22:48:57 -0500

Received: from hp.ufl.edu (128.227.163.114) by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44)

with ESMTP;

3 Sep 99 22:48:49 -0500

Message-ID: <37D08B40.39EE540@hp.ufl.edu>

Date: Fri, 03 Sep 1999 23:02:06 -0400

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

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: question about calling people who say take me off your list

References: <4.1.19990901152824.00ababd0@cfmc.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Richard Rands wrote:

> I would establish a database using an email system to which everyone in
the
> industry who is interested can email the names and phone number of people
> who refuse to participate.

But such phone numbers are moving targets, constantly changing.

At least it seems that way to me, since all my survey work has been
in Florida and Texas, places where folks move in and out and around
a lot.

How long would you keep a phone number on the list?

Heck, my daughter has been through three phone numbers in the last
year.

By putting a phone number on a no-contact list, we may be depriving
a new phone user of the opportunity to participate.

Colleen K. Porter

Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

cporter@hp.ufl.edu

>From abider@earthlink.net Mon Sep 6 19:25:59 1999

Received: from goose.prod.itd.earthlink.net (goose.prod.itd.earthlink.net
[207.217.120.18])

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

id TAA10570 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 6 Sep 1999 19:25:56 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from oemcomputer (sdn-ar-002varestP279.dialsprint.net
[168.191.217.81])

by goose.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id TAA23775

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 6 Sep 1999 19:25:34 -0700 (PDT)

Message-ID: <001301bef8d8\$c5140300\$51d9bfa8@oemcomputer>

Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>

From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>

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

Subject: A "dead heat"

Date: Mon, 6 Sep 1999 22:28:11 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----_NextPart_000_000C_01BEF8B7.1A6CE3C0"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3612.1700

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3612.1700

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_000C_01BEF8B7.1A6CE3C0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary poll result with Gore =
and Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical dead heat." Drehle in a big =
feature on Bradley in the Washington Post today uses the same phrase for =
these figures. Funny how the low statistical power of polls lets =
journalism make something ("dead heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by =
making nothing (no difference) out of, more likely than not, something =
[p{Bradley<Gore}>p(Gore</=3DBradley)]. In the case of Bradley v. Gore;
In this race at this point, TV and newspapers saying that there is a =
"dead heat" is a Great Big Something. =20

Comes a real election, a 4 percent difference between candidates becomes =
a "decisive victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on this =
revelation of the mood of the public. =20

-----_NextPart_000_000C_01BEF8B7.1A6CE3C0

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 4.72.3612.1706"" name=3DGENERATOR>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

<DIV>Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary=20

poll result with Gore and Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical = dead=20

heat." Drehle in a big feature on Bradley in the Washington = Post=20

today uses the same phrase for these figures. Funny how the low=20 statistical power of polls lets journalism make something ("dead=20 heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by making nothing = (no=20

difference) out of, more likely than not, something=20

[p{Bradley<Gore}>p(Gore<Bradley)]. In the case of Bradley = v.=20

Gore;</DIV>

<DIV>In this race at this point, TV and = newspapers=20

saying that there is a "dead heat" is a Great Big =

Something. =20

</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Comes a real=20

election, a 4 percent difference between candidates becomes a =

"decisive=20

victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on this revelation =

> would vote for Gore and 36% for Bradley. This "cute young anchor" said
> "and there is a 5% margin of error, so this really means they are the
> same."

On Mon, 6 Sep 1999, Albert Biderman wrote:

> Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary poll result with Gore and
Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical dead heat." Drehle in a big feature
on Bradley in the Washington Post today uses the same phrase for these
figures. Funny how the low statistical power of polls lets journalism make
something ("dead heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by making nothing (no
difference) out of, more likely than not, something

[p{Bradley<Gore}>p(Gore<=/Bradley)]. In the case of Bradley v. Gore;

> In this race at this point, TV and newspapers saying that there is a "dead
heat" is a Great Big Something.

>

> Comes a real election, a 4 percent difference between candidates becomes a
"decisive victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on this
revelation of the mood of the public.

>

>

* Alice Robbin *
* School of Information Studies *
* Florida State University *
* 232 Louis Shores Building *
* Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 *

* Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 *

* email: arobbin@mailers.fsu.edu *

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Sep 7 03:58:24 1999

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 DAA23689 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 03:58:23 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp24.vgernet.net [205.219.186.124])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id HAA13997

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 07:51:10 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37D4F006.9132854F@jwdp.com>

Date: Tue, 07 Sep 1999 06:59:18 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

References: <Pine.GSO.4.05.9909070626470.19228-100000@mailers.fsu.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The "margin of error" as reported in the media actually has one worthwhile use: It allows one to compute the approximate number of respondents when this is not given in the report. For example, from the reports cited here, I can deduce that the poll in question had fewer

than 400 respondents.

Other than that, the response of the "cute young anchor" is only marginally less inane than the pretense that the quoted "margin of error" might be an accurate indicator of statistical significance for most political polls.

Jan Werner

ALICE R ROBBIN wrote:

>

> Yes, and here are the words of the CNN anchor, sent to me by a colleague:

>

>>

>> All day yesterday one of the anchors on Headline News (CNN) reported on

>> a poll of voters conducted in New Hampshire. 40% of the voters said they

>> would vote for Gore and 36% for Bradley. This "cute young anchor" said

>> "and there is a 5% margin of error, so this really means they are the

>> same."

>

> On Mon, 6 Sep 1999, Albert Biderman wrote:

>

>> Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary poll result with Gore

and Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical dead heat." Drehle in a big

feature on Bradley in the Washington Post today uses the same phrase for

these figures. Funny how the low statistical power of polls lets journalism

make something ("dead heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by making nothing

(no difference) out of, more likely than not, something

[p{Bradley<Gore}>p(Gore</=Bradley)}. In the case of Bradley v. Gore;

>> In this race at this point, TV and newspapers saying that there is a "dead heat" is a Great Big Something.

>>

>> Comes a real election, a 4 percent difference between candidates becomes a "decisive victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on this revelation of the mood of the public.

>>

>>

>

> *****

> * Alice Robbin *

> * School of Information Studies *

> * Florida State University *

> * 232 Louis Shores Building *

> * Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 *

> * Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 *

> * email: arobbin@mail.fsu.edu *

> *****

>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Tue Sep 7 09:45:24 1999

Received: from fw ([63.71.157.115])

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

id JAA15098 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 09:45:22 -0700

(PDT)

From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com

Received: from exchng2.gallup.com (exchng2.gallup.com [198.175.140.80])

by fw (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id LAA09873

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 11:44:47 -0500 (CDT)

Received: by exchng2.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <RSBMQ0V8>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 11:44:48 -0500

Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90918662@EXCHNG3>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: REMINDER: Registration for Conference on Survey Nonresponse

Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 11:44:42 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Dear Bob,

I am finalizing the Summer/Fall issue of AAPOR News this week, and have drafted the following announcement about your conference to include in a new "Announcement" section. Can you confirm whether or not this is OK. I was particular unsure how to handle the registration deadline since it looks like you don't have one.

Many thanks,

--Lydia

International Conference on Survey Nonresponse

Portland, Oregon

Portland Hilton Hotel

October 28-31, 1999

Advance registration and hotel deadline: Oct 1

For more information, email: ICSN@SURVEY.UMD.EDU

or visit: www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/

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

From: Bob Groves [mailto:BGroves@survey.umd.edu]

Sent: Saturday, August 21, 1999 10:49 AM

To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU

Subject: REMINDER: Registration for Conference on Survey Nonresponse

Now that summer is over, you need to send in your registration for the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse, October 28-31, 1999, Portland, OR, USA.

Why?

- o It will be the largest gathering of research findings in survey nonresponse ever held. Over 150 scientific papers on theory and practical aspects of surveys regarding nonresponse.

- o Interact with others facing the same nonresponse problems that you face in your own work.

- o Learn results that will help you in your survey research.

CHECK OUT THE PAPERS ON
www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/

DOWNLOAD A REGISTRATION FORM ON
www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/reg_form.htm

MAKE HOTEL RESERVATIONS ON

www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/hotelres.htm

or email ICSN@SURVEY.UMD.EDU for more information.

Please forward this email to interested others.

>From BGroves@survey.umd.edu Tue Sep 7 09:58:37 1999

Received: from survey.umd.edu (survey.umd.edu [129.2.169.4])

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

id JAA23820 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 09:58:34 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from JPSM-Message_Server by survey.umd.edu

with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 07 Sep 1999 12:58:21 -0400

Message-Id: <s7d50bed.051@survey.umd.edu>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Tue, 07 Sep 1999 12:58:10 -0400

From: "Bob Groves" <BGroves@survey.umd.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: REMINDER: Registration for Conference on Survey

Nonresponse

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

This looks fine.

>>> <Lydia_Saad@gallup.com> 09/07/99 12:44PM >>>

Dear Bob,

I am finalizing the Summer/Fall issue of AAPOR News this week, and have drafted the following announcement about your conference to include in a new

"Announcement" section. Can you confirm whether or not this is OK. I was particular unsure how to handle the registration deadline since it looks like you don't have one.

Many thanks,

--Lydia

International Conference on Survey Nonresponse

Portland, Oregon

Portland Hilton Hotel

October 28-31, 1999

Advance registration and hotel deadline: Oct 1

For more information, email: ICSN@SURVEY.UMD.EDU

or visit: www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/

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

From: Bob Groves [<mailto:BGroves@survey.umd.edu>]

Sent: Saturday, August 21, 1999 10:49 AM

To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU

Subject: REMINDER: Registration for Conference on Survey Nonresponse

Now that summer is over, you need to send in your registration for the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse, October

28-31, 1999, Portland, OR, USA.

Why?

- o It will be the largest gathering of research findings in survey nonresponse ever held. Over 150 scientific papers on theory and practical aspects of surveys regarding nonresponse.

- o Interact with others facing the same nonresponse problems that you face in your own work.

- o Learn results that will help you in your survey research.

CHECK OUT THE PAPERS ON=20
www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/=20

DOWNLOAD A REGISTRATION FORM ON
www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/reg_form.htm=20

MAKE HOTEL RESERVATIONS ON
www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/hotelres.htm=20

or email ICSN@SURVEY.UMD.EDU for more information.

Please forward this email to interested others.

>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Tue Sep 7 10:08:38 1999

Received: from fw ([63.71.157.115])

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

id KAA03611 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 10:08:34 -0700
(PDT)
From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com
Received: from exchng1.gallup.com (gallup.com [198.175.140.73])
by fw (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTP id MAA10179
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 12:07:27 -0500 (CDT)
Received: by gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
id <RPQKC12M>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 12:07:28 -0500
Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F90918664@EXCHNG3>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: REMINDER: Registration for Conference on Survey Nonresponse
Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 12:07:20 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

To aapornet:

Now that I've blundered with an errant global email, I'm writing to invite all members to submit relevant announcements to the "AAPOR News" newsletter.

The current issue is going to press in about 48 hours, so time is of the essence. Survey research conferences, mergers, acquisitions, retirements, or anything else you feel would be of interest to the general membership is permissible. However, space is limited, so editorial decisions may have to be made about inclusions.

Also, if you are looking to buy/receive or sell/give away back issues of POQ and would like to include your name in a listing in the newsletter, please let me know right away. (I still have a number of such requests that came through a few months ago.)

Please reply directly to me, or your announcement will be "old news" by the time it's published!

Thank you,
Lydia
Publications and Information Chair

> =====

Lydia Saad
Managing Editor, The Gallup Poll phone: 609-279-2219
The Gallup Organization fax: 609-924-1857
47 Hulfish Street
lydia_saad@gallup.com
Princeton, NJ 08542

<http://www.gallup.com>

> =====

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

From: Saad, Lydia
Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 1999 11:45 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: REMINDER: Registration for Conference on Survey Nonresponse

Dear Bob,

I am finalizing the Summer/Fall issue of AAPOR News this week, and have drafted the following announcement about your conference to include in a new "Announcement" section. Can you confirm whether or not this is OK. I was particular unsure how to handle the registration deadline since it looks like you don't have one.

Many thanks,

--Lydia

International Conference on Survey Nonresponse

Portland, Oregon

Portland Hilton Hotel

October 28-31, 1999

Advance registration and hotel deadline: Oct 1

For more information, email: ICSN@SURVEY.UMD.EDU

or visit: www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/

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

From: Bob Groves [<mailto:BGroves@survey.umd.edu>]

Sent: Saturday, August 21, 1999 10:49 AM

To: AAPORNET@USC.EDU

Subject: REMINDER: Registration for Conference on Survey Nonresponse

Now that summer is over, you need to send in your registration for

the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse, October 28-31, 1999, Portland, OR, USA.

Why?

- o It will be the largest gathering of research findings in survey nonresponse ever held. Over 150 scientific papers on theory and practical aspects of surveys regarding nonresponse.

- o Interact with others facing the same nonresponse problems that you face in your own work.

- o Learn results that will help you in your survey research.

CHECK OUT THE PAPERS ON
www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/

DOWNLOAD A REGISTRATION FORM ON
www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/reg_form.htm

MAKE HOTEL RESERVATIONS ON
www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/hotelres.htm

or email ICSN@SURVEY.UMD.EDU for more information.

Please forward this email to interested others.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Sep 7 14:33:20 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id OAA27322 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 14:33:18 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id OAA25690 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 14:33:18 -0700
(PDT)

Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 14:33:18 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

In-Reply-To: <37D4F006.9132854F@jwdp.com>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909071328420.11617-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

In especially a two-candidate race, isn't what we'd most like to learn
from a poll simply the estimated probability that each candidate would win
the election? (were it held at the time)

That is, wouldn't we really like to hear the anchor say:

"If the poll were properly conducted, the best unbiased estimate (MLE) of
the chances of winning the election, were it held during the period when
the poll was conducted, are x percent for Gore and y percent for
Bradley or, in other words: Gore would have been, at that time, a x-to-y
favorite to defeat Bradley."

[here $y = 100 - x$, and the odds ratio would be reduced to its lowest common denominator]

One thing I like about this approach is that it directly makes the point that the poll results do not rule out the possibility that Bradley might actually win the election, but indeed presents--straightforwardly--the most current estimated likelihood that that might indeed happen. Isn't this the essence of statistics, the science, not of certainty, but of uncertainty--or rather the science of being as certain as one can be about whatever cannot be known for certain?

I think that most consumers would find it easier to interpret the idea that, for example, Bradley was found to have only, say, a 44 percent chance of winning the election, or that Gore was found to be the 14-to-11 favorite to win--much easier than they would find anything involving notions of "percent for" mixed in with "margin of error" (just the word "error" itself constitutes strong poison to the entire enterprise of popular understanding of polls and surveys).

When political experts are interviewed about a forthcoming election, after all, they are routinely asked, "What are candidate X's chances of winning?"--they are much less often asked "What percentage of the vote do you think candidate X will get?"

So why can't polls serve to address the first question directly, without bothering to muck around figuring out a popular way to answer the second question, one which only pollsters, it seems, ever actually ask?

-- Jim

On Tue, 7 Sep 1999, Jan Werner wrote:

> The "margin of error" as reported in the media actually has one
> worthwhile use: It allows one to compute the approximate number of
> respondents when this is not given in the report. For example, from the
> reports cited here, I can deduce that the poll in question had fewer
> than 400 respondents.

>

> Other than that, the response of the "cute young anchor" is only
> marginally less inane than the pretense that the quoted "margin of
> error" might be an accurate indicator of statistical significance for
> most political polls.

>

> Jan Werner

> _____

>

> ALICE R ROBBIN wrote:

>>

>> Yes, and here are the words of the CNN anchor, sent to me by a
colleague:

>>

>>>

>>> All day yesterday one of the anchors on Headline News (CNN) reported

on

>>> a poll of voters conducted in New Hampshire. 40% of the voters said they

>>> would vote for Gore and 36% for Bradley. This "cute young anchor" said

>>> "and there is a 5% margin of error, so this really means they are the

>>> same."

>>

>> On Mon, 6 Sep 1999, Albert Biderman wrote:

>>

>>> Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary poll result with Gore

and Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical dead heat." Drehle in a big

feature on Bradley in the Washington Post today uses the same phrase for

these figures. Funny how the low statistical power of polls lets journalism

make something ("dead heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by making nothing

(no difference) out of, more likely than not, something

[p{Bradley<Gore}>p(Gore<=/Bradley)]. In the case of Bradley v. Gore;

>>> In this race at this point, TV and newspapers saying that there is a

"dead heat" is a Great Big Something.

>>>

>>> Comes a real election, a 4 percent difference between candidates

becomes a "decisive victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on this

revelation of the mood of the public.

>>>

>>>

>>

>> *****

>> * Alice Robbin *

>> * School of Information Studies *

>> * Florida State University *

>> * 232 Louis Shores Building *
>> * Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 *
>> * Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 *
>> * email: arobbin@mailier.fsu.edu *
>> *****
>

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Tue Sep 7 14:45:25 1999

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll.soc.qc.edu [149.4.9.170])

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

id OAA05896 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 14:45:23 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)

by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id RAA13299

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 17:45:32 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 17:45:32 -0400 (EDT)

From: Andrew Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

X-Sender: andy@troll

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909071328420.11617-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.96.990907174336.12881F-100000@troll>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Dear All:

>

> In especially a two-candidate race, isn't what we'd most like to learn

> from a poll simply the estimated probability that each candidate would win
> the election? (were it held at the time)

This sounds an awful lot like the weatherman saying that the chance of
rain tomorrow is 70%.

Are these the standards to which we want to aspire?

Andy Beveridge

>From jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu Tue Sep 7 17:08:00 1999

Received: from ruby.berkeley.edu (ruby.Berkeley.EDU [128.32.136.5])

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

id RAA12636 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 17:07:59 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from uclink4.berkeley.edu (uclink4.Berkeley.EDU [128.32.25.39])

by ruby.berkeley.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id RAA00880

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 17:07:59 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from Joel (uhall521-1.SPH.Berkeley.EDU [128.32.208.54])

by uclink4.berkeley.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id RAA29803

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 17:07:55 -0700 (PDT)

Message-Id: <4.1.19990907165136.01560b70@uclink4.berkeley.edu>

X-Sender: jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Tue, 07 Sep 1999 17:07:37 -0700

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu>

Subject: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone surveys

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

We need some help on a feasibility study in which we are developing recommendations for how to increase racial/ethnic minority samples in CDC's state-based Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS). The minority groups of primary interest include African Americans, Vietnamese, Chinese, Koreans, and Filipinos residing in California. The first set of issues we're addressing deals with sampling.

In order to identify more efficient sampling methods than RDD (or list-assisted RDD), we have been investigating targeted minority RDD samples such as those developed by Survey Sampling, Inc. (SSI). Their methodology is summarized on their Web site --

[http://www.ssisamples.com/ssi.x2o\\$ssi_gen.search_item?id=60](http://www.ssisamples.com/ssi.x2o$ssi_gen.search_item?id=60)

We have some questions regarding this methodology and would greatly appreciate help. Also, we would be interested in references for papers that pertain to these issues.

In constructing their hierarchy of telephone exchanges, are the assumptions that SSI make reasonable ones? For example, they seem to be making assumptions about the stability of the population (as they're probably using 1990 Census data or projections), and the geographic distribution of listed numbers as compared to unlisted numbers. What sample bias is one likely to encounter by employing a targeted-RDD sample?

Would it be feasible and efficient to adapt this methodology for targeting specific API subgroups? How geographically concentrated would these groups have to be to make this worthwhile and how much of the overall subgroup

population must they constitute? If one wants sizable numbers for all of the groups mentioned, would it suffice to use the SSI Asian targeted sample rather than generate targeted samples for each specific subgroup?

Could we take survey data from a targeted RDD survey and combine it with a conventional RDD survey? If so, how would one compute the overall sampling weights and standard errors? In this dual-frame approach, we would have to weight down substantially the targeted sample which consists of sections of the state with high concentrations of the target groups. Thus, would there be any real advantage to pooling data from the two samples? Given this and what would happen to the survey design effect is there any point to conducting a targeted RDD survey?

Would the targeted portion of the survey need to sample from all levels of the target population; e.g., from exchanges with low, medium and high percent Asian? How would one estimate the optimal sample size to be obtained from each level? How would one compute sample weights? What impact would this have on the overall design effect?

Other sampling firms (e.g., Genesys) also produce targeted-minority RDD samples. Are their targeted samples any better than SSI's? Genesys has provided extensive documentation on their methodology. They suggest that one should not employ targeted samples for research purposes because these are not true probability samples as the "measures of size" used to generate these samples are crude estimates. If this is true, is there a methodology available for constructing targeted minority RDD samples that generate true probability samples?

We have seen an estimate that 67% of telephone households in California are

not listed in telephone directories. Given such a high unlisted rate, is there any reason to consider surname-list-driven samples for conducting population-based surveys of API groups with unique surnames? If so, is there any way to combine estimates from a list-driven survey with the statewide BRFSS RDD survey? How would one compute the overall standard errors and sampling weights?

Given all of the problems we've alluded to above with targeted samples, might it be wiser to recommend not trying to conduct state-wide surveys of small minority groups (i.e., < 8% of the overall population)? Rather, might

it make more sense to conduct conventional RDD surveys in selected counties that contain high concentrations of the minority populations of interest?

I apologize for this laundry list of questions and would greatly appreciate advice pertaining to any subset.

=====

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

Co-Director

Center for Family and Community Health

School of Public Health

University of California, Berkeley

140 Warren Hall

Berkeley, CA 94720-7360

Phone: 510-643-7314

Fax: 510-643-7316

E-mail: jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu

WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

=====

>From soliver@mail.heidelberg.edu Tue Sep 7 17:47:50 1999

Received: from nike.heidelberg.edu (nike.heidelberg.edu [141.139.0.11])

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

id RAA04339 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 17:47:49 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [141.139.155.12] ([141.139.155.12])

by nike.heidelberg.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id UAA15249

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 20:47:29 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 20:47:29 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <l03102800b3fb1b56a32a@[141.139.155.12]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Skip Oliver <soliver@mail.heidelberg.edu>

Subject: Announcement & question

Dear aapornet -

I'm a list newkie, and am uncertain if what follows is an appropriate contribution to the list. I'm sure you'll let me know if it's not.

I have an announcement, and a question: First -

The upcoming meeting of the Ohio Association of Economists and

Political Scientists (Oct. 29-30 in Findlay and Ada) will include a panel on - The Ethics of Political Opinion Polling (8:30 AM, Oct. 30)

We are looking for one or several more panel members to submit (short) papers and take part in a (spirited) discussion on the topic.

If you (or a grad student) would be interested in taking part, please contact Prof. Arnold J. Oliver at Heidelberg College (419-448-2219, or soliver@mail.heidelberg.edu) ASAP.

Now for the question. Does anyone know where I can get information on a particular polling "scandal"? As I understand it, back in the early 70's, a major pollster "cooked" polls for Richard Nixon. I'm not sure if this involved the manipulation of data, numbers, questions, analysis, or all of the above.

Can anyone tell me where I could find more information on this? Your help would be much appreciated.

Thanks, AJ Oliver
Heidelberg College

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Tue Sep 7 18:26:29 1999

Received: from smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.138])

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

id SAA19490 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 18:26:28 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from login3.isis.unc.edu (root@login3.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.133])

by smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.1) with ESMTP id VAA02221

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 21:26:28 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by email.unc.edu id <65629-119392>; Tue, 7 Sep 1999 21:26:18 -0400
Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 21:26:06 -0400 (EDT)
Sender: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login3.isis.unc.edu
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: A "dead heat"
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909071328420.11617-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990907211948.119724B-100000@login3.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Jim is on to something here. I used to do something like it when reporting elections in the 1970s. My method was to lower the confidence level enough so that the error margin was less than the front-runner's lead. Then I'd report that the probability was x percent that the front-runner was really ahead.

IMHO, the odds ratio is too tricky a tool for journalists because it gives misleading estimates when $p > .10$. I catch both social and medical scientists misusing it, too.

=====
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 <http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer>
=====

On Tue, 7 Sep 1999, James Beniger wrote:

> Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 14:33:18 -0700 (PDT)

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

> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

> To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

> Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

>

>

>

>

> In especially a two-candidate race, isn't what we'd most like to learn

> from a poll simply the estimated probability that each candidate would win

> the election? (were it held at the time)

>

> That is, wouldn't we really like to hear the anchor say:

>

> "If the poll were properly conducted, the best unbiased estimate (MLE) of

> the chances of winning the election, were it held during the period when

> the poll was conducted, are x percent for Gore and y percent for

> Bradley or, in other words: Gore would have been, at that time, a x-to-y

> favorite to defeat Bradley."

>

> [here $y = 100 - x$, and the odds ratio would be reduced to its lowest

> common denominator]

>

> One thing I like about this approach is that it directly makes the point

> that the poll results do not rule out the possibility that Bradley might

> actually win the election, but indeed presents--straightforwardly--the
> most current estimated likelihood that that might indeed happen. Isn't
> this the essence of statistics, the science, not of certainty, but of
> uncertainty--or rather the science of being as certain as one can be about

> whatever cannot be known for certain?

>

> I think that most consumers would find it easier to interpret the idea
> that, for example, Bradley was found to have only, say, a 44 percent
> chance of winning the election, or that Gore was found to be the 14-to-11
> favorite to win--much easier than they would find anything involving
> notions of "percent for" mixed in with "margin of error" (just the word
> "error" itself constitutes strong poison to the entire enterprise of
> popular understanding of polls and surveys).

>

> When political experts are interviewed about a forthcoming election, after
> all, they are routinely asked, "What are candidate X's chances of
> winning?"--they are much less often asked "What percentage of the vote do
> you think candidate X will get?"

>

> So why can't polls serve to address the first question directly, without
> bothering to muck around figuring out a popular way to answer the second
> question, one which only pollsters, it seems, ever actually ask?

>

>

> -- Jim

>

> *****

>

>

> On Tue, 7 Sep 1999, Jan Werner wrote:

>

>> The "margin of error" as reported in the media actually has one
>> worthwhile use: It allows one to compute the approximate number of
>> respondents when this is not given in the report. For example, from the
>> reports cited here, I can deduce that the poll in question had fewer
>> than 400 respondents.

>>

>> Other than that, the response of the "cute young anchor" is only
>> marginally less inane than the pretense that the quoted "margin of
>> error" might be an accurate indicator of statistical significance for
>> most political polls.

>>

>> Jan Werner

>> _____

>>

>> ALICE R ROBBIN wrote:

>>>

>>> Yes, and here are the words of the CNN anchor, sent to me by a
colleague:

>>>

>>>>

>>>> All day yesterday one of the anchors on Headline News (CNN) reported
on

>>>> a poll of voters conducted in New Hampshire. 40% of the voters said
they

>>>> would vote for Gore and 36% for Bradley. This "cute young anchor"
said

>>>> "and there is a 5% margin of error, so this really means they are the

>>>> same."

>>>

>>> On Mon, 6 Sep 1999, Albert Biderman wrote:

>>>

>>>> Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary poll result with Gore and Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical dead heat." Drehle in a big feature on Bradley in the Washington Post today uses the same phrase for these figures. Funny how the low statistical power of polls lets journalism make something ("dead heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by making nothing (no difference) out of, more likely than not, something

[p{Bradley<Gore}>p{Gore</=Bradley}]. In the case of Bradley v. Gore;

>>>> In this race at this point, TV and newspapers saying that there is a "dead heat" is a Great Big Something.

>>>>

>>>> Comes a real election, a 4 percent difference between candidates becomes a "decisive victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on this revelation of the mood of the public.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>> *****

- >>> * Alice Robbin *
- >>> * School of Information Studies *
- >>> * Florida State University *
- >>> * 232 Louis Shores Building *
- >>> * Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 *
- >>> * Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 *

>>> * email: arobbin@mailers.fsu.edu *

>>> *****

>>

>

>

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed Sep 8 04:29:26 1999

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 EAA18785 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 04:29:25 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp24.vgernet.net [205.219.186.124])
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id IAA26532
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 08:23:32 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37D648C1.409397C9@jwdp.com>

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 07:30:09 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909071328420.11617-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The odds of winning only represent an objective probability in the case
of pure chance events, such as a balanced roulette wheel, unloaded dice

or a properly shuffled deck of cards.

In such events as horse races, the odds of winning represent a subjective assessment, usually set initially by a handicapper and then adjusted through a pari-mutuel system (or a bookie's gut feelings) to account for the amounts of money placed on the contestants by the betting public.

There are outfits that attempt to use this approach for predicting elections, taking bets on the outcome (Las Vegas and London), or setting up a simulated stock market in candidates' "shares." One could make the argument that this is in fact what most political analysts do anyway.

One problem with this approach is that, even if you believe (as I do) that the responses to election polls are greatly skewed by feelings about who will win, as opposed to whom a respondent actually plans to vote for, it addresses the wrong question, namely "who do you expect to win" rather than "who would you vote for if the election were held today."

If voters were actually required to put their money where their mouth is, this would tend to result in perceived front-runners always winning. This is the type of bias that you see in popularity polls where people are induced to vote on, say, the 10 greatest composers of all time, by prizes awarded to those who come closest to the final results.

Jan Werner

James Beniger wrote:

>

> In especially a two-candidate race, isn't what we'd most like to learn
> from a poll simply the estimated probability that each candidate would win
> the election? (were it held at the time)

>

> That is, wouldn't we really like to hear the anchor say:

>

> "If the poll were properly conducted, the best unbiased estimate (MLE) of
> the chances of winning the election, were it held during the period when
> the poll was conducted, are x percent for Gore and y percent for
> Bradley or, in other words: Gore would have been, at that time, a x-to-y
> favorite to defeat Bradley."

>

> [here $y = 100 - x$, and the odds ratio would be reduced to its lowest
> common denominator]

>

> One thing I like about this approach is that it directly makes the point
> that the poll results do not rule out the possibility that Bradley might
> actually win the election, but indeed presents--straightforwardly--the
> most current estimated likelihood that that might indeed happen. Isn't
> this the essence of statistics, the science, not of certainty, but of
> uncertainty--or rather the science of being as certain as one can be about
> whatever cannot be known for certain?

>

> I think that most consumers would find it easier to interpret the idea
> that, for example, Bradley was found to have only, say, a 44 percent
> chance of winning the election, or that Gore was found to be the 14-to-11

> favorite to win--much easier than they would find anything involving
> notions of "percent for" mixed in with "margin of error" (just the word
> "error" itself constitutes strong poison to the entire enterprise of
> popular understanding of polls and surveys).
>
> When political experts are interviewed about a forthcoming election, after
> all, they are routinely asked, "What are candidate X's chances of
> winning?"--they are much less often asked "What percentage of the vote do
> you think candidate X will get?"
>
> So why can't polls serve to address the first question directly, without
> bothering to muck around figuring out a popular way to answer the second
> question, one which only pollsters, it seems, ever actually ask?

>

> -- Jim

>

> *****

>

> On Tue, 7 Sep 1999, Jan Werner wrote:

>

>> The "margin of error" as reported in the media actually has one
>> worthwhile use: It allows one to compute the approximate number of
>> respondents when this is not given in the report. For example, from the
>> reports cited here, I can deduce that the poll in question had fewer
>> than 400 respondents.

>>

>> Other than that, the response of the "cute young anchor" is only
>> marginally less inane than the pretense that the quoted "margin of
>> error" might be an accurate indicator of statistical significance for

>> most political polls.

>>

>> Jan Werner

>> _____

>>

>> ALICE R ROBBIN wrote:

>>>

>>> Yes, and here are the words of the CNN anchor, sent to me by a colleague:

>>>

>>>>

>>>> All day yesterday one of the anchors on Headline News (CNN) reported on

>>>> a poll of voters conducted in New Hampshire. 40% of the voters said they

>>>> would vote for Gore and 36% for Bradley. This "cute young anchor" said

>>>> "and there is a 5% margin of error, so this really means they are the

>>>> same."

>>>

>>> On Mon, 6 Sep 1999, Albert Biderman wrote:

>>>

>>>> Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary poll result with Gore and Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical dead heat." Drehle in a big feature on Bradley in the Washington Post today uses the same phrase for these figures. Funny how the low statistical power of polls lets journalism make something ("dead heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by making nothing (no difference) out of, more likely than not, something

[p{Bradley<Gore}>p{Gore</=Bradley}}]. In the case of Bradley v. Gore;

>>>> In this race at this point, TV and newspapers saying that there is a "dead heat" is a Great Big Something.

>>>>

>>>> Comes a real election, a 4 percent difference between candidates becomes a "decisive victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on this revelation of the mood of the public.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>> *****

>>> * Alice Robbin *
>>> * School of Information Studies *
>>> * Florida State University *
>>> * 232 Louis Shores Building *
>>> * Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 *
>>> * Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 *
>>> * email: arobbin@mailer.fsu.edu *
>>> *****

>>

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed Sep 8 04:44:39 1999

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 EAA20946 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 04:44:38 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp24.vgernet.net [205.219.186.124])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id IAA27355

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 08:38:46 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37D64C53.CD6A8DF8@jwdp.com>

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 07:45:23 -0400
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Announcement & question
References: <l03102800b3fb1b56a32a@[141.139.155.12]>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Perhaps you are referring to the controversy about whether or not Nixon was able to manipulate the Harris and Gallup polls. For an article on that see the Winter 1995-1996 issue of "Political Science Quarterly" or read it online at <http://www.epn.org/psq/psnixo.html>.

Whatever happened with Nixon, Gallup and Harris, it surely is less egregious than the phony poll results Frank Luntz cooked up to promote the "Contract with America" in 1994 (officially condemned by AAPOR), or the polls conducted by Clinton's pollsters Penn & Schoen that showed his heavy advertising improving his position, while they were secretly collecting a percentage of the ad placement fees (officially ignored by AAPOR).

Jan Werner

Skip Oliver wrote:

> Now for the question. Does anyone know where I can get
information
> on a particular polling "scandal"? As I understand it, back in the early
> 70's, a major pollster "cooked" polls for Richard Nixon. I'm not sure if
> this involved the manipulation of data, numbers, questions, analysis, or
> all of the above.
> Can anyone tell me where I could find more information on this?
> Your help would be much appreciated.

>

> Thanks, AJ Oliver

> Heidelberg

College

>From hoeyd@sunynassau.edu Wed Sep 8 05:50:58 1999

Received: from lib.acs.sunynassau.edu (LIB.ACS.SUNYNASSAU.EDU [198.38.8.2])

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

id FAA01393 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 05:50:57 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu ([198.38.9.253])

by lib.acs.sunynassau.edu with ESMTP for aapornet@usc.edu;

Wed, 8 Sep 1999 8:49:15 -0400

Received: from NCC_VOL2/SpoolDir by nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu (Mercury 1.40);

8 Sep 99 08:55:29 -500

Received: from SpoolDir by NCC_VOL2 (Mercury 1.31); 8 Sep 99 08:55:24 -500

Received: from sunynassau.edu by nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu (Mercury 1.31) with

ESMTP;

8 Sep 99 08:55:18 -500

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 08:48:43 -0400

Sender: DION HOEY <hoeyd@sunynassau.edu>

From: DION HOEY <hoeyd@sunynassau.edu>
To: Skip Oliver <aapornet@usc.edu>
X-EXP32-SerialNo: 00002181
Subject: RE: Announcement & question
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT
X-Mailer: WebMail (Hydra) SMTP v3.50
Message-ID: <130161D4CEF@nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu>

Prof Oliver:

Robert Shapiro, from Columbia University, wrote a book about polling in the Nixon White House. Pretty new, within past two years or so. You may want to try and ask Arthur Finkelstein, who polled for CREEP in 72 - office in Irvington, NY. He rarely gives interviews to reporters, but maybe a question from an academic might get a response.

>===== Original Message From Skip Oliver <aapornet@usc.edu> =====

>Dear aapornet -

>

> I'm a list newkie, and am uncertain if what follows is an

>appropriate contribution to the list. I'm sure you'll let me know if it's

>not.

>

> I have an announcement, and a question: First -

>

>The upcoming meeting of the Ohio Association of Economists and

>Political Scientists (Oct. 29-30 in Findlay and Ada) will include a panel

>on - The Ethics of Political Opinion Polling (8:30 AM, Oct. 30)

>

>We are looking for one or several more panel members to submit

>(short) papers and take part in a (spirited) discussion on the topic.

>

>If you (or a grad student) would be interested in taking part,

>please contact Prof. Arnold J. Oliver at Heidelberg College (419-448-2219,

>or soliver@mail.heidelberg.edu) ASAP.

>

> Now for the question. Does anyone know where I can get information

>on a particular polling "scandal"? As I understand it, back in the early

>70's, a major pollster "cooked" polls for Richard Nixon. I'm not sure if

>this involved the manipulation of data, numbers, questions, analysis, or

>all of the above.

> Can anyone tell me where I could find more information on this?

>Your help would be much appreciated.

>

> Thanks, AJ Oliver

> Heidelberg College

>From cmilstei@isr.umich.edu Wed Sep 8 08:18:13 1999

Received: from runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu
[141.211.144.15])

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

id IAA16951 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 08:18:12 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from s-isr-m1.umich.edu (isr.umich.edu [141.211.207.35])

by runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.8.5/2.3) with ESMTP id LAA16067 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:18:11 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <QZ7MKD6M>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:20:00 -0400

Message-ID: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E02045038@isr.umich.edu>

From: Carol Milstein <cmilstei@isr.umich.edu>

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

Subject: Membership Directory

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:19:55 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

The administrative office is preparing the 1999-2000 Membership Directory.

We expect to send it to the printer on October 4. If there are any
SIGNIFICANT changes in the information you wish printed in the directory,
please let us know before September 24.

Please reply to the AAPOR office directly (aapor@umich.edu), not to
aapornet.

Thanks,

Carol Milstein

AAPOR

>From rys4@columbia.edu Wed Sep 8 08:35:57 1999

Received: from aloha.cc.columbia.edu (cu61174@aloha.cc.columbia.edu

[128.59.59.134])

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

id IAA26641 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 08:35:56 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost by aloha.cc.columbia.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP

id LAA02242

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:35:54 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:35:54 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Robert Y. Shapiro" <rys4@columbia.edu>

Sender: rys4@columbia.edu

To: Skip Oliver <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Announcement & question--a correction...

In-Reply-To: <130161D4CEF@nov1.acs.sunynassau.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909081129100.26065-100000@aloha.cc.columbia.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

A quick correction: Larry Jacobs and I (R. Shapiro) also wrote an article on Nixon and presidential polling in the Summer 1995 Public Opinion Quarterly. We (nor I) did not write a full book on the Nixon White House, as suggested below.

Bob Shapiro

Columbia Univ. rys3@columbia.edu

On Wed, 8 Sep 1999, DION HOEY wrote:

> Prof Oliver:

>

> Robert Shapiro, from Columbia University, wrote a book about polling in

the

> Nixon White House. Pretty new, within past two years or so. You may want

to

> try and ask Arthur Finkelstein, who polled for CREEP in 72 - office in

> Irvington, NY. He rarely gives interviews to reporters, but maybe a

question

> from an academic might get a response.

>

>

> >===== Original Message From Skip Oliver <aapornet@usc.edu> =====

> >Dear aapornet -

> >

> > I'm a list newkie, and am uncertain if what follows is an

> >appropriate contribution to the list. I'm sure you'll let me know if

it's

> >not.

> >

> > I have an announcement, and a question: First -

> >

> >The upcoming meeting of the Ohio Association of Economists and

> >Political Scientists (Oct. 29-30 in Findlay and Ada) will include a panel

> >on - The Ethics of Political Opinion Polling (8:30 AM, Oct. 30)

> >

> >We are looking for one or several more panel members to submit

> >(short) papers and take part in a (spirited) discussion on the topic.

> >

> >If you (or a grad student) would be interested in taking part,

> >please contact Prof. Arnold J. Oliver at Heidelberg College

(419-448-2219,

>>or soliver@mail.heidelberg.edu) ASAP.

>>

>> Now for the question. Does anyone know where I can get information

>>on a particular polling "scandal"? As I understand it, back in the early

>>70's, a major pollster "cooked" polls for Richard Nixon. I'm not sure if

>>this involved the manipulation of data, numbers, questions, analysis, or

>>all of the above.

>> Can anyone tell me where I could find more information on this?

>>Your help would be much appreciated.

>>

>> Thanks, AJ Oliver

>> Heidelberg College

>

>From JAM@moviefone.com Wed Sep 8 08:36:59 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id IAA27351 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 08:36:57 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 08 Sep 1999 11:32:07 -0400

Message-Id: <s7d64937.035@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 11:31:57 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Membership Directory

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I rejoined AAPOR at the Conference in Florida. Any chance I could receive =
a copy of the 1998-99 directory?

Jay Mattlin

>>> Carol Milstein <cmilstei@isr.umich.edu> 09/08/99 11:19AM >>>

The administrative office is preparing the 1999-2000 Membership Directory.

We expect to send it to the printer on October 4. If there are any

SIGNIFICANT changes in the information you wish printed in the directory,

please let us know before September 24.

Please reply to the AAPOR office directly (aapor@umich.edu), not to

aapornet. =20

Thanks,

Carol Milstein

AAPOR

>From JAM@moviefone.com Wed Sep 8 08:43:42 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id IAA01151 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 08:43:41 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 08 Sep 1999 11:38:52 -0400

Message-Id: <s7d64acc.058@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 11:38:27 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Membership Directory

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Yikes! I apologize for broadcasting the last request to everyone on =

AAPORnet. I thought that it would go to Carol alone. =20

My mistake.

Jay Mattlin

>>> Carol Milstein <cmilstei@isr.umich.edu> 09/08/99 11:19AM >>>

The administrative office is preparing the 1999-2000 Membership Directory.

We expect to send it to the printer on October 4. If there are any

SIGNIFICANT changes in the information you wish printed in the directory,

please let us know before September 24.

Please reply to the AAPOR office directly (aapor@umich.edu), not to

aapornet. =20

Thanks,

Carol Milstein

AAPOR

>From kneuman@cra.ca Wed Sep 8 09:00:52 1999

Received: from cclgroup.ca ([142.176.86.2])

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

id JAA10193 for <AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 09:00:51 -0700

(PDT)

Message-id: <fc.000f7cf7001cdc34000f7cf7001cdc34.1cdc57@cclgroup.ca>

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 13:07:47 -0300

Subject: Information on Demographic Trends and Youth

To: AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU

From: kneuman@cra.ca (Keith Neuman)

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I am posting the following information request on behalf of a colleague:

I would appreciate hearing from anyone who may have knowledge of, or information on, demographic and economic trends that will have impacts on youth

(ages 13-24) over the coming twenty years.

Specifically, is anyone aware of models for/examples of forecasting effects of

population aging and economic change on young people, their families and

communities? Of particular interest are trends in education, employment,
rural
to urban migration, child and youth poverty, and social support.

Any information you provide will assist with a project that is examining the
opportunities and challenges faced by youth in the coming decades. The
broad
conceptual framework for this project is population health and the goal is
to
identify key policy issues in order to begin planning for the needs of youth
in
the future.

Thanks in advance for your assistance.

>From rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu Wed Sep 8 09:07:15 1999

Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])

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

id JAA13519 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 09:07:14 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [128.104.50.187] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu

id LAA43872 (8.9.1/50); Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:07:12 -0500

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Message-Id: <v04011702b3fc385b6197@[128.104.50.187]>

In-Reply-To: <v04011702b3f5b81816cf@[128.104.48.99]>

References: <s7c2c475.012@acpgate.acp.org>

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:07:04 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@students.wisc.edu>

Subject: The Polling Report, a bimonthly public opinion monitor

PollingReport.com

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

Provided by The Polling Report, a bimonthly public opinion monitor, this new site offers very frequently updated polling results and data. Updated whenever a new poll is released, the site provides a daily glimpse into public opinion trends. Users may select from polls grouped in three categories (Politics and Policy, Business/ Economy, or The American Scene), browse the most recent additions, or choose from selected polls featured on the main page. Current selections focus on the impeachment trial, the State of the Union Address, and the 2000 presidential election. Additional resources include a collection of articles on public opinion and survey research from The Polling Report and an internal search engine. [MD]

>From the Scout Report, Copyright Internet Scout Project 1994-1999.

<http://scout.cs.wisc.edu/>

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Wed Sep 8 09:13:01 1999

Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.74])

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

id JAA16440 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 09:13:00 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-2ive4c3.dialup.mindspring.com [165.247.17.131])

by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id MAA03940

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 12:13:10 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.1.19990908121414.00bf6550@pop.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 12:17:16 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>

Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.96.990907174336.12881F-100000@troll>

References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909071328420.11617-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I think Jim's idea is terrific. I don't understand Andy Beveridge's objection.

Jim's language is sure better than the "dead heat" language. Is there anyone who would take an even money bet on the trailing candidate? If so, let me know.

warren mitofsky

At 05:45 PM 9/7/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear All:

>

>>

>> In especially a two-candidate race, isn't what we'd most like to learn

>> from a poll simply the estimated probability that each candidate would win

>> the election? (were it held at the time)

>

>This sounds an awful lot like the weatherman saying that the chance of

>rain tomorrow is 70%.

>

>Are these the standards to which we want to aspire?

>

>Andy Beveridge

Mitofsky International

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From mdowling@ccbc.education.wisc.edu Wed Sep 8 09:52:16 1999

Received: from mail1.doit.wisc.edu (mail1.doit.wisc.edu [144.92.9.40])

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

id JAA10433 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 09:52:14 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [144.92.88.152] by mail1.doit.wisc.edu

id LAA54310 (8.9.1/50); Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:52:13 -0500

Message-Id: <3.0.2.32.19990908115217.006a10b0@ccbc.education.wisc.edu>

X-Sender: mdowling@ccbc.education.wisc.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.2 (32)

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 11:52:17 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Maritza Dowling <mdowling@ccbc.education.wisc.edu>

Subject: On line focus groups

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

I would greatly appreciate hearing from anyone who may have done some research using on-line focus groups.

There seems to be very little in the literature about this topic. Could anyone suggest where I can find information?

Thanks for your help!

M. Dowling

>From nancybelden@brspoll.com Wed Sep 8 09:53:55 1999

Received: from dbls.com ([209.8.216.50])

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

id JAA11345 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 09:53:50 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by dbls.com from localhost

(router,SLMail V3.1); Wed, 08 Sep 1999 12:58:38 -0400

Received: by dbls.com from amy [168.143.15.163]

(SLmail 3.1.2948 (Release Build)); Wed, 08 Sep 1999 12:58:35 -0400

Message-ID: <000f01befa16\$8b153540\$a30f8fa8@brspoll.clark.net>

From: "Nancy Belden" <nancybelden@brspoll.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Membership Directory

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 12:23:50 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Carol -- Please just double check that my email address got changed to the correct one -- nancybelden@brspoll.com

Thanks. -- Nancy

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

From: Carol Milstein <cmilstei@isr.umich.edu>

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

Date: Wednesday, September 08, 1999 11:23 AM

Subject: Membership Directory

>The administrative office is preparing the 1999-2000 Membership Directory.

>We expect to send it to the printer on October 4. If there are any

>SIGNIFICANT changes in the information you wish printed in the directory,

>please let us know before September 24.

>

>Please reply to the AAPOR office directly (aapor@umich.edu), not to

>aapornet.

>

>Thanks,

>

>Carol Milstein

>AAPOR

>From nancybelden@brspoll.com Wed Sep 8 09:56:42 1999

Received: from dbls.com ([209.8.216.50])

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

id JAA12563 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 09:56:37 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by dbls.com from localhost

(router,SLMail V3.1); Wed, 08 Sep 1999 13:01:35 -0400

Received: by dbls.com from amy [168.143.15.163]

(SLmail 3.1.2948 (Release Build)); Wed, 08 Sep 1999 13:01:32 -0400

Message-ID: <002301befa16\$456b420\$a30f8fa8@brspoll.clark.net>

From: "Nancy Belden" <nancybelden@brspoll.com>

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

Subject: sorry too

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 12:26:47 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----=_NextPart_000_0020_01BEF9F5.6B56B1A0"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0020_01BEF9F5.6B56B1A0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Sorry -- I just make the same mistake too -- but now anyone who wants =
it has my correct email address! -- Nancy Belden

-----=_NextPart_000_0020_01BEF9F5.6B56B1A0

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 4.72.3110.7"" name=3DGENERATOR>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

<DIV>Sorry -- I just make the same =
mistake too=20

-- but now anyone who wants it has my correct email address! -- =

Nancy=20

Belden</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0020_01BEF9F5.6B56B1A0--

>From JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu Wed Sep 8 10:40:20 1999

Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])

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

id KAA06093 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 10:40:19 -0700

(PDT)

From: JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu

Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

id <S3RS3JG0>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 10:40:55 -0700

Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213F8C31E@psg.ucsf.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Cc: DBinson@psg.ucsf.edu, LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu

Subject: RE: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone surveys

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 10:40:53 -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"

Joel, our experinece in using one of these target samples for pilot purposes was not good...I suggest you talk with Diane Binson here at CAPS....there are other techniques, one being dual frame sampling, that will improve the hit rates, as well as geo-based sampling, which is what we did on the GUMS study, that targets geograpic areas with higher hit rates....stay away from the cheapo methods, the will not produce good quality scientific samples...the are mostly for commercial uses. Joe

> -----

> From: Joel Moskowitz

> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Sent: Tuesday, September 7, 1999 5:07 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone surveys

>

> We need some help on a feasibility study in which we are developing

> recommendations for how to increase racial/ethnic minority samples in

> CDC's

> state-based Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS). The

> minority groups of primary interest include African Americans,

> Vietnamese,

> Chinese, Koreans, and Filipinos residing in California. The first set

> of

> issues we're addressing deals with sampling.

>

> In order to identify more efficient sampling methods than RDD (or

> list-assisted RDD), we have been investigating targeted minority RDD

> samples such as those developed by Survey Sampling, Inc. (SSI). Their

> methodology is summarized on their Web site --

> [http://www.ssisamples.com/ssi.x2o\\$ssi_gen.search_item?id=60](http://www.ssisamples.com/ssi.x2o$ssi_gen.search_item?id=60)

>

> We have some questions regarding this methodology and would greatly

> appreciate help. Also, we would be interested in references for

> papers

> that pertain to these issues.

>

> In constructing their hierarchy of telephone exchanges, are the

> assumptions

> that SSI make reasonable ones? For example, they seem to be making

> assumptions about the stability of the population (as they're probably

> using 1990 Census data or projections), and the geographic

- > distribution of
- > listed numbers as compared to unlisted numbers. What sample bias is
- > one
- > likely to encounter by employing a targeted-RDD sample?
- >
- > Would it be feasible and efficient to adapt this methodology for
- > targeting
- > specific API subgroups? How geographically concentrated would these
- > groups
- > have to be to make this worthwhile and how much of the overall
- > subgroup
- > population must they constitute? If one wants sizable numbers for all
- > of
- > the groups mentioned, would it suffice to use the SSI Asian targeted
- > sample rather than generate targeted samples for each specific
- > subgroup?
- >
- > Could we take survey data from a targeted RDD survey and combine it
- > with a
- > conventional RDD survey? If so, how would one compute the overall
- > sampling
- > weights and standard errors? In this dual-frame approach, we would
- > have to
- > weight down substantially the targeted sample which consists of
- > sections of
- > the state with high concentrations of the target groups. Thus, would
- > there
- > be any real advantage to pooling data from the two samples? Given
- > this and

> what would happen to the survey design effect is there any point to
> conducting a targetted RDD survey?
>
> Would the targeted portion of the survey need to sample from all
> levels of
> the target population; e.g., from exchanges with low, medium and high
> percent Asian? How would one estimate the optimal sample size to be
> obtained from each level? How would one compute sample weights? What
> impact would this have on the overall design effect?
>
> Other sampling firms (e.g., Genesys) also produce targeted-minority
> RDD
> samples. Are their targeted samples any better than SSI's? Genesys
> has
> provided extensive documentation on their methodology. They suggest
> that
> one should not employ targeted samples for research purposes because
> these
> are not true probability samples as the "measures of size" used to
> generate
> these samples are crude estimates. If this is true, is there a
> methodology
> available for constructing targeted minority RDD samples that generate
> true probability samples?
>
> We have seen an estimate that 67% of telephone households in
> California are
> not listed in telephone directories. Given such a high unlisted rate,
> is

> there any reason to consider surname-list-driven samples for
> conducting
> population-based surveys of API groups with unique surnames? If so,
> is
> there any way to combine estimates from a list-driven survey with the
> statewide BRFSS RDD survey? How would one compute the overall
> standard
> errors and sampling weights?
>
> Given all of the problems we've alluded to above with targeted
> samples,
> might it be wiser to recommend not trying to conduct state-wide
> surveys of
> small minority groups (i.e., < 8% of the overall population)? Rather,
> might
> it make more sense to conduct conventional RDD surveys in selected
> counties
> that contain high concentrations of the minority populations of
> interest?
>
> I apologize for this laundry list of questions and would greatly
> appreciate
> advice pertaining to any subset.
>
> =====
> Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.
> Co-Director
> Center for Family and Community Health
> School of Public Health

> University of California, Berkeley
> 140 Warren Hall
> Berkeley, CA 94720-7360
>
> Phone: 510-643-7314
> Fax: 510-643-7316
> E-mail: jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu
> WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>
> =====
>
>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Sep 8 11:08:15 1999
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA26078 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:08:14 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA20413 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:08:13 -0700
(PDT)

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:08:13 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Broadcast of Exit Poll Banned
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909081100550.15734-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright 1999 Agence France Presse

September 08, 1999 13:08 GMT

International news

India's Supreme Court bans TV broadcast of exit poll

NEW DELHI, Sept 8 -- India's Supreme Court on Wednesday stopped a private television network from broadcasting an exit poll conducted during the first phase of the country's national elections.

The independent Election Commission in a petition urged the court to enforce a ban on exit and opinion polls during the staggered elections which began September 5 and end October 3.

"We direct that the telecast of the opinion/exit poll on Jain Satellite Channel shall be deferred until further orders," the court ruling said.

Owner J.K. Jain told the court that his channel had already broadcast results of the exit poll in its news bulletins Wednesday morning.

"What is already done cannot be undone," the court responded. "But take notice that you will defer the telecast of the detailed exit poll slated for tonight."

The ruling Hindu nationalist-led coalition has opposed the Election Commission's (EC) ban, saying it impinged on freedom of expression and information.

Copyright 1999 Agence France Presse

>From kneuman@cra.ca Wed Sep 8 11:12:36 1999

Received: from cclgroup.ca ([142.176.86.2])

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

id LAA28583 for <AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:12:33 -0700

(PDT)

Message-id: <fc.000f7cf7001cdfef000f7cf7001cdfef.1ce00f@cclgroup.ca>

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 15:19:57 -0300

Subject: Information on Demographic Trends and Youth

To: AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU

From: kneuman@cra.ca (Keith Neuman)

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Following up on my request for information and Jeffrey Moore's suggestion,
here's my name and e-mail for any replies:

Keith Neuman

kneuman@cra.ca

>From scottb@vms.cis.pitt.edu Wed Sep 8 11:20:49 1999

Received: from post-ofc04.srv.cis.pitt.edu (root@post-ofc04.srv.cis.pitt.edu
[136.142.185.11])

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

id LAA05784 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:20:47 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from beach.ucsur.pitt.edu (beach.ucsur.pitt.edu [136.142.121.52])

by post-ofc04.srv.cis.pitt.edu with SMTP
(8.8.8/8.8.8/cispo-7.2.2.2)

ID <OAA26233@post-ofc04.srv.cis.pitt.edu> for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Wed, 8 Sep 1999 14:18:58 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by localhost with Microsoft MAPI; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 14:24:20 -0400

Message-ID: <01BEFA05.D768C260.scottb@vms.cis.pitt.edu>

From: Scott Beach <scottb@vms.cis.pitt.edu>

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

Subject: Survey research position at The University of Pittsburgh

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 14:24:19 -0400

X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet E-mail/MAPI - 8.0.0.4211

The following is a re-posting of a job announcement from about three weeks

ago. We felt that mid-August being prime vacation time, some people may not have seen it the first time.

JOB ANNOUNCEMENT

The University Center for Social and Urban Research (UCSUR) at the University of Pittsburgh has a position available beginning in September, 1999. UCSUR specializes in the design and implementation of surveys in cooperation with University faculty from many schools and departments.

Job Title: Survey Specialist -- A regular full-time staff position supported by University and external contract funding with full University benefits.

Duties and Responsibilities: Manage telephone (CATI) survey operations. Work with various research project teams to develop questionnaires, sampling, field and data processing procedures. Manage field staff, hire and train field supervisors and interviewers. Develop and produce interviewer training guides, codebooks, coding guides and survey fieldwork reports. Incumbent is responsible for oversight of day-to-day survey field operations that include maintenance of UCSUR survey facilities, writing system programs and scripts for the CATI system(CI3), and managing the resultant data files. Maintain effective communications with Center personnel and with collaborators in other departments in the

University. Develop and implement quality assurance procedures, ensuring overall adherence to scientific protocols and ethical conduct. Assist in the preparation of reports and publications and perform related duties as assigned.

Qualifications: Experience in managing day-to-day activities of ongoing survey research projects utilizing telephone, mail and face-to-face methods. Experience in working closely with faculty and staff from a variety of substantive and technical fields (epidemiologists, survey methodologists, statisticians). Strong background in the use of personal computers and proficiency with CATI systems required. Experience should include managing survey research projects focusing on social/health related issues. Must have strong data management skills. Must be able to learn quickly and work efficiently and creatively. Occasional evening and weekend hours required. Bachelor's degree in the social sciences with emphasis on survey research, computer science, or a related field is required. An advanced degree is preferred. A combination of education and equivalent experience may be substituted.

The successful candidate will have strong personnel management skills, good interpersonal skills, the ability to work independently, extensive knowledge of survey research methods, computer skills, statistical packages, spreadsheets, word processing, and CATI packages), excellent written and oral communication skills, and the ability to work as a team member on large, complex survey research projects.

The University of Pittsburgh offers a competitive salary and

excellent benefits. The University of Pittsburgh is an equal opportunity employer.

Interested candidates should submit a resume and professional references to:

Mr. Steven D. Manners, Assistant Director
University Center For Social and Urban Research
121 University Place
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
Phone: 412-624-3889 Fax: 412-624-4810
EMAIL: manners+@pitt.edu

>From kneuman@cra.ca Wed Sep 8 11:22:01 1999

Received: from cclgroup.ca ([142.176.86.2])

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

id LAA06490 for <AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 11:21:40 -0700

(PDT)

Message-id: <fc.000f7cf7001ce02e000f7cf7001ce02e.1ce070@cclgroup.ca>

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 15:29:03 -0300

Subject: Advocacy Polling

To: AAPORNET@VM.USC.EDU

From: kneuman@cra.ca (Keith Neuman)

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I am looking for viewpoints from fellow AAPORITES about a particular type of

advocacy polling. A client here in Canada recently asked about conducting a nation-wide survey on a current and somewhat controversial topic. The survey would have included a handful of standard opinion questions but then end with an offer to connect the respondent directly to his or her federal legislator's office so that they could express their views on the topic directly.

I am curious to know how commonly this type of activity takes place in the U.S. and how AAPOR would categorize it.

Keith Neuman
kneuman@cra.ca

>From bthompson@directionrsch.com Wed Sep 8 12:12:35 1999
Received: from proxy.directionrsch.com (root@dri74.directionrsch.com [206.112.196.74])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA09644 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 12:12:32 -0700
(PDT)
Received: from drione.directionrsch.com (drione.directionrsch.com [100.0.0.4])
by proxy.directionrsch.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id OAA20117
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 14:35:13 -0400
Received: by drione.directionrsch.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.3 (733.2 10-16-1998)) id 852567E6.0065E841 ; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 14:33:05 -0400
X-Lotus-FromDomain: DRI

From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <852567E6.0065E666.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 14:33:00 -0400

Subject: Re: Advocacy Polling

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

Having been a political pollster, I can say that you can find field and phone centers that make these kinds of advocacy calls in the US, but most reputable businesses either do not mix their polling and advocacy phone centers' work or only do one or the other. It can come back to haunt you even if what you are doing is legal.

As for a reputable political pollster, they might be asked to consult on some questions or topics by their clients based on their political knowledge, but from what I've seen, they won't field it themselves. That again is a "political" no-no.

>From vector@sympatico.ca Wed Sep 8 12:51:43 1999

Received: from smtp13.bellglobal.com (smtp13.bellglobal.com
[204.101.251.52])

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

id MAA04130 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 12:51:41 -0700
(PDT)

Received: from m-zwelling (ppp8400.on.bellglobal.com [207.236.124.64])

by smtp13.bellglobal.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id PAA10097

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 15:53:32 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37D6BD69.1255@sympatico.ca>

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 15:47:53 -0400

From: Marc Zwelling <vector@sympatico.ca>

Reply-To: vector@sympatico.ca

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-SYMPA (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Advocacy Polling - Keith Neuman

References: <fc.000f7cf7001ce02e000f7cf7001ce02e.1ce070@cclgroup.ca>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Isn't this what AAPOR (and PMRS in Canada) have worked to tirelessly to

halt -- blurring the line between treating our most valuable resource --

the public -- as fodder for the PR, marketing, and special-interest

business? Let the two camps remain distinct please - Marc

Zwelling/Vector Research + Development Inc.

Keith Neuman wrote:

>

> I am looking for viewpoints from fellow AAPORITES about a particular type

of

> advocacy polling. A client here in Canada recently asked about conducting

a

> nation-wide survey on a current and somewhat controversial topic. The survey

> would have included a handful of standard opinion questions but then end with

> an offer to connect the respondent directly to his or her federal legislator's

> office so that they could express their views on the topic directly.

>

> I am curious to know how commonly this type of activity takes place in the U.S.

> and how AAPOR would categorize it.

>

> Keith Neuman

> kneuman@cra.ca

>From mkshares@mcs.net Wed Sep 8 13:22:28 1999

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com [192.160.127.90])

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

id NAA22681 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 13:22:26 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mcs.net (P63-Chi-Dial-6.pool.mcs.net [205.253.225.127]) by

Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.7/8.8.2) with ESMTP id PAA03031 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Wed, 8 Sep 1999 15:22:17 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <37D67F1F.12887ACE@mcs.net>

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 15:22:12 +0000

From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

References: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990907211948.119724B-100000@login3.isis.unc.edu>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";

x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The poll discussed here was a KRC poll for the Boston Globe and WBZ-TV conducted August 27-31 of 800 respondents.

Both the GOP and Dem primary trial heats were covered which should mean about 400 for each (consistent with Jan's estimate based on the +/- 5% error margin.) Respondents were described as "Republican primary voters" and "Democratic primary voters".

Results: Gore 40%, Bradley 36%, undecided 24%.

So what are the odds of a Gore win and the odds of a Bradley win? Warren? Phil? Jim? I am not disagreeing with your comments. But I would like to know how you calculate the odds.

Or would Type I/Type II error calculation be more appropriate, if not for a news audience, but statistically more appropriate? In this case, what is the Type II error when accepting the null hypotheses and calling this a "statistical dead heat" when, in fact, Gore could actually be out in front?

On another issue, what is the expression of choice out there when describing a difference which is not significant such as this. Statistical dead heat? Statistical tie? Too close to call? Or what?

As background, In earlier New Hampshire polls, Gore led by 12 points (June, Boston Herald/WCVB) and by 17 points (August 15-17, "New Hampshire Poll"). In a WNDS-TV poll after the KRC poll, he led by 7 points.

Philip Meyer wrote:

- > Jim is on to something here. I used to do something like it when
- > reporting elections in the 1970s. My method was to lower the confidence
- > level enough so that the error margin was less than the front-runner's
- > lead. Then I'd report that the probability was x percent that the
- > front-runner was really ahead.
- > IMHO, the odds ratio is too tricky a tool for journalists because it
- > gives misleading estimates when $p > .10$. I catch both social and medical
- > scientists misusing it, too.
- >
- > =====
- > Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
- > CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
- > University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
- > Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 <http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer>
- > =====
- >
- > On Tue, 7 Sep 1999, James Beniger wrote:
- >

>> Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 14:33:18 -0700 (PDT)

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

>> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

>> To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

>> Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> In especially a two-candidate race, isn't what we'd most like to learn

>> from a poll simply the estimated probability that each candidate would
win

>> the election? (were it held at the time)

>>

>> That is, wouldn't we really like to hear the anchor say:

>>

>> "If the poll were properly conducted, the best unbiased estimate (MLE)
of

>> the chances of winning the election, were it held during the period when

>> the poll was conducted, are x percent for Gore and y percent for

>> Bradley or, in other words: Gore would have been, at that time, a

x-to-y

>> favorite to defeat Bradley."

>>

>> [here $y = 100 - x$, and the odds ratio would be reduced to its lowest

>> common denominator]

>>

>> One thing I like about this approach is that it directly makes the point

>> that the poll results do not rule out the possibility that Bradley might

>> actually win the election, but indeed presents--straightforwardly--the
>> most current estimated likelihood that that might indeed happen. Isn't
>> this the essence of statistics, the science, not of certainty, but of
>> uncertainty--or rather the science of being as certain as one can be
about
>> whatever cannot be known for certain?
>>
>> I think that most consumers would find it easier to interpret the idea
>> that, for example, Bradley was found to have only, say, a 44 percent
>> chance of winning the election, or that Gore was found to be the
14-to-11
>> favorite to win--much easier than they would find anything involving
>> notions of "percent for" mixed in with "margin of error" (just the word
>> "error" itself constitutes strong poison to the entire enterprise of
>> popular understanding of polls and surveys).
>>
>> When political experts are interviewed about a forthcoming election,
after
>> all, they are routinely asked, "What are candidate X's chances of
>> winning?"--they are much less often asked "What percentage of the vote
do
>> you think candidate X will get?"
>>
>> So why can't polls serve to address the first question directly, without
>> bothering to muck around figuring out a popular way to answer the second
>> question, one which only pollsters, it seems, ever actually ask?
>>
>>
>>

-- Jim

>>

>> *****

>>

>>

>> On Tue, 7 Sep 1999, Jan Werner wrote:

>>

>>> The "margin of error" as reported in the media actually has one
>>> worthwhile use: It allows one to compute the approximate number of
>>> respondents when this is not given in the report. For example, from
the
>>> reports cited here, I can deduce that the poll in question had fewer
>>> than 400 respondents.

>>>

>>> Other than that, the response of the "cute young anchor" is only
>>> marginally less inane than the pretense that the quoted "margin of
>>> error" might be an accurate indicator of statistical significance for
>>> most political polls.

>>>

>>> Jan Werner

>>> _____

>>>

>>> ALICE R ROBBIN wrote:

>>>>

>>>> Yes, and here are the words of the CNN anchor, sent to me by a
colleague:

>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> All day yesterday one of the anchors on Headline News (CNN)
reported on

>>>> a poll of voters conducted in New Hampshire. 40% of the voters
said they

>>>> would vote for Gore and 36% for Bradley. This "cute young anchor"
said

>>>> "and there is a 5% margin of error, so this really means they are
the

>>>> same."

>>>>

>>>> On Mon, 6 Sep 1999, Albert Biderman wrote:

>>>>

>>>> Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary poll result with
Gore and Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical dead heat." Drehle in a big
feature on Bradley in the Washington Post today uses the same phrase for
these figures. Funny how the low statistical power of polls lets journalism
make something ("dead heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by making nothing
(no difference) out of, more likely than not, something

[p{Bradley<Gore}>p(Gore</=Bradley)]. In the case of Bradley v. Gore;

>>>> In this race at this point, TV and newspapers saying that there is
a "dead heat" is a Great Big Something.

>>>>

>>>> Comes a real election, a 4 percent difference between candidates
becomes a "decisive victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on this
revelation of the mood of the public.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> *****

>>>> * Alice Robbin *

>>>> * School of Information Studies *

>>>> * Florida State University *

>>>> * 232 Louis Shores Building *

>>>> * Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 *

>>>> * Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 *

>>>> * email: arobbin@mailers.fsu.edu *

>>>> *****

>>>

>>

>>

>>

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Wed Sep 8 17:08:17 1999

Received: from rothko.bestweb.net (rothko.bestweb.net [209.94.100.160])

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

id RAA24316 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 17:08:14 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (isdn-10.tuckahoe.bestweb.net

[209.94.107.219])

by rothko.bestweb.net (8.9.1a/8.9.0) with ESMTP id UAA09633;

Wed, 8 Sep 1999 20:08:02 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37D6FA31.D7A11E19@troll.soc.qc.edu>

Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 20:07:13 -0400

From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win95; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

References: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909071328420.11617-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

<4.1.19990908121414.00bf6550@pop.mindspring.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>

> I think Jim's idea is terrific. I don't understand Andy Beveridge's objection.

> Jim's language is sure better than the "dead heat" language. Is there anyone

> who would take an even money bet on the trailing candidate? If so, let me know.

> warren mitofsky

>

This actually is a serious Bayesian problem. Will it rain tomorrow?

The answer,

is yes or no. The weathermen now tell us that it is likely to rain with various

degrees of certainty. But that is a prior probability. The posterior probability

is either one or zero. For pollsters to say that say Bradley has a 5 or 10% chance

of winning is not really that meaningful. That was what I was saying.

However,

if at this point in time he is within striking distance, and the undecided in

New Hampshire is 24% then that is very interesting. I think the margin

of

error approach is just fine.

I don't think we need a pollster to tell which way the wind blows or whether it is blowing at all or what chance it is that it will blow.

Andy

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Wed Sep 8 19:20:03 1999

Received: from smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.138])

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

id TAA07799 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 19:20:02 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from login6.isis.unc.edu (root@login6.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.136])

by smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.1) with ESMTP id WAA04027

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 22:20:01 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by email.unc.edu id <9230-172022>; Wed, 8 Sep 1999 22:19:53 -0400

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 22:19:42 -0400 (EDT)

Sender: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>

From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>

X-Sender: pmeyer@login6.isis.unc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

In-Reply-To: <37D67F1F.12887ACE@mcs.net>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990908214316.114422A-100000@login6.isis.unc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Jim's way might be better, but at least I can claim the virtue of

simplicity. If the sample of 400 is showing a 40-36 lead for Gore, then you need a 2 percent error margin to declare Gore at least even at 38-38.

Solve for z by taking 2E times the square root of N (this is derived from the standard pq/N formula for sampling error. You get $z = .80$, and the corresponding area to the left of that point on the curve is a tad more than 78 percent of the total.

We only care about one side because error on the other end would put Gore even further ahead.

Therefore we are 78 percent confident that Gore is leading Bradley. The people who call it a "dead heat" are really saying that they are not 95 percent confident, which is, of course, an arbitrary standard. And they probably haven't thought to use a one-tailed test.

Please check me on this, gang. I was pretty sure of myself when I used this method of dealing with close races in 1972, but I never noticed any imitators.

=====

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085

CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549

University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425

Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 <http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer>

=====

On Wed, 8 Sep 1999, Nick Panagakis wrote:

> Date: Wed, 08 Sep 1999 15:22:12 +0000

> From: Nick Panagakis <mkshares@mcs.net>

> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

>

>

> The poll discussed here was a KRC poll for the Boston Globe and WBZ-TV conducted August 27-31 of 800 respondents.

>

> Both the GOP and Dem primary trial heats were covered which should mean about 400 for each (consistent with Jan's estimate based on the +/- 5% error margin.) Respondents were described as "Republican primary voters" and "Democratic primary voters".

>

> Results: Gore 40%, Bradley 36%, undecided 24%.

>

> So what are the odds of a Gore win and the odds of a Bradley win? Warren? Phil? Jim? I am not disagreeing with your comments. But I would like to know how you calculate the odds.

>

> Or would Type I/Type II error calculation be more appropriate, if not for a news audience, but statistically more appropriate? In this case, what is the Type II error when accepting the null hypotheses and calling this a "statistical dead heat" when, in fact, Gore could actually be out in front?

>

> On another issue, what is the expression of choice out there when describing a difference which is not significant such as this. Statistical dead heat? Statistical tie? Too close to call? Or what?

>

> As background, In earlier New Hampshire polls, Gore led by 12 points

(June, Boston Herald/WCVB) and by 17 points (August 15-17, "New Hampshire Poll"). In a WNDS-TV poll after the KRC poll, he led by 7 points.

>

>

> Philip Meyer wrote:

>

>> Jim is on to something here. I used to do something like it when

>> reporting elections in the 1970s. My method was to lower the confidence

>> level enough so that the error margin was less than the front-runner's

>> lead. Then I'd report that the probability was x percent that the

>> front-runner was really ahead.

>> IMHO, the odds ratio is too tricky a tool for journalists because it

>> gives misleading estimates when $p > .10$. I catch both social and medical

>> scientists misusing it, too.

>>

>> =====

>> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085

>> CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549

>> University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425

>> Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 <http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer>

>> =====

>>

>> On Tue, 7 Sep 1999, James Beniger wrote:

>>

>>> Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 14:33:18 -0700 (PDT)

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

>>> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

>>> To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

>>> Subject: Re: A "dead heat"

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> In especially a two-candidate race, isn't what we'd most like to learn
>>> from a poll simply the estimated probability that each candidate would
win

>>> the election? (were it held at the time)

>>>

>>> That is, wouldn't we really like to hear the anchor say:

>>>

>>> "If the poll were properly conducted, the best unbiased estimate (MLE)
of

>>> the chances of winning the election, were it held during the period
when

>>> the poll was conducted, are x percent for Gore and y percent for

>>> Bradley or, in other words: Gore would have been, at that time, a

x-to-y

>>> favorite to defeat Bradley."

>>>

>>> [here $y = 100 - x$, and the odds ratio would be reduced to its lowest

>>> common denominator]

>>>

>>> One thing I like about this approach is that it directly makes the
point

>>> that the poll results do not rule out the possibility that Bradley
might

>>> actually win the election, but indeed presents--straightforwardly--the

>>> most current estimated likelihood that that might indeed happen.

Isn't

>>> this the essence of statistics, the science, not of certainty, but of
>>> uncertainty--or rather the science of being as certain as one can be
about

>>> whatever cannot be known for certain?

>>>

>>> I think that most consumers would find it easier to interpret the idea
>>> that, for example, Bradley was found to have only, say, a 44 percent
>>> chance of winning the election, or that Gore was found to be the
14-to-11

>>> favorite to win--much easier than they would find anything involving
>>> notions of "percent for" mixed in with "margin of error" (just the
word

>>> "error" itself constitutes strong poison to the entire enterprise of
>>> popular understanding of polls and surveys).

>>>

>>> When political experts are interviewed about a forthcoming election,
after

>>> all, they are routinely asked, "What are candidate X's chances of
>>> winning?"--they are much less often asked "What percentage of the vote
do

>>> you think candidate X will get?"

>>>

>>> So why can't polls serve to address the first question directly,
without

>>> bothering to muck around figuring out a popular way to answer the
second

>>> question, one which only pollsters, it seems, ever actually ask?

>>>

>>>

>>>

-- Jim

>>>

>>> *****

>>>

>>>

>>> On Tue, 7 Sep 1999, Jan Werner wrote:

>>>

>>>> The "margin of error" as reported in the media actually has one
>>>> worthwhile use: It allows one to compute the approximate number of
>>>> respondents when this is not given in the report. For example, from
the
>>>> reports cited here, I can deduce that the poll in question had fewer
>>>> than 400 respondents.

>>>>

>>>> Other than that, the response of the "cute young anchor" is only
>>>> marginally less inane than the pretense that the quoted "margin of
>>>> error" might be an accurate indicator of statistical significance
for
>>>> most political polls.

>>>>

>>>> Jan Werner

>>>> _____

>>>>

>>>> ALICE R ROBBIN wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>> Yes, and here are the words of the CNN anchor, sent to me by a
colleague:

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> All day yesterday one of the anchors on Headline News (CNN) reported on

>>>>> a poll of voters conducted in New Hampshire. 40% of the voters said they

>>>>> would vote for Gore and 36% for Bradley. This "cute young anchor" said

>>>>> "and there is a 5% margin of error, so this really means they are the

>>>>> same."

>>>>>

>>>>> On Mon, 6 Sep 1999, Albert Biderman wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>> Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary poll result with Gore and Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical dead heat." Drehle in a big feature on Bradley in the Washington Post today uses the same phrase for these figures. Funny how the low statistical power of polls lets journalism make something ("dead heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by making nothing (no difference) out of, more likely than not, something

[$p\{\text{Bradley} < \text{Gore}\} > p\{\text{Gore} < / = \text{Bradley}\}$]. In the case of Bradley v. Gore;

>>>>> In this race at this point, TV and newspapers saying that there is a "dead heat" is a Great Big Something.

>>>>>

>>>>> Comes a real election, a 4 percent difference between candidates becomes a "decisive victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on this revelation of the mood of the public.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>> *****
>>>> * Alice Robbin *
>>>> * School of Information Studies *
>>>> * Florida State University *
>>>> * 232 Louis Shores Building *
>>>> * Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 *
>>>> * Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 *
>>>> * email: arobbin@mailers.fsu.edu *
>>>> *****
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>
>

>From Scheuren@aol.com Thu Sep 9 03:48:09 1999
Received: from imo25.mx.aol.com (imo25.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.69])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id DAA05136 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 03:48:08 -0700
(PDT)
From: Scheuren@aol.com
Received: from Scheuren@aol.com
by imo25.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v22.4.) id 5AAFa16280 (4584)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 06:47:30 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <ad2591c.2508ea42@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 06:47:30 EDT
Subject: Re: Membership Directory
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 21

Dear Carol:

I should now be listed as a Senior Fellow at The Urban Institute,
202-261-5886.

For the rest, except that my children are growing up too fast, I will be
silent.

All the best, Fritz

>From nancybelden@brspoll.com Thu Sep 9 05:56:18 1999

Received: from dbls.com ([209.8.216.50])

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

id FAA22115 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 05:56:16 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by dbls.com from localhost

(router,SLMail V3.1); Thu, 09 Sep 1999 09:00:20 -0400

Received: by dbls.com from amy [168.143.15.163]

(SLmail 3.1.2948 (Release Build)); Thu, 09 Sep 1999 09:00:18 -0400

Message-ID: <005c01befabe\$8d3762a0\$a30f8fa8@brspoll.clark.net>

From: "Nancy Belden" <nancybelden@brspoll.com>

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

Subject: Keith Neuman's question

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 08:26:30 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0059_01BEFA9D.0458F1E0"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0059_01BEFA9D.0458F1E0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Let's be more definitive. AAPOR would call it BAD BAD BAD. A practice =
such as Keith describes (asking the "research respondent" if he/she =
wants to be patched through to a legislator) is just one in the arsenal =
of misuses being used to kill us.

But it is one of the most blatant. The poor respondent can't escape =
knowing that the encounter was a ruse. At least in push polling a few =
dimmer lights might still be wondering after they hung up, what =
happened.

If you subscribe to the Code, explain to the (un)client how much such =
practices harm our ability to perform good work that renders meaningful =
findings, strategy and winning campaigns.

-----_NextPart_000_0059_01BEFA9D.0458F1E0

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 4.72.3110.7" name=3DGENERATOR>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

<DIV>Let's be more definitive. =

AAPOR would call=20

it BAD BAD BAD. A practice such as Keith describes (asking the =

"research=20

respondent" if he/she wants to be patched through to a legislator) =

is just=20

one in the arsenal of misuses being used to kill us.</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>But it is one of the most =

blatant.The poor=20

respondent can't escape knowing that the encounter was a ruse. At least =

in push=20

polling a few dimmer lights might still be wondering after they hung up, =

what=20

happened.</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>If you subscribe to the Code, explain to the =

(un)client how=20

much such practices harm our ability to perform good work that renders=20

meaningful findings, strategy and winning =

campaigns.</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----_NextPart_000_0059_01BEFA9D.0458F1E0--

>From robb@macroint.com Thu Sep 9 08:08:34 1999

Received: from macroint.com (macroint.com [199.34.38.229])

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

id IAA05609 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 08:08:32 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by gateway.macroint.com id <131719>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 09:24:06

-0400

Mime-Version: 1.0

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 09:12:02 -0400

Message-Id: <99Sep9.092406edt.131719@gateway.macroint.com>

From: robb@macroint.com (Will Robb)

Subject: Re: On line focus groups

To: aapornet@usc.edu, Maritza Dowling <mdowling@ccbc.education.wisc.edu>

Cc: briggs@macroint.com (Edward Briggs)

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Maritza,

We have done some work with on-line focus groups, and have an on-line focus group facility set up. If properly done, they can work well.

Obviously, they are ideal for gathering respondents that scattered over a wide area. Text and graphic materials can be presented for comment, and the moderator can "present" existing web sites as well.

One nice advantage of web focus groups is the available of an exact transcript immediately after the group. - the conversation is recorded as it is typed.

The participant recruitment process is very similar, although getting the incentive, or stipend, to people is a little more complex.

We have found that the conversation is not as free-flowing if the respondents are not familiar with interacting in a "chat" type environment. On the other hand, if the group is comfortable with the technology, the conversation is often more lively.

If you want more information on our experience with Web based focus groups, you can call Ed Briggs at 301 572-0211. He is the lead developer of our web-based focus group facility.

Will Robb
Statistician

Macro International Inc.

>From robb@macroint.com Thu Sep 9 08:12:24 1999

Received: from macroint.com (macroint.com [199.34.38.229])

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

id IAA07383 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 08:12:22 -0700
(PDT)

Received: by gateway.macroint.com id <131724>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 09:11:10
-0400

Mime-Version: 1.0

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 08:58:45 -0400

Message-Id: <99Sep9.091110edt.131724@gateway.macroint.com>

From: robb@macroint.com (Will Robb)

Subject: Re: Information on Demographic Trends and Youth

To: AAPORNET@usc.edu, kneuman@cra.ca (Keith Neuman)

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Hello,

I know that the CDC has been conducting the Youth Risk Behavior Survey every two years since '91. This data has been assembled into a multi-year dataset to allow for the assessment of trends in behaviors related to alcohol & drug use, sexual behaviors, safety behaviors, diet, and demographics. The researchers at the CDC and myself have done some analysis of trends in some of these behaviors using these data, which I believe is available as a public

use
dataset. This data might give you some insight into how the demographics of
the
high school population is changing, as well as changes in behaviors that
will
have a life-long impact on their health.

If you are interested in this data, contact the Division of
Adolescent
and School Health at the Centers for Disease Control. Their web page is
www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dash/index.htm. Or email me and I will get you in touch
with the researchers there.

Will Robb

Statistician

Macro International Inc.

>From exp12@psu.edu Thu Sep 9 09:43:33 1999

Received: from f04n07.cac.psu.edu (f04s07.cac.psu.edu [128.118.141.35])

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

id JAA29840 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 09:43:32 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ecuador.la.psu.edu (ecuador.la.psu.edu [128.118.17.50]) by

f04n07.cac.psu.edu (8.8.7/8.6.12) with SMTP id JAA58968 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 09:54:34 -0400

Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19990909095432.016f1824@mail.psu.edu>

X-Sender: exp12@mail.psu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.1 (32)

Date: Thu, 09 Sep 1999 09:54:32 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@psu.edu>

Subject: "Statistical dead heats"

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Jim's language:

> "If the poll were properly conducted, the best unbiased estimate (MLE) of
> the chances of winning the election, were it held during the period when
> the poll was conducted, are x percent for Gore and y percent for
> Bradley or, in other words: Gore would have been, at that time, a x-to-y
> favorite to defeat Bradley."

is on the mark statistically. And this might be sufficient and appropriate
for polls conducted days or weeks before an election.

But I think we owe our audience equally careful phrasing regarding the
assumptions implicit in "were the election held today" or "during the
period when the poll was conducted."

Nick Panagakis, for example, points to a strong pro-Bradley trend evidenced
in NH polls. Extrapolating from this trend is risky, of course -- more
risky and extrapolating from 400 respondents to a half million voters. But
I think the news headline and 60 second broadcast summary should probably
give some weight to this.

Second, with 24% undecided I am not sure the phrase "if the election were
held today" makes much sense. There are times when it makes sense to

extrapolate beyond the range of our data. But since there are few examples of real elections in which 24% were undecided on election day, I'm wondering if it is scientifically honest to use this phrase (or Jim's more careful version).

Perhaps the best approach is to say that neither candidate has garnered the "support" of a majority of likely primary voters, that support for Bradley has increased, and that this suggests that the election appears more competitive at this stage than many experts had previously expected.

The reason we may wish to speak of "support" is because that is what candidates really have at this stage and that the respondents understand that candidates will continue to compete for that support for several months. Translating that support into a strong commitment (high likelihood) of voting for a candidate is a process that we know will continue right up until the election.

In short, the phrase "if the election were held today" may be the best possible phrasing for our questionnaires. But it may not be the best phrasing for the way we report polling results, especially as early as September.

~~~~~

Eric Plutzer (plutzer@psu.edu)  
Department of Political Science  
The Pennsylvania State University  
107 Burrowes Building, University Park, PA 16802

Phone: (814) 865-6576 Fax: (814) 863-8979

Personal homepage: <http://www.la.psu.edu/~eplutzer/>

>From LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu Thu Sep 9 11:12:31 1999

Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])

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

id LAA17149 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 11:12:29 -0700

(PDT)

From: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu

Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

id <SR336HM9>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 11:13:07 -0700

Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213CA31F8@psg.ucsf.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: On line focus groups

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 11:13:06 -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"

I think there are several other factors you must consider about on-line focus groups. First, if participants must have HOME access to the web, then, as discussed previously on AAPORNET, this can be a rather restricted segment of the population. Second, I reiterate a problem I have with anything on-line, who is at the keyboard? In other words, how do you know the specific person you recruited to be in the focus group is in fact the person participating. Once "logged on", that person could

hand off to anyone (spouse, roommate, etc.) without your knowledge. A similar problem is the one of on-line personas. We have anecdotal evidence that many chat room users create personas for on-line use, personas that have different characteristics and different opinions from the "real" person. After all, no one can see me here at my keyboard, so I can be anybody I want. To what extent does that behavior generalize to all on-line pursuits for that person? In other words, are you getting the real John/Jane Doe or some persona they create when on-line? As far as I know, there is no research on this issue. Finally, you should carefully evaluate how much you use nonverbal cues to control the focus group and to understand the full meaning and import of what was said. Did they mean what they said or were they just trying to get a rise out of people? Are they upset, bored, anxious, or fearful? You can't look in their eyes or read their body language. These are all issues that should be considered. It is an impersonal technology which may or may not be optimal for your needs.

Lance M. Pollack

University of California, San Francisco

lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

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

From: robb@macroint.com [SMTP:robb@macroint.com]

Sent: Thursday, September 09, 1999 6:12 AM

To: aapornet@usc.edu; Maritza Dowling

Cc: briggs@macroint.com

Subject: Re: On line focus groups

Maritza,

We have done some work with on-line focus groups, and have an on-line focus group facility set up. If properly done, they can work well.

Obviously, they are ideal for gathering respondents that scattered over a wide area. Text and graphic materials can be presented for comment, and the moderator can "present" existing web sites as well.

One nice advantage of web focus groups is the available of an exact transcript immediately after the group. - the conversation is recorded as it is typed.

The participant recruitment process is very similar, although getting the incentive, or stipend, to people is a little more complex.

We have found that the conversation is not as free-flowing if the respondents are not familiar with interacting in a "chat" type environment. On the other hand, if the group is comfortable with the technology, the conversation is often more lively.

If you want more information on our experience with Web based

focus groups, you

can call Ed Briggs at 301 572-0211. He is the lead developer of  
our web-based  
focus group facility.

Will Robb

Statistician

Macro International Inc.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Sep 9 12:00:35 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id MAA19055 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 12:00:29 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id LAA23494 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 12:00:20 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 11:59:52 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Beating "A 'dead heat'"

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909091136300.11647-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

At the risk of beating "A 'dead heat'":



First, I have proposed no changes at all in how surveys and polls are actually conducted, only in how they are reported by the media, in response to Jan Werner's comment about a "cute young anchor." I would not presume to tell the people who daily conduct survey research and public opinion polls how to do their work. I have done such work myself just enough to appreciate fully how well most survey research is conducted, each day, against considerable odds.

My point is this: The ways in which most survey and poll results are reported tend to obscure the considerable strengths of the statistical methods used and to exaggerate their weaknesses, not only among the general public, but also among many academics who I suspect have long ago stopped thinking about things so routine and familiar to us all.

Here's one strength of polls routinely obscured: In any competent scientific survey, regardless of how small the sample size, or how large the so-called "margin of error," all point estimates derived from that survey are still the best unbiased guesses (MLE) of the corresponding actual--but unknown and ultimately unknowable--population parameter.

How can I know so much about something unknown and unknowable? If probability and statistics do not enable us to make such an inference, then what exactly do they do? Isn't this the essence of statistical inference? Me, I'm satisfied with all of the above, and I have no pretensions to be a meteorologist.

In other words, if a competent poll reports that a candidate is favored by, say, 24 percent of those surveyed, then the best bet--over the long

run, as always--is that the actual percent is 24, with the second best bet being either 23 or 25, and the returns on your bets falling off ever more precipitously as you move ever higher or lower away from 24. In short, 24 is a damn good thing to have learned from the research, regardless of the "margin of error." If the survey has, say 1500 respondents, so much the better!

Wanna bet that virtually no consumers of survey and poll coverage by the popular media now know what I have just written, even though it is readily communicated and easy to understand? And how could consumers be expected to know this, when we have conspired to drill into their heads, in a daily drumbeat, terms like "margin of error of +/- 5 percent"?

When I hear the words "margin of error," my mind's eye sees a Gaussian-like hump centered on the survey's particular point estimate (the percentage favoring a candidate, say)--a hump almost as tall on the neighboring points, but falling off ever more drastically (short of its tails), as in my example above.

I don't think it extraordinarily difficult to get brighter and more educated consumers to see this Gaussian hump. To the extent that they did, they would come to appreciate the considerable value in almost all survey and poll results, rather than following the many anchors and reporters who each day routinely dismiss vast acres of point estimates, gathered through the sweat of our sisters and brothers in the field, merely because differences among these numbers are "within the study's reported margin of error."

There's much more to be said, of course, but several others of you are

already saying it far better than I--let's do continue to take turns.

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 14:33:18 -0700 (PDT)

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

In especially a two-candidate race, isn't what we'd most like to learn from a poll simply the estimated probability that each candidate would win the election? (were it held at the time)

That is, wouldn't we really like to hear the anchor say:

"If the poll were properly conducted, the best unbiased estimate (MLE) of the chances of winning the election, were it held during the period when the poll was conducted, are x percent for Gore and y percent for Bradley or, in other words: Gore would have been, at that time, a x-to-y favorite to defeat Bradley."

[ here  $y = 100 - x$  , and the odds ratio would be reduced to its lowest common denominator ]

One thing I like about this approach is that it directly makes the point that the poll results do not rule out the possibility that Bradley might actually win the election, but indeed presents--straightforwardly--the

most current estimated likelihood that that might indeed happen. Isn't this the essence of statistics, the science, not of certainty, but of uncertainty--or rather the science of being as certain as one can be about whatever cannot be known for certain?

I think that most consumers would find it easier to interpret the idea that, for example, Bradley was found to have only, say, a 44 percent chance of winning the election, or that Gore was found to be the 14-to-11 favorite to win--much easier than they would find anything involving notions of "percent for" mixed in with "margin of error" (just the word "error" itself constitutes strong poison to the entire enterprise of popular understanding of polls and surveys).

When political experts are interviewed about a forthcoming election, after all, they are routinely asked, "What are candidate X's chances of winning?"--they are much less often asked "What percentage of the vote do you think candidate X will get?"

So why can't polls serve to address the first question directly, without bothering to muck around figuring out a popular way to answer the second question, one which only pollsters, it seems, ever actually ask?

-- Jim

\*\*\*\*\*

On Tue, 7 Sep 1999, Jan Werner wrote:

> The "margin of error" as reported in the media actually has one  
> worthwhile use: It allows one to compute the approximate number of  
> respondents when this is not given in the report. For example, from the  
> reports cited here, I can deduce that the poll in question had fewer  
> than 400 respondents.

>

> Other than that, the response of the "cute young anchor" is only  
> marginally less inane than the pretense that the quoted "margin of  
> error" might be an accurate indicator of statistical significance for  
> most political polls.

>

> Jan Werner

> \_\_\_\_\_

>

> ALICE R ROBBIN wrote:

>>

>> Yes, and here are the words of the CNN anchor, sent to me by a  
colleague:

>>

>>>

>>> All day yesterday one of the anchors on Headline News (CNN) reported  
on

>>> a poll of voters conducted in New Hampshire. 40% of the voters said  
they

>>> would vote for Gore and 36% for Bradley. This "cute young anchor" said

>>> "and there is a 5% margin of error, so this really means they are the

>>> same."

>>

>> On Mon, 6 Sep 1999, Albert Biderman wrote:

>>

>>> Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary poll result with Gore and Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical dead heat." Drehle in a big feature on Bradley in the Washington Post today uses the same phrase for these figures. Funny how the low statistical power of polls lets journalism make something ("dead heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by making nothing (no difference) out of, more likely than not, something [p{Bradley<Gore}>p{Gore</=Bradley}]. In the case of Bradley v. Gore;

>>> In this race at this point, TV and newspapers saying that there is a "dead heat" is a Great Big Something.

>>>

>>> Comes a real election, a 4 percent difference between candidates becomes a "decisive victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on this revelation of the mood of the public.

>>>

>>>

>>

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

>> \* Alice Robbin \*

>> \* School of Information Studies \*

>> \* Florida State University \*

>> \* 232 Louis Shores Building \*

>> \* Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 \*

>> \* Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 \*

>> \* email: arobbin@mail.fsu.edu \*

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

>

>From ratledge@UDel.Edu Thu Sep 9 12:41:39 1999

Received: from copland.udel.edu (copland.udel.edu [128.175.13.92])

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

id MAA08655 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 12:41:35 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from murphy2.udel.edu (exchange.chep.udel.edu [128.175.63.18])

by copland.udel.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id PAA19015

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 15:40:21 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by murphy2.udel.edu with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63)

id <01BEFAD9.990B62A0@murphy2.udel.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 15:40:09

-0400

Message-ID: <c=US%a=\_%p=CUAPP%l=MURPHY2-990909194008Z-1429@murphy2.udel.edu>

From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDel.Edu>

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

Subject: RE: Beating "A 'dead heat'"

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 15:40:08 -0400

X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63

I agree. But I think its a victory simply to get the media to report a confidence interval and not treat the information as if its overly precise. That has not always been true. Most consumers would look at the poll and say "Those two candidates are in the same ballpark" as opposed to say the recent numbers for Bush and Buchanan. That interpretation is probably sufficient for consumers and the media has done its job in conveying it. The policy wonks and spinmeisters can play with it further to fit their

own needs.

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

>From: James Beniger [SMTP:beniger@almaak.usc.edu]

>Sent: Thursday, September 09, 1999 3:00 PM

>To: AAPORNET

>Subject: Beating "A 'dead heat'"

>

>

>

>

>At the risk of beating "A 'dead heat'":

>

>First, I have proposed no changes at all in how surveys and polls are

>actually conducted, only in how they are reported by the media, in response

>to Jan Werner's comment about a "cute young anchor." I would not presume

>to tell the people who daily conduct survey research and public opinion

>polls how to do their work. I have done such work myself just enough to

>appreciate fully how well most survey research is conducted, each day,

>against considerable odds.

>

>My point is this: The ways in which most survey and poll results are

>reported tend to obscure the considerable strengths of the statistical

>methods used and to exaggerate their weaknesses, not only among the

>general public, but also among many academics who I suspect have long ago

>stopped thinking about things so routine and familiar to us all.

>

>Here's one strength of polls routinely obscured: In any competent

>scientific survey, regardless of how small the sample size, or how large



>the so-called "margin of error," all point estimates derived from that  
>survey are still the best unbiased guesses (MLE) of the corresponding  
>actual--but unknown and ultimately unknowable--population parameter.

>

>How can I know so much about something unknown and unknowable? If  
>probability and statistics do not enable us to make such an inference,  
>then what exactly do they do? Isn't this the essence of statistical  
>inference? Me, I'm satisfied with all of the above, and I have no  
>pretensions to be a meteorologist.

>

>In other words, if a competent poll reports that a candidate is favored  
>by, say, 24 percent of those surveyed, then the best bet--over the long  
>run, as always--is that the actual percent is 24, with the second best bet  
>being either 23 or 25, and the returns on your bets falling off ever more  
>precipitously as you move ever higher or lower away from 24. In short,  
>24 is a damn good thing to have learned from the research, regardless of  
>the "margin of error." If the survey has, say 1500 respondents, so much  
>the better!

>

>Wanna bet that virtually no consumers of survey and poll coverage by the  
>popular media now know what I have just written, even though it is  
>readily communicated and easy to understand? And how could consumers be  
>expected to know this, when we have conspired to drill into their heads,  
>in a daily drumbeat, terms like "margin of error of +/- 5 percent"?

>

>When I hear the words "margin of error," my mind's eye sees a  
>Gaussian-like hump centered on the survey's particular point estimate (the  
>percentage favoring a candidate, say)--a hump almost as tall on the  
>neighboring points, but falling off ever more drastically (short of its

>tails), as in my example above.

>

>I don't think it extraordinarily difficult to get brighter and more  
>educated consumers to see this Gaussian hump. To the extent that they  
>did, they would come to appreciate the considerable value in almost all  
>survey and poll results, rather than following the many anchors and  
>reporters who each day routinely dismiss vast acres of point estimates,  
>gathered through the sweat of our sisters and brothers in the field,  
>merely because differences among these numbers are "within the study's  
>reported margin of error."

>

>There's much more to be said, of course, but several others of you are  
>already saying it far better than I--let's do continue to take turns.

>

> -- Jim

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>

>Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1999 14:33:18 -0700 (PDT)

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

>

>

>In especially a two-candidate race, isn't what we'd most like to learn  
>from a poll simply the estimated probability that each candidate would win  
>the election? (were it held at the time)

>

>That is, wouldn't we really like to hear the anchor say:

>

>"If the poll were properly conducted, the best unbiased estimate (MLE) of  
>the chances of winning the election, were it held during the period when  
>the poll was conducted, are x percent for Gore and y percent for  
>Bradley or, in other words: Gore would have been, at that time, a x-to-y  
>favorite to defeat Bradley."

>

>[ here  $y = 100 - x$  , and the odds ratio would be reduced to its lowest  
>common denominator ]

>

>One thing I like about this approach is that it directly makes the point  
>that the poll results do not rule out the possibility that Bradley might  
>actually win the election, but indeed presents--straightforwardly--the  
>most current estimated likelihood that that might indeed happen. Isn't  
>this the essence of statistics, the science, not of certainty, but of  
>uncertainty--or rather the science of being as certain as one can be about  
>whatever cannot be known for certain?

>

>I think that most consumers would find it easier to interpret the idea  
>that, for example, Bradley was found to have only, say, a 44 percent  
>chance of winning the election, or that Gore was found to be the 14-to-11  
>favorite to win--much easier than they would find anything involving  
>notions of "percent for" mixed in with "margin of error" (just the word  
>"error" itself constitutes strong poison to the entire enterprise of  
>popular understanding of polls and surveys).

>

>When political experts are interviewed about a forthcoming election, after  
>all, they are routinely asked, "What are candidate X's chances of  
>winning?"--they are much less often asked "What percentage of the vote do  
>you think candidate X will get?"

>

>So why can't polls serve to address the first question directly, without  
>bothering to muck around figuring out a popular way to answer the second  
>question, one which only pollsters, it seems, ever actually ask?

>

>

> -- Jim

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>

>On Tue, 7 Sep 1999, Jan Werner wrote:

>

>> The "margin of error" as reported in the media actually has one  
>> worthwhile use: It allows one to compute the approximate number of  
>> respondents when this is not given in the report. For example, from the  
>> reports cited here, I can deduce that the poll in question had fewer  
>> than 400 respondents.

>>

>> Other than that, the response of the "cute young anchor" is only  
>> marginally less inane than the pretense that the quoted "margin of  
>> error" might be an accurate indicator of statistical significance for  
>> most political polls.

>>

>> Jan Werner

>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>

>> ALICE R ROBBIN wrote:

>>>

>>> Yes, and here are the words of the CNN anchor, sent to me by a  
colleague:

>>>

>>>>

>>>> All day yesterday one of the anchors on Headline News (CNN) reported  
on

>>>> a poll of voters conducted in New Hampshire. 40% of the voters said

>>they

>>>> would vote for Gore and 36% for Bradley. This "cute young anchor"  
said

>>>> "and there is a 5% margin of error, so this really means they are the

>>>> same."

>>>

>>> On Mon, 6 Sep 1999, Albert Biderman wrote:

>>>

>>>> Caught on CNN yesterday a New Hampshire primary poll result with Gore

>>and Bradley at 40% to 36%, "a statistical dead heat." Drehle in a big

>>feature on Bradley in the Washington Post today uses the same phrase for

>>these figures. Funny how the low statistical power of polls lets

journalism

>>make something ("dead heat") out of nothing ("can't tell") by making

nothing

>>(no difference) out of, more likely than not, something

>>[p{Bradley<Gore}>p(Gore<=/Bradley)]. In the case of Bradley v. Gore;

>>>> In this race at this point, TV and newspapers saying that there is a

>>"dead heat" is a Great Big Something.

>>>>

>>>> Comes a real election, a 4 percent difference between candidates

>>becomes a "decisive victory" and occasions no end of op-opinionating on

this

>>revelation of the mood of the public.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>

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

>>> \* Alice Robbin \*  
>>> \* School of Information Studies \*  
>>> \* Florida State University \*  
>>> \* 232 Louis Shores Building \*  
>>> \* Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2100 \*  
>>> \* Office: 850-645-5676 Fax: 850-644-6253 \*  
>>> \* email: arobbin@mail.fsu.edu \*

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

>>

>

>

>From s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu Thu Sep 9 12:53:24 1999

Received: from smtpmail1.csuohio.edu (smtpmail1.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.29])

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

id MAA14201 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 12:52:48 -0700

(PDT)

From: s.kraus@NotesMail2.csuohio.edu

Received: by smtpmail1.csuohio.edu(Lotus SMTP MTA Internal build v4.6.2

(651.2 6-10-1998)) id 852567E7.006CD43E ; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 15:48:42 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: CSU

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Message-ID: <852567E7.006CD3F9.00@smtpmail1.csuohio.edu>

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 16:00:40 -0400

Subject: Re: Beating "A 'dead heat'"

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

While I agree with much of what Jim has offered, we need to distinguish among competence in survey research/polling, responsibility in media reporting, and voter (or consumer) knowledge and perceptions of a presidential election race. Not mutually exclusive, the behavior of individuals in this chain of actions/reactions is most complex and without systematic investigation in the social science literature.

Ultimately, we are confronted with the notion of "Who won?" -- in these discussions, "Who is winning?" -- because that's the media's "bottom line," perceived as such because "who is ahead?" in a race is what is news.

The average bloke knows what it means when media report "a close race" or other such common expressions of the plus or minus error terms. I am afraid precision is our hangup -- sometimes worth fighting for -- but, often of little consequence.

Best,

Sid

>From barry@arches.uga.edu Thu Sep 9 13:00:03 1999

Received: from mailgw.cc.uga.edu (mailgw.cc.uga.edu [128.192.1.101])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id NAA17473 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 13:00:02 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from archa8.cc.uga.edu (arch8.cc.uga.edu) by mailgw.cc.uga.edu  
(LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.011686CB@mailgw.cc.uga.edu>;  
Thu, 9 Sep 1999 15:59:54 -0400

Received: from archa14.cc.uga.edu (arch14.cc.uga.edu [128.192.95.114])  
by archa8.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id PAA31468  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 15:58:09 -0400

Received: from localhost (barry@localhost)  
by archa14.cc.uga.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id PAA156000  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 15:58:09 -0400

X-Authentication-Warning: archa14.cc.uga.edu: barry owned process doing -bs

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 15:58:09 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Barry A. Hollander" <barry@arches.uga.edu>

X-Sender: barry@archa14.cc.uga.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: On line focus groups

In-Reply-To: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213CA31F8@psg.ucsf.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.10.9909091552410.49546-100000@archa14.cc.uga.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I'll be curious to see where this discussion goes. I've been  
planning some online focus groups myself, but these are highly  
specific (people who play Internet-based games and whether



role playing increases their sense of "presence" in a virtual world).

Luckily, these people are very adept at the Net and the study itself is \*about\* using the Net, so I have no concerns about my focus group members differing so dramatically from the general population.

But the lack of nonverbal cues will be interesting. Of course people will use shortcuts such as j/k for just kidding or those annoying smiley faces. And, where I'm conducting the focus groups (a MUD), they have access to a wide number of emotes and socials (er, if you don't know, don't ask...too complicated for those not immersed in that culture).

Hmm, perhaps I'll throw some general political questions at them as well, although I'm more interested in social rather than political consequences of their time in these virtual worlds. If these work, I may try extending it to other areas.

But I look forward to hearing more about concerns and methodology at running focus groups in this environment.

---

Barry A. Hollander      College of Journalism  
Associate Professor      and Mass Communication  
barry@arches.uga.edu      The University of Georgia  
phone: 706.542.5027      Athens, GA 30602

web: <http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander>

>From HOneill536@aol.com Thu Sep 9 13:45:41 1999

Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.4])

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

id NAA01370 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 13:45:33 -0700

(PDT)

From: HOneill536@aol.com

Received: from HOneill536@aol.com

by imo14.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 5COZa23990 (4117)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 16:31:59 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <98516c3a.2509733e@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 16:31:58 EDT

Subject: Re: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone surveys

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 21

Joel, by all means stay away from the cheapo methods that Joe Catania says

are

the province of commercial researchers. Be PURE like all academic

researchers. Harry O'Neill

>From JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu Thu Sep 9 14:35:46 1999

Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])

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

id OAA06454 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 14:35:44 -0700

(PDT)

From: JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu

Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

id <SR3362LA>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 14:36:21 -0700

Message-ID: <71364B64597CD211B02800A0C921A213F8C32E@psg.ucsf.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone surveys

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 14:36:19 -0700

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1458.49)

Content-Type: text/plain

Ouch.....may be I should have said, methods that are appropriate to the goal of the enterprise, feel better?

> -----

> From: HOneill536@aol.com

> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Sent: Thursday, September 9, 1999 1:31 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone

> surveys

>

> Joel, by all means stay away from the cheapo methods that Joe Catania

> says are

> the province of commercial researchers. Be PURE like all academic

> researchers. Harry O'Neill

>

>From ratledge@UDel.Edu Thu Sep 9 14:50:01 1999

Received: from copland.udel.edu (copland.udel.edu [128.175.13.92])

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

id OAA15578 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 14:49:55 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from murphy2.udel.edu (exchange.chep.udel.edu [128.175.63.18])

by copland.udel.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id RAA08686

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 17:49:56 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by murphy2.udel.edu with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63)

id <01BEFAEB.B31048C0@murphy2.udel.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 17:49:44

-0400

Message-ID: <c=US%a=\_%p=CUAPP%l=MURPHY2-990909214942Z-1450@murphy2.udel.edu>

From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDel.Edu>

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

Subject: RE: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone surveys

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 17:49:42 -0400

X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.994.63

We have used about every technique in the book on BRFSS. Generally, RDD

does

about as well as anything if the proportion of the population is 15% or

higher. The

commercial numbers don't do much better and you don't really have a clue

of the

underlying sampling frame for calculation of the standard errors. We

also tried the

commercial sources for Hispanic populations and they had a much higher

incidence

rate but you are still left with some discomfort for the standard errors. If you use RDD and restrict to census tracts or zipcodes (using GENESYS so the sampling frame is the same as it would be for BRFSS) to increase the incidence, you at least have some knowledge of the underlying population sizes and sampling fractions so the data can be reweighted back into the larger sample but you still are left with a complex samples problem for the standard errors.

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

>From: Joel Moskowitz [SMTP:jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu]

>Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 1999 8:08 PM

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Subject: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone surveys

>

>We need some help on a feasibility study in which we are developing >recommendations for how to increase racial/ethnic minority samples in CDC's >state-based Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS). The >minority groups of primary interest include African Americans, Vietnamese, >Chinese, Koreans, and Filipinos residing in California. The first set of >issues we're addressing deals with sampling.

>

>In order to identify more efficient sampling methods than RDD (or >list-assisted RDD), we have been investigating targeted minority RDD >samples such as those developed by Survey Sampling, Inc. (SSI). Their >methodology is summarized on their Web site --

>[http://www.ssisamples.com/ssi.x2o\\$ssi\\_gen.search\\_item?id=60](http://www.ssisamples.com/ssi.x2o$ssi_gen.search_item?id=60)

>

>We have some questions regarding this methodology and would greatly appreciate help. Also, we would be interested in references for papers that pertain to these issues.

>

>In constructing their hierarchy of telephone exchanges, are the assumptions that SSI make reasonable ones? For example, they seem to be making assumptions about the stability of the population (as they're probably using 1990 Census data or projections), and the geographic distribution of listed numbers as compared to unlisted numbers. What sample bias is one likely to encounter by employing a targeted-RDD sample?

>

>Would it be feasible and efficient to adapt this methodology for targeting specific API subgroups? How geographically concentrated would these groups have to be to make this worthwhile and how much of the overall subgroup population must they constitute? If one wants sizable numbers for all of the groups mentioned, would it suffice to use the SSI Asian targeted sample rather than generate targeted samples for each specific subgroup?

>

>Could we take survey data from a targeted RDD survey and combine it with a conventional RDD survey? If so, how would one compute the overall sampling weights and standard errors? In this dual-frame approach, we would have to weight down substantially the targeted sample which consists of sections of the state with high concentrations of the target groups. Thus, would there be any real advantage to pooling data from the two samples? Given this and what would happen to the survey design effect is there any point to conducting a targeted RDD survey?

>

>Would the targeted portion of the survey need to sample from all levels of

>the target population; e.g., from exchanges with low, medium and high  
>percent Asian? How would one estimate the optimal sample size to be  
>obtained from each level? How would one compute sample weights? What  
>impact would this have on the overall design effect?

>

>Other sampling firms (e.g., Genesys) also produce targeted-minority RDD  
>samples. Are their targeted samples any better than SSI's? Genesys has  
>provided extensive documentation on their methodology. They suggest that  
>one should not employ targeted samples for research purposes because these  
>are not true probability samples as the "measures of size" used to generate  
>these samples are crude estimates. If this is true, is there a methodology  
>available for constructing targeted minority RDD samples that generate  
>>true probability samples?

>

>We have seen an estimate that 67% of telephone households in California are  
>not listed in telephone directories. Given such a high unlisted rate, is  
>there any reason to consider surname-list-driven samples for conducting  
>population-based surveys of API groups with unique surnames? If so, is  
>there any way to combine estimates from a list-driven survey with the  
>statewide BRFSS RDD survey? How would one compute the overall standard  
>errors and sampling weights?

>

>Given all of the problems we've alluded to above with targeted samples,  
>might it be wiser to recommend not trying to conduct state-wide surveys of  
>small minority groups (i.e., < 8% of the overall population)? Rather,  
might  
>it make more sense to conduct conventional RDD surveys in selected counties  
>that contain high concentrations of the minority populations of interest?

>

>I apologize for this laundry list of questions and would greatly appreciate

>advice pertaining to any subset.

>

>=====

>Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

>Co-Director

>Center for Family and Community Health

>School of Public Health

>University of California, Berkeley

>140 Warren Hall

>Berkeley, CA 94720-7360

>

>Phone: 510-643-7314

>Fax: 510-643-7316

>E-mail: [jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu](mailto:jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu)

>WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

>=====

>

>

>From [sidg@his.com](mailto:sidg@his.com) Thu Sep 9 18:21:06 1999

Received: from mail.his.com (root@mail.his.com [205.177.25.9])

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

id SAA08486 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 18:21:04 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from his.com (pm9-166.his.com [205.252.121.166])

by mail.his.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id VAA27851

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 21:21:02 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37D85B64.71593A1C@his.com>

Date: Thu, 09 Sep 1999 21:14:12 -0400



From: Sid Groeneman <sidg@his.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win95; I)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone surveys  
References: <98516c3a.2509733e@aol.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Well put, Harry. I couldn't agree with you more! There's nothing like  
facile  
stereotyping of an entire industry.

HOneill536@aol.com wrote:

> Joel, by all means stay away from the cheapo methods that Joe Catania says  
are  
> the province of commercial researchers. Be PURE like all academic  
> researchers. Harry O'Neill

>From tduffy@macroint.com Thu Sep 9 18:32:13 1999

Received: from macroint.com (macroint.com [199.34.38.229])

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

id SAA13059 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 18:32:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by gateway.macroint.com id <131714>; Thu, 9 Sep 1999 21:40:32

-0400

Mime-Version: 1.0

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 21:26:37 -0400

Message-Id: <99Sep9.214032edt.131714@gateway.macoint.com>

From: tduffy@macoint.com (Tom Duffy)

Subject: Re[2]: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone survey

To: aapornet@usc.edu, JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu

Cc: DBinson@psg.ucsf.edu, LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

"Cheapo" methods? Compromises are constantly being made in even the best examples of applied sampling in telephone surveys; many such compromises are made due to cost. Beyond relative cost, the critical issue is the degree to which commercial sampling vendors (and the researcher!) have an understanding of, and acknowledge, the limitations of the options they provide. I have only worked with 2 - SSI and Marketing Systems Group (Genesys) - and have found that both firms do have some staff capable of providing informed answers to questions about these. "Targeted" options are often unacceptable w/r/t coverage bias, but there are more acceptable alternatives that involve disproportionate exchange weighting and stratification.

Coverage in some of these alternatives can be the same as proportionate RDD frames, but it is heavily disproportionate, so weighting and error estimation can be difficult. The solution is to know and track probabilities of selection, and use an appropriate error estimation method, two things that one should already be doing in any telephone survey.

I disagree with a comment made in another posting that "RDD does as well" if the population is 15% or higher. I would put the number somewhat higher. In a survey of various minority groups in New York State, I used a frame in which exchanges were weighted by estimates of the proportion of eligible households, combined with a smaller proportionate RDD frame. This increased the "hit rate" from an initial estimate of under 25%, to well over 40%. The cost savings were used to increase the sample size, which more than offset the increased design effect. I believe that in addition to incidence, one must consider the expected degree of non-response among the target population, the calling protocol, and the proportion of interviewing time to be devoted to screening.

---

Tom Duffy  
Macro International Inc.  
100 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10013

---

Reply Separator

---

Subject: RE: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone surveys

Author: JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu at Internet

Date: 9/8/99 1:40 PM

Joel, our experinece in using one of these target samples for pilot purposes was not good...I suggest you talk with Diane Binson here at CAPS....there are other techniques, one being dual frame sampling, that

will improve the hit rates, as well as geo-based sampling, which is what we did on the GUMS study, that targets geographic areas with higher hit rates....stay away from the cheapo methods, they will not produce good quality scientific samples...they are mostly for commercial uses. Joe

> -----

> From: Joel Moskowitz

> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Sent: Tuesday, September 7, 1999 5:07 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Oversampling racial/ethnic minorities in phone surveys

>

> We need some help on a feasibility study in which we are developing

> recommendations for how to increase racial/ethnic minority samples in

> CDC's

> state-based Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS). The

> minority groups of primary interest include African Americans,

> Vietnamese,

> Chinese, Koreans, and Filipinos residing in California. The first set

> of

> issues we're addressing deals with sampling.

>

> In order to identify more efficient sampling methods than RDD (or

> list-assisted RDD), we have been investigating targeted minority RDD

> samples such as those developed by Survey Sampling, Inc. (SSI). Their

> methodology is summarized on their Web site --

> [http://www.ssisamples.com/ssi.x2o\\$ssi\\_gen.search\\_item?id=60](http://www.ssisamples.com/ssi.x2o$ssi_gen.search_item?id=60)

>

> We have some questions regarding this methodology and would greatly

- > appreciate help. Also, we would be interested in references for
- > papers
- > that pertain to these issues.
- >
- > In constructing their hierarchy of telephone exchanges, are the
- > assumptions
- > that SSI make reasonable ones? For example, they seem to be making
- > assumptions about the stability of the population (as they're probably
- > using 1990 Census data or projections), and the geographic
- > distribution of
- > listed numbers as compared to unlisted numbers. What sample bias is
- > one
- > likely to encounter by employing a targeted-RDD sample?
- >
- > Would it be feasible and efficient to adapt this methodology for
- > targeting
- > specific API subgroups? How geographically concentrated would these
- > groups
- > have to be to make this worthwhile and how much of the overall
- > subgroup
- > population must they constitute? If one wants sizable numbers for all
- > of
- > the groups mentioned, would it suffice to use the SSI Asian targeted
- > sample rather than generate targeted samples for each specific
- > subgroup?
- >
- > Could we take survey data from a targeted RDD survey and combine it
- > with a
- > conventional RDD survey? If so, how would one compute the overall

> sampling

> weights and standard errors? In this dual-frame approach, we would

> have to

> weight down substantially the targeted sample which consists of

> sections of

> the state with high concentrations of the target groups. Thus, would

> there

> be any real advantage to pooling data from the two samples? Given

> this and

> what would happen to the survey design effect is there any point to

> conducting a targeted RDD survey?

>

> Would the targeted portion of the survey need to sample from all

> levels of

> the target population; e.g., from exchanges with low, medium and high

> percent Asian? How would one estimate the optimal sample size to be

> obtained from each level? How would one compute sample weights? What

> impact would this have on the overall design effect?

>

> Other sampling firms (e.g., Genesys) also produce targeted-minority

> RDD

> samples. Are their targeted samples any better than SSI's? Genesys

> has

> provided extensive documentation on their methodology. They suggest

> that

> one should not employ targeted samples for research purposes because

> these

> are not true probability samples as the "measures of size" used to

> generate

> these samples are crude estimates. If this is true, is there a  
> methodology  
> available for constructing targeted minority RDD samples that generate  
> true probability samples?  
>  
> We have seen an estimate that 67% of telephone households in  
> California are  
> not listed in telephone directories. Given such a high unlisted rate,  
> is  
> there any reason to consider surname-list-driven samples for  
> conducting  
> population-based surveys of API groups with unique surnames? If so,  
> is  
> there any way to combine estimates from a list-driven survey with the  
> statewide BRFSS RDD survey? How would one compute the overall  
> standard  
> errors and sampling weights?  
>  
> Given all of the problems we've alluded to above with targeted  
> samples,  
> might it be wiser to recommend not trying to conduct state-wide  
> surveys of  
> small minority groups (i.e., < 8% of the overall population)? Rather,  
> might  
> it make more sense to conduct conventional RDD surveys in selected  
> counties  
> that contain high concentrations of the minority populations of  
> interest?  
>

> I apologize for this laundry list of questions and would greatly  
> appreciate  
> advice pertaining to any subset.

>

> =====

> Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

> Co-Director

> Center for Family and Community Health

> School of Public Health

> University of California, Berkeley

> 140 Warren Hall

> Berkeley, CA 94720-7360

>

> Phone: 510-643-7314

> Fax: 510-643-7316

> E-mail: [jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu](mailto:jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu)

> WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

> =====

>

>

>From [cmilstei@isr.umich.edu](mailto:cmilstei@isr.umich.edu) Fri Sep 10 05:46:18 1999

Received: from [runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu](mailto:runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu) ([runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu](mailto:runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu)  
[141.211.144.15])

by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id FAA14283 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Fri, 10 Sep 1999 05:46:17 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from [s-isr-m1.umich.edu](mailto:s-isr-m1.umich.edu) ([isr.umich.edu](mailto:isr.umich.edu) [141.211.207.35])

by [runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu](mailto:runningman.rs.itd.umich.edu) (8.8.5/2.3) with ESMTP id IAA19239 for  
<[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Fri, 10 Sep 1999 08:46:15 -0400 (EDT)



Received: by isr.umich.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <QZ7MKNRK>; Fri, 10 Sep 1999 08:48:05 -0400

Message-ID: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E02045051@isr.umich.edu>

From: Carol Milstein <cmilstei@isr.umich.edu>

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

Subject: RE: Membership Directory

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 1999 08:48:04 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Hi Jay,

I'll send you one today.

Carol Milstein

AAPOR

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

From: Jay Mattlin [mailto:JAM@moviefone.com]

Sent: Wednesday, September 08, 1999 11:32 AM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Membership Directory

I rejoined AAPOR at the Conference in Florida. Any chance I could receive a copy of the 1998-99 directory?

Jay Mattlin

>>> Carol Milstein <cmilstei@isr.umich.edu> 09/08/99 11:19AM >>>

The administrative office is preparing the 1999-2000 Membership Directory. We expect to send it to the printer on October 4. If there are any SIGNIFICANT changes in the information you wish printed in the directory, please let us know before September 24.

Please reply to the AAPOR office directly (aapor@umich.edu), not to aapornet.

Thanks,

Carol Milstein

AAPOR

>From LCook@FGINC.com Fri Sep 10 06:05:38 1999

Received: from exchange.fginc.com (mail.fginc.com [199.72.128.4])

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

id GAA18381 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Sep 1999 06:05:36 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by EXCHANGE with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <SMZP7MY6>; Fri, 10 Sep 1999 09:04:40 -0400

Message-ID: <60E6FEAC9464D3118D1800805F6509F91F85D6@EXCHANGE>

From: Lou Cook <LCook@FGINC.com>

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

Subject: RE: Membership Directory

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 1999 09:04:35 -0400

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Hi, Carol. I just joined AAPOR this past month. May I get a 98-99 directory too? Can you tell me when I can expect to begin receiving POQ and

my subscriptions?

Thanks. I'm looking forward to my first year's membership!

Lou Cook

Account Manager

FGI Research

(919) 932-8871

lcook@fginc.com

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

From: Carol Milstein [mailto:cmilstei@isr.umich.edu]

Sent: Friday, September 10, 1999 8:48 AM

To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'

Subject: RE: Membership Directory

Hi Jay,

I'll send you one today.

Carol Milstein

AAPOR

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

From: Jay Mattlin [mailto:JAM@moviefone.com]

Sent: Wednesday, September 08, 1999 11:32 AM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Membership Directory

I rejoined AAPOR at the Conference in Florida. Any chance I could receive a copy of the 1998-99 directory?

Jay Mattlin

>>> Carol Milstein <cmilstei@isr.umich.edu> 09/08/99 11:19AM >>>

The administrative office is preparing the 1999-2000 Membership Directory. We expect to send it to the printer on October 4. If there are any SIGNIFICANT changes in the information you wish printed in the directory, please let us know before September 24.

Please reply to the AAPOR office directly (aapor@umich.edu), not to aapornet.

Thanks,

Carol Milstein

AAPOR

>From ande271@ibm.net Fri Sep 10 07:18:13 1999

Received: from out5.ibm.net (out5.prserv.net [165.87.194.243])

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

id HAA05607 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Sep 1999 07:18:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (slip-32-100-253-215.ny.us.ibm.net [32.100.253.215])

by out5.ibm.net (/) with SMTP id OAA13564

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Sep 1999 14:17:30 GMT

Message-ID: <37D93E2A.3724@ibm.net>

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 1999 10:21:46 -0700

From: Jeanne Anderson <ande271@ibm.net>

Reply-To: ande271@ibm.net

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: JCatania

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

OW!

>From PAHARDING7@aol.com Fri Sep 10 17:02:19 1999

Received: from imo26.mx.aol.com (imo26.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.70])

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

id RAA15196 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Sep 1999 17:01:44 -0700

(PDT)

From: PAHARDING7@aol.com

Received: from PAHARDING7@aol.com

by imo26.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 5JPDa01827 (3941)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 10 Sep 1999 20:01:03 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <b007f201.250af5bf@aol.com>

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 1999 20:01:03 EDT

Subject: Harris Interactive

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 22

While posting my resume on Excite's Classifieds 2000 website....

<http://www.classifieds2000.com/cgi-cls/GetCoolNotifyInfo.exe?K255743174+c2k+Employment+Job+CoolNotify>

....I was questioned as follows before being given the opportunity to click-on Post Resume. Pretty routine stuff until we come to #4. Some of you may have encountered it, but this is the first up-close-and-personal exposure I've had to the reality of Harris Interactive. It's here, and God only knoweth what other web-sites may be serving the same purpose as this one.

1. Are you eighteen years of age (18) or older? Yes No (required)

2. Yes! I would like to receive email notification of new features and services available on Excite Classifieds & Auctions.

3. Yes! I would like to receive email notification of special offers and promotions from Excite Classifieds & Auctions advertisers.

4. Yes! I want to be heard. Please send me periodic email invitations to participate in the Harris Poll Online, so I can voice my opinion and have the exclusive opportunity to preview survey findings.

Items 2 and 3 are offers of freebies, and one might question Harris's invitation (right down to the exclamation point after "Yes") following-on this sequence. But what I was more concerned about is that the invitation is extended to a particular group of people who've taken the trouble (and it is

trouble) to have come this far on the this particular web-site because of something all of them share. They're either out of work or maybe sense they

soon will be or at least are dissatisfied enough with their jobs to undertake this still-innovative approach to jobsearching.

Which suggests me yet another biasing effect on whatever comes out of this exercise: the influence of a disproportionate representation of the jobless

among respondents reactions to.....what? Political candidates are never mentioned in the recruiting question. We can speculate (but not here) as to

the nature and direction of that influence, but that's not the point. If this group of people -- or any group sharing some communality of this much importance -- is over-represented in the Harris data, those data at once become suspect.

I'd love to know what other sorts of sites were chosen, whose "visitors" were similarly invited to take part in the Harris Poll Online.

Phil Harding

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Sep 12 21:08:01 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id VAA25417 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 12 Sep 1999 21:07:49 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id VAA20499 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 12 Sep 1999 21:07:46 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 1999 21:07:46 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Opinion Surveys for Permission Marketing

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909122101430.10687-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Folks,

The Sunday, September 12, New York Times Money & Business Section (sect. 3) includes a regular feature, "What They're Reading," compiled by Alisa Tang (p. 6).

Among the current reading of leading business executives is the following:

-----

DARIAN HEYMAN, 25

Co-founder of Beyond Interactive,



an Internet advertising agency  
based in Ann Arbor, Mich., now  
owned by Grey Advertising.

BOOK: "Permission Marketing" by  
Seth Godin (1999)

WHY: "It talks about the future of  
marketing and advertising. I  
think it's important not only to  
understand the technology  
behind the Internet, but also the  
applications, and this book does  
an excellent job explaining one  
facet of them."

-----

This book, currently the 145th best selling book for Amazon.com, is  
described at that Web site as offering, among its many other nuggets of  
wisdom, this advice for would-be permission marketers:

If you want to grab someone's attention, you first need to get  
his or her permission with some kind of bait--a free sample, a  
big discount, a contest, an 800 number, or \*\* EVEN JUST AN  
OPINION SURVEY. \*\* Once a customer volunteers his or her time,  
you're on your way to establishing a long-term relationship and  
making a sale. "By talking only to volunteers, Permission

Marketing guarantees that consumers pay more attention to the marketing message." [emphasis added]

Below is the larger context in which this advice appears.

-- Jim

---

---

---

---

Permission Marketing

by Seth Godin, Don Peppers

Hardcover - 255 pages 1 edition (May 1, 1999)

Simon & Schuster; ISBN: 0684856360

---

---

Reviews

Amazon.com

Seth Godin, one of the world's foremost online promoters, offers his best advice for advertising in Permission Marketing. Godin argues that

businesses can no longer rely solely on traditional forms of "interruption advertising" in magazines, mailings, or radio and television commercials. He writes that today consumers are bombarded by marketing messages almost everywhere they go. If you want to grab someone's attention, you first need to get his or her permission with some kind of bait--a free sample, a big discount, a contest, an 800 number, or \*\* EVEN JUST AN OPINION SURVEY. \*\* Once a customer volunteers his or her time, you're on your way to establishing a long-term relationship and making a sale. "By talking only to volunteers, Permission Marketing guarantees that consumers pay more attention to the marketing message," he writes. "It serves both customers and marketers in a symbiotic exchange." [emphasis added]

Godin knows his stuff. He created Internet marketer Yoyodyne and sold it in 1998 to Yahoo!, where he is a vice president. Godin delves into the strategies of several companies that successfully practice permission marketing, including Amazon.com, American Airlines, Bell Atlantic, and American Express. Permission marketing works best on the Internet, he writes, because the medium eliminates costs such as envelopes, printing, and stamps. Instead of advertising with a plain banner ad on the Internet, you should focus on discovering the customer's problem and getting permission to follow up with e-mail, he writes. Permission Marketing is an important and valuable book for businesses seeking better results from their advertising. --Dan Ring

#### Book Description

The man Business Week calls "the ultimate entrepreneur for the

Information Age" explains "Permission Marketing" -- the groundbreaking concept that enables marketers to shape their message so that consumers will willingly accept it.

Whether it is the TV commercial that breaks into our favorite program, or the telemarketing phone call that disrupts a family dinner, traditional advertising is based on the hope of snatching our attention away from whatever we are doing. Seth Godin calls this Interruption Marketing, and, as companies are discovering, it no longer works.

Instead of annoying potential customers by interrupting their most coveted commodity -- time -- Permission Marketing offers consumers incentives to accept advertising voluntarily. Now this internet pioneer introduces a fundamentally different way of thinking about advertising products and services. In his groundbreaking audiobook, Godin describes the four tests of Permission Marketing:

- \* Does every single marketing effort you create encourage a learning relationship with your customers? Does it invite customers to "raise their hands" and start communicating?
- \* Do you have a permission database? Do you track the number of people who have given you permission to communicate with them?
- \* If consumers gave you permission to talk to them, would you have anything to say? Have you developed a marketing curriculum to teach people about your products?
- \* Once people become customers, do you work to deepen your permission to

communicate with those people?

And in numerous informative case studies, including American Airlines frequent-flier program, Amazon.com, and Yahoo!, Godin demonstrates how marketers are already profiting from this key new approach in all forms of media.

---

Copyright (C) 1996, Amazon.com, Inc.

---

\*\*\*\*\*

>From Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org Sun Sep 12 21:14:11 1999

Received: from mail02-ord.pilot.net (mail-ord-2.pilot.net [205.243.174.16])

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

id VAA28039 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 12 Sep 1999 21:14:08 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from unknown-31-162.ama-assn.org ([204.48.31.162]) by

mail02-ord.pilot.net with ESMTP id XAA06901 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 12

Sep 1999 23:14:03 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from gateway.ama-assn.org (localhost [127.0.0.1]) by

unknown-31-162.ama-assn.org with SMTP id XAA02603 for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Sun, 12 Sep 1999 23:14:02 -0500 (CDT)

Received: by gateway.ama-assn.org id AA03943

(InterLock SMTP Gateway 3.0 for aapornet@usc.edu);

Sun, 12 Sep 1999 23:36:49 -0500

Message-Id: <199909130436.AA03943@gateway.ama-assn.org>

Received: by gateway.ama-assn.org (Internal Mail Agent-1);

Sun, 12 Sep 1999 23:36:49 -0500

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 1999 23:13:34 -0500

From: "Erin Henke" <Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org>

Sender: Postmaster@ama-assn.org

Reply-To: Erin\_Henke@ama-assn.org

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Opinion Surveys for Permission Marketing -Reply

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

I will be out of the office Monday and Tuesday, September 13th & 14th. I =  
will respond to your e-mail when I return to the office on Wednesday.

Have a good day!

>From BGroves@survey.umd.edu Mon Sep 13 06:01:25 1999

Received: from survey.umd.edu (survey.umd.edu [129.2.169.4])

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

id GAA06713 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Sep 1999 06:01:24 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from JPSM-Message\_Server by survey.umd.edu

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 13 Sep 1999 09:01:12 -0400

Message-Id: <s7dcbd58.084@survey.umd.edu>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 1999 09:00:58 -0400

From: "Bob Groves" <BGroves@survey.umd.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: See the Latest Research on Survey Nonresponse!

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

The preliminary program of the AAPOR-sponsored=20  
International Conference on Survey Nonresponse  
has just been published on

[www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/](http://www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/)=20

Check out the over 150 research papers on nonresponse.

Register for the conference at

[www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/registration.htm](http://www.jpsm.umd.edu/icsn99/registration.htm)=20

Make hotel reservations at=20

[www.hilton.com/groups/icsn99/index.html](http://www.hilton.com/groups/icsn99/index.html)=20

>From frey@nevada.edu Mon Sep 13 16:17:54 1999

Received: from pollux.nevada.edu (frey@pollux.nevada.edu [131.216.1.217])

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

id QAA10280 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Sep 1999 16:17:52 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (frey@localhost)

by pollux.nevada.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id QAA01433

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 13 Sep 1999 16:17:53 -0700 (PDT)

X-Authentication-Warning: pollux.nevada.edu: frey owned process doing -bs

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 1999 16:17:52 -0700 (PDT)

From: JAMES H FREY <frey@nevada.edu>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Cannon Ad (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.96.990913161738.681A-200000@pollux.nevada.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: MULTIPART/MIXED;

BOUNDARY="--2082995751-73958649-937264672=:681"

Content-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.96.990913161738.681B@pollux.nevada.edu>

This message is in MIME format. The first part should be readable text,  
while the remaining parts are likely unreadable without MIME-aware tools.  
Send mail to mime@docserver.cac.washington.edu for more info.

---2082995751-73958649-937264672=:681

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=us-ascii

Content-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.96.990913161738.681C@pollux.nevada.edu>



\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*

James H. Frey, Ph.D., Dean  
College of Liberal Arts, Box 455001  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
4505 South Maryland Parkway  
Las Vegas, NV 89154-5001  
frey@nevada.edu  
Office: (702)895-3401  
Fax: (702)895-4097

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

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 1999 15:52:29 -0700  
From: ricep@ccmail.nevada.edu  
To: James Frey <James\_Frey@ccmail.nevada.edu>  
Subject: Cannon Ad

DIRECTOR, CANNON CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH

RESPONSIBILITIES: The University of Nevada, Las Vegas seeks to fill the position of Director of the Cannon Center for Survey Research. The director is responsible for overseeing all aspects of the operation of the center including providing administrative leadership, client development, research planning and design, questionnaire construction and review, budget supervision, grant and contract development, report preparation, and recruitment and supervision of

center staff. Founded in 1977, the center operates a 15-station CATI system for

telephone surveys, but also conducts mail and face-to-face survey projects.

The

Center is a university facility and is housed in the College of Liberal Arts.

Additional information on the center and the university can be obtained from the

UNLV web site: <http://www.unlv.edu>.

Position also carries a non-tenure track, 12-month instructional appointment at

the Assistant Professor level, with a minimum teaching load in the department

consistent with applicant

---2082995751-73958649-937264672=:681

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=iso-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE

Content-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.96.990913161738.681D@pollux.nevada.edu>

Content-Description:

?s background.

QUALIFICATIONS: Applicants should have a Ph.D. in the social sciences =

or

related field and have experience in survey administration. Experience=

with

multiple survey methods and statistical analysis is also preferred.

**SALARY RANGE:** Salary is commensurate with experience and qualifications.

Position is contingent upon funding. The University offers an excellent fringe benefits package.

**THE SETTING:** UNLV is a premier urban institution with an appreciation of the balance between the importance of undergraduate education and a true commitment to scholarly research, artistic creation, and graduate education. UNLV has an enrollment of approximately 21,000 students and is surrounded by a community of about 1.3 million.

**APPLICATION DEADLINE & DETAILS:** Candidates should send letter of application, vita, and address information for three references to Dr. James H. Frey, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, 4505 South Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-5001. frey@nevada.edu or (702)895-3401. Review of applications will begin October 15, 1999 and continue until position is filled.

UNLV is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer. Persons are =  
selected  
on the basis of ability without regard to race, color sex, age, nationa=  
l origin,  
sexual orientation, religion, disability or veteran status.  
=

---2082995751-73958649-937264672=:681--

>From jcf3c@erols.com Tue Sep 14 09:33:12 1999

Received: from web1.planet2000.com ([159.169.245.10])

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

id JAA08504 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 09:33:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from 4000-039.inetconnect.net (4000-039.inetconnect.net

[216.230.3.39]) by web1.planet2000.com (NTMail 3.02.13) with ESMTP id

qa019438 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 12:35:18 -0400

Message-ID: <37DE7998.D91E88AF@erols.com>

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 1999 12:36:40 -0400

From: "John C. Fries" <jcf3c@erols.com>

Reply-To: JCF@SIRresearch.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.51 [en] (WinNT; I)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Revisiting Respondent Selection Methods

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

AAPORNetters,

I recently found myself in a position having to defend the use of respondent selection methods in RDD surveys. The issue was not so much which method is the best, but rather why it is necessary to use a random selection method such as "last/next birthday" or household inventory methods. I believe I was able to give an adequate theoretical explanation for not taking whoever answers the phone or asking simply for the head of household. But I needed something more practical...more concrete.

Anyway, my initial literature search (in both statistical journals and POQ) turned up relatively few articles (only about a handful) dedicated to respondent selection. I am primarily looking for empirical tests of the various methods. I would also appreciate hearing the collective wisdom of AAPOR members regarding their use of respondent selection techniques. Are they really necessary for obtaining a representative sample (or does asking for head of household actually do just as well)? And presuming respondent selection is indeed still necessary, what methods have others found to work best? Having recently switched from an academic to a more marketing based research facility, I have found the last birthday method to be more initially confusing (for both respondent and interviewer) than I previously realized.

Anyway, I apologize for my longwinded post. I would greatly appreciate any and all information others could provide.

Thanks in advance.

John

--

John C. Fries.....Voice: (804) 358-8981

Senior Project Director.....FAX: (804) 358-9701

Southeastern Institute of Research.....Richmond, Virginia

Marketing and Opinion Research.....email: JCF@SIRresearch.com

>From Sangster\_R@bls.gov Tue Sep 14 11:07:00 1999

Received: from dcgate.bls.gov (dcbgate.bls.gov [146.142.4.13])

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

id LAA02403 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 11:06:58 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from psbmail3.psb.bls.gov (psbmail3.psb.bls.gov [146.142.42.25])

by dcgate.bls.gov (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id OAA03290

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:06:27 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by localhost with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <S7KW4VJZ>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:05:57 -0400

Message-ID: <308A68716B76D211A7910008C74C12E36709E1@PSBMAIL2>

From: Sangster\_R <Sangster\_R@bls.gov>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: Opinion Surveys for Permission Marketing

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:05:54 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Why is everyone so quiet on this topic? It is a flagrant violation of ethics to lie to people about why they are actually participating in a

study. "Permission Marketing" is quickly catching on in the business world. It is cheap and it is effective. AAPOR needs to take a stance regarding the "surveying" aspects of the permission marketing scheme (or is it scam?). Given that this happens to be geared toward marketing ethics (or lack thereof) I would appreciate hearing from CMOR on this topic too. Perhaps AAPOR and CMOR could work together on how to respond?

There is another more subtle concern that is mentioned in this message. Permission Marketing is quota sampling hiding under the "volunteerism" idea of collecting a sample on the Internet based on who agree to respond. Perhaps the ASA should consider taking a stance on this particular issue?

Robie Sangster  
Bureau of Labor Statistics  
Office of Survey Methods Research

> -----

> From: James Beniger[SMTP:beniger@almaak.usc.edu]

> Sent: Monday, September 13, 1999 12:07 AM

> To: AAPORNET

> Subject: Opinion Surveys for Permission Marketing

>

> Folks,

>

> The Sunday, September 12, New York Times Money & Business Section (sect.

> 3) includes a regular feature, "What They're Reading," compiled by Alisa

> Tang (p. 6).

>

> Among the current reading of leading business executives is the following:

>

>

> -----

>

> DARIAN HEYMAN, 25

>

> Co-founder of Beyond Interactive,

> an Internet advertising agency

> based in Ann Arbor, Mich., now

> owned by Grey Advertising.

>

> BOOK: "Permission Marketing" by

> Seth Godin (1999)

>

> WHY: "It talks about the future of

> marketing and advertising. I

> think it's important not only to

> understand the technology

> behind the Internet, but also the

> applications, and this book does

> an excellent job explaining one

> facet of them."

>

> -----

>

>

> This book, currently the 145th best selling book for Amazon.com, is

> described at that Web site as offering, among its many other nuggets of

> wisdom, this advice for would-be permission marketers:



>  
> If you want to grab someone's attention, you first need to get  
> his or her permission with some kind of bait--a free sample, a  
> big discount, a contest, an 800 number, or \*\* EVEN JUST AN  
> OPINION SURVEY. \*\* Once a customer volunteers his or her time,  
> you're on your way to establishing a long-term relationship and  
> making a sale. "By talking only to volunteers, Permission  
> Marketing guarantees that consumers pay more attention to the  
> marketing message." [emphasis added]

>  
> Below is the larger context in which this advice appears.

> -- Jim

>

> \_\_\_\_\_

> \_\_\_\_\_

> \_\_\_\_\_

> \_\_\_\_\_

>

>

> Permission Marketing

>

> by Seth Godin, Don Peppers

>

> Hardcover - 255 pages 1 edition (May 1, 1999)

> Simon & Schuster; ISBN: 0684856360

>

> \_\_\_\_\_

> \_\_\_\_\_

>

>

> Reviews

>

> Amazon.com

>

> Seth Godin, one of the world's foremost online promoters, offers his best

> advice for advertising in Permission Marketing. Godin argues that

> businesses can no longer rely solely on traditional forms of

> "interruption advertising" in magazines, mailings, or radio and

> television commercials. He writes that today consumers are bombarded by

> marketing messages almost everywhere they go. If you want to grab

> someone's attention, you first need to get his or her permission with

> some kind of bait--a free sample, a big discount, a contest, an 800

> number, or **\*\* EVEN JUST AN OPINION SURVEY. \*\*** Once a customer volunteers

> his or her time, you're on your way to establishing a long-term

> relationship and making a sale. "By talking only to volunteers, Permission

> Marketing guarantees that consumers pay more attention to the marketing

> message," he writes. "It serves both customers and marketers in a

> symbiotic exchange." [emphasis added]

>

> Godin knows his stuff. He created Internet marketer Yoyodyne and sold it

> in 1998 to Yahoo!, where he is a vice president. Godin delves into the

> strategies of several companies that successfully practice permission

> marketing, including Amazon.com, American Airlines, Bell Atlantic, and

> American Express. Permission marketing works best on the Internet, he

> writes, because the medium eliminates costs such as envelopes, printing,

> and stamps. Instead of advertising with a plain banner ad on the

> Internet, you should focus on discovering the customer's problem and

> getting permission to follow up with e-mail, he writes. Permission

> Marketing is an important and valuable book for businesses seeking better  
> results from their advertising. --Dan Ring

>

>

> Book Description

>

> The man Business Week calls "the ultimate entrepreneur for the  
> Information Age" explains "Permission Marketing" -- the groundbreaking  
> concept that enables marketers to shape their message so that consumers  
> will willingly accept it.

>

> Whether it is the TV commercial that breaks into our favorite program, or  
> the telemarketing phone call that disrupts a family dinner, traditional  
> advertising is based on the hope of snatching our attention away from  
> whatever we are doing. Seth Godin calls this Interruption Marketing, and,  
> as companies are discovering, it no longer works.

>

> Instead of annoying potential customers by interrupting their most  
> coveted commodity -- time -- Permission Marketing offers consumers  
> incentives to accept advertising voluntarily. Now this internet pioneer  
> introduces a fundamentally different way of thinking about advertising  
> products and services. In his groundbreaking audiobook, Godin describes  
> the four tests of Permission Marketing:

>

> \* Does every single marketing effort you create encourage a learning  
> relationship with your customers? Does it invite customers to "raise  
> their hands" and start communicating?

>

> \* Do you have a permission database? Do you track the number of people

> who have given you permission to communicate with them?

>

> \* If consumers gave you permission to talk to them, would you have

> anything to say? Have you developed a marketing curriculum to teach

> people about your products?

>

> \* Once people become customers, do you work to deepen your permission to

> communicate with those people?

>

> And in numerous informative case studies, including American Airlines

> frequent-flier program, Amazon.com, and Yahoo!, Godin demonstrates how

> marketers are already profiting from this key new approach in all forms

> of media.

>

>

> \_\_\_\_\_

>

> Copyright (C) 1996, Amazon.com, Inc.

>

>

> \_\_\_\_\_

>

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

>

>

>From jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU Tue Sep 14 12:05:03 1999

Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])

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

id MAA05413 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 12:05:01 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])  
by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA24262  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:02:55 -0500 (CDT)  
Received: from main-Message\_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:03:16 -0500  
Message-Id: <s7de55a4.070@SRL.UIC.EDU>  
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1  
Date: Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:05:35 -0500  
From: Jennifer Parsons <jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU>  
To: soclist@listserv.uic.edu, UICUPPAF@listserv.uic.edu, aapornet@usc.edu  
Cc: amy@SRL.UIC.EDU  
Subject: Invitation to participate in Illinois Poll 2000

You are invited to participate in the third annual ILLINOIS POLL, a statewide, omnibus telephone survey conducted by the Survey Research Laboratory, a unit of the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Participating in this survey will provide you an opportunity to collect information on the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of adults throughout Illinois. The next Illinois Poll is scheduled for administration in March 2000. You will receive results from your questions by mid-May 2000.

The deadline for submitting questions for inclusion for the next ILLINOIS POLL is November 15, 1999. The total number of questions that can be included is limited, so don't delay.

How does the Illinois Poll work?

You submit already-prepared questions for inclusion in THE ILLINOIS POLL or work with SRL staff to design your questions. Your questions are combined with those from other participants to be administered all at once. The cost is lower because many expenses of conducting the poll are shared by all participants. Your questions may be close-ended, where respondents must select from a pre-determined set of answers, or open-ended, in which the respondent's answer is entered verbatim by the interviewer.

A minimum of 600 interviews will be completed; depending on the number of sponsors, we may be able to increase that number. Either way, you will have statistically reliable estimates for the state population as a whole. All interviewing is done in accordance with the most advanced survey techniques. All interviewing is conducted from SRL's Telephone Center on the UIC campus. Questionnaires are pretested to ensure reliability and validity. Interviewers receive intensive training and all phone work is monitored and closely supervised by SRL field staff. Calls are made during the daytime, evenings, and weekends to maximize the likelihood of finding the selected respondent at home.

What do I receive as a participant?

Included in the cost of individual question preparation is advice on question wording, formatting, and order; a pretest of the question(s), and any subsequent revisions that are required. As part of THE ILLINOIS POLL, demographic information will be gathered and shared with all participants. In addition, the specific demographics for your cases will

be turned over to you, each of your questions will be cross-tabulated for each demographic characteristic, and you will receive computer-generated frequencies for the survey results of your questions.

When the survey is complete, you will receive an ASCII data file that will allow you to do your own analysis; a SAS or SPSS set-up file that reads the data file; a codebook documenting the coding of each of your questions and the demographic questions; and a complete methodological report detailing both technical and quality-control procedures for the entire survey.

How much does it cost to participate?

The cost per close-ended question is \$1,200. Open-ended questions are more expensive and are priced individually. All participants will be required to complete a Service Project Agreement Form before their questions are included in the final questionnaire. You will have the option to select from several forms of payment. If you choose to be billed later, you will receive an invoice at the time administration of THE ILLINOIS POLL is completed and have 30 days to pay after receipt of the invoice.

For more information about the ILLINOIS POLL, please visit our Web site at <http://www.srl.uic.edu>, or contact the POLL coordinator:

Amy DeGrush, Project Coordinator  
Survey Research Laboratory (MC 336)  
412 S. Peoria, Sixth Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60607

312-413-7250 (ph)

312-996-3358 (fax)

amyd@srl.uic.edu

>From DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU Tue Sep 14 12:59:57 1999

Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])

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

id MAA03340 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 12:59:56 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])

by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA02973

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:57:49 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from main-Message\_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU

with Novell\_GroupWise; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:58:10 -0500

Message-Id: <s7de6281.012@SRL.UIC.EDU>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:58:30 -0500

From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Invitation to participate in Illinois Poll 2000 -Reply

Have UIUC depts received copies of this or should we look into how we can send them?

>From amyd@srl.uic.edu Tue Sep 14 13:11:25 1999

Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])



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

id NAA09236 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 13:11:24 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])

by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id PAA04833

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 15:09:18 -0500 (CDT)

Received: from main-Message\_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU

with Novell\_GroupWise; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 15:09:37 -0500

Message-Id: <s7de6530.018@SRL.UIC.EDU>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 1999 15:10:00 -0500

From: Amy DeGrush <amyd@SRL.UIC.EDU>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Invitation to participate in Illinois Poll 2000 -Reply

I sent them to particular UIUC people that I have contacted in the past but if there are some listservs that you could post it on, I would appreciate it.

Also, if you have any people that you would like for me to send them to, please let me know.

Once I get the brochures printed, I will send some to Urbana to hand out to people who stop by SRL. I think the seminars this fall will be helpful too.

Thanks.

>>> Diane O'Rourke <DOroure@SRL.UIC.EDU> 09/14/99 02:58pm >>>

Have UIUC depts received copies of this or should we look into how we

can send them?

>From sullivan@fsc-research.com Tue Sep 14 17:53:25 1999

Received: from web2 (root@web2.tdl.com [206.180.230.2])

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

id RAA09262 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 17:53:23 -0700

(PDT)

From: sullivan@fsc-research.com

Received: from michael.tdl.com (pm1i-198.tdl.com [206.180.234.198])

by web2 (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id RAA17964

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 17:53:07 -0700

Message-Id: <199909150053.RAA17964@web2>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 1999 17:58:01 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Subject: Sawtooth Software and Windows NT

X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Windows (v3.01d)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

We recently migrated a 40 station CATI CI3 for Windows application from Novell Netware to Windows NT as part of our Y2K upgrade. Yipe!! We are experiencing serious problems with the database management engine and nobody seems to know what to do about them. I need help with this problem and I mean fast. If you know what you are doing and can be on a plane tomorrow call

me at (415) 777-0707.

Ask for Mike Sullivan

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to [postmaster@fsc-research.com](mailto:postmaster@fsc-research.com), and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>From Eric.Rademacher@uc.edu Wed Sep 15 06:35:21 1999

Received: from newman.bch.uc.edu (newman.bch.uc.edu [129.137.33.152])

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

id GAA06922 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 06:35:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from 129.137.079.017.uc.edu (ipr03.ed1.uc.edu [129.137.79.17])

by newman.bch.uc.edu (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id IAA21344

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 08:20:36 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.32.19980915093724.006ecc9c@email.uc.edu>

X-Sender: rademaew@email.uc.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)

Date: Tue, 15 Sep 1998 09:37:24 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Eric Rademacher <Eric.Rademacher@uc.edu>

Subject: IPR/IHPHSR JOB POSTINGS

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The University of Cincinnati's Institute for Policy Research and Institute for Health Policy and Health Services Research have the following three job opportunities available. Please respond to the appropriate individual for each position.

Apologies for cross postings.

Thanks,

Eric Rademacher

Research Associate

University of Cincinnati

Institute for Policy Research

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Institute for Health Policy and Health Services Research

Institute for Policy Research

Health Survey Research

Senior Research Associate

The University of Cincinnati's Institute for Health Policy and Health Services Research (IHPHSR) and

Institute for Policy Research (IPR) are seeking a talented, experienced

survey researcher to design and administer health survey research projects. This person will design major research projects, seek external funding, and assist with the ongoing health survey projects and programs of the IHPHSR and IPR including their National Health Survey. It is expected that the Health Survey Researcher will also conduct and publish health survey research and survey methodology research and collaborate with the University's health/medical science faculty. Salary will be commensurate with experience and qualifications. A research faculty position is also negotiable.

#### Qualifications

- \* Masters degree required; earned Ph.D. preferred
- \* Extensive training and experience in health survey research
- \* Strong interest in both basic and applied health sciences research
- \* Demonstrable ability to generate externally funded grants/contracts
- \* Record of health survey research publication
- \* Strong oral and written communication skills
- \* Strong interpersonal skills

Send application letter, resume, and three or more names of references to:

Dr. Alfred J. Tuchfarber, Director  
Institute for Policy Research  
University of Cincinnati  
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0132

Phone: (513) 556-5080 Fax: (513) 556-9023

e-mail: alfred.tuchfarber@uc.edu

Oracle Database Administrator

Research Associate

The University of Cincinnati's Institute for Health Policy and Health Services Research (IHPHSR) is seeking an Oracle DBA with 2 or more years experience with Oracle in a Windows NT environment. Responsibilities include Oracle installation and maintenance, database design, performance monitoring and tuning, space management, security, release upgrades and tuning SQL statements. Experience with SAS and Cold Fusion Preferred. Bachelors degree and experience in research setting preferred. Strong interpersonal and communication skills (written and verbal) are required. Salary will be commensurate with experience and qualifications.

Minimum Qualifications:

- \* Two or more years experience as Oracle DBA
- \* Demonstrated skills as Oracle DBA
- \* Strong oral and written communication skills
- \* Strong interpersonal skills

Send letter of application, resume, and three or more names, addresses and phone numbers of references to:

Mark A. Carrozza

Institute for Health Policy and Health Services Research

University of Cincinnati

PO Box 670840

Cincinnati, Ohio 45267-0840

Phone: (513) 558-2751

Fax: (513) 558-9023

email: Mark.Carrozza@uc.edu

Web Application Developer

Research Associate

The University of Cincinnati's Institute for Health Policy and Health Services Research (IHPHSR) is seeking a Web Application Developer with 2 or more years experience web development in a Windows NT environment. This person will develop and maintain the web based data collection and dissemination systems for the IHPHSR. Responsibilities include database design, web application development and security, and data quality assurance. Experience with SAS, Cold Fusion, and Oracle preferred. Bachelors degree and experience in research settings preferred. Strong interpersonal and communication skills (written and verbal) are required. The ability to interact professionally with technical and non-technical people is required. Salary will be commensurate with experience and qualifications.

Minimum Qualifications:

- \* Two or more years as Web Application Developer
- \* Demonstrated Web Development skills
- \* Strong oral and written communication skills

\* Strong interpersonal skills

Send letter of application, resume, and three or more names, addresses, and telephone numbers of references to:

Mark A. Carrozza

Institute for Health Policy and Health Services Research

University of Cincinnati

PO Box 670840

Cincinnati, Ohio 45267-0840

Phone: (513) 558-2751

Fax: (513) 558-9023

email: Mark.Carrozza@uc.edu

>From cswhite@uiuc.edu Wed Sep 15 06:47:21 1999

Received: from ux6.cso.uiuc.edu (root@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu [128.174.5.9])

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

id GAA09879 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 06:47:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from dialup (london-6.slip.uiuc.edu [130.126.26.66])

by ux6.cso.uiuc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id IAA22138

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 08:47:05 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <000e01beff90\$c8bbffd0\$421a7e82@dialup.cso.uiuc.edu>

Reply-To: "Carolyn S White" <cswhite@uiuc.edu>

From: "Carolyn S White" <cswhite@uiuc.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Sawtooth Software and Windows NT

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 1999 08:41:30 -0700

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 4.72.3612.1700

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3612.1700

I run Sawtooth's CATI on a 12 station system under NT.

What particularly is the problem? There is a file you need to load for using NT that deals with locking files.

Only the NT administrator can install it.

There are certain issues about permissions -- the network drive subdirectory that you have cati installed on must be defined as root for that drive and all stations must have read and write privileges to that directory.

Call Gunnigar at Sawtooth. She knows her NT and is thoroughly familiar with cati. She has led me through many problems. If you aren't the network administrator, get the network administrator on the phone with the two of you.

Carolyn S. White, PhD

Program Coordinator, OCCSS

University of Illinois

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

From: sullivan@fsc-research.com <sullivan@fsc-research.com>

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

Date: Tuesday, September 14, 1999 5:53 PM

Subject: Sawtooth Software and Windows NT

>We recently migrated a 40 station CATI CI3 for Windows  
>application from Novell Netware to Windows NT as part of our Y2K  
>upgrade. Yipe!! We are experiencing serious problems with the  
>database management engine and nobody seems to know what to  
>do about them. I need help with this problem and I mean fast. If  
>you know what you are doing and can be on a plane tomorrow call  
>me at (415) 777-0707.

>

>Ask for Mike Sullivan

>

>

>The information contained in this communication is  
>confidential and is intended only for the use of the  
>addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co.  
>If you have received this communication in error,  
>please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by  
>e-mail to [postmaster@fsc-research.com](mailto:postmaster@fsc-research.com), and destroy this  
>communication and all copies thereof, including  
>attachments.

>

>From [slipset@gmu.edu](mailto:slipset@gmu.edu) Wed Sep 15 08:47:58 1999

Received: from [osf1.gmu.edu](mailto:osf1.gmu.edu) ([osf1.gmu.edu](mailto:osf1.gmu.edu) [129.174.1.13])

by [usc.edu](mailto:usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id IAA12780 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 08:47:57 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from gmu.edu ([129.174.27.227])  
by osf1.gmu.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id LAA17063  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 11:47:55 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37DFBFA9.926E7BA6@gmu.edu>

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 1999 11:47:53 -0400

From: Seymour Martin Lipset <slipset@gmu.edu>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.03 [en] (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: UNSUBSCRIBE

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

To Whom It May Concern,

Please UNSUBSCRIBE this e-mail address from your list. Thank you.

SML

>From rmatovic@ssk.com Wed Sep 15 09:22:12 1999

Received: from ssk.com ([204.254.230.66])

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

id JAA27462 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 09:22:02 -0700

(PDT)

Message-Id: <199909151622.JAA27462@usc.edu>

Received: from 204.254.230.80 by ssk.com

with SMTP (QuickMail Pro Server for MacOS 1.1.2); 15-Sep-1999 12:22:36

-0500

Date: 15 Sep 99 12:22:52 -0400

From: Rebecca Matovic <rmatovic@ssk.com>  
Subject: RE: Invitation to participate in Illinois Poll 2000  
To: aapornet <aapornet@usc.edu>  
X-Mailer: QuickMail Pro 1.5.2 (Mac)  
X-Priority: 3  
Reply-To: Rebecca Matovic <rmatovic@ssk.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-Ascii"

Reply to: RE: Invitation to participate in Illinois Poll 2000

Not particularly profound or relevant, but just another point of reference for what people charge to participate in omnibus polls.

Jennifer Parsons wrote:

>You are invited to participate in the third annual ILLINOIS POLL, a  
>statewide, omnibus telephone survey conducted by the Survey  
>Research Laboratory, a unit of the College of Urban Planning and Public  
>Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Participating in this  
survey  
>will provide you an opportunity to collect information on the attitudes,  
>perceptions, and behaviors of adults throughout Illinois. The next  
Illinois  
>Poll is scheduled for administration in March 2000. You will receive  
>results from your questions by mid-May 2000.  
>  
>The deadline for submitting questions for inclusion for the next  
ILLINOIS

>POLL is November 15, 1999. The total number of questions that can be included is limited, so don't delay.

>

>How does the Illinois Poll work?

>

>You submit already-prepared questions for inclusion in THE ILLINOIS

>POLL or work with SRL staff to design your questions. Your questions

>are combined with those from other participants to be administered all at

>once. The cost is lower because many expenses of conducting the poll

>are shared by all participants. Your questions may be close-ended,

>where respondents must select from a pre-determined set of answers,

>or open-ended, in which the respondent's answer is entered verbatim by

>the interviewer.

>

>A minimum of 600 interviews will be completed; depending on the number

>of sponsors, we may be able to increase that number. Either way, you

>will have statistically reliable estimates for the state population as a

>whole. All interviewing is done in accordance with the most advanced

>survey techniques. All interviewing is conducted from SRL's Telephone

>Center on the UIC campus. Questionnaires are pretested to ensure

>reliability and validity. Interviewers receive intensive training and

all

>phone work is monitored and closely supervised by SRL field staff. Calls

>are made during the daytime, evenings, and weekends to maximize the

>likelihood of finding the selected respondent at home.

>

>What do I receive as a participant?

>

>Included in the cost of individual question preparation is advice on  
>question wording, formatting, and order; a pretest of the question(s),  
and  
>any subsequent revisions that are required. As part of THE ILLINOIS  
>POLL, demographic information will be gathered and shared with all  
>participants. In addition, the specific demographics for your cases  
will  
>be turned over to you, each of your questions will be cross-tabulated  
for  
>each demographic characteristic, and you will receive  
>computer-generated frequencies for the survey results of your  
>questions.

>

>When the survey is complete, you will receive an ASCII data file that  
will  
>allow you to do your own analysis; a SAS or SPSS set-up file that reads  
>the data file; a codebook documenting the coding of each of your  
>questions and the demographic questions; and a complete  
>methodological report detailing both technical and quality-control  
>procedures for the entire survey.

>

>How much does it cost to participate?

>

>The cost per close-ended question is \$1,200. Open-ended questions are  
>more expensive and are priced individually. All participants will be  
>required to complete a Service Project Agreement Form before their  
>questions are included in the final questionnaire. You will have the  
option  
>to select from several forms of payment. If you choose to be billed

later,

>you will receive an invoice at the time administration of THE ILLINOIS

>POLL is completed and have 30 days to pay after receipt of the invoice.

>

>For more information about the ILLINOIS POLL, please visit our Web site

>at <http://www.srl.uic.edu>, or contact the POLL coordinator:

>

>Amy DeGrush, Project Coordinator

>Survey Research Laboratory (MC 336)

>412 S. Peoria, Sixth Floor

>Chicago, Illinois 60607

>312-413-7250 (ph)

>312-996-3358 (fax)

>[amyd@srl.uic.edu](mailto:amyd@srl.uic.edu)

>

>

>

>

>

>

>RFC822 header

>-----

>

>RECEIVED: from SF\_Database by POP\_Mailbox\_-1274800904 ; 14 SEP 99

15:06:32 UT

>Received: from USC.EDU by ssk.com

> with SMTP (QuickMail Pro Server for MacOS 1.1.2); 14-Sep-1999

15:06:30

>-0500

>Received: from usc.edu (listproc@localhost [127.0.0.1])  
> by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP  
> id MAA05553; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 12:05:13 -0700 (PDT)  
>Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])  
> by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
> id MAA05413 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 12:05:01 -0700  
(PDT)  
>Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])  
> by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA24262  
> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:02:55 -0500 (CDT)  
>Received: from main-Message\_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU  
> with Novell\_GroupWise; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:03:16 -0500  
>Message-Id: <s7de55a4.070@SRL.UIC.EDU>  
>Date: Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:05:35 -0500  
>Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu  
>Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu  
>Precedence: bulk  
>From: Jennifer Parsons <jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU>  
>To: soclist@listserv.uic.edu, UICUPPAF@listserv.uic.edu,  
aapornet@usc.edu  
>Cc: amy@SRL.UIC.EDU  
>Subject: Invitation to participate in Illinois Poll 2000  
>X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1  
>X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN  
>

>From rmatovic@ssk.com Wed Sep 15 09:23:22 1999

Received: from ssk.com ([204.254.230.66])



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

id JAA28275 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 09:23:19 -0700

(PDT)

Message-Id: <199909151623.JAA28275@usc.edu>

Received: from 204.254.230.80 by ssk.com

with SMTP (QuickMail Pro Server for MacOS 1.1.2); 15-Sep-1999 12:24:01

-0500

Date: 15 Sep 99 12:24:16 -0400

From: Rebecca Matovic <rmatovic@ssk.com>

Subject: Oops

To: aapornet <aapornet@usc.edu>

X-Mailer: QuickMail Pro 1.5.2 (Mac)

X-Priority: 3

Reply-To: Rebecca Matovic <rmatovic@ssk.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-Ascii"

Reply to: Oops

Sorry -- I meant to forward this to a colleague, not reply to the list --  
and I didn't mean to be disparaging of the poll, just it's not relevant  
to me.

Again Sorry!!!

Jennifer Parsons wrote:

>You are invited to participate in the third annual ILLINOIS POLL, a  
>statewide, omnibus telephone survey conducted by the Survey

>Research Laboratory, a unit of the College of Urban Planning and Public

>Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Participating in this survey

>will provide you an opportunity to collect information on the attitudes,

>perceptions, and behaviors of adults throughout Illinois. The next Illinois

>Poll is scheduled for administration in March 2000. You will receive

>results from your questions by mid-May 2000.

>

>The deadline for submitting questions for inclusion for the next

ILLINOIS

>POLL is November 15, 1999. The total number of questions that can be

>included is limited, so don't delay.

>

>How does the Illinois Poll work?

>

>You submit already-prepared questions for inclusion in THE ILLINOIS

>POLL or work with SRL staff to design your questions. Your questions

>are combined with those from other participants to be administered all at

>once. The cost is lower because many expenses of conducting the poll

>are shared by all participants. Your questions may be close-ended,

>where respondents must select from a pre-determined set of answers,

>or open-ended, in which the respondent's answer is entered verbatim by

>the interviewer.

>

>A minimum of 600 interviews will be completed; depending on the number

>of sponsors, we may be able to increase that number. Either way, you

>will have statistically reliable estimates for the state population as a

>whole. All interviewing is done in accordance with the most advanced  
>survey techniques. All interviewing is conducted from SRL's Telephone  
>Center on the UIC campus. Questionnaires are pretested to ensure  
>reliability and validity. Interviewers receive intensive training and  
all  
>phone work is monitored and closely supervised by SRL field staff. Calls  
>are made during the daytime, evenings, and weekends to maximize the  
>likelihood of finding the selected respondent at home.

>

>What do I receive as a participant?

>

>Included in the cost of individual question preparation is advice on  
>question wording, formatting, and order; a pretest of the question(s),  
and  
>any subsequent revisions that are required. As part of THE ILLINOIS  
>POLL, demographic information will be gathered and shared with all  
>participants. In addition, the specific demographics for your cases  
will  
>be turned over to you, each of your questions will be cross-tabulated  
for  
>each demographic characteristic, and you will receive  
>computer-generated frequencies for the survey results of your  
>questions.

>

>When the survey is complete, you will receive an ASCII data file that  
will  
>allow you to do your own analysis; a SAS or SPSS set-up file that reads  
>the data file; a codebook documenting the coding of each of your  
>questions and the demographic questions; and a complete

>methodological report detailing both technical and quality-control  
>procedures for the entire survey.  
>  
>How much does it cost to participate?  
>  
>The cost per close-ended question is \$1,200. Open-ended questions are  
>more expensive and are priced individually. All participants will be  
>required to complete a Service Project Agreement Form before their  
>questions are included in the final questionnaire. You will have the  
option  
>to select from several forms of payment. If you choose to be billed  
later,  
>you will receive an invoice at the time administration of THE ILLINOIS  
>POLL is completed and have 30 days to pay after receipt of the invoice.  
>  
>For more information about the ILLINOIS POLL, please visit our Web site  
>at <http://www.srl.uic.edu>, or contact the POLL coordinator:  
>  
>Amy DeGrush, Project Coordinator  
>Survey Research Laboratory (MC 336)  
>412 S. Peoria, Sixth Floor  
>Chicago, Illinois 60607  
>312-413-7250 (ph)  
>312-996-3358 (fax)  
>[amyd@srl.uic.edu](mailto:amyd@srl.uic.edu)  
>  
>  
>  
>

>

>

>RFC822 header

>-----

>

>RECEIVED: from SF\_Database by POP\_Mailbox\_-1274800904 ; 14 SEP 99

15:06:32 UT

>Received: from USC.EDU by ssk.com

> with SMTP (QuickMail Pro Server for MacOS 1.1.2); 14-Sep-1999

15:06:30

>-0500

>Received: from usc.edu (listproc@localhost [127.0.0.1])

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

> id MAA05553; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 12:05:13 -0700 (PDT)

>Received: from eeyore.cc.uic.edu (EEYORE.CC.UIC.EDU [128.248.171.51])

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

> id MAA05413 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 12:05:01 -0700

(PDT)

>Received: from SRL.UIC.EDU (SMTP.SRL.UIC.EDU [131.193.93.96])

> by eeyore.cc.uic.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA24262

> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:02:55 -0500 (CDT)

>Received: from main-Message\_Server by SRL.UIC.EDU

> with Novell\_GroupWise; Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:03:16 -0500

>Message-Id: <s7de55a4.070@SRL.UIC.EDU>

>Date: Tue, 14 Sep 1999 14:05:35 -0500

>Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

>Precedence: bulk

>From: Jennifer Parsons <jparsons@SRL.UIC.EDU>

>To: soclist@listserv.uic.edu, UICUPPAF@listserv.uic.edu,  
aapornet@usc.edu

>Cc: amyd@SRL.UIC.EDU

>Subject: Invitation to participate in Illinois Poll 2000

>X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

>X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN

>

>From axelrod@asu.edu Wed Sep 15 15:49:05 1999

Received: from post1.inre.asu.edu (post1.inre.asu.edu [129.219.13.100])

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

id PAA06577 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 15:49:04 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mainex1.asu.edu (mainex1.asu.edu [129.219.10.200])

by asu.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #31135) with ESMTP id <OFI40038JI1PN4@asu.edu> for  
aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 15:49:02 -0700 (MST)

Received: by mainex1.asu.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.10)

id <S6MP3C69>; Wed, 15 Sep 1999 15:49:01 -0700

Content-return: allowed

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 1999 15:48:59 -0700

From: Morris Axelrod <axelrod@asu.edu>

Subject: RE: Sawtooth Software and Windows NT

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

Message-id: <82E57D16D1D7D111A6B300A0C99B541006401102@mainex2.asu.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.10)

Content-type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01BEFFCC.7FF2976E"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BEFFCC.7FF2976E

Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Received in error.

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

From: sullivan@fsc-research.com [mailto:sullivan@fsc-research.com]

Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 1999 5:58 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Sawtooth Software and Windows NT

We recently migrated a 40 station CATI C13 for Windows application from Novell Netware to Windows NT as part of our Y2K upgrade. Yipe!! We are experiencing serious problems with the database management engine and nobody seems to know what to do about them. I need help with this problem and I mean fast. If you know what you are doing and can be on a plane tomorrow call me at (415) 777-0707.

Ask for Mike Sullivan

The information contained in this communication is

confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to [postmaster@fsc-research.com](mailto:postmaster@fsc-research.com), and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BEFFCC.7FF2976E

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">

<META NAME="Generator" CONTENT="MS Exchange Server version 5.5.2637.0">

<TITLE>RE: Sawtooth Software and Windows NT</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Received in error.</FONT>

</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>-----Original Message-----</FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>From: [sullivan@fsc-research.com](mailto:sullivan@fsc-research.com) [<A

href="mailto:sullivan@fsc-research.com">mailto:sullivan@fsc-research.com</A>

<BR></FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 1999 5:58 PM</FONT>



<BR><FONT SIZE=2>To: aapornet@usc.edu</FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>Subject: Sawtooth Software and Windows NT</FONT>

</P>

<BR>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>We recently migrated a 40 station CATI CI3 for Windows

</FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>application from Novell Netware to Windows NT as part of  
our Y2K </FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>upgrade.&nbsp;Yipe!!&nbsp;We are experiencing serious  
problems with the </FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>database management engine and nobody seems to know what to  
</FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>do about them.&nbsp;I need help with this problem and I  
mean fast.&nbsp;If </FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>you know what you are doing and can be on a plane tomorrow  
call </FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>me at (415) 777-0707.</FONT>

</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Ask for Mike Sullivan</FONT>

</P>

<BR>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>The information contained in this communication is </FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>confidential and is intended only for the use of the  
</FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>addressee.&nbsp;It is the property of&nbsp;Freeman,  
Sullivan & Co. </FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=2>If you have received this communication in error,</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by </FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this  
</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>communication and all copies thereof, including </FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>attachments. </FONT>  
</P>

</BODY>

</HTML>

-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BEFFCC.7FF2976E--

>From camburn@rti.org Fri Sep 17 08:07:41 1999

Received: from rtints26.rti.org (rtints26.rti.org [152.5.128.111])

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

id IAA29868 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 08:07:28 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by rtints26.rti.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <TB3Y0KT4>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 11:06:53 -0400

Message-ID: <89FDB122A0E0D2118D2E0090273FA8C5B82FB0@rtints26.rti.org>

From: "Camburn, Donald P." <camburn@rti.org>

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

Subject: Career Opportunity at Research Triangle Institute

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1999 11:06:53 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Please excuse the cross posting.

Research Triangle Institute's (RTI) Survey Research Division currently has an opening for a lead research coordinator. The position is in our Atlanta office and involves working with federal clients to coordinate the activities of various research groups as they develop standard questionnaire items. In addition, this person will participate in research on measurement methods, be responsible for assessing the reliability and validity of standard items, and plan and organize workshops. The successful candidate will combine a background and proven leadership in project management, survey methods research, and working intensely with government clients.

The position requires:

- \* Strong organizational skills;
- \* Masters Degree in applied survey research, statistics, sociology, or a related field.
- \* Experience (5 years or more) in a variety of social research methods;
- \* Excellent oral presentation and writing skills.

This position is a full-time position with RTI (not a term position). The assignment to this project in Atlanta is expected to last for 12 to 18 months. Upon completion of this project assignment, the incumbent will be given options of RTI locations among Atlanta; Research Triangle Park, NC; Chicago; or one of our Washington, D.C., area offices. RTI will pay relocation expenses.

Do not miss this opportunity to work with a great team of social science researchers and for a company with top-notch benefits, including

four weeks annual paid time off, excellent medical and dental coverage,  
tax-deferred savings plan and continued professional development.  
Competitive salary. We welcome and encourage diversity in the workplace.

Please refer to Job Number 33142 and apply at our web-site at:  
<http://www.rti.org> or E-mail your resume to: [jobs@rti.org](mailto:jobs@rti.org).

Candidates without Internet access can submit their cover letter and  
resume to:

Research Triangle Institute  
Office of Human Resources  
P.O. Box 12194  
RTP, NC 27709-2194

EOE AA/M/F/D/V

Donald P. Camburn

Research Triangle Institute

3040 Cornwallis Road      PHONE:    (919) 541-6696  
PO Box 12194              FAX:        (919) 541-7198  
Research Triangle Park    E-MAIL:    [camburn@rti.org](mailto:camburn@rti.org)  
North Carolina 27709-2194  
Website: <http://www.rti.org/units/shsp.cfm>

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Sep 17 11:18:46 1999  
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 LAA21442 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 11:18:44 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from jwdp.com (plp34.vgernet.net [205.219.186.134])  
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id PAA21325  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 15:24:45 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <37E2864C.89C23650@jwdp.com>  
Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1999 14:19:56 -0400  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: On reporting poll results ("dead heats" and others)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The only thing that sampling error tells you is the probability that the results of this particular survey do not differ by more than some arbitrary factor from what would be obtained if you were to conduct an infinite number of identical surveys from the exact same population, in the absence of any other error or bias.

The total error of a survey may be visualized as the hypotenuse of a right triangle, one side of which is the sampling error, which can be

calculated for probability samples, and the other the vector-sum of the error from all other sources, most of which cannot be calculated.

Ignoring the fact that the sampling error is often incorrectly reported for a simple random sample when more complex methods are actually used, the potential non-sampling error is not trivial in opinion polls. As an example, for a random sample of 1,100 respondents with a 65% response rate, the potential bias from non-response alone can add approximately +/- 17% to the +/- 3% sampling error at 50%. Unfortunately, since the probability of error within that maximum range cannot be calculated, it is not considered "scientific" and is not reported. But pretending that what cannot be calculated does not exist is shamanism, not science.

What is more, in a typical political poll, one counts responses to hypothetical questions among a population of those individuals reachable by telephone during certain limited hours, who are willing to cooperate and whose answers to other questions meets criteria that presumably indicate that they will actually vote in the election. These results are then projected to predict the outcome of the actual electoral process.

In other words, in a public opinion survey, the sampling frame, the sample and the measurement are all best guess approximations to begin with. What this means is that any formal derivation of inferences depends on assumptions that cannot be proven in an opinion poll, no matter how competently conducted. The fact that polling is as accurate as it is today is a tribute to the art of the profession, not to its mathematical acuity.

Arguments for reporting poll results in more "informative" ways, such as

the odds of the leader in a poll actually winning the election, make the classic mistake of confusing the nominal precision of the measurement with the real accuracy of the result. These can be equivalent only when there is no potential bias or error involved in the measurement, something that may be possible when pulling beans from an urn, but, as explained above, not in public opinion surveys.

Statements such as "dead heat" or "statistical tie" are incorrect because they describe the object of the measurement (the race), and not the measurement itself, which is the only thing the "margin of error" relates to. In these situations the correct interpretation is that the poll results themselves are inconclusive and therefore cannot be used to predict the winner of the race with an acceptable level of reliability.

While this may be difficult for some pollsters to explain to their clients, I believe that it is something that even members of the press can readily understand, and I would like to see AAPOR, NCPP and others encourage the use of this kind of terminology.

Jan Werner

>From dhenwood@panix.com Fri Sep 17 13:03:04 1999

Received: from mail2.panix.com (mail2.panix.com [166.84.0.213])

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

id NAA17906 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 13:02:51 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from [166.84.250.86] (dhenwood.dialup.access.net [166.84.250.86])

by mail2.panix.com (Postfix) with ESMTP id 286AA18CF2

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 16:02:24 -0400 (EDT)

Mime-Version: 1.0

X-Sender: dhenwood@popserver.panix.com

Message-Id: <v0421011db4084ec7119d@[166.84.250.86]>

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1999 16:03:04 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>

Subject: 77% of students to be millionaires

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

What do you all make of the following poll, done by KPMG?

Doug Henwood

-----

>Contact:

>Ned Steele Communications

>Lisa King/Seth Kolloen

>212-243-8383

>

>3 of 4 College Students Expect to be Millionaires, according to poll

>

>There is no lack of confidence among America's college students-77%

>expect to be millionaires in their lifetime, according to an on-line

>poll by KPMG LLP, the international professional services firm.

>

>"It stands to reason that soon-to-graduate college students would be

>optimistic about their future," said Bernie Milano, Partner in

>Charge of University Relations at KPMG. "With the Dow approaching

>10,000 and the job market continuing to grow, future job-seekers



>seem to be highly confident of their own success."

>

>In response to the question: "Do you think you are going to be a  
>millionaire in your lifetime?"

>

>77% of students said "Yes", they expect to be millionaires

>23% of students said "No", they do not expect to be millionaires

>

>This question was the third in a series the accounting, tax and

>consulting firm is asking in a weekly on-line poll for students to

>tally their views on emerging issues affecting their lives.

>Students can vote by dialing into [www.kpmg-campus.com](http://www.kpmg-campus.com) and responding

>to the question of the week by selecting the choice that best

>corresponds with their opinion.

>

>KPMG, a pioneer in using an only-for-students Web site to recruit

>the next generation of accountants and consultants, continues to

>upgrade its Web site throughout the academic year. The site's

>features include a "news" ticker alerting students to campus

>recruiting dates and other interesting news items, information about

>the firm and an advice column offering tips on their job search.

>

---

>

>KPMG LLP is the U.S. member firm of KPMG International. In the

>U.S., KPMG partners and professionals provide a wide range of

>accounting, tax and consulting services. As a provider of

>information-based services, KPMG delivers understandable business

>advice -- helping clients analyze their businesses with true

>clarity, raise their level of performance, achieve growth and

>enhance shareholder value. KPMG International's member firms have  
>more than 100,000 professionals, including 6,800 partners, in 160  
>countries. KPMG's Web site is <http://www.us.kpmg.com>.

>

>[Note to editors: Bernie Milano, the creator of the poll, is  
>available for interview]

>From mitchell@earinc.net Fri Sep 17 13:16:11 1999

Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com (smtp6.mindspring.com [207.69.200.74])

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

id NAA26523 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 13:16:06 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from ntwear02 (user-2ivebtq.dialup.mindspring.com

[165.247.47.186])

by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA08949

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 16:16:19 -0400 (EDT)

Reply-To: <mitchell@earinc.net>

From: "John Mitchell" <mitchell@earinc.net>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: 77% of students to be millionaires

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1999 16:15:51 -0400

Message-ID: <002801bf0149\$70fc0c30\$0d4992a8@ntwear02>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 1 (Highest)

X-MSMail-Priority: High

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0

X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

In-Reply-To: <v0421011db4084ec7119d@[166.84.250.86]>

I'd say that students applying for jobs at KPMG are driven by money and want to make a lot of cash. It's bullshit, basically.

Maybe they should do a poll again amongst the ones who don't get hired to be consultants?

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of

Doug Henwood

Sent: Friday, September 17, 1999 4:03 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: 77% of students to be millionaires

What do you all make of the following poll, done by KPMG?

Doug Henwood

-----

>Contact:

>Ned Steele Communications

>Lisa King/Seth Kolloen

>212-243-8383

>

>3 of 4 College Students Expect to be Millionaires, according to poll

>

>There is no lack of confidence among America's college students-77%  
>expect to be millionaires in their lifetime, according to an on-line  
>poll by KPMG LLP, the international professional services firm.

>

>"It stands to reason that soon-to-graduate college students would be  
>optimistic about their future," said Bernie Milano, Partner in  
>Charge of University Relations at KPMG. "With the Dow approaching  
>10,000 and the job market continuing to grow, future job-seekers  
>seem to be highly confident of their own success."

>

>In response to the question: "Do you think you are going to be a  
>millionaire in your lifetime?"

>

>77% of students said "Yes", they expect to be millionaires  
>23% of students said "No", they do not expect to be millionaires

>

>This question was the third in a series the accounting, tax and  
>consulting firm is asking in a weekly on-line poll for students to  
>tally their views on emerging issues affecting their lives.  
>Students can vote by dialing into [www.kpmg-campus.com](http://www.kpmg-campus.com) and responding  
>to the question of the week by selecting the choice that best  
>corresponds with their opinion.

>

>KPMG, a pioneer in using an only-for-students Web site to recruit  
>the next generation of accountants and consultants, continues to  
>upgrade its Web site throughout the academic year. The site's  
>features include a "news" ticker alerting students to campus  
>recruiting dates and other interesting news items, information about

>the firm and an advice column offering tips on their job search.

>

>

>KPMG LLP is the U.S. member firm of KPMG International. In the

>U.S., KPMG partners and professionals provide a wide range of

>accounting, tax and consulting services. As a provider of

>information-based services, KPMG delivers understandable business

>advice -- helping clients analyze their businesses with true

>clarity, raise their level of performance, achieve growth and

>enhance shareholder value. KPMG International's member firms have

>more than 100,000 professionals, including 6,800 partners, in 160

>countries. KPMG's Web site is <http://www.us.kpmg.com>.

>

>[Note to editors: Bernie Milano, the creator of the poll, is

>available for interview]

>From altschul@Oswego.EDU Fri Sep 17 13:20:19 1999

Received: from rocky-gw.oswego.edu (rocky-gw.oswego.edu [129.3.17.36])

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

id NAA29609 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 13:20:17 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (altschul@localhost)

by rocky-gw.oswego.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id QAA02997

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 16:20:14 -0400 (EDT)

X-Authentication-Warning: rocky-gw.oswego.edu: altschul owned process doing

-bs

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1999 16:20:14 -0400 (EDT)

From: Bruce Altschuler <altschul@Oswego.EDU>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: 77% of students to be millionaires

In-Reply-To: <v0421011db4084ec7119d@[166.84.250.86]>

Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.96.990917161320.1820B-100000@rocky-gw.oswego.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I wouldn't make much of this "poll." It's a self-selected sample -- the students who go to the KPMG web site are hardly a representative sample even of all college students. The release doesn't tell how many responses they received nor does it say how they avoid repeat answers or even how they keep nonstudents off their site (could a business professor log on from his/her campus computer?).

If we do accept the results as representing something it might simply be that a million bucks isn't what it used to be. I'm just an unwealthy college professor but a number of my colleagues have over a million in their pension funds. With inflation, these students are probably assuming that by the time they hit middle age being a millionaire will give them a living standard barely above average. Their house alone will likely be worth more than half the million.

Bruce Altschuler

SUNY Oswego

On Fri, 17 Sep 1999, Doug Henwood wrote:

> What do you all make of the following poll, done by KPMG?

>

> Doug Henwood

>

> -----

>

>>Contact:

>>Ned Steele Communications

>>Lisa King/Seth Kolloen

>>212-243-8383

>>

>>3 of 4 College Students Expect to be Millionaires, according to poll

>>

>>There is no lack of confidence among America's college students-77%

>>expect to be millionaires in their lifetime, according to an on-line

>>poll by KPMG LLP, the international professional services firm.

>>

>>"It stands to reason that soon-to-graduate college students would be

>>optimistic about their future," said Bernie Milano, Partner in

>>Charge of University Relations at KPMG. "With the Dow approaching

>>10,000 and the job market continuing to grow, future job-seekers

>>seem to be highly confident of their own success."

>>

>>In response to the question: "Do you think you are going to be a

>>millionaire in your lifetime?"

>>

>>77% of students said "Yes", they expect to be millionaires

>>23% of students said "No", they do not expect to be millionaires

>>

>>This question was the third in a series the accounting, tax and

>>consulting firm is asking in a weekly on-line poll for students to

>>tally their views on emerging issues affecting their lives.

>>Students can vote by dialing into [www.kpmg-campus.com](http://www.kpmg-campus.com) and responding

>>to the question of the week by selecting the choice that best

>>corresponds with their opinion.

>>

>>KPMG, a pioneer in using an only-for-students Web site to recruit

>>the next generation of accountants and consultants, continues to

>>upgrade its Web site throughout the academic year. The site's

>>features include a "news" ticker alerting students to campus

>>recruiting dates and other interesting news items, information about

>>the firm and an advice column offering tips on their job search.

>>\_\_\_\_\_

>>

>>KPMG LLP is the U.S. member firm of KPMG International. In the

>>U.S., KPMG partners and professionals provide a wide range of

>>accounting, tax and consulting services. As a provider of

>>information-based services, KPMG delivers understandable business

>>advice -- helping clients analyze their businesses with true

>>clarity, raise their level of performance, achieve growth and

>>enhance shareholder value. KPMG International's member firms have

>>more than 100,000 professionals, including 6,800 partners, in 160

>>countries. KPMG's Web site is <http://www.us.kpmg.com>.

>>

>>[Note to editors: Bernie Milano, the creator of the poll, is

>>available for interview]

>

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Fri Sep 17 13:44:52 1999

Received: from imsety.oit.unc.edu (imsety.oit.unc.edu [152.2.21.99])

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

id NAA15149 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 13:44:51 -0700



(PDT)

Received: from login6.isis.unc.edu (root@login6.isis.unc.edu [152.2.25.136])

by imsety.oit.unc.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id QAA00707

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 16:44:51 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by email.unc.edu id <9241-27802>; Fri, 17 Sep 1999 16:44:41 -0400

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1999 16:44:37 -0400 (EDT)

Sender: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>

From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>

X-Sender: pmeyer@login6.isis.unc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: 77% of students to be millionaires

In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.96.990917161320.1820B-100000@rocky-gw.oswego.edu>

Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.990917164026.55596E-100000@login6.isis.unc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Maybe they are assuming a return of inflation. At a 5.5% annual rate, a net worth of \$200,000 today would be equivalent to a million 30 years from now.

=====  
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085

CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549

University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425

Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 <http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer>  
=====

On Fri, 17 Sep 1999, Bruce Altschuler wrote:

> Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1999 16:20:14 -0400 (EDT)  
> From: Bruce Altschuler <altschul@Oswego.EDU>  
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Re: 77% of students to be millionaires

>  
> I wouldn't make much of this "poll." It's a self-selected sample  
> -- the students who go to the KPMG web site are hardly a representative  
> sample even of all college students. The release doesn't tell how many  
> responses they received nor does it say how they avoid repeat answers or  
> even how they keep nonstudents off their site (could a business professor  
> log on from his/her campus computer?).  
> If we do accept the results as representing something it might  
> simply be that a million bucks isn't what it used to be. I'm just an  
> unwealthy college professor but a number of my colleagues have over a  
> million in their pension funds. With inflation, these students are  
> probably assuming that by the time they hit middle age being a millionaire  
> will give them a living standard barely above average. Their house alone  
> will likely be worth more than half the million.

>  
> Bruce Altschuler  
> SUNY Oswego

>  
> On Fri, 17 Sep 1999, Doug Henwood wrote:  
>  
>> What do you all make of the following poll, done by KPMG?

>>  
>> Doug Henwood

>>

>> -----

>>

>>>Contact:

>>>Ned Steele Communications

>>>Lisa King/Seth Kolloen

>>>212-243-8383

>>>

>>>3 of 4 College Students Expect to be Millionaires, according to poll

>>>

>>>There is no lack of confidence among America's college students-77%

>>>expect to be millionaires in their lifetime, according to an on-line

>>>poll by KPMG LLP, the international professional services firm.

>>>

>>>"It stands to reason that soon-to-graduate college students would be

>>>optimistic about their future," said Bernie Milano, Partner in

>>>Charge of University Relations at KPMG. "With the Dow approaching

>>>10,000 and the job market continuing to grow, future job-seekers

>>>seem to be highly confident of their own success."

>>>

>>>In response to the question: "Do you think you are going to be a

>>>millionaire in your lifetime?"

>>>

>>>77% of students said "Yes", they expect to be millionaires

>>>23% of students said "No", they do not expect to be millionaires

>>>

>>>This question was the third in a series the accounting, tax and

>>>consulting firm is asking in a weekly on-line poll for students to

>>>tally their views on emerging issues affecting their lives.

>>>Students can vote by dialing into [www.kpmg-campus.com](http://www.kpmg-campus.com) and responding  
>>>to the question of the week by selecting the choice that best  
>>>corresponds with their opinion.

>>>

>>>KPMG, a pioneer in using an only-for-students Web site to recruit  
>>>the next generation of accountants and consultants, continues to  
>>>upgrade its Web site throughout the academic year. The site's  
>>>features include a "news" ticker alerting students to campus  
>>>recruiting dates and other interesting news items, information about  
>>>the firm and an advice column offering tips on their job search.

>>>\_\_\_\_\_

>>>

>>>KPMG LLP is the U.S. member firm of KPMG International. In the  
>>>U.S., KPMG partners and professionals provide a wide range of  
>>>accounting, tax and consulting services. As a provider of  
>>>information-based services, KPMG delivers understandable business  
>>>advice -- helping clients analyze their businesses with true  
>>>clarity, raise their level of performance, achieve growth and  
>>>enhance shareholder value. KPMG International's member firms have  
>>>more than 100,000 professionals, including 6,800 partners, in 160  
>>>countries. KPMG's Web site is <http://www.us.kpmg.com>.

>>>

>>>[Note to editors: Bernie Milano, the creator of the poll, is  
>>>available for interview]

>>

>

>

>From [mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com) Mon Sep 20 09:21:28 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id JAA27914 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Sep 1999 09:21:26 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from markbri (ip214.washington13.dc.pub-ip.psi.net  
[38.30.214.214]) by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange  
Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)

id S018V4HB; Mon, 20 Sep 1999 12:21:21 -0400

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: Mocking democracy

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 1999 12:04:12 -0400

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCJKFIDCKOFNAEEMELPCJAA.mark@bisconti.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

This morning I received a 1-page FAX at work titled "National Gun Control  
Poll," saying:

--We are conducting a nationwide opinion poll on gun control.

--We are faxing over 4 million voting forms throughout the country.

--Please make copies of this form and pass them to friends and colleagues.

To vote, simply check one of the boxes below and fax your vote back to us.  
Alternatively you can post your vote to us at the address below.

Question: Would you like to see more effective gun control laws? YES NO

Yes--fax to 1-900-370-3200

No--fax to 1-900-680-3200)

In small print: Calls to these numbers cost \$2.95 per minute, a small price  
to pay for greater democracy. Calls take approximately 1 or 2 minutes.

Your views are important. We make sure that decision makers are hearing  
them! When complete, poll results will be available at:

[www.pollresults.co.uk](http://www.pollresults.co.uk)

Poll commissioned by 21st Century Fax Ltd. 1204 Third Ave., Suite 108, NY,  
NY 10021. If you do not wish to participate in any further polls please  
call toll free 1-800-606-5720.

###

My 2 cents: The "\$2.95 small price to pay for democracy" makes me angry. I  
support our local DC gun control laws put in place by citizens shortly after  
they were allowed to have limited local self-govt. in 1974, and I resent  
that VA and CA Congressmen have been trying to abolish DC's gun laws,  
mocking DC by saying they want to "give DC citizens equal rights to own  
guns" (but not equal voting rights) by adding riders to our \$5 billion  
budget bill, 80% local taxes, which four Congressional subcommittees, 2  
committees, the full Congress and the President must "sign off on" after the

Congressional Control Board, Mayor, and Council have reached consensus.  
They hit a nerve. This "poll" is not about democracy--whomever is doing  
this is making the work meaningless. Talk about a poll tax.

Mark Richards

>From Simonetta@artsci.com Mon Sep 20 10:19:56 1999

Received: from as\_server.artsci.com ([207.140.81.19])

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

id KAA28467 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Sep 1999 10:19:47 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by AS\_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

id <ST22HGRN>; Mon, 20 Sep 1999 13:15:45 -0400

Message-ID: <8125C7B6D1A9D011943A0060975E6BA91B4F38@AS\_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@artsci.com>

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

Subject: RE: Mocking democracy

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 1999 13:15:44 -0400

X-Priority: 3

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

According to that website they have received over 90,000 faxes  
on this issue.

They also suggest "Email us at [comments@pollresults.co.uk](mailto:comments@pollresults.co.uk)"

I knew that name rang a bell.

%<.....

"MAY 05, 16:58 EDT

FCC Probes Mass Faxing of Gun Survey

By JEANNINE AVERSA

Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) - Federal regulators are investigating whether a British company illegally faxed a gun control survey to individuals and businesses that didn't request it.

The Federal Communications Commission is reviewing the matter to determine whether the company, 21st Century Fax Ltd., violated a U.S. law that bars unsolicited faxes that contain advertisements to businesses and residences, said Dorothy Attwood, chief of the Common Carrier Bureau's enforcement division.

The FCC has received about 25 complaints specifically on the matter, she said.

The company faxed out a survey seeking people's views on whether more



effective gun control is needed and asked that their answers be faxed back to a 900 telephone number for a \$2.95 a minute charge, with most of the money going to 21st Century Fax Ltd., Attwood said. She indicated that this appears to fit the definition of an advertisement.

The fax was sent out shortly after the Columbine High School shootings in Littleton, Colo.

Attwood said the fax may have been sent out to as many as 3 million machines.

The FCC is also looking to determine the extent to which people and companies received the fax but didn't request it.

If the FCC determines a violation of the law occurred, it could fine the London-based company or impose other penalties. The FCC is not sure when it will issue a decision in the matter, Attwood said.

The Federal Trade Commission also is looking into whether the company violated its rules pertaining to the billing of 900 telephone calls.

The company could not immediately be reached.

The Washington Post, in Wednesday editions, reported that 21st Century Fax's director Gordon Ritchie said the company did not violate the law. The FCC's rules ``only apply to unsolicited faxes to the U.S.," the Post quoted Ritchie as saying. "

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Art & Science Group, Inc.  
simonetta@artsci.com <http://www.artsci.com>

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

> From: Mark Richards [mailto:mark@bisconti.com]

> Sent: Monday, September 20, 1999 12:04 PM

> To: AAPORNET

> Subject: Mocking democracy

>

>

> This morning I received a 1-page FAX at work titled "National

> Gun Control

> Poll," saying:

>

> --We are conducting a nationwide opinion poll on gun control.

> --We are faxing over 4 million voting forms throughout the country.

> --Please make copies of this form and pass them to friends

> and colleagues.

>

> To vote, simply check one of the boxes below and fax your  
> vote back to us.  
> Alternatively you can post your vote to us at the address below.  
>  
> Question: Would you like to see more effective gun control  
> laws? YES NO  
>  
> Yes--fax to 1-900-370-3200  
> No--fax to 1-900-680-3200)  
>  
> In small print: Calls to these numbers cost \$2.95 per  
> minute, a small price  
> to pay for greater democracy. Calls take approximately 1 or  
> 2 minutes.  
> Your views are important. We make sure that decision makers  
> are hearing  
> them! When complete, poll results will be available at:  
>  
> [www.pollresults.co.uk](http://www.pollresults.co.uk)  
>  
> Poll commissioned by 21st Century Fax Ltd. 1204 Third Ave.,  
> Suite 108, NY,  
> NY 10021. If you do not wish to participate in any further  
> polls please  
> call toll free 1-800-606-5720.  
>  
> ###  
>  
> My 2 cents: The "\$2.95 small price to pay for democracy"

> makes me angry. I  
> support our local DC gun control laws put in place by  
> citizens shortly after  
> they were allowed to have limited local self-govt. in 1974,  
> and I resent  
> that VA and CA Congressmen have been trying to abolish DC's gun laws,  
> mocking DC by saying they want to "give DC citizens equal  
> rights to own  
> guns" (but not equal voting rights) by adding riders to our \$5 billion  
> budget bill, 80% local taxes, which four Congressional  
> subcommittees, 2  
> committees, the full Congress and the President must "sign  
> off on" after the  
> Congressional Control Board, Mayor, and Council have reached  
> consensus.  
> They hit a nerve. This "poll" is not about  
> democracy--whomever is doing  
> this is making the work meaningless. Talk about a poll tax.  
>

> Mark Richards

>

>From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Mon Sep 20 11:17:16 1999

Received: from carriage.chesco.com (carriage.chesco.com [209.195.192.2])

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

id LAA00142 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Sep 1999 11:17:11 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (mxhyp3x44.chesco.com [209.195.202.223])

by carriage.chesco.com (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id OAA03574

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 20 Sep 1999 14:17:07 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <000c01bf0394\$0bab92e0\$dfcac3d1@default>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Biotechnology

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 1999 14:14:55 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

References to any recent (past year or so) summaries of consumer attitudes toward biotechnology (genetic engineering of crops) would be much appreciated.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Mark Richards <mark@bisconti.com>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Date: Monday, September 20, 1999 12:22 PM

Subject: Mocking democracy

>This morning I received a 1-page FAX at work titled "National Gun Control

>Poll," saying:

>

>--We are conducting a nationwide opinion poll on gun control.

>--We are faxing over 4 million voting forms throughout the country.

>--Please make copies of this form and pass them to friends and colleagues.

>

>To vote, simply check one of the boxes below and fax your vote back to us.

>Alternatively you can post your vote to us at the address below.

>

>Question: Would you like to see more effective gun control laws? YES NO

>

>Yes--fax to 1-900-370-3200

>No--fax to 1-900-680-3200)

>

>In small print: Calls to these numbers cost \$2.95 per minute, a small price

>to pay for greater democracy. Calls take approximately 1 or 2 minutes.

>Your views are important. We make sure that decision makers are hearing

>them! When complete, poll results will be available at:

>

>[www.pollresults.co.uk](http://www.pollresults.co.uk)

>

>Poll commissioned by 21st Century Fax Ltd. 1204 Third Ave., Suite 108, NY,

>NY 10021. If you do not wish to participate in any further polls please

>call toll free 1-800-606-5720.

>

>###

>

>My 2 cents: The "\$2.95 small price to pay for democracy" makes me angry.

I

>support our local DC gun control laws put in place by citizens shortly  
after

>they were allowed to have limited local self-govt. in 1974, and I resent

>that VA and CA Congressmen have been trying to abolish DC's gun laws,

>mocking DC by saying they want to "give DC citizens equal rights to own

>guns" (but not equal voting rights) by adding riders to our \$5 billion

>budget bill, 80% local taxes, which four Congressional subcommittees, 2

>committees, the full Congress and the President must "sign off on" after

the

>Congressional Control Board, Mayor, and Council have reached consensus.

>They hit a nerve. This "poll" is not about democracy--whomever is doing

>this is making the work meaningless. Talk about a poll tax.

>

>Mark Richards

>

>

>From jtransue@polisci.umn.edu Tue Sep 21 08:44:26 1999

Received: from mhub0.tc.umn.edu (0@mhub0.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.40])

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

id IAA07983 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Sep 1999 08:44:24 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from polisci.umn.edu by mhub0.tc.umn.edu with ESMTP; Tue, 21 Sep

1999 10:44:22 -0500

Received: from POLISCI/SpoolDir by polisci.umn.edu (Mercury 1.44);

21 Sep 99 10:44:22 -0600

Received: from SpoolDir by POLISCI (Mercury 1.44); 21 Sep 99 10:44:09 -0600

Received: from [207.58.30.148] (207.58.30.148) by polisci.umn.edu (Mercury 1.44);

21 Sep 99 10:43:58 -0600

Subject: Data Analyst Needed

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 99 10:43:56 -0500

From: John Transue <jtransue@polisci.umn.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>, <H-POLMETH@H-NET.MSU.EDU>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Message-Id: <D776380384@polisci.umn.edu>

=====

Research Assistant needed to work with National Election Survey Data and state election data. The project involves working with data sets that have already been assembled, combining and analyzing these data sets. Strong background in data analysis and data base programs required. Background with NES, state election data, or other large data sets (such as other national surveys) and SPSS would be helpful. The position is well suited to anybody with graduate level quantitative training in political science, sociology, economics, psychology or related fields. Pay will be competitive.

Please contact:

Emily Greenwald

Metropolitan Area Research Corporation



1313 Fifth Street SE, 106B

Minneapolis, MN 55414

612-379-3929

612-379-3934 (fax)

egreenwa@metroresearch.org

>From mark@bisconti.com Tue Sep 21 13:46:08 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id NAA14932 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Sep 1999 13:45:59 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from markbri (ip49.washington13.dc.pub-ip.psi.net [38.30.214.49])

by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service

Version 5.5.2232.9)

id TLXJ1DAL; Tue, 21 Sep 1999 16:45:50 -0400

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: Medical Marijuana

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 1999 16:28:53 -0400

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCKFIDCKOFNAEECENLCJAA.mark@bisconti.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Is anyone aware of data on what U.S. adults think Congress should do regarding the DC Medical Marijuana Initiative? By comparison, does anyone know what proportion of US adults would support a state overturning a city Initiative? Thanks, Mark.

Background for those interested:

The results of Initiative 59, put on the Nov. 1998 DC ballot by AIDS and cancer patients after collecting 32,000 signatures, were not released until yesterday. Congress added a rider to DC's budget bill forbidding them to use any of their money to count the vote (cost: \$1.64). Proponents filed a lawsuit. Yesterday, a Federal judge ruled against Congress saying this is a First Amend. violation. Results were made public: the Initiative passed by 69% with a majority in every precinct. DC's elected mayor, 13-member Council, and non-voting Delegate to the House of Reps. praised the ruling and support enacting it. It is similar to Initiatives in effect in Alaska, California, Oregon, and Washington state (a lot of data was reported at the annual AAPOR meeting and was published in June/July Public Perspective). However, Congress, in a preemptive strike, attached a new rider to DC's budget bill, now on Clinton's desk, prohibiting DC from spending its money to ENACT the law. Congressional members on DC's oversight committees have vowed to overturn it, and Congressman Ernest Istook said "...the White House has signaled that it might veto the bill over this and another drug issue (free needles for drug addicts). If there is a veto, it'll show that the Bill Clinton is as soft on drugs as he is on Puerto Rican terrorists." Under the DC Home Rule Charter, Congress has 30 days to override any DC legislation.

The following was passed by voice vote during today's legislative meeting of the DC Council.

-----

#### RESOLUTION IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To declare, on an emergency basis, the sense of the Council on respecting the rights of the electorate of the District and request the Congress of the United States not impede the implementation of the voters' decision.

RESOLVED, BY THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, That this resolution may be cited as the "Sense of the Council on Initiative 59 Emergency Resolution of 1999".

#### Sec. 2. The Council finds that:

(1) The right of Americans to vote, to have their votes tallied, and to have the results of a lawful election put into effect, is at the heart of the American system of democracy.

(2) The District of Columbia Board of Elections and Ethics, in accord with the decision of the United States District Court, has counted and certified the votes cast November, 1998 on District Initiative 59, "The Legalization of Marijuana for Medical Treatment Initiative of 1998."

(3) Initiative 59 was approved by sixty-nine percent of

District voters overall and by large margins in every precinct of every ward in the city, reflecting the caring and compassionate response of District voters to pleas from patients suffering with cancer, glaucoma, AIDS, and other serious illnesses.

(4) The Mayor has expressed his continuing support for Initiative 59.

(5) Congress continues, as it has for over a half-century, to spend billions of American dollars and to put thousands of Americans in harm's way upholding democracy and the right to meaningful elections around the world.

Sec. 3 It is the sense of the Council that:

(1) The District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority should promptly approve Initiative 59 and the Council urges the Authority to do so.

(2) The Congress and Federal Government of the United States should refrain from interference with the mandate of the District's citizens, as expressed through their overwhelming support of Initiative 59, and from imposing additional life-threatening hardship on patients already stricken with cancer, glaucoma, AIDS, and other serious illnesses.

Sec. 4 The Secretary of the Council of the District of Columbia shall transmit copies of this resolution upon its adoption to the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management

Assistance Authority, the District of Columbia Delegate to the United States Congress, and to the chairpersons of the committees of the United States Congress with oversight and budgetary jurisdiction over the District of Columbia.

Sec. 5 Effective date. This resolution shall take effect immediately.

-----

Passed on voice vote in the DC Council, Tuesday, September 21, 1999

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Tue Sep 21 15:14:18 1999

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])

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

id PAA05071 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Sep 1999 15:14:12 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (garnet1-fi.acns.fsu.edu

[192.168.197.1])

by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA69326

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Sep 1999 18:14:10 -0400

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial085.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.32.85])

by garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id SAA90194

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Sep 1999 18:14:04 -0400

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 1999 18:14:04 -0400

Message-Id: <199909212214.SAA90194@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>

X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>

Subject: Re: Graduate Seminars data

Hi Pat,

Thanks for the handouts about the graduate program. I had two corrections (that work in our favor):

In Spring 1993, Attitudes and Public Opinion actually had 9 students enrolled. The others enrolled through Political Science. We cross-listed the course that semester as a courtesy to Political Science because they wanted to count the course in their then-existing Masters in Applied Political Science Program. There were something like 4 students from neither Political Science nor Sociology but I don't know why they enrolled under Political Science rather than our number.

Theories of Social Psychology was taught 3 times over this time period:

Fall 1993, Spring 1996, and Spring 1998

Regards,

Susan

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

Susan Losh, PhD.

Department of Sociology

Florida State University

Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000

850-644-1753 Office

850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

FAX 850-644-6208

>From slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Tue Sep 21 15:19:20 1999

Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])

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

id PAA08309 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Sep 1999 15:19:17 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (garnet1-fi.acns.fsu.edu

[192.168.197.1])

by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA66300

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Sep 1999 18:19:15 -0400

Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial085.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.32.85])

by garnet1.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id SAA56470

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 21 Sep 1999 18:19:14 -0400

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 1999 18:19:14 -0400

Message-Id: <199909212219.SAA56470@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>

X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>

Subject: Re: Ooops

Sorry list. I honestly don't know how this one happened. Blame it on Eudora.

Susan

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

Susan Losh, PhD.

Department of Sociology

Florida State University

Tallahassee FL 32306-2270

PHONE 850-385-4266 Academic Year 1999-2000

850-644-1753 Office

850-644-6416 Sociology Office

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

FAX 850-644-6208

>From janisrussell@yahoo.com Wed Sep 22 06:29:45 1999

Received: from web802.mail.yahoo.com (web802.mail.yahoo.com [128.11.23.62])

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

id GAA29321 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 06:29:42 -0700

(PDT)

Message-ID: <19990922134104.14717.rocketmail@web802.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [208.233.17.171] by web802.mail.yahoo.com; Wed, 22 Sep 1999

06:41:04 PDT

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1999 06:41:04 -0700 (PDT)

From: Janis Russell <janisrussell@yahoo.com>



Subject: Market Research Job Opening

To: aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

## MARKETING RESEARCH CAREER OPPORTUNITY

Project Director

We invite you to join us at a full-service, custom marketing research supplier. Over the past 20 years, PERT Survey Research has established partnerships with well-known national companies in the areas of Consumer Package Goods, Service and Health Care.

The Project Director works with the project team to design the survey, review the data, analyze and interpret the results, prepare the data, and write the report or presentation, including recommendations to our clients.

Required:

• A four year degree minimum and experience writing research reports.

• Excellent oral and written communication and analytical skills

• Word and Powerpoint skills

Exposure to questionnaire design, statistics, and

writing multivariate techniques is helpful.

Must be able to work with project team including Account Representative, Project Analyst, Graphics person, and Statistician to understand study objectives and assist in study design. Also must be able to work independently to design a questionnaire, review tables, and analyze the data and prepare a marketing-oriented report. Able to work under deadlines and manage multiple projects.

Career growth potential into account management. Excellent company paid benefits. Team environment and casual dress policy.

Janis Russell, Director of Project Services ext.

168

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Bid and sell for free at <http://auctions.yahoo.com>

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Sep 22 08:12:29 1999

Received: from smtp5.mindspring.com (smtp5.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])

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

id IAA28123 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 08:12:27 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-37kbt87.dialup.mindspring.com [207.69.245.7])

by smtp5.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id LAA17326

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 11:12:23 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19990922104718.009fc5e0@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1999 11:03:02 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>

Subject: Millionaires and Gun Control

In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.96.990917161320.1820B-100000@rocky-gw.oswego.ed

u>

References: <v0421011db4084ec7119d@[166.84.250.86]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="====\_4659290==\_ .ALT"

-----\_4659290==\_ .ALT

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

Bruce Altschuler is correct when he comments that becoming a millionaire today is not as difficult as it was, say, 10-15-20 years ago. Those lucky enough to work in corporate environments at an executive level (even middle management) can often depend on plentiful stock options, which, when accumulated over a 10-15 year period are often worth several million. It's a very different world than the academic. Students who go to the KPMG web site are already interested in serious financial matters (as potential accountants and consultants), so forgetting for the moment whether the poll findings are valid, it should come as no surprise that many expect to

become millionaires. Many are able to achieve this in their 30's and 40's...as painful as that is to hear.

About the gun control "poll" it strikes me that this is just another scam. An easy way to make lots of money at virtually no cost. The poll is invalid for all the reasons that others have cited. But, it is a great way to make big bucks with little effort,

Dick Halpern

-----

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.  
Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research  
Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology  
3837 Courtyard Drive  
Atlanta, GA 30339-4248  
rshalpern@mindspring.com  
phone/fax 770 434 4121

-----

--===== \_4659290==\_ .ALT

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

<html>

<font size=3>Bruce Altschuler is correct when he comments that becoming a millionaire today is not as difficult as it was, say, 10-15-20 years ago.

Those lucky enough to work in corporate environments at an executive level (even middle management) can often depend on plentiful stock options, which, when accumulated over a 10-15 year period are often worth several million. It's a very different world than the academic. Students who go to the KPMG web site are already interested in serious financial matters (as potential accountants and consultants), so forgetting for the moment whether the poll findings are valid, it should come as no surprise that many expect to become millionaires. Many are able to achieve this in their 30's and 40's...as painful as that is to hear.<br>

<br>

About the gun control &quot;poll&quot; it strikes me that this is just another scam. An easy way to make lots of money at virtually no cost. The poll is invalid for all the reasons that others have cited. But, it is a great way to make big bucks with little effort,<br>

<br>

Dick Halpern<br>

<br>

</font><br>

<hr>

<font size=1 color="#0000FF">Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. <br>

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research <br>

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology <br>

3837 Courtyard Drive <br>

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248 <br>

rshalpern@mindspring.com <br>

phone/fax 770 434 4121 <br>

<hr>

</font></html>

-----\_4659290==\_.ALT--

>From JAM@moviefone.com Wed Sep 22 09:25:28 1999

Received: from smtp1.moviefone.com (smtp1.moviefone.com [205.228.252.100])

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

id JAA27754 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 09:25:22 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from moviefone-Message\_Server by smtp1.moviefone.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 12:20:31 -0400

Message-Id: <s7e8c98f.055@smtp1.moviefone.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1999 12:20:05 -0400

From: "Jay Mattlin" <JAM@moviefone.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Millionaires and Gun Control

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Let's not get too carried away about the earning potential of today's =  
college graduates. Most of us in the commercial world - and most of =  
those entering the commercial world now - are not participating in the =  
stock option bonanza that a few at the top have been enjoying. (AOL =  
bought the company I work for a few months ago, and so I now have AOL =  
options. Though I'm long past the age of 30, I doubt whether those options =  
will ever be worth anything like seven figures.)

Though there has been a lot of publicity about stock options and the =  
amounts of money that some executives have attained through options, the =  
30 year-old millionaires are the exception, rather than the rule. There =  
has been a lot of hype about Internet millionaires, but those who have =  
not achieved this financial milestone should not be too chagrined about =  
missing out on a mythical gravy train. =20

Of course, I also agree with prior postings about the meaningless of a =  
statistic from a self-selected sample of students who checked out the Web =  
site of a major financial firm. =20

Jay Mattlin

>>> dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com> 09/22/99 11:03AM >>>

Bruce Altschuler is correct when he comments that becoming a millionaire=20=

today is not as difficult as it was, say, 10-15-20 years ago. Those =

lucky=20

enough to work in corporate environments at an executive level (even =

middle=20

management) can often depend on plentiful stock options, which, when=20

accumulated over a 10-15 year period are often worth several million. =

It's=20

a very different world than the academic. Students who go to the KPMG =

web=20

site are already interested in serious financial matters (as potential=20

accountants and consultants), so forgetting for the moment whether the =

poll=20

findings are valid, it should come as no surprise that many expect to=20

become millionaires. Many are able to achieve this in their 30's and=20  
40's...as painful as that is to hear.

About the gun control "poll" it strikes me that this is just another =  
scam.=20

An easy way to make lots of money at virtually no cost. The poll is =  
invalid=20

for all the reasons that others have cited. But, it is a great way to =  
make=20

big bucks with little effort,

Dick Halpern

-----

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology

3837 Courtyard Drive

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

rshalpern@mindspring.com=20

phone/fax 770 434 4121

-----

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed Sep 22 09:51:20 1999

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 JAA14085 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 09:51:17 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from jwdp.com (plp3.vgernet.net [205.219.186.103])

by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id OAA06609

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 14:03:33 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37E908F8.507EB917@jwdp.com>

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1999 12:51:04 -0400

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Online polls and SPAM

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The column below appears in the September 20 issue of Infoworld, a weekly newspaper for people in information technologies. It may also be read online at:

<http://www.infoworld.com/cgi-bin/displayNew.pl?/foster/foster.htm>

GRYPE LINE - Ed Foster - September 20, 1999

Watch out, that free trip offer may turn your inbox into a prime spam target

If we could have just a moment of your time, we're

conducting a brief, confidential online survey for a major corporation that has identified you as a key customer. To make it worth your while, we're offering all participants a free Caribbean cruise or other fabulous prizes, and all you have to do is go to [www.unrecognizable.com](http://www.unrecognizable.com) and answer a few simple questions. ...

PHONY ONLINE SURVEYS are becoming one of the scourges of the Internet. Like many of the other spam scams we discussed last week, they are generally designed just to collect live e-mail addresses and other contact information for sucker lists that the spammers can use themselves or sell to others. Fortunately, they are often easily recognizable -- spammers can't spell things like Caribbean, for one thing -- so only newbies or the terminally naive will fall for most of them.

Unfortunately, there is a hitch -- every once in a while, the phony survey turns out to be real.

Back in the spring, a reader received an e-mail from an organization he had never heard of that claimed they were a market research company conducting an online survey for Microsoft. A few months previously, the reader had filled out a similar survey from another company that said it was working for Microsoft, only to find out later that it had been a fraud.

More wary now, he tried contacting Microsoft directly to

see if they could confirm whether or not the survey was bogus. An official from "Microsoft Information Security" offered to track it down, but after several months of correspondence, the reader had still not heard definitively one way or the other. That's when he wrote me, suggesting that I warn others about the phony Microsoft surveys.

"Seems like someone may be trying to get e-mail addresses and other info out of people falsely," the reader wrote.

"If not, why is this coming to me from someone other than a Microsoft address? How do I know this person/survey is valid? If it is, why is Microsoft giving away my address and information to another company without my knowledge or consent?"

On examining the message the reader had received, I would have agreed there was every reason to believe it was a fake except for the fact that it originated from a domain I happen to know is that of a real market research company.

While not an organization of which most software customers would have heard, I had to believe the message was either an outstanding piece of forgery or it really was being done for Microsoft. So I told the reader I thought it might be real and promised to look into it.

Before I got much further, however, another reader sent

me a very different survey message, except that it also said it was being done for Microsoft.

That e-mail, which promised free software as a reward for the first 200 qualified respondents, came from a market research organization I didn't know (although in the message it claimed to be affiliated with one of the major research companies). More ominously, it did not point survey participants to a URL but instead included an .exe file attachment to run the survey on the participant's own computer. Or, for all the reader knew, it might actually give him a nice new virus or search his hard disk for passwords, credit card numbers, or whatever.

Deciding that the message was a scam of some sort, the reader thought better of doing the survey. What scares me though is that apparently 200 people did fill it out.

They were lucky, because after talking to both research companies and to Microsoft, it now appears that both surveys were real. (Microsoft still hasn't been able to confirm the validity of the message with the .exe file, but they admit that's probably just because it's so unclear from the content of the message which product group might have commissioned it.) I hope the free software was worth the risk.

And there was a risk, because, as we've seen, there are volumes upon volumes of e-mail messages in circulation that pretend to be from Bill Gates and promise to give

you money. Microsoft doesn't appreciate the scams that use the company's name illicitly, so why is it muddying the water by having third parties run surveys online that even Microsoft officials can't validate without considerable research?

My advice once again is that, in any situation where you can't be certain a message is real, assume that it is a fake. You might miss out on a few freebies, but you'll also surely avoid some spam as well as some telemarketing harassment and perhaps much worse.

Let Microsoft and other vendors run their surveys as they see fit. Their results may be skewed to the naive end of the customer spectrum, but perhaps that's what they want.

-----  
Copyright (c) 1999 InfoWorld Media Group Inc.

>From lphillips@mpf.com Wed Sep 22 11:21:46 1999

Received: from eve.telalink.net (eve.telalink.net [207.152.1.3])

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

id LAA06863 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 11:21:42 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mail.telalink.net (death [207.152.1.12]) by eve.telalink.net

(MTA-v3.8/10.00v-fbmx-blkspam) with ESMTP id NAA20456 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 13:21:26 -0500 (CDT)

X-Envelope-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Received: from ([207.152.55.146])

by mail1.telalink.net (MTA-v4.9.1/0.0a-fbmx) with ESMTP id SAA08888

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 18:20:55 GMT

Message-ID: <37E91DFB.563E3A81@mpf.com>

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1999 13:20:43 -0500

From: Lyda Phillips <lphillips@mpf.com>

Reply-To: lphillips@mpf.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Free Validation

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I would like some feedback on the following. We are a PR firm that as part of its client work conducts issues surveys, political polling, market surveys, etc. We use several large, well-known and reliable firms to make our calls. Recently we won a bid to conduct a survey of public attitudes toward schools in a medium-sized city. The survey was commissioned by the local Chamber of Commerce. A firm that was an unsuccessful bidder on the project called the Chamber and offered to validate our results for the Chamber pro bono. Our vendor says they routinely validate a percentage of their calls as standard operating procedure, but would be extremely uncomfortable turning over to a competitor the names and numbers of the respondents both from a professional and ethical standpoint. What does anyone else think of this "Free Validation" offer, professionally, ethically, etc?

Lyda Phillips

MP&F

lphillips@mpf.com

>From robb@macroint.com Wed Sep 22 12:25:54 1999

Received: from macroint.com (macroint.com [199.34.38.229])

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

id MAA14132 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 12:25:37 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by gateway.macroint.com id <131742>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 15:34:28

-0400

Mime-Version: 1.0

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1999 15:21:59 -0400

Message-Id: <99Sep22.153428edt.131742@gateway.macroint.com>

From: robb@macroint.com (Will Robb)

Subject: Re: Free Validation

To: Lyda Phillips <lphillips@mpf.com>, AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Lyda,

As a project manager for a large research firm, I would not accept the offer.

As your vendor pointed out, releasing the names and numbers of respondents is against professional standards designed to protect respondent's confidentiality. From a business perspective, I would be suspicious as well.

The motivations of the firm offering the validation are not clear, and they would be in a position to do a lot of damage.

Also, practically speaking, we routinely do validation on surveys as well, and find that it is difficult to validate any but the most factual questions,

and then only very shortly after the original call. The delays, and the potential for different protocol & question usage, induced by having a second vendor make the calls has the potential for turning up a lot of false "no verifies"

William Robb

Project Manager, Statistician

Macro International Inc.

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Wed Sep 22 12:38:45 1999

Received: from smtp5.mindspring.com (smtp5.mindspring.com [207.69.200.82])

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

id MAA22030 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 12:38:33 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from default (user-38ld4b4.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.145.100])

by smtp5.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id PAA27700;

Wed, 22 Sep 1999 15:38:26 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <4.2.0.58.19990922150851.009fd3f0@mail.mindspring.com>

X-Sender: rshalpern@mail.mindspring.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1999 15:15:27 -0400

To: lphillips@mpf.com

From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>



Subject: Re: Free Validation

Cc: aapornet@usc.edu

In-Reply-To: <37E91DFB.563E3A81@mpf.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="===== \_20604651== \_ALT"

--===== \_20604651== \_ALT

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

I think it is simply another way to get names and addresses of mailing lists for other uses. I concur with your vendor's reluctance to give up names to someone unknown to them. At 02:20 PM 9/22/1999 , you wrote:

Why would an unknown third party come out of the woods to validate for free???? There are few free lunches these days. Think what a marvelous data base this third party could build by making the offer to one research vendor after another --- at little cost to themselves, and then go and sell the list to other vendors. Another great way to make a few bucks! Sorry, but I am very skeptical when I hear these things.

Dick Halpern

>I would like some feedback on the following. We are a PR firm that as  
>part of its client work conducts issues surveys, political polling,  
>market surveys, etc. We use several large, well-known and reliable firms  
>to make our calls. Recently we won a bid to conduct a survey of public  
>attitudes toward schools in a medium-sized city. The survey was

>commissioned by the local Chamber of Commerce. A firm that was an  
>unsuccessful bidder on the project called the Chamber and offered to  
>validate our results for the Chamber pro bono. Our vendor says they  
>routinely validate a percentage of their calls as standard operating  
>procedure, but would be extremely uncomfortable turning over to a  
>competitor the names and numbers of the respondents both from a  
>professional and ethical standpoint. What does anyone else think of this  
>"Free Validation" offer, professionally, ethically, etc?

>

>Lyda Phillips

>MP&F

>lphillips@mpf.com

-----

Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D.

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology

3837 Courtyard Drive

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248

rshalpern@mindspring.com

phone/fax 770 434 4121

-----

--===== \_20604651==\_.ALT

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

<html>

<font size=3>I think it is simply another way to get names and addresses of mailing lists for other uses. I concur with your vendor's reluctance to give up names to someone unknown to them. At 02:20 PM 9/22/1999 , you wrote:<br>

<br>

Why would an unknown third party come out of the woods to validate for free???? There are few free lunches these days. Think what a marvelous data base this third party could build by making the offer to one research vendor after another --- at little cost to themselves, and then go and sell the list to other vendors. Another great way to make a few bucks! Sorry, but I am very skeptical when I hear these things.<br>

<br>

Dick Halpern<br>

<br>

<br>

<blockquote type=cite cite>I would like some feedback on the following.

We are a PR firm that as<br>

part of its client work conducts issues surveys, political polling,<br>

market surveys, etc. We use several large, well-known and reliable

firms<br>

to make our calls. Recently we won a bid to conduct a survey of

public<br>

attitudes toward schools in a medium-sized city. The survey was  
commissioned by the local Chamber of Commerce. A firm that was an  
unsuccessful bidder on the project called the Chamber and offered  
to

validate our results for the Chamber pro bono. Our vendor says they  
routinely validate a percentage of their calls as standard  
operating

procedure, but would be extremely uncomfortable turning over to a  
competitor the names and numbers of the respondents both from a  
professional and ethical standpoint. What does anyone else think of  
this

&quot;Free Validation&quot; offer, professionally, ethically, etc?  
<br>

Lyda Phillips<br>

MP&F<br>

lphillips@mpf.com</font></blockquote><br>

<br>

<br>

<br>

<br>

<br>

<br>

<br>

<hr>

<font size=1 color="#0000FF">Richard S. Halpern, Ph.D. <br>

Consultant, Strategic Marketing and Opinion Research <br>

Adjunct Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology <br>

3837 Courtyard Drive <br>

Atlanta, GA 30339-4248 <br>  
rshalpern@mindspring.com <br>  
phone/fax 770 434 4121 <br>  
<hr>  
</font></html>

-----\_20604651==\_ .ALT--

>From rrand@cfmc.com Wed Sep 22 12:59:11 1999  
Received: from mail.cfmc.com (main.cfmc.com [206.15.13.129])  
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP  
id MAA04704 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 12:59:07 -0700  
(PDT)  
Received: from rrand-W98 (rand-w95.cfmc.com [206.15.13.172])  
by mail.cfmc.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id MAA15687  
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 12:59:48 -0700  
Message-Id: <4.1.19990922120113.00bc9100@cfmc.com>  
X-Sender: rrand@cfmc.com  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1  
Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1999 12:10:21 -0700  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
From: Richard Rands <rrand@cfmc.com>  
Subject: Re: Free Validation  
In-Reply-To: <37E91DFB.563E3A81@mpf.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

>What does anyone else think of this  
>"Free Validation" offer, professionally, ethically, etc?

>

A "professional" vendor makes it a practice to do spot checks of their work, and if they are not already doing it, they should be monitoring a percentage of their calls. In that case, allowing a competitor with a potential "sour grapes" attitude would not be appropriate. You are opening the door to having the respondents inappropriately probed for wrong responses or even badgered into a negative response. If they have been promised confidentiality, giving their names to another group is unethical.

Richard Rands

President

CfMC

>From gulicke@slhn.org Wed Sep 22 13:08:50 1999

Received: from ntserver.slhn.org (ntserver.slhn.org [205.147.244.5])

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

id NAA10098 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 13:08:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by ntserver with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <SRHP09LS>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 16:07:34 -0400

Message-ID: <7138ECDD5A46D11192AC00805F1930FFBA5215@ntserver>

From: "Gulick, Elizabeth" <gulicke@slhn.org>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Trauma Patient Satisfsaction Survey

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1999 16:07:32 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BF0536.1B75759E"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BF0536.1B75759E

Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Thanks to all who responded to my request for information in measuring patient satisfaction with Trauma patients. Many, many of you responded and I feel compelled to share some of my findings. I was not able to find anything in the literature and have come to the conclusion that no specific tool exists. So, being the crazy person I am, I have developed my own tool based on the information needs of my facility. I feel shamed to tell you all this tool probably won't be tested for validity (we don't have the resources or expertise). But, I would like to share with you all some of the conclusions we came to in designing this tool. Some of these came from some of you out there in AAPOR land. Here goes:

- The patients themselves may not be able to complete the survey. The tool has been designed so that family members are encouraged to complete it if the patient cannot. The first question asks who is completing the survey.
- The "Trauma Experience" not only includes the Emergency Department but the whole visit from entry into the ED to discharge from the inpatient unit. Some of you survey your Trauma patients with your generic inpatient satisfaction survey.
- Communication with family regarding patient's condition seems to be a big factor in satisfaction with Trauma services.

- Some of the things we have asked on the survey included issues regarding communications with patient/family members, pain management, levels of privacy, Trauma team staff questions, if they had a choice which hospital would they go to for trauma related injuries, etc....

I'm sure some of you more experienced AAPORites are cringing at what might be thought of as a crude attempt at doing this. We are viewing this as a pilot with the hopes of publishing this in something that won't ridicule us for lack of validity testing. We hope to gain some quality improvement opportunities out of the results with the thought that the survey tool will be refined based on the results. Again, thanks to all who helped.

Elizabeth P. Gulick

Quality Coordinator

St. Luke's Hospital

801 Ostrum St.

Bethlehem, PA 18015

(610) 954 - 4129

(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)

[gulicke@slhn.org](mailto:gulicke@slhn.org) <mailto:gulicke@slhn.org>

-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BF0536.1B75759E

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">

<HTML>



<HEAD>

<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html"; =  
charset=3Diso-8859-1">

<META NAME=3D"Generator" CONTENT=3D"MS Exchange Server version =  
5.5.2448.0">

<TITLE>Trauma Patient Satisfsaction Survey</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY>

<P><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">Thanks to all who responded to my =  
request for information in measuring patient satisfaction with Trauma =  
patients.&nbsp; Many, many of you responded and I feel compelled to =  
share some of my findings.&nbsp; I was not able to find anything in the =  
literature and have come to the conclusion that no specific tool =  
exists.&nbsp; So, being the crazy person I am, I have developed my own =  
tool based on the information needs of my facility.&nbsp; I feel shamed =  
to tell you all this tool probably won't be tested for validity (we =  
don't have the resources or expertise).&nbsp; But, I would like to =  
share with you all some of the conclusions we came to in designing this =  
tool.&nbsp; Some of these came from some of you out there in AAPOR =  
land.&nbsp; Here goes:</FONT></P>

<UL><LI><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">The patients themselves may not =  
be able to complete the survey.&nbsp; The tool has been designed so =  
that family members are encouraged to complete it if the patient =  
cannot.&nbsp; The first question asks who is completing the =  
survey.</FONT></LI>

<LI><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">The "Trauma Experience" not only =  
includes the Emergency Department but the whole visit from entry into =

the ED to discharge from the inpatient unit.&nbsp;Some of you survey =  
your Trauma patients with your generic inpatient satisfaction =  
survey.</FONT></LI>

<LI><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">Communication with family regarding =  
patient's condition seems to be a big factor in satisfaction with =  
Trauma services.</FONT></LI>

<LI><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">Some of the things we have asked on =  
the survey included issues regarding communications with patient/family =  
members, pain management, levels of privacy, Trauma team staff =  
questions, if they had a choice which hospital would they go to for =  
trauma related injuries, etc....</FONT></LI>

<BR>

</UL>

<P><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Arial">I'm sure some of you more experienced =  
AAPORites are cringing at what might be thought of as a crude attempt =  
at doing this.&nbsp;We are viewing this as a pilot with the hopes of =  
publishing this in something that won't ridicule us for lack of =  
validity testing.&nbsp;We hope to gain some quality improvement =  
opportunities out of the results with the thought that the survey tool =  
will be refined based on the results.&nbsp;Again, thanks to all who =  
helped.</FONT></P>

<P><B><I><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Tahoma">Elizabeth P. =  
Gulick</FONT></I></B>

<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Tahoma">Quality Coordinator</FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Tahoma">St. Luke's Hospital</FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Tahoma">801 Ostrum St.</FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Tahoma">Bethlehem, PA&nbsp;18015</FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Tahoma">(610) 954 - 4129</FONT>

<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Tahoma">(610) 954 - 2050 (Fax)</FONT>

<BR><A HREF=3D"mailto:gulicke@slhn.org"><U><FONT COLOR=3D"#0000FF" =

SIZE=3D2 FACE=3D"Tahoma">gulicke@slhn.org</FONT></U></A>

</P>

</BODY>

</HTML>

-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01BF0536.1B75759E--

>From fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu Wed Sep 22 14:34:32 1999

Received: from pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu [130.39.64.234])

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

id OAA29424 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 14:34:30 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from weber (weber.lapop.lsu.edu [130.39.69.59]) by

pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (AIX4.3/UCB 8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id QAA15228 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 22 Sep 1999 16:26:31 -0500

Message-ID: <007501bf0541\$bcad2460\$3b452782@weber.laopo.lsu.edu>

Reply-To: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

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

Subject: Falling response rates, privacy, and a proposal

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1999 16:30:47 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3155.0

I'd like to float a fairly speculative idea on aapornet and see what people think. There's been a lot of discussion about falling response rates and respondents' concerns about privacy. Here are a few things that people point out:

- Many people believe they are fighting a rearguard battle to retain whatever shreds of privacy they still have, especially from marketing and political databases, whether mail, phone, or on-line.
  
- Many people find it very difficult to distinguish a legitimate survey researcher who is collecting information about the population in general from someone who is collecting information in order to target them as potential customers, voters, etc - or worse.
  
- Probably, these doubts and reservations are skewed toward those who have higher education/information, status, etc.
  
- Thus, there may be a skew along these lines in the samples we are able to collect, and survey non-response may be biased along these lines.
  
- This issue is likely to get worse, not better.

Here's my idea. What if there were a phone number that a skeptical respondent could call to verify that the interviewer is calling from a legitimate organization and it's not a scam. Jan Werner's posting earlier today showed how hard it can be for a would-be respondent to verify this information even from the organization running or sponsoring the survey.

Plus, why should the respondent believe the organization itself, especially if s/he doesn't know the organization? So, what if the verification number was some kind of independent consortium that all pollsters participated in (maybe 1-800-TRU-POLL ?). If a respondent didn't want to participate, the interviewer could give him/her a code number for the study, and the respondent could call 1-800-TRU-POLL and verify that the study was legit. And in turn, the survey organization would have to somehow register with 1-800-TRU-POLL and have their study vetted (say, according to AAPOR standards).

Now, I know this could be a big hassle for the survey researcher, and there are all kinds of potential issues of confidentiality, of protection of proprietary instruments and/or respondent lists, plus any number of technical problems ... the list could go on and on. But it's meant to address

what could be a growing problem that threatens all survey research. A couple considerations:

- Not every respondent would be directed to call 1-800-TRU-POLL; just the ones who otherwise refuse to participate. Obviously, not all of them would do it, but some might.

- It would be useful to list the phone number in phone books, so respondents would see that it's established. Plus, it could be publicized, so that it becomes known in the way that a margin of error has become known. Again, this would not be equally known to everyone, but it would probably be better known especially among those who would otherwise refuse to be interviewed, again, especially the better educated/informed.

- This would probably eventually lead to a kind of negotiation between respondents and interviewers about what would be asked. But this negotiation is already taking place. Privacy-minded respondents simply refuse to even begin the survey. Again, this is probably a growing number of people. These same people would probably ask what private information was going to be asked of them before they would agree to proceed. Surveyors might have to provide some of this information to 1-800-TRU-POLL and expect that the respondent would only answer certain types of questions. This part is most speculative, but it seems to follow from the premise.

Well, this is either quite speculative - or it's being done and I don't know about it! I'm sure there are plenty of problems with it, but if people like the idea, they could refine it. I also recognize that it's not something that survey researchers would probably \*want\* to do, but maybe it would provide a stop-gap that helps prevent a growing problem from getting worse.

What do people think?

Rick Weil

Frederick Weil, Associate Professor

Department of Sociology

Louisiana State University

Baton Rouge, LA 70803

225-388-1140 Phone

225-388-5102 FAX

email: [fweil@lapop.lsu.edu](mailto:fweil@lapop.lsu.edu)

>From kneuman@cra.ca Thu Sep 23 05:35:51 1999

Received: from cclgroup.ca ([142.176.86.2])

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

id FAA16465 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 05:35:49 -0700  
(PDT)

Message-id: <fc.000f7cf7001d91583b9aca002880562c.1d99df@cclgroup.ca>

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 1999 09:43:35 -0300

Subject: Re: Falling response rates, privacy, and a proposal

To: fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu

Cc: aapornet@usc.edu

From: kneuman@cra.ca (Keith Neuman)

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Rick Weil's concept of having an independent 1-800 phone number for  
skeptical

respondents is an interesting concept, and one that was actually instituted  
in

Canada several years ago, by an association of polling organizations  
concerned

about this very issue. Survey companies can register their surveys, pay a  
fee

per interview, and can then offer respondents the toll free number if they  
have

any concerns (this number is also publicized though only minimally).

Hard to say what the impact this system has had. Anyone interested in

finding

about more about it can contact: the Canadian Survey Research Council (no web

site but their phone is 416-620-0702). Their 1-800 number is 1-800-554-9996

Keith Neuman

Corporate Research Associates

Halifax, Nova Scotia

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Thu Sep 23 06:12:15 1999

Received: from makalu.hp.ufl.edu (root@makalu.hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.150])

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

id GAA23521 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 06:12:13 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.149])

by makalu.hp.ufl.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with ESMTP id JAA13132

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 09:24:00 -0400

Received: from K2/SpoolDir by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44);

23 Sep 99 09:21:30 -0500

Received: from SpoolDir by K2 (Mercury 1.44); 23 Sep 99 09:21:10 -0500

Received: from hp.ufl.edu (128.227.163.130) by hp.ufl.edu (Mercury 1.44)

with ESMTP;

23 Sep 99 09:20:56 -0500

Message-ID: <37EA29DC.85EA1385@hp.ufl.edu>

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 1999 09:23:44 -0400

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

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)



X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Falling response rates, privacy, and a proposal

References: <007501bf0541\$bcad2460\$3b452782@weber.laopo.lsu.edu>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Rick Weil wrote:

[some thoughtful observations including...]

- > - Many people believe they are fighting a rearguard battle to retain
- > whatever shreds of privacy they still have, especially from marketing and
- > political databases, whether mail, phone, or on-line.

This is kinda true, but I think it's a bit more complex than we realize.

The complaint I hear more often is the perceived time a survey takes rather than the invasion of privacy. But if they say something like, "intrusion into my life," we could interpret it either way.

Plus, I suspect there is a gender thing going on, with harried moms more concerned about the time crunch and guys lying on the couch having the luxury to worry about esoteric concepts like privacy. (Sexist, I know, but studies do show that women still do more of the house-related work, and we are catching these folks at home.)

And that theory may actually help explain why those young males seem to be such rare species in some of our samples.

- > - Many people find it very difficult to distinguish a legitimate survey

- > researcher who is collecting information about the population in general
- > from someone who is collecting information in order to target them as
- > potential customers, voters, etc - or worse.

Many amins. I just finished mailing off 10,700+ letters to people who were initially refusals/noncontacts for our RDD survey. We purposely attempted to look credible: writing on high-quality University letterhead, signing each letter in blue ink, giving the real first and last name of the PI.

It was amazing how many people responded, "Oh, we didn't know it was really someone like you...."

And of course we are so lucky to have the (generally) good name of the University to back us up. Of course, the downside of being affiliated with a college is that this is football season and in our case there are keen in-state rivalries which may hurt us in some areas. (How do you weight to account for that kind of bias?)

- > - Probably, these doubts and reservations are skewed toward those who have
- > higher education/information, status, etc.

Now there I can't quite agree. Although the NPR Car Guys demonstrated this kind of attitude recently in their public castigation of Census 2000, I have always felt that doubts cut across all socio-educational barriers.

I've even found (and did with this project, too) that once you adequately answered all the questions of the more-educated types, they

can sometimes be converted more easily. After all, think about how many higher-education people use statistics or polls in some aspect of their work.

But the less-educated sometimes have this stubborn distrust; there is nothing you can say to convince them that we are not going to make up whatever numbers we want.

BTW, those of you who are lucky enough to have 1-800 numbers for respondents to call are so far ahead. We only had a 1-888 number to list in the persuasion letter, and of course many people still don't really believe those are toll-free :(

> Here's my idea. What if there were a phone number that a skeptical  
> respondent could call to verify that the interviewer is calling from a  
> legitimate organization and it's not a scam. [...]

But if time crunch is a major factor, they are not going to bother.

And it all comes back to a public education campaign. Here in Florida, we could never win that battle, because the AARP is so far ahead of us in discouraging people to participate.

Not so sound discouraging, but...

Actually, our subcontractor hands out my name and phone number on a routine basis to skeptics. It helps that they can also call University information and ask for me, which is a way of validating who we are.

But that also makes us less likely to be willing to spend money to be listed with the TRU-POLL thing.

Colleen K. Porter

Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study

cporter@hp.ufl.edu

phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109

UF Department of Health Services Administration

Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>From lphillips@mpf.com Thu Sep 23 07:13:50 1999

Received: from eve.telalink.net (eve.telalink.net [207.152.1.3])

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

id HAA07507 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 07:13:48 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mail.telalink.net (death [207.152.1.12]) by eve.telalink.net

(MTA-v3.8/10.00v-fbmx-blkspam) with ESMTP id JAA04853 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 09:13:39 -0500 (CDT)

X-Envelope-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Received: from ([207.152.55.146])

by mail1.telalink.net (MTA-v4.9.1/0.0a-fbmx) with ESMTP id OAA08022

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 14:13:39 GMT

Message-ID: <37EA3587.968EC3BA@mpf.com>

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 1999 09:13:27 -0500

From: Lyda Phillips <lphillips@mpf.com>

Reply-To: lphillips@mpf.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 [en] (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Thanks

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thanks to everyone for "validating" my opinion that this was an unprofessional offer from a desperate competitor. Our client is politely refusing their offer for "free validation," though I liked the suggestion of having the chamber suggest they do a whole new survey free. I suspect they do have ulterior motives. I have been doing surveys with outside phone banks/statisticians for four years, and this is the first time anything like this has come up. Again, I really appreciate the responses and agree it's hard enough doing this work without having to fight sharks in the water.

Lyda Phillips

MP&F

lphillips@mpf.com

1-800-818-6953

>From dkb@casro.org Thu Sep 23 13:57:18 1999

Received: from mail.saturn5.net (mail.saturn5.net [207.122.105.6])

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

id NAA09561 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 13:57:15 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from diane ([207.122.105.206]) by mail.saturn5.net

(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-59533U600L2S100V35)

with SMTP id net for <aapornet@usc.edu>;

Thu, 23 Sep 1999 16:54:32 -0400

Message-ID: <00de01bf0607\$256b7400\$ca697acf@diane>

From: dkb@casro.org ((CASRO) Diane Bowers)

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Respondent Privacy

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 1999 17:03:43 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_00DB\_01BF05E5.978B4640"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_00DB\_01BF05E5.978B4640

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

In response to Rick Weil's suggestion re the 800 number: this is =  
precisely

what CMOR (the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research) is doing. We  
have set up an 800 number (1-800-887-CMOR or 2667), to which we have =  
just

added an IVR technology to provide consistent information to =  
respondents, to

the industry, and to the public in general. Interested consumers and =  
survey  
respondents can call CMOR's Consumer Hotline and receive information =  
about  
the research industry 24 hours a day.

Please visit CMOR's website ([www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org)) to learn more about this =  
program,  
to keep up to date about our efforts to address respondent cooperation  
issues, as well as our very successful efforts on government affairs. =

Diane  
Bowers

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

From: Rick Weil <[fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu](mailto:fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu)>  
To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Date: Wednesday, September 22, 1999 6:47 PM  
Subject: Falling response rates, privacy, and a proposal

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_00DB\_01BF05E5.978B4640

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 4.72.3110.7"" name=3DGENERATOR>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>

<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>

<DIV>In response to Rick Weil's suggestion re the 800 number:&nbsp; this =

is=20

precisely<BR>what CMOR (the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research) =

is=20

doing.&nbsp; We<BR>have set up an 800 number (1-800-887-CMOR or 2667), =

to which=20

we have just<BR>added an IVR technology to provide consistent =

information to=20

respondents, to<BR>the industry, and to the public in general.&nbsp; =

Interested=20

consumers and survey<BR>respondents can call CMOR's Consumer Hotline and =

receive=20

information about<BR>the research industry 24 hours a day.<BR><BR>Please =

visit=20

CMOR's website (<A href=3D"http://www.cmor.org">www.cmor.org</A>) to =

learn more=20

about this program,<BR>to keep up to date about our efforts to address=20

respondent cooperation<BR>issues, as well as our very successful efforts =

on=20

government affairs.&nbsp; Diane<BR>Bowers<BR>-----Original =

Message-----<BR>From:=20

Rick Weil &lt;<A=20

href=3D"mailto:fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu">fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu</=



A>&gt;<BR>To:=20

AAPORNET &lt;<A =

href=3D"mailto:aapornet@usc.edu">aapornet@usc.edu</A>&gt;<BR>Date:=20

Wednesday, September 22, 1999 6:47 PM<BR>Subject: Falling response =

rates,=20

privacy, and a proposal<BR></DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_00DB\_01BF05E5.978B4640--

>From mikemassagli@mediaone.net Thu Sep 23 19:26:11 1999

Received: from chmls06.mediaone.net (chmls06.mediaone.net [24.128.1.71])

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

id TAA11736 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 19:26:10 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mediaone.net (mikemassagli.ne.mediaone.net [24.128.40.255])

by chmls06.mediaone.net (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id WAA25258

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 22:26:09 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <37EAE0F4.A9353D5D@mediaone.net>

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 1999 22:24:52 -0400

From: Michael Massagli <mikemassagli@mediaone.net>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en]C-MOENE (Win98; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Subject: [Fwd: aapor posting]

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----8655F7637E1DFB38B2DB2C86"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----8655F7637E1DFB38B2DB2C86

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'd appreciate if you'd post the following notice of a job opportunity.

-----8655F7637E1DFB38B2DB2C86

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Return-Path: <Mike\_Massagli@picker.bidmc.harvard.edu>

Received: from chmls16.mediaone.net ([24.128.1.213]) by

chmls14.mediaone.net (Netscape Messaging Server 4.1) with ESMTP

id FIIYFV00.PLX for <mikemassagli@ne.mediaone.net>; Thu, 23 Sep

1999 14:09:31 -0400

Received: from chmls12.mediaone.net (chmls12.mediaone.net [24.128.1.214])

by chmls16.mediaone.net (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id OAA29687

for <mikemassagli@ne.mediaone.net>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 14:09:30 -0400

(EDT)

Received: from pickernotes.picker.bidmc.harvard.edu (pickernotes.picker.org

[134.174.239.194])

by chmls12.mediaone.net (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id OAA12003

for <mikemassagli@mediaone.net>; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 14:09:30 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by pickernotes.picker.bidmc.harvard.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA SMTP v4.6

(462.2 9-3-1997)) id 852567F5.00639068 ; Thu, 23 Sep 1999 14:07:30 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: PICKER

From: "Mike Massagli" <Mike\_Massagli@picker.bidmc.harvard.edu>

To: mikemassagli@mediaone.net

Message-ID: <852567F5.00637F87.00@pickernotes.picker.bidmc.harvard.edu>

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 1999 14:07:27 -0400

Subject: aapor posting

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

The Picker Institute is a non-profit [501 (c) (3)] organization located in Boston, Massachusetts. The Institute's mission is to promote healthcare quality assessment and improvement strategies that address patients' needs and concerns as defined by patients, and to help develop models of care that make the experience of illness and health care more humane. The Institute has developed standard survey methods of measuring patient experience with episodes of care for acute and chronic illness, and was part of the AHCPR-sponsored (Consumer Assessment of Health Plans Study) development team. The Institute assists in implementation of patient surveys and in devising quality improvement strategies to address the surveys' findings. The Institute's research and development staff, through externally-funded research grants, contracts, and on-going internal development projects, fosters the Institute's mission by discovering enhanced methods of collecting patient-generated feedback and devising new ways of incorporating it into healthcare improvement strategies.

The Institute is seeking qualified applicants for the position of Survey Scientist.

Duties: Develop survey instruments using state-of-the-art techniques of question design and evaluation; design samples, design analyses of survey data and prepare reports; oral presentation of results to clients and professionals; provide consultation/technical assistance to project teams on survey sampling, design and analysis. Write proposals and implement project plans. Lead internal development projects and externally funded

basic research projects.

Qualifications: Experienced survey research methodologist, 3 to 5 years.

Knowledge of health services research focused on patient experience of care, functional health status, and health-related quality of life.

Extensive knowledge of survey research methods, question design and evaluation, multivariate statistical methods, sampling and experimental design. Excellent written and oral communication skills. Supervisory skills and project management experience; advanced SAS, SPSS or database programming skills; Ph.D. required.

Please send your resume to: Human Resources, The Picker Institute, 1295

Boylston Street, Suite 100, Boston, MA 02215 or e-mail

brigid\_macdonald@picker.org. We are an equal opportunity employer M/F/D/V.

For more information about The Picker Institute, please visit our website at [www.picker.org](http://www.picker.org).

---

Michael Massagli

Director of Research and Development

The Picker Institute

1295 Boylston Street, Suite 100

Boston, MA 02215

Main Number: (617) 667-2388      Fax: (617) 975-5708      Direct

Line: (617) 667-8497

<http://www.picker.org>

---

-----8655F7637E1DFB38B2DB2C86--

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Sep 24 07:45:04 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id HAA17428 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 07:45:02 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id HAA28770 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 07:45:04 -0700

(PDT)

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 1999 07:45:04 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Conrad Taeuber, 1906-1999

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909240740510.27704-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

---

---

September 24, 1999

Conrad Taeuber, 93, Scholar

Who Directed Federal Censuses

By NICK RAVO

Conrad Taeuber, who directed the federal census in 1960 and 1970, died on Sept. 11 in a nursing home in Nashua, N.H., where he had been living for several years. He was 93.

Taeuber, a demographer by training, worked at the Federal Bureau of the Census from 1951 until 1973, becoming associate director for demographic programs in 1968.

Earlier in his career, after teaching at the University of Wisconsin and Mount Holyoke College, Taeuber examined rural problems and migration at the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the Federal Department of Agriculture.

Later, at the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization and the Census Bureau, Taeuber strove to improve the reliability of demographic data. He also taught at Georgetown University.

He wrote several books, "People of the Drought States," with Carl Taylor (1937), "Rural Migration in the United States," with C.R. Lively (1939), "The Changing Population of the United States," with his first wife, Irene Taeuber (1958), and "People of the United States in the 20th Century," also with Mrs. Taeuber (1971).

Taeuber was born on June 15, 1906, in Hosmer, S.D. He received his bachelor's degree, a master's degree and a doctorate from the University of Minnesota.

Mrs. Taeuber died in 1974. Taeuber's second wife, Dorothy Harris, died in 1998. He is survived by two sons, Richard of Salisbury, Md., and Karl of Madison, Wis.; three stepdaughters, Carolyn Wiljanen of Chelmsford, Mass., Joanne Harrington of Lenox, Mass., and Marilyn Clements of Reading, Mass.; a stepson, Robert Harris of Florida; a sister, Emmy Anderson of San Rafael, Calif.; 14 grandchildren, and 27 great-grandchildren.

---

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

>From john.nordbo@dot.state.wi.us Fri Sep 24 08:41:36 1999

Received: from dot.state.wi.us (hfstbx.dot.state.wi.us [130.47.34.2])

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

id IAA07745 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 08:41:26 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by dot.state.wi.us; id LAA25736; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 11:41:26 -0400

(EDT)

Received: from mes01.dot.state.wi.us(130.47.218.16) by

hfstbx.dot.state.wi.us via smap (V4.2)

id xma025643; Fri, 24 Sep 99 10:41:15 -0500

Received: by mes01.dot.state.wi.us with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

id <SKP41XKH>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 10:41:15 -0500

Message-ID: <3995FAFE614ED211A9330060942583E90180D03E@mes02.dot.state.wi.us>

From: "Nordbo, John" <john.nordbo@dot.state.wi.us>

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

Subject: Organizations who offer training seminars

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 1999 10:41:13 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)



Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Greetings!

I am seeking information on organizations through which I can attend training on Survey Research and Survey Program Management skills. At present, I am unable to commit to (semester-long) college courses, thus, I am primarily interested in three-day to five-day-long seminars or workshops. I have looked into the short programs offered through the UW Management Institute here in Madison. While they appear to offer some of what I am looking for, I would like to learn more about other opportunities offered through places such as the Nielsen Burke Institute in Cincinnati (whom I have already contacted).

Any information you can provide on organizations who offer this type of training would be greatly appreciated!

Thank you,

John P. Nordbo  
Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
Office of Organizational Development Services  
4802 Sheboygan Ave Room 414  
Madison, WI 53707  
mailto:john.nordbo@dot.state.wi.us

>From BGroves@survey.umd.edu Fri Sep 24 09:06:21 1999

Received: from survey.umd.edu (survey.umd.edu [129.2.169.4])

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

id JAA18040 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 09:06:20 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from JPSM-Message\_Server by survey.umd.edu

with Novell\_GroupWise; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 12:06:10 -0400

Message-Id: <s7eb6932.081@survey.umd.edu>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 1999 12:06:02 -0400

From: "Bob Groves" <BGroves@survey.umd.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Organizations who offer training seminars

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

You might want to check out the JPSM web site

[www.jpsm.umd.edu/=20](http://www.jpsm.umd.edu/=20)

>>> "Nordbo, John" <john.nordbo@dot.state.wi.us> 09/24/99 11:41AM >>>

Greetings!

I am seeking information on organizations through which I can attend training on Survey Research and Survey Program Management skills. At present, I am unable to commit to (semester-long) college courses, thus, I am primarily interested in three-day to five-day-long seminars or = workshops.

I have looked into the short programs offered through the UW Management

Institute here in Madison. While they appear to offer some of what I am looking for, I would like to learn more about other opportunities offered through places such as the Nielsen Burke Institute in Cincinnati (whom I have already contacted). =20

Any information you can provide on organizations who offer this type of training would be greatly appreciated! =20

Thank you,=20

John P. Nordbo  
Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
Office of Organizational Development Services  
4802 Sheboygan Ave Room 414  
Madison, WI 53707  
mailto:john.nordbo@dot.state.wi.us=20

>From fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu Fri Sep 24 10:20:29 1999

Received: from pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu [130.39.64.234])

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

id KAA01038 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 10:20:26 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from weber (weber.lapop.lsu.edu [130.39.69.59]) by

pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu (AIX4.3/UCB 8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id MAA13646 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 12:12:38 -0500

Message-ID: <002701bf06b0\$98e6b350\$3b452782@weber.lapop.lsu.edu>

Reply-To: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

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

Subject: Re: Falling response rates, privacy, and a proposal

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 1999 12:16:53 -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

I thought I might summarize & respond to a day's worth of responses to the idea of having a toll-free number that skeptical respondents could call to verify that a survey was legit - some were on-list, some off-list.

- The Canadian Survey Research Council is already doing something of this sort, but it's hard to say what impact it's had yet.

- My suggestion is probably most relevant for better-educated people who have time in principle to respond to a survey. It won't help encourage people who refused because they don't have enough time in the first place. Also, people who are broadly socially alienated - often lower status, lower educated - are not likely to believe reassurances any more than they (didn't) believe the initial interviewer.

- University research probably needs this suggestion less than does commercial research because of the University's legitimating "halo" effect. Also, many people are concerned about telemarketing and don't really expect

that to come from a university. Finally, if a skeptical would-be respondent can call a university researcher whose number is publicly listed, that may be sufficient to answer concerns.

- CMOR (the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research) is already partly doing this. However, I looked at the CMOR website & phoned their 800 number, and I think they're not doing quite what I had in mind. Their web site and phone number mainly provide general education and information about the distinction between survey research and telemarketing (possibly oversimplifying somewhat). This is likely to \*reinforce\* the skeptical respondent's concerns, not allay them. The skeptical respondent wants to know whether the interviewer who \*just called\* is a survey researcher, telemarketer, or what, and CMOR doesn't seem set up to answer that question now. It sounds like CMOR might have an ideal starting basis for building such a system, since they already address the question in general. If that's something they wanted to do, they are probably well-placed to do it.

Rick Weil

Frederick Weil, Associate Professor

Department of Sociology

Louisiana State University

Baton Rouge, LA 70803

225-388-1140 Phone

225-388-5102 FAX

email: [fweil@lapop.lsu.edu](mailto:fweil@lapop.lsu.edu)

>From lavrakas.1@osu.edu Fri Sep 24 11:58:28 1999

Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu  
[128.146.214.32])

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

id LAA26620 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 11:58:26 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from oemcomputer (ts33-9.homenet.ohio-state.edu [140.254.114.160])

by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA23560

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 14:58:25 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 1999 14:58:25 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <199909241858.OAA23560@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: lavrakas.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu

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: Full and Assistant Professor openings

It is with considerable pride that the School of Journalism and  
Communications and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences at Ohio  
State University announces these faculty openings for which searches will be  
conducted during the 1999/2000 academic year.

The School under the leadership of AAPOR member, Dr. Carroll Glynn, has  
identified both Public Opinion and Political Communication as among its key  
core areas of concentration.

Please circulate this information to whomever you think would be interested

and would qualify.

-----

### Tenured Full Professor Opening

The School of Journalism and Communications at The Ohio State University invites applicants for one tenured faculty opening for Full Professor starting September 2000. Applications are sought from senior scholars who already hold that rank or who would be clearly eligible for promotion to the rank by September 2000.

The School is seeking an extremely accomplished individual who will make very important contributions to the social science research, teaching, and service responsibilities of the School in one or more of the following priority areas: (1) public opinion; (2) political communication; (3) new communication technologies and society; and, (4) mass communication, including public affairs journalism. A Ph.D. in communication or in another relevant social science discipline and a strong record of one's commitment to communication as evidenced through existing scholarship is expected.

The School of Journalism and Communication, which is part of the OSU College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, was formed July 1, 1996, by the merger of the former School of Journalism and Department of Communication. The School offers the B.A., M.A. and Ph.D., and intends to be a leading center in the teaching and application of social science research in the field. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences has many excellent units, including top-rated empirical programs in political science, psychology, geography, and sociology, and a new, vigorous Center for Survey Research

which provides numerous research opportunities for faculty throughout the University.

The Ohio State University is one of the nation's largest and most comprehensive public research universities. It is located in Columbus, the state capital, a high quality-of-life and rapidly growing and diversifying metropolitan area of more than 1.5 million residents. The area offers a wide range of affordable housing, many cultural and recreational amenities, and a strong service and technology-based economy. Additional information about the University and school is available via [www.osu.edu](http://www.osu.edu) and about the Columbus area at [www.columbus.org](http://www.columbus.org).

A review of applications will take place starting November 15, 1999 and continue until the position is filled. Applicants should send: (1) a three to five page letter of application which includes a very clear statement of the candidates' scholarly agenda as it explicitly relates to the above mentioned social science priority areas of the School; (2) a vita; and (3) the names of and full contact information for at least three references. This application packet should be sent to: Faculty Search Committee Chair, School of Journalism and Communication, The Ohio State University, 154 North Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210-1339. Please note that Ohio State University is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action Employer. Our School seeks a highly diversified group of faculty, and especially encourages applications from women, minorities, Vietnam era and disabled veterans, and other individuals with disabilities.



## Tenure Track Assistant Professor Openings

The School of Journalism and Communication at The Ohio State University invites applicants for two to four tenure track faculty openings for Assistant Professor starting September 2000. Applications are sought from promising individuals who either will be newly starting at the rank of Assistant Professor or continuing at that rank. It is expected that all Ph.D. work will have been completed before September 2000.

The School is seeking very promising individuals who will make important contributions to the social science research, teaching, and service responsibilities of the School in one or more of the following priority areas: (1) public opinion; (2) political communication; (3) new communication technologies and society; and, (4) mass communication, (which can include public affairs journalism). All candidates are expected to be able to contribute to the School's core teaching areas at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. A Ph.D. in communication or in another relevant social science discipline and a strong commitment to communication as evidenced through existing scholarship should be in hand at the time the appointment is made.

The School of Journalism and Communication, which is part of the OSU College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, was formed July 1, 1996, by the merger of the former School of Journalism and Department of Communication. The School offers the B.A., M.A. and Ph.D., and intends to be a leading center in the teaching and application of social science research in the field. The College of Social and Behavioral sciences has many excellent units, including top-rated empirical programs in political science, psychology,

geography, and sociology, and a new, vigorous Center for Survey Research which provides numerous research opportunities for faculty throughout the University.

The Ohio State University is one of the nation's largest and most comprehensive public research universities. It is located in Columbus, the state capital, a high quality-of-life and rapidly growing and diversifying metropolitan area of more than 1.5 million residents. The area offers a wide range of affordable housing, many cultural and recreational amenities, and a strong service and technology-based economy. Additional information about the University and school is available via [www.osu.edu](http://www.osu.edu) and about the Columbus area at [www.columbus.org](http://www.columbus.org).

A review of applications will take place starting November 15, 1999 and continue until positions are filled. Applicants should send: (1) a three to five page letter of application which includes a very clear statement of the candidates' scholarly agenda as it explicitly relates to the above mentioned social science priority areas of the School; (2) a vita; and (3) the names of and full contact information for at least three references. This application packet should be sent to: Faculty Search Committee Chair, School of Journalism and Communication, The Ohio State University, 154 North Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210-1339. Please note that Ohio State University is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action Employer. Our School seeks a highly diversified group of faculty, and especially encourages applications from women, minorities, Vietnam era and disabled veterans, and other individuals with disabilities.

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Sat Sep 25 03:13:15 1999

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 DAA26529; Sat, 25 Sep 1999 03:13:14 -0700 (PDT)

From: MILTGOLD@aol.com

Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com

by imo22.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id yBCLa12189 (3950);

Sat, 25 Sep 1999 06:12:39 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <da670bcd.251dfa17@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 25 Sep 1999 06:12:39 EDT

Subject: Re: Organizations who offer training seminars

To: john.nordbo@dot.state.wi.us, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 3.0.1 for Mac sub 79

In a message dated 9/24/99 11:42:09 AM, john.nordbo@dot.state.wi.us wrote:

<<I am seeking information on organizations through which I can attend training on Survey Research and Survey Program Management skills. At present, I am unable to commit to (semester-long) college courses, thus, I am primarily interested in three-day to five-day-long seminars or workshops.>>

It sounds like you might be willing to travel outside your area. Therefore,

I'm suggesting the Institute for Program Evaluation, in Arlington, VA (IPE) which just sent out their catalog. It contains short several day courses taught by various professionals in Survey Research, Program Evaluation, Analysis of Messy Data (their title), and some survey program management courses, I think. One course is taught by Johnny Blair of the University of Maryland Survey Research Center. Perhaps they're on the web (I would guess as [ipe.com](http://ipe.com), but I'm not sure).

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

Research Statistician

U. S. Dept. of Justice

[miltgold@aol.com](mailto:miltgold@aol.com)

>From [RoniRosner@aol.com](mailto:RoniRosner@aol.com) Mon Sep 27 09:29:49 1999

Received: from [imo15.mx.aol.com](mailto:imo15.mx.aol.com) ([imo15.mx.aol.com](mailto:imo15.mx.aol.com) [198.81.17.5])

by [usc.edu](http://usc.edu) (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id JAA07074 for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Mon, 27 Sep 1999 09:29:48 -0700

(PDT)

From: [RoniRosner@aol.com](mailto:RoniRosner@aol.com)

Received: from [RoniRosner@aol.com](mailto:RoniRosner@aol.com)

by [imo15.mx.aol.com](mailto:imo15.mx.aol.com) (mail\_out\_v22.4.) id 5SKRa10642 (4323)

for <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>; Mon, 27 Sep 1999 12:29:15 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <19bd1d40.2520f55a@aol.com>

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 1999 12:29:14 EDT

Subject: "Designing Great Questionnaires" -- 10/6 NYAAPOR afternoon workshop

To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 4.0 for Windows 95 sub 215

Date ..... Wednesday, 6 October 1999

Time ..... 1:30 p.m. sharp -- 4:30 p.m. -- NOTE NEW TIME!

Place ..... NBC/Mezzanine

30 Rockefeller Plaza (49th - 50th)

MUST USE STUDIO ELEVATORS

(in center of lobby, follow signs)

DESIGNING GREAT QUESTIONNAIRES: Part II

Dr. Jon Krosnick, Departments of Psychology and

Political Science, Ohio State University

Last year, Dr. Krosnick presented a highly-regarded -- and sold-out -- short course on question writing. This year, he will address a new set of topics, including:

- \* no-opinion filters,
- \* question wording,
- \* question order,
- \* attitude recall questions,
- \* and asking "why?"

His talk is based on research on the cognitive processes in which survey respondents engage when answering questions. Krosnick will identify cognitive issues to be considered when writing survey questions and make useful recommendations regarding how to avoid sources of bias in measurement and maximize accuracy.

Dr. Jon Krosnick has emerged as a leader in survey design. He has published numerous articles related to improving survey data collection techniques, and is the author of the forthcoming book "The Handbook of Questionnaire Design" (Oxford Press, 1999), the basis of this workshop.

ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE PHONE RESERVATION ONLY. So, reserve now! E-MAIL RONI ROSNER (RoniRosner@aol.com), or call if you must (212/722-5333).

Return the form below with your cheque by Friday, 1 Oct. Pre-paid fees are on the return form below. Fees at the door are: \$50 (members), \$65 (nonmembers), \$30 (student members), \$40 (student nonmembers, HLMs). Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

-----  
I will attend the NYAAPOR afternoon workshop on Wed., 6 Oct. 1999 with \_\_\_\_\_ additional guests.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

OFFICE PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

HOME PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

AFFILIATION: \_\_\_\_\_

GUEST'S NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

AFFILIATION: \_\_\_\_\_

PREPAID FEES:

MEMBERS: \$40 \_\_\_ NONMEMBERS: \$55 \_\_\_ STUDENT

MEMBERS: \$25 \_\_\_ STUDENT NONMEMBERS, HLMs: \$35 \_\_\_

Send form and cheque payable to NYAAPOR by 1 Oct. to:

Roni Rosner, 1235 Park Avenue, #7C, New York, New York 10128-1759

>From daves@startribune.com Mon Sep 27 13:41:35 1999

Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com  
[132.148.80.211])

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

id NAA28789 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 27 Sep 1999 13:41:32 -0700

(PDT)

Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id PAA29115; Mon, 27 Sep 1999

15:49:23 -0500

Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by  
firewall2.startribune.com via smap (V4.2)

id xma027790; Mon, 27 Sep 99 15:47:12 -0500

Received: from STAR-Message\_Server by mail.startribune.com

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 27 Sep 1999 15:36:55 -0600

Message-Id: <s7ef8f17.008@mail.startribune.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 1999 15:36:21 -0600

From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: AAPOR Code clarification

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="=\_3462E167.00611FE7"

This is a MIME message. If you are reading this text, you may want to consider changing to a mail reader or gateway that understands how to properly handle MIME multipart messages.

--=\_3462E167.00611FE7

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Fellow AAPOR members,

As you may know, a committee that includes Janice Ballou, Paul Lavrakas, David Moore, Tom Smith and me is revising AAPOR's Standard Definitions booklet. One of the things that the committee is proposing to Council is a clarification in the portion of the AAPOR Code that refers to "completion rates." Tom Smith drafted that proposal, which I've included here as a MS-Word attachment and as a part of the text of this message as a courtesy to those who don't have MS-Word. Council suggested in its September meeting that we post the memo to get comments from you prior to Council's November meeting.

Thanks in advance for your thoughtful deliberation.

For the Standard Definitions committee,

Rob Daves

Director of polling & news research

Star Tribune

Minneapolis

daves@startribune.com

612/673-7278



## A Note on the AAPOR Code

Tom W. Smith

NORC, University of Chicago

May, 1999

Revised June, 1999

The AAPOR Standards of Minimal Disclosure require the distribution =  
of...

"5. Size of sample and, if applicable, completion =  
rates and information on eligibility criteria and screening procedures."

1. "Completion rates" is not mentioned in the Standard Definition =  
publication, nor is it used in a dozen major works on survey methods and =  
sampling that I consulted. But from two sources that do use it, we can =  
determine what AAPOR's code is calling for.=20

a. The CASRO Response Rates report (p. 8) says that "Completion =  
Rate is to be considered as a collective term that is used to designate =  
how well a task has been accomplished. In general, completion rates are =  
used to measure how well the various components involved in a sample =  
survey are accomplished." The CASRO report adds, "In determining a =  
response rate, completion rates are used to evaluate the component steps. =

These component steps are then combined to form the response rate."=20

b. Lessler and Kalsbeek (1992, p. 368-369), in *Nonsampling Error in Surveys* note 11 definitions of completion rates, including 8 cited in the CASRO report. These cover a range of meanings and include both cooperation and response rates as defined in Standard Definitions as well as others things such as eligibility rate.

I believe that the "completion rates" in the AAPOR code should be understood to cover all outcome rates as defined in Standard Definitions. That is, "completion rates" is the same as "outcome rates" in that document and refers to the family of distinct rates (response, nonresponse, cooperation, refusal, etc.) that may be calculated based on the final disposition of sample cases.

I propose that a) Council adopt this understanding of the term "completion rates" and b) in the next edition of Standard Definition a line be added saying that completion rates are the range of figures herein referred to as outcome rates.

2. "if applicable" is a potentially dangerous loophole. It is my understanding that it was added to cover convenience samples and other non-probability designs for which completion rates could not be calculated. What AAPOR means is illustrated by a similar passage in *Best Practices*...=20

"12. Disclose all methods of the survey to permit evaluation and replication...A comprehensive list of the elements proposed for disclosure...includes...

documentation and a full description, if applicable=

, of any response or completion rates cited (for quota designs, the number =  
of refusals)..."

Thus, completion rates should be reported for all surveys using designs =  
that are open to the calculation of such rates and even for designs that =  
don't permit the calculation of all such rates (e.g. quota samples), =  
appropriate rates should be presented.

The danger is that "if applicable" could be interpreted in other =  
ways such as, "if they exist" or "if available."=20

I propose that AAPOR Council adopt an interpretation of "if =  
applicable" that (as a first cut) says something like...

Completion rates should be disclosed in all cases =  
in which a survey design is open to the calculation of such rates. This =  
would typically include all random or full-probability samples (e.g. RDD =  
telephone surveys). For sample designs that do not employ such a design =  
(e.g. block quota samples), appropriate outcome figures such as the number =  
of attempted cases, the number of completed cases, and the number of =  
refusals should be routinely reported.=20

--=\_3462E167.00611FE7

Content-Type: application/octet-stream; name="nonresp.doc"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="nonresp.doc"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAANgAAAAAAAA  
AA

EAAAOAAAAEAAAD+////AAAAADUAAAD////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////s

pcEAWQAJBAAACBK/AAAAAAAAEAAAAABAAA4hEAAA4AYmpIavNX81cAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAAJBBYABykAAJE9AQCRPQEA1Q0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//w8AAAA  
A

AAAAAAD//w8AAAAAAAAAAD//w8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAF0AAAAAGIEAAAAAAAYgQAAGIE  
AAAAAAAYgQAAAAAABiBAAAAAAAGIEAAAAAAAYgQAABQAAAAAAAAAAAAAHYEAAAAAADgQA  
AAAAAB2BAAAAAAAHYEAAA4AAArgQAAAwAAC6BAAAFAAAAHYEAAAAAAAgSAAAYBAADaBAAA  
AAAAANoEAAAAAAA2gQAAAAAADaBAAAAAANoEAAAAAAA2gQAAAAAADaBAAAAAANoEAA  
AA

AAAAIAYAAIAAACWBgAAAAAAJYGAAAAAAAgYAAGcAAAD9BgAAGgIAABcJAAAaAgAAMQsAACQA  
AABwDAAA9AEAGQOABaAAAAVQsAABUAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAYgQAAAAAADaBAAAA  
AA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADaBAAAAAANoEAAAAAAA2gQAAAAAADaBAAAAAAAFULAAAA  
AA

JgYAAAAAABiBAAAAAAAGIEAAAAAAA2gQAAAAAAANoEAAAAAAA2gQAAAAAA  
m

BgAAAAAACYGAAAAAAAJgYAAAAAADaBAAAmgAAAGIEAAAAAAA2gQAAAAAABiBAAAAAANoE  
AAAAAAAIYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADgQAAAAAAB2BAAAAAAAGIEAAAAAAAYgQA  
AAAAABiBAAAAAAAGIEAAAAAAA2gQAAAAAACUBgAAAAAACYGAAABuAAAAJgYAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAAAAJQGAAAAAAAYgQAAAAAABiBAAAAAAANoEAAAAAAANoEAAAAAAANoEAAAAAAANoE  
AA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAIYAAAAAADaBAAAAAAAM4EAAAMAAAAwLxpFJD  
/

vgF2BAAAAAAAAHYEAAAAAAAAAdAUAALIAAACUBgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
UEg

Tm90ZSBvbiB0aGUgQUFQT1lgQ29kZRNQUklWQVRFlAEVDQ0JVG9tIFcuIFNtaXRoDQ0JTk9SQuywg  
VW5pdmVyc2l0eSBvZiBDbGljYWdvDQ0JTW5F5LCAxOTk5DQlSZXZpc2VkiEp1bmUsIDE5OTkNDQ0J  
VGhliEFBUe9SIFN0YW5kYXJkcyBvZiBNaW5pbWFSIERpc2Nsb3N1cmUgcmVxdWlyZSB0aGUgZGlz  
dHJpYnV0aW9uIG9mLi4uDQ0JjUuIFNpemUgby2Ygc2FtcGxllGFuZCAsaWYgYXBwbGljYWJsZSwg  
Y29tcGxldGlubiByYXRlcyBhbmQgaW5mb3JtYXRpb24gb24gZWxpZ2liaWxpdkHkgY3JpdGVyaWEg  
YW5kIHJmcmVlbnluZyBwcm9jZWR1cmVzLiINDTEuIjJDb21wbGV0aW9uIHJhdGVzIiBpcyBub3Qg  
bWVudGlubmVklGlulHRoZSBTdGFuZGFyZCBEZwZpbml0aW9uIHb1YmXpY2F0aW9uLCBub3lgaXMg  
aXQgdXNlZCBpbilBhIGRvemVuIG1ham9yIHdvcmtzIG9uIHh1cnZleSBtZXRob2RzIGFuZCBzYW1w  
bGluZyB0aGF0IEkgY29uc3VsdGVkLiBCdXQgZnJvbSB0d28gc291cmNlcyB0aGF0IGRvIHVzZSBp  
dCwgd2UgY2FuIGRldGVybWluZSB3aGF0IEFBUe9Sj3MgY29kZSBpcyBjYWxsaW5nIGZvci4gDQ0J  
YS4gVGhliENBU1JPIFJlc3BvbnNlIFJhdGVzIHJlcG9yCAocC4gOCkgc2F5cyB0aGF0ICJDb21w  
bGV0aW9uIFJhdGUgaXMgdG8gYmUgY29uc2lkZXJlZCBhcyBhIGNvbGxIY3RpdmUgdGVybSB0aGF0  
IGlzIHVzZWQgdG8gZGVzaWduYXRlIGhvdyB3ZWxsIGegdGFzayBoYXMGYmVlbiBhY2NvbXBsaXNo  
ZWQuIElulGdlbmVyYWwsIGNvbXBsZXRob24gcmF0ZXMGYXJlIHVzZWQgdG8gbWVhc3VyZSBob3cg  
d2VsbCB0aGUgdmFyaW91cyBjb21wb25lbnRzIGludm9sdmVklGlulGEgc2FtcGxllHN1cnZleSBh  
cmUgYWNjb21wbGlzaGVkLiIGVGHliENBU1JPIHJlcG9ydCBhZGRzLCAiSW4gZGV0ZXJtaW5pbmCG  
YSByZXNwb25zZSBYXRlLCBjb21wbGV0aW9uIHJhdGVzIGFyZSB1c2VkiHRvIGV2YWx1YXRlIHRO  
ZSBjb21wb25lbnQgc3RlcHMuIFRoZXNlIGNvbXBvbmVudCBzdGVwcyBhcmUgdGhlbiBjb21iaW5l  
ZCB0byBmb3JtIHROZSBYXNwb25zZSBYXRlLiIGDQ0JYi4gTGvzc2xlcilBhbmQgS2Fsc2JlZSwg  
KDE5OTIsIHAuIDM2OC0zNjklCBpbilBOb25zYW1wbGluZyBFcnJvciBpcyBTdXJlZlZlIG5vdGUg  
MTEgZGVmaW5pdGlubnMgb2YgY29tcGxldGlubiByYXRlcywgaW5jbHVkaW5nIDggY2l0ZWQgaW4g  
dGhliENBU1JPIHJlcG9ydC4gVGhlc2UgY292ZXlYYSByYW5nZSBvZiBtZWZuaW5ncyBhbmQgaW5j  
bHVkZSBib3RoIGNvb3BlcmF0aW9uIGFuZCBYXNwb25zZSBYXRlcyBhcyBkZWZpbmVklGlulFN0  
YW5kYXJkIERlZmluaXRpb25zIGFzIHdlbGwgYXMGb3RoZXJlIHROaW5ncyBzdWN0IGFzIGVsaWdp

YmlsaXR5IHJhdGUuDQ0JSSBiZWxpZXZlIHRoYXQgdGhlcjB21wbGV0aW9uIHJhdGVzliBpbjB0  
aGUgQUFQT1IlgY29kZSBzaG91bGQgYmUgdW5kZXJzdG9vZCB0byBjb3ZlciBhbGwgb3V0Y29tZSBy  
YXRlcyBhcyBkZWZpbmVkiGluIFN0YW5kYXJkIERlZmluaXRpb25zLiBUaGF0IGlzLCAiY29tcGxl  
dGlvbiByYXRlcyIgaXMgdGhliHNhbWUgYXMglm91dGNvbWUgcmF0ZXMiIGluIHROyXQgZG9jdW1l  
bnQgYW5kIHJlZmVycyB0byB0aGUgZmFtaWx5IG9mIGRpc3RpbmN0IHJhdGVzIChyZXNwb25zZSwg  
bm9ucmVzcG9uc2UsIGNvb3BlcmF0aW9uLCByZWZ1c2FsLCBlidGMuKSBOaGF0IG1heSBiZSBjYWxj  
dWxhdGVkIGJhc2VkiG9uIHRoZSBmaW5hbCBkaXNwb3NpdGlvbiBvZiBzYW1wbGUgY2FzZXMuDQlJ  
IHByb3Bvc2UgdGhhdCBhKSBD3VuY2IsIGFkb3B0IHRoaXMgdW5kZXJzdGFuZGluzYvZiB0aGUg  
dGVybySAiY29tcGxlidGlvbiByYXRlcyIlgYW5kiGplIGluIHRoZSBuZXh0IGVkaXRpb24gb2YgU3Rh  
bmRhcmlmQgRGVmaW5pdGlvbiBhIGxpbnUgYmUgYWRkZWQgc2F5aW5nIHRoYXQgY29tcGxlidGlvbiBy  
YXRlcyBhcmUgdGhliHNhbmdlIG9mIGZpZ3VyZXMGaGVyZWluIHJlZmVycmVkiHRvIGFzIG91dGNv  
bWUgcmF0ZXMuDQ0yLiAiaWYgYXBwbGljYWJsZSIgaXMgYSBwb3RlbnRpYWxseSBkYW5nZXJvdXMg  
bG9vcGhvbGUuEl0IGlzlG15IHVuZGVyc3RhbmlmRpbmcmgdGhhdCBpdCB3YXMgYWRkZWQgdG8gY292  
ZXIlgY29udmVuaWVuY2Ugc2FtcGxlcyBhbmQgb3RoZXIgbm9uLXByb2JhYmlsaXR5IGRlc2lnbnMg  
Zm9yIHdoaWN0IGNvbXBsZXRp24gcmF0ZXMGY291bGQgYm90IGlIGNhbGN1bGF0ZWQuIFdoYXQg  
QUFQT1IlgBWVhbnMgaXMgaWxsdXN0cmF0ZWQgYnkgYSBzaW1pbGFyIHh3c3NhZ2UgaW4gQmVzdCBQ  
cmFjdGllZXMuLi4gDQ0JlJyLiBEaXNjbG9zZSBhbGwgbWV0aG9kcyBvZiB0aGUgcmF0ZXMuDQ0yLiA  
IHBlcm1pdCBldmFsdWF0aW9uIGFuZCBYb3BsaWNhdGlvbi4uLkEgY29tcHJlaGVuc2l2ZSBsaXN0  
IG9mIHRoZSBibGVtZW50cyBwcm9wb3NIZCBmb3IglZGZlY2xvc3VyZS4uLmluY2x1ZGVzLi4uDQ0J  
ZG9jdW1lbnRhdGlvbiBhbmQgYSBmdWxslGRlc2NyaXB0aW9uLCBpZiBhcHBsaWNhYmxlLCBvZiBh  
bnkgcmVzcG9uc2Ugb3IlgY29tcGxlidGlvbiByYXRlcyBjaXRIZCAoZm9yIHJlZmVycmVkiHRvIGRlc2lnbnMs  
IHRoZSBudW1iZXIgb2YgcmVmdXNhbHMpLi4uIG0NVGh1cywgY29tcGxlidGlvbiByYXRlcyBzaG91  
bGQgYmUgcmVwb3J0ZWQgZm9yIGFsbCBzdXJ2ZXIzIHVzaW5nIGRlc2lnbnMgdGhhdCBhcmUgb3Bl  
biB0byB0aGUgY2F5Y3VsYXRpb24gb2Ygc3VjaCBYb3RlcyBhbmQgZXZlbiBmb3IglZGVzaWduY292  
aGF0IGRvbid0IHBlcm1pdCB0aGUgY2F5Y3VsYXRpb24gb2YgYWxsIHh1Y2ggcmF0ZXMGKGUuZy4g  
cXVvdGEgc2FtcGxlcyksIGFwcHJvcHJpYXRlIHJhdGVzIHNo3VsZCBiZSBwcmVzcW50ZWQuDQlU  
aGUgZGFuZ2VylGlzIHRoYXQgImImIGFwcGxpY2FibGUuIGNvdWxkiGllIGludGVycHJldGVkiGlu  
IG90aGVyIHdheXMgc3VjaCBhcywglmImIHRoZXkgZXhpc3QiIG9yICJpZiBhdmFpbGFibGUuIiAN  
CUkgcHJvcG9zZSB0aGF0IEFBUE9SIENvdW5jaWwgYWRvcHQgYW4gaW50ZXJwcmV0YXRpb24gb2Yg











AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAZBAAAGgQAACIEAA  
Aj

BAAAJAQAAGoFAAB9BQAAVQgAAHEIAAGCQAANAKAAOJAAD0CQAAWQsAAGwLAADIDAAA8wwAANU  
R

AADWEQAA4REA AOIRAAD99PDk9P3g/eD94P3g/eD94P3bAP0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
kDagAAABVCAEHPioBQIj9/xcCCIEDagAAAAAGCAFAiP3/  
Q0oUAFUIAQcCCIFaiP3/EAllgQNqAAAAAECI/f9VCAEABECI/f8VAAQAACUEAAAmBAAANAQAADUE  
AABSBAAUwQA AF4EAABYBAAAcwQA AHQE AAC+BAAAvwQA ADSFAAA8BQA AOWYAADwGAAAKCAAJQg  
A

AGgJAABpCQAA6AoAANgLAADZCwAA+A wAAPkMAACUDQAA9gAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAO0AAAAAAAA  
AA

AAD2AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADtAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA9g  
AA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAPYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADtAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAO0AAAA  
AA

AAAAADtAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA3wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAO0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADtAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AA

7QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAO0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADtAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAO0AA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAADtAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA7QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAO0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADtAAAA  
AA

AAAA7QAAAAAAAAAAAAAN8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOAAADJAMqJAEPHNACEYQw/Q3GCAACMP0AAA  
AA













AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAAGAE4AbwByAG0AYQBsAAAAAQbAA8AAgAAAAAAAA4AABA8f8CADg  
A

AAAGAE4AbwByAG0AYQBsAAAAAQbAA8AAgAAAAAAAA4AABA8f8CADg  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAPABBQPL/oQA8AAAAFgBEAGUAZgBhAHUAbAB0ACAAUABhAHIAyQBnAHIAyQBwAGgA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAPABBQPL/oQA8AAAAFgBEAGUAZgBhAHUAbAB0ACAAUABhAHIAyQBnAHIAyQBwAGgA  
IABGAG8AbgB0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACwAK0ABAPIALAAAAwARQBUAGQAbgBvAHQAZQAgAFQAZQB4

IABGAG8AbgB0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACwAK0ABAPIALAAAAwARQBUAGQAbgBvAHQAZQAgAFQAZQB4  
AHQAAAACAA8AAAA2ACpAogABATYAAAARAEUAbgBkAG4AbwB0AGUAIABSAGUAZgBIAHIAZQBwAGMA

IABGAG8AbgB0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACwAK0ABAPIALAAAAwARQBUAGQAbgBvAHQAZQAgAFQAZQB4  
ZQAAAAMASCoBAC4AHUABABIBLgAAAA0ARgBvAG8AdABuAG8AdABIACA AVABIAHgAdAAAAIAEQAA

IABGAG8AbgB0AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACwAK0ABAPIALAAAAwARQBUAGQAbgBvAHQAZQAgAFQAZQB4  
ADgAJkCiACEBOAAAABIARgBvAG8AdABuAG8AdABIACA AVABIAHgAdAAAAIAEQAA  
AQA6ABNAAQACADoAAAAFAFQATwBDACAAMQAAA B0AEwAOhNACD4TQAhGEMP0TpOABKiQBDcYFAA  
GQ

JAoAAAA2ABRAAQACADYAAAAFAFQATwBDACAAMgAAABkAFAAOhNACD4SgBRGEMP0qJAENxgUAAZAK  
CgAAADYAFUABAAIANgAAAAUAVABPAEMAIAAzAAAAGQAVAA6E0AIPhHAIEYQw/SokAQ3GBQABkCQK  
AAAANgAWQAEAAgA2AAAABQBUE8AQwAgADQAAAAZABYADoTQAg+EQAsRhDD9KiQBDCYFAAGQJAoA  
AAA2ABdAAQACADYAAAAFAFQATwBDACAANQAAABkAFwAOhNACD4QQDhGEMP0qJAENxgUAAZAKCgA  
A  
ADIAGEABAAIAMgAAAAUAVABPAEMAIAA2AAAAFQAYAA+E0AIRhDD9KiQBDCYFAAGQJIAAAAAqABIA  
AQACACoAAAAFAFQATwBDACAANwAAAA0AGQAPhNACEYQw/SokAQAAADIAGkABAAIAMgAAAAUAVAB  
P  
AEMAIAA4AAAAFQAAaAA+E0AIRhDD9KiQBDCYFAAGQJIAAAAAyABtAAQACADIAAAAAFAFQATwBDACAA  
OQAAABUAGwAPhNACEYQw/SokAQ3GBQABkCQKAAAAOgAKQAEAAgA6AAAAABwBJAG4AZABIAHgAIAAx  
AAAAGQAcAA6E0AIPhKAFEYRg+iokAQ3GBQABkCQKAAAAOgALQAEAAgA6AAAAABwBJAG4AZABIAHgA  
IAAyAAAAGQAdAA6E0AIPhKAFEYQw/SokAQ3GBQABkCQKAAAANgAuQAEAAgA2AAAACwBUAE8AQQAg  
AEgAZQBhAGQAaQBuAGcAAAANAB4AKiQBDCYFAAGQJIAAAAAiACJAAQACACIAAAHAEMAYQBwAHQA  
aQBvAG4AAAAACAB8AAAAyAP5P8v8BAjIAAAARAF8ARQBxAHUAYQB0AGkAbwBuACAAQwBhAHAAAdABp  
AG8AbgAAAAAAAAAAAAOINAAAEAAAoAAAAAP////8AAAAAAwAAAAAMAAAADAAAABQAAAAgAAAAALAAA  
A  
CwAAAAsAAAAALAAACwAAAAsAAAAALAAAADgAAAAEAADiEQAAEAAAAAAAAEAACUDQAA4hEAABEAAAAT  
AAAAAAQAAOIRAAASAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAKAAAAHQIAACQCAAAPBAAAMAQAADUEAAA9BAAAVQQAAG  
AE  
AAB4BgAAgwYAANUNAADVQAA1w0AANcNAADYDQAA2A0AANkNAADaDQAA3A0AAN0NAADfDQAA4A  
0A  
AOMNAAHAAQABwAcAAcAHAHAHABwABwAcAAcAHAHAHAQABwAEAAIABAHAHAQABwAEAAcABAACA  
AAA  
AADTAAAA2gAAAH4BAACJAQAAZwIAAHACAACbBAAAAPQAACMHAAAnBwAA3QcAAN8HAAD1CAAA9gg  
A  
AJYJAACjCQAA1Q0AANUNAADXQAA1w0AANgNAADYDQAA2Q0AANoNAADcDQAA3Q0AAN8NAADgDQ  
AA  
4w0AAAcAGgAHABoABwAaAAcAGgAHABoABwAaAAcAGgAHABoABwAEAAcABAACAAQABwAEAAcABAA  
H  
AAQAAgD//wIAAAAMAEOAbwBhAG4AIABTAGMAaABhAGYAZQByACYAXABcAEYAUwBQAFUAQgBcAFYA  
TwBMADEAXABVAFMARQBSAFMAXABEAAEAVgBFAFMAUgBQAFwAbgBvAG4AcgBIAHMCAAAuAGQAbwBj  
AP9ASFAgTGFzZXJkZXQgNS81TSAtIFN0YW5kYXJkAFxcQ21jXC5QUV90ZXdzX1Jlc2VhcmNoXzEu























AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAQAAAIAAAADAAAABAAAAUAAAAGAAAABwAAAAGAAAJAAACgAAAAsAAAAMAAAADQAAAA  
4A

AAAPAAAEEAAAABEAAAASAAAEEwAAABQAAAD+////FgAAABcAAAAYAAAAGQAAABoAAAAbAAAAHAAA

AP7///8eAAAHWAAACAAAAhAAAAlgAAACMAAAAKAAAA/v///yYAAAAnAAAAKAAACkAAAAqAAAA

KwAAACwAAAD+////LgAAAC8AAAAwAAAAMQAAADIAAAAZAAAANAAAAP7///9///NwAAAP7///+

////v////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

//9SAG8AbwB0ACAARQBUAHQAcgB5AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAFgAFaf////////AwAAAAyJAgAAAAAwAAAAAAAAEYAAAAAF4ZNIr/vgFAdpQU

kP++ATkAAACAAAAAAAAAAEQAYQB0AGEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
A



//////////////////////////////////////8B

AP7/AwoAAP///8GQCIAAAAAAMAAAAAABGGAAAE1pY3Jvc29mdCBXb3JkIERvY3VtZW50AAoA

AABNU1dvcmREb2MAEAAAFdvcmQuRG9jdW1lbnQuOAD0ObJxAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
A

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
A==

--\_3462E167.00611FE7--

>From kagay@nytimes.com Tue Sep 28 09:21:25 1999

Received: from gatekeeper.nytimes.com (gatekeeper.nytimes.com  
[199.181.175.201])

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

id JAA12846 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Sep 1999 09:21:24 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from mailgate.nytimes.com (mailgate.nytimes.com [170.149.200.253])

by gatekeeper.nytimes.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id MAA03515

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Sep 1999 12:13:37 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from emailname.nytimes.com (aa33-254.nytimes.com [170.149.33.49])

by mailgate.nytimes.com (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with SMTP id MAA27035

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 28 Sep 1999 12:23:19 -0400 (EDT)

Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19990928122145.00a4e5b4@mailgate.nytimes.com>

X-Sender: kagay@mailgate.nytimes.com

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (32)

Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1999 12:21:45 -0400

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Mike Kagay <kagay@nytimes.com>

Subject: Career Opportunities/Nielsen Media Research

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

>From: "DiBattista, Nicole" <Nicole\_DiBattista@tvratings.com>

>To: "'kagay@nytimes.com'" <kagay@nytimes.com>

>Subject: Career Opportunities/Nielsen Media Research

>Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1999 11:43:09 -0400

>

>Dear Michael:

>

>My name is Nicole DiBattista and I received your name from the AAPOR

>Website. I hope you do not mind this intrusion, but I can use your

>assistance. I am a corporate recruiter with Nielsen Media Research and we

>have career opportunities available at our Tampa Bay, Florida location for

>individuals with Survey Research backgrounds.

>

> Nielsen Media Research, the leader in the TV ratings industry,

>relies on innovative technology to provide audience measurement data. We

>are a "full-service" research supplier providing Research Design, Sample

>Design, Data Collection and Report Processing. <http://www.nielsenmedia.com>

>

>



>Because I am limited as to how many people I can contact per day, I thought  
>I would take advantage of technology....and network with those who are  
>directly in the industry.

>

>Can you recommend individuals, colleges, websites, etc, I should contact to  
>post our opportunities for Survey Research professionals? Please feel free  
>to refer my name to your colleagues as well. I look forward to discussing  
>Nielsen Media Research in more detail.

>

>Sincerely,

>

>Nicole DiBattista, Corporate Staffing Specialist

>Human Resources Department

>Nielsen Media Research

>375 Patricia Avenue

>Dunedin, Florida 34698

>dibattn@tvratings.com

>1-800-237-9720 ext. 3278

>fax 727-738-3012

>

>

>

>From 71501.716@compuserve.com Wed Sep 29 06:10:07 1999

Received: from spamgaaf.compuserve.com (as-img-6.compuserve.com  
[149.174.217.151])

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

id GAA29841 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 29 Sep 1999 06:10:06 -0700

(PDT)

Received: (from mailgate@localhost)

by spamgaaf.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.7) id JAA16387;

Wed, 29 Sep 1999 09:09:29 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 1999 09:06:39 -0400

From: Margaret Roller <71501.716@compuserve.com>

Subject: Falling response rates, privacy, and a proposal

Sender: Margaret Roller <71501.716@compuserve.com>

To: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>

Cc: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Message-ID: <199909290909\_MC2-86D6-EF61@compuserve.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset=us-ascii

Content-Disposition: inline

I currently use a similar but different idea with a volunteer satisfaction study I conduct for a large non-profit. I provide an 800 number all volunteers in the sample can call to request another questionnaire or tell me why they have elected not to participate. They are told that the 800 number takes them into a voice mail system where they can leave an anonymous message. 1%-6% of the sample have been responding to this number. Many to tell me why they aren't participating. Most are anonymous. I find the information useful as I analyze final dispositions.

Margaret Roller

Roller Marketing Research

>From mark@bisconti.com Wed Sep 29 08:49:35 1999

Received: from pivot.healthnotes.com ([209.3.111.158])

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

id IAA19300 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 29 Sep 1999 08:49:33 -0700

(PDT)

Received: from markbri (ip182.washington13.dc.pub-ip.psi.net  
[38.30.214.182]) by pivot.healthnotes.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange  
Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2232.9)

id TNVVL05K; Wed, 29 Sep 1999 11:49:25 -0400

From: "Mark Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

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

Subject: Medical Marij follow-up

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 1999 11:31:27 -0400

Message-ID: <NCBBKJCKFIDCKOFNAEEEEEDCKAA.mark@bisconti.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Thanks for info folks. DC's 69% vote in support of Initiative 59 is similar to the proportion of U.S. adults who said they would vote in favor of making marijuana legally available for doctors to prescribe in order to reduce pain and suffering (73%, Gallup, March 1999). A majority of Independents (79%), Democrats (76%), and Republicans (63%) said they would vote in favor of such a law.

U.S. adults oppose general legalization of marijuana--only 29% support (NORC, May 1998). 51% believe smoking marijuana is always morally wrong and

should not be legally tolerated (Gallup, 1996), and 47% believe use of marijuana is very dangerous (Gallup, August 28-30, 1995).

Most of this was reported in The Public Perspective (June/July 1999). I am unaware of any data about whether the public thought Clinton should have vetoed the DC budget (as revised by Congress against the will of DC citizens--for those interested articles follow). Please let me know of any data related to the relationship between the federal govt. and the District and its citizens (over whom Congress, ie--the US public's reps., has exclusive legislative authority). Thanks, mark.

-----

President Vetoes D.C. Budget Bill

Republicans in Congress Accused of Violating Home Rule to Pursue Social Agenda

By Stephen C. Fehr

Washington Post Staff Writer

Wednesday, September 29, 1999; Page A04

President Clinton kept a promise yesterday to veto the District's \$4.7 billion budget for the fiscal year that begins Friday, because of what he said were unfair restrictions placed on the D.C. government by congressional Republicans.

"Congress had added a number of unacceptable riders that prevent local residents from making their own decisions about local matters," the president said in a statement. Among other things, he was referring to GOP efforts to block the District from legalizing the use of marijuana for

medical purposes or implementing a needle-exchange program for drug addicts to try to slow the spread of HIV and AIDS.

Republicans argued that such measures would promote drug use; Clinton countered that Congress's interference was done in a way that lawmakers "would not have done to any other local jurisdiction in the country."

For now, the veto has little practical effect on D.C. government operations. Congress is expected to consider a resolution keeping money flowing to the city at this year's spending levels until a permanent budget agreement can be reached before lawmakers adjourn this fall.

But "it does mean that no new projects can proceed and that we can't hire for newly funded positions," said Valerie Holt, the city's chief financial officer.

The president's action was a symbolic victory for the city's Democratic leadership, which turned against its own spending plan after Republicans added riders that sought to undo several decisions made by city residents.

Congress's move against the medical use of marijuana ran counter to the results of a citywide referendum in which D.C. residents overwhelmingly supported such a proposal. The GOP also blocked approval of the District's needle-exchange program, which was patterned after efforts in six other cities.

D.C. Mayor Anthony A. Williams (D), when told of the veto while at the White House yesterday with first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton for a news conference on the New Year's celebration on the Mall, said, "It is unfortunate that

Congress, after all the good work on our budget and support for our local officials' priorities, adopted social riders that intrude into the self-government of the District."

Republicans shot back that Clinton's veto amounted to presidential support for drug use. They suggested that favorite programs of Williams and others could be cut when the budget is reconsidered next month. Republicans, Democrats and the Clinton administration will negotiate a final budget; it is unlikely that there is enough support for a congressional override of Clinton's veto.

"My fear is that the budget is so tight that you could put the money in jeopardy the second time around," said Rep. Thomas M. Davis III (R-Va.), chairman of the House Government Oversight subcommittee on the District.

"The reality is, among Republicans and Democrats, the constituency for spending money for the District is not that great. They'd rather put money into other programs for their own constituents."

Linda Ricci, spokeswoman for the White House budget office, countered:

"There's no reason Congress can't go back and make improvements to this bill on issues of home rule while still maintaining the same level of funding we've agreed upon."

The budget includes the largest tax cut in the city's history and a college tuition program that would allow D.C. high school graduates to attend universities elsewhere at lower, in-state tuition rates. There's money to clean up the Anacostia River, wipe out open-air drug markets and widen the 14th Street bridges.

"It's unfortunate that the president thinks that legalizing marijuana and giving drug needles away is more important than providing college scholarships to D.C. students," said Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Tex.), chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee on the District.

(c) Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company

-----

A Veto to Defend Home Rule

Wednesday, September 29, 1999; Page A28

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S first veto of a D.C. appropriations bill was not unexpected, given the recommendations he received from several local groups and his own Office of Management and Budget to reject the measure on home-rule grounds. In vetoing the bill in its existing form, however, the president now assumes the burden of working with the Republican-led Congress to fashion a compromise that retains all the fine features of the budget originally sent to Capitol Hill by the city, as well as important funding added during congressional budget markups.

The city's new mayor and a reform-minded council produced a balanced budget containing a healthy surplus and the largest tax cut in the city's history.

Their efforts to develop a consensus spending plan were aided by Congress's own local agent, the D.C. financial control board. House and Senate appropriators should have leaped to shepherd this year's D.C. budget through Congress. Instead, congressional micromanagers elected once again to step upon the District's home-rule prerogatives by adding a number of

unacceptable riders. In doing so, Congress converted a good D.C. budget into presidential veto-bait.

In nixing the bill, President Clinton declared that "Congress has interfered in local decisions in this bill in a way that it would not have done to any other local jurisdiction in the country." He's absolutely right.

One disingenuous House GOP critic is accusing the White House of promoting "a pro-drug agenda" because the vetoed measure contains congressional bans on medical-marijuana legalization and a needle-exchange program. The charge is both wrong and unfair. The veto defends a broad principle, not drugs. It is, as the president said, "to let the people of the District . . . make local decisions about local matters, as they should under home rule."

Some Republicans also resorted to the scare tactic of threatening to cut a new tuition-assistance program for D.C. high school graduates and to eliminate crime-fighting and children's health funding if the bill is vetoed. The threat makes little sense. Congressional Republicans and Democrats already have agreed to funding levels in the bill. Any attempt to impose spending cuts at this stage would be an act of pure vindictiveness. The only items warranting outright elimination are the intrusive riders. The city deserves a clean bill. The president and Congress should make that happen.

(c) Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company

Mark Richards



>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Sep 29 11:13:27 1999

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

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

id LAA17618 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 29 Sep 1999 11:13:25 -0700  
(PDT)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

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

id LAA14070 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 29 Sep 1999 11:13:24 -0700  
(PDT)

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 1999 11:13:24 -0700 (PDT)

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

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: WAPOR call for papers (fwd)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.9909291112230.3187-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

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

Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1999 19:00:54 -0700 (PDT)

From: P. Moy <pmoy@u.washington.edu>

To: beniger@usc.edu

Subject: WAPOR call for papers

CALL FOR PAPERS

World Association for Public Opinion Research

May 17-18, 2000

Portland, Oregon

The World Association for Public Opinion Research seeks proposals for papers to be presented at its annual conference May 17-18, 2000 in Portland, Oregon. Proposals related to any topic in public opinion are welcome for consideration. In keeping with the purposes outlined in its Constitution, WAPOR particularly welcomes proposals related to:

Methodology

Recent elections around the world

Survey research technology in emerging democracies

Citizens and government

Trust in government

Media influences on public opinion

Public opinion on political, social, and economic issues

Theories of public opinion

WAPOR also encourages submissions by graduate students.

All proposals should include a title, mailing address, email address, and telephone number for each co-author or participant, and should not exceed 750 words. Please send all submissions by mail or fax to the conference chair:

Patricia Moy

School of Communications

University of Washington

Box 353740

Seattle, Washington 98195

U.S.A.

FAX: +1.206.543.9285

Submissions should be received by Wednesday, 8 December 1999.

Confirmation of receipt will be sent mid-December, and final decisions about the program will be made by early February 2000.

\*\*\*\*\*