As a political scientist, I am familiar with these election models and I have been saying for some time that the Democrats will win the presidential election this year.

Nonetheless, the other day a Republican reminded me that despite the fact that Anne Richards was a popular governor in Texas, and despite the fact that our political science models would have predicted her reelection, George Bush Jr. beat her.

While Bush may be going through a rocky stretch right now, some in my academic field have suggested that there are enough unique factors surrounding this election to confound these electoral models. For example, it is difficult for these models to quantify the moral indignation surrounding the Clinton administration and how this may be projected on to the Gore ticket. While our models do well in predicting the electoral effects of scandal, the Clinton scandal is a qualitatively different type of scandal, unprecedented at the presidential level. We simply don't know how it will effect voting. In addition, our models do not quantify how badly the GOP wants this election. Not since the Republicans mobilized behind William McKinley, have the elites in the GOP focused all of their money, campaign resources, and sheer determination on one candidate. The outcome of the GOP primary process was determined 5 months before it began.

Taken all together, it is my own judgement that this election will be a very good test as to whether campaigns really matter.

Joe Aistrup, Ph.D.
Director, Docking Institute of Public Affairs
jaistrup@fhsu.edu
We do know how this will affect voting. It affected voting in 1998.

In 1998, Democrats gained House seats - the first time a party in control of the White House has done so since 1934. After the Judiciary committee's vote on about October 8, Democratic candidates began to climb in many polls around the country. Candidates like Schumer in NY, Davis in CA and others turned tight races into landslides.
I think the indignation ran in the other direction.

Look. Voters did not like the President's actions. But they did not think they were impeachable and they reacted to the GOP efforts to do so accordingly.

> For example,
> it is difficult for these models to quantify the moral indignation surrounding the Clinton administration and how this may be projected on to the Gore ticket. While our models do well in predicting the electoral effects of scandal, the Clinton scandal is a qualitatively different type of scandal, unprecedented at the presidential level. We simply don't know how it will effect voting.
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Date: Fri, 01 Sep 2000 09:34:17 -0500
From: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Voter registration data

Thanks to all of you who responded to my questions. Your responses were very helpful. Linda

Date: Fri, 1 Sep 2000 12:23:45 -0400
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: FYI--Public Opinion on Public/Charter Schools
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLCLIIBCEOCCKAA.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 V5.50.4133.2400

FYI: Interesting study.
The 32nd Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools (June 2000), by Lowell C. Rose and Alec M. Gallup http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kpo10009.htm

Mark Richards
This is a multi-part message in MIME format. 

This may be of interest to some of you since it deals with survey research methodology...I found on the National Science Web site.

Dick Halpern
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SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

GENERAL INFORMATION

Program Title: Research on Survey and Statistical Methodology

Synopsis of Program: The Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics (MMS) Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences invites research proposals that further the development of new and innovative approaches to surveys and to the analysis of survey data. Although proposals submitted in response to this announcement may address any aspect of survey methodology, priority will be given to basic research proposals that are interdisciplinary in nature, have broad implications for the field in general, and have the greatest potential for creating fundamental knowledge of value to the Federal Statistical System. Potential topics for consideration include basic research on survey measurement issues, data collection procedures, technological issues related to survey design, methods for small area estimation, and statistical approaches for the analysis of survey data.

Cognizant Program Officer(s):

* Cheryl L. Eavey, Program Director, Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics, Room 995, telephone: 703.292.7269, e-mail: ceavey@nsf.gov.

Applicable Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number:

* 47.075 --- Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences

ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

* Organization Limit: None
* PI Eligibility Limit: None
* Limit on Number of Proposals: None

AWARD INFORMATION

* Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant
* Estimated Number of Awards: 3-7
* Anticipated Funding Amount: NSF anticipates reserving $600,000 in FY2001 and $600,000 in FY2002 for this activity, pending the availability of funds.

PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Preparation Guidelines
* Proposal Preparation Instructions: Standard Preparation Guidelines
  o Standard GPG Guidelines apply.

B. Budgetary Information

* Cost Sharing Requirements: Statutory Cost Sharing (1%) is required
* Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations: Not Applicable.
* Other Budgetary Limitations: Grantees may be invited to participate in a two-day annual meeting in the Washington DC area to report on their activities and interact with other grantees and agency staffers. Budget requests should include travel funds to accommodate that possibility.

C. Deadline/Target Dates

* Letter of Intent Due Date(s): None
* Preproposal Due Date(s): None
* Full Proposal Due Date(s):
  December 1, 2000
  November 30, 2001

D. FastLane Requirements

* FastLane Submission: Full Proposal Required

* FastLane Contact(s):
  o Gail D. Williams, Staff Associate, OAD/SBE, e-mail: sesfl@nsf.gov.
  o FastLane Help Desk, telephone: 1.800.673.6188, e-mail: fastlane@nsf.gov.

PROPOSAL REVIEW INFORMATION

* Merit Review Criteria: National Science Board approved criteria apply.

AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

* Award Conditions: Standard NSF award conditions apply.
* Reporting Requirements: Standard NSF Reporting Requirements apply.

-------------------------------------------------------------
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I. INTRODUCTION

The Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics (MMS) Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences, in collaboration with a consortium of federal statistical agencies represented by the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy (ICSP) and the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM), invites research proposals that further the development of new and innovative approaches to surveys and to the analysis of survey data. Although proposals submitted in response to this funding opportunity may address any aspect of survey methodology, priority will be given to basic research proposals that are interdisciplinary in nature, have broad implications for the field in general, and have the greatest potential for creating fundamental knowledge of value to the Federal Statistical System. Because methodological problems often require knowledge and expertise from multiple disciplines, collaborations are especially encouraged among the relevant sciences, including the social sciences, linguistics, cognitive science, statistics, computer science, and economics.

This announcement invites proposals for the second and third year of a three-year competition. An earlier Research on Survey Methodology competition, held in FY99, resulted in the funding of four projects (six awards). That awards list is available on the MMS home page at http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/ses/mms/start.htm.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Federal Statistical System faces the challenge of gathering relevant and reliable data for the next decade and beyond. Researchers should think creatively regarding the development of methods for survey research in the 21st century. For example, the potential for conducting surveys via the Web raises a host of important methodological questions; issues of nonresponse affect the validity and reliability of survey data; and methods are needed for handling multimedia databases.

Basic research on survey measurement issues, data collection procedures, technological issues related to survey design, methods for small area estimation, and statistical approaches for the analysis of survey data has the potential to greatly benefit the Federal Statistical System in particular and the conduct of surveys in general. Potential topics for consideration include but are not limited to:
Measurement Issues:

* Decision approaches for determining new data needs and eliminating data items that are no longer needed.
* Calibration of and adjustment for measurement errors.
* Measurement of complex social concepts such as disability, labor force attachment, poverty, and income inequality.
* Measurement of complex social indicators such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the Producer Price Index (PPI), or the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
* Measurement of rare and elusive populations and sensitive topics by network sampling and other methods.
* Statistical models of survey measurement errors based on theories from the social and behavioral sciences.
* Investigation of rotation group bias and its effects on household and establishment surveys.

Questionnaire Design:

* Improvement of procedures for designing and pretesting questionnaires for household and establishment surveys.
* Interviewing inflexibility and the conversational aspects of designing questionnaires.
* Designing questionnaires that are more understandable to respondents.
* Assessment of error and cost effects by data collection mode.
* Investigations of the cognitive aspects of survey response heuristics such as forward telescoping, context effects, anchoring effects, and seam effects.

Survey Technology:

* Methodological issues associated with web-based surveys.
* Graphical editing and data imputation.
* Providing greater access to complex data such as geo-coded data in spatial displays while assuring confidentiality protection.
* Data extraction and exploration techniques.
* Methods for linking designs of population and establishment sample surveys.

Analytical Issues:

* Innovations that address and overcome reasons for nonresponse.
* Integration of information across government surveys.
* Creative uses of administrative records to supplement surveys.
* Analysis of longitudinal data.
* Linking data and metadata.

Small Area Estimation:

* Improving uncertainty measures for small area estimates.
* Investigating and improving robustness properties of small area models.
* Allowing for uncertainty about sampling error properties (e.g.,
uncertainty about variances) in small area modeling and estimation.

* Using generalized linear models (GLIM) applied to unit level data from complex surveys in doing small area estimation.

* Reconciling small area estimates for different levels of aggregation when different information is available at those different levels.

INFORMATION ON PARTICIPATING FEDERAL STATISTICAL AGENCIES

The Interagency Council on Statistical Policy (ICSP) consists of the heads of the 14 largest statistical agencies and is chaired by the chief statistician of the Office of Management and Budget. It was formally established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 to discuss and determine statistical policy issues. The Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM) consists of experts from within the Federal Statistical System who consider methodological issues of importance to the statistical system. The Federal Statistical System includes 10 agencies that have statistical activities as their principal mission and about 60 agencies that carry out statistical activities in conjunction with other missions, such as providing services or enforcing regulations.

Proposals may include the direct participation of ICSP/FCSM agencies. Consortium agencies include:

Department of Agriculture

* National Agricultural Statistics Service
* Economic Research Service

Department of Commerce

* Bureau of the Census
* Bureau of Economic Analysis

Department of Education

* National Center for Education Statistics

Department of Energy

* Energy Information Administration

Department of Health and Human Services

* National Center for Health Statistics

Department of Justice

* Bureau of Justice Statistics

Department of Labor

* Bureau of Labor Statistics
III. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

The categories of proposers identified in the Grant Proposal Guide are eligible to submit proposals under this program announcement/solicitation.

IV. AWARD INFORMATION

NSF expects to fund three to seven awards, with an approximate duration of one to three years, and an expected award range of $60,000 to $125,000 per award per year. NSF anticipates reserving $600,000 in FY2001 and $600,000 in FY2002 for this activity (with the expected contribution evenly divided between NSF and the participating federal statistical agencies). Additional funds beyond the anticipated yearly total of $600,000 may be provided by federal agencies with special interests in particular research topics. For example, the U.S. Census Bureau has indicated that additional funds may be available for research on methods for small area estimation. Given the limited funds available, investigators are not encouraged to include significant expenses for direct data collection in their budgets.

V. PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

Full Proposal Instructions:

Proposals submitted in response to this program announcement/solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide (GPG). The complete text of the GPG (including electronic forms) is available electronically on the NSF Web Site at: http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?nsf012. Paper copies of the GPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (301) 947-2722 or by e-mail from pubs@nsf.gov.
Proposers are reminded to identify the program announcement/solicitation number (NSF 00-147) in the program announcement/solicitation block on the NSF Form 1207, Cover Sheet For Proposal to the National Science Foundation. Compliance with this requirement is critical to determining the relevant proposal processing guidelines. Failure to submit this information may delay processing.

B. Budgetary Information

In accordance with Congressional requirements (see GPM 330), NSF requires that each awardee share in the cost of research projects resulting from unsolicited proposals. For purposes of NSF, proposals submitted in response to this announcement/solicitation are considered unsolicited. The awardee may meet the statutory cost sharing requirement by choosing either of two alternatives: (1) by cost sharing a minimum of one percent on the project; or (2) by cost sharing a minimum of one percent on the aggregate costs of all NSF-supported projects requiring cost sharing.

The minimum one percent statutory cost sharing requirement discussed above need NOT be entered on Line M of the NSF Form 1030.

Other Budgetary Limitations: Grantees may be invited to participate in a two-day annual meeting in the Washington DC area to report on their activities and interact with other grantees and agency staffers. Budget requests should include travel funds to accommodate that possibility.

C. Deadline/Target Dates

Proposals submitted in response to this announcement/solicitation must be submitted by 5:00 PM, local time on the following date(s): December 1, 2000, November 30, 2001

D. FastLane Requirements

Proposers are required to prepare and submit all proposals for this Program Announcement through the FastLane system. Detailed instructions for proposal preparation and submission via FastLane are available at: http://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/a1/newstan.htm. For FastLane user support, call 1-800-673-6188.

Submission of Signed Cover Sheets. The signed copy of the proposal Cover Sheet (NSF Form 1207) must be postmarked (or contain a legible proof of mailing date assigned by the carrier) within five working days following proposal submission and be forwarded to the following address:
VI. PROPOSAL REVIEW INFORMATION

A. NSF Proposal Review Process

Reviews of proposals submitted to NSF are solicited from peers with expertise in the substantive area of the proposed research or education project. These reviewers are selected by Program Officers charged with the oversight of the review process. NSF invites the proposer to suggest at the time of submission, the names of appropriate or inappropriate reviewers. Care is taken to ensure that reviewers have no conflicts with the proposer. Special efforts are made to recruit reviewers from non-academic institutions, minority-serving institutions, or adjacent disciplines to that principally addressed in the proposal.

Proposals will be reviewed against the following general review criteria established by the National Science Board. Following each criterion are potential considerations that the reviewer may employ in the evaluation. These are suggestions and not all will apply to any given proposal. Each reviewer will be asked to address only those that are relevant to the proposal and for which he/she is qualified to make judgements.

What is the intellectual merit of the proposed activity? How important is the proposed activity to advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields? How well qualified is the proposer (individual or team) to conduct the project? (If appropriate, the reviewer will comment on the quality of the prior work.) To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative and original concepts? How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Is there sufficient access to resources?

What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity? How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while promoting teaching, training, and learning? How well does the proposed activity broaden the participation of underrepresented groups (e.g., gender, ethnicity, disability, geographic, etc.)? To what extent will it enhance the infrastructure for research and education, such as facilities, instrumentation, networks, and partnerships? Will the results be disseminated broadly to enhance scientific and technological understanding? What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society?

Principal Investigators should address the following elements in their proposal to provide reviewers with the information necessary
to respond fully to both of the above-described NSF merit review criteria.

NSF staff will give these elements careful consideration in making funding decisions.

Integration of Research and Education

One of the principal strategies in support of NSF's goals is to foster integration of research and education through the programs, projects, and activities it supports at academic and research institutions. These institutions provide abundant opportunities where individuals may concurrently assume responsibilities as researchers, educators, and students and where all can engage in joint efforts that infuse education with the excitement of discovery and enrich research through the diversity of learning perspectives.

Integrating Diversity into NSF Programs, Projects, and Activities

Broadening opportunities and enabling the participation of all citizens - women and men, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities - is essential to the health and vitality of science and engineering. NSF is committed to this principle of diversity and deems it central to the programs, projects, and activities it considers and supports.

A summary rating and accompanying narrative will be completed and signed by each reviewer. In all cases, reviews are treated as confidential documents. Verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers, are mailed to the Principal Investigator/Project Director by the Program Director. In addition, the proposer will receive an explanation of the decision to award or decline funding.

B. Review Protocol and Associated Customer Service Standard

All proposals are carefully reviewed by at least three other persons outside NSF who are experts in the particular field represented by the proposal. Proposals submitted in response to this announcement/solicitation will be reviewed by a multidisciplinary panel consisting of scholars from the relevant sciences. Mail reviews may be solicited at the discretion of the MMS Program Director. Proposals deemed meritorious also will be ranked for their potential value to the Federal Statistical System by the Survey Research Subcommittee of the FCSM, which will include one representative from each participating agency. Final programmatic recommendations will be made by NSF staff, in consultation with representatives from the Survey Research Subcommittee of the FCSM.

Reviewers will be asked to formulate a recommendation to either support or decline each proposal. The Program Officer assigned to manage the proposal's review will consider the advice of reviewers and will formulate a recommendation.
NSF will be able to tell applicants whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months for 95 percent of proposals. The time interval begins on the proposal deadline or target date or from the date of receipt, if deadlines or target dates are not used by the program. The interval ends when the Division Director accepts the Program Officer's recommendation.

In all cases, after programmatic approval has been obtained, the proposals recommended for funding will be forwarded to the Division of Grants and Agreements for review of business, financial, and policy implications and the processing and issuance of a grant or other agreement. Proposers are cautioned that only a Grants and Agreements Officer may make commitments, obligations or awards on behalf of NSF or authorize the expenditure of funds. No commitment on the part of NSF should be inferred from technical or budgetary discussions with a NSF Program Officer. A Principal Investigator or organization that makes financial or personnel commitments in the absence of a grant or cooperative agreement signed by the NSF Grants and Agreements Officer does so at its own risk.

VII. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Notification of the Award

Notification of the award is made to the submitting organization by a Grants Officer in the Division of Grants and Agreements. Organizations whose proposals are declined will be advised as promptly as possible by the cognizant NSF Program Division administering the program. Verbatim copies of reviews, not including the identity of the reviewer, will be provided automatically to the Principal Investigator. (See section VI. A, for additional information on the review process.)

B. Award Conditions

An NSF award consists of: (1) the award letter, which includes any special provisions applicable to the award and any numbered amendments thereto; (2) the budget, which indicates the amounts, by categories of expense, on which NSF has based its support (or otherwise communicates any specific approvals or disapprovals of proposed expenditures); (3) the proposal referenced in the award letter; (4) the applicable award conditions, such as Grant General
Conclusions (NSF-GC-1)* or Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP)=

Terms and Conditions * and (5) any NSF brochure, program guide, announcement or other NSF issuance that may be incorporated by reference = in the award letter. Cooperative agreement awards also are administered in accordance with NSF Cooperative Agreement Terms and Conditions (CA-1). Electronic mail notification is the preferred way to transmit NSF awards = to organizations that have electronic mail capabilities and have requested such notification from the Division of Grants and Agreements.

*These documents may be accessed electronically on NSF's web site at http://www.nsf.gov/home/grants/grants_gac.htm. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (301) 947-2722 or by e-mail from pubs@nsf.gov.

More comprehensive information on NSF Award Conditions is contained in the NSF Grant Policy Manual (GPM) Chapter II, (NSF 95-26) available electronically on the NSF web site at http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?gpm. The GPM is also for sale through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office (GPO), Washington= , DC 20402. The telephone number at GPO for subscription information is (20=)
512-1800. The GPM may be ordered through the GPO web site at http://www.gpo.gov.

C. Reporting Requirements

For all multi-year grants (including both standard and continuing grants)= , the PI must submit an annual project report to the cognizant Program Officer at least 90 days before the end of the current budget period.

Within 90 days after the expiration of an award, the PI also is required = to submit a final project report. Approximately 30 days before expiration, NSF will send a notice to remind the PI of the requirement to file the final project report. Failure to provide final technical reports delays NSF review and processing of pending proposals for that PI. PIs should examine the formats of the required reports in advance to assure availability of required data.

NSF has implemented an electronic project reporting system, available through FastLane. This system permits electronic submission and updating = of project reports, including information on: project participants (individual and organizational); activities and findings; publications; and other specific products and contributions. PIs will not be required to re-enter= information previously provided, either with a proposal or in earlier updates using the electronic system.

VIII. CONTACTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
General inquiries should be made to the Research on Survey and Statistical Methodology Program: Cheryl L. Eavey, Program Director, Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics, Room 995, telephone: 703.292.7269, e-mail: ceavey@nsf.gov. For questions related to the use of FastLane, contact,

* Gail D. Williams, Staff Associate, OAD/SBE, e-mail: sesfl@nsf.gov.
* FastLane Help Desk, telephone: 1.800.673.6188, e-mail: fastlane@nsf.gov.

IX. OTHER PROGRAMS OF INTEREST

The NSF Guide to Programs is a compilation of funding for research and education in science, mathematics, and engineering. The NSF Guide to Programs is available electronically at http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?gp. General descriptions of NSF programs, research areas, and eligibility information for proposal submission are provided in each chapter.

Many NSF programs offer announcements or solicitations concerning specific proposal requirements. To obtain additional information about these requirements, contact the appropriate NSF program offices. Any changes in=

NSF's fiscal year programs occurring after press time for the Guide to Programs will be announced in the NSF E-Bulletin, which is updated daily = on the NSF website at http://www.nsf.gov/home/ebulletin, and in individual program announcements/solicitations. Subscribers can also sign up for NSF= 's Custom News Service (http://www.nsf.gov/home/cns/start.htm) to be notified of new funding opportunities that become available.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The National Science Foundation (NSF) funds research and education in most fields of science and engineering. Awardees are wholly responsible for conducting their project activities and preparing the results for publication. Thus, the Foundation does not assume responsibility for such=

findings or their interpretation.

NSF welcomes proposals from all qualified scientists, engineers and educators. The Foundation strongly encourages women, minorities and persons with disabilities to compete fully in its programs. In accordance with Federal statutes, regulations and NSF policies, no person on grounds of race, color, age, sex, national origin or disability shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving financial assistance from NSF (unless otherwise specified in the eligibility requirements for a particular program).

Facilitation Awards for Scientists and Engineers with Disabilities (FASED=
provide funding for special assistance or equipment to enable persons with disabilities (investigators and other staff, including student research assistants) to work on NSF-supported projects. See the program announcement/solicitation for further information.

The National Science Foundation has Telephonic Device for the Deaf (TDD) and Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) capabilities that enable individuals with hearing impairments to communicate with the Foundation about NSF programs, employment or general information. TDD may be accessed at (703) 292-5090, FIRS at 1-800-877-8339.

The National Science Foundation is committed to making all of the information we publish easy to understand. If you have a suggestion about how to improve the clarity of this document or other NSF-published materials, please contact us at plainlanguage@nsf.gov.

PRIVACY ACT AND PUBLIC BURDEN STATEMENTS

The information requested on proposal forms and project reports is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. The information on proposal forms will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals; project reports submitted by awardees will be used for program evaluation and reporting within the Executive Branch and to Congress. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to applicant institutions/grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to government contractors, experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work; to other government agencies needing information as part of the review process or in order to coordinate programs; and to another Federal agency, court or party in a court or Federal administrative proceeding if the government is a party. Information about Principal Investigators may be added to the Reviewer file and used to select potential candidates to serve as peer reviewers or advisory committee members. See Systems of Records, NSF-50, "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records," 63 Federal Register 267 (January 5, 1998), and NSF-51, "Reviewer/Proposal File and Associated Records," 63 Federal Register 268 (January 5, 1998). Submission of the information is voluntary. Failure to provide full and complete information, however, may reduce the possibility of receiving an award.

Pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.5(b), an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to an information collection unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The OMB control number for this collection is 3145-0058. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the=
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Synopsis of Program: The Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics (MMS) Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences invites research proposals that further the development of new and innovative approaches to surveys and to the analysis of survey data. Although proposals submitted in response to this announcement may address any aspect of survey methodology, priority will be given to basic research proposals that are interdisciplinary in nature, have broad implications for the field in general, and have the greatest potential for creating fundamental knowledge of value to the Federal Statistical System. Potential topics for consideration include basic research on survey measurement issues, data collection procedures, technological issues related to survey design, methods for small area estimation, and statistical approaches for the analysis of survey data.

Cognizant Program Officer(s):

* Cheryl L. Eavey, Program Director, Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics, Room 995, telephone: 703.292.7269, e-mail: ceavey@nsf.gov.

Applicable Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number:

* 47.075 --- Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences

ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

* Organization Limit: None
* PI Eligibility Limit: None
* Limit on Number of Proposals: None

AWARD INFORMATION

* Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant
* Estimated Number of Awards: 3-7
* Anticipated Funding Amount: NSF anticipates reserving $600,000 in FY2001 and $600,000 in FY2002 for this activity, pending the availability of funds.

PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS
A. Proposal Preparation Guidelines

* Proposal Preparation Instructions: Standard Preparation Guidelines
  o Standard GPG Guidelines apply.

B. Budgetary Information

* Cost Sharing Requirements: Statutory Cost Sharing (1%) is required
* Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations: Not Applicable.
* Other Budgetary Limitations: Grantees may be invited to participate in a two-day annual meeting in the Washington DC area to report on their activities and interact with other grantees and agency staffers. Budget requests should include travel funds to accommodate that possibility.

C. Deadline/Target Dates

* Letter of Intent Due Date(s): None
* Preproposal Due Date(s): None
* Full Proposal Due Date(s):
  December 1, 2000
  November 30, 2001

D. FastLane Requirements

* FastLane Submission: Full Proposal Required

* FastLane Contact(s):
  o Gail D. Williams, Staff Associate, OAD/SBE, e-mail: sesfl@nsf.gov.
  o FastLane Help Desk, telephone: 1.800.673.6188, e-mail: fastlane@nsf.gov.

PROPOSAL REVIEW INFORMATION

* Merit Review Criteria: National Science Board approved criteria apply.

AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

* Award Conditions: Standard NSF award conditions apply.
* Reporting Requirements: Standard NSF Reporting Requirements apply.

------------------------------------------------------------------------
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I. INTRODUCTION

The Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics (MMS) Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences, in collaboration with a consortium of federal statistical agencies represented by the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy (ICSP) and the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM), invites research proposals that further the development of new and innovative approaches to surveys and to the analysis of survey data. Although proposals submitted in response to this funding opportunity may address any aspect of survey methodology, priority will be given to basic research proposals that are interdisciplinary in nature, have broad implications for the field in general, and have the greatest potential for creating fundamental knowledge of value to the Federal Statistical System. Because methodological problems often require knowledge and expertise from multiple disciplines, collaborations are especially encouraged among the relevant sciences, including the social sciences, linguistics, cognitive science, statistics, computer science, and economics.

This announcement invites proposals for the second and third year of a three-year competition. An earlier Research on Survey Methodology competition, held in FY99, resulted in the funding of four projects (six awards). That awards list is available on the MMS home page at http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/ses/mms/start.htm.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Federal Statistical System faces the challenge of gathering relevant and reliable data for the next decade and beyond. Researchers should think creatively regarding the development of methods for survey research in the 21st century. For example, the potential for conducting surveys via the Web raises a host of important methodological questions; issues of nonresponse affect the validity and reliability of survey data; and methods are needed for handling multimedia databases.

Basic research on survey measurement issues, data collection procedures, technological issues related to survey design, methods for small area estimation, and statistical approaches for the analysis of survey data has the potential to greatly benefit the Federal Statistical System in particular and the conduct of surveys in general. Potential topics for consideration include but are not limited to:
Measurement Issues:

* Decision approaches for determining new data needs and eliminating data items that are no longer needed.
* Calibration of and adjustment for measurement errors.
* Measurement of complex social concepts such as disability, labor force attachment, poverty, and income inequality.
* Measurement of complex social indicators such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the Producer Price Index (PPI), or the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
* Measurement of rare and elusive populations and sensitive topics by network sampling and other methods.
* Statistical models of survey measurement errors based on theories from the social and behavioral sciences.
* Investigation of rotation group bias and its effects on household and establishment surveys.

Questionnaire Design:

* Improvement of procedures for designing and pretesting questionnaires for household and establishment surveys.
* Interviewing inflexibility and the conversational aspects of designing questionnaires.
* Designing questionnaires that are more understandable to respondents.
* Assessment of error and cost effects by data collection mode.
* Investigations of the cognitive aspects of survey response heuristics such as forward telescoping, context effects, anchoring effects, and seam effects.

Survey Technology:

* Methodological issues associated with web-based surveys.
* Graphical editing and data imputation.
* Providing greater access to complex data such as geo-coded data in spatial displays while assuring confidentiality protection.
* Data extraction and exploration techniques.
* Methods for linking designs of population and establishment sample surveys.

Analytical Issues:

* Innovations that address and overcome reasons for nonresponse.
* Integration of information across government surveys.
* Creative uses of administrative records to supplement surveys.
* Analysis of longitudinal data.
* Linking data and metadata.

Small Area Estimation:

* Improving uncertainty measures for small area estimates.
* Investigating and improving robustness properties of small area models.
* Allowing for uncertainty about sampling error properties (e.g., uncertainty about variances) in small area modeling and estimation.
* Using generalized linear models (GLIM) applied to unit level data from complex surveys in doing small area estimation.
* Reconciling small area estimates for different levels of aggregation.
when different information is available at those different levels.

INFORMATION ON PARTICIPATING FEDERAL STATISTICAL AGENCIES

The Interagency Council on Statistical Policy (ICSP) consists of the heads of the 14 largest statistical agencies and is chaired by the chief statistician of the Office of Management and Budget. It was formally established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 to discuss and determine statistical policy issues. The Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM) consists of experts from within the Federal Statistical System who consider methodological issues of importance to the statistical system. The Federal Statistical System includes 10 agencies that have statistical activities as their principal mission and about 60 agencies that carry out statistical activities in conjunction with other missions, such as providing services or enforcing regulations.

Proposals may include the direct participation of ICSP/FCSM agencies. Consortium agencies include:

Department of Agriculture

  * National Agricultural Statistics Service
  * Economic Research Service

Department of Commerce

  * Bureau of the Census
  * Bureau of Economic Analysis

Department of Education

  * National Center for Education Statistics

Department of Energy

  * Energy Information Administration

Department of Health and Human Services

  * National Center for Health Statistics

Department of Justice

  * Bureau of Justice Statistics

Department of Labor

  * Bureau of Labor Statistics

Department of Transportation

  * Bureau of Transportation Statistics

Department of Treasury
III. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

The categories of proposers identified in the Grant Proposal Guide are eligible to submit proposals under this program announcement/solicitation.

IV. AWARD INFORMATION

NSF expects to fund three to seven awards, with an approximate duration of one to three years, and an expected award range of $60,000 to $125,000 per award per year. NSF anticipates reserving $600,000 in FY2001 and $600,000 in FY2002 for this activity (with the expected contribution evenly divided between NSF and the participating federal statistical agencies). Additional funds beyond the anticipated yearly total of $600,000 may be provided by federal agencies with special interests in particular research topics. For example, the U.S. Census Bureau has indicated that additional funds may be available for research on methods for small area estimation. Given the limited funds available, investigators are not encouraged to include significant expenses for direct data collection in their budgets.

V. PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

Full Proposal Instructions:

Proposals submitted in response to this program announcement/solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide (GPG). The complete text of the GPG (including electronic forms) is available electronically on the NSF Web Site at: http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?nsf012. Paper copies of the GPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (301) 947-2722 or by e-mail from pubs@nsf.gov.

Proposers are reminded to identify the program announcement/solicitation number (NSF 00-147) in the program announcement/solicitation block on the NSF Form 1207, Cover Sheet For Proposal to the National Science Foundation. Compliance with this requirement is critical to determining the relevant proposal processing guidelines. Failure to submit this information may
delay processing.

B. Budgetary Information

In accordance with Congressional requirements (see GPM 330), NSF requires that each awardee share in the cost of research projects resulting from unsolicited proposals. For purposes of NSF, proposals submitted in response to this announcement/solicitation are considered unsolicited. The awardee may meet the statutory cost sharing requirement by choosing either of two alternatives: (1) by cost sharing a minimum of one percent on the project; or (2) by cost sharing a minimum of one percent on the aggregate costs of all NSF-supported projects requiring cost sharing.

The minimum one percent statutory cost sharing requirement discussed above need NOT be entered on Line M of the NSF Form 1030.

Other Budgetary Limitations: Grantees may be invited to participate in a two-day annual meeting in the Washington DC area to report on their activities and interact with other grantees and agency staffers. Budget requests should include travel funds to accommodate that possibility.

C. Deadline/Target Dates

Proposals submitted in response to this announcement/solicitation must be submitted by 5:00 PM, local time on the following date(s):
December 1, 2000 November 30, 2001

D. FastLane Requirements

Proposers are required to prepare and submit all proposals for this Program Announcement through the FastLane system. Detailed instructions for proposal preparation and submission via FastLane are available at: http://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/a1/newstan.htm. For FastLane user support, call 1-800-673-6188.

Submission of Signed Cover Sheets. The signed copy of the proposal Cover Sheet (NSF Form 1207) must be postmarked (or contain a legible proof of mailing date assigned by the carrier) within five working days following proposal submission and be forwarded to the following address:

National Science Foundation
DIS - FastLane Cover Sheet
4201 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22230

VI. PROPOSAL REVIEW INFORMATION

A. NSF Proposal Review Process

Reviews of proposals submitted to NSF are solicited from peers with expertise
in the substantive area of the proposed research or education project. These reviewers are selected by Program Officers charged with the oversight of the review process. NSF invites the proposer to suggest at the time of submission, the names of appropriate or inappropriate reviewers. Care is taken to ensure that reviewers have no conflicts with the proposer. Special efforts are made to recruit reviewers from non-academic institutions, minority-serving institutions, or adjacent disciplines to that principally addressed in the proposal.

Proposals will be reviewed against the following general review criteria established by the National Science Board. Following each criterion are potential considerations that the reviewer may employ in the evaluation. These are suggestions and not all will apply to any given proposal. Each reviewer will be asked to address only those that are relevant to the proposal and for which he/she is qualified to make judgements.

What is the intellectual merit of the proposed activity?
How important is the proposed activity to advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields? How well qualified is the proposer (individual or team) to conduct the project? (If appropriate, the reviewer will comment on the quality of the prior work.) To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative and original concepts? How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Is there sufficient access to resources?

What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?
How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while promoting teaching, training, and learning? How well does the proposed activity broaden the participation of underrepresented groups (e.g., gender, ethnicity, disability, geographic, etc.)? To what extent will it enhance the infrastructure for research and education, such as facilities, instrumentation, networks, and partnerships? Will the results be disseminated broadly to enhance scientific and technological understanding? What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society?

Principal Investigators should address the following elements in their proposal to provide reviewers with the information necessary to respond fully to both of the above-described NSF merit review criteria. NSF staff will give these elements careful consideration in making funding decisions.

Integration of Research and Education
One of the principal strategies in support of NSF's goals is to foster integration of research and education through the programs, projects, and activities it supports at academic and research institutions. These institutions provide abundant opportunities where individuals may concurrently assume responsibilities as researchers, educators, and students and where all can engage in joint efforts that infuse education with the excitement of discovery and enrich research through the diversity of learning perspectives.
Integrating Diversity into NSF Programs, Projects, and Activities

Broadening opportunities and enabling the participation of all citizens - women and men, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities - is essential to the health and vitality of science and engineering. NSF is committed to this principle of diversity and deems it central to the programs, projects, and activities it considers and supports.

A summary rating and accompanying narrative will be completed and signed by each reviewer. In all cases, reviews are treated as confidential documents. Verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers, are mailed to the Principal Investigator/Project Director by the Program Director. In addition, the proposer will receive an explanation of the decision to award or decline funding.

B. Review Protocol and Associated Customer Service Standard

All proposals are carefully reviewed by at least three other persons outside NSF who are experts in the particular field represented by the proposal. Proposals submitted in response to this announcement/solicitation will be reviewed by a multidisciplinary panel consisting of scholars from the relevant sciences. Mail reviews may be solicited at the discretion of the MMS Program Director. Proposals deemed meritorious also will be ranked for their potential value to the Federal Statistical System by the Survey Research Subcommittee of the FCSM, which will include one representative from each participating agency. Final programmatic recommendations will be made by NSF staff, in consultation with representatives from the Survey Research Subcommittee of the FCSM.

Reviewers will be asked to formulate a recommendation to either support or decline each proposal. The Program Officer assigned to manage the proposal's review will consider the advice of reviewers and will formulate a recommendation.

NSF will be able to tell applicants whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months for 95 percent of proposals. The time interval begins on the proposal deadline or target date or from the date of receipt, if deadlines or target dates are not used by the program. The interval ends when the Division Director accepts the Program Officer's recommendation.

In all cases, after programmatic approval has been obtained, the proposals recommended for funding will be forwarded to the Division of Grants and Agreements for review of business, financial, and policy implications and the processing and issuance of a grant or other agreement. Proposers are cautioned that only a Grants and Agreements Officer may make commitments, obligations or awards on behalf of NSF or authorize the expenditure of funds. No commitment on the part of NSF should be inferred from technical or budgetary discussions with a NSF Program Officer. A Principal Investigator or organization that makes financial or personnel commitments in the absence of a grant or cooperative agreement signed by the NSF Grants and
Agreements Officer does so at its own risk.

VII. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Notification of the Award

Notification of the award is made to the submitting organization by a Grants Officer in the Division of Grants and Agreements. Organizations whose proposals are declined will be advised as promptly as possible by the cognizant NSF Program Division administering the program. Verbatim copies of reviews, not including the identity of the reviewer, will be provided automatically to the Principal Investigator. (See section VI. A, for additional information on the review process.)

B. Award Conditions

An NSF award consists of: (1) the award letter, which includes any special provisions applicable to the award and any numbered amendments thereto; (2) the budget, which indicates the amounts, by categories of expense, on which NSF has based its support (or otherwise communicates any specific approvals or disapprovals of proposed expenditures); (3) the proposal referenced in the award letter; (4) the applicable award conditions, such as Grant General Conditions (NSF-GC-1)* or Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) Terms and Conditions * and (5) any NSF brochure, program guide, announcement or other NSF issuance that may be incorporated by reference in the award letter. Cooperative agreement awards also are administered in accordance with NSF Cooperative Agreement Terms and Conditions (CA-1). Electronic mail notification is the preferred way to transmit NSF awards to organizations that have electronic mail capabilities and have requested such notification from the Division of Grants and Agreements.

*These documents may be accessed electronically on NSF's web site at http://www.nsf.gov/home/grants/grants_gac.htm. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (301) 947-2722 or by e-mail from pubs@nsf.gov.


C. Reporting Requirements

For all multi-year grants (including both standard and continuing grants), the PI must submit an annual project report to the
cognizant Program Officer at least 90 days before the end of the current budget period.

Within 90 days after the expiration of an award, the PI also is required to submit a final project report. Approximately 30 days before expiration, NSF will send a notice to remind the PI of the requirement to file the final project report. Failure to provide final technical reports delays NSF review and processing of pending proposals for that PI. PIs should examine the formats of the required reports in advance to assure availability of required data.

NSF has implemented an electronic project reporting system, available through FastLane. This system permits electronic submission and updating of project reports, including information on: project participants (individual and organizational); activities and findings; publications; and other specific products and contributions. PIs will not be required to re-enter information previously provided, either with a proposal or in earlier updates using the electronic system.

VIII. CONTACTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

General inquiries should be made to the Research on Survey and Statistical Methodology Program: Cheryl L. Eavey, Program Director, Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics, Room 995, telephone: 703.292.7269, e-mail: ceavey@nsf.gov. For questions related to the use of FastLane, contact,

* Gail D. Williams, Staff Associate, OAD/SBE, e-mail: sesfl@nsf.gov.
* FastLane Help Desk, telephone: 1.800.673.6188, e-mail: fastlane@nsf.gov.

IX. OTHER PROGRAMS OF INTEREST

The NSF Guide to Programs is a compilation of funding for research and education in science, mathematics, and engineering. The NSF Guide to Programs is available electronically at http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?gp. General descriptions of NSF programs, research areas, and eligibility information for proposal submission are provided in each chapter.

Many NSF programs offer announcements or solicitations concerning specific proposal requirements. To obtain additional information about these requirements, contact the appropriate NSF program offices. Any changes in NSF's fiscal year programs occurring after press time for the Guide to Programs will be announced in the NSF E-Bulletin, which is updated daily on the NSF web site at http://www.nsf.gov/home/ebulletin, and in individual program announcements/solicitations. Subscribers can also sign up for NSF’s Custom News Service (http://www.nsf.gov/home/cns/start.htm) to be notified of new funding opportunities that become available.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
The National Science Foundation (NSF) funds research and education in most fields of science and engineering. Awardees are wholly responsible for conducting their project activities and preparing the results for publication. Thus, the Foundation does not assume responsibility for such findings or their interpretation.

NSF welcomes proposals from all qualified scientists, engineers and educators. The Foundation strongly encourages women, minorities and persons with disabilities to compete fully in its programs. In accordance with Federal statutes, regulations and NSF policies, no person on grounds of race, color, age, sex, national origin or disability shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving financial assistance from NSF (unless otherwise specified in the eligibility requirements for a particular program).

Facilitation Awards for Scientists and Engineers with Disabilities (FASED) provide funding for special assistance or equipment to enable persons with disabilities (investigators and other staff, including student research assistants) to work on NSF-supported projects. See the program announcement/solicitation for further information.

The National Science Foundation has Telephonic Device for the Deaf (TDD) and Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) capabilities that enable individuals with hearing impairments to communicate with the Foundation about NSF programs, employment or general information. TDD may be accessed at (703) 292-5090, FIRS at 1-800-877-8339.

The National Science Foundation is committed to making all of the information we publish easy to understand. If you have a suggestion about how to improve the clarity of this document or other NSF-published materials, please contact us at plainlanguage@nsf.gov.

PRIVACY ACT AND PUBLIC BURDEN STATEMENTS

The information requested on proposal forms and project reports is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. The information on proposal forms will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals; project reports submitted by awardees will be used for program evaluation and reporting within the Executive Branch and to Congress. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to applicant institutions/grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to government contractors, experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work; to other government agencies needing information as part of the review process or in order to coordinate programs; and to another Federal agency, court or party in a court or Federal administrative proceeding if the government is a party. Information about Principal Investigators may be added to the Reviewer file.
and used to select potential candidates to serve as peer reviewers or advisory committee members. See Systems of Records, NSF-50, "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records," 63 Federal Register 267 (January 5, 1998), and NSF-51, "Reviewer/Proposal File and Associated Records," 63 Federal Register 268 (January 5, 1998). Submission of the information is voluntary. Failure to provide full and complete information, however, may reduce the possibility of receiving an award.

Pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.5(b), an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to an information collection unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The OMB control number for this collection is 3145-0058. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions. Send comments regarding this burden estimate and any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, Information Dissemination Branch, Division of Administrative Services, National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA 22230, or to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for National Science Foundation (3145-0058), 725 17th Street, N.W. Room 10235, Washington, D.C. 20503.

OMB control number: 3145-0058.
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I am trying to locate State by State survey predictions of the current presidential election. Any help will be appreciated.

Best,

Sid

I am trying to locate State by State survey predictions of the current presidential election. Any help will be appreciated.

Best,

Sid
Earlier this year, someone posted a link to a table that shows the effect of low response rates in surveys. It was a matrix with different response rates on one axis and different assumptions about the degree of difference in the nonrespondents on the other. Who can show me how to retrieve that?

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

Date: Mon, 4 Sep 2000 00:49:56 -0400
From: s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Pres. Elec. predictions by States

I am trying to locate State by State survey predictions of the current presidential election. Any help will be appreciated.

Best,

Sid

******

Sid,

This is almost two days old--sorry that I haven't found anything more recent.

-- Jim

******

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company
STATE-BY-STATE ELECTORAL ANALYSIS

Filed at 12:22 p.m. EDT

By The Associated Press

Here's a look at the 50 states in the battle for electoral votes in the presidential campaign. List includes the number of electoral votes in each state and an analysis based upon poll results and interviews with more than 100 Democratic, Republican and independent analysts.

-- ALABAMA (9). Solid Bush.

-- ALASKA (3). Solid Bush.

-- ARIZONA (8) Lean Bush. Sen. John McCain's home state will be tough for Gore to crack.

-- ARKANSAS (6) Tossup. President Clinton's home state is turning Republican.

-- CALIFORNIA (54) Lean Gore. Bush yet to make major financial investment in this must-win state for Gore.

-- COLORADO (8) Lean Bush. Democrats not targeting.

-- CONNECTICUT (8) Lean Gore. Adding native son Sen. Joseph Lieberman to ticket gives Gore the edge for now.

-- DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (3) Solid Gore.

-- DELAWARE (3) Tossup. State has voted for winner in every presidential election since 1948.

-- FLORIDA (25). Tossup. While Bush toys with Gore in California, the vice president is making a play for Florida. Bush brother Jeb is governor.

-- GEORGIA (13). Lean Bush. South tough for Gore, but Clinton could energize blacks.

-- HAWAII (4). Solid Gore. Republicans say they've got shot, but state still Gore's to lose.

-- ILLINOIS (22) Lean Gore. Polls give Gore slight edge, though both campaigns spending millions.

-- INDIANA (12) Solid Bush. Little evidence that Gore will break traditional GOP hold.

-- IOWA (7) Lean Gore. Democrats say race closer than public polls show.

-- KANSAS (6) Solid Bush.

-- KENTUCKY (8) Lean Bush. Gore reduces ad buy, but advisers say negative attacks soon to come. Tobacco, coal issues hurt Gore.

-- LOUISIANA (9) Tossup. Clinton won state twice, but Bush looks strong.

-- MAINE (4) Tossup. Home of Bush family retreat, but both campaigns say race is close.


-- MASSACHUSETTS (12) Solid Gore. Bush doesn't even want to debate in the state.

-- MICHIGAN (18) Tossup. Poll shows Gore moves into tie as unions warm to Democrat.

-- MINNESOTA (10) Lean Gore. Post-convention poll shows Gore pulling away from Bush.

-- MISSISSIPPI (7) Solid Bush.

-- MISSOURI (11) Tossup. Close Senate race makes this presidential bellwether state one of the hottest spots in American politics.

-- MONTANA (3) Lean Bush. Could soon be solid GOP.

-- NEBRASKA (5) Solid Bush.

-- NEVADA (4) Lean Bush. Democrats hinge hopes on late-breaking issues, such as nuclear waste dumps.

-- NEW HAMPSHIRE (4) Tossup. Poll shows race tied in state that handed Bush big primary defeat.

-- NEW JERSEY (15) Lean Gore. Traditional battleground turning Democratic, but not out of Bush's range if he buys ads.
-- NEW MEXICO (5). Tossup. Both campaigns say it's a dead heat.

-- NEW YORK (33). Solid Gore. Hillary Rodham Clinton's Senate race getting all the attention.

-- NORTH CAROLINA (14). Lean Bush. National Democrats say they've got a shot; local party officials are not as optimistic.

-- NORTH DAKOTA (3) Solid Bush

-- OHIO (21) Tossup. Republican polls show Bush well ahead; Democrats say Gore has edge. Call it a tie.

-- OKLAHOMA (8) Solid Bush.

-- OREGON (7) Tossup. Toughest of West Coast Democratic states for Gore to hold.

-- PENNSYLVANIA (23) Tossup. Poll gives Gore lead, but momentum isn't enough to move state out of battleground category.

-- RHODE ISLAND (4) Lean Gore. No polls, but analysts give vice president edge.

-- SOUTH CAROLINA (8) Solid Bush.

-- SOUTH DAKOTA (3) Solid Bush.

-- TENNESSEE (11) Lean Gore. State turning Republican, but it's still his home.

-- TEXAS (32) Solid Bush in his home state.

-- UTAH (5). Solid Bush.

-- VERMONT (3) Lean Gore. "Take state back" is GOP rallying cry, a likely futile one at that.

-- VIRGINIA (13) Solid Bush.


-- WEST VIRGINIA (5) Lean Gore. Coal and steel workers upset with Gore, but state only votes Republican in GOP landslide years.

-- WISCONSIN (11) Tossup. Democratic state giving Bush a long look.

-- WYOMING (3) Solid Bush.
Bush insults reporter who wrote critical articles

NAPERVILLE, Ill. (Reuters) - George W. Bush, who has promised to bring a new tone of civility to politics, displayed little warmth for a reporter Monday, whispering to his running mate that the journalist was a "major league asshole."

The Republican presidential nominee was unaware his microphone was live when he leaned over to Dick Cheney at a Labor Day rally and said, "There's Adam Clymer, major league asshole from the New York Times."

Cheney responded, "Oh yeah, he is, big time."

Bush was unhappy with a series of articles by Clymer that were critical of the Texas governor's record in Austin.

Bush, whose bid for the White House has been based largely on "changing the tone" in Washington, told the rally in the Chicago suburb that it was "time to get some plain-spoken folks" in the nation's capital.

Later, Cheney was asked by a television producer if "calling people names" was part of the campaign.
"I won't respond to it," Cheney said of the question. "The governor made a private comment to me."

Bush's spokeswoman, Karen Hughes, said the remark was "a whispered aside to his running mate."

"It was not intended as a public comment," she said, adding, "It was a reference to a series of articles the governor felt was unfair."

The campaign of Bush's Democratic rival, Vice President Al Gore, was quick to respond.

"We hold virtually all members of the Fourth Estate in the highest regard and we believe they should be part of the democratic process day in and day out," spokesman Chris Lehane said. — REUTERS

---

My thanks to AAPORNETter Nick Panagakis for suggesting these new data from Labor Day weekend polls conducted in five states. -- Jim

---

State Polls on Presidential Race

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Some state polls on the presidential race from Labor Day weekend. When results don't total 100 percent, the remainder favored other candidates, didn't know or refused to answer.
ALABAMA (9 electoral votes)
- George W. Bush, 48 percent
- Al Gore, 36 percent
(Bush led 52 percent to 28 percent in May)

INDIANA (12 electoral votes)
- Bush, 47 percent
- Gore, 38 percent
(Bush led 54 percent to 36 percent in March)

NEW JERSEY (15 electoral votes)
- Gore, 39 percent
- Bush, 32 percent
(Gore and Bush were virtually even before the conventions, Gore led by 12 points in a Quinnipiac poll taken just after the conventions)

OHIO (21 electoral votes)
- Bush, 49 percent
- Gore, 43 percent
(Bush held a similar lead in polls taken just before the conventions)

RHODE ISLAND (4 electoral votes)
- Gore, 54 percent
- Bush, 23 percent
(Gore led 39 percent to 25 percent in February)

--------

The Alabama poll of 407 registered voters was taken Aug. 28-31 by the University of South Alabama for the Mobile Register and has an error margin of 5 percentage points.

The Indiana poll of 600 registered voters was taken Aug. 24/27 by Market Shares for The Indianapolis Star and had an error margin of 4 percentage points.

The New Jersey Gannett poll of 430 likely voters was taken Aug. 24/27 and has an error margin of 5 percentage points.

The Ohio mail poll of 2,778 randomly selected registered voters was taken from Aug. 25 through Friday by The Columbus Dispatch and has an error margin of 2 percentage points.

The Rhode Island poll of 438 likely voters was taken Aug. 26-30 by Brown University for The Providence Journal and has an error margin of 6 percentage points.

------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright 2000 Los Angeles Times
------------------------------------------------------------------

******

========================================================================
Date: Mon, 4 Sep 2000 18:47:17 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>
Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format="flowed"

Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at <http://prorev.com/amline.htm>.

--

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

there's a Hotline newsletter that has all the polls done nationally and statewide -- that might help you determine how the candidates are doing. I don't think there are predictions yet -- wait til it gets closer to the election.

Susan

> -----Original Message-----
> From:   s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu
> [SMTP:s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu]
> Sent:   Sunday, September 03, 2000 9:50 PM
> To: AAPORNET
> Subject:  Pres. Elec. predictions by States
> >
> > I am trying to locate State by State survey predictions of the current presidential election. Any help will be appreciated.
> >
> > Best,
> >
> > Sid
> >
Dear Colleagues,

The Kiev International Institute of Sociology informs that between 2nd --16th 
October, 2000 it will conduct an omnibus survey of the 
adult = population of Ukraine.

Closing Date for Questions:
22nd September, 2000=20

Results Available:
26th October, 2000

Costs per one question:
Closed (pre-coded) question (one variable in SPSS) or closed
(pre-coded) question with multi-choice selection (up to 5 variable in SPSS):
- Full sample $260
- Half sample $130

Closed (pre-coded) question with multi-choice selection (k variables in = SPSS, k>5)
- Full sample $260 + $50*(k-5)
- Half sample $130 + $25*(k-5)

Open-ended question
- Full sample $460
- Half sample $240

Closed question in the battery of 3 and more questions
- Full sample $190
- Half sample $110

Discounts:
- For clients who will purchase more than 10 questions - 10% discount;
- For clients who participated in one of the previous omnibus - 20% = discount.

Demographics included:
- sex, age, education and place of residence (oblast, urban or rural).

Other demographics:
- ethnicity, socio-economic status, income, language, religiousness and = size of settlement.

The cost of every additional demographic question is $55 for 2,000 respondents sample and $30 for 1,000 sample.

Please find more details in the attached files ('!index.htm' is the main one, the rest are illustrative of types of questions) or on our www-site http://kiis.com.ua/?omnibus

Contacting us is very simple
You can easily get in touch with us via email, phone or fax or visit us = in person.

Contact person re Omnibus survey:
- Natalia Kharchenko,
  Deputy Director of KIIS

Our Phone and Fax numbers:
- (380-44) 463-5868
- 238-2567
- 238-2568

Our mailing address
- 8/5 Voloshska St., Kiev, 04070, Ukraine
- P.O.Box 92

Our electronic mail
Dear Colleagues,

The Kiev International Institute of Sociology informs that between 2nd--16th October, 2000 it will conduct an omnibus survey of the adult population of Ukraine.

Closing Date for Questions: 22nd September, 2000
Results Available: 26th October, 2000

Costs per one question:

Closed (pre-coded) = question=20 (one variable in SPSS) or
closed (pre-coded) question with multi-choice = 20 selection (up to 5
variable in SPSS): Full = 20
sample $260 Half = 20
sample $130 Closed (pre-coded) =
question 20 with multi-choice selection (k variables in SPSS,
k > 5): Full =

$260 + $50*(k-5) Half = 20
$130 + $25*(k-5)
Open-ended = 20 question Full
sample $460 Half = 20
sample $240 Closed question in the battery = 20 of 3 and more questions
Full =
sample $210 Half sample $130

Discounts:
For clients who will purchase more than =
10-20 questions - 10% discount;
For clients who participated in one = of the = 20 previous omnibus - 20% discount.

Demographics included:
sex, age, education and place of residence (oblast, urban or rural).

Other demographics:
ethnicity, socio-economic status, income, language, religiousness and size of settlement.

The cost of every additional demographic question is $55 for 2,000 respondents sample
and $30 for 1,000 sample.

Please find more details in the attached files (http://kiis.com.ua/?omnibus) or on
our www-site.

Contacting us is very simple.
You can easily get in touch with us via email, phone or fax.

Contact person re Omnibus survey:
Natalia Kharchenko, Deputy Director of KIIS.
Our Phone = (380-44) 463-5868
Fax = 238-2568
Our mailing address = 8/5 Voloshskaya St.,
Kiev, 04070, Ukraine.
Our P.O. Box = 92.
Our electronic mail = omnibus@kiis.com.ua.

Denisov 2003
Vladimir Paniotto
Director of KIIS
 reliable
The very best source of state by state polls is Thepollingreport.com. Very up-to-date. Unfortunately, the state level polls are for subscribers only.

Too Much Corporate Power? is Business Week's cover story in their September 11 issue....now on the newsstands. The article is based on the findings of a recently conducted Harris poll dealing with public attitudes toward Big Business, HMO's, political influence of big companies, etc. The story itself is not yet on-line but if you want an advance look the issue is on the newsstands.

Some of the interesting findings:

* 72% agree strongly or somewhat that business has gained too much power over too many aspects of American life
* Less than half agree strongly or somewhat that what is good for business is good for most Americans
* Only 18% (good and excellent) believe that HMO's are serving their consumers well.
* 73% believe that big business executives get paid too much.
* 74% believe that big companies have too much power in influencing government policy, politicians and policy makers in Washington
* 74% agree with Al Gore's sentiments expressed at the Democratic convention with respect to his criticism of "big tobacco, big oil, big polluters, pharmaceutical companies, HMO's...etc."

The article is worth reading for its analysis, conclusions and the issues that it raises. To quote Daniel Yankelovich " There's a yellow light flashing now and (business execs) better pay attention"

Dick Halpern
Too Much Corporate Power? is Business Week's cover story in their September 11 issue...now on the newsstands. The article is based on the findings of a recently conducted Harris poll dealing with public attitudes toward Big Business, HMO's, political influence of big companies, etc. The story itself is not yet online but if you want an advance look the issue is on the newsstands. Some of the interesting findings:

- 72% agree strongly or somewhat that business has gained too much power over too many aspects of American life
- Less than half agree strongly or somewhat that what is good for business is good for most Americans
- Only 18% (good and excellent) believe that HMO's are serving their consumers well.
- 73% believe that big business executives get paid too much.
- 74% believe that big companies have too much power in influencing government policy, politicians and policy makers in Washington
- 74% agree with Al Gore's sentiments expressed at the Democratic convention with respect to his criticism of "big tobacco, big oil, big polluters, pharmaceutical companies, HMO's...etc."

The article is worth reading for its analysis, conclusions and the issues that it raises. To quote Daniel Yankelovich: "There's a yellow light flashing now and (business execs) better pay attention!"

Dick Halpern
Fellow AAPORneters,

A few weeks ago, I asked whether there was any software for transferring digitally taped interviews directly to text on the computer. Unfortunately, the consensus seems to be that the technology isn't there yet. Since so many people expressed an interest in the responses, though, I am forwarding Richard Rands's comments, with his permission, on the subject.

Frank Rusciano

Return-path: <rrands@cfmc.com>
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528) id <01JT9ODTSPN400110R@enigma.rider.edu> for RUSCIANO@enigma.rider.edu (ORCPT rfc822;rusciano@rider.edu); Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:07:00 EDT
Received: from hermes.rider.edu (hermes.rider.edu [192.107.45.99]) by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528) with ESMTP id <01JT9ODTDXIC0010RP@enigma.rider.edu> for RUSCIANO@enigma.rider.edu (ORCPT rfc822;rusciano@rider.edu); Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:06:59 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by hermes.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-32 #37528) id <01JT9OEOQ2R7K0004V1@hermes.rider.edu> for RUSCIANO@enigma.rider.edu (ORCPT rfc822;rusciano@rider.edu); Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:07:43 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from mail.cfmc.com (mail.cfmc.com [206.15.13.129]) by hermes.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-32 #37528) with ESMTP id <01JT9OEPAW5E0004Y2@hermes.rider.edu> for RUSCIANO@enigma.rider.edu (ORCPT rfc822;rusciano@rider.edu); Tue, 22 Aug 2000 11:07:43 -0400 (EDT)
Hi Frank,

CfMC has a product called Sound Survent that supports digital recording and playback with our Survent CATI system. We have been watching the Voice recognition software situation very closely to determine when we can link an automatic transcription package to the system. We have been told by those who are most knowledgeable in voice recognition, that there are two significant problems involved. First, the vocabulary required for such a system is far too much for the current state-of-the-art. Most voice recognition systems on the market, such as airline reservation and ordering systems can work because they have very limited vocabulary to accommodate. The second problem is that digital recording from telephone interviews has such a loss of signal to noise ratio, the ability to handle normal conversations is almost impossible. They are upbeat and keep promising that in a few years it will be possible. But as far as we can tell, there is nothing on the market today that will take a sound file and convert it to a text file.

If you would like to speak to some of our clients who use Sound Survent, I will be happy to supply you with some contacts. They are currently transcribing the files using a feature in the system that lets data entry people play back the sound files with start/stop/pause/backup/forward capability as they listen and type.

Richard Rands
President
Computers for Marketing Corp.
San Francisco

Has anyone had any experience with using digital recorders and the accompanying transcription software for interviews? I was wondering if there is a reliable recorder and software setup that one can use to record an interview, and then have the results automatically transcribed on the computer in a Word file (or some other easy to edit format). Since I don't know if all AAPORneters would be interested in this (or probably know about it already), you can reply directly to
It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!

-----Original Message-----
From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at <http://prorev.com/amline.htm>.

--

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

Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.
The very best source of state by state polls is Thepollingreport.com.

Can't quibble with the characterization of our site, but please note that our URL is www.pollingreport.com (no "the").

The Survey Research Center (SRC) of the University of Michigan plans to make a tenure-track open-rank appointment to an interdisciplinary Program in Survey Methodology. The program is located in two sites: 1) the SRC in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and 2) the Joint Program in Survey Methodology, a consortium of the University of Maryland, University of Michigan, and Westat, Inc., located in College Park, Maryland. This appointment will be located in the Michigan group sited in Ann Arbor.

The Survey Methodology Program scientists conduct research on survey methods, provide direction on innovation in research techniques used within SRC, and provide graduate and postgraduate teaching in survey methodology. The graduate teaching instructs both JPSM students at the University of Maryland and University of Michigan students through distance learning technology. This mix of teaching, innovation in survey practice, and research varies across scientists in the program but averages about .33 time in each
of the three domains.

The appointment is in the area of social science-based survey methodology. Successful candidates are expected to be pursuing a research program in one or more of the following areas: effects of mode of data collection on survey data quality, social and cognitive psychological influences on measurement error in surveys; the role of the survey interviewer in data quality; effects of question structure, context, wording on responses; and the impact of household affiliation patterns on survey coverage errors.

The successful candidate is expected to demonstrate a publication record in scholarly journals and a history of funding in peer review grant or research contract mechanisms, at a level commensurate with their career stage. Experience in graduate teaching and graduate student mentoring is desirable.

The position will be a joint appointment, the primary appointment as an Assistant, Associate or Senior Research Scientist in the SRC and a Research Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor at the University of Maryland, Joint Program in Survey Methodology. Affiliations with the appropriate University of Michigan Department are possible.

The University of Michigan is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. The University makes every effort to be responsive to the needs of dual-career couples.

Applicants should forward a curriculum vitae, a statement of interest, and three letters of reference to:

James S. House, Director
Survey Research Center
Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, Room 1355
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104-1248

Screening of applications will begin immediately and continue until the position is filled.

Date: Wed, 6 Sep 2000 09:59:06 -0400
Message-Id: <200009061359.JAA68466@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: What's the Census selling now?

OK, I admit it, I couldn't resist reading today's article on how to be a millionaire on msn.com.
But partway through, here's what caught my eye. How did best-selling author Thomas J. Stanley of "The Millionaire Next Door" and now "The Millionaire Mind" find his sample of 1000 to study?

Article author Terry Savage says:

Now, it could be argued that all the millionaires in Stanley's survey were "old" millionaires -- at least, that they made their millions in the older, pre-Internet economy. That's how they showed up on the databases of the IRS and Census Bureau, which were the sources for finding his subjects.

Forget about resoling your expensive shoes. Does anyone know the real story of how Stanley located people to interview (I didn't read the book) or can I really believe the IRS and Census giving/selling this type of sensitive information? It cannot be.

Susan
Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
slosh@garnet.fsu.edu
visit the site at:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm
850-644-8778
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I HAVE JUST JOINED THE FACULTY AT:

The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453
Hospitals to keep patient survey secret
The Boston Globe

By Larry Tye, Globe Staff, 9/6/2000

The results of a major survey on what patients think is right or wrong with Massachusetts hospitals will not be made public because of worries about how it was conducted.

The decision to keep the findings secret was disclosed in a letter mailed to hospitals Friday by the Massachusetts Hospital Association, in which it warned that any public release of the institutions' scores in the survey 'would be misleading and improper.'

The survey, only the third of its kind, was intended to help consumers choose a hospital and measure what, if any, improvements hospitals have made since 1998, when a similar survey was made public.

Polls are showing that Ralph Nader represents a greater threat to Gore than Buchanan does to Bush.

Below, Nader was restored as a candidate on the Illinois ballot, at least until an appeal by state Democrats is heard.

Can anyone bring us up to date on Nader's ballot status in other key swing or battleground states such as WA, OR, MI, MO, OH, PA, NJ, etc.
NADER GETS REPRIEVE ON ILLINOIS PETITIONS

Published on 08/26/2000

A federal judge cleared the way Friday for consumer activist Ralph Nader to be placed on the presidential ballot in Illinois in November—if his third party withstands a Democratic-backed objection to its nominating petitions.

U.S. District Judge William Hibbler granted the Nader campaign a preliminary injunction, after finding a state requirement that only registered voters could circulate petitions had been an undue burden.

=========================================================================
Okay, so we always try to explain to clients that each number in a table is really just a point estimate, and there is a corresponding range estimate that better represents the "truth."

One group of folks wants us to give "the" margin of error at the bottom of each table we generate. We tried to explain that the margin of error is for each estimate in the table--if we talked to more Blacks than Hispanics, if more people refused to answer a particular item, then there will be different margins of error. (We generally do an appendix in the technical report that has those numbers.)

But this client insisted, saying, "The political polls only have one margin of error in the box for the whole survey, even though they probably talked to different numbers of people for this or that."

Are we being too academic? Any references on how to scientifically come up with that one magic number?

Thanks bunches,

Colleen

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

Date: Wed, 6 Sep 2000 11:12:53 -1200
From: "James Bason" <jbason@arches.uga.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <200009061359.JAA68466@garnet1.acns.fsu.edu>
Subject: Re: What's the Census selling now?
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6700
The data for Tom's book came from a mail survey that our Center conducted. 5,000 questionnaires were mailed out to a sample that Tom provided us that was developed by Jon Robbin, who used Geocoding to classify 90 percent of the households in America (see Appendix 1, page 249 of his book for a description of this methodology).

The process involves coding average net income for specific neighborhoods, then using a mathematical capitalization model to estimate average net worth. Then by coding neighborhoods by descending net worth, a sample of the highest net worth households is obtained.

For an additional description of the methodology, see:


Jim

James Bason, PhD
Director and Assistant Research Scientist
Survey Research Center
University of Georgia
jbason@arches.uga.edu
706-542-6110
706-542-4057 FAX
114 Barrow Hall
Athens, GA 30602

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Susan Losh" <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2000 1:59 AM
Subject: RE: What's the Census selling now?

> OK, I admit it, I couldn't resist reading today's article on how to be
> a millionaire on msn.com.
> http://moneycentral.msn.com/articles/smartbuy/basics/5236.asp
> But partway through, here's what caught my eye. How did best-selling
> author
> Thomas J. Stanley of "The Millionaire Next Door" and now "The
> Millionaire Mind" find his sample of 1000 to study?
> Article author Terry Savage says:
> Now, it could be argued that all the millionaires in Stanley's survey
> were "old" millionaires -- at least, that they made their millions in
> the
> older,
> pre-Internet economy. That's how they showed up on the databases of
> IRS
> and Census Bureau, which were the sources for finding his subjects.
Forget about resoling your expensive shoes. Does anyone know the real story of how Stanley located people to interview (I didn't read the book) or can I really believe the IRS and Census giving/selling this type of sensitive information? It cannot be.

Susan
Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
slosh@garnet.fsu.edu

visit the site at: http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm

850-644-8778
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776

PLEASE MAKE A NOTE!

I HAVE JUST JOINED THE FACULTY AT:

The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453
I think you should tell your client that political polls seen in the media are intended for a general audience. There is no room for an error table showing not only potential error for the total sample and sub-groups within the sample - but for errors associated with each estimate; i.e., 50%, 40% and 60%, 30% and 70%, etc.

There is no single error measure which could apply to an entire table of data. Your technical appendix table of errors is the only practical way of showing this.

You may find the attached excel file useful, parts of which I have used to explain potential error for: 1) total samples, 2) sub-groups and 3) single estimates for a single survey.

Colleen K Porter wrote:

> Okay, so we always try to explain to clients that each number in a table is really just a point estimate, and there is a corresponding range estimate that better represents the "truth."
>
> One group of folks wants us to give "the" margin of error at the bottom of each table we generate. We tried to explain that the margin of error is for each estimate in the table--if we talked to more Blacks than Hispanics, if more people refused to answer a particular item, then there will be different margins of error. (We generally do an appendix in the technical report that has those numbers.)
>
> But this client insisted, saying, "The political polls only have one margin of error in the box for the whole survey, even though they probably talked to different numbers of people for this or that."
>
> Are we being too academic? Any references on how to scientifically come up with that one magic number?
>
> Thanks bunches,
>
> Colleen
>
> 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

------------753D68BF236879A5DF2EAA73
Content-Type: application/x-excel; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="44565052"; name="Sample Error Table.XLS"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Description: Unknown Document
Content-Disposition: inline;
   filename="Sample Error Table.XLS"

0MBR4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAABAAAQAABAAA
Dear Nick and Everyone,

According to the September 1st edition of Ballot Access News, the Green Party is on in WA, OR, MI, MO, PA and NJ. I believe the signatures are being counted in OH. Nader is in court in NC, OK and SD.

Yours,

Chris

:-----Original Message-----
:From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis
:Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2000 2:18 AM
:To: aapornet@usc.edu
:Subject: Nader Ballot Watch

Polls are showing that Ralph Nader represents a greater threat to Gore than Buchanan does to Bush.

Below, Nader was restored as a candidate on the Illinois ballot, at least until an appeal by state Democrats is heard.

Can anyone bring us up to date on Nader's ballot status in other key swing or battleground states such as WA, OR, MI, MO, OH, PA, NJ, etc.

NADER GETS REPIERVE ON ILLINOIS PETITIONS

Published on 08/26/2000

A federal judge cleared the way Friday for consumer activist Ralph Nader to be placed on the presidential ballot in Illinois in November--if his third party withstands a Democratic-backed objection to its nominating petitions.
U.S. District Judge William Hibbler granted the Nader campaign a preliminary injunction, after finding a state requirement that only registered voters could circulate petitions had been an undue burden.

Date: Wed, 6 Sep 2000 14:45:09 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)
From: bwiggins@irss.unc.edu (Bev Wiggins)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Register Now for SAPOR Conference
X-Mailer: Siren Mail (Windows Version 4.0.2 (Windows 95/NT))
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET="US-ASCII"

The annual conference of the Southern Association for Public Opinion Research will be held on October 5 and 6, 2000 in Raleigh, North Carolina. The deadline for early registration (lower rates) is September 15, 2000. See the SAPOR website <http://www.irss.unc.edu/sapor/2000Conference.htm> for more information about the conference, the preliminary agenda, a list of area attractions, and a conference registration form. Questions can be addressed to me at bwiggins@irss.unc.edu or to conference chairperson Michael Link at link@rti.org. Please join us!

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

Date: Wed, 6 Sep 2000 14:50:44 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)
From: bwiggins@irss.unc.edu (Bev Wiggins)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Statistical Analyst-- Job Posting
X-Mailer: Siren Mail (Windows Version 4.0.2 (Windows 95/NT))
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET="US-ASCII"

Statistical Analyst: Expertise in survey methodology (sampling, missing data, weighting), national health data and statistical software. Assists faculty and graduate students. PhD in a quantitative field preferred. 12-month salary: $65,000 minimum. Deadline: November 15, 2000. Send letter of interest, names
Howard Schuman writes:
>Here is a hypothesis that will be testable with future survey data: If
>the Gore/Lieberman ticket wins (or at least does reasonably well),
>there will be a highly significant (p < .01) increase in the proportion
>of Jews who report that they observe the sabbath.

At the risk of sounding cynical such a study would have to be conducted periodically over time. Doubtless the proportion would increase immediately after election but my guess is that it would decline to current levels within a year or less. The rate of decline would be interesting.

Dick Halpern

#WEB375 - Research Manager for Programming, Audience and Corporate Research
Plays a key role in evaluating programming that NPR (National Public Radio)
produces and distributes; oversees primary and secondary research projects, analyzes Arbitron data; and supervises a staff of 2 analysts. Bachelor's degree or equivalent experience required; and Masters or Ph.D. degree preferred. Hands-on analytical experience; proficiency using SPSS, Excel, Power Point, MS Word, and database software; strong written and oral communication skills; ability to effectively present research results to producers and management; extensive experience with media research, particularly working Arbitron estimates; and ability to effectively work as a member of a team of diverse individuals required.

This position will remain open until filled. More information about our organization may be found at: www.npr.org

For consideration, send cover letter and resume, indicating job title and number, to:

National Public Radio
Human Resources Department
635 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20001
fax: (202) 414-3047
e-mail employment@npr.org

Please note: NPR does not accept or retain general applications for employment. Individuals must apply for specific, open positions.

NPR is an Equal Opportunity Employer

In addition to the address above, you may email your application to jnixon@npr.org (Jackie Nixon, Director of Audience & Corporate Research, NPR)

Lori A. Kaplan
Research Manager for Business & Corporate Development
NPR, Audience & Corporate Research
635 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20001
ph. 202.414.2811
fx. 202.414.3041

Greetings, fellow Chapter members & friends!

Below are announcements for TWO interesting talks being sponsored by the Chapter (and co-sponsored by WSS)—one for October 3 (not previously reported), and the other for October 11.

October 11: Colonias on the US/Mexico Border: Barriers to Enumeration in Census 2000, by Manuel de la Puente and David Stemper, U.S. Bureau of the Census

DETAILED INFO ON EACH APPEARS BELOW

We hope to see you there!

Rob Santos
Chapter President

************* BEGIN OCT. 3 Session Description *************


When: Tuesday, October 3, 2000, 12:30-1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Roger Tourangeau, University of Michigan and perhaps another, to be named

Location: BLS Conference and Training Center, Room #2 Postal Square Building 2 Massachusetts Ave., NE Washington, DC (Enter on First St., NE, and bring a photo ID)

Metro: Union Station, Red Line

RSVP: To be placed on the visitor's list, send e-mail to audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com or call Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 by Thursday, September 28.

Abstract: We describe the results of an experiment on Web surveys. Many studies have demonstrated the advantages of self-administration, which include increased reporting of sensitive information and decreased interviewer effects. Computer administration of survey questions appears to combine the advantages of self-administration with the added advantages of computer assistance. Still, a growing body of evidence suggests that features of the computer interface can elicit reactions similar to those triggered by human interviewers. Our experiment examined features of the interface thought to create a virtual social presence. We varied whether or not the electronic questioner is identified by name ("Hi! I'm John") and whether or not it offers explicit reminders of prior answers. The main hypothesis to be tested in the study is that the more the interface creates a sense of social presence, the more respondents will act as if they are interacting with another human being. The major effects of social presence will be lower levels of reporting sensitive
information; at the same time, rates of missing data may be reduced. Thus, the analyses examine both unit and item nonresponse and levels of reporting. The study is designed to begin to fill an important gap in knowledge about the impact of Web data collection on data quality and to address important theoretical concerns about socially desirable reporting and interacting with computers.

********** END Oct. 3 SESSION DESCRIPTION **********

**********BEGIN OCT 11 SESSION DESCRIPTION **********

Topic: Colonias on the US/Mexico Border: Barriers to Enumeration in Census 2000

When: Wednesday, October 11, 2000, 12:30-1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Manuel de la Puente and David Stemper, U.S. Bureau of the Census

Location: BLS Cognitive Lab, Room 2990
Postal Square Building
2 Massachusetts Ave., NE
Washington, DC
(Enter on First St., NE, and bring a photo ID)

Metro: Union Station, Red Line

RSVP: To be placed on the visitor's list, send e-mail to audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com or call Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 by Thursday, September 28.

Abstract: Colonias are unincorporated, generally low income residential subdivisions, lacking basic infrastructure and services (e.g., paved roads and public water systems) along the border between the U.S. and Mexico. The population in these settlements can range from 50 to over 15,000 persons. A recent unofficial estimate of the total population in Colonias totaled 1.2 million persons.

This presentation presents findings from ethnographic studies and focus groups conducted in four colonias in three southwestern states. The U.S. Census Bureau initiated and executed this research in conjunction with Census 2000 in order to identify and understand barriers to census enumeration in colonias. The presentation will draw on ethnographic reports and focus groups with colonia residents, census enumerators, and crew leaders in order to discuss barriers to census enumeration in colonias and present an assessment of census procedures from the point of view of census enumerators and crew leaders. The presentation will conclude by discussing how the knowledge obtained from this research can be used by the Census Bureau to develop appropriate enumeration procedures and effective outreach and promotion programs for colonias.

Note: If you want a direct e-mail notice of these meetings in the future, please contact dc-aapor.admin@erols.com
Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us?

Warren Mitofsky

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:
>It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen
>Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer
>and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not
>a great idea to promote these!
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
>Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five
>States
>
>Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally
>of national and state polls on his website, at
>---
>
>Doug Henwood
>Left Business Observer
>Village Station - PO Box 953
>New York NY 10014-0704 USA
>+1-212-741-9852 voice +1-212-807-9152 fax
>email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
>web: <http://www.pani.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>
>
>Because e-mail can be altered electronically,
>the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen website? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us?

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:

It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice (&quot;press one for yes&quot;) for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!

From: Doug Henwood

Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at

---

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
+1-212-741-9852 voice +1-212-807-9152 fax
email:
web:

Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Welcome to New York AAPOR's first session of the 2000-2001 membership year. The specific details are presented below.

I would also like to take this opportunity to remind you to join or renew your membership, so as to not miss hearing about the rest of our upcoming and exciting Fall events. I look forward to seeing you soon.

Janet L. Streicher, President, NYAAPOR

NEW YORK AAPOR, THE FIRST AMENDMENT CENTER (formerly The Media Studies Center) & THE ONLINE NEWS ASSOCIATION present an Evening Meeting

Date ......................... Wednesday, 20 September 2000 Reception ............... 5:30 p.m. Presentation ............ 6:00 -- 7:30 p.m.
Place ........................ Newseum/NY, Mezzanine 580 Madison Ave. (56-57th Sts.)

Admission ................. NYAAPOR members, student members, HLMs, FAC, ONA free; other students, $5*; all others, $15*

(* free if joining at the meeting)

RSVP by ....................... Wednesday, 13 Sept.

PLEASE E-MAIL RoniRosner@aol.com ONLY, NOT AAPORNET

CROSSING THE CHASM between WEB SURVEYS and PROBABILITY SAMPLING

Internet survey methods have proliferated, becoming fully integrated into the survey researchers toolkit. However, many on-line polls and surveys suffer from the limitations of convenience or self-selected samples.
Can the power of the internet be combined with the rigors of probability sampling? Join our distinguished panelists as they provide varying perspectives on the opportunities, challenges and hope for representative web surveys. Featuring:

* Dr. Karol Krotki, InterSurvey
  "Internet Surveys and Household Probability Sampling: an Overview"

* Daniel Slotwiner, InterSurvey
  "InterSurvey Case Studies from Online Polling and Market Research"

* Mike Godwin, Chief Correspondent, IP Worldwide; Columnist, American Lawyer;
  "Online Polling and Representative Samples: Implications for Internet Journalism"

* Discussant: Warren Mitofsky, Mitofsky International
  "Online Polling: Snake Oil or Panacea"

BUILDING SECURITY CANNOT ADMIT ANYONE WHOSE NAME IS NOT ON OUR LIST!! If you are planning to attend, respond by Wed., 13 Sept. E-mail RoniRosner@aol.com Or, if you must, call 722-5333

Date: Thu, 07 Sep 2000 16:23:10 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Richard C. Rockwell" <richard@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>
Subject: RE: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States
In-Reply-To: <4.3.2.7.2.20000907153905.00b2f320@pop.mindspring.com>
References: <EBABBFAC597AD211A0CB00A0C9DCF072E947DC@ny27newsncge.nbcnews.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Some light might be cast on these questions by Scott Rasmussen's article in the "From the Field" section of the Sept/Oct 2000 issue of Public Perspective ("For 'Yes', Press 1: Automated Polling by Rasmussen Research", pages 41-43). Also, look for a related article in the Nov/Dec 2000 issue of Public Perspective.

At 03:42 PM 09/07/2000 -0400, Warren Mitofsky wrote:
> Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us? warren mitofsky
>
> At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:
> It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic"
>") for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!
Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running
tally of national and state polls on his website, at

Because e-mail can be altered electronically,
the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

Here was his original comments to the AAPornet.

-----Original Message-----
From: Doug Rivers [mailto:drivers@intersurvey.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2000 7:10 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
These are interesting hypotheses, but it turns out that they aren't true. For example, we slightly overrepresent, not underrepresent, computer users and persons with college or higher degrees. I've heard the "professional respondents" hypothesis countless times, but we find no evidence of it. Josh Clinton has done a study comparing new panel members with those on the panel 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 months, and he finds no evidence of panel effects. The only noticeable difference is that persons report higher Internet usage rates in their first month on the panel, but even this is back to normal after 2 months.

Doug Rivers
InterSurvey
>
> Speaking at the NEAAPOR mini-conference this spring, Doug Rivers of InterSurvey addressed this very question, telling us that they provided ALL respondents with WebTV units, regardless of whether or not they had a computer or Internet access. This was necessary not just to eliminate sample bias, but also to make sure that all respondents see the same survey under the same conditions, which would not be possible otherwise given the huge variety that exists in computers and software.
>
> To my way of thinking, this may reduce one kind of bias, but it introduces other kinds. In particular, it skews the sample towards a TV-oriented audience and away from the more computer literate and perhaps even the better educated segments of society in general.
>
> There are a lot of other issues involved in the Intersurvey process, including the measures they take to keep their panel "fresh" by making sure they participate regularly in surveys and dropping those who do not. IMO this tends to produce "professional" respondents likely to tailor their answers to what they think the survey sponsors want to hear. But then, that may well soon be the only kind that will answer surveys anyway.
>
> Jan Werner

=========================================================================  
Date: Thu, 7 Sep 2000 17:17:57 -0400  
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "Sam Smith" <ssmith@IGC.APC.ORG>  
Subject: RE: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States  
Message-ID: <JAEPUNBGDEENLLCTIIIBEACCLAA.mark@bisconti.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Rasmussen Research website is http://portraitofamerica.com/

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Richard C. Rockwell
Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2000 5:23 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

Some light might be cast on these questions by Scott Rasmussen's article in the "From the Field" section of the Sept/Oct 2000 issue of Public Perspective ("For 'Yes', Press 1: Automated Polling by Rasmussen Research", pages 41-43). Also, look for a related article in the Nov/Dec 2000 issue of Public Perspective.

At 03:42 PM 09/07/2000 -0400, Warren Mitofsky wrote:
> Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us?
>warren mitofsky

========================================================================
Date: Thu, 7 Sep 2000 15:11:42 -0700
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com
Received: from 6b7va (fscnt1.fsc-research.com [206.180.228.75])
   by web2.tdl.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id PAA24938
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 7 Sep 2000 15:08:48 -0700
Message-Id: <200009072208.PAA24938@web2.tdl.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: RE: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States
In-reply-to: <4.3.2.7.2.20000907153905.00b2f320@pop.mindspring.com>
References: <EBABBFFAC597AD211A0CB00A0C9DF072E847DC@ny27newsnbcge.nbcnewsws.nbc.com>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.01d)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Intuition says the response rate is in the low single digits.

Date sent: Thu, 07 Sep 2000 15:42:24 -0400
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States
Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us?

warren mitofsky

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:
> It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!

-----Original Message-----
> From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
> Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five
> States
>
> Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at
> --
> 
> Doug Henwood
> Left Business Observer
> Village Station - PO Box 953
> New York NY 10014-0704 USA
> +1-212-741-9852 voice +1-212-807-9152 fax
> email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
> web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>
> 
> Because e-mail can be altered electronically,
> the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

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

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com
you share it with us?

warren mitofsky

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:

It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at &lt;http://prorev.com/amline.htm&gt;.

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
+1-212-741-9852 voice +1-212-807-9152 fax
email: mailto:dhenwood@panix.com
web: &lt;http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html&gt;

Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

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.
Based on "just my dislike" or "my just dislike"?

I've got a call into them - hopefully they'll respond tomorrow.

Here's the link to their methodology site:


-----Original Message-----
From: sullivan@fsc-research.com [mailto:sullivan@fsc-research.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2000 6:12 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

Intuition says the response rate is in the low single digits.

Date sent: Thu, 07 Sep 2000 15:42:24 -0400
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us?

warren mitofsky

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:
>It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen
>Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer
>and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not
>a great idea to promote these!
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
>Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States
>
>Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at <http://prorev.com/amline.htm>.
>
>---
>
>Doug Henwood
>Left Business Observer
>Village Station - PO Box 953
>New York NY 10014-0704 USA
>+1-212-741-9852 voice  +1-212-807-9152 fax
>email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
>web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>
>
>Because e-mail can be altered electronically,
>the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

--=====================_5314069==_.ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>
<font size=3>Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen website? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us?warren mitofsky<br> <br>&nbsp;At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:<br> <blockquote type=cite cite>It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research<br>polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice (&quot;press one for yes&quot;) for<br>their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!<br>
<br>-----Original Message-----
From: Doug Henwood
[a href="mailto:dhenwood@panix.com"
 eudora="autourl">mailto:dhenwood@panix.com</a>]<br>Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM<br>To: aapornet@usc.edu<br>Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States<br>
<br>Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website,
</font>
</html>
Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

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.

Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.
WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Buoyed by support from women, Democrat Al Gore leads Republican George W. Bush by six percentage points in the U.S. presidential race in which the gender gap has become a chasm, according to a new Reuters/Zogby poll released Thursday.

The poll of 1,001 likely voters conducted for Reuters Monday through Wednesday by pollster John Zogby found the vice president leading Bush, the governor of Texas, by 46 to 40 percent.

Green Party candidate Ralph Nader polled 5 percent and the Reform Party's Pat Buchanan scored 2 percent. In a two-man matchup, Gore led 49 to 43 percent.

Gore's lead was still on the edges of the poll's statistical margin of error of plus or minus 3.2 percent but the survey confirmed the vice president had kept the bounce he received from last month's Democratic convention and added to it.

In the last Reuters/Zogby poll, taken the weekend following the convention that ended Aug. 17 and released Aug. 21, Gore had led by three points. Since then, his support has risen by two percentage percent and Bush's has dropped by two points.

Recent history shows that the candidate leading in the first poll after Labor Day almost invariably goes on to win the election.

MASSIVE GENDER GAP

The main feature of the poll was a massive gender gap, with women supporting Gore by 21 percentage points while men were backing Bush by 11 points. That added up to an unprecedented 32-point differential.

"I guess you could say that Gore supporters are from Venus and Bush supporters are from Mars. This is as wide as you can imagine it," said pollster John Zogby.

In the 1996 presidential election, President Clinton won the vote among women by 16 points but Republican Bob Dole edged the vote among men by one point -- a 17-point gap.
In the new poll, more than 77 percent of respondents said they did not intend to change their minds before the Nov. 7 election. Undecided voters broke two to one for Gore when asked which way they leaned.

Nearly two-thirds said the United States was headed in the right direction—a leading indicator that the party holding the White House could expect to be rewarded with a new term.

Asked to rank issues, voters indicated that education and Social Security remained at the top of their agenda, followed by universal health care for children, military preparedness and providing prescription drugs for seniors. Cutting taxes and campaign finance reform lagged well behind.

GORE AHEAD ON ISSUES

Respondents preferred Gore's position over Bush's by a wide margin on education (25 points), health care for children (30 points), a patient's bill of rights (40 points) and campaign finance reform (32 points).

Gore also led by nine points on providing prescription drugs for older Americans. Bush led by four points on tax cuts, six points on military preparedness and a single point on Social Security.

"Gore has built a clear advantage on many of the key issues," Zogby said. "But it would be a mistake to read too much into this poll, which was taken after a period when Bush has been on the ropes. This is still a horse race."

The poll showed Gore and Bush remained in a virtual dead heat in the key Midwest region, where many experts believe the election will be won. Gore led easily on both coasts and made inroads into Bush's base in the South as well.

While both candidates enjoyed overwhelming support from their own party faithful, Gore led by eight points among independent voters. He also led among most age groups, though the two candidates were statistically tied in the crucial 35- to 55-year-old bracket.

Gore's lead among voters living in big cities was offset by Bush's wide advantage among rural voters. The race was a virtual tie among suburban and small-town voters.

Bush led by eight points among whites but Gore was getting almost 90 percent of the black vote and had a 21-point lead among Hispanics.

Many experts, including Zogby, believe one key group to watch in the election are those earning $25,000-$50,000 a year who have
not fully participated in the country's prosperity. The two candidates were tied in this group.

---

(C) 2000 Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

---

*****

Date: Thu, 07 Sep 2000 18:39:34 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: RE: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States
In-Reply-To: <200009072208.PAA24938@web2.tdl.com>
References: <4.3.2.7.2.20000907153905.00b2f320@pop.mindspring.com>
<EBABBFAC597AD211A0CB00A0C9DCEF072E847DC@ny27newsnbcge.nbcnews.nbc.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="="
--=5314069== .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Intuition is not what I am after.
warren mitofsky

At 03:11 PM 9/7/00 -0700, you wrote:
> Intuition says the response rate is in the low single digits.
>
> Date sent: Thu, 07 Sep 2000 15:42:24 -0400
> Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
> From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

> Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike
> for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work
> than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know
> more, like their response rates, would you share it with us? warren
> mitofsky
>
>
> At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:
> > It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen
> > Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer
> > and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably
> > not a great idea to promote these!
> >
> > ------Original Message-----
> > > From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at <http://prorev.com/amline.htm>.

---

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

Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
+1-212-980-3031 Phone
+1-212-980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us?

warren mitofsky

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:

>>It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!

>>-----Original Message-----
>>From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
>>Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
>>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>>Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States
>>
>>Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at
>><http://prorev.com/amline.htm>. --
Intuition is not what I am after.

warren mitofsky

At 03:11 PM 9/7/00 -0700, you wrote:

Intuition says the response rate is in the low single digits. Date sent: Thu, 07 Sep 2000 15:42:24 -0400

From: aapornet@usc.edu

Warren
Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us?<n> warren mitofsky

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:

It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice; probably not a great idea to promote these!

From: Doug Henwood
douglas@panix.com

Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at http://prorev.com/amline.htm.

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
+1-212-741-9852 voice & +1-212-807-9152 fax
email: douglas@panix.com
web: http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html
Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us?

warren mitofsky

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:

It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice (&quot;press one for yes&quot;) for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!

-----Original Message-----
From: Doug Henwood
Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at http://prorev.com/amline.htm

---
Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
+1-212-741-9852 voice +1-212-807-9152 fax
email: dhenwood@panix.com
web: http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html

Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

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 <br> e-mail to postmaster@fsc-<br> research.com,<n
and destroy this <br> communication and all copies <br> thereof, including <br> attachments. </font></b></blockquote><br>

Mitofsky International<br>
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor<br>
New York, NY 10022<br>
212 980-3031 Phone<br>
212 980-3107 FAX&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&n

---
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<HTML>
<HEAD>
<TITLE>Post-ABC Poll: Bush, Gore Even</TITLE>
</HEAD>
Al Gore and George W. Bush are locked in a dead-even race for the White House, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll, with Gore having consolidated gains he made at his convention and enjoying the edge on who is best equipped to handle the issues voters say are most important to them. The Post-ABC poll reveals an electorate that is sharply divided over the choice for president in November but relatively contented with both major-party candidates. With two months remaining before Election Day, the poll foreshadows a fiercely competitive contest as Gore tries to capitalize on the strong economy and Bush seeks to make a compelling case for changing parties after eight years of Democratic control.

In a four-way matchup, Gore and Bush each received 47 percent support among likely voters, with Green Party nominee Ralph Nader at 3 percent and Reform Party nominee Patrick J. Buchanan at 1 percent. In a hypothetical two-way race, Bush led Gore 49 percent to 47 percent. The polls taken immediately after Labor Day are considered especially important by presidential candidates because they are the first that measure the lasting impact of the summer political conventions, and they mark the moment in the race that many Americans begin to pay serious attention to the candidates.

In the past four elections, the candidate ahead at Labor Day has gone on to win the White House. Twice since World War II – in 1960 and 1980 – the race was statistically tied at this stage. The 1960 race stayed close until the end, with John F. Kennedy narrowly defeating Richard M. Nixon. The 1980 contest broke open in late October, with Ronald Reagan easily defeating President Jimmy Carter. The Gore and Bush campaigns said they expect this race to remain competitive until the end.

The new Post-ABC findings represent a slight narrowing in the race since the weekend immediately after Gore's convention last month, when the Democratic nominee led Bush 48 percent to 44 percent. But more important, the poll shows the clear shift that has occurred since July, just before the two major-party conventions, when Bush led Gore by 8 percentage points. Unlike Bush, who surged to a double-digit lead at the time of the GOP convention, only to see it begin to evaporate the following week, Gore has retained most of the support he acquired at his convention.

The race has polarized along classic lines. Men support Bush 52 percent to 38 percent, while women support Gore by an identical margin. Gore enjoys the support of about eight in 10 Democrats, while Bush has the backing of almost nine in 10 Republicans. Independent voters narrowly favor Bush. Gore holds a clear lead in the Northeast, but in every other region, including the battleground Midwest, the poll finds the race is statistically tied. The poll is based on telephone interviews with 1,065 registered voters nationwide, including 738 likely voters, and was conducted Sept. 4-6. The margin of sampling error is...
plus or minus 3 percentage points for the overall results and 4 percentage points for results based on the sample of likely voters.

After trailing most of the year, Gore not only has wiped out Bush's overall lead, but also has seized the advantage on a number of key questions of character and on issues.

Gore leads Bush as the candidate voters say is best able to deal with nine of the 17 issues tested in the survey, including education, health care and prescription drug benefits for the elderly, the economy and Social Security; issues that voters said are critically important to them this year.

Bush holds a clear lead on two issues: taxes and defense. Six weeks ago, Bush led Gore on seven issues and the Democrat was favored on two: health care and the environment.

Some of these shifts have been dramatic. Five weeks ago, Bush had a 13-point advantage as the candidate best able to manage the federal budget; today, Gore leads by five points, an 18-point swing.

The vice president has turned a nine-point deficit into a five-point lead on the issue of the candidate best able to handle the national economy and has gone from even with Bush on education to a 12-point advantage.

The candidates are tied on six issues, including the traditional Republican issue of crime, on which Bush had a 20-point lead in July. Neither candidate is seen as better able to reform campaign finance laws, an area where Republicans believe Gore is vulnerable. And Gore ties Bush even on one of the Republican's signature issues: changing the tone in Washington.

Gore also has managed to erase Bush's advantage as the candidate best able to encourage high moral standards and values; a clear indication that the Democrat, at least for the moment, has separated himself from the personal problems of President Clinton. Before the conventions, Bush led Gore by 11 points on this measure; today the two are tied.

The Democratic nominee also has cut into areas of Bush strength. Bush is still seen as the candidate best able to hold down taxes, but his 16-point lead on this issue in July has dwindled to six.

On issues that have divided the two candidates, those surveyed sided more with Gore's call for smaller tax cuts and his opposition to school vouchers. But about six in 10 agree with Bush's proposal to divert some of the Social Security payroll tax to private accounts.

On personal attributes, Bush is still viewed as the stronger leader, by a 65 percent to 54 percent margin, an advantage he has enjoyed throughout the campaign. Gore has gained eight points since July, while the percentage viewing Bush as a strong leader has increased by four points.

The new Post-ABC News poll suggests that voters are feeling more comfortable with Gore, who has consistently been portrayed as distant and stiff in comparison with Bush's more open and engaging personal style.

In July, fewer than half of voters said Gore had "an appealing personality." Today, 55 percent see Gore that way.

But Bush still is viewed as the more personable candidate; six in 10 voters said they find Bush personally appealing and fewer than a third said he's boring, according to the poll.
More voters said they trust Gore now than offered a similar view just a few weeks ago. Sixty-three percent agreed that Gore is "honest and trustworthy"; up from 47 percent in July, bringing him even with Bush on this key character trait.

The gender gap that exists on the choice for president is even wider when voters are asked who can best handle the issues. Among the 17 issues tested by The Post and ABC, Gore leads among women on all but one of them: defense, where he is tied with Bush. Among men, Bush leads on 12 of the 17 issues, is tied with Gore on three and trails on three others.

On the key issue of education, which voters ranked as their top concern, Gore is preferred over Bush by 57 percent to 32 percent among women. Among men, Bush has a five-point advantage. The vice president has a 24-point lead among women as the candidate who best understands the problems of the middle class. Among men, neither candidate has an advantage.

Although voters are divided on whom they want as the next president, they have an equally high opinion of both as potential presidents. Asked to put aside their personal preference, equal percentages (69 percent) said Bush and Gore would be good presidents. By sizable margins, they said Gore and Bush are running positive campaigns, with Gore receiving slightly higher marks.

Assistant polling director Claudia Deane contributed to this report.

---

August 22, 2000

The Marin County Department of Health and Human Services is seeking assistance in recruiting a consulting Epidemiologist to help plan and launch the Department’s new Epidemiology Program. I would greatly appreciate your sharing this announcement with associates, staff and others who may be interested.
Sonoma and Napa to the north. The Department provides a full range of health and social services within four divisions: Aging, Public Health, Mental Health and Social Services. Currently, the Department has 560 employees and a $90 million budget. Marin County has 245,000 residents. Known for its natural resources, national parks and open space combined with sophistication and proximity to San Francisco, the County is also well known for its highly educated, involved and active citizens. Marin has a unique blend of programs not found in many counties. The County’s economy is strong and the Board of Supervisors has demonstrated a continuing commitment to the public health and social service interests of Marin County citizens. As a result, this consulting opportunity offers the right individual a chance to participate in an exciting and meaningful way in the stimulating health and human services field.

The Department is requesting proposals for a consulting Epidemiologist to plan, develop and provide interim management assistance for the Department’s new Epidemiology program, for a period of six to twelve months. While the Department will hire a full-time Epidemiology Program Coordinator, several major initiatives being launched in the coming weeks require immediate assistance from a seasoned, experienced Epidemiologist who is skilled in planning and launching new programs at the county level while the hiring process is carried out.

Scope of Work:

The Department is launching three major projects this fall requiring substantial epidemiologist involvement and leadership:

1. Breast Cancer Research Project: Marin County has the highest breast cancer rate of any county in California. Funding is pending from the Centers for Disease Control State of California to begin planning research activities leading to identification of factors contributing to Marin’s high incidence rate. The consulting Epidemiologist will serve as the lead on launching this project, including gathering information on state of the art research, developing community involvement, planning short and long-term research strategies, and reporting findings to the professional and lay community.

2. Marin Community Health Survey: A national survey research firm is being awarded a contract this fall to conduct a comprehensive survey of the health status and health needs of Marin County residents. Epidemiological expertise is needed in questionnaire design, fielding, data analysis, and reporting.

3. Establish Department Epidemiology Program: The Department is establishing an Epidemiology program that will support Department and community planning efforts; design and conduct related studies to assess the incidence and prevalence of disease; identify risk factors and environmental associations; and help to design appropriate public health interventions for the County.
is needed in the start-up and organization of this essential function.<br>

Experience/Background required:<br>

- BA/BS minimum, MS/MPH or PhD at an accredited college or university in epidemiology, biostatistics, in public health, social or life science, or related field. Experience with statistical packages and electronic data analysis. Demonstrated ability in grant writing.<br>

- Skill in PC-based software applications including database manager, spreadsheet, charting, and GIS, word processing and statistical analysis.<br>

- Excellent written and oral communication skills<br>

- Demonstrated ability to plan and manage multiple projects<br>

- Management experience and experience in working with county and community organizations desirable<br>

Anticipated Term of Project: Six months (up to twelve months if necessary)<br>

Contact For further information:<br>

Madeline Kellner<br>Director, Division of Health Services<br>20 North San Pedro Road, Ste 2028<br>San Rafael, CA 94903<br>Tel: 415-499-3707
Post-ABC Poll: Bush, Gore Even
But CNN tracking (first set of samples) and Zogby have Gore up but within the margin of error
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JD Franz Research, Inc., a Sacramento-based firm with a combination of public and private sector clients that has been in existence since 1981, is seeking a Project Coordinator. Primary responsibilities include managing the data collection function (both telephone and intercept), participating in research planning and design deliberations, conducting survey pretests, and related activities.

Requires BA/BS in related field or equivalent (MA/MS preferred) and demonstrated successful supervisory experience with entry-level workforce as well as with experienced personnel. Excellent communications and computer skills essential. Familiarity with CATI systems a plus. Recent graduates are encouraged to apply. Must be able and willing to work on location for one- to two-week periods a few times a year.

JD Franz Research is an equal opportunity employer. If you are interested, please send your resume and salary requirements by September 20, 2000 to:

Jennifer D. Franz, Ph.D.
JD Franz Research, Inc.
550 Bercut Drive, Suite H
Sacramento, CA  95814

You may also submit your materials as a Word attachment to jdfranz@earthlink.net.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY School of Journalism and Communication invites applications for up to six tenure-track faculty positions (ranks open), available September 2001. The School is seeking applicants dedicated to making important contributions to social scientific research, teaching and
service. The School's priority areas include: (1) public opinion/political communication, (2) new communication technologies and society, (3) mass communication, and (4) public affairs journalism. All candidates are expected to be able to contribute to one or more priority areas at both the undergraduate and graduate levels or specialize in areas that are a bridge between priority areas. A Ph.D. in communication, mass communication, or another relevant social science discipline is required. Salary is competitive and commensurate with rank and experience.

The School of Journalism and Communication offers the B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. and intends to be a leading center for research and teaching in the field of communication. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences has many excellent units, including top-rated empirical programs in political science, psychology, geography and sociology, as well as the Center for Survey Research. Opportunities for interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary research are a hallmark of the College.

The campus is strategically located in Columbus, the capital city of Ohio. Columbus is the center of a rapidly growing and diverse metropolitan area of more than 1.5 million residents. It is a friendly city with a high quality of life. The area offers a wide range of affordable housing, many cultural and recreational amenities, and a strong economy based on government as well as service and technology-based industries. Additional information about the University and School is available via www.osu.edu and about the Columbus area at www.columbus.org.

Interested candidates should send a letter of application, current vita, and the names and contact information for three references to the address below.

Dr. Daniel G. McDonald  
Search Committee Chair  
School of Journalism and Communication  
154 North Oval Mall  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, OH 43210-1339

Review of applications will begin November 1, 2000. The committee will review new applications until April 1, 2001 or until all positions are filled. The Ohio State University is an equal opportunity-affirmative action employer and especially encourages applications from women, minorities, Vietnam-era and disabled veterans, and other individuals with disabilities.

Daniel G. McDonald  
Professor  
School of Journalism and Communication  
3080 Derby Hall  
154 North Oval Mall  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, OH 43210

=========================================================================  
Date: Fri, 08 Sep 2000 10:00:51 -0500  
From: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu  
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])
General Social Survey Student Paper Competition

The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago announces the latest annual General Social Survey (GSS) Student Paper Competition. To be eligible papers must: 1) be based on data from the 1972-1998 GSSs or from the GSS's cross-national component, the International Social Survey Program (any year or combination of years may be used), 2) represent original and unpublished work, and 3) be written by a student or students at an accredited college or university. Both undergraduates and graduate students may enter and college graduates are eligible for one year after receiving their degree. Recent college graduates who completed an appropriate undergraduate or senior honors thesis are encouraged to consider submitting such research. Professors are urged to inform their students of this opportunity.

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

Paper will be judged by the principal investigators of the GSS (James A. Davis and Tom W. Smith) with assistance from a group of leading scholars. Separate prizes will be awarded to the best undergraduate and best graduate-level entries. Entrants should indicate in which group they are competing. Winners will receive a cash prize of $250, a commemorative plaque, and SPSS Base, the main statistical analysis package of SPSS. SPSS Base is donated by SPSS, Inc. of Chicago, Illinois. Honorable mentions may also be awarded by the judges.

Two copies of each paper must be received by February 15, 2001. The winner will be announced in late April, 2001. Send entries to:

Tom W. Smith
General Social Survey
National Opinion Research Center
1155 East 60th St.
Chicago, IL 60637
FYI: Sam Smith, publisher of Progressive Review, explained his 3-day rolling average—see http://prorev.com/indexa.htm or below.

(Unlike Ms. Huffington,) Smith said he's more interested in how well polling results predict voter outcome than response rates. Whatever the response rates were, Smith found Rasmussen to be accurate in predicting the Presidential primaries. cheers, mark

"MORNING LINE
As the Review's unique Morning Line attracts growing attention, there has also been a spike in misinformation about it, including, of all places, on the bulletin board of the American Public Opinion Research, where a reader wrote:

"It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!" Here are a few facts:

-- The Review, unlike most major media, uses all available polls to create a moving average of the last five polls. We don't know of anyone else who does this. The networks, Newsweek, and the Washington Post, on the other hand, tout their own polls and downplay information about others. Thus their poll reports can distort available information.
-- The Review also publishes the daily tracking poll of Rasmussen Research. It does so in part because Rasmussen was the top pollster in predicting this year's heavily contested primaries. In fact, nine of the 14 pollsters we studied had an average error that varied no more than two points from each other, but Rasmussen provides a daily tracking service.

-- The Rasmussen daily tracking poll can and does vary from our five poll moving average. For example, as this is written, Rasmussen has Bush ahead by two points; the five poll average has Gore ahead by three.

-- Taking a month by month average of all the Rasmussen polls that we have used (one a week) and comparing it to the average of all the other polls we find a difference ranging from 0.5 to two points each month. In August, Newsweek varied from the all-poll average by 0.6 points. We are not talking big differences.

-- There are varied techniques used by pollsters. The Review, as always, takes the inductive approach to such matters: favor the evidence over the principles that allegedly rule it.

-- In the end, most pollsters do a good job and Rasmussen is up there with the rest. Our moving average -- a principle used, incidentally, by stock market technicians -- smoothes out variations and discounts anomalies. It helped us come within 30 electoral votes in predicting the last two presidential elections.

-- The most interesting recent use of Morning Line was made by Rick Kipper of Portland OR. He writes: "Living on the west coast, I am interested in how soon the election might be over on election day. Past elections have all been decided before I leave work. This year felt like it could last longer. To check this hypothesis, I took your current data and sorted it by time zone. Currently Bush wins at the close of the polls in the Mountain states. This is indeed much later than in past elections. Then I switched just three states to the Gore column, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Oregon. To my astonishment the election is not decided until Hawaii puts Gore over the top. This would indeed be an amazing outcome to have a close election and for it to be decided after all the polls close."
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FYI: Sam Smith, publisher of Progressive Review, explained his 3-day rolling average—see http://prorev.com/indexa.htm or below. (Unlike Ms. Huffington,) Smith said he’s more interested in how well polling results predict voter outcome than response rates. Whatever the response rates were, Smith found Rasmussen to be accurate in predicting the Presidential primaries.
As the Review's unique Morning Line attracts growing attention, there has also been a spike in misinformation about it, including, of all places, on the bulletin board of the American Public Opinion Research, where a reader wrote:

"It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!"

Here are a few facts:

-- The Review, unlike most major media, uses all available polls to create a moving average of the last five polls. We don't know of anyone else who does this. The networks, Newsweek, and the Washington Post, on the other hand, tout their own polls and downplay information about others. Thus their poll reports can distort available information.

-- The Review also publishes the daily tracking poll of Rasmussen Research. It does so in part because Rasmussen was the top polister in predicting this year's heavily contested primaries. In fact, nine of the 14 pollsters we studied had an average error that varied no more than two points from each other, but Rasmussen provides a daily tracking service.
The Rasmussen daily tracking poll can and does vary from our five poll moving average. For example, as this is written, Rasmussen has Bush ahead by two points; the five poll average has Gore ahead by three.

Taking a month by month average of all the Rasmussen polls that we have used (one a week) and comparing it to the average of all the other polls we find a difference ranging from 0.5 to two points each month. In August, Newsweek varied from the all-poll average by 0.6 points. We are not talking big differences.

There are varied techniques used by pollsters. The Review, as always, takes the inductive approach to such matters: favor the evidence over the principles that allegedly rule it.

In the end, most pollsters do a good job and Rasmussen is up there with the rest. Our moving average -- a principle used, incidentally, by stock market technicians -- smooths out variations and discounts anomalies. It helped us come within 30 electoral votes in predicting the last two presidential elections.

The most interesting recent use of Morning Line was made by Rick Kipper of Portland OR. He writes:

"Living on the west coast, I am interested in how soon the election might be over on election day. Past elections have all been decided before I leave work. This year felt like it could last longer. To check this
hypothesis, I took your current data = and sorted it by time zone. Currently Bush wins at the close of the polls in = the Mountain states. This is indeed much later than in past elections. Then = I switched just three states to the Gore column, Michigan, Wisconsin, and = Oregon. To my astonishment the election is not decided until Hawaii puts Gore = over the top. This would indeed be an amazing outcome to have a close election = and for it to be decided after all the polls close. &quot;

<p class="MsoNormal"><span style="font-size:12.0pt;mso-ascii-font-family:Calibri;mso-ascii-theme-font:minor-latin;mso-hansi-font-family:Calibri;mso-hansi-theme-font:minor-latin;" lang="en-US">Sometimes that's all there is.</span></p>

Intuition is not what I am after.

warren mitofsky
At 03:11 PM 9/7/00 -0700, you wrote:
> Intuition says the response rate is in the low single digits.
>
> Date sent:              Thu, 07 Sep 2000 15:42:24 -0400
> Send reply to:          aapornet@usc.edu
> From:                   Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
> To:                     aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject:                RE: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States
>
> Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us? warren

> At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:
> > It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
> > Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States
>
> > > Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Doug Henwood
> > > Left Business Observer
> > > Village Station - PO Box 953
> > > New York NY 10014-0704 USA
> > > +1-212-741-9852 voice +1-212-807-9152 fax
> > > email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
> > >
> > > Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.
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Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us?

--

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:

It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!

-----Original Message-----
From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at <http://prorev.com/amline.htm>. --

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

Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

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
This attracted some attention on AAPORNET when it first occurred so I thought I'd post this.

>From the Chronicle of Higher Education

"Top Officials Quit U. of Hong Kong Amid Charges They Violated a Scholar's Academic Freedom By BURTON BOLLAG Two top officials of the University of Hong Kong resigned Wednesday over allegations that they had pressured a prominent academic pollster to stop conducting public-opinion surveys showing falling approval for the territory's chief executive, who is appointed by officials in Beijing.

Cheng Yiu-chung, the vice chancellor, and Wong Siu-lun, the pro-vice chancellor, stepped down just before the university's council was scheduled to consider a 74-page report by a three-member independent panel. The report backed up charges by Robert Chung, director of the university's Public Opinion Program, that the pro-vice chancellor had passed along a message to him from the vice chancellor, telling him to stop the offending surveys or face a loss of university funds.

The pressure, the panel found, "was calculated to inhibit his right to academic freedom."

The two officials who stepped down have denied the accusations, as has Hong Kong's chief executive, Tung Chee-hwa, for whose benefit
the pressure was allegedly applied. The two university officials did not indicate why they had stepped down."

The Chronicle site is a subscription site (for this article) so I have not included the URL.

(If this looks funny I apologize - my computer has crashed and I am using someone else's laptop)
--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

Investor's Business Daily also has started running a "Meta Poll" combining results of multiple presidential polls. I don't have their methodology statement at hand but am curious what AAPORnetters think of the validity of this general approach.

Mike Mokrzycki
Associated Press

"Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com> on 09/08/2000 11:33:47 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: "Sam Smith" <ssmith@IGC.APC.ORG> (bcc: Michael Mokrzycki/TheAP)

Subject: RE: Presidential Race Results Rolling Average

FYI: Sam Smith, publisher of Progressive Review, explained his 3-day rolling average—see http://prorev.com/indexa.htm or below. (Unlike Ms. Huffington,) Smith said he's more interested in how well polling results predict voter outcome than response rates. Whatever the
response rates were, Smith found Rasmussen to be accurate in predicting the
Presidential primaries. cheers, mark

"MORNING LINE
As the Review's unique Morning Line attracts growing attention, there has
also
been a spike in misinformation about it, including,
of all places, on the bulletin board of the American Public Opinion Research,
where a reader
wrote:
"It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research
polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic
dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not
a great idea to promote these!" Here are a few facts:
-- The Review, unlike most major media, uses all available polls to create a
moving average of the last five polls. We don't know of
anyone else who does this. The networks, Newsweek, and the Washington Post, on
the other hand, tout their own polls and downplay
information about others. Thus their poll reports can distort available
information.
-- The Review also publishes the daily tracking poll of Rasmussen Research. It
does so in part because Rasmussen was the top
pollster in predicting this year's heavily contested primaries. In fact, nine
of the 14 pollsters we studied had an average error
that varied no more than two points from each other, but Rasmussen provides a
daily tracking service.
-- The Rasmussen daily tracking poll can and does vary from our five poll
moving average. For example, as this is written, Rasmussen
has Bush ahead by two points; the five poll average has Gore ahead by three.
-- Taking a month by month average of all the Rasmussen polls that we have
used (one a week) and comparing it to the average of all
the other polls we find a difference ranging from 0.5 to two points each month. In August, Newsweek varied from the all-poll average
by 0.6 points. We are not talking big differences.
-- There are varied techniques used by pollsters. The Review, as always,
takes
the inductive approach to such matters: favor the
evidence over the principles that allegedly rule it.
-- In the end, most pollsters do a good job and Rasmussen is up there with the
rest. Our moving average -- a principle used,
incidentally, by stock market technicians -- smoothes out variations and
discounts anomalies. It helped us come within 30 electoral
votes in predicting the last two presidential elections.
-- The most interesting recent use of Morning Line was made by Rick Kipper of
Portland OR. He writes: "Living on the west coast, I
am interested in how soon the election might be over on election day. Past
elections have all been decided before I leave work. This
year felt like it could last longer. To check this hypothesis, I took your
current data and sorted it by time zone. Currently Bush
wins at the close of the polls in the Mountain states. This is indeed much
later than in past elections. Then I switched just three
states to the Gore column, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Oregon. To my
astonishment
the election is not decided until Hawaii puts Gore
over the top. This would indeed be an amazing outcome to have a close election and for it to be decided after all the polls close."
I am doing some consulting work for a client who wants to develop a web-based or a CD-ROM-based training for interviewers and test administrators. We are just at the brainstorming stage of this effort, but our current thinking is to develop a product that can be accessed via the Internet, for those field staff who have internet access, but to also make a similar CD product for those who have a computer but do not have Internet access. We plan to test this new training package on field staff who have either worked on the survey in past years and just need a "refresher course" and for those who live in areas of the country which are so remote that attending an in-person training is difficult or impossible. If the field test goes well, the ultimate goal is to use the computer training for all field staff on the project, eliminating the need for in-person training entirely. A lofty idea possibly, but one we feel is worth pursing...

While I have worked on this particular survey for a number of years (in a past life) and am very familiar with its current training materials, I do not have any experience developing computer/web-based training programs. I would like to take a look at any CD or web-based training programs that you may be aware of or have developed for field staff. If you know of such programs and would be willing to share a demo version with me, and/or your experiences in the development process I would be ever grateful.

Thanks much,
Cindy Good
goodc1@home.com
410-381-4638
I am doing some consulting work for a client who wants to develop a web-based or a CD-ROM-based training for interviewers and test administrators. We are just at the brainstorming stage of this effort, but our current thinking is to develop a product that can be accessed via the Internet, for those field staff who have internet access, but to also make a similar CD product for those who have a computer but do not have Internet access. We plan to test this new training package on field staff who have either worked on the survey in past years and just need a "refresher course" and for those who live in areas of the country which are so remote that attending an in-person training is difficult or impossible. If the field test goes well, the ultimate goal is to use computer training for all field staff on the project eliminating the need for in-person training entirely. A lofty idea possibly, but one we feel is worth pursuing...
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Thanks much,

Cindy = Good
FRIDAY NEWS:

* Microsoft, Harris Interactive Reach Anti-Spam Settlement

Harris Interactive (Nasdaq: HPOL), the New York-based market research firm will be able to access millions of MSN Hotmail addresses following the settlement of an anti-spam lawsuit, the Reuters news agency reported today.

Late in July, Harris filed a federal anti-trust lawsuit against Microsoft, America Online (NYSE: AOL) and ten other ISPs, accusing them of "unfair and arbitrary" attempts to block its online market research. At the crux of the high-stakes battle is the use of the Realtime Blackhole Technology (RBL) used by MAPS, a not-for-profit company which tracks and blocks unsolicited emails. Harris also reached a settlement with AOL after the ISP ditched the MAPS technology. MAPS, based in California, is also named in the suit.

Microsoft (Nasdaq: MSFT) spokesman Jim Cullinan told the Reuters news agency that the company was satisfied it could ensure the Harris surveys reached its 70 million Hotmail customers while still maintaining its ability to protect them from spam. "After looking into it, we'll make sure their e-mails get through to Hotmail customers," Cullinan said. He did not say if MSN Hotmail will continue using the RBL to block unwanted spam mail.

Harris depends on Internet users who agree to participate in its service. Harris then provides the data to paying clients. It is seeking injunctive relief and "significant" monetary damages from the companies, but Cullinan told Reuters no money was involved in the settlement.

MAPS, however, has scoffed at the lawsuit, describing it as "insane." The anti-spam group accused Harris of trying to force ISPs to "accept unsolicited bulk commercial mail."
Kelly Thompson, a MAPS spokesperson said "This suit is just insane. They are trying to take away (the ISP's) right to do business with whomever they want, and trying to force all of us to let them send unsolicited traffic across our networks. When Harris pollsters come to my door, will they also file suit to force me to invite them in?"
Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site? If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with us? Warren Mitofsky

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:
It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work! Probably not a great idea to promote these!

-----Original Message-----
From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five States

Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running tally of national and state polls on his website, at <http://prorev.com/amline.htm>.

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
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Given the discussion of Rasmussen's polling, I thought you'd be interested in this post from the Libertarian Party that I received.

Rob

Robert P. Daves                      v: 612.673-7278
Director of Strategic & News Research f: 612.673-4359
e: daves@startribune.com
Star Tribune                           e:
425 Portland Av. S.
Minneapolis MN USA 55488
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Surprising new survey: A whopping 16% of voters are really libertarians

WASHINGTON, DC -- A surprising new poll says more Americans are libertarians than conservatives or liberals -- suggesting that the traditional Left/Right political spectrum has become obsolete in the 21st century, the Libertarian Party said today.

According to a just-released survey by Rasmussen Research, 16% of Americans -- about one of every six voters -- strongly support libertarian positions on issues, compared to only 13% who are staunchly liberal and 7% who are consistently conservative.

Another 32% of Americans are centrists, 14% are "authoritarians," and 17% fall on "the borders" of the different categories, according to a nationwide poll of 822 likely voters unveiled yesterday at the www.PortraitOfAmerica.com website.

"According to this survey, libertarians appear to be the great stealth factor in American politics -- invisible to the radar of politicians and pundits who are used to thinking in terms of the old-fashioned Left/Right spectrum," said Steve Dasbach, national director of the Libertarian Party.

"Astonishingly, this survey also reveals that there are actually more libertarians than either conservatives, liberals, or authoritarians. This suggests that when Libertarian Party candidates are able to fashion together a coalition of libertarians, voters on the edges of libertarianism, and libertarian-leaning centrists, we could have an election-winning plurality."
The Rasmussen survey is the first wide-scale, scientifically accurate survey of the American public to use the so-called "World's Smallest Political Quiz," a 10-question quiz that measures political beliefs on a four-way axis -- conservative / liberal / libertarian / authoritarian -- rather than the traditional two-way conservative/liberal line.

The quiz, developed by Libertarian Party founder David Nolan and publicized by the non-partisan Advocates for Self Government, measures peoples' opinions on economic and personal issues by asking 10 questions about taxes, drug laws, immigration, business subsidies, minimum wage laws, foreign aid, and more.

According to the quiz, an individual supporting a high degree of both economic and personal freedom falls in the "libertarian" quadrant, while someone who supports government control in both areas lands in the "authoritarian" section.

An individual who supports personal liberty but wants the government to control the economy scores as a "liberal," while someone who favors economic liberty but wants the government to control personal behavior ends up in the "conservative" quadrant.

In response to the individual questions, surprisingly large numbers of Americans supported supposedly "radical" Libertarian positions on issues, noted Dasbach. For example:

* 28% agreed that drug laws did more harm than good and should be repealed.
* 30% agreed that all foreign aid should be privately funded.
* 42% agreed that businesses and farms should operate without government subsidies.
* 36% agreed that "we should end taxes" and Americans should pay for government services with user fees.

"The survey suggests there is a vast, untapped pool of Americans who hold very strong libertarian positions -- but do not yet realize they are libertarian," said Dasbach. "This voting block could become the most potent force in American politics in the 21st century, and that's good news for the Libertarian Party."

Interestingly, while 16% of voters scored libertarian, only 2% used that label to describe their political beliefs, according to the survey.

Previous surveys by Gallup have suggested that 19% to 22% of the population was libertarian, but had relied on a less rigorous two-question
The Rasmussen survey had a margin of error of 3%.

The results of the Rasmussen poll using the "World's Smallest Political Quiz" shouldn't be surprising to anybody familiar with fifty years of social science research on US ideologies. The bi-dimensional structure and the substantial number of libertarians is among the most well known facts about the US electorate. There are some debates about the precise nature of the divide (e.g., compare Lipset's "Authoritarianism: Left, Right and Center" from ca. 1960 with Conover and Feldman's quantitative work of the early 1980s; or the typologies from the Pew Center's cluster analysis).

The fundamental difference between libertarians and their conservative and liberal counterparts is not in the size of their core constituency. Rather, liberals and conservatives have formed coalitions -- within the two major parties -- that are only possible by making certain compromises of principal. Most libertarians, on the other hand, pride themselves on their intellectual consistency; they eschew compromise; and therefore have never emerged at the core of a coalition that would have any chance of winning an election under the libertarian banner. Rather, most find themselves choosing -- year after year -- whether the Republicans' moral conservatism or the Democrats' market interventions are the lesser evil.

Not a year goes by without several students coming by my office to talk about the epiphany they have when they come across the "World's Smallest Political Quiz." It seems that only the libertarians themselves ever seem surprised by the size of their plurality in the mass public -- and surprised at why they have not emerged as an identified player in electoral politics.

Eric Plutzer
Associate Professor of Political Science & Sociology
Penn State University http://polisci.la.psu.edu/faculty/plutzer/
This is most interesting in the light of the current political campaigning and polling. From the front page of Saturday's NY Times.................

One Consulting Firm Finds Voter Data Is a Hot Property

By LESLIE WAYNE

SAN FRANCISCO - At the end of an alley on a nondescript street, a political consulting firm with the unusual name of Aristotle International has compiled the nation's largest voter data bank, the names of 150 million Americans registered to vote. And it is selling them to politicians like George W. Bush, Joseph I. Lieberman and John McCain in ways that many fear removes too much privacy from the voting booth.

Want to contact Democrats in your district between the ages of 45 and 55, who have Hispanic names, children, own their homes and annual incomes of more than $75,000? That's possible. What about sending a personalized letter to Republican women, in a specific precinct, older than 65 who have made campaign contributions and voted in at least three primaries?

"No problem," according to Aristotle's advertising.

How about reaching the rich? Aristotle's "Fat Cat" list of wealthy donors can turn "your personal computer into a proven fund-raising machine" and "raise more money than you ever thought possible."

With promises like that, it is not surprising Aristotle, which was started in 1983 by two brothers with the same middle name, has a client list that reads like a political convention: 45 senators, more than 200 members of the House, 46 Republican and Democratic state parties, and most major presidential candidates this year except Al Gore, whose campaign said it would not hire any firm whose practices could jeopardize the public's privacy.

Of particular concern this election season, when electronic privacy has become a significant issue, is Aristotle's ability to help transmit "pop-up" campaign advertisements to specific voters using the Internet.

"They are one of the first companies to fully exploit the use of
technology in the political system," said William Dal Col, a Republican strategist and manager of the New York Senate campaign of Rick A. Lazio, who is not an Aristotle client. "They found a niche and exploited it dramatically. They built a database and made it readily accessible. And they market, market, market it."

For nearly two decades, John Aristotle Phillips and Dean Aristotle Phillips have been collecting voter registration lists from states, towns and counties. While this information is public, it is not always easy to obtain - located on ledgers or computers in town halls, state office buildings or county courthouses, each with different hours and different rules of access.

As a result of the brothers' persistence, Aristotle now has the nation's largest repository of registered voters, including their names, addresses, telephone numbers, party affiliation and frequency of voting. Aristotle blends this data with information from other sources - the Internet and commercial vendors that sell personal data - to provide office-seekers with even more detailed voter profiles, including information about their cars, ethnicity, incomes, employers and up to 25 other factors.

In Wisconsin, for instance, where public voter lists do not include a person's party affiliation, Aristotle can make that information available. And any Congressional candidate can use Aristotle's software to find out if any donor has inadvertently given more than the $1,000 allowed. And Aristotle's data bank can help place candidates' advertisements that pop up, as if by magic, on the computer screens of some voters.

For campaigns pressed for time and worried about cash, such precise information is golden, enabling them to identify potential supporters and not waste money on the unswayable. In some ways, Aristotle's voter lists simply provide a modern version of the information that office-seekers have long used to get out the vote.
"It's not the database; it's the data," said Steve Grubbs, a former official of Steve Forbes's presidential campaign. "If I want to talk to retirees in Alabama who are registered to vote, I'd go to Aristotle first. If I wanted soccer moms who are registered Republican, I'd go there. Lots of states don't keep their voter files very well. Aristotle does this a lot better than the government."

But information that makes for good business or could be useful in politics concerns privacy advocates, especially when it begins to pull back the curtain of one of the most protected locations in America, the voting booth. Privacy advocates say this scrutiny of the electorate has brought a Big Brother aspect to politics; many fear that if citizens feel their privacy is being invaded by voting and donating to campaigns, they may stop going to the polls.

Moreover, the combination of the information available on the Internet with voter lists creates a potent stew of data that voters may not even know exists.

"We're concerned," said Ari Schwartz, an analyst at Center for Democracy and Technology, a Washington nonprofit group. "And we are especially concerned when we are talking about voting and citizenship, things that are so central to the election process."

John Aristotle Phillips, the company's chief executive, declined to comment, citing a pending public offering of the company's stock. But he provided access to the company's offices and promotional literature. At the office, a rah-rah attitude was pervasive among a youthful staff. A hand-written sign offered a daily update of voters in the firm's database: at the time, 150,811,187.

Drawing on state motor vehicle registrations, the Postal Service and Census Bureau, among other sources, the Aristotle databank includes a person's age, sex, telephone number, party affiliation and estimated income, whether he or she rents or owns a home, has children,
an ethnic surname. It also provides the make and model of voters' cars, whether they are campaign donors, their employer and occupation, and how often they vote. A dollar sign pops up next to the name of a voter identified as a "Fat Cat."

"As more and more voting information becomes electronic, the ability to cross-match that information with other data and build a voter profile becomes easier," said Robert Arena, a Republican strategist and webmaster for Bob Dole's presidential campaign in 1996. "Some people are finding it disturbing."

Equally, if not more, troubling to privacy advocates is Aristotle's recent foray into the advertisements that pop up when voters surf the Web. Since the advertisements appear only on the computer screens of potential supporters, they require an intimate knowledge of an individual's Web-surfing habits.

For instance, with the deadline for getting on the ballot for the Virginia primary only 10 days away, the McCain campaign hired Aristotle to send Internet advertisements to registered Virginia Republicans. When a potential voter went on-line, if he were a positive match with an Aristotle list, a McCain banner advertisement would appear inviting him to sign and circulate a McCain petition.

"It was effective in getting McCain on the ballot," said Max Fose, the campaign's Internet manager. "We needed to pull out the stops."

Aristotle charged about $5,000 for the project, Mr. Fose said. In Aristotle's filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission for its upcoming stock offering, it says it takes data only from public and "standard commercially available" data sellers. It adds that its database "does not contain information of a confidential nature."

Aristotle, which has not set a date for the offering, also said it did not use hidden tracking systems, or cookies, that could collect data on behavior of those who see its clients' advertisements. Use of such devices, which track Web visits, has been criticized by privacy
advocates and government regulators as a hidden intrusion into private behavior.

Still, privacy concerns have caused two big Internet players to scuttle plans to enter ventures with Aristotle. In the last year, Microsoft and its America On-line backed away from proposals by Aristotle to mesh voter data with information Internet users give to Microsoft and America On-line when registering to go on-line. The venture would have made it easier for Aristotle to place Internet advertisements and would have provided the company with millions of e-mail addresses.

In fact, America On-line and Microsoft each recently enacted policies prohibiting combining data about voter registration with information collected from their users.

"There's a backlash when it comes to mixing this data," said Cyrus Krohn, director of political advertising for Microsoft.

Aristotle is also raising eyebrows with its "California Gold Rush" and "Fat Cat" databases of campaign donors because it is illegal to sell Federal Election Commission data, which is available to the public free, for commercial purposes. But Ian Sturton, a commission spokesman, said, "If someone thinks there is a violation, they can file a complaint." No one has.

Moreover, to protect itself, Aristotle requires all candidates using its services to sign a statement saying they will not use the information for illegal purposes.

"Federal election data cannot be used for commercial purposes, but no one has ever challenged it," said Trevor Potter, a former federal election commissioner. "These are some fuzzy areas, and no one has really pushed the edges of it."

When it comes to selling contributor lists, Aristotle's gushy advertisements either warm the hearts of politicians looking for cash or are examples to advocates of campaign finance reform of what is wrong
with the system.

The company's promotional material offers breathless come-ons:

"Hit your opponent in the Wallet! Using Fat Cats, you can ferret out your adversary's contributors and slam them with a mail piece explaining why they shouldn't donate money to the other side. This technique is 100 percent legal and especially effective in rough primary battles. "You'll be amazed!" the material continues. "Upon viewing Fat Cats for the first time, even the most hardened political pros react with awe. Party bosses and seasoned politicians who think they 'have seen it all' can't

Aristotle is looking for fat cats, too. The company, whose revenues doubled to $3.9 million last year from $1.7 million in 1997, has yet to turn a profit. High costs - including a hiring spree and heavy advertising - have caused Aristotle to rack up losses, $1.9 million for 1999 and $2.8 million for the first half of this year.

Aristotle wants to sell stock to raise $20 million to $28 million. How would the money be used? According to its S.E.C. filings, to get more voter names and more information about them.
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useful. Most people I know who have been quoted or who read an article about which they have specific technical expertise have usually found the article to be lacking in precision. Good enough to give a reader a general idea, but not really totally accurate. So it is with overall "margins of errors" as reported in most media. Not really wrong, but not really the full story either. The truth is usually more complex. In this respect, reports of polls are not really any different from reports of most anything. (And usually only those directly affected really care about the nuances anyway).

-----Original Message-----
From: "Colleen K Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2000 7:50 AM
Subject: margins of error

> Okay, so we always try to explain to clients that each number in a table is really just a point estimate, and there is a corresponding range estimate that better represents the "truth."
> One group of folks wants us to give "the" margin of error at the bottom of each table we generate. We tried to explain that the margin of error is for each estimate in the table--if we talked to more Blacks than Hispanics, if more people refused to answer a particular item, then there will be different margins of error. (We generally do an appendix in the technical report that has those numbers.)
> But this client insisted, saying, "The political polls only have one margin of error in the box for the whole survey, even though they probably talked to different numbers of people for this or that."
> Are we being too academic? Any references on how to scientifically come up with that one magic number?
> Thanks bunches,
> Colleen
> 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
>

============================================================================
Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 09:10:57 -0700
From: Stuart Sobel <sso@CBDMP.ORG>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Exciting Job Opportunity in San Francisco Area
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
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_000_01C01C0A.F7C39C80
Content-Type: text/plain;
       charset="iso-8859-1"

<<EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY Field Manager.doc>>

Stuart Sobel
HR Manager
California Birth Defects Monitoring Program
1830 Embarcadero, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606-5226
Email: sso@cbdmp.org <mailto:Mla@cbdmp.org>
Phone: 510/434-5336
Fax: 510/434-5393

------=_NextPart_000_01C01C0A.F7C39C80
Content-Type: application/msword;
       name="EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY Field Manager.doc"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Disposition: attachment;
       filename="EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY Field Manager.doc"
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Hello AAPOR:

I received the following message from the Green Party asking me to support Ralph Nader. Does anyone know about this email campaign?

I'm just curious to know how they got my email address and who else they sent it to.

Martha Kropf
The upcoming election may be one of the most important in our history. But what is really at stake, and who's telling you what you need to know?

While rhetoric has been fast and furious, the truth about both candidates has been difficult to come by. But it's time the public faced facts.

In the past 8 Years, as the BBC Reports: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/sci/tech/newsid_916000/916037.stm the Ozone hole has grown
to record proportions, and while we can decry Texas, who does bare blame, the national administration took no steps through the EPA - a federal body - to do anything.

And who voted -for- Wire Taps, against HIV testing funds for the military, for keeping gay marriage an impossibility, for limits on habeas corpus, against campaign finance reform, and for funding religious institutions, against the ACLU? http://www.aclu.org/vote-guide/Lieberman_J.html

And who proposed that their plan came from biblical pretense? That in some way, the guiding principals of medicare are the commandment: honor thy father and mother? And who's taking faith to the government in a way we have not seen before, virtually unnoticed? http://www.beliefnet.com/frameset.asp?pageLoc=/story/36/story_3613_1.html&boardID=4262

And while Farm Bureau was busy notifying a government that refused to listen as early as June that there were problems with Firestone, what did the administration do? Nothing until 88 people were dead, leaving 28 notices from even insurance companies unanswered.

And while proclaiming racial sensitivity, lawmakers are perpetuating racism occurring in the secret service
But there is a man running who stands by his word, who offers a real choice, who has stood up for the public.

Instead of listening to promises that ring as true as a first grader promising if elected class president he'll offer an extra recess, you have a bold chance to send a message to both parties that there is a man running who does represent the public.

And that man in Ralph Nader.

The man who stood up to the Tire industry and called for criminal offenses.
The man endorsed by Earth First - because he understands that being an environmentalist is more than saying you are, and more than taking money away from fire fighters while the country burns.

The man endorsed by the Electrician's Union as someone who understands that free trade with countries like China - something favored by the old school candidates - is a disservice and a moral outrage to the majority of America.

Time has come for a change. And that change is an honest change about more than fake promises or a procession to the presidency by grounds of nepotism.

VOTE GREEN!

Martha,

The e-mail addresses of virtually all faculty, staff and students at the universities and colleges throughout North America, and in
many other countries, are available via their institution's homepage. This is a much better deal for candidates like Nader than it is for most candidates, as I'm sure you know. I have no knowledge that the Nader people did in fact get your e-mail address in this way, of course--only that they might at least have done so (assuming you are listed) for little time or effort.

-- Jim

On Mon, 11 Sep 2000, Kropf, Martha E. wrote:

> Hello AAPOR:
> > I received the following message from the Green Party asking me to support Ralph Nader. Does anyone know about this email campaign? I'm just curious to know how they got my email address and who else they sent it to.
> > Martha Kropf
> > Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
> Assistant Professor
> Department of Political Science
> University of Missouri-Kansas City
> 213 Haag Hall
> 5100 Rockhill Road
> Kansas City, MO 64110-2499
> 816-235-5948

I doubt very seriously that this mailing is from the Green Party.

The "votethisfall.com" domain name is not a registered domain name.

There have been huge numbers of posting on Usenet of similar information at least one of which has been traced back to an Anti-Green poster.

Here's the Green's view of SPAM -

http://www.greens.org/about/policy.html

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
Hello AAPOR:

I received the following message from the Green Party asking me to support Ralph Nader. Does anyone know about this email campaign? I'm just curious to know how they got my email address and who else they sent it to.

Martha Kropf

Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
213 Haag Hall
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO 64110-2499
816-235-5948

-----Original Message-----
From: gogreen@votethisfall.com [mailto:gogreen@votethisfall.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 09, 2000 1:07 PM
To: kropfm@umkc.edu
Subject: Important Information About This Fall's Election

The upcoming election may be one of the most important in our history. But what is really at stake, and who's telling you what you need to know?

While rhetoric has been fast and furious, the truth about both candidates has been difficult to come by. But it's time the public faced facts.

In the past 8 Years, as the BBC Reports:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/sci/tech/newsid_916000/916037.stm the Ozone hole has grown to record proportions, and while we can decry Texas, who does bare blame, the national administration took no steps through the EPA - a federal body - to do anything.

And who voted -for- Wire Taps, against HIV testing funds for the military, for keeping gay marriage an impossibility, for limits on habeas corpus, against campaign finance reform, and for funding religious institutions, against the ACLU?
http://www.aclu.org/vote-guide/Lieberman_J.html
And who proposed that their plan came from biblical pretense? That in some way, the guiding principals of medicare are the commandment: honor thy father and mother? And who's taking faith to the government in a way we have not seen before, virtually unnoticed?


And while Farm Bureau was busy notifying a government that refused to listen as early as June that there were problems with Firestone, what did the administration do? Nothing until 88 people were dead, leaving 28 notices from even insurance companies unanswered.

And while proclaiming racial sensitivity, lawmakers are perpetuating racism occurring in the secret service.

http://www.washingtontimes.com/national/default-200098232723.htm

But there is a man running who stands by his word, who offers a real choice, who has stood up for the public.

Instead of listening to promises that ring as true as a first grader promising if elected class president he'll offer an extra recess, you have a bold chance to send a message to both parties that there is a man running who does represent the public.

And that man in Ralph Nader.

The man who stood up to the Tire industry and called for criminal offenses.


The man endorsed by Earth First - because he understands that being an environmentalist is more then saying you are, and more then taking money away from fire fighters while the country burns.

The man endorsed by the Electrician's Union as someone who understands that free trade with countries like China - something favored by the old school candidates - is a disservice and a moral outrage to the majority of America.

Time has come for a change. And that change is an honest change about more then fake promises or a procession to the presidency by grounds of nepotism.

VOTE GREEN!

========================================================================
Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 14:19:01 -0400
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
I find it hard to believe that the Green Party would send out a message that no one proofread ("Texas, who [sic] bare [sic] the blame"? "Endoreed [sic] by Earth First"?). Given the tone of the letter (talking about the "last eight years"), this might be from someone who would benefit from Nader taking votes away from another candidate.

An interesting strategy, particularly being sent to someone in a battleground state in this election....

Frank Rusciano

"Kropf, Martha E." wrote:

> Hello AAPOR:
> 
> I received the following message from the Green Party asking me to support Ralph Nader. Does anyone know about this email campaign? I'm just curious to know how they got my email address and who else they sent it to.
> 
> Martha Kropf
> 
> Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
> Assistant Professor
> Department of Political Science
> University of Missouri-Kansas City
> 213 Haag Hall
> 1500 Rockhill Road
> Kansas City, MO 64110-2499
> 816-235-5948
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: gogreen@votethisfall.com [mailto:gogreen@votethisfall.com]
> Sent: Saturday, September 09, 2000 1:07 PM
> To: kropfm@umkc.edu
> Subject: Important Information About This Fall's Election
> 
> The upcoming election may be one of the most important in our history. But what is really at stake, and who's telling you what you need to know?
> While rhetoric has been fast and furious, the truth about both candidates has
> been difficult to come by. But it's time the public faced facts.
>
> In the past 8 Years, as the BBC Reports:
> http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/sci/tech/newsid_916000/916037.stm
> Ozone hole has grown to record proportions, and while we can decry
> Texas, who does bare blame, the national administration took no steps
> through the EPA - a federal body - to do anything.
>
> And who voted -for- Wire Taps, against HIV testing funds for the
> military, for keeping gay marriage an impossibility, for limits on
> habeas corpus, against campaign finance reform, and for funding
> religious institutions, against the ACLU?
> http://www.aclu.org/vote-guide/Lieberman_J.html
>
> And who proposed that their plan came from biblical pretense? That in
> some way, the guiding principals of medicare are the commandment:
> honor thy father and mother? And who's taking faith to the government
> in a way we have not seen before, virtually unnoticed?
> D=4262
>
> And while Farm Bureau was busy notifying a government that refused to
> listen as early as June that there were problems with Firestone, what
> did the administration do? Nothing until 88 people were dead, leaving
> 28 notices from even insurance companies unanswered.
>
> And while proclaiming racial sensitivity, lawmakers are perpetuating
> racism occurring in the secret service
> http://www.washingtontimes.com/national/default-200098232723.htm
>
> But there is a man running who stands by his word, who offers a real
> choice, who has stood up for the public.
>
> Instead of listening to promises that ring as true as a first grader
> promising if elected class president he'll offer an extra recess, you
> have a bold chance to send a message to both parties that there is a
> man running who does represent the public.
>
> And that man in Ralph Nader.
>
> The man who stood up to the Tire industry and called for criminal
> offenses.
> T10
> 0
>
> The man endorsed by Earth First - because he understands that being an
> environmentalist is more then saying you are, and more then taking
> money away from fire fighters while the country burns.
>
> The man endorsed by the Electrician's Union as someone who understands
> that free trade with countries like China - something favored by the
old school candidates
- is a disservice and a moral outrage to the majority of America.

Time has come for a change. And that change is an honest change about
more then fake promises or a procession to the presidency by grounds
of nepotism.

VOTE GREEN!

I find it hard to believe that the Green Party would send out
a message that no one proofread ("Texas, who [sic]bare [sic] the
blame"?&nbsp;
"endoreed [sic] by Earth First"?).&nbsp; Given the
tone of the letter (talking about the "last eight years"), this might be from
someone who would benefit from Nader taking votes away
from another candidate.&nbsp; An interesting strategy, particularly being
sent
to someone in a battleground state in this
election.... &lt;p&gt;Frank Rusciano &lt;p&gt;'Kropf, Martha E.' wrote: &lt;blockquote
TYPE=CITE&gt;Hello AAPOR: &lt;p&gt;I received the following message
from the Green Party asking me to support Ralph &lt;br&gt;Nader. Does anyone know
about this email campaign? I'm just curious to know how
&lt;br&gt;they got my email address and who else they sent it to. &lt;p&gt;Martha Kropf
&lt;p&gt;Martha Kropf, Ph.D. &lt;br&gt;Assistant Professor
&lt;br&gt;Department of Political Science &lt;br&gt;University of Missouri-Kansas City
&lt;br&gt;213 Haag Hall &lt;br&gt;5100 Rockhill Road &lt;br&gt;Kansas City,
MO&amp;nbsp; 64110-2499 &lt;br&gt;816-235-5948 &lt;p&gt;-----Original Message-----
&lt;br&gt;From: gogreen@votethisfall.com [&lt;a
href="mailto:gogreen@votethisfall.com">mailto:gogreen@votethisfall.com</a&gt;]
&lt;br&gt;Sent: Saturday, September 09, 2000 1:07 PM
&lt;br&gt;To: kropfm@umkc.edu
&lt;br&gt;Subject: Important Information About This Fall's Election &lt;p&gt;The upcoming
election may be one of the most important in our
history.&nbsp; But what &lt;br&gt;is really at stake, and who's telling you what
you need to know? &lt;p&gt;While rhetoric has been fast and
furious, the truth about both candidates has &lt;br&gt;been difficult to come
by.&nbsp;&amp;nbsp;&lt;br&gt;But it's time the public faced facts. &lt;p&gt;In
the past 8 Years, as the BBC Reports: &lt;br&gt;&lt;a
href="http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/sci/tech/newsid_916000/916037.stm">htt
p://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/sci/tech/newsid_916000/916037.stm</a&gt;&lt;/p&gt;
the Ozone
&lt;br&gt;hole has grown to record proportions, and while we can decry Texas, who
does &lt;br&gt;bare blame, the national administration took no
steps through the EPA
- a
&lt;br&gt;federal body - to do anything.
&lt;p&gt;And who voted -for- Wire Taps, against HIV testing funds for the military,
for &lt;br&gt;keeping gay marriage an impossibility , for
limits on habeas corpus, against &lt;br&gt;campaign finance reform, and for funding
religious institutions, against the &lt;br&gt;ACLU? &lt;br&gt;&lt;a
And who proposed that their plan came from biblical pretense? That in some way, the guiding principals of medicare are the commandment: honor thy father and mother? And who’s taking faith to the government in a way we have not seen before, virtually unnoticed?

And while Farm Bureau was busy notifying a government that refused to listen as early as June that there were problems with Firestone, what did the administration do? Nothing until 88 people were dead, leaving 28 notices from even insurance companies unanswered. And while proclaiming racial sensitivity, lawmakers are perpetuating racism occurring in the secret service.

But there is a man running who stands by his word, who offers a real choice, who has stood up for the public. Instead of listening to promises that ring as true as a first grader promising if elected class president he’ll offer an extra recess, you have a bold chance to send a message to both parties that there is a man running who does represent the public. And that man in Ralph Nader. The man who stood up to the Tire industry and called for criminal offenses.

The man endorsed by Earth First - because he understands that being an environmentalist is more than saying you are, and more then taking money away from fire fighters while the country burns. The man endorsed by the Electrician's Union as someone who understands that free trade with countries like China - something favored by the old school candidates - is a disservice and a moral outrage to the majority of America. Time has come for a change. And that change is an honest change about more then fake promises or a procession to the presidency by grounds of nepotism.

VOTE GREEN!
Does anyone have a recommendation for a good interviewer training video, oriented to telephone interviewing, that emphasizes proper interviewing techniques. We have been using a 1970's video produced by Mathematica, which is very good, but it is primarily geared toward door-to-door interviewing. The 1970's dress and hairstyles make this very memorable and entertaining for our new interviewers. However, I would like to find out if there are new training videos that emphasize telephone interviewing techniques.

Please reply to:

bbaumgar@haglerbailly.com

I will be happy to share responses with others who are interested in the results.

Bob Baumgartner

It was also State Farm Insurance, not the Farm Bureau that "was busy notifying the government" regarding Firestone.

Frank Rusciano wrote:

> I find it hard to believe that the Green Party would send out a message that no one proofread ("Texas, who [sic]bare [sic] the blame"? "endoreed [sic] by Earth First"?). Given the tone of the letter (talking about the "last eight years"), this might be from someone who would benefit from Nader taking votes away from another candidate. An interesting strategy, particularly being sent to someone in a battleground state in this election....
"Kropf, Martha E." wrote:

Hello AAPOR:

I received the following message from the Green Party asking me to support Ralph Nader. Does anyone know about this email campaign? I'm just curious to know how they got my email address and who else they sent it to.

Martha Kropf

Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Missouri-Kansas City
213 Haag Hall
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO  64110-2499
816-235-5948

-----Original Message-----
From: gogreen@votethisfall.com [mailto:gogreen@votethisfall.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 09, 2000 1:07 PM
To: kropfm@umkc.edu
Subject: Important Information About This Fall's Election

The upcoming election may be one of the most important in our history. But what is really at stake, and who's telling you what you need to know?

While rhetoric has been fast and furious, the truth about both candidates has been difficult to come by. But it's time the public faced facts.

In the past 8 Years, as the BBC Reports:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/sci/tech/newsid_916000/916037.stm
the Ozone hole has grown to record proportions, and while we can decry Texas, who does bare blame, the national administration took no steps through the EPA - a federal body - to do anything.

And who voted -for- Wire Taps, against HIV testing funds for the military, for keeping gay marriage an impossibility, for limits on habeas corpus, against campaign finance reform, and for funding religious institutions, against the ACLU?
http://www.aclu.org/vote-guide/Lieberman_J.html

And who proposed that their plan came from biblical pretense? That in some way, the guiding principals of medicare are the commandment: honor thy father and mother? And who's taking faith to the government in a way we have not seen
And while Farm Bureau was busy notifying a government that refused to listen as early as June that there were problems with Firestone, what did the administration do? Nothing until 88 people were dead, leaving 28 notices from even insurance companies unanswered.

And while proclaiming racial sensitivity, lawmakers are perpetuating racism occurring in the secret service. But there is a man running who stands by his word, who offers a real choice, who has stood up for the public.

Instead of listening to promises that ring as true as a first grader promising if elected class president he'll offer an extra recess, you have a bold chance to send a message to both parties that there is a man running who does represent the public.

And that man in Ralph Nader.

The man who stood up to the Tire industry and called for criminal offenses. The man endorsed by Earth First - because he understands that being an environmentalist is more than saying you are, and more than taking money away from fire fighters while the country burns.

The man endorsed by the Electrician's Union as someone who understands that free trade with countries like China - something favored by the old school candidates - is a disservice and a moral outrage to the majority of America.

Time has come for a change. And that change is an honest change about more than fake promises or a procession to the presidency by grounds of nepotism.

VOTE GREEN!

It was also State Farm Insurance, not the Farm Bureau that "was busy notifying the government" regarding Firestone. Frank Rusciano
wrote: <blockquote TYPE=CITE>I find it hard to believe
that the Green Party would send out a message that no one proofread ("Texas,
who [sic] bare [sic] the blame"?&nbsp; "endoreed [sic]
by Earth First"?).&nbsp; Given the tone of the letter (talking about the
"last
eight years"), this might be from someone who would
benefit from Nader taking votes away from another candidate.&nbsp; An
interesting strategy, particularly being sent to someone in a
battleground state in this election.... <p>Frank Rusciano <p>"Kropf, Martha
E." wrote: <blockquote TYPE=CITE>Hello AAPOR: <p>I
received the following message from the Green Party asking me to support
Ralph
<br>Nader. Does anyone know about this email
campaign? I'm just curious to know how <br>they got my email address and who
else they sent it to. <p>Martha Kropf &lt;Martha Kropf,
Ph.D. &lt;br&gt;Assistant Professor &lt;br&gt;Department of Political Science
&lt;br&gt;University of Missouri-Kansas City &lt;br&gt;213 Haag Hall &lt;br&gt;5100
Rockhill Road &lt;br&gt;Kansas City, MO&amp;nbsp; 64110-2499 &lt;br&gt;816-235-5948 &lt;p&gt;-----
Original Message-----
&lt;br&gt;From: gogreen@votethisfall.com [&lt;a
href="mailto:gogreen@votethisfall.com">mailto:gogreen@votethisfall.com&lt;/a&gt;]
&lt;br&gt;Sent: Saturday, September 09, 2000 1:07 PM
&lt;br&gt;To: kropfm@umkc.edu
&lt;br&gt;Subject: Important Information About This Fall's Election &lt;p&gt;The upcoming
election may be one of the most important in our
history.&nbsp; But what &lt;br&gt;is really at stake, and who's tell ing you what
you need to know? &lt;p&gt;While rhetoric has been fast and
furious, the truth about both candidates has &lt;br&gt;been difficult to come
by.&nbsp;&lt;br&gt;&nbsp; But it's time the public faced facts. &lt;p&gt;In
the past 8 Years, as the BBC Reports: &lt;br&gt;&lt;a
href="http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/sci/tech/newsid_916000/916037.stm">htt
p
://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/sci/tech/newsid_916000/916037.stm&lt;/a&gt;
the Ozone
&lt;br&gt;hole has grown to record proportions, and while we can decry Texas, who
does &lt;br&gt;bare blame, the national administration took no
steps through the EPA
- a
&lt;br&gt;federal body - to do anything.
&lt;p&gt;And who voted -for- Wire Taps, against HIV testing funds for the military,
for &lt;br&gt;keeping gay marriage an impossibility , for
limits on habeas corpus, against &lt;br&gt;campaign finance reform, and for funding
religious institutions, against the &lt;br&gt;ACLU? &lt;br&gt;&lt;a
href="http://www.aclu.org/vote-
guide/Lieberman_J.html">http://www.aclu.org/vote-guide/Lieberman_J.html&lt;/a&gt;
&lt;p&gt;And who proposed that their plan came from biblical pretense? That in some
way, &lt;br&gt;the guiding principals of medicare are
the&amp;nbsp; commandment: honor thy father and &lt;br&gt;mother?&nbsp; And who's
taking
faith to the government in a way we have not seen
&lt;br&gt;before, virtually unnoticed? &lt;br&gt;&lt;a
m1&amp;boardI"&gt;http://www.beliefnet.com/frameset.asp?pageLoc=/story/36/story_3613_1.html&amp;boardI&lt;/a&gt;
&lt;br&gt;D=4262
And while Farm Bureau was busy notifying a government that refused to listen as early as June that there were problems with Firestone, what did the administration do? Nothing until 88 people were dead, leaving 28 notices from even insurance companies unanswered. And while proclaiming racial sensitivity, lawmakers are perpetuating racism occurring in the secret service.

But there is a man running who stands by his word, who offers a real choice, who has stood up for the public. Instead of listening to promises that ring as true as a first grader promising if elected class president he'll offer an extra recess, you have a bold chance to send a message to both parties that there is a man running who does represent the public. And that man in Ralph Nader.

The man who stood up to the Tire industry and called for criminal offenses is endorsed by Earth First - because he understands that being an environmentalist is more than saying you are, and more than taking money away from fire fighters while the country burns. The man endorsed by the Electrician's Union as someone who understands that free trade with countries like China - something favored by the old school candidates - is a disservice and a moral outrage to the majority of America. Time has come for a change.

VOTE GREEN!</blockquote>

---

Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 13:55:30 -0700
From: "Du, Can" <candu@rand.org>
To: ’aapornet@usc.edu’
Subject: RE: Interviewer Training Videos

I am also interested in the responses you are getting. Please forward a copy to me. Thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: Bob Baumgartner [mailto:bbaumgartner@haglerbaillly.com]
Sent: Monday, September 11, 2000 1:27 PM
To: ’aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: Interviewer Training Videos
Does anyone have a recommendation for a good interviewer training video, oriented to telephone interviewing, that emphasizes proper interviewing techniques. We have been using a 1970's video produced by Mathematica, which is very good, but it is primarily geared toward door-to-door interviewing. The 1970's dress and hairstyles make this very memorable and entertaining for our new interviewers. However, I would like to find out if there are new training videos that emphasize telephone interviewing techniques.

Please reply to:

bbaumgar@haglerbailly.com

I will be happy to share responses with others who are interested in the results.

Bob Baumgartner

-----Original Message-----
From: Bob Baumgartner <mailto:bbbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com]
Sent: Monday, September 11, 2000 1:27 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: Interviewer Training Videos

Does anyone have a recommendation for a good interviewer training video, oriented to telephone interviewing, that emphasizes proper interviewing techniques. We have been using a 1970's video produced by Mathematica, which is very good, but it is primarily geared toward door-to-door interviewing. The 1970's dress and hairstyles make this very memorable and entertaining for our new interviewers. However, I would like to find out if there are new training videos that emphasize telephone interviewing techniques.

Please reply to:
bbaumgar@haglerbailly.com

I will be happy to share responses with others who are interested in the results.

Bob Baumgartner

========================================================================= Date: Mon, 11 Sep 2000 16:21:36 -0500 From: "Richard Day" <rday@rdresearch.com> To: <aapornet@usc.edu> References: <713ED6F94609D211B5F200805F9FE8EE3DCFB4@MADFPS001> Subject: Re: Interviewer Training Videos MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit X-Priority: 3 X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300 X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

I recommend that you examine the material put together by the Market Research Assoc.

----- Original Message ----- From: Bob Baumgartner <bbaumgartner@haglerbailly.com> To: <aapornet@usc.edu> Sent: Monday, September 11, 2000 3:26 PM Subject: RE: Interviewer Training Videos

> Does anyone have a recommendation for a good interviewer training video, oriented to telephone interviewing, that emphasizes proper interviewing techniques. We have been using a 1970's video produced by Mathematica, which is very good, but it is primarily geared toward door-to-door interviewing. The 1970's dress and hairstyles make this very memorable and entertaining for our new interviewers. However, I would like to find out if there are new training videos that emphasize telephone interviewing techniques.
>
> Please reply to:
> bbaumgar@haglerbailly.com
>
> I will be happy to share responses with others who are interested in the results.
>
> Bob Baumgartner
>
>
As the article, "One Consulting Firm Finds Voter Data Is a Hot Property" points out, lists of names and addresses of voters with particular characteristics are readily available....for a price, of course. We are beginning to see more and more of this not only with respect to voting but with respect to all sorts of telemarketing on the Internet. So, while we may think that our e-mail addresses are confidential we will be disappointed when we discover that they are not.

Dick Halpern

>Martha,
>
The e-mail addresses of virtually all faculty, staff and students at
>the universities and colleges throughout North America, and in many
>other countries, are available via their institution's homepage. This
>is a much better deal for candidates like Nader than it is for most
>candidates, as I'm sure you know. I have no knowledge that the Nader
>people did in fact get your e-mail address in this way, of course--only
>that they might at least have done so (assuming you are listed) for
>little time or effort.
>
>Jim

******

On Mon, 11 Sep 2000, Kropf, Martha E. wrote:
>>
>> Hello AAPOR:
>>
>> I received the following message from the Green Party asking me to
>> support Ralph
>> Nader. Does anyone know about this email campaign? I'm just curious
>> to
>> know how
>> they got my email address and who else they sent it to.
>>>
>> Martha Kropf
>>
>> Martha Kropf, Ph.D.
>> Assistant Professor
>> Department of Political Science
>> University of Missouri-Kansas City
Contact the Marketing Research Association at http://www.MRA-Net.org or (860) 257-4008

They have what you are looking for.

You know, I could probably go along with your suggestion that we ought to withhold judgement until we know more if it wasn’t for the damage I fear this technology could cause the legitimate survey industry. Compliance rates on the telephone are bad enough given the level of telemarketing respondents currently experience.

Can you imagine what would happen to telephone compliance rates if everyone started using autodialers and voice response systems to survey residences. Stay on the line for an important message! TELEPHONE SURVEYING WOULD BECOME A THING OF THE PAST.
If criticism is founded on supposition, then I would prefer to label it as speculation. Sometimes new approaches that may seem unsound may actually be significant developments. I am suggesting that we withhold judgments that condemn Rasmussen's methods until we know more.

warren mitofsky

At 08:57 AM 9/8/00 -0700, you wrote:
> Sometimes that's all there is.
>
> At 03:11 PM 9/7/00 -0700, you wrote:
> > Intuition is not what I am after.
> > warren mitofsky
> >
> > At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:
> > > It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen
> > > Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic
> > > dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work!
> > > Probably not a great idea to promote these!
> > >
> > >-----Original Message-----
> > >From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
> > >Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
> > >To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > >Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five
> > >States
Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running
tally of national and state polls on his website, at
<http://prorev.com/amline.htm>. --

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

Because e-mail can be altered electronically,
the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

Is your negative view of the Rasmussen Polls based on just your
dislike for automatic dialers, or do you know something more about
their work than the information contained on the Rasmussen web site?
If you know more, like their response rates, would you share it with
us? warren mitofsky

At 03:44 PM 9/5/00 -0400, you wrote:

It seems these guys at the Progressive Review are using Rasmussen
Research polls for their analysis. Rasmussen uses an automatic
dialer and a robotic voice ("press one for yes") for their work!
Probably not a great idea to promote these!

-----Original Message-----
From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]
Sent: Monday, September 04, 2000 6:47 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Presidential Race Results from Weekend Polls in Five
States

Sam Smith, proprietor of the Progressive Review, keeps a running
tally of national and state polls on his website, at
<http://prorev.com/amline.htm>. --

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
Village Station - PO Box 953
New York NY 10014-0704 USA
Because e-mail can be altered electronically, the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

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

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

The information contained in this communication is confidential and 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.

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

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

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.

Dear [Name],

Freeman Writes:

"You know, I could probably go along with your suggestion that we ought to withhold judgement until we know more if it wasn't for the damage I fear this technology could cause the legitimate survey industry. Compliance rates on the telephone are bad enough given the level of telemarketing respondents currently experience.

Can you imagine what would happen to telephone compliance rates if everyone started using autodialers and voice response systems to survey residences. Stay on the line for an important message! TELEPHONE SURVEYING WOULD BECOME A THING OF THE PAST."

I thought this already happened!!!!

Hoynoski writes:

"You know, I could probably go along with your suggestion that we ought to withhold judgement until we know more if it wasn't for the damage I fear this technology could cause the legitimate survey industry. Compliance rates on the telephone are bad enough given the level of telemarketing respondents currently experience.

Can you imagine what would happen to telephone compliance rates if everyone started using autodialers and voice response systems to survey residences. Stay on the line for an important message! TELEPHONE SURVEYING WOULD BECOME A THING OF THE PAST."

I thought this already happened!!!!
I am very pleased to announce that Dr. Paul J. Lavrakas will be joining Nielsen Media Research (NMR) as Vice President and Senior Research Methodologist, effective October 1, 2000. In this capacity, Dr. Lavrakas will be responsible primarily for the methodological research functions of the Nielsen Station Index (NSI) unit of NMR, which includes the Company's telephone interviewing center, diary samples, and local meter samples.

Dr. Lavrakas comes to us from Ohio State University's School of Journalism & Communication and the OSU Center for Survey Research, where he has been a Full Professor since 1996. Prior to joining Ohio State, he was a professor in various departments of Northwestern University from 1978-1996; a visiting professor at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research and Department of Communication; and an instructor at Loyola University of Chicago and St. Xavier College in Chicago in the 1970s. He has performed consulting work for myriad companies (in particular media firms), government agencies, and universities.

As part of his academic career, Dr. Lavrakas has been the founding Faculty Director of the Center for Survey Research at Ohio State University's College of Social & Behavioral Sciences since 1996. He also founded the Northwestern University Survey Laboratory in 1982 and served as its Director for 14 years. In earlier years, he was a research associate at Northwestern University and at Loyola University of Chicago.

Dr. Lavrakas has authored and co-authored an extensive array of publications and has given numerous presentations on diverse topics over the years, with a strong concentration on survey methodology. He has also served in various capacities on numerous national committees. Additionally, he is a member of several well-respected professional associations for survey research, public opinion research, psychology, and statistics.

Dr. Lavrakas received his Ph.D. in Applied Social Psychology from Loyola University in Chicago in 1977. He also holds a Master's degree in Experimental Social Psychology from Loyola and a Bachelor's degree in General Social Sciences from Michigan State University.

Dr. Lavrakas will be based in NMR's New York City office and will be relocating to the New York area in the near future. He currently lives with his wife Barbara in Granville, Ohio. Their adult son, Nik, lives in Chicago.

We are excited to have someone with Dr. Lavrakas' extensive experience on board at Nielsen Media Research, and anticipate that his many talents and expert knowledge will greatly enhance our research enterprise.

Bruce W. Hoynoski
Senior Vice President
Research
Am I confused or is the following quote from CNN an example of what Bennett, Ravitch, et al. have been saying is the failure of our schools to teach arithmetic?

What's for sure is the immortality of "Dead Heat." (See AAPORNET archives.)

Albert D. Biderman

> Tracking poll: Gore and Bush remain neck-and-neck
> From CNN Polling Director Keating Holland
>
> September 12, 2000
> Web posted at: 5:01 p.m. EDT (2101 GMT)
>
> WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush remain virtually tied in the daily CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll as minor party challengers Ralph Nader and Pat Buchanan lag behind with single-digit support.
>
> Interviews with 732 likely voters, conducted September 9-11, found Gore -- the Democratic nominee for president -- holding a six-point lead over Republican rival Bush. Gore claimed 48 percent of the survey's likely voters, while Bush had the support of 42 percent. But with a margin of error of plus or minus 4 percent, Gore's advantage is statistically insignificant.
>

------------------------------
After reading the thread copied below about reporting the margin of error, I found it interesting that in an article yesterday the USA Today went to the trouble of reporting the margin of error for each question discussed, rather than for the entire survey. (I'm not a daily reader of the USA Today, so I don't know if this is a new practice or something they've been doing for some time).

Poll: Trust in tires falters
http://www.usatoday.com/money/consumer/autos/mauto830.htm

"The public is wary of Firestone tires - and to a lesser extent Ford Explorers - after a recall of 6.5 million tires, most on the sport-utility vehicle, and reports of at least 88 deaths, a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll shows.

About 77% of 1,197 consumers surveyed for the poll said they at least would be less likely to buy Firestone tires because of coverage of the recall. The question has a margin of error of +/-3 percentage points.

Phil Pacsi, Firestone director of consumer tire brand marketing, isn't surprised. "Once we get through the recall process, it will be our challenge to change those numbers," he said.

The survey found that of 475 people who said they previously would have considered buying an Explorer, 44% now said they at least would be less likely to buy one. That question has a margin of error of +/-5 percentage points."

>-----Original Message-----
>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mkshares@mcs.net]
>Subject: Re: margins of error
>
>I think you should tell your client that political polls seen in the media are intended for a general audience. There is no room for an error table showing not only potential error for the total sample and sub-groups within the sample - but for errors associated with each estimate; i.e., 50%, 40% and 60%, 30% and 70%, etc.
>
>Colleen K Porter wrote:
>
>> One group of folks wants us to give "the" margin of error at the bottom of each table we generate. We tried to explain that the margin of error is for each estimate in the table--if we talked to more Blacks than Hispanics, if more people refused to answer a particular item, then there will be different margins of error. (We generally do an appendix in the technical report that has those numbers.)
But this client insisted, saying, "The political polls only have one margin of error in the box for the whole survey, even though they probably talked to different numbers of people for this or that."

Are we being too academic? Any references on how to scientifically come up with that one magic number?

Thanks bunches,

Colleen

Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2000 10:49:38 -0500
From: "Richard Day" <rday@rdresearch.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: interviewing youth ages 12-18

We are conducting a study of young people ages 12-18 for a government agency.

In one study we will interview students in a randomly selected classroom. The survey will be handed out. We expect that we will need permission from the superintendent and the principal, and certainly notification of the teacher. Do we need permission from each parent/guardian??

In the other study we will be administering the survey via telephone to a sample of another population of youth ages 12-18. I presume that we need parental/guardian permission. Can that permission be audio taped? Does it require paper, i.e. mail out the permission form, hope it comes back?

thank you in advance.

Richard Day
The only problem with the USA Today piece is that I believe they are using the error for 50% estimates in reference to a finding of 77%.

At the 95% level of confidence, a 50% finding in a 1200 sample has a +/- 2.83% potential error which does round to +/- 3%. This is what the writer was using.

But a finding of 77% has an error margin of about +/- 2.38% which rounds to +/- 2%. [1.96 X SQRT (.77 X .23 / 1197)]

It is conventional to use sample error for 50% estimates because this is the maximum possible error for all possible estimates under or over 50% - given a specific sample size. When we try to associate error with specific estimates* it becomes a can of worms which is what I was trying to say in my reply to Colleen last week:

> I think you should tell your client that political polls seen in the
media are intended for a general audience. There is no room for an
error table showing not only potential error for the total sample and
sub-groups within the sample - but *errors associated with each
estimate*; i.e., 50%, 40% and 60%, 30% and 70%, etc.

"Safir, Adam" wrote:

After reading the thread copied below about reporting the margin of
error, I found it interesting that in an article yesterday the USA
Today went to the trouble of reporting the margin of error for each
question discussed, rather than for the entire survey. (I'm not a
daily reader of the USA Today, so I don't know if this is a new
practice or something they've been doing for some time).

Poll: Trust in tires falters
http://www.usatoday.com/money/consumer/autos/mauto830.htm

"The public is wary of Firestone tires - and to a lesser extent Ford
Explorers - after a recall of 6.5 million tires, most on the
sport-utility vehicle, and reports of at least 88 deaths, a USA
TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll shows.

About 77% of 1,197 consumers surveyed for the poll said they at least
would be less likely to buy Firestone tires because of coverage of the
recall. The question has a margin of error of +/-3 percentage points.

Phil Pacsi, Firestone director of consumer tire brand marketing, isn't
surprised. "Once we get through the recall process, it will be our
challenge to change those numbers," he said.

The survey found that of 475 people who said they previously would
have considered buying an Explorer, 44% now said they at least would
be less likely to buy one. That question has a margin of error of +/-5
percentage points."

The only problem with the USA Today piece is that I believe they are using the error for 50% estimates in reference to a finding of 77%.
At the 95% level of confidence, a 50% finding in a 1200 sample has a
+/- 2.83% potential error which does round to +/- 3%. This is what the
writer was using.

But a finding of 77% has an error margin of about +/- 2.38% which rounds to
+/- 2%. [1.96 X SQRT (.77 X .23 / 1197)]
conventional to use sample error for 50% estimates because this is the maximum
possible error for of all possible estimates under or over 50% - given a specific sample size. When we try to associate error with *specific estimates* it becomes a can of worms which is what I was trying to say in my reply to Colleen last week: <blockquote TYPE=CITE><pre>I think you should tell your client that political polls seen in the media are intended for a general audience. There is no room for an error table showing not only potential error for the total sample and sub-groups within the sample - but*errors associated with each estimate*; i.e., 50%, 40% and 60%, 30% and 70%, etc.</pre></blockquote>

"Safir, Adam" wrote: <blockquote TYPE=CITE>After reading the thread copied below about reporting the margin of error, I found it interesting that in an article yesterday the USA Today went to the trouble of reporting the margin of error for each question discussed, rather than for the entire survey. (I'm not a daily reader of the USA Today, so I don't know if this is a new practice or something they've been doing for some time). <p>Poll: Trust in tires falters</p><a href="http://www.usatoday.com/money/consumer/autos/mauto830.htm">http://www.usatoday.com/money/consumer/autos/mauto830.htm</a><p>The public is wary of Firestone tires - and to a lesser extent Ford Explorers - after a recall of 6.5 million tires, most on the sport-utility vehicle, and reports of at least 88 deaths, a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll shows. About 77% of 1,197 consumers surveyed for the poll said they at least would be less likely to buy Firestone tires because of coverage of the recall. The question has a margin of error of +/-3 percentage points. Phil Pacsi, Firestone director of consumer tire brand marketing, isn't surprised. "Once we get through the recall process, it will be our challenge to change those numbers," he said. The survey found that of 475 people who said they previously would have considered buying an Explorer, 44% now said they at least would be less likely to buy one. That question has a margin of error of +/-5 percentage points." </p>&nbsp;
We're doing the same thing, passing out questionnaires in classrooms. We were approved for a waiver of informed consent since the instruments are anonymous--the student seals their booklet in an unmarked envelope before returning it.

We send letters home with each student, with a form that parents can check off if they wish to _decline_ their child's participation. This used to be called 'passive consent,' but our IRB claims consent is like pregnancy--you either follow informed consent or not. So the notes to parents are not, strictly speaking, required; they cannot substitute for informed consent because we do not require them to be returned.

You should also have a full, active consent, plan approved; some schools will require it and you might as well have it ready. We get about 10% of the permission slips back from active consent schools. (one attempt; no follow up was budgeted)

Note that if this was instead a confidential design (panel, linked data, follow ups, etc) we would have been required to follow full informed consent because the subject matter includes sensitive/illegal acts: drugs, sex, and alcohol. Less sensitive subjects may still be approved for waiver of informed consent in a confidential design.

Our experience with a number of school districts has been that there are many different paths to approval--it can come from principals, superintendents, boards, research review committees, etc.

Don't know from experience about your phone permission question; but it would seem to me that as long as your instrument (paper, cati data) shows the interviewer asked the parent and received permission you wouldn't have to tape it. Taping and preserving the recordings triggers another set of requirements.

Good luck,

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Day
Sent: 13 September 2000 8:50 AM
Subject: interviewing youth ages 12-18

We are conducting a study of young people ages 12-18 for a government agency.

In one study we will interview students in a randomly selected classroom. The survey will be handed out. We expect that we will need permission from the superintendent and the principal, and certainly notification of the teacher. Do we need permission from each parent/guardian??

In the other study we will be administering the survey via telephone to a sample of another population of youth ages 12-18. I
premise that we need parental/guardian permission. Can that permission be audio taped? Does it require paper, i.e. mail out the permission form, hope it comes back?

thank you in advance.

Richard Day

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2000 14:14:10 -0400
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Harris Interactive drops ISP lawsuit
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

"HARRIS INTERACTIVE HAS dropped its lawsuit against a number of leading ISPs and an anti-spam organization, the U.S. online market research company announced Tuesday. Harris Interactive had already removed both Microsoft and America Online from the legal action."

"Harris Interactive said Tuesday it has "voluntarily discontinued" its legal action against MAPS and the remaining ISPs, the company said in a statement. "'We sued to open communication with our respondents, and that goal was accomplished,' Harris Interactive CEO Gordon Black said in the statement. 'Continuation of the suit is not in our shareholders' best interests.'"

Article available at
http://www.infoworld.com/articles/hn/xml/00/09/12/000912hnharris.xml
<http://www.infoworld.com/articles/hn/xml/00/09/12/000912hnharris.xml>

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Still posting from a floater
simonetta@artsci.com

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2000 17:06:20 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Mary Ann Jones <maj1@is2.nyu.edu>
Subject: RE: interviewing youth ages 12-18
In-Reply-To: <B6426E926476D411B8E800B0D03D5C1A01030C16@mainex2.asu.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

The IRB at my university would be likely to have two problems with proposed study:
first, they would require active consent from the parents, even if it were an anonymous survey; secondly, they would take a dim view of distributing the questionnaire in a class. It would be viewed as coercive, even if it's made clear that participation is voluntary. The bar for collecting data from individuals under 18 is set pretty high unless it's part of their school curriculum.
At 10:38 AM 9/13/2000 -0700, you wrote:
> We're doing the same thing, passing out questionnaires in classrooms.
> We were approved for a waiver of informed consent since the instruments
> are anonymous--the student seals their booklet in an unmarked envelope
> before returning it.
> We send letters home with each student, with a form that parents can
> check off if they wish to _decline_ their child's participation. This
> used to be called 'passive consent,' but our IRB claims consent is like
> pregnancy--you either follow informed consent or not. So the notes to
> parents are not, strictly speaking, required; they cannot substitute
> for informed consent because we do not require them to be returned.
> You should also have a full, active consent, plan approved; some
> schools will require it and you might as well have it ready. We get
> about 10% of the permission slips back from active consent schools.
> (one attempt; no follow up was budgeted)
> Note that if this was instead a confidential design (panel, linked
> data, follow ups, etc) we would have been required to follow full
> informed consent because the subject matter includes sensitive/illegal
> acts: drugs, sex, and alcohol. Less sensitive subjects may still be
> approved for waiver of informed consent in a confidential design.
> Our experience with a number of school districts has been that there
> are many different paths to approval--it can come from principals,
> superintendents, boards, research review committees, etc.
> Don't know from experience about your phone permission question; but it
> would seem to me that as long as your instrument (paper, cati data)
> shows the interviewer asked the parent and received permission you
> wouldn't have to tape it. Taping and preserving the recordings triggers
> another set of requirements.
> Good luck,
>
> Shap Wolf
> Survey Research Laboratory
> Arizona State University
> shap.wolf@asu.edu
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Richard Day
> Sent: 13 September 2000 8:50 AM
> Subject: interviewing youth ages 12-18
>
> We are conducting a study of young people ages 12-18 for a government
> agency.
>
> In one study we will interview students in a randomly selected
> classroom. The survey will be handed out. We expect that we will need
> permission from the superintendent and the principal, and certainly
> notification of the teacher. Do we need permission from each
> parent/guardian??
In the other study we will be administering the survey via telephone to a sample of another population of youth ages 12-18. I presume that we need parental/guardian permission. Can that permission be audio taped? Does it require paper, i.e. mail out the permission form, hope it comes back?

thank you in advance.

Richard Day

Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2000 23:32:13 -0700
From: "Michael O'Neil" <mikeoneil@earthlink.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <39BF115F.A660820F@american.edu>
Subject: Re: "Dead Heat" Lives On
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

What I find more lacking in these reports is this: while an individual survey with a +/- 4% margin of error and a lead of 6 percent MIGHT be described as a "dead heat" (although it would far more accurately be described as a "probable Gore lead"), when several national polls conducted about the same time show essentially the same results (as I believe they have), the important observation is that Gore has a lead. Most of these organizations seem to subordinate journalistic criteria by promoting their own polls and downplaying other available polls that could shed light on what is happening.

I guess it is more "all the news WE paid for" than "all the news that fits"

Mike O'Neil
mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2000 10:32 PM
Subject: "Dead Heat" Lives On

Am I confused or is the following quote from CNN an example of what Bennett, Ravitch, et al. have been saying is the failure of our schools to teach arithmetic?

What's for sure is the immortality of "Dead Heat." (See AAPORNET archives.)
WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush remain virtually tied in the daily CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll as minor party challengers Ralph Nader and Pat Buchanan lag behind with single-digit support.

Interviews with 732 likely voters, conducted September 9-11, found Gore -- the Democratic nominee for president -- holding a six-point lead over Republican rival Bush. Gore claimed 48 percent of the survey's likely voters, while Bush had the support of 42 percent. But with a margin of error of plus or minus 4 percent, Gore's advantage is statistically insignificant.

--

Date: Thu, 14 Sep 2000 09:44:48 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@psu.edu>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET digest 1520
In-Reply-To: <200009140704.AAA21907@usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 03:04 AM 9/14/00, Nick Panagakis wrote:
> The only problem with the USA Today piece is that I believe they are using
> the error for 50% estimates in reference to a finding of 77%.

This is not quite right either. The confidence interval narrows, strictly speaking, when the true (UNKNOWN) population proportion moves away from .50. Thus the margin of error of 2.38% applies when the TRUE value is .77. So it is not unreasonable to use .5 as a baseline -- especially for questions on emerging issues (like the Firestone/Ford tire controversy) when we have no basis for a better null hypothesis.
This is not my understanding of sample error.

Eric Plutzer wrote:

> At 03:04 AM 9/14/00, Nick Panagakis wrote:
> >To: aapornet@usc.edu
> >Subject: Re: margins of error
> >
> >The only problem with the USA Today piece is that I believe they are
> >using the error for 50% estimates in reference to a finding of 77%.
> >This is not quite right either. The confidence interval narrows,
> >strictly speaking, when the true (UNKNOWN) population proportion moves
> >away from .50. Thus the margin of error of 2.38% applies when the
> >TRUE value is .77. So it is not unreasonable to use .5 as a baseline
>>-- especially for questions on emerging issues (like the
>>Firestone/Ford tire controversy) when we have no basis for a better
>null hypothesis.
>>
> >Eric Plutzer
> >Associate Professor of Political Science & Sociology
> >Penn State University http://polisci.la.psu.edu/faculty/plutzer/

Nevertheless, given that the margin of error is greatest at .50, going with a
more conservative estimate of error may be the safer
bet in the absence of a specific hypothesis test. In other words, when in
doubt, assume the higher error rate.

-----Original Message-----
From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mkshares@mcs.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2000 5:04 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: AAPORNET digest 1520

This is not my understanding of sample error.

Eric Plutzer wrote:

> At 03:04 AM 9/14/00, Nick Panagakis wrote:
> >To: aapornet@usc.edu
> >Subject: Re: margins of error
> >
> >The only problem with the USA Today piece is that I believe they are
> >using
> >the error for 50% estimates in reference to a finding of 77%.
> >
> >This is not quite right either. The confidence interval narrows,
> >strictly speaking, when the true (UNKNOWN) population proportion moves
> >away from .50. Thus the margin of error of 2.38% applies when the
> >TRUE value is .77. So it is not unreasonable to use .5 as a baseline
> >-- especially for questions on emerging issues (like the
> >Firestone/Ford tire controversy) when we have no basis for a better
> >null hypothesis.
> >
> >Eric Plutzer
> >Associate Professor of Political Science & Sociology
> >Penn State University  http://polisci.la.psu.edu/faculty/plutzer/

I have no quarrel with your comment.

But the story said: "About 77% of 1,197 consumers surveyed for the poll said
they at least would be less likely to buy Firestone
tires. The question has a margin of error of +/-3 percentage points" which is
not correct.

"Cooney, Brendan" wrote:

> Nevertheless, given that the margin of error is greatest at .50, going
with a more conservative estimate of error may be the safer bet in the absence of a specific hypothesis test. In other words, when in doubt, assume the higher error rate.

-----Original Message-----
From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mkshares@mcs.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2000 5:04 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: AAPORNET digest 1520

This is not my understanding of sample error.

Eric Plutzer wrote:

> > At 03:04 AM 9/14/00, Nick Panagakis wrote:
> > >To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > >Subject: Re: margins of error
> > >
> > >The only problem with the USA Today piece is that I believe they using
> > >the error for 50% estimates in reference to a finding of 77%.
> > >
> > >This is not quite right either. The confidence interval narrows, strictly speaking, when the true (UNKNOWN) population proportion moves away from .50. Thus the margin of error of 2.38% applies when the TRUE value is .77. So it is not unreasonable to use .5 as a baseline -- especially for questions on emerging issues (like the Firestone/Ford tire controversy) when we have no basis for a better null hypothesis.
> >
> > Eric Plutzer
> > Associate Professor of Political Science & Sociology
> > Penn State University http://polisci.la.psu.edu/faculty/plutzer/

Date: Thu, 14 Sep 2000 13:03:19 -0400
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Laurie J. Bauman" <bauman@aecom.yu.edu>
Subject: Study on Child Health in FSU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I'm seeking an individual or organization that would be able to manage a small scale household survey of child health in two urban centers in Kazakhstan and Kirghizstan, in the Former Soviet Union (FSU). The project is currently under development and would probably rely on existing professional staff in the FSU for data collection. Please e-mail me at bauman@aecom.yu.edu for more information. Thanks.

Laurie J. Bauman, Ph.D.
Professor of Pediatrics
Albert Einstein College of Medicine
1300 Morris Park Avenue
Bronx, NY 10461
Phone: 718-918-4421
Laurie J. Bauman wrote:

>I'm seeking an individual or organization that would be able to
>manage a small scale household survey of child health in two urban
>centers in Kazakhstan and Kirghizstan, in the Former Soviet Union
>(FSU). The project is currently under development and would probably
>rely on existing professional staff in the FSU for data collection.
>Please e-mail me at bauman@aecom.yu.edu for more information.
>Thanks.

You should ask David Johnson <davidjohnson@erols.com>, proprietor of
the excellent Johnson's Russia List, to post your query. Everyone
who's seriously interested in the FSU subscribes.

Doug Henwood

What the recent thread on margins of error left out is that the total margin
of error is not the same thing as the margin of
sampling error. One of my pet peeves with journalists' reporting of polls
concerns their misleading use of "margin of [sampling]
error" as if it encompassed all possible error. Jim Lemert Professor emeritus
Journalism and Communication, Univ. of Oregon (not in
residence) Mailing address: P.O. Box 2224, Waldport, OR 97394
e-mail: Jlemert@Oregon, UOregen.edu
phone: (541) 563-2984
FAX: (541) 563-7101

After reading the thread copied below about reporting the margin of error, I
found it interesting that in an article yesterday the
USA Today went to the trouble of reporting the margin of error for each question discussed, rather than for the entire survey. (I'm not a daily reader of the USA Today, so I don't know if this is a new practice or something they've been doing for some time).

Poll: Trust in tires falters
http://www.usatoday.com/money/consumer/autos/mauto830.htm

"The public is wary of Firestone tires - and to a lesser extent Ford Explorers - after a recall of 6.5 million tires, most on the sport-utility vehicle, and reports of at least 88 deaths, a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll shows.

About 77% of 1,197 consumers surveyed for the poll said they at least would be less likely to buy Firestone tires because of coverage of the recall. The question has a margin of error of +/-3 percentage points.

Phil Pacsi, Firestone director of consumer tire brand marketing, isn't surprised. "Once we get through the recall process, it will be our challenge to change those numbers," he said.

The survey found that of 475 people who said they previously would have considered buying an Explorer, 44% now said they at least would be less likely to buy one. That question has a margin of error of +/-5 percentage points."

>-----Original Message-----
>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mkshares@mcs.net]
>Subject: Re: margins of error
>
>I think you should tell your client that political polls seen in the media are intended for a general audience. There is no room for an error table showing not only potential error for the total sample and sub-groups within the sample - but for errors associated with each estimate; i.e., 50%, 40% and 60%, 30% and 70%, etc.
>
>Colleen K Porter wrote:
>
>> One group of folks wants us to give "the" margin of error at the bottom of each table we generate. We tried to explain that the margin of error is for each estimate in the table--if we talked to more Blacks than Hispanics, if more people refused to answer a particular item, then there will be different margins of error. (We generally do an appendix in the technical report that has those numbers.)
>> But this client insisted, saying, "The political polls only have one margin of error in the box for the whole survey, even though they probably talked to different numbers of people for this or that."
Are we being too academic? Any references on how to scientifically come up with that one magic number?

Thanks bunches,

Colleen

----------------------------------------------------------
Date: Thu, 14 Sep 2000 16:59:10 -0400
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: "Dead Heat" Lives On
References: <39BF115F.A660820F@american.edu>
<001c01c01e15$85127620$733bdd18@phoenix.speedchoice.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The margin of error magic Mike O'Neil bemoans gets taken even one step further. When Giraldo put five of the latest pres. polls on the screen last night that variusly had Gore from +4 to +8, he agreed with his guest, a Rep. (R), who remarked on how strong a candidate Bush was to stay within the margin of error on all these polls even after two bad weeks.

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

Michael O'Neil wrote:

> What I find more lacking in these reports is this: while an individual survey with a +/- 4% margin of error and a lead of 6 percent MIGHT be described as a "dead heat" (although it would far more accurately be described as a "probable Gore lead"), when several national polls conducted about the same time show essentially the same results (as I believe they have), the important observation is that Gore has a lead. Most of these organizations seem to subordinate journalistic criteria by promoting their own polls and downplaying other available polls that could shed light on what is happening.
> I guess it is more "all the news WE paid for" than "all the news that fits"
> Mike O'Neil
> mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu
> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu> To: <aapornet@usc.edu> Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2000 10:32 PM Subject: "Dead Heat" Lives On
> Am I confused or is the following quote from CNN an example of what Bennett, Ravitch, et al. have been saying is the failure of our
What's for sure is the immortality of "Dead Heat." (See AAPORNET archives.)

Albert D. Biderman

Tracking poll: Gore and Bush remain neck-and-neck
From CNN Polling Director Keating Holland
September 12, 2000
Web posted at: 5:01 p.m. EDT (2101 GMT)

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush remain virtually tied in the daily CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll as minor party challenger Ralph Nader and Pat Buchanan lag behind with single-digit support.

Interviews with 732 likely voters, conducted September 9-11, found Gore -- the Democratic nominee for president -- holding a six-point lead over Republican rival Bush.

Gore claimed 48 percent of the survey's likely voters, while Bush had the support of 42 percent. But with a margin of error of plus or minus 4 percent, Gore's advantage is statistically insignificant.

We have interviewed adolescents by telephone, but the protocol called for an initial interview with the parent or guardian. At the end of the adult interview, we asked for permission to interview the sampled teen on the same topic [health care experiences].

Our IRB does not require us to keep a taped copy of the consent given. There is a field in the CATI interview for the interviewer to indicate whether or not the parent consents to having the child interviewed. If yes, attempts are made to talk with the teen.

Good luck!
-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Ann Jones [mailto:maj1@is2.nyu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2000 8:06 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: interviewing youth ages 12-18

The IRB at my university would be likely to have two problems with proposed study: first, they would require active consent from the parents, even if it were an anonymous survey; secondly, they would take a dim view of distributing the questionnaire in a class. It would be viewed as coercive, even if it's made clear that participation is voluntary. The bar for collecting data from individuals under 18 is set pretty high unless it's part of their school curriculum.

At 10:38 AM 9/13/2000 -0700, you wrote:
> We're doing the same thing, passing out questionnaires in classrooms.
> We were approved for a waiver of informed consent since the instruments
> are anonymous--the student seals their booklet in an unmarked envelope
> before returning it.
> We send letters home with each student, with a form that parents can
> check off if they wish to _decline_ their child's participation. This
> used to be called 'passive consent,' but our IRB claims consent is like
> pregnancy--you either follow informed consent or not. So the notes to
> parents are not, strictly speaking, required; they cannot substitute
> for informed consent because we do not require them to be returned.
> You should also have a full, active consent, plan approved; some
> schools will require it and you might as well have it ready. We get
> about 10% of the
> permission slips back from active consent schools. (one attempt; no
> follow up was budgeted)
> Note that if this was instead a confidential design (panel, linked
> data, follow ups, etc) we would have been required to follow full
> informed consent
> because the subject matter includes sensitive/illegal acts: drugs, sex,
> and alcohol. Less sensitive subjects may still be approved for waiver
> of informed consent in a confidential design.
> Our experience with a number of school districts has been that there
> are many different paths to approval--it can come from principals,
> superintendents, boards, research review committees, etc.
> Don't know from experience about your phone permission question; but it
> would seem to me that as long as your instrument (paper, cati data)
> shows the interviewer asked the parent and received permission you
> wouldn't have to tape it. Taping and preserving the recordings triggers
> another set of requirements.
> Good luck,
>
> Shap Wolf
> Survey Research Laboratory
> Arizona State University
> shap.wolf@asu.edu
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Richard Day
> Sent: 13 September 2000 8:50 AM
> Subject: interviewing youth ages 12-18
> We are conducting a study of young people ages 12-18 for a government
> agency.
> In one study we will interview students in a randomly selected
> classroom. The survey will be handed out. We expect that we will need
> permission from the superintendent and the principal, and certainly
> notification of the teacher. Do we need permission from each
> parent/guardian??
> In the other study we will be administering the survey via telephone to
> a sample of another population of youth ages 12-18. I presume that we
> need parental/guardian permission. Can that permission be audio taped?
> Does it require paper, i.e. mail out the permission form, hope it comes
> back?
> thank you in advance.
>
> Richard Day

========================================================================= Date: Thu, 14 Sep 2000 16:52:55 -0400 To: aapornet@usc.edu From: Dan McDonald <mcdonald.221@osu.edu> Subject: Director, CSR In-Reply-To: <552C05F65B68D211B9320008C7565F1EA57198@nmrusschcx1.nielsen media.com> Mime-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="=====================_206308243==_.ALT"

--=====================_206308243==_.ALT
The Center for Survey Research at the Ohio State University is seeking applicants for the position of Faculty Director. This is a tenured position, with the Director spending approximately 50% time directing the activities of the Center for Survey Research, and the remainder as a faculty member in one of the academic units of the University. Thus, candidates for the position should have a record of excellence in scholarly publications in survey research or methodology, teaching, and service appropriate for appointment as a tenured associate or full professor at the University. The specific tenuring unit is open, depending on the research and teaching focus of the candidate.

The Ohio State University Center for Survey Research is a full-service survey center conducting telephone, mail and Web/Internet surveys. The Center has an annual budget of approximately 1.5 million dollars, of which approximately $250,000 is committed through the University and College of Social and Behavioral Sciences in support of its mission to educate and train students in survey research methods and to facilitate scholarship. The Center has nine full-time staff members, approximately 30 part-time staff members, and 100+ part-time interviewers who work in the Center's 30 station, networked CATI facility. A Faculty Associate Director and an Operations Director report to the Faculty Director.

The Center conducts funded surveys supporting research of university faculty members and, since November 1996, has conducted the Buckeye State Poll in partnership with The Columbus Dispatch, WBNS-TV and the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. In addition, the Center has developed working relationships with a number of organizations external to the University, including government and non-profit agencies.

The Center is formally a part of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, but has faculty associates from a number of other Colleges, and provides expertise in survey research to the broader University community. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences has 9 academic units, which include the Departments of Political Science, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Journalism/Communication, Public Policy and Management, Anthropology, Geography, and Speech and Hearing Science, as well as several additional research units, including the Center for Human Resource Research. Faculty in these academic and research units regularly interact in collaborative research efforts, and the new Director will be encouraged to stimulate such efforts, and lead the Center for Survey Research's future growth and expansion. A joint appointment in more than one of these cognate departments, or in a department that is part of another College, may be possible for qualified candidates.

In addition to academic credentials appropriate for appointment with tenure in the University, previous administrative experience in a survey research unit is highly desirable. Applicants should submit curriculum vitae and names of three references to:

Janet M. Weisenberger, Ph.D., Associate Dean
Chair, Search Committee
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Ohio State University
1010 Derby Hall
For full consideration, applications should be received by November 30, 2000; however, review of applications will continue until the position is filled.

The Ohio State University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Qualified women, minorities, Vietnamera Veterans, disabled veterans and the disabled are encouraged to apply.
Faculty Associate Director and an Operations Director report to the Faculty Director. The Center conducts funded surveys supporting research of university faculty members and, since November 1996, has conducted the Buckeye State Poll in partnership with The Columbus Dispatch, WBNS-TV and the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. In addition, the Center has developed working relationships with a number of organizations external to the University, including government and non-profit agencies. The Center is formally a part of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, but has faculty associates from a number of other Colleges, and provides expertise in survey research to the broader University community. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences has 9 academic units, which include the Departments of Political Science, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Journalism/Communication, Public Policy and Management, Anthropology, Geography, and Speech and Hearing Science, as well as several additional research units, including the Center for Human Resource Research. Faculty in these academic and research units regularly interact in collaborative research efforts, and the new Director will be encouraged to stimulate such efforts, and lead the Center for Survey Research's future growth and expansion. A joint appointment in more than one of these cognate departments, or in a department that is part of another College, may be possible for qualified candidates.

In addition to academic credentials appropriate for appointment with tenure in the University, previous administrative experience in a survey research unit is highly desirable. Applicants should submit curriculum vitae and names of three references to:

Chair, Search Committee
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Ohio State University
1010 Derby Hall
154 N. Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 688-3167
(614) 292-9530 (fax)

For full consideration, applications should be received by November 30, 2000; however, review of applications will continue until the position is filled.

The Ohio State University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Qualified women, minorities, Vietnamera Veterans, disabled veterans and the disabled are encouraged to apply.

Daniel G. McDonald
Professor
School of Journalism and Communication
3080 Derby Hall
154 North Oval Mall
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

---=_206308243==_ALT--

Date: Thu, 14 Sep 2000 21:09:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login1.isis.unc.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Well said, Mike. This tunnel vision has been a problem from my earliest days in the news business.

----

I guess it is more "all the news WE paid for" than "all the news that fits"
The IRB at my university would be likely to have two problems with proposed study:

1. They would require active consent from the parents, even if it were an anonymous survey; secondly, they would take a dim view of distributing the questionnaire in a class. It would be viewed as coercive, even if it's made clear that participation is voluntary.

2. The bar for collecting data from individuals under 18 is set pretty high unless it's part of their school curriculum.

At 10:38 AM 9/13/2000 -0700, you wrote:

> We're doing the same thing, passing out questionnaires in classrooms.
>
> We were approved for a waiver of informed consent since the instruments are anonymous--the student seals their booklet in an unmarked envelope before returning it.
>
> We send letters home with each student, with a form that parents can check off if they wish to decline their child's participation. This used to be called 'passive consent,' but our IRB claims consent is like pregnancy--you either follow informed consent or not. So the notes to parents are not, strictly speaking, required; they cannot substitute for informed consent because we do not require them to be returned.
>
> You should also have a full, active consent, plan approved; some schools will require it and you might as well have it ready. We get about 10% of the permission slips back from active consent schools. (one attempt; no follow up was budgeted)
>
> Note that if this was instead a confidential design (panel, linked data, follow ups, etc) we would have been required to follow full informed consent because the subject matter includes sensitive/illegal acts: drugs, sex, and alcohol. Less sensitive subjects may still be approved for waiver of informed consent in a confidential design.
>
> Our experience with a number of school districts has been that there are many different paths to approval--it can come from principals, superintendents, boards, research review committees, etc.
> Don't know from experience about your phone permission question; but
> it would seem to me that as long as your instrument (paper, cati
> data) shows the interviewer asked the parent and received permission
> you wouldn't have to tape it. Taping and preserving the recordings
> triggers another set of requirements.
> Good luck,
> Shap Wolf
> Survey Research Laboratory
> Arizona State University
> shap.wolf@asu.edu
> 
> ----Original Message-----
> From: Richard Day
> Sent: 13 September 2000 8:50 AM
> Subject: interviewing youth ages 12-18
> We are conducting a study of young people ages 12-18 for a government
> agency.
> In one study we will interview students in a randomly selected
> classroom. The survey will be handed out. We expect that we will
> need permission from the superintendent and the principal, and
> certainly notification of the teacher. Do we need permission from
> each parent/guardian??
> In the other study we will be administering the survey via telephone
> to a sample of another population of youth ages 12-18. I presume
> that we need parental/guardian permission. Can that permission be
> audio taped? Does it require paper, i.e. mail out the permission
> form, hope it comes back?
> thank you in advance.
> Richard Day
> 
> Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (859) 257-4684
> Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (859) 323-1972
> University of Kentucky Pager: 288-5771
> 302 Breckinridge Hall langley@pop.uky.edu
> Lexington, KY 40506-0056
> 
> http://www.rgs.uky.edu/src
This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_000B_01C01EF7.8445DBA0
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thank you to all who kindly responded with your advice and experience regarding interviewing young people ages 12-18. The range of experiences, insights and advice was most appreciated.

The sharing of professional experience is just one of the things that makes AAPOR such a wonderful organization.

-----=_NextPart_000_000B_01C01EF7.8445DBA0
Content-Type: text/x-vcard;
   name="Richard Day.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: attachment;
   filename="Richard Day.vcf"
BEGIN:VCARD
VERSION:2.1
N:Day;Richard
FN:Richard Day
ORG:Richard Day Research
TEL;WORK;VOICE:(847)328-2329 ADR;WORK;ENCODING=3DQUOTED-PRINTABLE::801 Davis Street=3D0D=3D0AThird Floor;Evanston;IL;60201
LABEL;WORK;ENCODING=3DQUOTED-PRINTABLE:801 Davis Street=3D0D=3D0AThird Floor=3D0D=3D0AEvanston,IL 60201
URL:
URL:http://www.rdresearch.com EMAIL;PREF;INTERNET:rday@rdresearch.com
REV:20000915T142958Z
END:VCARD

Date: Fri, 15 Sep 2000 08:14:19 -0700 (PDT)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: What We Fear Most--As American as Apple Pie
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0009150801260.28556-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Here's proof enough that the Federal Trade Commission report on the entertainment industry closely mirrors the themes of the nearly six thousand formal challenges to the free circulation of books--
especially in schools and school libraries--over the past ten years. Whether you prefer your censorship bottom-up or top-down, it's going to amount to the same thing, one way or the other.

-- Jim

Compiled by J.R. Beniger, from data Copyright (C) 2000, American Library Association <http://www.ala.org/bbooks/challeng.html>

WHAT WE FEARED MOST, OVER THE DECADE JUST ENDED

Between 1990 and 1999, there were 5,718 challenges to the free circulation of books reported to--or otherwise recorded by--the Office for Intellectual Freedom of the American Library Association. The reasons for these challenges distribute as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Reason for Challenge</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexually explicit</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>20.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive language</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuit to age group</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occult theme; promoting Satanism</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual theme; promoting same</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting a religious viewpoint</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nudity</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex education</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-family</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FOR TABLE (see notes below)</strong></td>
<td>7,124</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

The number of challenges and the number of reasons for those challenges are not equal because works are often challenged on more than one ground.
According to the Office for Intellectual Freedom, seventy-one percent of the challenges were to material in schools or school libraries (sometimes in both). Another twenty-six percent were to material in public libraries. Almost sixty percent of the challenges were brought by parents, sixteen percent by patrons, and almost ten percent by administrators.

The Office for Intellectual Freedom does not claim comprehensiveness in recording challenges.

Compiled by J.R. Beniger, from data Copyright (C) 2000, American Library Association <http://www.ala.org/bbooks/challeng.html>

I find it interesting how the news media swings on these things. It used to be that when a candidate was ahead by two points, they would say he or she was ahead, regardless of the margin of error. Now, they appear to err on the side of extreme caution. Generally, the latter might be preferable, since they now have a little more knowledge than before; it would be interesting to see how the public reacts to seeing someone ahead by six or so, and the commentator saying it's a dead heat. I'm not sure the public wouldn't be confused.

Frank Rusciano

"Albert D. Biderman" wrote:

> The margin of error magic Mike O'Neil bemoans gets taken even one step further. When Giraldo put five of the latest pres. polls on the screen last night that variously had Gore from +4 to +8, he agreed with his guest, a Rep. (R), who remarked on how strong a candidate Bush was to stay within the margin of error on all these polls even after two bad weeks.
> Albert D. Biderman
> abider@american.edu
Michael O'Neil wrote:

What I find more lacking in these reports is this: while an individual survey with a +/- 4% margin of error and a lead of 6 percent MIGHT be described as a "dead heat" (although it would far more accurately be described as a "probable Gore lead"), when several national polls conducted about the same time show essentially the same results (as I believe they have), the important observation is that Gore has a lead. Most of these organizations seem to subordinate journalistic criteria by promoting their own polls and downplaying other available polls that could shed light on what is happening.

I guess it is more "all the news WE paid for" than "all the news that fits"

Mike O'Neil
mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu> 
To: <aapornet@usc.edu> 
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2000 10:32 PM 
Subject: "Dead Heat" Lives On

Am I confused or is the following quote from CNN an example of what Bennett, Ravitch, et al. have been saying is the failure of our schools to teach arithmetic?

What's for sure is the immortality of "Dead Heat." (See AAPORNET archives.)

Albert D. Biderman

Tracking poll: Gore and Bush remain neck-and-neck
From CNN Polling Director Keating Holland
September 12, 2000
Web posted at: 5:01 p.m. EDT (2101 GMT)
WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush remain virtually tied in the daily CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll as minor party challenger Ralph Nader and Pat Buchanan lag behind with single-digit support.

Interviews with 732 likely voters, conducted September 9-11, found Gore -- the Democratic nominee for president -- holding a six-point lead over Republican rival Bush. Gore claimed 48 percent of the survey's likely voters, while Bush had the support of 42 percent. But with a
Television news people are talking heads. Somebody has got to be telling them this is a statistical dead heat. If not, somebody should be telling them it is not.

I find it interesting how the news media swings on these things. It used to be that when a candidate was ahead by two points, they would say he or she was ahead, regardless of the margin of error. Now, they appear to err on the side of extreme caution. Generally, the latter might be preferable, since they now have a little more knowledge than before; it would be interesting to see how the public reacts to seeing someone ahead by six or so, and the commentator saying it's a dead heat. I'm not sure the public wouldn't be confused.

Frank Rusciano

"Albert D. Biderman" wrote:

> The margin of error magic Mike O'Neil bemoans gets taken even one step further. When Giraldo put five of the latest pres. polls on the screen last night that variously had Gore from +4 to +8, he agreed with his guest, a Rep. (R), who remarked on how strong a candidate Bush was to stay within the margin of error on all these polls even after two bad weeks.
> Albert D. Biderman
> abider@american.edu
Michael O'Neil wrote:

What I find more lacking in these reports is this: while an individual survey with a +/- 4% margin of error and a lead of 6 percent MIGHT be described as a "dead heat" (although it would far more accurately be described as a "probable Gore lead"), when several national polls conducted about the same time show essentially the same results (as I believe they have), the important observation is that Gore has a lead. Most of these organizations seem to subordinate journalistic criteria by promoting their own polls and downplaying other available polls that could shed light on what is happening.

I guess it is more "all the news WE paid for" than "all the news that fits"

Mike O'Neil
mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2000 10:32 PM
Subject: "Dead Heat" Lives On

Am I confused or is the following quote from CNN an example of what Bennett, Ravitch, et al. have been saying is the failure of our schools to teach arithmetic?

What's for sure is the immortality of "Dead Heat." (See AAPORNET archives.)

Albert D. Biderman

Tracking poll: Gore and Bush remain neck-and-neck
From CNN Polling Director Keating Holland
September 12, 2000
Web posted at: 5:01 p.m. EDT (2101 GMT)

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush remain virtually tied in the daily CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll as minor party challenger Ralph Nader and Pat Buchanan lag behind with single-digit support.

Interviews with 732 likely voters, conducted September 9-11, found Gore -- the Democratic nominee for president -- holding a six-point lead over Republican rival Bush. Gore claimed 48 percent of the survey's likely voters, while Bush had the support of 42 percent. But with a
I think what we may be seeing here is evidence of a learning curve in the news media. Many journalists have now reached a "first stage" understanding of what the margin of (sampling) error is, which is a step forward from their earlier ignorance of this concept altogether. Eventually, I think (and hope), more journalists will grasp the more subtle ideas that "margin of sampling error" is not the only source of error in a survey and that when the margin between two candidates is less than the margin of sampling error it does not mean that the two candidates are, for all intents and purposes, tied.

I also think that discussions such as these on AAPORNET have the effect of reminding survey researchers that part of their job in communicating with the news media is to use every contact with journalists as an opportunity to educate them a little more about these things. If everyone who reads AAPORNET were to take a moment to clarify this (or another) concept the next time they speak to a journalist, I think the overall quality of reporting on polls would improve at a noticeable pace.

Larry McGill
Director of Research
The Freedom Forum

-----Original Message-----
From: Frank Rusciano [mailto:rusciano@rider.edu]
I find it interesting how the news media swings on these things. It used to be that when a candidate was ahead by two points, they would say he or she was ahead, regardless of the margin of error. Now, they appear to err on the side of extreme caution. Generally, the latter might be preferable, since they now have a little more knowledge than before; it would be interesting to see how the public reacts to seeing someone ahead by six or so, and the commentator saying it's a dead heat. I'm not sure the public wouldn't be confused.

Frank Rusciano

"Albert D. Biderman" wrote:

> The margin of error magic Mike O'Neil bemoans gets taken even one step further.
> When Giraldo put five of the latest pres. polls on the screen last night that variously had Gore from +4 to +8, he agreed with his guest, a Rep. (R), who remarked on how strong a candidate Bush was to stay within the margin of error on all these polls even after two bad weeks.
> Albert D. Biderman
> abider@american.edu
> Michael O'Neil wrote:
> > What I find more lacking in these reports is this: while an individual survey with a +/- 4% margin of error and a lead of 6 percent MIGHT be described as a "dead heat" (although it would far more accurately be described as a "probable Gore lead"), when several national polls conducted about the same time show essentially the same results (as I believe they have), the important observation is that Gore has a lead. Most of these organizations seem to subordinate journalistic criteria by promoting their own polls and downplaying other available polls that could shed light on what is happening.
> > I guess it is more "all the news WE paid for" than "all the news that fits"
> > Mike O'Neil
> > mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu
> > ----- Original Message ----- 
> > From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu> 
> > To: <aapornet@usc.edu> 
> > Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2000 10:32 PM 
> > Subject: "Dead Heat" Lives On 
> > 
> > Am I confused or is the following quote from CNN an example of 
> > what Bennett, Ravitch, et al. have been saying is the failure of 
> > our schools 
> > to teach arithmetic? 
> > 
> > What's for sure is the immortality of "Dead Heat." (See AAPORN 
> > archives.) 
> > 
> > Albert D. Biderman 
> > 
> > Tracking poll: Gore and Bush remain neck-and-neck 
> > From CNN Polling Director Keating Holland 
> > September 12, 2000 
> > Web posted at: 5:01 p.m. EDT (2101 GMT) 
> > WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George 
> > Bush 
> > remain virtually tied in 
> > the daily CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll as minor party 
> > challengers 
> > Ralph Nader and Pat 
> > Buchanan lag behind with single-digit support. 
> > 
> > Interviews with 732 likely voters, conducted September 9-11, 
> > found 
> > Gore -- the Democratic nominee for 
> > president -- holding a six-point lead over Republican rival 
> > Bush. 
> > Gore 
> > claimed 48 percent of the survey's 
> > likely voters, while Bush had the support of 42 percent. But 
> > with a 
> > margin of error of plus or minus 4 
> > percent, Gore's advantage is statistically insignificant. 
> > 
> > 
> > ———————————————————————————————————
> 
> Date: Fri, 15 Sep 2000 11:01:38 -0500 
> To: aapornet@usc.edu 
> From: Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu> 
> Subject: Re: "Dead Heat" Lives On 
> In-Reply-To: <200009151538.IAA05541@web2.tdl.com> 
> References: <39C23E37.AFDCDEF7@rider.edu> 
> Mime-Version: 1.0
There is a process problem here I think. Of course, if several polls all show a lead at the edge of the margin of error, we can in fact reject the null hypothesis with a confidence far exceeding the "normal" 95%. One problem is that that requires us to treat our own work not as a newsworthy event in itself, but formally making acknowledgment of what others are doing, to which there are many logistical and/or competitive barriers. Another factor is the near universal fear of being wrong. If my final result is such that I could be 94.95% sure that (taking my results by themselves) the candidates are NOT tied, this may give the best of all worlds.

If the candidate who is ahead in my polls, "wins" by a margin less than twice of what is necessary to be "statistically significant", then I will say that I was "within the margin of error" of the true result, so I should be congratulated. If the election comes close to being a "tie", I can always say, "but I told you it was a statistical dead heat". If, God forbid, the candidate I showed as behind actually wins (by less than that same magic margin), I can claim that "I said it was too close to call", so the surprise result vindicates my poll.

None of this is terribly intellectually honest (not to mention accurate), but human nature does after all come into play, especially when some will automatically jump into the fray after elections demanding to know "why were you wrong?".

Don

At 08:41 AM 09/15/2000 -0700, you wrote:
> Television news people are talking heads. Somebody has got to be telling them this is a statistical dead heat. If not, somebody should be telling them it is not.
>
>Date sent: Fri, 15 Sep 2000 11:20:23 -0400
>Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
>From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Re: "Dead Heat" Lives On
>
>G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
>Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
>University of Wisconsin Survey Center
>1800 University Avenue
>Madison WI 53705
>608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

=========================================================================
Senior Statistician II

The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago seeks a senior level statistician or survey methodologist. Responsibilities include (1) design and select samples for large-scale, complex survey-research projects; (2) analyze survey databases and deliver information; (3) develop sampling and analytical sections of proposals; (4) serve as sampling task leader, analysis task leader, and internal consultant in relevant fields of expertise; and (5) conduct research in areas of interest to NORC's clients. Qualifications include a Master's or Ph.D. in field of statistics or social science; 8-10 years experience in positions of increasing responsibility in statistics, survey research methods, or related field, with at least 2 years experience in project management and proposal development; good communication skills; good computer skills; and publication record or other evidence of effectiveness in survey research or similar information-based industry. Please contact Mike Biladeau (biladeau-mike@norcmail.uchicago.edu) or call 773.256.6258.
acknowledgement of what others are doing, to which there are many logistical and/or competitive barriers. Another factor is the near universal fear of being wrong. If my final result is such that I could be 94.95% sure that (taking my results by themselves) the candidates are NOT tied, this may give the best of all worlds. If the candidate who is ahead in my polls, "wins" by a margin less than twice of what is necessary to be "statistically significant", then I will say that I was "within the margin of error" of the true result, so I should be congratulated. If the election comes close to being a "tie", I can always say, "but I told you it was a statistical dead heat". If, God forbid, the candidate I showed as behind actually wins (by less than that same magic margin), I can claim that "I said it was too close to call", so the surprise result vindicates my poll.

None of this is terribly intellectually honest (not to mention accurate), but human nature does after all come into play, especially when some will automatically jump into the fray after elections demanding to know "why were you wrong?".

Don
At 08:41 AM 09/15/2000 -0700, you wrote:
> Television news people are talking heads. Somebody has got to
> be telling them this is a statistical dead heat. If not, somebody
> should be telling them it is not.
> >
> Date sent: Fri, 15 Sep 2000 11:20:23 -0400
> Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
> From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: "Dead Heat" Lives On
>
> G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705
608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

=========================================================================
is also accurate.

If I understand correctly, the "margin of error" reported is the error derived from the theoretical design. It is not the standard error of the particular estimator for each candidate or of the difference between first and second resulting from the actual sample. I know that this error is not necessarily larger, but it can be. Would not be better to use the standard error of the actual estimator instead of the theoretical "margin of error" in these cases. Not only because it is more precise, but also because it can even happen that this error could be smaller than that the other and then one can break the dead heat.

Ulises Beltrán
Survey Research Unit
Office of the President of Mexico
ulisesb@mail.internet.com.mx

Don Ferree wrote:

> There is a process problem here I think. Of course, if several polls all show a lead at the edge of the margin of error, we can in fact reject the null hypothesis with a confidence far exceeding the "normal" 95%. One problem is that that requires us to treat our own work not as a newsworthy event in itself, but formally making acknowledgment of what others are doing, to which there are many logistical and/or competitive barriers. Another factor is the near universal fear of being wrong. If my final result is such that I could be 94.95% sure that (taking my results by themselves) the candidates are NOT tied, this may give the best of all worlds. If the candidate who is ahead in my polls, "wins" by a margin less than twice of what is necessary to be "statistically significant", then I will say that I was "within the margin of error" of the true result, so I should be congratulated. If the election comes close to being a "tie", I can always say, "but I told you it was a statistical dead heat". If, God forbid, the candidate I showed as behind actually wins (by less than that same magic margin), I can claim that "I said it was too close to call", so the surprise result vindicates my poll.

> None of this is terribly intellectually honest (not to mention accurate), but human nature does after all come into play, especially when some will automatically jump into the fray after elections demanding to know "why were you wrong?".

> Don
> At 08:41 AM 09/15/2000 -0700, you wrote:
> > Television news people are talking heads. Somebody has got to be telling them this is a statistical dead heat. If not, somebody should be telling them it is not.
> >
> > Date sent: Fri, 15 Sep 2000 11:20:23 -0400
> > Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
> > From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Re: "Dead Heat" Lives On
PLEASE E-MAIL RoniRosner@aol.com ONLY, NOT AAPORNET, by 19 Sept.

NEW YORK AAPOR presents an All-Day Workshop

Date ...................... Wednesday, 27 September 2000
Continental Breakfast ..... 9:00 a.m.-- 9:30 a.m. Presentation
.......................... 9:30 a.m. -- 4:00 p.m. Buffet Lunch served: ...... 1:00 p.m. -- 2 p.m.

Place ...................... The New York Academy of Medicine/Room 21
1216 Fifth Avenue, entrance on 103rd Street

The Academy, an historic landmark, is across from the Central Park Conservatory Garden, on Museum Mile. We suggest taking the #6 to 96th & Lexington Ave., or any Madison Ave. bus (except #30). Public parking is on Madison @ 105th.

SURVEY RESEARCH 101 --
LEARN THE BASICS FROM THE MASTERS

This all-day workshop, conducted by acknowledged leaders in the field, will take both researchers and non-researchers step-by-step through the survey research process.

am
DEFINING THE ISSUES ................. Harry O'Neill, Vice Chairman
.................................................. Roper Starch
Worldwide

SELECTING THE METHODOLOGY .. Barry Feinberg, Ph.D., Director
.................................................. Custom Research,
Inc./NY

SELECTING THE SAMPLE ................ Warren Mitofsky, President
Mitofsky
International

ASKING QUESTIONS ..................... Janice Ballou, Director
The Eagleton Institute

FIELDING THE SURVEY .............. Mark Schulman, Ph.D., President
Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc.

ANALYZING THE DATA ............... Zvia Naphtali, Ph.D., Data Manager
The NYC Nonprofits Project

REPORTING THE RESULTS .......... Humphrey Taylor, Chairman
The Harris Poll

ATTENDANCE IS BY ADVANCE PHONE RESERVATION ONLY.
E-MAIL RONI ROSNER (RoniRosner@aol.com), or call if you must (212/722-5333).

Return the form below with your cheque by Fri., 22 Sept. Pre-paid fees are below. Fees at the door are: $125 (NYAAPOR members), $155 (non-members), $90 (NYAAPOR student members), $120 (student non-members, HLMs). Sorry, no refund but you can send someone in your place.

I will attend the NYAAPOR all-day workshop on Wed., 27 Sept. 2000 with ______ additional guests.

NAME: ____________________________________
OFFICE PHONE: ________________________________
HOME PHONE: _________________________________
AFFILIATION: __________________________________
GUEST'S NAME: ________________________________
AFFILIATION: __________________________________

PREPAID FEES:
NYAAPOR MEMBERS: $95 ______ NONMEMBERS: $125 _____
NYAAPOR STUDENT MEMBERS: $70 ______
STUDENT NONMEMBERS, HLMs: $85 ______

Send form and cheque payable to NYAAPOR by 22 Sept. to: Roni Rosner, 1235 Park Avenue, #7C, New York, New York 10128-1759

Date: Fri, 15 Sep 2000 18:13:57 -0400
From: "Richman, Alvin" <richman@pd.state.gov>
I believe some of the difficulty in reporting the significance of presidential election campaign poll results stems from confusion about how we are applying the "margin of sampling error." Is it the sampling error around a single proportion (e.g., support for Bush or support for Gore) or around the difference between those two proportions (i.e., the point spread between Gore and Bush). If we're talking about the latter, are there any relatively easy to communicate "rules of thumb" by which to estimate the sampling error for the DIFFERENCE between two proportions from the same sample and question?

Also, many agree that multiple polls taken over a short period of time can more reliably gauge voter preference compared to a single poll. But how much more reliably? For example, between September 7-13, six different pollsters obtained an average preference of 47% for Gore and 41% for Bush in 4-way matchups. While a difference of 6 percentage points might not quite be within the margin of error for a single poll, intuitively we feel that a six-poll average of 6 points (47% Gore vs. 41% Bush) must be real. But again, are there any relatively simple procedures by which we can make and communicate this type of decision?

Alvin Richman
Office of Research
Department of State
(202) 619-5140
richman@pd.state.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Michael O'Neil [mailto:mikeoneil@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2000 2:32 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: "Dead Heat" Lives On

What I find more lacking in these reports is this: while an individual survey with a +/- 4% margin of error and a lead of 6 percent MIGHT be described as a "dead heat" (although it would far more accurately be described as a "probable Gore lead"), when several national polls conducted about the same time show essentially the same results (as I believe they have), the important observation is that Gore has a lead. Most of these organizations seem to subordinate journalistic criteria by promoting their own polls and downplaying other available polls that could shed light on what is happening.
I guess it is more "all the news WE paid for" than "all the news that fits"

Mike O'Neil
mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2000 10:32 PM
Subject: "Dead Heat" Lives On

> Am I confused or is the following quote from CNN an example of what > Bennett, Ravitch, et al. have been saying is the failure of our > schools to teach arithmetic?
> > What's for sure is the immortality of "Dead Heat." (See AAPORN
> archives.)
> > Albert D. Biderman
> > > Tracking poll: Gore and Bush remain neck-and-neck
> > > From CNN Polling Director Keating Holland
> > > September 12, 2000
> > > Web posted at: 5:01 p.m. EDT (2101 GMT)
> > > > WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W.
> > > Bush remain virtually tied in
> > > the daily CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll as minor party
> > > challengers
> > > Ralph Nader and Pat
> > > Buchanan lag behind with single-digit support.
> > > > > Interviews with 732 likely voters, conducted September 9-11, found
> > > Gore -- the Democratic nominee for
> > > president -- holding a six-point lead over Republican rival Bush.
> > > > Gore
> > > claimed 48 percent of the survey's
> > > likely voters, while Bush had the support of 42 percent. But with a
> > > margin of error of plus or minus 4
> > > percent, Gore's advantage is statistically insignificant.
> > > >
> > >
> >
>========================================================================
Date: Fri, 15 Sep 2000 22:00:56 -0400
From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: AP on Internet Research
Dear Colleagues:

The thread on how to calculate the margin of error over several polls and, in particular, what is the margin of error of a "lead" has been of interest. I am in South Africa and have not been following closely but let me add a point or two.

First a reference. The American Statistical Association (ASA) has a series of pamphlets entitled, What is a Survey, that covers some of what has been discussed quite nicely. One of these pamphlets is on the margin of error in polling. It was written by Lynne Stokes and Tom Belin.

In the pamphlet, the authors state that the margin of error of a lead can be approximated by multiplying the usual margin of error by 1.7. Thus in a single poll, with a margin of error of (say) 3%, the margin of error on the lead would be about 5% -- 1.7 times 3%.

For estimating over multiple polls, there is a 1993 article in Chance, another ASA publication, that may be worth reviewing. The article is by Ansulabehere and Belin and develops mathematically and empirically the well-known point that estimates by different
polling organizations cannot be treated as differing only on sampling error.

Different polls certainly can still be averaged and arguably the average will be more stable than the individual polls. Sample size needs to be taken into account but, because of what others have called "house effects" the exact way to average requires some thought.

For those wishing access to the What Is a Survey series, free copies (one to a customer) are available from ASA by going to their website at <amstat.org> or calling 703-684-1221.

Best to all, Fritz

========================================================================= Date: Sat, 16 Sep 2000 01:51:05 -0400 From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu> X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: "Dead Heat" Lives On References: <39BF115F.A660820F@american.edu>
 <001c01c01e15$85127620$733bdd18@phoenix.speedchoice.com> <39C23E37.AFDCDEF7@rider.edu> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Frank Rusciano wrote:

> I find it interesting how the news media swings on these things. It > used to be that when a candidate was ahead by two points, they would > say he or she was ahead, regardless of the margin of error. Now, they > appear to err on the side of extreme caution. Generally, the latter > might be preferable, since they now have a little more knowledge than > before; it would be interesting to see how the public reacts to seeing > someone ahead by six or so, and the commentator saying it's a dead > heat. I'm not sure the public wouldn't be confused.
> > Frank Rusciano

Whether it is more incautious to be misleading by a Type I erroneous statement or a Type II one depends upon the practical significance of a small difference or a departure from a point value. As some other replies to my post suggest, the field of statistics and the English language together offer a good repertoire for expressing an appropriate degree of caution of both kinds.

Election polling is a hazardous occupation because small differences can be extremely important and because there can be many small differences to contend with. The two-party system tends to make elections regress toward 50/50 splits. Popular two-party vote spreads in five of the postwar presidential elections were less than 6 percent. Small differences are also important because the change measures in on-going polling indicate the progress of the campaign.
Forget about "bandwagon" research. Candidates know, for instance: "Show no mo' and they'll sho' be no dough."

Albert Biderman
abider@american.edu

NEWSWEEK POLL: Gore Holds Lead Among Likely Voters, 52- to 38-
Percent

New York, Sept. 16 /PRNewswire/ -- Vice President Al Gore now leads
Republican presidential opponent Texas Gov. George W. Bush by
a 14-point margin (52% to 38%) among likely voters in a four-way race with
Green Party candidate Ralph Nader (3%) and Reform
candidate Pat Buchanan (2%) in the latest Newsweek Poll. Among registered
voters, Gore's lead over Bush is almost as big: 50-38
percent. In the Newsweek Poll one week ago, Gore led Bush by eight-point
margins in both groups: 49- to 41 percent among likely
voters and 47- to 39 percent among registered voters.

Likely voters are identified by past voting history, voting intentions and
other factors. Traditionally high in the ranks of
likely voters are those 50 and over, a group where Gore now leads 53- to 38 percent, and college graduates, who currently favor the vice president over Bush by 48- to 38 percent.

In a two-way race, Gore's lead over Bush expands to 56-to 40 percent among likely voters and 54-to 41 percent among registered voters, the poll shows. One week ago, Gore enjoyed an 8-point margin with likely voters (51% vs. 43%) and a 9-point lead among registered voters (52% vs. 41%).

Even though Bush recently provided more details about his prescription drug plan, Gore still leads Bush by 20 percentage points as the candidate seen best able to help seniors pays for prescription drugs (52% vs. 32%) and to handle health care generally (53% vs. 33%) among registered voters.

For the first time in a Newsweek Poll, marginally more see Gore as having "strong leadership qualities" than Bush: 62 percent vs. 59 percent. In May, Bush had a 71-to 44 percent advantage over Gore in this quality. Gore has a 13-point margin over Bush as seeming intelligent and well-informed: 80 percent vs. 67 percent. Gore also has big leads over Bush on other characteristics: cares about people like you (58% to 44%) and shares your views on most major political issues (52% to 44%), according to the poll which is part of Newsweek's political coverage in the September 25 issue (on newsstands Monday, Sept. 18). Gore also has a marginal lead in being seen as honest and ethical (57% to 53%).

On a separate topic, 69 percent of registered voters polled -- and 77 percent of parents of children aged 5-17 -- say it's very important to limit the violence that children are exposed to on television, in movies, video games and other entertainment media. And 70 percent of all those polled (71% of parents) say it's the parents who are mainly responsible for limiting the amount of violence that children are exposed to in this medium; 11 percent say it's the sellers and distributors of the material who are responsible. Only 7 percent say it should be the creators of that material -- and just 5 percent say it should be the government. Majorities of all those polled (52%) and of parents (59%) have a big problem with advertising for R-rated movies and other entertainment media with violent content. Forty-nine percent of those polled say taking under-age children to R-rated movies is a big problem because children are exposed to inappropriate content; 27 percent say it's not a problem because parents are a pretty good judge of which R-rated movies are OK for their kids to see.

For this Newsweek Poll, Princeton Survey Research Associates interviewed by telephone a national sample of 853 registered voters, of which 580 were likely voters, on September 14-15, 2000. The margin of error for registered voters is plus or minus 4 percentage points. The margin of error for the likely voters sample is plus or minus 5 percentage points.
AS ELECTORAL VOTE TAKES SHAPE, CAMPAIGNS FOCUS ON PERCEPTIONS

By ADAM CLYMER

WASHINGTON, Sept. 16 -- Vice President Al Gore, who has erased Gov. George W. Bush's lead in most national polls, has also edged ahead of him in the battle for electoral votes, according to independent and partisan analysts. But despite the postconvention trend in Mr. Gore's favor, enough states are either tossups or held so narrowly that the race remains fiercely competitive.

The overall picture is almost a mirror image of how things looked before the Republican National Convention, when Mr. Bush held a slim but decided lead in the Electoral College.

But major states that had leaned Mr. Bush's way, like Florida, Michigan, Missouri and Wisconsin,
have since become tossups, according to strategists in both campaigns, as well as postconvention polls and political scientists interviewed around the country. Similarly, earlier tossup states like Minnesota, New Jersey and Pennsylvania are now leaning toward Mr. Gore.

Both sides are fighting hard in the battleground states. This week, for example, the Bush campaign and the Republican National Committee were buying television time costing $995,000 in Pennsylvania, $719,000 in Michigan and $665,000 in Ohio. Television spending by the Gore campaign and the Democratic National Committee was $763,000 in Pennsylvania, $632,000 in Michigan and $745,000 in Ohio.

Although the campaigns did not disagree sharply about how most states stood, they offered very different interpretations of what the current standings meant. Matthew Dowd, the Bush campaign's internal pollster, said: "This race is right now nationally within one or two points. Electorally, we both are starting out with about the same amount of states in our safe column. Then there are 10 or 12 states that are sort of up for grabs, even, or us up a little in some, or them up in some."

Tad Devine, a Gore strategist, argued that the trend in Mr. Gore's favor was continuing. "Gore's advantage in critical battlegrounds has grown enormously and is continuing to grow," he said. "I think it's a different world coming out of the convention. The race is much more settled. Voters have a much more serious take on the race." But, he conceded, "It's a long way from Election Day."

Before the conventions, it was the Bush campaign claiming a lead and the Gore campaign maintaining that there was essentially a dead heat in the contest for the 270 electoral votes that make a majority of the 538 to be cast.

For now, the vice president appears safe in 10 states, with 142 electoral votes, including California, New York and now Connecticut. Eight others, with 97 electoral votes, are leaning his way, with such additions as Washington and Iowa.

If all those states stayed in Mr. Gore's column, he would have 239 electoral votes, and to win he would need to find 31 others from 10 tossup states with 98 electoral votes.

Governor Bush holds commanding leads in 17 states, but only 3 of them, Indiana, Texas and
Virginia, have more than 10 electoral votes. The 17 have a total of 132 votes. Six more states, with 69 electoral votes, lean his way, though the margins in some, like Ohio and Colorado, have slipped.

If Mr. Bush held those 23 states, he would have 201 electoral votes. So to win, he would need 69 of the 98 votes from those 10 tossup states.

The financial advantage held by the Republican National Committee over its Democratic counterpart could help him win the tossup states. In some of those states, even ones Democrats think they can win, Democrats are not yet advertising on television. And while the Republican margins are narrow in many states, in some others they are huge. For example, this week's Florida spending showed $1,026,000 backing Mr. Bush and $330,000 on Mr. Gore's side.

But even as the campaigns put differing emphases on different states as they seek 270 electoral votes, their fortunes in the states are hardly independent of the national trends that have favored Mr. Gore in recent weeks. These include his growing strength in how voters perceive his personal qualities and a deepening advantage over his signature health care issues.

John Petrocik, chairman of the political science department at the University of Missouri in Columbia, said he thought Mr. Bush's lead in Missouri had declined because "a large component of how you are doing in every given state is how you're doing nationally."

"What determines whether he carries Missouri does not just happen in Missouri," Mr. Petrocik said.

One national hazard for the Republicans is the recent, and perhaps exaggerated, sense that Mr. Bush is in trouble. When Republican strategists say of the Bush campaign, as one did this week, "They have to almost draw a royal straight flush to win ^x almost," then followers may get discouraged, too.

Ed Sarpolus, a Michigan pollster, said one reason for Mr. Bush's decline in that state, and elsewhere in the Midwest, was a growing number of Republicans' "losing confidence in George Bush."

In The Detroit Free Press today, a poll he conducted reported a Gore lead of 45 percent to 37 percent for Mr. Bush. Another factor in Mr. Gore's gains in Michigan has been a sharp drop in
support for Ralph Nader of the Green Party.

But in several important states, Republicans were optimistic that a new emphasis on voter turnout would pull them through. Al Cardenas, chairman of the Florida Republican Party, said his state was a tossup. "I didn't feel that way a few months ago," Mr. Cardenas said. And though he said the state could go either way, he argued that the Republicans' advantage lay in "a much better ground operation, a much more comprehensive ground attack in terms of our phone banks and absentee ballots."

In Wisconsin, Rod Hise, executive director of the State Republican Party, insisted that party members "haven't been as excited, enthusiastic and energetic as they are about this one for a very long time."

"The opportunity that Republicans in Wisconsin have to contribute to a Bush victory in November has really electrified the grass roots of our party here," Mr. Hise said. "The foot soldiers are ready for battle. That is a dynamic that has not always been the case."

But if Mr. Hise was encouraged, so was Senator Russell D. Feingold, Democrat of Wisconsin. Mr. Feingold said, "This surge since the convention has really got me far more optimistic."

"We've made up enormous ground," he said. Agreeing with Mr. Hise that the race was even in Wisconsin, Mr. Feingold argued that Mr. Gore had come through much better as a person, and was helped by health care issues and his emphasis on Social Security over tax cuts ^× positions "clearly in tune with most Wisconsinites."

Two battleground states that appear to have shifted sharply are New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Although Chuck Haytaian, the Republican state chairman in New Jersey, predicted a narrow Bush victory "by 25,000 votes," an independent pollster, Cliff Zukin of Rutgers University, said he thought the state was leaning strongly to Mr. Gore.

Mr. Zukin, director of the Star-Ledger Eagleton Rutgers poll, said that at the Democratic National Convention and later, Mr. Gore "was sounding populist themes which resonate well in New Jersey."

Though much attention in the presidential race has been paid to the battles for large
electoral-jackpot states like Florida and Michigan, the candidates have not ignored the rest of the country. Following are examinations of the status of the campaign in several states where the race is considered close.

Close Calls in Oregon
And Washington

Though voters in Oregon and Washington State rejected Mr. Bush's father in both 1988 and 1992 and gave President Clinton a wide margin of victory four years ago, the Texas governor has repeatedly said he expects the Pacific Northwest to be highly competitive.

The latest polls agree, showing Mr. Bush barely behind Mr. Gore in Washington and essentially even with him in Oregon.

Mr. Bush has made repeated visits to the Northwest, most recently last week, in which he criticized Mr. Gore's environmental record but also reiterated his staunch opposition to proposals to help salmon runs by breaching dams in eastern Washington. Such proposals are favored by many environmentalists but are anathema in many communities in the affected region.

Mr. Bush could be helped by a variety of factors, one of which is the strong popularity in some Northwestern cities of Mr. Nader, who drew 10,000 people to a rally in Portland, Ore., recently and who, most analysts say, draws many more left-leaning voters from Mr. Gore than he does from Mr. Bush.

In Washington State, Mr. Bush could be helped by a strong turnout for Mr. Nader, by his stand on dams that could energize a vote in parts of eastern Washington, and perhaps even by lingering resentment in the home state of Microsoft to the federal government's antitrust case against the software giant.

A poll of 500 Washington voters taken for KING-TV in Seattle last week indicated that Mr. Gore was at 45 percent, Mr. Bush at 41 percent, Mr. Nader at 5 percent and Patrick J. Buchanan of the Reform Party at 1 percent, with the rest undecided. The survey had a margin of sampling error of 4 percentage points.

A separate Washington State survey by Moore Information of Portland, which has polled for
many Republican candidates in the region, found Mr. Gore at 44 percent, Mr. Bush at 43 percent and Mr. Nader at 4 percent.

That poll also was of 500 voters, with a margin of sampling error of 4 percentage points. But a Democratic pollster, Mark Mellman, conducting a regular tracking survey of 200 voters for an upcoming United States Senate primary, found Mr. Gore in the lead by roughly 10 points.

In Oregon, a poll taken this week for The Oregonian and KATU-TV showed Mr. Nader at 8 percent, leaving Mr. Gore with 42 percent, virtually tied with Mr. Bush at 41 percent. About 8 percent of those surveyed were undecided, and the support for Mr. Buchanan was negligible.

-- SAM HOWE VERHOVEK

Gun Plan Shows Bush Isn't Solid in Colorado

One of the early signs that Colorado's eight electoral votes may no longer be a sure bet for Mr. Bush is a ballot initiative to require background checks of those buying guns at weekend shows.

Sponsors collected more than 85,000 signatures supporting the measure, which Republicans have historically opposed as more gun control, and it is expected to win overwhelmingly in November.

Democrat pollsters have also begun to see enough growing support for Democratic candidates for the State Senate, which Republicans have controlled for 40 years, that Democratic leaders say they believe they can overcome the current five-seat margin.

Then, said the Democrats' state party chairman, Tim Knaus, Mr. Gore's message on growth, environment, education and the economy began to catch on, and all of a sudden the presidential race in the state appears to be a dead heat.

The latest statewide poll, conducted this month for The Rocky Mountain News and KCNC, the CBS affiliate in Denver, found that Mr. Gore had closed the advantage Mr. Bush held in July, 45 percent to 31 percent, to a virtual tie of 43 to 40, with Mr. Gore inside the margin of error of 4 percentage points.

"That was huge news," Mr. Knaus said. "I was
actually taken aback by how much momentum there was. I had been hoping we were within 10 points."

Gov. Bill Owens, who is serving as Mr. Bush's state campaign chairman, said he did not believe the poll and pointed to another, conducted by a firm that he and other Colorado Republicans use, that showed Mr. Bush with a lead "above 10 points."

Yet, he conceded: "The race has obviously narrowed, and Governor Bush has had some difficult weeks. But campaigns run in cycles and after a tough month that left us essentially even, we have a nice base to go back up."

Colorado has recently shown an independent streak in presidential elections, supporting Bill Clinton over President Bush in 1992 by 4 percentage points and Bob Dole over Mr. Clinton four years later by 2 points in a race in which third-party candidates won 10 percent of the vote.

But as one measure of the apparent shift back, the Democrats are investing more capital in Colorado, with Mr. Gore's running mate, Senator Joseph I. Lieberman of Connecticut, visiting today, to be followed by Mr. Gore's daughter Kristen next week. And talks are under way to bring in Mr. Gore.

Mr. Owens said he welcomed the visits. "I'm confident enough Coloradans will support Governor Bush," he said. "So every dollar they spend here takes it out of states they have a better chance of winning."

-- MICHAEL JANOFSKY

Stiff Fight to Sway New Mexico Voters

New Mexico has been a reliable national bellwether in presidential politics. In every presidential race except one since it became a state in 1912, New Mexico has supported the winner, often close to the margin as the nation as a whole. The lone exception came in 1976 when the state backed Gerald R. Ford.

This may help explain why both Mr. Gore and Mr. Bush already have both visited this state with only five electoral votes and likely will come again before Election Day.

This weekend, The Albuquerque Journal is
scheduled to release a poll that declares the race a statistical tie. The poll of 553 likely and registered voters gave Mr. Bush 43 percent and Mr. Gore 42 percent, with 11 percent remaining undecided. The poll, conducted by Research and Polling Inc., was taken from Sept. 7-13. Neither Mr. Bush nor Mr. Gore has an apparent reason for claiming momentum; a March poll found the two candidates tied.

Mr. Bush has courted Hispanic voters aggressively, and New Mexico would seem fertile ground for this appeal, since Hispanic residents make up about 41 percent of the state's population. But The Journal poll shows Mr. Gore with a lead among Hispanics, 57 percent to 25 percent.

"The Hispanic vote is critical for any Democratic presidential candidate to win here, and by a good margin, too," said F. Chris Garcia, a University of New Mexico political science professor, who noted that a strong Hispanic showing carried Mr. Clinton to victory in 1992 and 1996.

Mr. Garcia cited issues such as health care, education and Social Security as those important to voters but noted that no single issue seemingly stands out. There are about 918,000 registered voters (out of a state population of 1.7 million), with about 54 percent as Democrats, 33 percent as Republicans and the rest affiliated with other parties. Still, Mr. Garcia said the state was slowly becoming more conservative.

--- JIM YARDLEY

By All Standards

It's Close in Missouri

In the world of politics, Missouri is a curious hybrid.

It has two major cities: Kansas City with a Western flavor, St. Louis with an Eastern edge. It has large rural areas that resemble the Deep South. And it has fast-growing suburbs.

Missouri, with a Democratic governor and two Republican senators, tends to seesaw in presidential contests. In all but one election since 1900, the state has voted for the winning presidential candidate. (The exception was 1956, when Missouri went for Adlai Stevenson over Dwight D. Eisenhower.)
"I don't know whether to say we're a bipartisan state or simply ambivalent," said James W. Davis, a political science professor at Washington University in St. Louis.

But even by these standards, this contest for Missouri's 11 electoral votes is looking like a very close call, polls suggest.

One poll, taken by Zogby International and published on Sept. 10 in The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, showed Mr. Gore with a slight lead 45 percent to Mr. Bush's 40 percent. But with a margin of sampling error of 4 percentage points, that lead is decisively soft.

"Bush, I think, isn't regarded worse than he was," Professor Davis said. "He hasn't come down so much as Gore has come up."

In the poll, Mr. Gore's strongest support was in St. Louis. Outside the cities, he and Mr. Bush were statistically tied.

The candidates or their running mates have been visiting Missouri almost once a week.

The issues on the minds of Missourians are not too different from those preoccupying other voters. Education, health care and Social Security are most important, with farmers worried about agricultural policy.

John Hancock, the executive director of the State Republican Party, said he was optimistic, partly because much of Missouri is still quite rural, and Democrats have trouble in rural states, he said.

Roy Temple, executive director of the Missouri Democratic Party, said the suburbs were the real battleground. Mr. Gore is "aggressively campaigning here and I think that's making a difference," he said.

Politics is certainly on the brain in Missouri this year. There is a tight Senate race between the Republican incumbent, John Ashcroft, and Gov. Mel Carnahan. There are contests for governor, two Congressional seats and four other state offices.

And with the presidential race, "as neck and neck as it is," Mr. Davis said, "everyone might think that their vote might make a difference."

-- PAM BELLUCK
Georgia Could Be Big Test for Bush

Georgia has not spent much time this year on anyone's list of hotly competitive states, but its unusual demographics could make it an important testing ground for Mr. Bush's ability to hold on to his base. Though Mr. Bush is still ahead here, his lead is narrow, and political professionals say there is no better place to gauge his national strength in the weeks ahead.

"If Georgia turns out to be close, that means Gore will win nationally," said Bobby Kahn, chief of staff for Gov. Roy E. Barnes and a leading Democratic strategist in the state.

The state has always been comfortable with centrist Democrats like Mr. Barnes and Senator Max Cleland, but like the rest of the South, it remains suspicious of Democratic presidential tickets. While Georgia did vote for Bill Clinton in 1992, that was mostly because Ross Perot drew support away from George Bush; four years later, Mr. Clinton drew more votes than in 1992, but was narrowly beaten by Bob Dole for the state's 13 electoral votes.

This teetering political balance is sustained by three distinct voting groups: African-Americans in Atlanta and a few smaller cities, who vote Democratic; suburbanites, many of them newcomers, in the growing rings around Atlanta, who tend to be Republican but will support centrist Democrats, and rural voters, who are less tied to party affiliations.

Black voters in Georgia tend to be better organized than in other Southern states, and their turnout, along with that of white suburban women, will be the key to the outcome, pollsters say. Two polls taken for each of the major parties since the convention showed Mr. Bush with leads of 6 and 7 percentage points, but both were fairly conservative with their estimates of black turnout. Both parties acknowledge that if black turnout is higher than it was for Mr. Barnes's election in 1998, the race will be much closer.

As a result, the Democrats will be concentrating on getting out black voters, hoping that the former Democratic Gov. Zell Miller's popular Senate candidacy will bring along suburbanites. Mr. Bush has already begun running television advertisements in the state's largest markets,
unlike Mr. Gore; but both sides are expected to spend a considerable amount of money and time in the state beginning next month.

-- DAVID FIRESTONE

Poll Finds Dead Heat
In New Hampshire

New Hampshire could fall either way. Mr. Bush had been leading slightly in recent months, but the latest poll by the University of New Hampshire Survey Center has Mr. Bush and Mr. Gore tied at 42 percent. About 10 percent said they preferred other candidates and 6 percent remained undecided.

Historically, the state had been a good bet for Republican presidential candidates, until Mr. Clinton was victorious here twice. The governor, Jeanne Shaheen, is a Democrat in her second term, and made Mr. Gore's short list of possible running mates. Still, 37 percent of registered voters are Republicans, compared with 27 percent who are Democrats.

Mr. Bush probably has uncomfortable memories of New Hampshire because of his stinging loss to Senator John McCain in the primary in February, but polls indicate he has won back most of those Republican votes. The polls show that each candidate can count on about three-quarters of his party's registered voters and will need to secure the rest, as well as win over a substantial number of independents, to prevail. New Hampshire residents like to vote, usually insuring a good turnout.

In the last few weeks, each candidate made his first campaign visit to New Hampshire since the primaries, and both made appearances at public schools. Voters in the state are particularly concerned with the local issue of education financing, as was made clear by the contentious debates that led up to Tuesday's statewide primaries. Taxes are, as always here, a biting concern.

New Hampshire is by far Bush's best chance of a victory in New England, and in recent weeks he has been running more ads here than his competition.

-- JULIE FLAHERTY

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company
I regret to inform you that Steve Manners, an AAPOR member at the University of Pittsburgh, passed away Friday September 15th of a heart attack. Steve was a friend of mine and I know we will all miss him terribly. Our thoughts go out to his wife Bunny and his family during this difficult time.

AAPOR Colleagues--

We currently have a federal client who is very unhappy about a response rate we are achieving on a study, and I was wondering if anyone out there could give me some advice.

The study is to be administered monthly, within a one week time period, to a national random sample of persons aged 16 and over. The sample is identified using random digit dialing and next birthday method to select the eligible household member. Of course, juveniles have to have parental consent before we interview them. We are obligated to deliver 1,000 completed interviews each month within that seven day period. Interviews average about 20 minutes.

Our big problem is response rate. Our usual response rates are usually much higher, but we have time to "work" the respondents. Our response rate for numbers screened eligible or not yet determined whether eligible or not is as follows:

20% Complete
48% Refuse
5% Language (English only)
18% Selected respondent not eligible within 7 day period
10% Household status of number not determined

My two questions are:

1) Is this an unreasonable response rate given the rapid turnaround? Is the refusal rate unreasonable for cold calling and lack of time to do any type of refusal conversion or working the "not availables"? What type of response rates do others get in similar situations?

2) Does anyone have any suggestions on what we can do to improve performance?

Responses/Suggestions/References would be greatly appreciated.

Joan Cwi
Battelle
cwijs@battelle.org
410.372.2703

---

Date: Tue, 19 Sep 2000 16:59:47 -0400
From: "Faggin & Batista" <leleba@usp.br>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: web surveys
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 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

I am trying to use Perseus for the Web 3.0 and am experiencing problems setting up the database. The program worked well for formatting and distributing the questionnaires, but despite the help given by the people at Perseus it was impossible to make the program open any database or create a new one. I follow all the steps suggested by the helpers at Perseus but nothing seems to work. Does anyone had the same problem with this soft? Does anyone know what can I do? TIA.

Leandro Batista
University of São Paulo, Brazil

---

Date: Tue, 19 Sep 2000 19:24:22 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <20000919192422.TAA26566@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu>
I am very pleased to announce that AAPOR member, Dr. Gerald (Jerry) Kosicki, has agreed to serve as Interim Faculty Director of the Ohio State U. Center for Survey Research for 2000/2001. Jerry completed his PhD work at University of Wisconsin-Madison in the 1980s and has been a professor at Ohio State University since 1987. He is a former journalist and newspaper editor, and is the author of many articles and chapters on political communication, media effects, and the relationship between communication and public opinion. He has taught primarily graduate and undergraduate social science and survey research methods.

For the past two years, Jerry has been the co-principal investigator of the Buckeye State Poll, which is the monthly RDD survey of Ohioans that our Center conducts in partnership with the Columbus Dispatch, WBNS-TV, and the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. In taking on the faculty leadership of the Center, Jerry has also agreed to serve as the Principal Investigator for the Buckeye State Poll starting in October, after I finish my last month at OSU.

It is my opinion that Jerry is the ideal person at Ohio State to simultaneously take on these two roles at the Center in this transitional year, and the Center is very fortunate that he has agreed to serve in these capacities.

I am also very pleased to announce that AAPOR member, Dr. Erik R. Stewart, has been promoted to the new position of Director of Operations at the Center. Erik joined the center's leadership team in March, 1997, as Assistant Director of Operations. Since then he also has held an appointment as adjunct Assistant Professor of Human Development and Family Science in the College of Human Ecology. Prior to his employment at OSU, Erik worked clinically, administratively and in research capacities in Ohio's Mental Health, Alcohol and Drug Addiction system since the early 1980's. Immediately prior to assuming his position with the Center in 1997, he spent five years serving as the Director of Planning and Evaluation for a multi-county public service board in Ohio. He received his doctorate in the early 1990s in Family Relations and Human Development at Ohio State.

Jerry, Erik and our Associate Faculty Director, Prof. Elizabeth A. Stasny (of OSU's Statistics Dept.), will be working together as the leadership team to help the Center continue to grow in this, its fifth year of existence. I am confident that they will be very successful in their efforts.
The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) is looking for references and experts on panel survey sampling, questionnaire design, and analysis, especially in the area of employee attitudes, intentions, and behaviors such as turnover. DMDC is looking both for experts to work in a consulting and advisory role, and for permanent employees. Please send statements of interest and recommendations to the address listed below. If you know of recent or ongoing work in these areas, please send that information as well to the address listed below.

Traditional large-scale personnel surveys in the Department of Defense (DoD) have used paper surveys mailed to individuals. These surveys are large to be cost-effective and have had to remain in the field for 3-6 months to allow a highly mobile employee population to be found and have time to respond. While not all employees (military and civilian) have had access to the Internet, the Internet offers potential as a way to stay connected to a panel recruited through traditional postal contacts. Turnover in the population also has to be considered with about 16% of the military force replaced each year. DMDC wants to consider methodological issues in designing a prototype Internet panel survey to track employees' attitudes, intentions, and behaviors.

DMDC is the most comprehensive repository of personnel, manpower, training, and financial data in DoD. DMDC surveys are conducted in support of DoD management of a large and diverse employee population. Survey data are used for program evaluation purposes and to understand better the effects of policies and programs on various DoD populations, e.g., military members, spouses of military members, civilian employees, and retirees. Survey topics in the last five years have included compensation, sexual harassment, job satisfaction, racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination, financial (banking) services, schools, career decisions, retention/separation, family benefits, family support, and other quality of life issues. DMDC works with internal DoD clients to design, plan, and analyze surveys. Some design and analysis work is contracted out and monitored by DMDC project officers. For further information on DMDC surveys please see http://www.dmdc.osd.mil/surveys/index.html
AS ELECTORAL VOTE TAKES SHAPE,
CAMPAIGNS FOCUS ON PERCEPTIONS

By ADAM CLYMER

WASHINGTON, Sept. 16 -- Vice President Al Gore, who has erased Gov. George W. Bush's lead in most national polls, has also edged ahead of him in
the battle for electoral votes, according to independent and partisan analysts. But despite the postconvention trend in Mr. Gore's favor, enough states are either tossups or held so narrowly that the race remains fiercely competitive.

The overall picture is almost a mirror image of how things looked before the Republican National Convention, when Mr. Bush held a slim but decided lead in the Electoral College.

But major states that had leaned Mr. Bush's way, like Florida, Michigan, Missouri and Wisconsin, have since become tossups, according to strategists in both campaigns, as well as postconvention polls and political scientists interviewed around the country. Similarly, earlier tossup states like Minnesota, New Jersey and Pennsylvania are now leaning toward Mr. Gore.

Both sides are fighting hard in the battleground states. This week, for example, the Bush campaign and the Republican National Committee were buying television time costing $995,000 in Pennsylvania, $719,000 in Michigan and $665,000 in Ohio. Television spending by the Gore campaign and the Democratic National Committee was $763,000 in Pennsylvania, $632,000 in Michigan and $745,000 in Ohio.

Although the campaigns did not disagree sharply about how most states stood, they offered very different interpretations of what the current standings meant. Matthew Dowd, the Bush campaign's internal pollster, said: "This race is right now nationally within one or two points. Electorally, we both are starting out with about the same amount of states in our safe column. Then there are 10 or 12 states that are sort of up for grabs, even, or us up a little in some, or them up in some."

Tad Devine, a Gore strategist, argued that the trend in Mr. Gore's favor was continuing. "Gore's advantage in critical battlegrounds has grown enormously and is continuing to grow," he said. "I think it's a different world coming out of the convention. The race is much more settled. Voters have a much more serious take on the race." But, he conceded, "It's a long way from Election Day."

Before the conventions, it was the Bush campaign claiming a lead and the Gore campaign maintaining that there was essentially a dead heat in the contest for the 270 electoral votes that make a majority of the 538 to be cast.
For now, the vice president appears safe in 10 states, with 142 electoral votes, including California, New York and now Connecticut. Eight others, with 97 electoral votes, are leaning his way, with such additions as Washington and Iowa.

If all those states stayed in Mr. Gore's column, he would have 239 electoral votes, and to win he would need to find 31 others from 10 tossup states with 98 electoral votes.

Governor Bush holds commanding leads in 17 states, but only 3 of them, Indiana, Texas and Virginia, have more than 10 electoral votes. The 17 have a total of 132 votes. Six more states, with 69 electoral votes, lean his way, though the margins in some, like Ohio and Colorado, have slipped.

If Mr. Bush held those 23 states, he would have 201 electoral votes. So to win, he would need 69 of the 98 votes from those 10 tossup states.

The financial advantage held by the Republican National Committee over its Democratic counterpart could help him win the tossup states. In some of those states, even ones Democrats think they can win, Democrats are not yet advertising on television. And while the Republican margins are narrow in many states, in some others they are huge. For example, this week's Florida spending showed $1,026,000 backing Mr. Bush and $330,000 on Mr. Gore's side.

But even as the campaigns put differing emphases on different states as they seek 270 electoral votes, their fortunes in the states are hardly independent of the national trends that have favored Mr. Gore in recent weeks. These include his growing strength in how voters perceive his personal qualities and a deepening advantage over his signature health care issues.

John Petrocik, chairman of the political science department at the University of Missouri in Columbia, said he thought Mr. Bush's lead in Missouri had declined because "a large component of how you are doing in every given state is how you're doing nationally."

"What determines whether he carries Missouri does not just happen in Missouri," Mr. Petrocik said.

One national hazard for the Republicans is the recent, and perhaps exaggerated, sense that Mr. Bush is in trouble. When Republican strategists
say of the Bush campaign, as one did this week, "They have to almost draw a royal straight flush to win ^× almost," then followers may get discouraged, too.

Ed Sarpolus, a Michigan pollster, said one reason for Mr. Bush's decline in that state, and elsewhere in the Midwest, was a growing number of Republicans' "losing confidence in George Bush."

In The Detroit Free Press today, a poll he conducted reported a Gore lead of 45 percent to 37 percent for Mr. Bush. Another factor in Mr. Gore's gains in Michigan has been a sharp drop in support for Ralph Nader of the Green Party.

But in several important states, Republicans were optimistic that a new emphasis on voter turnout would pull them through. Al Cardenas, chairman of the Florida Republican Party, said his state was a tossup. "I didn't feel that way a few months ago," Mr. Cardenas said. And though he said the state could go either way, he argued that the Republicans' advantage lay in "a much better ground operation, a much more comprehensive ground attack in terms of our phone banks and absentee ballots."

In Wisconsin, Rod Hise, executive director of the State Republican Party, insisted that party members "haven't been as excited, enthusiastic and energetic as they are about this one for a very long time."

"The opportunity that Republicans in Wisconsin have to contribute to a Bush victory in November has really electrified the grass roots of our party here," Mr. Hise said. "The foot soldiers are ready for battle. That is a dynamic that has not always been the case."

But if Mr. Hise was encouraged, so was Senator Russell D. Feingold, Democrat of Wisconsin. Mr. Feingold said, "This surge since the convention has really got me far more optimistic."

"We've made up enormous ground," he said. Agreeing with Mr. Hise that the race was even in Wisconsin, Mr. Feingold argued that Mr. Gore had come through much better as a person, and was helped by health care issues and his emphasis on Social Security over tax cuts. "x positions "clearly in tune with most Wisconsinites."

Two battleground states that appear to have shifted sharply are New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Although Chuck Haytaian, the Republican state
chairman in New Jersey, predicted a narrow Bush victory "by 25,000 votes," an independent pollster, Cliff Zukin of Rutgers University, said he thought the state was leaning strongly to Mr. Gore.

Mr. Zukin, director of the Star-Ledger Eagleton Rutgers poll, said that at the Democratic National Convention and later, Mr. Gore "was sounding populist themes which resonate well in New Jersey."

Though much attention in the presidential race has been paid to the battles for large electoral-jackpot states like Florida and Michigan, the candidates have not ignored the rest of the country. Following are examinations of the status of the campaign in several states where the race is considered close.

Close Calls in Oregon
And Washington

Though voters in Oregon and Washington State rejected Mr. Bush's father in both 1988 and 1992 and gave President Clinton a wide margin of victory four years ago, the Texas governor has repeatedly said he expects the Pacific Northwest to be highly competitive.

The latest polls agree, showing Mr. Bush barely behind Mr. Gore in Washington and essentially even with him in Oregon.

Mr. Bush has made repeated visits to the Northwest, most recently last week, in which he criticized Mr. Gore's environmental record but also reiterated his staunch opposition to proposals to help salmon runs by breaching dams in eastern Washington. Such proposals are favored by many environmentalists but are anathema in many communities in the affected region.

Mr. Bush could be helped by a variety of factors, one of which is the strong popularity in some Northwestern cities of Mr. Nader, who drew 10,000 people to a rally in Portland, Ore., recently and who, most analysts say, draws many more left-leaning voters from Mr. Gore than he does from Mr. Bush.

In Washington State, Mr. Bush could be helped by a strong turnout for Mr. Nader, by his stand on dams that could energize a vote in parts of eastern Washington, and perhaps even by lingering
resentment in the home state of Microsoft to the federal government's antitrust case against the software giant.

A poll of 500 Washington voters taken for KING-TV in Seattle last week indicated that Mr. Gore was at 45 percent, Mr. Bush at 41 percent, Mr. Nader at 5 percent and Patrick J. Buchanan of the Reform Party at 1 percent, with the rest undecided. The survey had a margin of sampling error of 4 percentage points.

A separate Washington State survey by Moore Information of Portland, which has polled for many Republican candidates in the region, found Mr. Gore at 44 percent, Mr. Bush at 43 percent and Mr. Nader at 4 percent.

That poll also was of 500 voters, with a margin of sampling error of 4 percentage points. But a Democratic pollster, Mark Mellman, conducting a regular tracking survey of 200 voters for an upcoming United States Senate primary, found Mr. Gore in the lead by roughly 10 points.

In Oregon, a poll taken this week for The Oregonian and KATU-TV showed Mr. Nader at 8 percent, leaving Mr. Gore with 42 percent, virtually tied with Mr. Bush at 41 percent. About 8 percent of those surveyed were undecided, and the support for Mr. Buchanan was negligible.

-- SAM HOWE VERHOVEK

Gun Plan Shows Bush Isn't Solid in Colorado

One of the early signs that Colorado's eight electoral votes may no longer be a sure bet for Mr. Bush is a ballot initiative to require background checks of those buying guns at weekend shows.

Sponsors collected more than 85,000 signatures supporting the measure, which Republicans have historically opposed as more gun control, and it is expected to win overwhelmingly in November.

Democrat pollsters have also begun to see enough growing support for Democratic candidates for the State Senate, which Republicans have controlled for 40 years, that Democratic leaders say they believe they can overcome the current five-seat margin.

Then, said the Democrats' state party chairman,
Tim Knaus, Mr. Gore's message on growth, environment, education and the economy began to catch on, and all of a sudden the presidential race in the state appears to be a dead heat.

The latest statewide poll, conducted this month for The Rocky Mountain News and KCNC, the CBS affiliate in Denver, found that Mr. Gore had closed the advantage Mr. Bush held in July, 45 percent to 31 percent, to a virtual tie of 43 to 40, with Mr. Gore inside the margin of error of 4 percentage points.

"That was huge news," Mr. Knaus said. "I was actually taken aback by how much momentum there was. I had been hoping we were within 10 points."

Gov. Bill Owens, who is serving as Mr. Bush's state campaign chairman, said he did not believe the poll and pointed to another, conducted by a firm that he and other Colorado Republicans use, that showed Mr. Bush with a lead "above 10 points."

Yet, he conceded: "The race has obviously narrowed, and Governor Bush has had some difficult weeks. But campaigns run in cycles and after a tough month that left us essentially even, we have a nice base to go back up."

Colorado has recently shown an independent streak in presidential elections, supporting Bill Clinton over President Bush in 1992 by 4 percentage points and Bob Dole over Mr. Clinton four years later by 2 points in a race in which third-party candidates won 10 percent of the vote.

But as one measure of the apparent shift back, the Democrats are investing more capital in Colorado, with Mr. Gore's running mate, Senator Joseph I. Lieberman of Connecticut, visiting today, to be followed by Mr. Gore's daughter Kristen next week. And talks are under way to bring in Mr. Gore.

Mr. Owens said he welcomed the visits. "I'm confident enough Coloradans will support Governor Bush," he said. "So every dollar they spend here takes it out of states they have a better chance of winning."

-- MICHAEL JANOFSKY

Stiff Fight to Sway
New Mexico Voters
New Mexico has been a reliable national bellwether in presidential politics. In every presidential race except one since it became a state in 1912, New Mexico has supported the winner, often close to the margin as the nation as a whole. The lone exception came in 1976 when the state backed Gerald R. Ford.

This may help explain why both Mr. Gore and Mr. Bush already have both visited this state with only five electoral votes and likely will come again before Election Day.

This weekend, The Albuquerque Journal is scheduled to release a poll that declares the race a statistical tie. The poll of 553 likely and registered voters gave Mr. Bush 43 percent and Mr. Gore 42 percent, with 11 percent remaining undecided. The poll, conducted by Research and Polling Inc., was taken from Sept. 7-13. Neither Mr. Bush nor Mr. Gore has an apparent reason for claiming momentum; a March poll found the two candidates tied.

Mr. Bush has courted Hispanic voters aggressively, and New Mexico would seem fertile ground for this appeal, since Hispanic residents make up about 41 percent of the state's population. But The Journal poll shows Mr. Gore with a lead among Hispanics, 57 percent to 25 percent.

"The Hispanic vote is critical for any Democratic presidential candidate to win here, and by a good margin, too," said F. Chris Garcia, a University of New Mexico political science professor, who noted that a strong Hispanic showing carried Mr. Clinton to victory in 1992 and 1996.

Mr. Garcia cited issues such as health care, education and Social Security as those important to voters but noted that no single issue seemingly stands out. There are about 918,000 registered voters (out of a state population of 1.7 million), with about 54 percent as Democrats, 33 percent as Republicans and the rest affiliated with other parties. Still, Mr. Garcia said the state was slowly becoming more conservative.

-- JIM YARDLEY

By All Standards
It's Close in Missouri

In the world of politics, Missouri is a curious hybrid.
It has two major cities: Kansas City with a Western flavor, St. Louis with an Eastern edge. It has large rural areas that resemble the Deep South. And it has fast-growing suburbs.

Missouri, with a Democratic governor and two Republican senators, tends to seesaw in presidential contests. In all but one election since 1900, the state has voted for the winning presidential candidate. (The exception was 1956, when Missouri went for Adlai Stevenson over Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

"I don't know whether to say we're a bipartisan state or simply ambivalent," said James W. Davis, a political science professor at Washington University in St. Louis.

But even by these standards, this contest for Missouri's 11 electoral votes is looking like a very close call, polls suggest.

One poll, taken by Zogby International and published on Sept. 10 in The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, showed Mr. Gore with a slight lead ^× 45 percent to Mr. Bush's 40 percent. But with a margin of sampling error of 4 percentage points, that lead is decisively soft.

"Bush, I think, isn't regarded worse than he was," Professor Davis said. "He hasn't come down so much as Gore has come up."

In the poll, Mr. Gore's strongest support was in St. Louis. Outside the cities, he and Mr. Bush were statistically tied.

The candidates or their running mates have been visiting Missouri almost once a week.

The issues on the minds of Missourians are not too different from those preoccupying other voters. Education, health care and Social Security are most important, with farmers worried about agricultural policy.

John Hancock, the executive director of the State Republican Party, said he was optimistic, partly because much of Missouri is still quite rural, and Democrats have trouble in rural states, he said.

Roy Temple, executive director of the Missouri Democratic Party, said the suburbs were the real battleground. Mr. Gore is "aggressively campaigning here and I think that's making a
difference," he said.

Politics is certainly on the brain in Missouri this year. There is a tight Senate race between the Republican incumbent, John Ashcroft, and Gov. Mel Carnahan. There are contests for governor, two Congressional seats and four other state offices.

And with the presidential race, "as neck and neck as it is," Mr. Davis said, "everyone might think that their vote might make a difference."

-- PAM BELLUCK

Georgia Could Be Big Test for Bush

Georgia has not spent much time this year on anyone's list of hotly competitive states, but its unusual demographics could make it an important testing ground for Mr. Bush's ability to hold on to his base. Though Mr. Bush is still ahead here, his lead is narrow, and political professionals say there is no better place to gauge his national strength in the weeks ahead.

"If Georgia turns out to be close, that means Gore will win nationally," said Bobby Kahn, chief of staff for Gov. Roy E. Barnes and a leading Democratic strategist in the state.

The state has always been comfortable with centrist Democrats like Mr. Barnes and Senator Max Cleland, but like the rest of the South, it remains suspicious of Democratic presidential tickets. While Georgia did vote for Bill Clinton in 1992, that was mostly because Ross Perot drew support away from George Bush; four years later, Mr. Clinton drew more votes than in 1992, but was narrowly beaten by Bob Dole for the state's 13 electoral votes.

This teetering political balance is sustained by three distinct voting groups: African-Americans in Atlanta and a few smaller cities, who vote Democratic; suburbanites, many of them newcomers, in the growing rings around Atlanta, who tend to be Republican but will support centrist Democrats, and rural voters, who are less tied to party affiliations.

Black voters in Georgia tend to be better organized than in other Southern states, and their turnout, along with that of white suburban women, will be the key to the outcome, pollsters
say. Two polls taken for each of the major
parties since the convention showed Mr. Bush with
leads of 6 and 7 percentage points, but both were
fairly conservative with their estimates of black
turnout. Both parties acknowledge that if black
turnout is higher than it was for Mr. Barnes's
election in 1998, the race will be much closer.

As a result, the Democrats will be concentrating
on getting out black voters, hoping that the
former Democratic Gov. Zell Miller's popular
Senate candidacy will bring along suburbanites.
Mr. Bush has already begun running television
advertisements in the state's largest markets,
unlike Mr. Gore; but both sides are expected to
spend a considerable amount of money and time in
the state beginning next month.

-- DAVID FIRESTONE

Poll Finds Dead Heat
In New Hampshire

New Hampshire could fall either way. Mr. Bush had
been leading slightly in recent months, but the
latest poll by the University of New Hampshire
Survey Center has Mr. Bush and Mr. Gore tied at
42 percent. About 10 percent said they preferred
other candidates and 6 percent remained
undecided.

Historically, the state had been a good bet for
Republican presidential candidates, until Mr.
Clinton was victorious here twice. The governor,
Jeanne Shaheen, is a Democrat in her second term,
and made Mr. Gore's short list of possible
running mates. Still, 37 percent of registered
voters are Republicans, compared with 27 percent
who are Democrats.

Mr. Bush probably has uncomfortable memories of
New Hampshire because of his stinging loss to
Senator John McCain in the primary in February,
but polls indicate he has won back most of those
Republican votes. The polls show that each
candidate can count on about three-quarters of
his party's registered voters and will need to
secure the rest, as well as win over a
substantial number of independents, to prevail.
New Hampshire residents like to vote, usually
insuring a good turnout.

In the last few weeks, each candidate made his
first campaign visit to New Hampshire since the
primaries, and both made appearances at public
schools. Voters in the state are particularly
concerned with the local issue of education
financing, as was made clear by the contentious debates that led up to Tuesday's statewide primaries. Taxes are, as always here, a biting concern.

New Hampshire is by far Bush's best chance of a victory in New England, and in recent weeks he has been running more ads here than his competition.

-- JULIE FLAHERTY
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WASHINGTON, Sept. 16 -- Vice President Al Gore, who has erased Gov. George W. Bush's lead in most national polls, has also edged ahead of him in the battle for electoral votes, according to independent and partisan analysts. But despite the postconvention trend in Mr. Gore's favor, enough states are either tossups or held so narrowly that the race remains fiercely competitive.

The overall picture is almost a mirror image of how things looked before the Republican National Convention, when Mr. Bush held a slim but decided lead in the Electoral College.

But major states that had leaned Mr. Bush's way, like Florida, Michigan, Missouri and Wisconsin, have since become tossups, according to strategists in both campaigns, as well as postconvention polls and political scientists interviewed around the country. Similarly, earlier tossup states like Minnesota, New Jersey and Pennsylvania are now leaning toward Mr. Gore.

Both sides are fighting hard in the battleground states. This week, for example, the Bush campaign and the Republican National Committee were buying television time costing $995,000 in Pennsylvania, $719,000 in Michigan and $665,000 in Ohio. Television spending by the Gore campaign and the Democratic National Committee was $763,000 in Pennsylvania, $632,000 in Michigan and $745,000 in Ohio.

Although the campaigns did not disagree sharply about how most states stood, they offered very different interpretations of what the current standings meant. Matthew Dowd, the Bush campaign's internal pollster, said: "This race is right now nationally within one or two points. Electorally, we both are starting out with about the same amount of states in our safe column. Then there are 10 or 12 states that are sort of up for grabs, even, or us up a little in some, or them up in some."
Tad Devine, a Gore strategist, argued that the trend in Mr. Gore’s favor was continuing. “Gore's advantage in critical battlegrounds has grown enormously and is continuing to grow,” he said. "I think it's a different world coming out of the convention. The race is much more settled. Voters have a much more serious take on the race." But, he conceded, "It's a long way from Election Day."

Before the conventions, it was the Bush campaign claiming a lead and the Gore campaign maintaining that there was essentially a dead heat in the contest for the 270 electoral votes that make a majority of the 538 to be cast.

For now, the vice president appears safe in 10 states, with 142 electoral votes, including California, New York and now Connecticut. Eight others, with 97 electoral votes, are leaning his way, with such additions as Washington and Iowa.

If all those states stayed in Mr. Gore's column, he would have 239 electoral votes, and to win he would need to find 31 others from 10 tossup states with 98 electoral votes.

Governor Bush holds commanding leads in 17 states, but only 3 of them, Indiana, Texas and Virginia, have more than 10 electoral votes. The 17 have a total of 132 votes. Six more states, with 69 electoral votes, lean his way, though the margins in some, like Ohio and Colorado, have slipped.

If Mr. Bush held those 23 states, he would have 201 electoral votes. So to win, he would need 69 of the 98 votes from those 10 tossup states.

The financial advantage held by the Republican National Committee over its Democratic counterpart could help him win the tossup states. In some of those states, even ones Democrats think they can win, Democrats are not yet advertising on television. And while the Republican margins are narrow in many states, in some others they are huge. For example, this week's Florida spending showed $1,026,000 backing Mr. Bush and $330,000 on Mr. Gore's side.

But even as the campaigns put differing emphases on different states as they seek 270 electoral votes, their fortunes in the states are hardly independent of the national trends that have favored Mr. Gore in recent weeks. These include his growing strength in how voters perceive his personal qualities and a deepening advantage over his signature health care issues.
John Petrocik, chairman of the political science department at the University of Missouri in Columbia, said he thought Mr. Bush's lead in Missouri had declined because "a large component of how you are doing in every given state is how you're doing nationally."

"What determines whether he carries Missouri does not just happen in Missouri," Mr. Petrocik said.

One national hazard for the Republicans is the recent, and perhaps exaggerated, sense that Mr. Bush is in trouble. When Republican strategists say of the Bush campaign, as one did this week, "They have to almost draw a royal straight flush to win "x almost," then followers may get discouraged, too.

Ed Sarpolus, a Michigan pollster, said one reason for Mr. Bush's decline in that state, and elsewhere in the Midwest, was a growing number of Republicans' "losing confidence in George Bush."

In The Detroit Free Press today, a poll he conducted reported a Gore lead of 45 percent to 37 percent for Mr. Bush. Another factor in Mr. Gore's gains in Michigan has been a sharp drop in support for Ralph Nader of the Green Party.

But in several important states, Republicans were optimistic that a new emphasis on voter turnout would pull them through. Al Cardenas, chairman of the Florida Republican Party, said his state was a tossup. "I didn't feel that way a few months ago," Mr. Cardenas said. And though he said the state could go either way, he argued that the Republicans' advantage lay in "a much better ground operation, a much more comprehensive ground attack in terms of our phone banks and absentee ballots."

In Wisconsin, Rod Hise, executive director of the State Republican Party, insisted that party members "haven't been as excited, enthusiastic and energetic as they are about this one for a very long time."

"The opportunity that Republicans in Wisconsin have to contribute to a Bush victory in November has really electrified the grass roots of our party here," Mr. Hise said. "The foot soldiers are ready for battle. That is a dynamic that has not always been the case."

But if Mr. Hise was encouraged, so was Senator Russell D. Feingold, Democrat of Wisconsin. Mr.
Feingold said, "This surge since the convention has really got me far more optimistic."

"We've made up enormous ground," he said. Agreeing with Mr. Hise that the race was even in Wisconsin, Mr. Feingold argued that Mr. Gore had come through much better as a person, and was helped by health care issues and his emphasis on Social Security over tax cuts "x positions "clearly in tune with most Wisconsinites."

Two battleground states that appear to have shifted sharply are New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Although Chuck Haytaian, the Republican state chairman in New Jersey, predicted a narrow Bush victory "by 25,000 votes," an independent pollster, Cliff Zukin of Rutgers University, said he thought the state was leaning strongly to Mr. Gore.

Mr. Zukin, director of the Star- Ledger Eagleton Rutgers poll, said that at the Democratic National Convention and later, Mr. Gore "was sounding populist themes which resonate well in New Jersey."

Though much attention in the presidential race has been paid to the battles for large electoral-jackpot states like Florida and Michigan, the candidates have not ignored the rest of the country. Following are examinations of the status of the campaign in several states where the race is considered close.

Close Calls in Oregon And Washington

Though voters in Oregon and Washington State rejected Mr. Bush's father in both 1988 and 1992 and gave President Clinton a wide margin of victory four years ago, the Texas governor has repeatedly said he expects the Pacific Northwest to be highly competitive.

The latest polls agree, showing Mr. Bush barely behind Mr. Gore in Washington and essentially even with him in Oregon.

Mr. Bush has made repeated visits to the Northwest, most recently last week, in which he criticized Mr. Gore's environmental record but also reiterated his staunch opposition to proposals to help salmon runs by breaching dams in eastern Washington. Such proposals are favored by many environmentalists but are anathema in
many communities in the affected region.

Mr. Bush could be helped by a variety of factors, one of which is the strong popularity in some Northwestern cities of Mr. Nader, who drew 10,000 people to a rally in Portland, Ore., recently and who, most analysts say, draws many more left-leaning voters from Mr. Gore than he does from Mr. Bush.

In Washington State, Mr. Bush could be helped by a strong turnout for Mr. Nader, by his stand on dams that could energize a vote in parts of eastern Washington, and perhaps even by lingering resentment in the home state of Microsoft to the federal government's antitrust case against the software giant.

A poll of 500 Washington voters taken for KING-TV in Seattle last week indicated that Mr. Gore was at 45 percent, Mr. Bush at 41 percent, Mr. Nader at 5 percent and Patrick J. Buchanan of the Reform Party at 1 percent, with the rest undecided. The survey had a margin of sampling error of 4 percentage points.

A separate Washington State survey by Moore Information of Portland, which has polled for many Republican candidates in the region, found Mr. Gore at 44 percent, Mr. Bush at 43 percent and Mr. Nader at 4 percent.

That poll also was of 500 voters, with a margin of sampling error of 4 percentage points. But a Democratic pollster, Mark Mellman, conducting a regular tracking survey of 200 voters for an upcoming United States Senate primary, found Mr. Gore in the lead by roughly 10 points.

In Oregon, a poll taken this week for The Oregonian and KATU-TV showed Mr. Nader at 8 percent, leaving Mr. Gore with 42 percent, virtually tied with Mr. Bush at 41 percent. About 8 percent of those surveyed were undecided, and the support for Mr. Buchanan was negligible.

-- SAM HOWE VERHOVEK

Gun Plan Shows Bush Isn't Solid in Colorado

One of the early signs that Colorado's eight electoral votes may no longer be a sure bet for Mr. Bush is a ballot initiative to require background checks of those buying guns at weekend shows.
Sponsors collected more than 85,000 signatures supporting the measure, which Republicans have historically opposed as more gun control, and it is expected to win overwhelmingly in November.

Democrat pollsters have also begun to see enough growing support for Democratic candidates for the State Senate, which Republicans have controlled for 40 years, that Democratic leaders say they believe they can overcome the current five-seat margin.

Then, said the Democrats' state party chairman, Tim Knaus, Mr. Gore's message on growth, environment, education and the economy began to catch on, and all of a sudden the presidential race in the state appears to be a dead heat.

The latest statewide poll, conducted this month for The Rocky Mountain News and KCNC, the CBS affiliate in Denver, found that Mr. Gore had closed the advantage Mr. Bush held in July, 45 percent to 31 percent, to a virtual tie of 43 to 40, with Mr. Gore inside the margin of error of 4 percentage points.

"That was huge news," Mr. Knaus said. "I was actually taken aback by how much momentum there was. I had been hoping we were within 10 points."

Gov. Bill Owens, who is serving as Mr. Bush's state campaign chairman, said he did not believe the poll and pointed to another, conducted by a firm that he and other Colorado Republicans use, that showed Mr. Bush with a lead "above 10 points."

Yet, he conceded: "The race has obviously narrowed, and Governor Bush has had some difficult weeks. But campaigns run in cycles and after a tough month that left us essentially even, we have a nice base to go back up."

Colorado has recently shown an independent streak in presidential elections, supporting Bill Clinton over President Bush in 1992 by 4 percentage points and Bob Dole over Mr. Clinton four years later by 2 points in a race in which third-party candidates won 10 percent of the vote.

But as one measure of the apparent shift back, the Democrats are investing more capital in Colorado, with Mr. Gore's running mate, Senator Joseph I. Lieberman of Connecticut, visiting today, to be followed by Mr. Gore's daughter
Kristen next week. And talks are under way to bring in Mr. Gore.

Mr. Owens said he welcomed the visits. "I'm confident enough Coloradans will support Governor Bush," he said. "So every dollar they spend here takes it out of states they have a better chance of winning."

-- MICHAEL JANOFSKY

Stiff Fight to Sway
New Mexico Voters

New Mexico has been a reliable national bellwether in presidential politics. In every presidential race except one since it became a state in 1912, New Mexico has supported the winner, often close to the margin as the nation as a whole. The lone exception came in 1976 when the state backed Gerald R. Ford.

This may help explain why both Mr. Gore and Mr. Bush already have both visited this state with only five electoral votes and likely will come again before Election Day.

This weekend, The Albuquerque Journal is scheduled to release a poll that declares the race a statistical tie. The poll of 553 likely and registered voters gave Mr. Bush 43 percent and Mr. Gore 42 percent, with 11 percent remaining undecided. The poll, conducted by Research and Polling Inc., was taken from Sept. 7-13. Neither Mr. Bush nor Mr. Gore has an apparent reason for claiming momentum; a March poll found the two candidates tied.

Mr. Bush has courted Hispanic voters aggressively, and New Mexico would seem fertile ground for this appeal, since Hispanic residents make up about 41 percent of the state's population. But The Journal poll shows Mr. Gore with a lead among Hispanics, 57 percent to 25 percent.

"The Hispanic vote is critical for any Democratic presidential candidate to win here, and by a good margin, too," said F. Chris Garcia, a University of New Mexico political science professor, who noted that a strong Hispanic showing carried Mr. Clinton to victory in 1992 and 1996.

Mr. Garcia cited issues such as health care, education and Social Security as those important to voters but noted that no single issue seemingly stands out. There are about 918,000
registered voters (out of a state population of 1.7 million), with about 54 percent as Democrats, 33 percent as Republicans and the rest affiliated with other parties. Still, Mr. Garcia said the state was slowly becoming more conservative.

-- JIM YARDLEY

By All Standards
It's Close in Missouri

In the world of politics, Missouri is a curious hybrid.

It has two major cities: Kansas City with a Western flavor, St. Louis with an Eastern edge. It has large rural areas that resemble the Deep South. And it has fast-growing suburbs.

Missouri, with a Democratic governor and two Republican senators, tends to seesaw in presidential contests. In all but one election since 1900, the state has voted for the winning presidential candidate. (The exception was 1956, when Missouri went for Adlai Stevenson over Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

"I don't know whether to say we're a bipartisan state or simply ambivalent," said James W. Davis, a political science professor at Washington University in St. Louis.

But even by these standards, this contest for Missouri's 11 electoral votes is looking like a very close call, polls suggest.

One poll, taken by Zogby International and published on Sept. 10 in The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, showed Mr. Gore with a slight lead ^x 45 percent to Mr. Bush's 40 percent. But with a margin of sampling error of 4 percentage points, that lead is decisively soft.

"Bush, I think, isn't regarded worse than he was," Professor Davis said. "He hasn't come down so much as Gore has come up."

In the poll, Mr. Gore's strongest support was in St. Louis. Outside the cities, he and Mr. Bush were statistically tied.

The candidates or their running mates have been visiting Missouri almost once a week.

The issues on the minds of Missourians are not too different from those preoccupying other
voters. Education, health care and Social Security are most important, with farmers worried about agricultural policy.

John Hancock, the executive director of the State Republican Party, said he was optimistic, partly because much of Missouri is still quite rural, and Democrats have trouble in rural states, he said.

Roy Temple, executive director of the Missouri Democratic Party, said the suburbs were the real battleground. Mr. Gore is "aggressively campaigning here and I think that's making a difference," he said.

Politics is certainly on the brain in Missouri this year. There is a tight Senate race between the Republican incumbent, John Ashcroft, and Gov. Mel Carnahan. There are contests for governor, two Congressional seats and four other state offices.

And with the presidential race, "as neck and neck as it is," Mr. Davis said, "everyone might think that their vote might make a difference."

-- PAM BELLUCK

Georgia Could Be Big Test for Bush

Georgia has not spent much time this year on anyone's list of hotly competitive states, but its unusual demographics could make it an important testing ground for Mr. Bush's ability to hold on to his base. Though Mr. Bush is still ahead here, his lead is narrow, and political professionals say there is no better place to gauge his national strength in the weeks ahead.

"If Georgia turns out to be close, that means Gore will win nationally," said Bobby Kahn, chief of staff for Gov. Roy E. Barnes and a leading Democratic strategist in the state.

The state has always been comfortable with centrist Democrats like Mr. Barnes and Senator Max Cleland, but like the rest of the South, it remains suspicious of Democratic presidential tickets. While Georgia did vote for Bill Clinton in 1992, that was mostly because Ross Perot drew support away from George Bush; four years later, Mr. Clinton drew more votes than in 1992, but was narrowly beaten by Bob Dole for the state's 13 electoral votes.
This teetering political balance is sustained by three distinct voting groups: African-Americans in Atlanta and a few smaller cities, who vote Democratic; suburbanites, many of them newcomers, in the growing rings around Atlanta, who tend to be Republican but will support centrist Democrats, and rural voters, who are less tied to party affiliations.

Black voters in Georgia tend to be better organized than in other Southern states, and their turnout, along with that of white suburban women, will be the key to the outcome, pollsters say. Two polls taken for each of the major parties since the convention showed Mr. Bush with leads of 6 and 7 percentage points, but both were fairly conservative with their estimates of black turnout. Both parties acknowledge that if black turnout is higher than it was for Mr. Barnes's election in 1998, the race will be much closer.

As a result, the Democrats will be concentrating on getting out black voters, hoping that the former Democratic Gov. Zell Miller's popular Senate candidacy will bring along suburbanites. Mr. Bush has already begun running television advertisements in the state's largest markets, unlike Mr. Gore; but both sides are expected to spend a considerable amount of money and time in the state beginning next month.

-- DAVID FIRESTONE

Poll Finds Dead Heat
In New Hampshire

New Hampshire could fall either way. Mr. Bush had been leading slightly in recent months, but the latest poll by the University of New Hampshire Survey Center has Mr. Bush and Mr. Gore tied at 42 percent. About 10 percent said they preferred other candidates and 6 percent remained undecided.

Historically, the state had been a good bet for Republican presidential candidates, until Mr. Clinton was victorious here twice. The governor, Jeanne Shaheen, is a Democrat in her second term, and made Mr. Gore's short list of possible running mates. Still, 37 percent of registered voters are Republicans, compared with 27 percent who are Democrats.

Mr. Bush probably has uncomfortable memories of New Hampshire because of his stinging loss to Senator John McCain in the primary in February,
but polls indicate he has won back most of those Republican votes. The polls show that each candidate can count on about three-quarters of his party's registered voters and will need to secure the rest, as well as win over a substantial number of independents, to prevail. New Hampshire residents like to vote, usually insuring a good turnout.

In the last few weeks, each candidate made his first campaign visit to New Hampshire since the primaries, and both made appearances at public schools. Voters in the state are particularly concerned with the local issue of education financing, as was made clear by the contentious debates that led up to Tuesday's statewide primaries. Taxes are, as always here, a biting concern.

New Hampshire is by far Bush's best chance of a victory in New England, and in recent weeks he has been running more ads here than his competition.

-- JULIE FLAHERTY
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Can someone point me to a survey that has asked Americans their perceptions of the percentage of the U.S. population that are African American, Asian American, etc.? I recall reading results of this type some years ago, but I haven't been able to put my finger on them.
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